



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.36, No.26

July 14th, 2000

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"Too often, one forgets that politics, which ought to see to the stabilisation of economics, has itself become a monopoly. But because this monopoly is present in the form of political parties, and because party politics struts under the name of democracy, the people are taken in. They think that political parties were made for them, whereas they were made to exploit them..."*

"Political parties are very careful not to denounce the money monopoly; the other monopolies are criticised (it is in style to win votes) but of the money monopoly, not a word is said. Likewise, the money monopoly is very careful not to put up obstacles to party politics. The big economic monopoly and the big political monopoly seem to have passed a kind of gentlemen's agreement between themselves, a mutual accord to protect each other – at the people's expense."

– Louis Even quoted in *"In This Age of Plenty"*, 1988

GLOBAL FINGERS UNRAVEL ANOTHER AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRY by Jeremy Lee:

Behind the death-throes of thousands more Australian farmers, this time in the Dairy Industry, can be seen the ruthless manoeuvring of giant multinationals.

The particular culprit this time is the giant Italian multinational Parmalat Finanziaria – after control of the dairy industries in both Australia and New Zealand.

Control of the Dairy Industry does not directly involve throwing farmers off the land – although that will be a national consequence. It involves control of the distribution mechanism which delivers milk, via the supermarket, to the consumer.

Even where farmers own their own co-operative they are at the mercy of the distribution system.

The idea is that a smaller number of Victorian farmers will provide the milk for the whole of Australia. Any farmers' association which wishes to deliver milk to the housewife must now compete against multinationals in three-month tenders from the supermarket chains for the cheapest bulk-price. They haven't got a dog's chance!

In Victoria most farmers deliver their milk to one of two organisations – Bonlac, which is 25% New Zealand-owned, and Murray Goulburn. But it is distributed to the consumer via the Melbourne-based National Foods.

In June 1998 Parmalat bought Pauls for \$437 million, and is currently in the process of a takeover of National Foods, offering \$4 a share, in a bid totalling \$1.1 billion.

If the takeover is successful, Victorian farmers – or those who remain in business – will be in the hands of a multinational in finally getting their milk to Victorian consumers.

If they think that they can make up by replacing milk sales in the other States, they are still in the hands of the same multinational.

Take Queensland, for instance. Milk sales in greater Brisbane (60% of the State) are virtually controlled by Pauls (Parmalat-owned). National Foods have about 2% – but they will probably soon be owned by Parmalat anyway.

In the rest of Queensland distribution is largely in the hands of Dairyfarmers, one of the last Australian-owned dairy companies. It will be in an invidious position. Locked permanently out of 60% of the Queensland market, which will be supplied from Victoria via Pauls/Parmalat, it will also have to compete in tendering for market share in the rest of Queensland to the supermarkets at de-regulated prices. It is not hard to foresee a situation where the little, struggling Australian-owned co-operatives will soon be swallowed up by a Parmalat monopoly.

The Federal Government's reaction is ignominious. It has offered a \$1.8 billion "repackaging" fund, to help dairyfarmers who are being shunted off their farms. But this will be funded by an 11 cent levy on milk, over four or five years; in other words, remaining farmers and consumers will, between them, fund the industry's funeral arrangements. The payments made to replaced farmers will be taxable, so the Federal Government will reap \$460 million in taxation from a fund which producers and consumers pay for!

LAST-DITCH FIGHT: In an angry reaction to the feeling of betrayal by their own State industry organisations, dairy farmers throughout Australia are coming together in a new organisation, the Australian Milk Producers' Association (AMPA). Among other goals is a legal challenge to the way the industry has been manipulated and the compensation package handled.

They need all the support they can get. If unsuccessful, the final price will be paid by the household consumer.

Speaking of National Foods, the current Parmelat target, *The Australian Financial Review* (30/6/2000) said: "..... *The Melbourne-based NatFoods is the country's most efficient milk producer and will benefit more than any other producer of scale from deregulation, which will shave about \$500 million from the incomes of farmers and push it mostly into the coffers of producers. Some of these savings might flow to consumers, but households shouldn't hold their breaths*"

FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH: The following letter-to-the-editor, which appeared in *The Australian* (20/6/2000), needs no comment. It appeared under the heading *MORE BENALLAS:*

"Your Editorial on the National Party ignores one basic fact. Country voters can now separate rhetoric from reality. Under the stewardship of both Tim Fischer and John Anderson, there has been no balancing net that you refer to; both leaders totally embraced and signed up to an agenda of small government (national competition policy) and economic rationalism (deregulation, privatisation and so on).

"The policy manifestation of this philosophy is that in practice there is no tangible difference between the Coalition partners, or indeed to the ALP, other than for the GST.

"This is why there will be a lot more Benallas to come for the National Party. Playing with smoke and mirrors will not change this, only a fundamental change in policy direction will do that. The clock is surely ticking and it's time the leadership gave reality to the rhetoric of representing country voters." – BRIAN HANDLEY, President, Moe Branch of the National Party, Newborough, Victoria.

ANOTHER ATSIC DEBACLE: The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC), the organisation with an annual billion-dollar budget funded by the taxpayers they continually denigrate, is to allocate some of the money to establishing a special committee to focus on a treaty. Up to \$1

million could be spent. That should allow for plenty of trips to United Nations gab-fests to increase pressure on their own country.

It's an interesting thought that, if ATSIC was disbanded, and the whole budget was given on a per capita basis to Aborigines, each one – man, woman and child – would receive more than \$2,000 per year, plus mining royalties and all the other benefits they receive.

A slight hitch is that the present chairman of ATSIC, Mr. Geoff Clark, is under a cloud for alleged sex offences. We wonder whether ATSIC will fund his legal fees?

DIAMONDS ARE A THUG'S BEST FRIEND: A major investigation into how warring parties in a host of African countries obtain their arms was described in the *Guardian Weekly* (22-28/6/2000). The key is the number of diamond mines in such countries as Angola and Sierra Leone. Regular shipments of diamonds are delivered to Antwerp. UNITA, for instance, under the Angolan rebel Jonas Savimbi, " ...earned an estimated \$150 million to buy arms, medicines, diesel fuel, mining machinery and other commodities"

One of the main operators in the trade is a former Soviet KGB officer, Victor Bout, who runs a fleet of ex-Soviet planes out of Sharjah in the United Arab Emirates. Overwhelmingly the arms shipments come from Eastern Europe, with Bulgaria the main source.

A 'POLITICALLY CORRECT' REPORT OF EVENTS? by Betty Luks:

It is now possible to 'tap into' overseas sources swiftly and read 'the news behind the news' – thanks to the Internet. We can quickly catch up with the facts of a story the establishment media will not tell us – or do not want us to know.

The Age, July 5th, 2000, carried a story of women being attacked by a large group of drunken men in New York Central Park after a Puerto Rican Day Parade on June 11th. The emphasis in *The Age* story was on the failure of a number of NY policemen to come to the aid of the women being attacked.

In fact, complaints from victims of the attacks were initially 'played down' by Howard Safir, NY Police Commissioner, "but, he was forced to change his tune when New York television stations began showing amateur video recordings of dozens of women being attacked by a large group of men milling in the park after the parade," reports Mark Riley, New York correspondent for *The Age*. Riley refers to one victim, a French tourist on her honeymoon, who was doused with water, had her skirt ripped off and was then "groped by a number of men."

But that is not all there is to this story. Nicholas Stix, freelance journalist (*Toogood Reports*) presents the 'bigger picture':

"Race is the 800-pound gorilla no one wants to talk about, in New York City's Central Park wilding spree. But all the tiptoeing around it merely underscores its ubiquity.

Every single one of the 33 suspects is black or Hispanic. A decisive majority is black. Though police refuse to divulge the racial breakdown of the victims, it appears that the victims of the most serious attacks were overwhelmingly white (though the media keep running videos of smiling black and Hispanic girls being splashed with water, as if that was what the wilding was all about).

The story is that the men went on a wilding spree from about 2 pm until 6:30 or so, in broad daylight, in a park full of tens of thousands of visitors, with a thousand or so police officers within shouting distance. The perpetrators sprayed women with water, before proceeding to rob them, rip their clothes off, grope their genitalia, and in several cases, manually rape them (forcing their fingers into unwilling women's vaginas).

In the case of a French couple visiting the city, the mob held down the husband, who could see half-a-dozen members strip his wife naked, and then take turns jamming their fingers into her.

Feminist organizations were quick to protest. NOW, in particular, organized a protest on Sunday, June 18th, in which its supporters attacked the police! The problem for NOW is that none – as in zero – of the

perpetrators were white. No "privileged, white, heterosexual males" had had the decency to accommodate feminists by attacking at least one white female. As recent history has shown, a black man could rape, murder and dismember a white woman and no feminist organization would decry black racism.

Feminists see themselves in alliance with black and Hispanic groups, an alliance that has been profitable in terms of power, propaganda, lucrative lawsuits, set-aside programmes and discriminatory policies favouring women. However, it has also exacted a terrible price. For while white women have stuck to the bargain, blacks – who have profited as much from it as the white women have – have not.

And so, blacks (especially black women) routinely stab feminists in the back, by celebrating black violence against white women, whether in supporting O.J. Simpson, and cheering his 1996 acquittal of killing his wife, Nicole; by turning the black men who gang-raped and beat almost to death a young woman in the 1989 Central Park Jogger case into folk heroes, and then engaging in a year-long campaign of public vilification against the victim; and finally in refraining from any criticism of the men who attacked white women on June 11th, while roundly condemning the majority-white police force.

Every time such an assault takes place, white feminists are forced to eat crow by blacks' – especially black women's – embrace of the attackers. And white feminists have proved yet again – as they did through their unflinching support of serial sexual abuser Bill Clinton – that there is no depth to which they will not sink, to avoid criticizing those whom they perceive to be their political allies.

NOW President Patricia Ireland released a statement arguing: "Congress must pass the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act to extend hate crimes protection to women and pass the reauthorization and expansion of the Violence Against Women Act" which, "would fund training for police and other law enforcement and court personnel, among other things".

Since blacks and Hispanics are in practice routinely exempted from prosecution under hate crimes statutes, Ireland's demands would have had no effect on the Central Park attackers. The only point I can see in Ireland's proposal is as a source for soft, federal patronage jobs for middle-class women – "training."

I sought to broach these issues with the folks at NOW. Val Henning of NOW's press office called back, asking "what constituency does Toogood Reports serve?" I answered, "I really wouldn't know," thinking to myself that I had always written for an "audience" of everyone who could read the language. That was the last I heard from NOW. Hearing me speak constantly of white female victims, you may be asking, "But what about the two black victims?" To which I say, "What black victims?" In less than 48 hours, Ashanna Cover and Josina Lawrence, of Somerset, New Jersey, were able to round up a high-priced attorney, get the most high-profile "civil rights" leader in the nation on their side, file a multimillion-dollar lawsuit, and hold a press conference. But somehow, they never found the time to co-operate with the police.

At their press conference, Cover and Lawrence were accompanied by the Rev. Al Sharpton. Having Al Sharpton as one's spokesman automatically brings with it a credibility problem. When the NYPD brass sought to interview the women, and have them look through mug shots of all the officers on duty in the area where the women said the first two cops they encountered brushed them off, the women refused to co-operate. None of the other victims or witnesses has identified Cover or Lawrence. Neither Cover nor Lawrence has identified any attackers who assaulted them, nor any of the police officers whom they insist refused to help them. Can you say, "Quick, sealed, tax-free, cash settlement"?

In January, 1991, I was attacked on a Brooklyn-bound subway by a gang of three blacks and two Hispanics. A white NYPD detective I spoke with at the transit bureau that night in January, 1991, acknowledged that the attack was obviously racially motivated, a "bias" crime, but "there are some things you can't say," due to the political climate. The detective also reported that such racially motivated attacks by blacks against whites occur every single day in New York City.

The media and the city's PR machine notwithstanding, the climate has gotten considerably stormier in the intervening nine-and-a-half years. Just imagine, if no one had bothered to tape the events in Central Park on June 11th."