



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.34, No.24

July 3rd, 1998

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"The history of modern political society is in large measure the history of the struggle of the ordinary citizen to exercise some influence upon government – and of his repeated failure to achieve that modest ambition – all governments control the governed."*

– Professor G.W. Keeton (later Mr. Justice Keeton)
in his classic work, *The Passing of Parliament*

THE REAL HANSON THREAT by Eric D. Butler:

I have constantly maintained that the arrival of Pauline Hanson upon the Australian political scene, and the subsequent national reaction to her famous maiden parliamentary speech, was a political phenomenon of the greatest significance. Pauline Hanson has demonstrated that she is a woman of both courage and determination. Watching her on television leaves no doubt that she is gaining in confidence as she battles the media mafia. But as a close student of political history, I must, as a responsible commentator, caution that the current Hanson euphoria contains within it the seeds of potential disaster. The dust of the Queensland political explosion has now settled sufficiently to make a realistic assessment of the current Australian political situation. No such assessment is possible if it does not face the basic truth, that rarely is a government **voted into office**; governments are generally **voted out of office** when there is sufficient resentment of the results of the policies being imposed upon a community.

Not only the policies, but the style of the Whitlam Government resulted in his Government being swept from office in 1975. There was a general air of relief as Gough Whitlam was replaced by Malcolm Fraser. I lost several friends when shortly after the Fraser Government had been elected with a huge majority, I publicly warned that it was already on the road to disaster. Eventually Malcolm Fraser and his colleagues were seen as politicians who had betrayed the trust of the Australian people. They were voted out in 1983 to be replaced by Bob Hawke in an election in which, as Hawke's predecessor Bill Hayden said, could easily have been won by the "drover's dog". Bob Hawke's style of government, assisted by the man who came to be known as "the world's greatest Treasurer" Paul Keating, temporarily created the impression that Australia was moving on to a new course. The League of Rights warned that so far from moving on to a new course, the Hawke-Keating Government was continuing on the internationalist course pioneered by the Whitlam and Fraser Governments. Public resentment was growing and the Labor politicians reached the conclusion that Bob Hawke had outlived his political usefulness. He was replaced by Paul Keating. But Keating's style of government, and his open attack on traditional Australia, merely added to the growing public resentment against what they perceived to be as an intensification of the undermining of the traditional Australia. The globalisation of the economy, with mounting foreign debt and unemployment, and the increasing sell off of Australian assets, should have resulted in electoral defeat for the Keating Government, but it was saved by a Coalition Opposition which committed political suicide by electing its own internationalist, John Hewson, who sought to gain election by advocating the imposition of the International Monetary Fund's preferred tax "reform", the General Services Tax. Once again the Australian electors voted NO, and Keating survived.

But Keating soon demonstrated that he was determined to continue taking Australia down the internationalist disaster course. He overlooked the fundamental political truth that the electors had not voted **for** him but **against** a threatened tax. Keating fell into the same political trap by convincing himself that he had won against the Hewson-led Coalition. Howard made exactly the same mistake when he won the last Federal elections with such a massive majority. He won primarily because of the growing pent-up feelings of electors who had come to detest Keating. Those same feelings of detestation have now been transferred to John Howard and the Coalition.

Rural and regional Australia have felt betrayed by the Liberal and National Parties. The Queensland State election result was a reflection of that sense of betrayal. Primarily because of the attacks upon her by some National and Liberal Party members, and the mass media, Pauline Hanson has been elevated into a perceived catalyst of a movement of grassroots revolt. There is adequate evidence that large numbers of Queensland electors voted for One Nation candidates primarily because they associated the movement with Pauline Hanson. Surveys indicate that many who voted for One Nation were hazy about policy matters. They associated the major political parties with most of their problems and were determined to punish them. Pseudo intellectuals like Phillip Adams are horrified at what is happening. Adams speaks for his spiritual allies when he wails that the "clock is being turned backward". The Zionist Jewish press is hysterical. They see growing support for a Hanson movement as a rejection of the multiculturalism they so fervently support.

The Queensland election results are beyond doubt a defining moment in Australian politics. Coalition leaders Howard and Fischer clearly have been shaken. They are loud in their statements that they will make a greater effort to listen to what the people are saying. New Labor Premier Beattie is saying the same thing, primarily because he is dependent upon the vote of new Independent Wellington, who is a strong advocate of the Citizens' Initiative and Referendum concept. So is his fellow Independent Mrs. Cunningham. If Independent Wellington can have his CIR proposals tested in the new Parliament, this could produce some explosive results. While One Nation claims to support the CIR concept, the wording of the One Nation policy is far from satisfactory. But Queensland Parliamentary debate on CIR could see widening support for a concept which the League has always strongly supported. But as demonstrated in New Zealand the concept can be subverted and discredited.

The essence of the Queensland revolt is that it has challenged centralised power. As the League of Rights has demonstrated over 50 years of persistent educational work, in modern history Money Power has been the main instrument for centralising power. But it has been progressively buttressed with the establishment of bureaucratic and other instruments for centralising power over the individual. In his famous classic, *The New Despotism*, a former Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Hewart, warned that a change of politicians did not mean an automatic change of policies. The growth of internationalism is a manifestation of the will to power on a global scale.

History provides a number of examples of numerous failures by movements which challenged centralised power, these failures resulting from a lack of adequate knowledge concerning what was involved. I was interested to see that the newly elected One Nation Members were lectured by former Queensland Premier Sir Joh Bjelke Petersen. It would have been instructive if Sir Joh had informed the newly elected One Nation Queensland Members why he was unable to establish a promised State Bank, and why a Queensland National Party Government was unable to implement a basically sound policy of long term low interest loans for rural industries. In its day the Joh-for-Canberra movement created as much ferment as the One Nation movement. As National Director of the League of Rights at the time, and a personal friend and admirer of Sir Joh, I warned him that the Joh-for-Canberra move could only end in disaster, and it did.

Those who have centralised power over a long period of time are not going to surrender that power without a struggle. One Nation has managed to recruit an army to fight a war without a clear idea of the nature of the war, and what is required to have any chance of winning that war. Over many years the League of Rights has

evolved the only training programme which seeks to equip the individual to wage that war effectively. When one of Pauline Hanson's close colleagues, Mr. David Ettridge, started talking about "printing money" he demonstrated the nature of the problems I am warning about. Mr. David Oldfield's attempt to deal with what was a major tactical disaster merely demonstrated his own lack of understanding of the modern banking system. There is an old and very wise saying that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. I am sure that the overwhelming majority of One Nation supporters, including their recently elected Queensland Members, are motivated by the best of intentions, but they have entered a conflict which requires far more than good intentions. What the League offers to all who are interested is a programme which will at least equip them to fight effectively, and to avoid the many pitfalls which have destroyed many movements of good intentions.

The nature of the conflict in which One Nation finds themselves involved is such that their leaders are making a fatal mistake when they fail to co-operate in any way with the most experienced and able patriotic politician in the Federal Parliament, Graeme Campbell. If they start from the viewpoint that they are "competing" with Campbell's Australia First Party, they demonstrate a serious philosophical flaw. The description of the League of Rights as a "fascist movement" is but another manifestation of that flaw.

Having been "demonised" by the enemies of traditional Australia, I have never at any time sought to meet Pauline Hanson or her advisers, feeling that is the best contribution I can make to ensure that Pauline Hanson is not placed in the position of trying to defend me. She clearly is not equipped to do this, nor are her closest advisers. But for the record I am fearful that there will be a major loss of morale if large numbers of good Australians find that their faith in One Nation has been misplaced. The best contribution the League of Rights can make in the battle for Australia is to intensify its educational work and to encourage as many people as possible, irrespective of which group they belong to, to avail themselves of the League's training schools.

GREAT TRAIN BRIBERY by David Thompson:

The timing of the unveiling of the proposed Melbourne to Darwin railway can only lead to the conclusion that it is seen by the Prime Minister as a potential issue with which to tempt One Nation voters back to the Coalition. A \$9 billion nation-building project like this must attract attention in the neglected regional areas where One Nation is polling strongly.

This is not a "new" proposal. We reported on this previously (see *Intelligence Survey*, September 1997) when the issue was originally raised by Councillor Bevan O'Regan, of Narrabri in NSW. 23 local government councils have been promoting the drama of a flat-route inland rail system link Brisbane and Melbourne since late 1994, but what suddenly appeared in mid-1997 was a consortium that wants to expand this to include Darwin.

O'Regan claims that this consortium, Australian Transport and Energy Corridor Pty. Ltd., is a multinational corporation, and that in numerous conferences with consortium representative Mr. Everald Compton, Councillors were assured that **money was no object**, and that companies around the world were ready to finance the scheme (*From the Parish Pump*, August 1997). Compton is on record as saying that "*we will put this through, and we don't want the States to get in the way*". It is no doubt significant that the proposal was "launched" by the Prime Minister, rather than a State Premier.

Why would Mr. Howard be involved in promoting the project if it is to be financed by foreign investment? The only possible advantage for him is a potential "nation-building" election winner, so long as seats won in NSW and Queensland can balance those lost in South Australia, where the Adelaide-Darwin link is jeopardised! And it is clear that international investors would prefer to negotiate with only one central government with the "clout" to push the project through.

If the rail link is such a good idea, promoting Darwin as a trading port with "Asia", why don't we build it with

335.405
ONT

Australian investment? In fact, why not use a "people's bank" to issue the credit to build it, as we did with the Trans-Continental Railway from 1913-1917? Is this "printing money"? So what?

If this was suggested by a former fish-and-chip shop owner, it is a ludicrous idea. But if this is suggested by, say, the highly-paid chief economist for the Royal Bank of Canada, would it be taken seriously? Because Mr. John McCallum told a conference in Melbourne on June 17th that "... *I think printing money is the solution (for Japan's banking crisis).*" Did Treasurer Costello pour scorn on this? Not a peep! If it would work for Japan, why not Australia?

The following day a senior World Bank official, Jean-Michel Severino, told a Sydney forum that the world faced a depression unless it was willing to finance expansionary economic policies in Asia. Where were the "expansionary" funds to come from? The planet Mars? They would have to be **created** by someone, somewhere.

CREDIT CREATION POWERS: It is perfectly clear that new credits can be created for useful projects. The **real** experts agree with this, whatever Mr. Costello may say. The only questions are: 1) by whom, and 2) for what? If the new Melbourne-Darwin rail link is ever built, new credits may be required. If so, under conventional economic rules, they will be created by a private bank, somewhere, and lent to either multinational companies or Australian governments for the purpose.

The alternative is for Australians to use their sovereign powers over money to issue the credit here, with our own banking system, and build the railway, **if it is required**. This is the type of project being promoted by various groups, from the Citizens Electoral Councils (CEC) to the National Civic Council. While on the surface this is a constructive proposal, it is also an extremely dangerous principle, better understood by Karl Marx than the CEC, or even perhaps the National Civic Council.

In his *Manifesto of the Communist Party* Karl Marx listed 10 essential steps for the destruction of the free society. Step 5 reads: "Centralisation of Credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly." With such powers over credit creation, Marx knew that central control of the economy, and hence the life of the individual, **could be massively increased**.

Such powers in the hands of Mr. John Howard would result in the same massive increase of central government power. Mr. Howard (or his Ministers) could compel the unemployed to work in outback Australia on the railway. The next project could be the Bradfield Scheme, turning the northern river systems inland. With such powers, the Commonwealth could direct the economic activity of the nation from one central point: Canberra. Karl Marx would have been most impressed!

Who, then should have the powers of credit creation, if not private banks, and not governments? If we return to the two over-riding questions: 1) by whom, and 2) for what?, the relevant question is not "by whom?". Of course governments should have this power, **but for what?** The answer to this is clearly for the benefit of their constituents, to give **the individual** access to the nation's real credit.

If individual Australians can be convinced that their real credit should be invested in a Melbourne-Darwin railway line, then let them invest it. If it is a disaster, then it is upon their own heads. If, as Marx suggests, Mr. Howard has "an exclusive monopoly" to direct all economic activity, the individual has little or no choice concerning objectives. Mr. Howard may **say** it is a great nation-building project, but he may **in fact** be using it as a great vote-winning project.

Genuine freedom requires that the individual be free to choose **on one issue at a time**. George Washington once compared government with fire: "Government is not reason; it is not eloquence; it is force! Like fire, it is a dangerous servant, and a fearful master." The credit creation mechanism in the hands of such a master would clearly be devastating for the free society.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights.

145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368

Subscription \$40.00 p.a.

OF AUSTRALIA