



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.35

September 12th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"The urbanised masses, uprooted and cut loose from their own social traditions and ancestral memories, get no guidance; though their commonsense may reject the gospel of Marx, they can make no alternative faith out of academic subtleties or the false pseudo-sciences of fifty years ago which are still being hashed up and which have become the mental background of millions who have never read the original authors and have not heard of their successors. For Europe the Christian tradition has become associated in the minds of the largely dechristianised masses with the bourgeois 'camp', although in fact the long campaign against Christianity has been directed from within that camp."*

– Sir David Kelly in *The Hungry Sheep*

EXPLOITING THE TRAGEDY OF PRINCESS DIANA by Eric D. Butler:

There is an old Latin tag which in essence says that no one should speak ill of the dead, but it needs to be said that the unprecedented outpouring of emotions concerning the tragic death of the Princess of Wales, and the attempt to manipulate that emotion as part of an ongoing campaign to destroy the institution of Constitutional Monarchy and a British culture which is directly linked with that concept of Monarchy, requires a strong dose of realism at the present time. Such realism will not be found in the mass media, which during the week following the tragedy indicated the type of poison that is going to be used against the Royal Family in general, and against Prince Charles in particular. The tragedy must bear heaviest upon Prince Charles, whom some vulgar commentators have suggested that he was responsible for driving his wife out of the Royal Family and, therefore, indirectly to her death. Such illogical rubbish is a reflection of the intellectual rot of our times.

But, before attempting to apportion blame, the tragedy of the life and death of the Princess must be seen in perspective. The tragedy has all the makings of a classical Greek tragedy, and for that reason alone has gripped the imagination of millions around the world. The defenders of the Princess have constantly referred to her as a "modern" woman. Unfortunately she lived her life during a period when what is termed the modern world was progressively freeing itself from the roots of the past. As a young girl she felt the pain of a broken home. There was a constant feeling of insecurity. At the relatively young age of 19 she was being married to the man who was trained to be a King. Overnight she was being propelled towards international stardom. Clearly there were going to be stresses and strains, with no one close enough to the Princess to provide the type of advice a young married girl required. She and Prince Charles shared few basic common interests. Like many a young married bride, Princess Diana felt that with time she could change her husband. But by training and temperament Prince Charles is a traditionalist. Princess Diana was not, through no fault of her own.

All married couples are aware of the early adjustment problems in marriage. Princess Diana's eating problem merely accentuated the difficulties. Only those who have had to try to cope with anyone suffering from this

type of illness can understand what it means. Prince Charles found himself in a situation with which he did not understand and could not cope with while still fulfilling his public duties. The seeds of tragedy were growing out of control. The anti-Royalist media scented blood. With no one of real substance to whom she could turn, an unhappy young woman was vulnerable to the worst possible type of advice. An assortment of gurus were being consulted. Her five year adulterous affair with the unspeakable Hewitt and other liaisons were evidence of a deeply unhappy woman. A girl with a unique capacity to relate to people, Princess Diana's feverish energies found an outlet in her numerous charity works. She was a phenomenon. But it was her restlessness which made her vulnerable. The very mass media which helped to build her up as a type of movie star, has skilfully dripped in a deadly Republican poison.

In her famous BBC interview, in which she described the Royal Family as "the enemy" and expressed the view that Prince Charles was not fit to be King, Princess Diana unfortunately added more grist to the Republican mill, obviously without understanding the far reaching implications of what she was saying. Further grist to the Republican mill has been provided by Earl Spencer at Princess Diana's funeral service, with his attack on a Royal Family which had already broken with convention in order to demonstrate that, contrary to what the mass media was saying, they were also grieving for Princess Diana. While it is understandable how Princess Diana's brother felt about the death of his sister, his speech will be seen in retrospect as a manifestation of bad taste to tell Prince Charles to his face that in effect he was not capable of bringing up his own sons.

Whether the restless Princess Diana would have found genuine love with the billionaire playboy who died with her in a fatal car crash, for which he was much more responsible than the unfortunate Prince Charles, can only be speculated upon. Irrespective of whether the driver was drunk or not, it was an act of criminal folly to drive a car at such a high speed. Did no one in the car order the driver to slow down, or to stop? It was a tragic end to a tragic life, one which at one time appeared to offer so much.

It is certain that the Princess Diana tragedy, which is the stuff of which novels are written and films made, will result in the "re-appraisal" of the institution of Constitutional Monarchy. But there are already signs that the mass media will be used to foster a Princess Diana cult as part of a sinister campaign to completely abolish the concept of the Monarchical form of government. Even the Queen herself is being indirectly attacked, as one of the "enemy" which drove Princess Diana to act as she did. But the major target is Prince Charles who, with all the imperfections to which all human beings err (except, of course, the self appointed intellectuals) has indicated that he has some understanding of the importance of traditions in sustaining a nation.

What is required at the present time is some real intellectual meat in defence of the system of Constitutional Monarchy. What is the basic role of the Monarchy? Can that role be fulfilled if the Monarchy is expected to perform like some type of a Soap Opera? Should Princess Diana be remembered only as a beautiful young woman, tragically cut down in the prime of life because of her controversies with other members of the Royal Family, or should it not be stressed that her greatest legacy was that of life itself, the life of her two sons who represent the continuity of a nation? In his speeches and writings, Prince Charles makes it clear that he understands the vital role of tradition in history. He understands that unless a nation constantly returns to its roots, continuing stable life is impossible. The emerging campaign to bring Prince William to the Throne prematurely is not for the sake of the young man, but to try and ensure that he is cut off from that wisdom and understanding which his father can help to provide.

At the end of the day, the basic question to be asked about what type of government do people want, is it one where there are no checks on the natural will-to-power of all governments? Or one where there is an "umpire" who is born and trained to ensure that there is fair play for all? If this and similar questions are asked during any "re-appraisal" of Constitutional Monarchy, then the death of Princess Diana may result in increasing numbers of people opening their eyes to a reality they had not previously seen.

FISCHER IN CLEFT STICK ON TRADE PROTECTION by David Thompson:

It is clear that Deputy Prime Minister Fischer is now forced to acknowledge the electoral backlash against the elimination of all tariff and other protective measures as a matter of ideological faith. The photographs of mountains of oranges being dumped, and orange groves being bulldozed because we now import Brazilian orange concentrate instead of eating our own, has had a deep impact, even in the cities.

It is clear that we are in the grip of a form of insanity to be destroying perfectly good food while others in our own cities (and the world) go hungry. And all because of "economic rationalism". What a mad, incomprehensible god to worship. Once the reality of such insane policies begins to penetrate the national consciousness, there is an increasing and potent backlash.

It is because of this backlash that National Party backbenchers will be able to cross the floor of the Parliament and vote with the Opposition on such issues as industrial protection, and get away with it. There may be anger among National Party leadership about Bob Katter crossing the floor on the question of sugar tariffs last week, breaking party "solidarity". But Katter will survive it, because he is reflecting the anger in his electorate that politicians, insulated from the realities of farming, should sacrifice canegrowers for an insane form of ideological purity.

But Mr. Fischer's squirming about the fact that the new "level playing field" rules will force Australia to accept cooked chicken from Asian producers will evoke little sympathy for him. After all, **Tim Fischer helped to make those rules** whilst lobbying in his role of Australia's Minister for Trade. Fischer is hoist upon his own petard.

The truth of the matter is that, as Australians realise the depth of the betrayal that has been perpetrated on the altar of "the global market", "level playing field", and "free trade", increasing pressure is being applied to find ways of protecting domestic industries. The key question is what will Fischer, Howard, and others do about their agreement with the World Trade Organisation (W.T.O.)?

It is no longer up to our politicians what trade regulations we will enforce. It is increasingly a matter for the international trade bureaucracy – the W.T.O. Fischer, Howard and Co. willingly continued on the path begun by Keating, Evans and the rest towards "free trade". It is going to be extremely difficult to retreat along that same path.

The Prime Minister has managed one organised retreat in the face of the possible devastation of the Australian motor industry without some form of protection. As the consequences of the elimination of tariffs on textile, clothing and footwear become evident, another retreat will have to be organised. Such retreats need to become a rout if Australian industry is to survive. What will Mr. Howard do about the W.T.O. agreements?

NATIONALS REFUSE TO PLACE HANSON LAST: Last week's news that the National Party in Queensland may refuse to place One Nation Party candidates last on election ballot papers may serve to destroy the proposed "united front" between the A.L.P. and the Coalition on what is to be done about Pauline Hanson. As the National Party Member for Dawson, De-Anne Kelly, has pointed out, the National Party constituency could be expected to overlap substantially with the One Nation constituency, and to put One Nation last would be an act of political suicide.

There are, however, a number of unanswered questions as yet. What will Senator Boswell's response be to the suggestion that National Party preferences should flow **towards** One Nation? It was Boswell who was "used" to tip the proverbial bucket on Hanson and One Nation in the Senate, accusing Hanson of "extremism", racism, bigotry, etc. The political elites lauded the Boswell nonsense as a "courageous" speech, showing integrity.

But the truth is that the Queensland Nationals, as elsewhere in the Party, have been alarmed at the way their own members have deserted them to support One Nation. Deputy Prime Minister Fischer is not regarded with great sympathy by Queensland Nationals, and neither is his colleague John Anderson, Minister for Agriculture. A big majority of firearms owners in Queensland had National Party sympathies until Borbidge and Fischer betrayed their interests by surrendering to Mr. Howard's ill-informed demands on guns. This has **certainly not** been forgotten in Queensland.

It would appear that National Party rules do not permit Mr. Fischer and Mr. Anderson to impose their Federal Executive's wishes upon the Queensland branch in respect of voting preferences. If the Queensland Nationals refuse to put One Nation last as a matter of principle, this sends a powerful message to the rest of Australia – a message that must have a profound effect throughout the nation. It is also a message that anti-Hanson forces fear, because it signals a grassroots rebellion is being **heard and heeded**. It is a much-needed blast of defiance at those who seek to push ordinary Australians away from the political decision-making process. But most of all, it is another sign of health from one of the most decentralised parts of Australia.

INTEREST RATES FOR BIG BUSINESS: The B.H.P. Report to Shareholders for 1997 reveals that "the Big Australian" carries approximately \$10.5 *billion* in debts as of May 31st, 1997. The report also lists "B.H.P.'s 1997 Contribution to Wealth Creation", in which interest on borrowed funds of \$606 million is listed. This is a most interesting statistic, as simple calculations reveal that the effective interest rate for B.H.P. is about **5.7%**. How many small businesses in Australia enjoy such an interest rate on their operating debt?

The truth is that the banks obviously prefer their "big" customers rather than hundreds (or thousands) of "small" customers. The banking industry is deliberately cutting its links with the "bottom" end of the finance "market", by increasing fees, and reducing the number of branches. As one report noted, this means that building societies, credit unions and even **pawnbrokers** are moving into the lower levels of the "finance industry".

The preference shown to the "big" customers takes place in a variety of perks unavailable to small business. And B.H.P. of course, far from being a small business, is no longer even an "Australian" business really. It is a multinational, with global interests that may not always coincide with Australian interests.

Another "big" business favoured by the banks is the "Eurotunnel" under the Channel between France and Britain. This debt-ridden venture regularly requires refinancing, and if it had been a private business or small manufacturer, the bankers would have foreclosed long ago. Instead the banks are claiming a 45.5% stake in the Eurotunnel in return for a new debt package.