



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.37, No.19

May 25th, 2001

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"...we may employ a conception which will be familiar to students of Eastern Philosophy, which regards the world, or society, as a macrocosm or 'Great Man', reflecting on a gigantic scale the microcosm or individual man. In this conception every attribute of the human individual is repeated on a mighty scale in the 'World Man', and to this World Man, the 'Prince of this World', the human individual bears very much the same relation that the blood corpuscle of the individual does to the human body... Now the interest of the blood corpuscle, if it can be imagined to have an interest, is only concerned with the body of which it is a constituent – in so far as the continued existence of that body tends towards its own progressive evolution, and the interest of the human individual in society is similar..."*

"When we do things under the compulsion of Society, we are blood-corpuscles, not individuals; we are doing them in the interests of Society primarily, and only secondarily, if at all, in the interests of our own individuality..."

– C.H. Douglas in *"Social Credit"*, First Edition, 1924

IT'S NOT SAINTS THAT GO FOR POWER by Jeremy Lee:

These were the concluding words of the League's National Director, Betty Luks, delivered in a calm and reasoned manner, to a segment on the ABC's 7.30 Report on May 16th. The segment dealt with allegations that Graeme Campbell's entry into One Nation meant that the League now, somehow, controlled that party.

Senator Ron Boswell, threatened with defeat at the coming Federal Election, reiterated his oft-repeated and inaccurate allegations that the League has *"been called the most racist organisation in Australia. They're anti-Semitic; they're anti-Asian. He (i.e. Graeme Campbell) may say he's not being run by them, but many of Australia First's officers and office holders are League of Rights people. And also the people that donate to him considerable amounts of money come from the League of Rights"*

Thus spake the Grim Weeper during the interview. Any connection between what he said and the real truth is purely coincidental. But Boswell must build up a controversy to exploit if he is to improve his chances of re-election. He must be widely seen as the National Party knight in shining armour, riding forth to save what's left of rural Australia from a fate worse than death.

Unfortunately, Senator Boswell is not a natural on a horse! Not only does he look like a sack of potatoes in the saddle, but he obviously has not worked out how to point his trusty steed in the right direction!

IN THIS ISSUE: • *It's Not Saints That Go For Power* • *The Issue Of Sovereignty* • *Former High Court Judge*
• *The 'Black Economy' and the GST* • *Boswell Continues To Attack League of Rights*

"ON TARGET"

May 25th, 2001

Page 1 (73)

By contrast, Betty Luks was the epitome of moderation, not concerned with scoring the "brownie-points" which politicians have to drum up, but simply stating the truth.

Graeme Campbell was quoted in *The Australian Jewish News* (18/5/01) by Bernard Freedman as saying it was "unmitigated bull s..t" to claim that One Nation was threatened with infiltration by extremists because of his association with the League of Rights.

"...The League of Rights is about as subversive as the Country Women's Association and almost as powerful,' Mr. Campbell says.

"So, if the League of Rights is so unimportant, why continue to talk to them? 'I talk to anyone. I am not going to have anyone deprive me my freedom of speech. There is no advantage in my talking to the League of Rights, but I'm damned if I'm going to be intimidated into not talking to them by any pressure group. The more B'nai B'rith attacks me for talking to the League of Rights, the more I'll continue talking to them.'"

It would appear that Australia's Jewish Community is being coerced into believing that the resurgence of One Nation poses a threat to them. Another article in the same issue of *The Australian Jewish News*, headed DANGER: ONE NATION AHEAD, was a rambling condemnation which claimed One Nation's message was "one of intolerance, racism, prejudice, resentment and bitterness". It added that "None of this augurs well for the Jewish community".

Which explains why pressure from certain sections of the Jewish community for stronger racial vilification legislation is so strong. But there is no justification for further restrictions on freedom of speech, which such legislation would entail.

THE ISSUE OF SOVEREIGNTY: The real threat to the free society, summed up so well by Betty Luks in the few words she was given, lies in the fact that with every centralisation of power there is a corresponding withdrawal of personal sovereignty from the individual. This was well summed up by two prominent Australians a few years ago. P.P. McGuiness, currently Editor of *Quadrant*, wrote in *The Australian*, March 22nd, 1994:

".... With every multilateral treaty or bargain; every adhesion to bodies such as the United Nations or General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; every agreement on the international trading regime, on international co-ordination and standards on human rights and the environment, or the rights of indigenous peoples, or racial, sexual, or other discrimination; on international property rights or cultural co-operation; with every convention of the International Labour Organisation signed - there has been not only the creation of new heads of power for the Commonwealth, but a cession of power to interfere in and legislate for Australia to the various international communities of signatories and organisations"

FORMER HIGH COURT JUDGE: Seven months later the former High Court of Australia Judge Sir Ninian Stephen, presenting the Sir Earle Page Lecture, was quoted by *The Bulletin* (11/10/94) as saying:

"National Governments worldwide are increasingly experiencing diminished sovereignty, diminished power to legislate as they see fit and increased obligations to conform to criteria and benchmarks imposed by international agencies," he said. Stephen, our most respected international jurist, argued that a "democratic deficit" may emerge in Australia, where the cabinet and not the parliament decides to enter treaties. This would be compounded if the UN and similar bodies held greater sway over what happened within a country than did its own decision-making institutions.

He said "When power passes from nation-states to international agencies, the individual elector risks becoming increasingly unimportant. The decline in extent of national sovereignty may mean just that:

policy affecting the citizen may be determined at levels altogether too remote, in international forums, by people largely immune to the sorts of pressures that the citizen can still exert over policy-making by Australian governments"

Which goes right to the heart of the problem. Sovereignty does not have its source either in the nation-state, or in international agencies. The source – the very start – of sovereignty is within each individual, and is God-given.

Individuals can voluntarily share their sovereignty with others for mutual advantage. The essential safeguard is the ability to "contract out" of arrangements with which the individual does not agree. Where he joins with others to enable government to make laws for community or national benefit, the institutions involved are there for individuals – not the other way round. It has no business making decisions, or pursuing policies with which the people are not in agreement.

This is the essence of the crisis facing Australia and other nations at the moment. Governments have taken upon themselves the illicit right to determine the future, whether the people like it or not. The situation we mentioned last week, where the people of Switzerland were able to stop their government applying for membership of the European Union by forcing a referendum on the issue would provide an essential check on runaway governments in other parts of the world.

What happens when governments, armed with all the sanctions of the all-powerful State, move towards objectives with which most people disagree? The problem has worked its way through history, although probably never so intensely or so widely as currently.

Where the rift between government and peoples becomes too wide, it ends in physical repression, or in revolution.

More than once the Coalition criticised Labor's use of international treaties – when in Opposition. But once in government they "out-Heroded Herod". We have advanced further towards handing Australia's decision-making powers over to international agencies than under any previous government – Labor included.

It is too much to believe that Prime Minister Howard doesn't know what he is doing. He has, more than once, referred obliquely to Australia's "diminution of sovereignty". But he will only defer to the Australian people when there is a possibility he will be voted out of office. At all other times he ploughs on, oblivious to the damage he is causing, or the people he is hurting in the process.

THE 'BLACK ECONOMY' AND THE GST: Some may remember in those distant days before the GST predictions by Government spokesmen that it would reduce the "black economy". Peter Reith was one who suggested that as much as \$7 billion in extra revenue would be collected, although the official government estimate was \$3.5 billion. Wishful thinking!

The Editorial in *The Australian Financial Review* (18/5/01) said: " Earlier this month, two admittedly small-scale studies suggested that more small businesses were moving into the black economy to avoid the GST. One indicated that 31 percent of respondents had been offered GST-free goods or services and the other suggested 68 percent of respondents would now participate in the black economy, compared with 43 percent in a previous survey...There is evidence that the cash economy has increased in size in both New Zealand and Canada after the introduction of a consumption tax"

Surprise! Surprise! The obvious answer (if you're a politician, of course) is to abolish cash altogether, and make any sort of barter a hanging offence! How dare the goose decide to retain a few feathers for itself?

BOSWELL CONTINUES TO ATTACK LEAGUE OF RIGHTS by Betty Luks:

Of course Senator Boswell's recent attacks on the Australian League of Rights *had nothing to do* with the fact that the Queensland National Party polled just 8 percent of the primary vote in the recent Surfers Paradise by-election! Nor was there any connection between the scare tactics directed at possible One Nation voters and the appalling revelation that the ruling elite had thrown our Australian producers to the wolves and opened up the domestic market to increasing amounts of highly subsidised imports – for just twenty-two percent of the food and fibre production which is the percentage of production Australia exports!

One wonders what links there are between the tragic suicides of 41,000 of Australians over the last twenty years (*Adelaide Advertiser* 19/4/01) and the deregulation and free market policies of the political parties.

Newsweekly reporter Pat Byrne tells the stark truth about the betrayal of the Australian people in his article "*The Facts Behind the Rural Revolt*", 5/5/01.

He writes that some National Party politicians say they have argued strongly that deregulation and free market policies have been behind the demise of agricultural industries and regional communities, but, incredibly, "No matter how convincing their case, they have ended up hitting a brick wall with National Party leadership."

The mantra from the party leaders has been "... it's the export market that matters. We export 80 percent of our agricultural product and if de-regulation helps farmers become more efficient for the export market, then deregulation is necessary, albeit a necessary evil."

Mr. Byrne reminds his readers, "This has been a long-cherished argument of the National Party, the Coalition, the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), the National Farmers Federation (NFF), the Australian Bureau of Agricultural Resource Economics (ABARE), the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (AFFA), Federal Treasury and the think-tanks that advocate globalism and the free market. That argument is now in tatters..."

"Mummy the emperor is not wearing any clothes": The man who has courageously noted that 'the emperor is not wearing any clothes' is Mark McGovern, an economist at the Queensland University, and his conclusions "were almost the exact opposite of what has been the conventional wisdom for two decades". His expertise is in input-output analysis.

Mr. McGovern published his findings "On the Unimportance of Exports to Australian Agriculture" in *The Australasian Journal of Regional Studies* (Vol.5, No.2, 1999).

As a direct result, the Queensland National Party set up a committee to investigate the findings. "After a year long investigation," writes Pat Byrne, "the Agricultural Production Destination Committee broadly endorsed the McGovern findings in its report to the Queensland National Party Central Council in November last year. Despite this, the National Party Federal leadership has been in a state of denial over the research...."

Senator Ron Boswell would know of this and one must assume his attacks on the League and One Nation are designed to provide a distraction and take the spotlight off of his own party's (and the Liberals') betrayal of the Australian people.

"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.