



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.29

August 1st, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"There is no surer indication of the misdirection in the affairs of any country than a continuous rise in the cost of living which, it should be borne in mind, includes the involuntary losses of the individual in taxes, rates, and extortions, as well as his expenditure. The idea that high taxation prevents inflation is ignorance or worse. It is nearly irrelevant whether the misdirection proceeds from incompetence or Fifth Column treason. We are of the opinion that both are in evidence... Since observing this phenomenon at close quarters, we have always been sceptical of incompetence in high places. Not as to the existence of it, but as to the accident of its existence."*

– C.H. Douglas, April 29th, 1950

TO CUT, OR NOT TO CUT; THIS IS THE QUESTION by Eric D. Butler:

As one contemplates the mass of confusing comments concerning whether interest rates should be cut further, one is reminded by the painful indecision of Hamlet in Shakespeare's famous play. *"To be or not to be, that was the question"* Hamlet contemplated. But unlike Hamlet, there is no evidence that those considering whether or not to cut interest rates, are contemplating shuffling of "this mortal coil": rather the opposite. It appears that Federal Treasurer Peter Costello and those who think as he does are not in favour of a further cut in interest rates, arguing that the past cuts have yet "to work their way through the system". And there is always the fear that some unforeseen development might require an increase in interest rates. Such an increase could be disastrous if too close to the next Federal elections. The politicians, particularly those in marginal seats, have no intention, if at all possible, of "shuffling" off the political coil – at least not until they have their future pensions secured. Their approach to the question of interest rates is governed primarily by their own self interests.

But it is clear that the politicians have no more understanding of the realities of the finance-economic system than have the certified economic "experts", who appear to be baffled by the fact that past interest cuts have failed to stimulate the economy and have any effect on unemployment. Those living in the real world know that far more than reductions in interest rates are required to have any serious effect on the economy. A reduction of interest rates to zero would not **of itself** overcome the deep fear of unemployment which permeates the whole community. What is the value of a low interest rate loan for a house or a new business if one finds oneself suddenly out of a job? The high bankruptcy rate and the continuing high unemployment is stark evidence of the grim reality of the situation.

This is not to say that reduced interest rates do not have a marginal value for some. But there are those who have been attempting to live on the investments of their past savings. Generally speaking, the reduction in the cost of living does not offset the loss of income from interest bearing investments. Under the present debt system of finance-economics, there can only be relatively few winners with the great majority losing. Thus the spectacle of the few becoming even richer with the great majority becoming more stressed.

Anyone who has taken the trouble to attend the League of Rights' Social Dynamics Schools knows that it is mathematically impossible to maintain the present economic system without an expansion of total financial debt, both private and public, with crushing taxation essential in an attempt to service the debts, and that a rising cost of living is inevitable. Attempts to slow the rising cost of living by the type of measures which Paul Keating used (remember the Keating quip about "the depression we had to have"?) and which Treasurer Costello is applying with even greater vigour, merely increases growing social tensions.

One reaction to the situation is that there must be a massive expansion of new credits for some type of capital works programme. Mr. B.A. Santamaria, who appears to be a late convert to some type of monetary reform, quoting material which has been well known to Social Crediters for over half a century, has now been joined by a group of businessmen headed by prominent business executive David Mortimer, who urge that an extra \$1 billion be spent on industrial projects over the next five years. Even this relatively modest palliative is at present rejected by Treasurer Costello and his "experts". Clearly there is division in the Federal Cabinet about what should be done.

Appealing to the past is of little value unless the appropriate lessons are learned. A massive expansion of new financial credits for the Second World War certainly "solved", for a period, the problem of "poverty amidst plenty". Massive destruction for war got rid of the plenty while the great majority had a paid job which either enabled them to buy the rationed consumer production, or to save for the future. But as demonstrated by Douglas, a massive expansion of capital production inevitably produces a big increase in price rises. It was not inflation which caused the Great Depression of the 'thirties, but the boom in capital production in the U.S.A. Inflation was the inevitable result of a massive expansion programme.

The Second World War demonstrated that the only effective answer to inflation was the introduction of a Consumer Discount System. Although crudely operated, the system was effective. The "experts", headed by Fabian D.H.C. Coombs, fought tooth and nail to ensure that the Consumer Price Discount system was never re-introduced. Clearly this was a **conscious** policy. It is difficult for the average generally uninformed individual to grasp that the present desperate situation has been compounded by a **long term policy** to force an economically defenceless Australia into what is known now as "The Global Economy". Last week the Victorian North Eastern city of Wangaratta saw some thousands march in a protest against the threatened loss of local industry jobs resulting from further tariff cuts. If those afraid of the destruction of yet another Australian industry, Yakka, were asked what connection there was between what was happening and a speech made over 20 years ago by the then American Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger, they would almost certainly look extremely puzzled.

But it was in the early 70s that Dr. Kissinger, closely associated with International Banking, told representatives of the United Nations that the time had come when sovereign nations could no longer solve their own problems; they had to come together in a New International Economic Order. "Free trade" had to be developed worldwide. Starting with Gough Whitlam and his Fabians, Australian politicians started to fall into line. Here and there even a few orthodox economists issued warnings. But through the Universities and other centres of "Higher Learning", the gospel of economic rationalism, as it is now termed, was promulgated. The politicians have become victims of a gospel which in practice threatens the future of Australia. All this has not happened by chance. It is the result of conscious long term policy planning. There are several aspects of the situation which it is essential to bear in mind: No type of World State can possibly work. As the destructive results of the policy of global centralism become clearer, it becomes easier to explain to people the reality of Global Planning. This must then be followed by effective action. Pauline Hanson and her followers have stumbled into a minefield which they must either understand, or be ultimately destroyed. The League of Rights is correctly perceived as the one movement with sufficient knowledge and ability to offer constructive action. This is why the League of Rights is the target of the most venomous attacks.

Whether or not interest rates are reduced or increased is only a sideshow concerned with the major battle to be fought.

RUBBERY 1996 CENSUS RESULTS by David Thompson:

The national census conducted every five years may be more remarkable for what it does not tell us, rather than what it reveals. Anyone who has been pressured to fill in statistical forms for agriculture building, or other industries, knows full well that the figures, if not outright lies, are at best "rubbery".

Many of the things we need to know about Australia will never be revealed by the census. For example, how many illegal immigrants are now in Australia, and what is their country of origin or racial group? The census doesn't tell us, because those in this category are careful not to fill out a census form.

One result from the 1996 census is the information that between 1991 and 1996 the number of "indigenous people" increased by a massive 33%, from 265,458 to 352,970. Behind such an incredible increase lies a story which should be pursued, but has not been, perhaps because it is still not politically correct to do so.

"Indigenous people" in N.S.W. increased in number since the last census by **nearly 50%**, while the overall N.S.W. population increase was around 10%. What could be the explanation for this? Do "indigenous people" breed far more vigorously than others? The Bureau of Statistics report on the 1996 census offers the vague suggestion that the huge increase "is partly explained by people's increased willingness to declare their indigenous origin".

This is an interesting statement, pregnant with meaning. First it confirms that in the past there has been a reluctance to tell the Bureau the truth in some matters. Perhaps in many matters. It means that the figures for "indigenous people" in the past have been wrong. Or does it imply that since it is becoming fashionable/profitable to be "indigenous" now, others are claiming indigenous status to which they are not entitled? More to the point, it indicates that both the past census figures were incorrect, and so are the present figures.

Just who are indigenous people, anyway? Were we asked to categorise ourselves as "indigenous" or otherwise at census time, or were we asked for our cultural/racial origins, leaving the Department to decide whom was indigenous, and whom was not? What criteria have they adopted for "indigenous"? Is this bureaucratic code for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander? And just what is the definition of an Aborigine? Someone who can claim more Aboriginal than non-Aboriginal in their genetic background? Or simply someone who "feels like" an Aborigine? Are those with more European in their background than Aboriginal permitted to claim "Aboriginal" status? Of course.

As with most statistics, almost anything can be proven by manipulating the numbers of the 1996 census. Those who plan major business decisions on the bald figures, without significantly more analysis of what motivates us to describe ourselves as we do, may suffer serious disappointment.

JEWISH GOLD - PALISTINIAN LAND? The outrage and indignation expressed by Jewish leaders such as Mr. Isi Leibler over the tardiness of Swiss banks to release information concerning unclaimed bank accounts from the World War II era is a little overdone. An advertisement published in the Australian press last week (*The Australian*, 23/7/97) listed two pages of dormant accounts, and invites those who wish to make a claim for them, to do so. The advertisement advises that claims will be evaluated by an independent panel of arbitrators under "relaxed standards of proof".

The Swiss Bankers Association together with a committee of "Eminent Persons" has (somehow) identified the published accounts as those identified as belonging to Holocaust victims. There is no reason why the descendants of those who owned the bank accounts should not benefit from their contents, and the Swiss should be congratulated for their co-operation, even if it is belated.

However, those of Palestinian descent might ask whether the Israeli State is prepared to adopt the same approach to land, homes and other property that was stolen from their ancestors after World War II. While

many Jews claim to have been hounded out of Europe by the Nazis, so, too, do many Palestinians claim to have been hounded out of their homes by the same European Jews.

Many Palestinians in the Middle East can easily trace their ancestry back to property – sometimes homes still standing – confiscated from them by the Jewish immigrants from Europe. The Palestinians are often portrayed as something akin to "dirty Moslem terrorists", although it is generally overlooked that over 10% of the Palestinians are Christians, some of whom can trace their heritage through the centuries back to the New Testament Church.

The story of what **really** happened to bring the modern State of Israel into being has largely been suppressed as an inconvenient embarrassment to the Zionists. Palestinian Christians like Elias Chacour ("**Blood Brothers**"), Sami Hadawi ("**Bitter Harvest**") and Audeh Rantisi ("**Blessed Are The Peacemakers**") tell a harrowing story of how their families were dispossessed of their homes, villages, land and belongings by terrorist intimidation from the Zionists.

Others, like Ethel Mannin ("**Road to Beersheba**") and Colin Chapman ("**Whose Promised Land?**") tell the same story. One of the most notorious acts of terrorism was that of the Deir Yassin massacre of April 1948, deliberately designed to terrorise the Palestinian population, and frighten them from their homes. Menachem Begin, himself a terrorist leader, praised those who butchered over 250 people, writing "as in Deir Yassin, so everywhere, we will attack and smite the enemy.....".

Is there any suggestion that the Israeli State would consider offering to return the Palestinians' homes, land and belongings to their descendants? Is there any trace of indignation from leaders like Isi Leibler about the 49 years that have passed without Israel admitting that the real owners of some Israeli land have been either murdered or forced to take refuge in nearby countries?

"**Blood Brothers**" by Elias Chacour, \$12.00 (\$14.00 posted); "**Whose Promised Land?**" by Colin Chapman, \$13.00 (\$15.00 posted); "**Bitter Harvest**" by Sami Hadawi, \$15.00 (\$18.00 posted); from all League Book Services.

WILL PAULINE HANSON RUN FOR THE SENATE? Wayne Goss has announced that he intends to contest the seat of Oxley, presently held by Pauline Hanson, following a redistribution of electoral boundaries which might jeopardise Hanson's chances of holding the seat. It is notable that some new parts of the seat after redistribution, like Inala, contain high concentrations of Aboriginal people.

Oxley has traditionally been a **safe Labor seat**. The circumstances under which Miss Hanson won Oxley should be remembered. She was disendorsed by the Liberal Party after nominations were closed, and no Liberal candidate contested Oxley. It is clear that Hanson attracted the Liberal Party vote, and also a large proportion of those A.L.P. voters who saw an opportunity of voting against Paul Keating without having to vote Liberal to do so. Pauline Hanson was regarded as "the enemy of our enemy" by the tribal A.L.P. voters, and, therefore, as their friend.

It is almost certain that the above circumstances will not be repeated next time Oxley goes to the polls. If Mr. Goss contests Oxley, together with a Liberal Party candidate, Hanson must struggle to hold Oxley. Wayne Goss was once ranked as the nation's most popular political leader whilst Premier of Queensland. He sees leadership opportunities (perhaps even Prime Ministerial opportunities) opening up before him in a badly decimated A.L.P.

Pauline Hanson has been provided with an honourable reason for standing for the Senate: the political establishment has robbed her of her constituents by re-drawing the electoral boundaries. She can now appeal to a State-wide constituency as a Senate candidate.