



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.19

May 23rd, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"We are a British community in the South Seas and regard ourselves as the trustees for the British way of life in a part of the world where it is of the utmost significance that there should be in the Antipodes a people and a territory corresponding in purpose and its outlook to the Motherland itself."*

– Australian Prime Minister John Curtin in his 1994 address to the British House of Commons

BUDGET A MANIFESTATION OF INVINCIBLE STUPIDITY by Eric D. Butler:

The wise Confucius warned that it was folly to run even harder on the wrong road. But in spite of the predictions of last year's Federal budget having been proved wrong, John Howard and his Treasurer Peter Costello doggedly continue down the same disaster course. Costello's reliability as a commentator may be judged by his absurd claim that the Pauline Hanson *One Nation* party is a front for the dreaded League of Rights. Treasurer Costello confesses that last year's Budget predictions, that unemployment would fall, had unfortunately not come about. But just you wait until this time next year, says Treasurer Costello. But there is nothing in his budget to suggest that there will be any fall in the unemployment rate. It is as certain as the sunrise that there will be no relief for Australia's youth. In all the chatter about the budget there has been relatively little comment concerning the significance of the proposal to encourage those eligible to retire, to stay in the work force for a few extra years. This proposal is the very opposite of what could be done to start to remove a major political and social time bomb: high youth unemployment. What is required is a financial policy which encourages workers to retire at an earlier age, this helping to make it easier for the young to become employed. Contrary to what the radical feminists say, the great majority of married women with young children would prefer to devote themselves full time to their homes and families – **if it were made financially possible.**

A recent study, **Divided Nation**, the result of a joint project of the Institute of Public Affairs and the Melbourne University's Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, concludes that the real rate of unemployment in Australia is higher than the official figures of approximately 8 percent. The report says that the official figures underestimate the unemployment level by ignoring that large numbers are only part time workers while many have become so discouraged that they are no longer looking for work, but have become dependent on welfare. Unemployment levels among the young are at least 20 percent. The best that the Howard Government can offer are bandaid proposals such as "Work for the Dole", which leave untouched the basic question of how to ensure that the young, the future of the nation, have an outlet for their creative energies. The "Work for the Dole" programme is motivated primarily by political considerations. Large numbers of hard-pressed taxpayers are naturally receptive

to the argument that their taxes are being used to finance a debauched youth which increasingly turns to drugs or becomes involved in violent crime. Those best qualified to express an opinion, those working with the young unemployed, stress that there is a close relationship between the rising drug problem and unemployment. Police spokesmen frankly admit that they are losing the battle against the increase in trafficking of hard drugs like heroin. While the destruction of young lives by a growing drug culture is tragic, just as tragic is the high suicide rate among the young. This rate is highest among young males. It is particularly high among young rural males, who have become increasingly depressed by what is a loss of self esteem. There is nothing in the Costello-Howard budget which offers anything of value to these young Australians.

In one of his major works, "*The Monopoly of Credit*", C.H. Douglas, the author of Social Credit, published a graph showing how in times of acute economic depression suicide rates increase as desperate people see no way out of their problems. And they are not helped by what Douglas described as the "invincible stupidity" of the economic "experts" and brainwashed politicians. A product of his own background, John Howard is the classic example of invincible stupidity. Thank God he was not Prime Minister of Australia during the most perilous days of the Pacific war, or he would have been telling Australians that they could not use their vast resources to defend themselves because of a lack of foreign investment. Having gained a glimpse of reality through his study of Social Credit, Labor Prime Minister John Curtin took steps to ensure that artificial financial restrictions were removed to make a maximum war effort possible. Has government also demonstrated that the inflation problem, resulting from massive credit expansion, could be eliminated by a system of consumer price discounts.

Attempting to answer what Pauline Hanson is suggesting, John Howard makes the statement that "The only way you can reduce foreign investment is to reduce the need for it and that is to generate greater savings so that we don't have to borrow the savings of foreigners to finance consumption". It was this type of economic gibberish early in the Second World War, the claim being that the war effort could only be financed out of savings, or taxes, which resulted in the Menzies Government being swept from office to be later replaced by John Curtin. Anyone who cannot see that whatever economic activities needed in Australia can be financed without pawning the nation to international bankers, has nothing to offer Australia at a time when its situation is as perilous as it was during the Second World War. If the nation cannot find constructive and necessary economic activities to absorb the energies of the young, then those energies will be used for destructive purposes.

Former Labor Member Graeme Campbell appears to be the only Federal politician reflecting the spirit of John Curtin and many of his colleagues. But at least Pauline Hanson is bringing some commonsense to bear by indicting the **direction** in which Australia must move for salvation. It is time to sweep the economic rationalists and their absurd theories aside, to be replaced with commonsense. John Howard is clearly a cotsack, suffering from invincible economic stupidity and he must be moved off the Australian political stage as quickly as possible. His pension will ensure that he does not have to suffer what he has helped to inflict on others.

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO GRAEME CAMPBELL? by David Thompson:

Since the intensity of political attention has focused on Pauline Hanson and her *One Nation*, little has been heard of Graeme Campbell and *Australia First* in the big daily press, and the current affairs programmes. Has Campbell packed up, gone home, and left it all to Hanson?

No, he has not. In fact, Campbell has supported Hanson in a personal capacity, and encouraged her to

continue hitting the issues in the face of severe intimidation. At the same time, he has continued to patiently construct a sound political base with *Australia First*, and continues to address public meetings around the country. *Australia First* has now been registered as a political party in Queensland and N.S.W., and is preparing to contest the Queensland State elections.

As *One Nation* has risen in the opinion polls to become a theoretical electoral threat to the Coalition – National Party in particular – increasing attention has been focused on **what specific policies** Pauline Hanson's party will propose. Hanson herself has been vague on this in some cases, pleading (justifiably) that *One Nation* has just been born, and much consultation and research must be undertaken before hard policies can be presented.

Last week, ABC television approached Hanson and Campbell to do a joint interview. Breaking a habit of refusing to do taped interviews with the ABC, Campbell agreed to take part. When Hanson was asked for policy detail on matters such as trade, foreign investment, etc., she deferred to Campbell, saying that since he had much better developed policy suggestions on such issues, he should answer the question. We are informed that Campbell did so, competently and succinctly, dealing in particular with the highly relevant steel industry and BHP.

The interview was screened by the ABC on Friday, May 16th, but **not once did Campbell appear** in any part of the interview! He had been completely edited out. No explanation was offered, and no reference to Campbell at all. Perhaps what he had to say was irrelevant? Perhaps Hanson is the "hot" issue, not Campbell? Then why go to the trouble to invite Campbell to take part at all? In our view, the ideological enemies of Pauline Hanson and Graeme Campbell (for they are the same enemies) would prefer that Campbell's sharper, more focused and more competently-argued policy suggestions were not widely available in an environment of intense interest in **the same issues** pursued by Hanson.

CAMPBELL COULD YET BE THE KEY: The public meeting he addressed in Adelaide last week is a demonstration that Campbell has not "gone away". The meeting was well attended, Campbell spoke brilliantly, local press covered the event and Campbell was interviewed on radio. Being a political realist, in dealing with *One Nation*, Campbell made the point that even if all combined, the smaller political parties simply lack the numbers to challenge the entrenched major party blocs. What was required, said Campbell, was to combine **on issues** to force policy changes and political concessions from the major parties. The evidence is that this is already starting to occur on questions such as immigration policy, and tariffs on imported cars.

The Campbell strategy reflects our views, that **changes in policy** are more important than starting new parties. Sometimes public pressure can force policy changes without new parties, sometimes a new party with clear and popular alternative policies can be promoted as a serious threat to the bigger parties, thereby forcing policy changes. Campbell has stressed on a number of occasions that the latter is the role of *Australia First*. The proposed role of *One Nation* on the other hand is not yet quite clear.

As has been reported in the press, Graeme Campbell faces a crisis in that he has been charged with "dangerous driving causing grievous bodily harm" under the N.S.W. Traffic Act, and a similar offence under the N.S.W. Crimes Act. At the time, Campbell admitted that he did not see a motorcyclist to whom he should have given way, resulting in an injury to the cyclist. There was no alcohol involved, and N.S.W. police did not proceed with prosecutions. However, the Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions in N.S.W. has decided that Campbell must face the above charges, one of which carries

335. 405
ONT
a possible prison sentence of one year. According to Section 43 (ii) of the Constitution, if Campbell is convicted of this offence, he is disqualified from sitting in Parliament.

This is a serious threat to Campbell, and the question of political intrigue has not yet been ruled out. He is determined to defend the charges, heard on August 1st, pointing out that legal advice indicates that proof of **intent** to cause grievous bodily harm is required to secure his conviction.

It is clear that, while Pauline Hanson is receiving high profile media attention, Graeme Campbell is regarded as just as serious a threat by the economic rationalists, and the political elites. While no real objection is made to intensive coverage of Hanson profiles, rallies, etc., these political elites in press and Parliament are determined to prevent any serious public discussion of policy issues that could shift Australia from its present political course. Graeme Campbell has not gone away, and, in the end, could prove the key to securing those vital policy shifts.

MORE FARMERS TO BE FORCED OUT: It doesn't seem to matter whether it is an A.L.P. or Coalition Government – rural policy of continual "rationalisation" of farmers, and "down-sizing" of country towns, continues. Minister for Primary Industries, Mr. Anderson, has announced assistance measures to help up to 4,000 farm families to leave the land "with dignity". 3,000-4,000 farm families across eastern Australia were "blighted" by low commodity prices, drought, high debt and falling property prices, according to Anderson. Instead of the typical political shortsightedness of dealing with **the effects** of rural devastation – moving more farmers into the cities – even the National Party seems incapable of helping families to remain on their properties **"with dignity"**. This could be done by dealing with the **causes** of the problem. Long-term, low-interest finance is **essential** to maintain and restore a rural Australia that is vital to the national interest. How can Fischer, Howard, or any political leader stand by while rural Australia is denuded of people, and then refuse any future demands from, say, Red China, to re-settle a few million Chinese in areas which we clearly do not want to occupy? How many **more** farmers must be forced off their properties before Ministers like Anderson can say "enough is enough"? Does Mr. Anderson have an optimum number of farmers in mind? Does he have a long-term rural policy? Does he have a clue?

HUMBUG FROM INDONESIA: "*The Indonesian Observer*" warned last week of damaged relations between Asia and Australia over Pauline Hanson's policies on immigration, etc. An editorial entitled *Hanson Will Haunt Australia* said, "She holds dangerous views. These views have been blamed for a rising number of racial attacks on Asians in that country . . .". The paper then calls on Australians to "do something about this" before "Asia" concludes that we are a "racist" country. Such humbug and effrontery are astounding! Even now the racial frictions within Indonesia continue to simmer dangerously. Since before Christmas, Chinese homes, churches, temples and property have been torched in political riots in Indonesia, with Islamic groups in particular involved. Chinese Indonesians have been murdered. Why does not the Prime Minister of Indonesia condemn "racist" attitudes that lead to such outrages? Because he knows that a declaration for multiculturalism and equality in Indonesia, predominantly Islamic, would direct the same attacks upon himself?

The April edition of *Intelligence Survey* carries a most revealing article, *Who are the Real Racists?*, in which the racially-inspired policies of a number of Asian countries are studied. Perhaps it should be sent to the "*Indonesian Observer*". Such double standards should be exposed as simply a form of intimidation to which the West has shown repeated weakness. We recommend the incredible book "*The Asian Mind Game*" by Chin-ning Chu (\$24.00 posted) for a realistic understanding of "Asia".