



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.33

September 4th, 1998

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"Money is a mechanism, and can be used or misused like any other mechanism, and if the population of this or any other country is willing to allow the mechanism of money to be controlled by the few, then so long as inducement by money is the basis of credit, so long will the few control the many."*

– C.H. Douglas in *Credit Power and Democracy* (1920)

AN ELECTION FOR THE NEXT CENTURY? by Eric D. Butler:

Several media headlines have described the coming Federal Elections, to be held on Saturday, October 3rd, as "an election for the next century". In one sense this is true. But in the flood of comment, both from the politicians and the media, there has as yet been no comment concerning one of the most fundamental issues the next Parliament will be required to deal with: a referendum concerning Australia's future constitutionally. Will there be a referendum concerning the question of whether Australia is to remain a constitutional monarchy? And what is proposed to ensure that Australia is effectively insulated against a global recession which is becoming progressively worse.

The old saying remains true, that those who will not learn from the mistakes of history are doomed to repeat those mistakes. Does John Howard genuinely believe that his promised GST offers any real salvation for the nation? It is clear that John Howard sought the earliest possible election because he was fearful that the longer he left the election, the greater the danger that he would not be re-elected. There has been much talk about "visions" for the future, but the "vision" of most politicians is how they can best survive until the next elections! The political history of John Howard is one of doing whatever appears to be the best way of surviving politically. Over a lifetime of political life, John Howard has always been highly regarded by the real government at Canberra, the permanent bureaucracy, staffed by those who reflect the latest economic or other "trends". It is generally overlooked that John Howard was one of the first to accept a new gospel – that of "economic rationalism".

As Australian electors consider their future as a nation, it is essential that they do not lose sight of the fact that the basic issue confronting them on October 3rd is either a constitution down a disastrous internationalist road, or the development of a robust nationalist road. In his brilliant article, "Constructive Nationalism", which first appeared in *The West Australian* of August 6th, and was subsequently republished in the League of Rights *Intelligence Survey*, Graeme Campbell

demonstrates why he stands head and shoulders intellectually above fellow nationalists at Canberra. Those who know him best well understand his capacity for original thinking. There are few of Campbell's calibre at Canberra. Even when one does not completely agree with Campbell, one can still appreciate his commonsense approach to problems. It is not surprising that he is feared by the internationalists and their devotees.

But the same kind of people are also fearful that in spite of all the efforts of the self appointed elitists, a big section of the Australian people reject as alien what they have been promoting. The emergence of Pauline Hanson as a type of lightning rod, realising the pent-up feelings of those who feel that they have been betrayed at many different levels by those whom they trusted, has been a major factor in completely changing the whole Australian political scene. That most boring and tiresome of former Australian political leaders, former Prime Minister of Malcolm Fraser, has admitted in launching the latest publication on "Hansonism", that the emergence of Pauline Hanson has "changed Australia for ever". Fraser admitted that people who wanted to stamp out the Hanson influence had their work ahead of them. He said that "I really do believe One Nation has created some sort of divide . . . Australia is never going to be quite the same again".

This is most encouraging news for all genuine Australian nationalists. Graeme Campbell has been commenting on this development for some time. Pauline Hanson did not create the divide: she has dramatised a reality which has emerged into the open for all to see. That reality is starting to haunt certain people, which explains the sudden emergence of what *The Australian* of August 21st describes as "an unlikely alliance of business, union and religious leaders" to campaign against One Nation. Of considerable significance is the fact that former Prime Minister Bob Hawke is reported by the writer of *The Australian* report, Kimina Lyall, as having played a key role in bringing the anti-Hanson Alliance together. The statement denouncing "One Nation" was signed by the Business Council of Australia, the Australian Council of Trade Unions, the Australian Council of Social Services, the Executive Council of Australian Jewry and Catholic and Anglican Archbishops. The statement says that Pauline Hanson's immigration policies "simply do not recognise the demographic, social or economic realities of our nation. They threaten Australian jobs by undercutting the growth that flows from an open economy".

Those who regularly read the Zionist press are not surprised by a development which has the open endorsement of prominent Zionist business leaders. Bob Hawke probably played the major role in bringing together the anti-Hanson "Alliance". No doubt adequate funds will be made available to finance one of the most interesting, and significant, political alliances to emerge in Australian political history. But what influence, if any, this "Alliance" will have on voting patterns at the coming elections remains to be seen. Veteran public opinion pollster Rod Morgan has expressed the opinion that electoral support for One Nation is not only holding up but in some areas could be increasing. The major political parties are going to be the main losers at the elections, the worst affected being the National Party. A number of strong Independents are starting to emerge in an electoral contest which will see the emergence of a new political atmosphere with a greater division of political powers. The role of the Senate is going to be of great importance. Thus growing suggestions from the major parties that its power should, if possible, be reduced. The League of Rights has, over many years, made a major contribution to what has developed. It must now equip itself for a changed political situation. There will be greater opportunity for constructive action.

FORCED TO MAKE FALSE CHOICES by David Thompson:

When listing the virtues of the Australian way of life, the proposition that this nation is "a democracy" is often included, as though this somehow provides a guarantee of "freedom". We might well reflect on this as we enter a period of communal madness, when politicians and press ask normally sensible people to suspend their critical faculties, and "choose" those who expect to lead us into the next century. In fact, the headline of *The Australian* last Monday read "*Choice for a new century*". But how wide is the choice?

It might be a suitable time to recall that in the old Soviet Union, dictatorship included elements of "democracy". For example, everyone of sound mind and specified age had the right to vote. For any candidate they liked, just as we do. But the limiting factor in the Soviet was that only the Communist Party could stand candidates. What did this mean? Simply that voters could choose whichever candidate they preferred to implement the only policy that was offered. Some choice. But is a "democracy" any less totalitarian when there is no limit placed on who can stand as a candidate, but strictly limited choice on which policies they are offering? As a generalisation, this is the "choice" before Australians for October 3rd.

Mr. Howard proposes that the election will be contested on tax structure and economic management. Mr. Beazley responds that Labor has learned its lesson (i.e.: don't mention Paul Keating) and that he, too, believes in tax reform, but without the "dead hand" of the dreaded GST. Mr. Howard is certain to gloss over the suspect wisdom of proposing a major new tax as part of a re-election strategy. He will avoid any reference to the fate of Tony Rundle in Tasmania. Mr. Howard will also avoid references to selling Telstra.

But, in reality what are the choices? While both major parties are offering reduced personal tax, neither is prepared to index the tax brackets. This means that any personal tax cut is **strictly temporary**, to be clawed back by "bracket creep". Shadow Treasurer Evans proposes a system of tax credits, which no-one understands yet, and would only be attractive if paid in US dollars. The ALP tax policy is condemned as not proposing any genuine "reform". But the Coalition tax package is far too reformist for some, with the GST remaining hugely unpopular. On one hand, a weakly reformist ALP tax proposal, with income tax cuts that remind us of Mr. Keating's L-A-W promise, glibly broken, and an extension of capital gains tax. On the other hand, a vigorously reformist Coalition tax package, with the poisonous GST at the core. Whatever else it is, this is not genuine choice.

Whichever side prevails, and succeeds in forming the next government, voters will be short-changed. "Democracy" will not have given them freedom of choice even in areas concerning taxation, let alone on other issues which have a huge impact, like the global market, immigration, multiculturalism, industry policy, etc. This effectively leaves a large vacuum for an alternative, if any of the minor parties can articulate it. Australia First can do so, but may be completely lost in the election maelstrom. Can One Nation do it?

If freedom of choice is the capacity to choose or refuse one thing at a time, elections are not a time

NATIONAL LIBRARY
28 SEP 1999
N 335.405
ONT

when it is available. If this is "democracy", then it is a dubious virtue, since being forced to make what amount to false choices at the ballot box is hardly "freedom".

OF AUSTRALIA

Fortunately, the Australian system is less based on "democracy" than **representative government**. Thus, it is certain that neither major party group will control the Senate in the next Parliament. Would the Senate reject the GST, risking a return to the 1975 deadlock over a money bill? Much depends on the composition of the Senate next year, and the courage of those who hold sway there. It is in the Senate that the "mandate" grab-bag of party policy can be sorted out, with the worst of it rejected.

PRIVATISATION REJECTED IN TASMANIA: The fate of Tony Rundle, Liberal leader in Tasmania, who called an early election on the bold (some now say foolhardy) proposal of selling off the State's hydro-electric infrastructure, provides a pointer on the issue of privatisation. Premier Bob Carr of NSW had more astutely measured the electorate's rejection of the privatisation trend, and has dropped any proposal to sell off the NSW electricity industry indefinitely. Carr had taken this step even before the Tasmanian election, and must now feel vindicated by the Tasmanian result, and better placed to win the next NSW election.

But what of the parallels between the sale of Tasmania's Hydro, and the introduction of a GST? When campaigning in Tasmania a fortnight ago, Mr. Howard claimed there was a "direct parallel" between selling the Hydro to pay the Tasmanian debt, and his proposal to reform the tax system. *"You can't go on forever pretending there's nothing the matter, any more than you can go on pretending there's nothing wrong with the Australian taxation system,"* he said. Tasmanians appeared to have turned a deaf ear. Even Mr. Howard's \$150 million bribe to sell the Hydro did not sufficiently move the Tasmanians. Mr. Howard will be hoping that the "direct parallel" doesn't extend quite as far as he warned.

LIBERALS COOL ON CIR: The Independent Peter Wellington, of Queensland, is rumoured to be researching the issue of initiative and referendum with some enthusiasm. He has proposed the introduction of the Swiss system to the Queensland Parliament, giving the electorate the chance to initiate genuine change, or reject unpopular legislation from the parliament. In this sense, initiative and referendum (CIR) could provide the check upon the House of Assembly that is lacking in the only State without an upper house.

However, Mr. Wellington is reported to be dismayed that the Liberal leader, David Watson, has indicated that he would not support a private members bill for CIR. Although no legislation has been framed and Mr. Wellington has not yet formally addressed the issue, the Liberals have indicated that they would join the ALP in opposing it. This is assuming that the ALP would oppose a bill for CIR, which might not be the case.

All electoral comment authorised by David Thompson, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne, Victoria, 3000.

"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.