



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.46

November 28th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"She is an extraordinarily shrewd and perceptive observer of the world; hers is advice worth having."*

– British Labor Prime Minister, Tony Blair, toasting Queen Elizabeth II at her golden wedding anniversary celebration at a Whitehall banquet (*Weekend Australian*, November 22nd, 1997).

BASIC BATTLE LINES DRAWN IN COMMON MARKET BATTLE:

Eric Butler provided the following assessment of the Common Market issue at the end of his recent visit to the United Kingdom. What has emerged since the election of the Blair "New Labor Government" is that the basic issue is centralisation of power versus decentralisation. On one side the representatives of big business and internationalism have openly made their intentions clear, while on the other side the fight to preserve independence and sovereignty is being led by the federation of small businesses. Those conducting the small business campaign have displayed a professionalism which has been lacking in the past. A number of excellent letters has appeared in sections of the media stressing the fact that small business is pro British. The following is an example of such letters this appearing in the Scottish media 'quote'. The statement that New Labor has now become the business party needs more clarification and in depth analyse. Certainly Tony Blair has cuddled up to big business in the shape of the multicultural corporations, but that is not exactly the whole picture in considering the industrial and commercial enterprises which provide jobs and prosperity for our people. "It used to be said that what was good for General Motors was good for America, and that was true in the days when G.M. set up its expanding facilities in the bustling cities around the Great Lakes, providing big and bigger pay packets for the workers who flocked to its production lines." The new breed of multinationals is just as likely to be cutting jobs at home so that it can expand among the sweat shops of East Asia, and that, along with more sinister developments such as the multinational agreement on investment, makes it both anti-people and anti-nation – compare its normal approach to our economic and political subjugation within a European union.

"Britain's host of small and medium sized businesses is of a totally different kind. It counts many more heads than the multinationals and they mean much more to the community in locally based wages and prosperity.

"William Hague should not lose any sleep over Tony Blair's cosy relationship with the ruthless exploiters of global capitalism. Small business is both pro British and against a single currency and is only looking for a clear signal from our political leadership before crystallising its alignments."

This letter was signed by Mr. James Gibb Stuart of Glasgow, a well known publisher. Slowly a growing number of prominent businessmen are beginning to grasp the true nature of the battle. I well recall during my 1962-63 visit to the United Kingdom how a number of supporters of the E.E.C. told me that the clear political intentions of the marketeers should not be taken too seriously; that, in effect, the words in the Rome Treaty did not mean what they said. I was reminded of my experiences as I read a recent article in the *Sun* of November 6th. Prominent businessman Sir Michael Edwardes, ex-Director of British Leyland, commenting on the proposal that the U.K. accept the current proposal, said that "I voted for the E.E.C. in the 1975 referendum, but none then suggested that we were handing over British Sovereignty to Brussels. People are now suggesting there is an overwhelming case for the Euro, but I have yet to hear one". Sir Michael says that it is a "suicidal" proposal that the U.K. should accept a single currency policy. He denies that so far from British businessmen be generally in favour of what is proposed, "The majority have grave misgivings about the whole venture."

The cleavage between Big Business and smaller business has been heightened by a report from two prominent economists that the economies of the Common Market nations where over eleven million are officially declared to be unemployed is fast reaching the stage where there could be open conflict between the Common Market countries as they struggle to maintain their economies. When one considers the general plight of a world economy which is clearly now faced with mounting crises, it is not surprising that there is growing friction throughout the E.E.C. The British people have some type of a breathing space with the Labor Government stating that it will not impose a common currency on the British people during the lifetime of the present Labor Government.

THE ADVANCE OF WORLD GOVERNMENT by David Thompson.

Those calling for an Australian republic expect that, if they are able to campaign loudly enough and hard enough, the day will eventually dawn when the great Event will formally take place, marked by a stirring ceremony of some sort. If it were ever to come about, this is probably exactly how it will occur. But to assume that the proposition of a global government will never take place because no-one is campaigning loudly for it, and no formal ceremony is even envisaged is a great mistake.

The emergence of the global state is a gradual affair, and rather than being announced with a fanfare of trumpets, it is gradually coming into focus, until that which was assumed not to be in existence because it was not clearly seen, will eventually come into clear focus as an undeniable (and thoroughly unpleasant) reality.

Many of the elements that will be essential planks in any global government are already in place. The informed observer can already detect many of the global government's processes functioning, even if in a defacto role as yet. For example, the United Nations already churns out the world state's laws, even if only a few nations take any notice so far. If anything, it is the global communications network that is the most visible part of the new world order, with the power to influence opinion internationally and instantaneously.

We may not yet have noticed, and it is certainly not formalised, but the Treasurer of the world state is Mr. David Camdessus, Director of the International Monetary Fund, and his Minister for Finance Mr. Wolfensohn. It has taken the Asian financial 'melt-down' to see the I.M.F. role emerging clearly into the open. The rescue package for Thailand to shore up the Thai currency was something of a macabre curiosity, and compared to the Mexico bail-out for its sheer size. Now that Korea is begging for I.M.F. help, the global strategy begins to come into sharp focus.

The process of financial deregulation, trade liberalisation and global markets has irrevocably shifted the economic emphasis of the nation-state away from self-sufficiency, and committed it to integration with "global" economies. As other national (or regional) economies begin to stagger, all those with whom it is linked also suffer. The transmitted trauma is so great that Big Brother is called upon to save the day, and the I.M.F. steps in.

Initially Korea, our second-largest trading partner, had determined that it would not call in the I.M.F. for help - *because an I.M.F. package would inevitably include harsh and unpopular conditions*. Thailand certainly found this to be the case, initially rebelling against the I.M.F. demands for higher fuel prices to raise more revenue. But the Thais were forced to capitulate, and the process of world government grinds on to Korea.

After Korea, it is quite clear that the next domino is Japan. Japan's financial markets have been shaken by a series of bank failures, and now the collapse of the Hokkaido Bank, one of Japan's *big* banks - of world class size. The insolvency of one of the four biggest securities houses, Yamaichi, increases the pressure on Japan. Again the I.M.F. Treasury bureaucrats of the world state will move in and lay down the rules for financial survival. What choice will Japan have but to follow Korea, Thailand, Mexico, etc., and capitulate? The Minister for Communications in the emerging world to be the once-Australian, Rupert Murdoch. With the aid of the global banking structure, Murdoch is supervising one of the largest global media empires ever. In an important address in the U.S.A. last weekend, Murdoch told senior executives of multinational corporations that the nation-state had to stand aside, so as not to impede global progress. National regulations, said Murdoch, were a problem, because they prevented "convergence, and seamless connectivity" in global communications.

What does this mean? Perhaps only Murdoch knows; perhaps it is the language of the global policy-maker, which is far above we plebeians who earnestly vote at national elections when all the while it is the Murdochs who are making the *real* decisions. Murdoch was talking about exploiting the immense opportunities now becoming available in Communist China.

The only question before us is whether enough patriots will see the future in sharp enough focus to help prevent the forthcoming disasters now approaching. It is an elementary truth that Australia does not *have* to be a victim of the global power grab. If we decide on the alternative, we are so far quite free to simply opt out of the international madness. But without the will to do so, the first steps cannot be taken.

THE WIK BETRAYAL: WHERE HAVE WE SEEN IT ALL BEFORE? With an earnest Prime Minister, compromising to placate critics on every side: churches, lobby groups, foreign nations, and a voluble press willfully misrepresenting the facts and baying for the blood of 'the establishment', and the farming/grazing pioneering-type feeling betrayed by their own people, the Australian indigenous agony resembles a pattern that should be familiar. Where have we seen it all before?

Although some of the details are different, the nation on the rack today because of alleged crimes committed against its indigenous people could just as well be South Africa of the 1980s, or Rhodesia of the 1970s. The pattern emerging in Australia is every bit comparable to what was done to the Rhodesians, and then the South Africans. Last week we even had the World Council of Churches turning its attention to Australia, condemning Howard's ten-point Wik plan as immoral because it was "racist".

The General Secretary to the W.C.C., Dr. Konrad Raiser, said, "*Any legislation which disregards or abrogates native title is a step backwards and will not help reconciliation of Aboriginal and white Australians. The Australian churches believe this is the number one moral issue facing the country . . .*"

Where was Dr Kaiser and his self-righteous moralising in 1993, when Keating was employing whatever tactics were available to him to force the Native Title Bill through the Senate, in the belief that it extinguished native title on pastoral leases? Has Kaiser read the Howard bill? No.

Who could forget the same World Council of Churches turning a blind eye when Comrade Nkomo and Comrade Mugabe's murderous terrorists were butchering Christian missionaries in Rhodesia? Who can forget the horror of the civilian aircraft shot down by the same terrorist forces in 1978, who then found the wreckage, and deliberately slaughtered all survivors, including women and children? Who could forget the dramatic address, "*A Deafening Silence*", by Rev J.R. daCosta, Dean of Salisbury Cathedral in the wake of the massacre? The Kariba massacre is a corrosive stain that sponsors of terrorism in Rhodesia like the W.C.C., attempt to blot it out in vain.

The selective standards of the W.C.C. should be brought to the attention of the latest set of 'victims' of this world body – the Australian people, including the aborigines, many of whom are Christians. The truth is that the W.C.C. "Programme to Combat Racism", which included the funding of "freedom fighters" in Southern Africa, is now being transferred to Australia. It may not come in military form – certainly not just yet – but the pattern is the same.

The comparison between John Howard and Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith is crude, yet Howard's Wik legislation is in itself a compromise.

"If the amending Bill of the government is passed – and I want the Australian public to understand this very clearly – it will still be possible for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islander people to make native title claims on 79% of the land mass of Australia", Howard told the Parliament on November 20th (our emphasis).

Howard's dramatic map of Australia, displayed on the ABC's *7.30 Report* back in September, told the story. It merely inflamed the proponents of native title, and generated a savage backlash in which the 32-year-old Noel Pearson labelled Howard and his colleagues "racist scum". In general, the Churches critical of Howard have not resiled from such verbal terrorism, but encouraged it.

It will be remembered that Howard was a Minister in the Fraser Government which turned a deaf ear to the Rhodesian agony. Can Howard learn anything from the disaster of 20 years ago in southern Africa, which he then refused to acknowledge?

Recommended Reading: "*A Deafening Silence*" by Rev. J.R. daCosta; address by the Dean of Salisbury Cathedral after the Karima massacre; cassette tape, \$6.00 from M.E.A. Tapes, P.O. Box 184, The Basin, Vic., 3154. "*Too Bright The Vision*" by Father Arthur Lewis; describes the consequences of the W.C.C. campaign against Rhodesia. \$16.00 posted from all League Book Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL NOTES: Malcolm Fraser has joined Howard and Keating in warning of the problems involving a popularly elected head of state. Fraser writes that, at present, "*the office of governor-general appears to be an office of enormous power. It is, however, constrained because the governor-general's position can be terminated at any time by the prime minister on a recommendation to the Queen. It is this capacity for dismissal, coupled with the convention and practice of nearly a century that limits the power of an otherwise formidable office. . . . Thus an elected, by whatever means, governor-general or president would immediately involve an office of significance and power.*"

In an opinion piece on the republic, former N.S.W. Premier Neville Wran confirms our own assessment of an elected head of state: *If you want to guarantee absolutely that the president of Australia will be a party politician and that the main candidates for the office are nominated by the main parties, then make the president an elected office. . .*" (*The Australian*, 20/11/97).

15 DEC 1997