



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.47

December 11th, 1998

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"At any given moment there is an orthodoxy, a body of ideas which it is assumed all right-thinking people will accept without question. It is not exactly forbidden to state this or that or the other, but it is 'not done'"*

"Anyone who challenges the prevailing orthodoxy finds himself silenced with surprising effectiveness. A genuinely unfashionable opinion is almost never given a fair hearing, either in the popular press, or in the high-brow periodicals."

– George Orwell

ONE NATION AND "ANTI-SEMITISM" by David Thompson:

Mr. Jeremy Jones, of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, accuses One Nation of being responsible for the rise of "anti-Semitism" in Australia. This curious accusation, made early last week, must come as a surprise to Pauline Hanson and others associated with the One Nation Party, since no public position has been taken on Zionism or Judaism, and no debate on such issues has taken place. Mr. Jones offers no evidence for the allegation.

Jeremy Jones has taken it upon himself to make the judgement about who or what is "anti-Semitic"; a potent charge that is sufficiently ill-defined so that those accused are incapable of defending themselves from it. How does one **prove** he is not "anti-Semitic"? It is one of those charges akin to the loaded question: "When did you stop beating your wife?" The accused can only protest that he loves his wife; "some of my best friends are Jews".

Why has the charge of "anti-Semitism" been levelled at One Nation at this particular time? How do we know that there has been a "rise in anti-Semitism" in Australia? Because Jeremy Jones says so.

Could this have something to do with the challenge to Senator Heather Hill, who is accused of occupying a Senate seat whilst holding dual citizenship in contravention of Section 44 of the Constitution? The One Nation Senator, of British background, has been challenged by Sydney Chinese businessman, Mr. Hong, and will face a court hearing to determine her fitness to sit in the Senate.

Those who read the Jewish press will have noted the strong support from the leadership of the Jewish lobby for Mr. Hong's challenge to Senator Hill. The Jewish lobby has campaigned against One Nation as soon as it became apparent that Pauline Hanson and One Nation were giving expression to the very substantial (but often unspoken) opposition to the policy of multiculturalism. It was the Jewish lobby, through the *Australia/Israel Review*, that attempted to intimidate One Nation supporters by publishing a list of some of the One Nation membership.

Mr. Jones and his colleagues can only generate what they fear – "anti-Semitism", or at least criticism

of their tactics – by intemperate attacks on any group that legitimately expresses opposition to government policies, whether multiculturalism, mass immigration, or other policies. The use of the smear of "anti-Semitism" as a term of political abuse is a cowardly attempt to intimidate. It is a heavy-handed and contemptuous response to those who seek to pursue legitimate political policies with which Mr. Jones disagrees.

If Mr. Jones and his colleagues are strong supporters of Australia's immigration policies, and the policy of multiculturalism, then let them debate the merits of such policies. But if he wishes to do so, Mr. Jones should avoid the impression that he represents Australian Jewry. There is no available evidence that indicates that Mr. Jones speaks for all Australian Jews on the matter. In fact, the evidence suggests that Australian Jewry also opposes multiculturalism; marriage outside the Jewish faith is condemned as undermining the future of the Jewish community. Or is there another double standard here – multiculturalism for others, but not for Jewish Australians?

Y2K REACTION by Jeremy Lee:

While it is obvious the Millennium Bug presents a far greater hazard than many imagine, some reactions are over the top. Queensland's *Sunday Mail* (29/11/98), in a double-page spread headed TROOPS BRACE FOR 2000 BUG, went on: "Government, Police and Defence chiefs are moving to action stations in a bid to combat the millennium bug. Fears are growing that the year 2000 could herald chaos across the nation . . ."

There followed a lengthy and sensational report concerning steps being proposed to combat social breakdown in the aftermath of the failure of computer systems in all sectors, including traffic, hospitals, law-and-order, government services and the commercial distribution of essentials like water, power and food.

While up to now there has been a tendency to underplay potential problems, it now looks as though the reverse is the case. The deliberate exploitation of major and minor crises for the purpose of removing individual rights and strengthening central control over people has happened in the past. Nobody can predict the full implications of the millennium bug, or Y2K as it is often called. But the commonsense of Australians to get organised when necessary has been demonstrated time and again. Usually, the best thing government can do is keep out of the way.

And there may yet be solutions which avert crisis. David McNicoll, writing in *The Bulletin* (24/11/98), said: ". . . . Bruce Parker and Michael Carr, principles of a Sydney computer firm MFX Research, are on their way to Brussels for a date with the computer bosses of NATO. In front of an audience of 90 they will explain how they believe they can thwart the millenium bug. Already their researches and results have aroused interest in many nations, leading to the approach from NATO. Their development, MFX 2000, is a software programme that identifies short date usage in computer programmes, applications and data. It will change all short date usage by inserting the century component. It is 'language independent', and includes Asian character sets"

EUROPE, SINGLE CURRENCY AND THE MURDOCH GLOBAL EMPIRE: Rupert Murdoch's media empire – far greater than that of Alexander the Great – is still expanding. *The Australian* (25/11/98) reported: "The news corporation has unveiled its first significant assault on continental Europe with the creation of a European broadcasting subsidiary and confirmation of a proposed joint venture in the Italian pay TV market. News Corp Europe, which will be based in Milan, Italy, has been established to investigate and manage media investments in continental Europe"

Commenting on the move *The Australian Financial Review* (26/11/98) said: ". . . . Announcing his latest media push onto the continent this week, Murdoch said he had always supported the idea of a European Union – which would be news to The Sun which has, along with most of London's conservative press consistently opposed Britain's entry into the single currency.

"But Murdoch added: 'I believe that a European-wide media can provide a great deal more glue than some enforced single currency.'

"In other words, a single European market is fine by him so long as News Corp gets to dominate it. Which is as it ever was. Political and social concerns such as loss of sovereignty or culture tend to get swept aside when there is money to be made"

MULTINATIONALS WANT UNION: The same AFR article went on: *"This week, business leaders increased the pressure on the Labour Government to set a more concrete timetable for Britain's entry into the single currency by taking out a full-page ad in the influential Financial Times. Murdoch didn't sign the declaration, but 114 leaders of Britain's leading multinationals did, including the chiefs of Unilever, Glaxo, Shell and ICI:*

"The British Government should aim to join the single currency as soon as the conditions for successful entry are in place"

During the last British election, one of the concessions wrung out of both major parties by the Referendum Party, led by the late Sir James Goldsmith, was that a referendum would be held before Britain committed itself to the Single Currency programme. It will be interesting to see how British PM Tony Blair gets round this one.

CORRUPTION IN EUROPE: Why any nation would want to join the European circus (dubbed by *This England* as "Eutopia") is beyond comprehension. The *Newsweek* section of *The Bulletin* (1/12/98) gave a few examples of the scams going on: *"Talk about flushing money down the toilet. The European Union has funded some pretty wasteful projects, including several high-tech sewage plants that remain closed because no one knows how to operate them. It has also compensated fishermen for scrapping boats that have rested on the ocean floor for years. And given some wheat growers subsidies that were worth more than the value of their crops. So it's no surprise that last week the EU's spending watchdog, the European Court of Auditors, refused to give the EU's books a seal of approval. In their report, the auditors found that last year the EU had wasted or misused \$5.9 billion – about 5 percent of its total budget. And it wasn't the first time; it was the fourth year in a row that the Court refused to certify that the cash had been properly spent and accounted for"*

The article continued with a litany of unfortunate rorts and bungles. Perhaps the most innovative was this example: *" In Italy, for instance, farmers are reportedly planting plastic olive trees – which appear real to the satellites that monitor them – to collect extra subsidies"*

Australian farmers, apparently, have a lot to learn! They never got as far as "plastic sheep" during the sheep slaughter! But it's only a matter of time. Incidentally, we can only hope that the EU's sewage systems are not governed by computer in the year 2000!

GLOBAL TAKEOVERS SPEED UP: The fact that over 60 percent of the world's economy is now dominated by multinationals – some with economies far bigger than nations – is not enough for the super-controllers. Their ability to dictate the future, to order nations to hand over their money-systems and their sovereignty, and to strip bare the democratic constitutional process, needs a further concentration of power.

The merger of Germany's Deutsche Bank with the American Bankers Trust will produce a giant with assets well in excess of \$A1 trillion. This is matched by the merger of Exxon and Mobil which, if it is finalised, will constitute the biggest industrial merger in history.

The Bulletin (8/12/98) carried a feature article by Max Walsh, which said in part: *"The era of mega-mergers which is transforming the global corporate landscape has moved into a new feverish phase with the resurgence in international stock markets that has followed interest rate cuts. It is an economic*

revolution that will increasingly impact on Australia While the global economy is experiencing corporate merger activity on an unprecedented scale, the driving forces involved in this process can vary from sector to sector. There is, however, the defining common denominator that, regardless of the industry involved, the message is that big is better Australia is more a concerned bystander in what is happening because it is largely a branch-office economy, with only a handful of locally-based companies of any significance in any corner of the international marketplace. We are, in other words, being conscripted into the global merger and rationalisation process but have little or no say in its outcome At the moment we can do little more than sit on the sidelines as the global corporate landscape is reshaped by merger fever. We can watch but we are certainly not immune from the consequences"

With respect to Mr. Walsh, whose description of what is happening is graphic and accurate, it is simply not true that Australia is helpless in the face of this insanity. The truth is that our leaders are simply too terrified to take a stand for future Australians. There was never any compulsion on each member of the Gadarene swine to rush into the sea and drown. A novel account of this biblical story concerned one pig – was it Babe? – who pulled out of the suicidal rush. His fellows called him rude names as they rushed past him to self-destruction – "Fascist!"; "Reactionary!"; "Deviationist!"; "Extremist!". But he was the only one to survive.

Whatever else is said about Malaysia's Dr. Mahathir, he has shown that a resolute leader **can** buck the global system. Australia, with its supremely rich natural resources, has much more going for it than Malaysia. But its leaders are cowed and beaten. Neither John Howard nor Kim Beazley can be expected to opt for Australia's constitutional independence. The name-calling would be too fearful to contemplate.

For example, how would Kim Beazley react to the following, which appeared in the ALP Platform and Rules (1982 edition)? *"Labor is greatly concerned at the extent to which our industry is foreign-controlled, and the likelihood that this foreign control of our economy will increase further unless preventative action is taken.*

"Labor believes that increasing foreign domination of the Australian economy by foreign-based transnational corporations endangers our national sovereignty and places our resources, technology and the leading role in determining the future pattern of development at the control of corporations whose interests are not necessarily in accord with the best interests of our nation. Furthermore, their international scale and enormous economic power reduce the authority of the elected government over the national economy"

Or how would today's Liberals line up with the sentiments first expressed by their Party when Menzies came to power in 1949, and reprinted time after time because it said the things today's Party hacks have long forgotten. This is what the Liberal Party's "We Believe" included: ". . . . We believe in Australia, her courage, her capacity, her future and her national sovereignty, exercised through Parliaments deriving their authority from the people by free and open elections . . . We believe that National Financial and Economic power and policy are not to be designed to control men's lives, but to create a climate in which men may be enabled to work out their own salvation in their own way . . . We believe that, under the blessing of Divine Providence, and given the goodwill, mutual tolerance and understanding, energy, and an individual sense of purpose, there is no task which Australia cannot perform, and no difficulty which she cannot overcome"

It's a little different now. Globalism, obedience and conformity have replaced national sovereignty and reliance on Divine Providence – more's the pity.

NATIONAL LIBRARY

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,
1499 Russell Street, Melbourne. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.

Subscription \$40.00 p.a.

OF AUSTRALIA