



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.34, No.15

May 8th, 1998

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"The policy of centralisation of power is a denial of the right of men and women to freedom. It is the denial of the sanctity of human personality. It is the denial of the omnipotence of God and the antithesis of the social policy inherent in Christ's teachings."*

— L.D. Byrne, March 4th, 1972

THE REALITIES OF DARKEST AFRICA by Eric D. Butler:

Not even the mass media which campaigned for years for an end to "apartheid" in South Africa, and the "liberation" of the whole of Africa from its European "colonial oppressors", can suppress the truth about what is happening throughout most of sub-tropical Africa. Red Cross and other international relief agencies are urgently calling for an increased flow of aid. Blood-chilling reports come out of Rwanda and other central African countries as the mass slaughter of the victims of tribal warfare continues. The early Christian missionaries in Africa, men like David Livingstone, described the "charnell house" conditions they had to contend with. The availability of modern automatic weapons enables mass killing on a much bigger scale than in the days of Livingstone. It is impossible to estimate accurately how many millions have died since the famous "winds of change" speech by British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan in Capetown 40 years ago. A number of factors were responsible for the European retreat from Africa. There was Moscow's long term anti-British campaign strategy with its stress on "anti-colonialism", a strategy which relied upon "student intellectuals" educated at British and other European Universities; there was the disease of "liberalism" which spread like a cancer through Western societies; and there was the imperialism of International Finance which, in its campaign to create a "New World Order", fostered and exploited both Liberalism and Communism. The strategic importance of Africa, with its vast natural resources, was not overlooked by the globalists. The recent visit to Africa by President Clinton, the current hero of the globalists, was not unrelated to the grand global strategy. Needless to say, Clinton was full of praise for the new Africa, particularly South Africa, which was the final and most important African target. Having betrayed a Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) which was for a decade a major stumbling block to the globalists' African strategy, South Africa is being destroyed

by the forces of anarchy which are a feature of the new Africa. Nelson Mandela was the chosen front man for the globalists. Zulu leader Chief Buthelezi, who offered a moderate form of apartheid (separate development in the form of a Swiss-type federation) was ruthlessly elbowed aside by the globalists. Waiting in the wings to replace Mandela after he has played his part, are the type of Communists, now known as social democrats, who are collaborating with the representatives of International Finance to create the new Russia.

But, as in the new Russia, a major feature of the New South Africa is escalating crime and social integration. The activities of the much publicised Truth and Reconciliation Commission, in which that strange Christian Archbishop Desmond Tutu has played a prominent role, has tended to distract attention from the soaring crime rate and the breakdown of law and order. Some of the published figures provide a glimpse of realities. In Gauteng Province, which includes Johannesburg, over 200 policemen, mostly black, have been murdered since 1996. The rate of police killings continues to escalate. During the first nine months of 1997 more than 17,000 civilians, most of these blacks, have suffered violent deaths. Not surprisingly, those who can leave South Africa are continuing to do so in growing numbers. Whites who continue to live in South African towns or cities, protect themselves behind high walls and by sophisticated electronic devices. Hi-jacking of motor cars is a common daily occurrence. The police openly admit that law and order no longer prevails in many areas. Since African National Congress members took over the Johannesburg Metropolitan Council, large sums of money have disappeared. The Council's response to these developments is a massive increase in rates. Long established business organisations continue to leave. Property values have collapsed. The starry-eyed idealists confidently predicted that with the end to apartheid, there would be a flood of foreign investments into South Africa with the South African Government able to fulfil the lavish promises it made before the elections. Millions remain unemployed. As happened in the USA, where the whites have moved out of those cities dominated by blacks, South African whites are increasingly moving to the Western Cape Province, which has the only South African local government controlled by whites.

Nelson Mandela has been forced by reality to face the truth that unless his government can curb South Africa's crime rate the new South Africa will sink to the same low level of chaos and corruption affecting the rest of Africa. Mandela has promised that every possible action will be taken to prevent the killing of White South African farmers, who provided the food necessary to feed not only South African, but other people throughout Africa. Pressured by the same kind of people responsible for an African disaster which threatens to become worse, to weaken their immigration policies and to embark on even more multicultural madness, Australians should carefully heed the lessons of South Africa. Their slogan for survival should be "One nation, one people, on flag and one constitution". A nationalism which respects the nationalism of other peoples, while proudly upholding its own, provides the only hope for the survival of traditional Australia.

MAI SHELVED FOR SIX MONTHS by David Thompson.

News reports on Wednesday of last week indicate that the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has postponed negotiations on the Multilateral Agreement on Investment for six months, hoping that "fundamental differences" among the group can be resolved.

It appears that the international protests against the MAI in Canada and Europe have forced negotiators to reconsider the timetable of the treaty. According to sparse press reports, the French in particular have objected to the threat to French culture by a United States-dominated international cultural onslaught. Sensitive to the decline in the use of French internationally, the French had insisted that the treaty must exclude all cultural issues in order to protect their artistic, cultural and audiovisual industries which could be swamped by the influence of Hollywood. (*The Australian*, 30/4/98).

This touches sensitive chords, including the question of Jewish influence, since the overwhelming 'cultural' dominance of Hollywood is Jewish. The question of cultural protection is a serious issue in Australia, too, since the High Court ruling in the New Zealand television product case last week. In this case the Court ruled that international free-trade agreements *can* override measures designed to protect local cultural productions.

Richard Letts, chairman of the Music Council of Australia points out that this affects not only television, but film, music and any other artistic production. He called for an urgent statement from major political parties in Australia about exemptions for Australian cultural productions, although apparently unaware that the draft of the MAI insists that such exemptions ('reservations') must be rolled back over time.

The French Cultural Minister, Catherine Trautman, said "The principle of MAI is offensive because it regards works of art merely as investments, not as creations. . . . The MAI would end each country's policy of arts subsidies, and sabotage any European cultural policy." (*Le Monde/ The Guardian*, 1 March, 1998).

The Australian's European correspondent quotes the OECD Secretary-General, Donald Johnson, as downplaying the differences that prevented an agreement in time for the OECD annual ministerial meeting. "I am sure these small parochial issues will be able to be worked out". But the disagreements are serious, and the suggestion that they are 'parochial' is to minimise the importance of the sovereignty of the nation-state, which is the major basis of all conflict on the MAI. It is unlikely that this will be resolved by October, when negotiations are due to resume.

Since the main objective of the MAI is to override national sovereignty in regard to foreign investment, the entire basis of the treaty is one of major objection. The Australian negotiators are reported to have sought exemptions from the MAI provisions for the Foreign Investment Review Board's screening processes, foreign ownership limits on Telstra, privatisations, Social services, performance requirements, monopolies and the interests of aborigines. That is, they want protection for Australian investors overseas, but do not want to give too much away when it comes to protecting foreign investment in Australia. This is clearly unrealistic, as the intention of the MAI is to permit unrestricted foreign investment.

The postponement of negotiations relieves those opposed to the treaty of having to give expression to objections by the end of May, which was the original timetable for accepting the treaty. But the MAI has not 'gone away'. It is certain to reappear in another form. The multinationals have a vested interest in its prevailing over governments.

HAZARDOUS PRIVATISATION PROCESS: The privatisation of the South Australian State power utility, ETSA, has become an embarrassing disaster for the State Premier and Ministers involved. It is the classic case of the "new class elites" setting the political agenda without reference to the wishes of the electorate.

When it became clear that there was serious electoral opposition to selling off ETSA, Premier Olsen and his deputy, Graham Ingerson simply went ahead in secret. Their problem now is that it has been revealed that while the secret negotiations continued, they were strenuously insisting that *there were no plans* to sell off ETSA.

The chairman of ETSA, Mr. Mike Janes, now admits that he had a staff member working on the privatisation from his home. At the public inquiry in Adelaide he was asked why he had done this. Because "the last thing I wanted to do was start a situation. . . . when people would go running around with the view that ETSA was going to be privatised", he answered.

The Premier, Mr Olsen, has been forced to admit that he attended secret briefings in Sydney on the privatisation, organised by Shroder's merchant bank, who were paid \$50,000 for their services. But rather than admitting that he lied at the time of the election campaign, Olsen and his office have attempted to "manage" the issue to control the extent of political damage.

But the problem is quite clear. They lied to the South Australian voters, who apparently believed them. The "last thing" they wanted to do was be honest with the electorate!

In Victoria, a privatisation expert from the Victorian Treasury is highly critical of the privatisation of prisons, criticising the Port Phillip institution for not being sufficiently regulated. "You need a regulatory body to have real powers to find out if its well run," he said. Which was the reason that things like prisons, electricity, water, and communication infrastructure was always run by the State! In every case, State governments have parliamentary committees which held regular inquiries into many areas of public administration to ensure they are "well run". And when they were not "well run", the *public inquiry* would lead to the relevant politician accepting personal responsibility for correcting the problem.

But under the new religion of economic rationalism, accountability is of lesser importance than "efficiency". In the case of the Victorian prison, the investigation into its efficiency is being run by the head of a government department for correctional institutions. That is, the bureaucrats are investigating the bureaucrats, rather than the politicians investigating the bureaucrats. On this principle, the privatisation of Australian public infrastructure will become an extremely expensive mistake.