



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.29

August 4th, 2000

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"The only revolution advocated by Social Credit is the monetary revolution. No social upheaval is called for, no class warfare is desired, and to no class is relegated the right to dominate others, not even to the class of financiers and bankers who are sharply rebuked for having become the masters and dictators of the country, whereas they should have remained its servants.*

"The Social Credit system believes, as does Catholic Sociology, that there are social inequalities that are inevitable and admits the differentiation of groups and professions. But it also desires all to respect one another and to work in harmony for the common welfare."

"Social Credit and Catholicism" by George-Henri Levesque, O.P. 1936

ELECTORAL INQUIRY A FAILURE by Jeremy Lee:

The report by the Parliamentary Joint Select Committee on Electoral Matters, set up two years ago to investigate the fairness or otherwise of Australia's electoral system, has finally been tabled. Every member of the Committee was from one of the major political parties. It received hundreds of submissions, many concerned with the unfairness of compulsory preferential voting. Its Report noted that in many submissions there was a strong belief that: *".... something is radically wrong and unfair with the current system of full preferential voting. It is argued that: the present system is specifically designed to favour the major parties"*

Despite the obvious coercion inherent in a system which forces voters to allocate preferences to unwanted alternatives, no recommendation was made to return to genuine choice.

One of the issues leading to the inquiry was that of Albert Langer, briefly jailed for recommending voters give the same number to unwanted candidates, thus obviating preference (i.e. allocating numbers like 1,2,3 3 3).

With a stroke of machiavellian genius the Report recommended that the Act be changed so that Langer's recommendation no longer be a crime – but that votes cast this way should be null and void!

It is quite clear that the Committee's Report was not concerned with increasing free choice for voters.

NEW ASSOCIATION TO COUNTER ELECTORAL FRAUD: Those attending the Inverell Forum a few years ago will remember a paper by Dr. Amy McGrath, giving evidence of electoral rorts in Australia. As a result of her pioneering a new society has been formed to counter the abuse of the electoral system. In its brochure it says:

"Dr. Amy McGrath, O.A.M., a Sydney historian published *The Fraudging of Votes* in Feb. 1996 after

her account of union election corruption, *The Forging of Votes* in 1994. It deals with the evolution of our electoral system, the manifold and manifest opportunities for fraud, and the evidence of fraud. Following these initiatives, a number of people decided to form a Society to gain wider public awareness of what we see to be the greatest threat to our democracy, evident corruption of our electoral system. The Society is determined to be independent of any political party and without patronage. It is named after the Victorian politician who created the world's first 'limited' secret ballot law, designed to achieve an effective scrutiny to detect fraud after elections. Unfortunately in Australia it was later replaced by an 'absolute' secret ballot system in which fraud is effectively untraceable. It is our belief that this 'absolute' system has been abused increasingly, rendering it corrupt, both potentially and in practice."

The Society, the H.S. Chapman Society offers Forum and Video speakers, including parliamentarians and councillors, lawyers and academics, former electoral commissioners, journalists and unionists. It is launching a nation-wide petition asking for an electoral ombudsman, and an amendment to the Electoral Act providing for more effective access to courts on disputed returns. The address: The H.S. Chapman Society, Box 2391, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W., 2001.

G.M. FOOD LABELLING: As this article is being written (Friday, 28/7) Health Ministers from Australia and New Zealand are meeting to decide the details of labelling genetically-modified food. The most recent survey shows over 95% of Australians in favour of labelling of ALL foods that contain ANY G.M. products.

It seems that Prime Minister Howard has been under enough pressure to intervene personally. He has written to all concerned Ministers in Australia and New Zealand suggesting that foodstuffs containing one percent of G.M. product or less should not require labelling. This suggestion is strongly opposed by a lot of groups and individuals who believe that this would be impossible to police.

The issue is now an international one, having produced deep division at the recent G-8 conference in Japan. *The Australian* (24/7/2000) reported:

".... acrimony developed with the U.S. and Canada in one camp and European nations in the other. Europe harbours deep suspicions over what it has billed as 'Frankenstein food' but the U.S. has a \$US4 billion (\$A7 billion)-a-year G.M. food industry and is wary of Europe using safety fears to create a trade barrier by stealth"

Louise Sylvan, of the Australian Consumers Association (*Australian Financial Review*, 13/7/2000), wrote of the one-per-cent proposal:

"....The Australian Consumers' Association estimates that about three-quarters of processed foods in Australia would remain unlabelled for G.M. under these broad exemptions, undermining the right of consumers in a free market to be able to know what they are buying.

"The Australian Medical Association, the Public Health Association and A.C.A. were so concerned about this proposal that they jointly expressed their reservations to the Prime Minister, Mr. Howard"

OUTCASTS AMONG THEIR OWN: A feature story in *The Courier-Mail* (Queensland, 23/7/2000) carried what must be inexplicable news to unsuspecting Australians. A busload of Afghan illegal immigrants arrived in Brisbane from the Curtin Detention Centre in Western Australia. On arrival, they were met with loudly-expressed hostility – not from any other racial group, but by Afghans who have been living in southern Queensland for a number of years.

One quoted reaction: "We don't know what kind of people they are or whether they came for humanitarian reasons. We came to Australia as official refugees. We are angry because they came here

illegally by paying smugglers \$US8,000 (\$11,800). Where do they get that sort of money? They must be wealthy"

As we have said before, the Australian Government is playing with fire, attempting to fight a street fighter by Marquis of Queensberry rules which nobody but Mr. Ruddock understands.

GENESIS OF SEPTEMBER WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM? Have you been invited to a Government-convened seminar or conference lately? Possibly a Local Government 'Community Forum'? Please read on. The following is part of a report which came from the American groups Environmental Perspectives, Inc. and Sovereignty International Incorporated, 1229 Broadway, Suite 313, Bangor, Maine 04401:

ANATOMY OF THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENDA – The Overall Plan: The age of environmentalism started in 1967 with the publishing of the "Iron Mountain Report" (named after its first meeting place, Iron Mountain, N.Y.) by a group of intellectual elitists from various disciplines in the U.S. The purpose of the report was to define a mechanism to switch from the threat of war as a means to control society to something that would work in peace. They chose environmental holocausts. Foreign Affairs began to promote environmental holocausts in 1970. The major foundations began to fund environmental activism in the early 1970s.

Maurice Strong, a Canadian industrialist with dirt poor childhood, was a security guard at the UN at age 18, was put on the fast track by David Rockefeller and associates, became vice president of Dome Petrochemical at age 25 and has had a dazzling career since then.

In 1972 Strong was Secretary General of the first Earth Summit in Stockholm. This led to the creation of the United Nations Environmental Program (U.N.E.P.) in 1972. Strong was U.N.E.P.'s first Executive Director.

At the same time Strong served as the Director of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (I.U.C.N.).

The I.U.C.N. was accredited by the U.N. in 1946 to become its "scientific advisor" and was made up of various government scientists. It has done some fairly good work.

In the early 1970s Strong expanded the I.U.C.N. to include Non-Governmental Organizations (N.G.O's.). There are now 74 governments, 104 government agencies and over 700 N.G.O. organizations as members. Because of their overwhelming majority, these N.G.O's. now control the I.U.C.N.'s agenda.

The I.U.C.N.'s official mission "is to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable." The I.U.C.N., "promotes alternative models for sustainable communities and lifestyles, based in ecospiritual practice and principles...to accelerate our transition to a just and sustainable future.... The problems that face the world today, humanity must undergo a radical change in its attitudes, values, and behavior.... In response to this situation, a new global ethics is taking form, and it is finding expression in international law."

This new global ethic is centered on what is called biocentrism. "In a biocentric approach," states the I.U.C.N., "the rights of nature are defended first and foremost on the grounds of the intrinsic value of animals, plants, rivers, mountains, and ecosystems rather than simply on the basis of their utilitarian value or benefit to humans."

This biocentric world view is at the heart of the I.U.C.N.'s pantheistic/new age definition of sustainable development, "Sustainable by definition, means not only indefinitely prolonged, but nourishing, as the earth is nourishing to life and the self-actualizing of persons and communities. The word development

need not be restricted to economic activity, but can mean the evolution, unfolding growth and fulfillment of any and all aspects of life. Thus sustainable development may be defined as the kind of human activity that nourishes and perpetuates the fulfillment of the whole community of life on earth. This definition is at the heart of almost all U.N. treaties and agreements.

WHAT IS AGENDA 21? Agenda 21 is the United Nation's blue print for the complete restructuring of nations to fit into the proper environmental mould. As listed below, Agenda 21 outlines, in detail, the U.N.'s vision for a completely managed society, dictating the processes to be used for industry, agriculture, housing development and even education. The White House's new drive for massive acquisition of private property is necessary for the full implementation of Agenda 21.

ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (Agenda 21)

Excerpts from the Preamble to REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (Agenda 21)

"Humanity stands at a defining moment in history. We are confronted with a perpetuation of disparities between and within nations, a worsening of poverty, hunger, ill health and illiteracy, and the continuing deterioration of the ecosystems on which we depend for our well-being. However, integration of environment and development concerns and greater attention to them will lead to the fulfillment of basic needs, improved living standards for all, better protected and managed ecosystems and a safer, more prosperous future. No nation can achieve this on its own; but together we can – in a global partnership for sustainable development.

"Agenda 21 addresses the pressing problems of today and also aims at preparing the world for the challenges of the next century. It reflects a global consensus and political commitment at the highest level on development and environment co-operation. Its successful implementation is first and foremost the responsibility of Governments. National strategies, plans, policies and processes are crucial in achieving this. International co-operation should support and supplement such national efforts. In this context, the United Nations system has a key role to play. Other international, regional and sub-regional organizations are also called upon to contribute to this effort. The broadest public participation and the active involvement of the non-governmental organizations and other groups should also be encouraged."

List of All of the Subjects Covered Under Agenda 21's All Encompassing 'Hooks': Management of Solid Waste, Management of Radioactive Wastes, Strengthening the Role of Major Groups, Global Action for Women, Children and Youth in Sustainable Development, Indigenous People, NGO Partners, Local Authorities Initiatives in support of Agenda 21, Strengthening Workers and Trade Unions, The Role of Business Industry, Scientific Technological communities, The Role of Farmers, Financial Resources Mechanisms, Transfer of Technology, Science for Sustainable Development, Promoting Education Training, National Mechanisms International Cooperation, International Institutional Arrangements, International Legal Mechanisms, International Cooperation, Combating Poverty, Changing Consumption Patterns, Demographics & sustainability, Protecting Human Health, Human Settlements, Integrating Environment and development in decision-making, Protection of the Atmosphere, Planning and Management of Land Resources, Combating Deforestation, Desertification Drought, Sustainable Mountain Development, Sustainable Agriculture, Conservation of Biological Diversity, Management of Biotechnology, Protection of the Oceans, Management and use of Water Resources, Management of Toxic Chemicals, Management of Hazardous Wastes.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052J, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.
Subscription \$40.00 p.a.