



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.35

September 18th, 1998

---

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** *"Journalism is a false picture of the world, thrown upon a lighted screen in a darkened room so that the real world is not seen."*  
– G.K. Chesterton

---

## **WHAT COMES AFTER PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON?** by Eric D. Butler:

The President of the USA is often described as "the most power individual in the world". Considering the present state of the USA, where President Clinton is facing the threat of being impeached by Congress and removed from office, this statement must be qualified. The threat of impeachment suggests that President Clinton has been disloyal to the national interest. There are Americans who argue that Clinton has been guilty of betraying the sovereignty of the USA, quoting a number of such betrayals as the imposition of "free trade" and other policies which progressively centralise power over the individual American people. Generally overlooked outside the USA has been the far reaching significance of the growing relationship with Communist China. There have been claims by some Americans that Clinton received financial support from China before the last Presidential elections. There have also been allegations that American technology concerning national security has been illegally passed to the Chinese. It would not be surprising if some of these allegations were true. Students of the conspiratorial nature of the international Marxist movement recall how information concerning the nexus between International Finance, Big Business and the Soviet Union was generally unknown until recent years. The mass media of the West played a major role in destroying reputable scholars like Dr. Antony Sutton, who attempted to explore in depth the relationship between International Finance and revolutionary movements like Marxism and National Socialism. Those with some understanding of the subject were not surprised when, after being removed from power in the former Soviet Union, the "reformed" Communist leader Gorbachev reappeared on the world scene as a colleague of the notorious Dr. Henry Kissinger, working for the creation of a "New World Order". A German-Jewish migrant to the USA at the end of World War Two, Kissinger owed his rapid promotion to his close association with international financiers like David Rockefeller.

It was after a rather tarnished record of involvement in the politics of the State of Arkansas that Bill Clinton eventually made his way to the American White House via the Democratic Party. As happens in most modern nations where power is centralised, few political leaders can come to power without the support of those who wield power, generally through a mass media linked to financial power. Rupert Murdoch has had a few anxious moments concerning his international banking backers as he has climbed the international power structure. Probably very few politicians are directly bribed in the conventional sense. In a society in which power is progressively centralised, the highly ambitious politician does not take long to learn that he makes progress easiest when he steers clear of certain

had been sown in the Whitlam years, they were stimulated by the Fraser Government. The record shows Treasurer John Howard as a dedicated supporter of the first steps towards economic rationalism. He was an early supporter of the de-regulation of the banking system. One of his advisers was John Hewson, the man who eventually became leader of the Liberal Party and led it to a disastrous defeat, primarily on the issue of a Goods and Services Tax. If veteran pollster Gary Morgan is correct, the GST will also prove fatal for John Howard at the coming Federal elections. But if John Howard loses Government on October 3rd, it will be primarily because of a general perception that the Howard Government's overall policies have been a continuation of the policies of the Hawke and Keating Governments.

The realists among the students of Australian politics, and the impact of the debt system, were not surprised when the Howard Government so enthusiastically embraced "globalism" as the inevitable wave of the future. As the League of Rights has been warning for over half a century, dogged adherence to the debt system makes increasing taxation, creeping inflation and centralisation appear inevitable. It was a Liberal/National Party Coalition which pioneered the rural revolution with the slogan of getting bigger or getting out. The present debt system makes it appear inevitable that Australia should attempt to solve its rural problems by tying the economy to the boom conditions which were allegedly going to continue indefinitely. The programme of globalism had its roots in the policies being promoted by the international debt merchants and spread like a virus throughout the international bureaucracies associated with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. John Howard was an early victim of the disease of globalism. When the "world's greatest treasurer" Paul Keating returned from his first visit to Wall Street, following the election of the Hawke Government in 1983, and reversed himself on the subject of allowing foreign banks into Australia, John Howard complained about Keating taking his policy.

Linked to the programme of economic globalism – "We are now all part of the global economy" was the new creed – was an intensification of the attack on Australia's traditional immigration policy. Historian Blainey had warned about the long term destructive implications of the programme. With the aid of the media and the treacherous academics in the universities, Professor Blainey was viciously attacked and destroyed with him was any possibility of a rational discussion about immigration. Perhaps John Howard sensed that Blainey was not only right, but that there was political mileage in the immigration issue. The vicious campaign launched against Howard resulted in a retreat, conducted in such a way that it left no doubt that John Howard was not going to lead any campaign designed to preserve genuine Australian independence. He came to office at the last Federal elections virtually crawling to the highly organised ethnic lobby, one which has been increasingly manipulated by the Zionist-Jewish lobby. Howard's well known almost fanatical support of Zionist Israel will be found in his philosophical roots. Those roots emerged clearly during the national debate on gun controls. The subject of gun controls has received little or no mention during the present election campaign. But it is one of those issues which have helped to badly erode rural support for the Coalition Government.

Mr. Tim Fischer's support for globalism and its destructive effect on Australia's struggling rural communities has resulted in a bitterness not often seen in rural Australia. It is not surprising that there is a widespread feeling among rural and regional Australia that there has been betrayal by those they felt they could trust. John Howard and Tim Fischer are belatedly saying that they are

now "listening". But the millions now being promised on the eve of the election were merely increasing the widespread cynicism now so obvious. If a Beazley Labor Government is elected primarily as a protest against what is seen as a betrayal by the Howard Government, this of itself will not solve Australia's basic problems. There is no evidence that a Beazley Labor Government would tackle the basic problems rotting away the foundations of traditional Australia. The writer's view is that the best election result would be the defeat of the Coalition Government by a small majority, this resulting in a coalescing of all genuine nationalists behind a group of politicians determined to start immediately to restore Australia to its traditional roots.

Once again the Senate may well prove to be the safeguard for the future. When John Howard and his fellows criticise the Senate, they insult the Australian people. The Senate is also elected by the Australian people. In the main they are probably the most independently minded. Australia desperately requires such people at this time of great peril. For my own part, I have no faith in the John Howards of the Liberal Party. They have betrayed the trust of many of their fellow Australians and deserve to pay the appropriate political price. Their adequate pensions will ensure that they do not starve to death. Consider the plight of Malcolm Fraser, Keating and Hawke.

### WILL THE SENATE HOLD THE LINE? by David Thompson:

*"The Senate will not let him (Mr. Howard) have his GST. And to think I used to believe in the Senate's abolition. Memo to Paul Keating: Thank God for the swill; they alone can save the day."* – former Senator Graham Richardson (*The Bulletin*, 8/9/98).

Richardson's comment is most significant for several reasons. First, in the light of the threat to the Crown, it should be noted that hindsight is useless. If the republicans are permitted to demolish the Constitution, it is no good in the midst of a crisis in 10 years saying "If only we still had the Governor-General . . .". Richardson, who once led the pack in undermining the Senate – both by his own actions as a Senator, and his recommendation that it be abolished (after he left, of course) – is in the next breath going to be calling for the abolition of the Australian Crown.

Whether it is 10 years or whether it is a hundred years before the next constitutional deadlock occurs, the role of the Crown could again be crucial, as it was in 1975. All the smarties who claim that they know best and that the Crown is an anachronism could, in time, be forced into Richardson's position on the Senate.

The irony of Richardson's comment on the Senate preventing Mr. Howard pushing through a GST is that he is probably wrong. It may be a shaky assumption, but if we assume that the Coalition parties can retain a majority of the House of Representatives, much will depend on the composition of the Senate. How will the numbers line up? The fact is that Mr. Howard will not control the Senate directly, especially if a number of One Nation or other Independent Senators are elected. He is then faced with a dilemma. How to push through the hated GST?

Surely Richardson has not forgotten that the new Senators will not take their seats until July 1st, 1999? This means that the Prime Minister and Treasurer Costello have the option of presenting their GST legislation to the Senate long before the new Senators actually take their seats. There are many, in fact, who privately believe that this was an important motivation for holding an election now, when it could easily have been held next March or April.

Mr. Howard is already making the claim, wherever he can, that he is seeking a "mandate" for his GST. If he has the numbers in the House of Representatives, he will claim the moral authority for pushing the GST through.

But what about the Democrats? At present they are sitting on the fence – "two bob each way". Ms. Lees implies that the Democrats would claim a "mandate" too – to tinker with the GST in areas where they believe it is unsatisfactory. For example, they suggest that a GST on foods is immoral, perhaps with the New Zealand experience imprinted on their minds.

The battle for "control" of the Senate, of course, is a party political battle. It is notable that whenever an Independent is placed in the position of holding the "balance of power" in the Senate, he/she is regarded as "controlling" the Senate. But, in reality, this is only a function of Party politics. That Mr. Howard should be deprived of "control" of the Senate is only as it should be. But other Parties should not "control" the Senate either.

In recent times, one of the few Senators who has functioned with the original purpose of the Senate in mind is Senator Harradine. He has sought, wherever possible, to place the interests of Tasmania first. If every Senator put the interests of their State first, politics in Australia would be a very different business.

**PRESIDENT CLINTON AND POLITICAL POWER:** The strident denials of sexual misconduct by President Bill Clinton a few weeks ago have been exposed in the most dramatic way. His situation gives new dimensions to the phenomenon of lies in politics. Since his electoral standing did not seem to be seriously damaged until recently, this seems to imply that the American people – like Australians – perhaps take lies in politics for granted.

It is interesting that, for the "most powerful man in the world", Mr. Clinton is in so much hot water for an issue that is relatively pedestrian. But to whom does "the most powerful man in the world" defer? A number of obscure reports last week gave an indication of where the power really lies.

Mr. Clinton gave an address to the Council on Foreign Relations in which he gave his approval for the programme for global power. He observed that a quarter of the world's population lives in countries of declining economic growth. This, he said, justified the leading economic powers in acting together in the best interests of all nations. With the suggestion of a slight easing in US interest rates, and the promise of more concentrated political power, the "markets" responded with enthusiasm. It is "the Market" that now exercises not only economic but political sovereignty.

What is happening to Bill Clinton? When President Kennedy was shot, the details gradually emerged about his women, but it almost appears that Clinton is being assassinated **because of his** womanising. Or is there another agenda below the surface? In any case, the weapon of destruction seems to be the Internet.

---

All election 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.