



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.35, No.17

May 7th, 1999

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"The group exists for the benefit of the individual, in the same sense that the field exists for the benefit of the individual flower, or the tree for the fruit. Groups of any kind, whether called nations, business systems, or any other association, eventually decay and disappear if they fail to foster a sufficient number of excellent individuals, . . . It is also true that excellence involves exercise, a man does not become a good cricketer by reading books on cricket."*

– C.H. Douglas (1963)

CAN AUSTRALIANS LEARN FROM THE LESSONS OF HISTORY? by Eric D. Butler:

Although the war in Vietnam left an indelible mark on the Australian psyche, and was a relatively recent event, how many Australians can recall the events which led up to Australia's involvement? It has become fashionable to now admit that the involvement of the USA in the Vietnam war was a great disaster. The war ended with the whole of Vietnam under a Communist dictatorship. The will of the USA to continue the conflict was undermined within the USA. As President Lyndon Johnson was forced to admit, it was the Zionist Jewish lobby within the UN, using its control of the mass media like *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, which was the driving force behind the anti-Vietnam campaign. This fact was mentioned by the late Sir Reginald Sholl, who served as Australian Consul in New York for several years. Needless to say, Sir Reginald was quickly condemned for his "anti-Semetic" comments. No one attempted to deny the truth of what Sir Reginald said. One explanation was that the Zionist Jewish Lobby in the USA was afraid that the USA campaign in Vietnam tended to weaken its ability to defend the Zionist State of Israel.

Be that as it may, it is not without significance that the most Zionist-dominated USA administration in history is backing the current NATO military campaign in Yugoslavia. Support lost for the bombing campaign against Iraq is readily understandable. But what is the motive for the bombing of Yugoslavia? A number of explanations have been advanced, some of them bizarre and providing evidence to support the view that all supporters of the conspiratorial factor in history as being, at best, slightly "nutty".

Which raises the question of how many Australians, including the political leaders, have any understanding of the history of the Balkans. In the absence of this understanding, Australians could be drawn into a conflict with long-term historical implications. What is happening in Yugoslavia can only

be understood in the context of global politics dominated by a strategy to create some type of a New Internationalist World Order.

While it can be legitimately argued that Australia should attempt, in its own long-term interests, to influence the course of events in an explosive Indonesia, what Australian strategies or other interests are threatened as a Serbian dominated Yugoslavia attempts to prevent one of its Provinces (Kosovo) to secede from the Yugoslavia Federation? It is important to recall that it was the pioneers of Internationalism who, at the Versailles Peace Conference following the First World War, who insisted that as the Balkans had been the trigger for the First World War, although with other manifestations of "extreme" nationalism, they should be unified into one Federation. But such a Federation merely left sources of historical friction which have subsequently been exploited to advance global objectives.

The Internationalists who dominated the Versailles Peace Conference opposed any suggestion that a centralised Germany should be decentralised into its original states and imposed such hard conditions on the defeated Germans that it was almost certain that a dictator like Hitler would emerge. When he did, he was backed by all the forces of internationalism, who then sought another World War.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) was originally created allegedly to deal with possible Russian aggression, and to advance the programme for creating a United States of Europe. The collapse of the Soviet Union seriously dented this strategy. Another purpose had to be found for NATO.

The politically naive Serbian leader provided the type of excuse necessary to trigger a major conflict. This conflict is designed to create a climate of world opinion which will readily endorse any programme which will advance globalisation.

Albanian refugees being airlifted to Australia will not solve the basic problems of the Balkans, but it will increase Australia's problems. The Internationalists of all types are eager and willing to take advantage of such problems. History guarantees that such problems are inevitable unless a halt is called in the very near future.

Saying no to globalist policies is not negative, but can lead to positive and constructive results. Australia should give the necessary lead. Unless such a lead is given, the Balkans affair could follow the Vietnam pattern. It has been said that those who refuse to learn from the mistakes of history are doomed to repeat those mistakes.

THE TAIL THAT REFUSES TO WAG by Jeremy Lee:

One might have thought that the National Party would have woken long ago to the need for a major push to revive the bush. Even the blind can see that rural Australia is at the tail-end of a long period of decline which started at the end of the 'sixties. Spaced over the quarter of a century since then has been a refugee crisis which in terms of numbers must be reaching the half-million – obviously led by the 250,000 or so farmers who have walked off the land.

All this while the National Party sat on its hands – or washed them, Pilate-like, while the protracted disaster unfolded.

The National Party is now, in reality, two parties; the State-oriented section, of which the Queensland National Party is most obvious; and the "Fed-Nats", best represented by leader Tim Fischer, which

has decided that its best chance of harvesting the choicest plums of politics is to tread in the footsteps of the Liberals.

It was all fine until One Nation brought into public view what all but the most obtuse of politicians must have known – a seething anger and resentment in rural Australia that had finally tired of being the "bunny" for complacent party hacks who never took a stand on anything.

Aware now that, whatever long-term fate befalls One Nation, the disaffected in rural Australia will continue to seek political weapons that can turn the tide, the Nationals are looking for a few alternatives to retrieve their fortunes. Most Federal Nationals are only in office now with the barest of margins.

The Australian Financial Review (30/4/99), in an intriguing full-page report, described a Sydney meeting between Kerry Packer and a number of top corporate leaders, and the "elite" of the National Party.

"Kerry Packer delivered some passionate views in favour of greater government intervention to solve the woes of the bush, views that took the National Party leadership by surprise. His timing could not have come at a more critical moment as the National Party stands at the crossroads, facing fundamental decisions about its policy direction and leadership, with Fischer tipped to resign this year.

"And Packer – with broad agreement from many of the senior business people at the lunch – was championing a far more radical position than the Federal Nationals dared even suggest.

"The Nationals at the meeting – Federal leader Tim Fischer, his deputy John Anderson and Party president Don MacDonald – were not surprised to hear Packer's assessment that rural Australia was falling disastrously and irrevocably behind the cities. He could have been reading from a National Party script. But what did surprise them was the extent to which Packer, with dissent from only a minority in the room, thought the Government should move to remedy the situation . . ."

The last time the Nationals were bluntly confronted with the truth was in the mid-eighties, when Ian MacLachlan, as leader of the fledgling National Farmers' Association, gave them a tongue-lashing widely reported in the media. But MacLachlan became a party-politician, and the NFF became a "puppy-dog" establishment body, and the Nationals went back to their old ways of doing nothing – until One Nation mauled them in the Queensland State election.

The article, by Lenore Taylor, described it thus:

"... Fischer has committed his nine-year leadership of the Party to helping the bush face the reality of globalisation, rather than hide from it. Anderson has been part of that push and would continue it.

"But the economic and social pain caused by globalisation, falling commodity prices, cuts to government services in the bush and the flight of population to the cities has translated directly into political pain for the National Party. And that political pain is translating directly into support for leadership contenders who would take a more interventionist stance on policy and be more prepared to rock the Coalition boat . . ."

Is it possible for a party to cleanse and revigorate itself? The very nature of the back-stabbing ambition fostered in party politics mitigates against such a possibility. It is more likely that the best elements are forced to break away – which may yet eventuate. It is clear that the philosophy espoused by Tim Fischer and John Anderson will alienate rural Australia – or what's left of it – even further.

N
335-405
ONT

NSW UPPER HOUSE PUTS BRAKES ON CARR by David Thompson:

Counting for the NSW Legislative Council took nearly a month, because of the record of over 200 candidates, and more than 80 political parties and 'groups'. The result of the Upper House election has offended the major parties, even those in Opposition - they know it is a threat to their own claim for a "mandate" when they next replace the ALP in government.

The result of the election for the Council was: Labor - 8 seats, Coalition - 6; One Nation - 1; Greens - 1; Democrats - 1; Unity - 1; Outdoor Recreation Party - 1; Reform the Legal System - 1; and the Rev Fred Nile just managed to win the last seat from the Registered Clubs Party.

Premier Carr is now faced with an Upper House in which Labor holds 16 seats, the Coalition 13 seats, and a cross bench of 13 members. In practice, many of those on the cross benches are committed to following the Government's 'line' on most issues, unless they believe they have a "mandate" to object to what Mr. Carr's Ministry proposes. But it will by no means be a "free run" for Bob Carr in the Legislative Council as it is for, say, Premier Kennett in Victoria who holds his own majority in Victoria's Legislative Council.

The number of candidates and groups standing in NSW for the Upper House made for an unusual result. The Greens, for example, are livid that the Outdoor Recreation Party, who polled only 7,624 primary votes, were able to garner enough preferences to have Malcolm Jones elected. To rub salt into the wounds, Jones was not even present at the declaration of the poll, preferring to do a spot of 4-wheel driving in one of his favourite bush haunts on the South Coast. In his view, the wilderness should be available to everyone; horses, motor-bikes, 4-wheel drives, the lot! The Greens don't quite see it this way.

Even with such a small primary vote, Jones was able to successfully organise preference deals that gave him a higher overall vote than *either the Democrats or the Greens*, who received 10 times his primary vote. All of a sudden, the Greens, in particular, are not so sure that "preferential voting" is such a good system! Mr. Jones thinks its fine, as does Peter Breen.

The Reform the Legal System candidate, Peter Breen, was elected on about 35,000 primary votes, and preferences from many quarters, including One Nation. One Nation's vote was the third highest party vote (6.3%), successfully outpolling the Greens again, and propelling David Oldfield into the Council.

The Unity Party, which was set up as an anti-One Nation party, also benefitted from preferences. Dr. Peter Wong received 35,000 primary votes, and picked up sufficient preferences to win a seat. Strangely, neither the Greens nor the Democrats are objecting to this; to do so would clearly be racist!

But it is becoming clearer, from the NSW results, that voters are turning away from the major parties, and are prepared to deliberately cast a vote (or a preference) for minor groups or independents. Do the big parties get the message yet? There is no sign that they do.

