



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.38, No.10

March 22nd, 2002

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** *"Canon Demant, after referring to the Roman idea of a universal law for all men, and to the Greeks having taught men to get outside the stream of Nature and grasp reality by thought, said that Christianity by insisting on man's special position as a creature made in God's image, had made these two facts a working habit of mind. By giving things a meaning outside society and the State, it gave the human person a significance unknown outside Europe. The overall existence of the Church, something exterior to tribe and class and state, was the root of the European belief in freedom."*

– Sir David Kelly, *"The Hungry Sheep"*, 1955

## STEREOTYPING WITH THE POLITICAL TAR-BRUSH by Jeremy Lee:

Periodically the media carry the latest hatchet job on what they are pleased to call 'extremist' elements of the political spectrum. All sorts of allegations are made and, judging by past experiences, no space for rebuttal is provided.

The latest to attract some unjustified flak is Susan Bryce of Queensland, editor of *The Freedom and Survival Guide*, which stands out as a well researched and documented periodical. Having become a media adviser to Senator Len Harris of One Nation, she was the target for a critical article by Glenn Milne, chief political correspondent of the Seven Network, in *The Australian* (11/3/02).

Susan Bryce's crime, apparently, is that she also writes for *New Dawn*, which Milne classifies as a magazine which ".... believes in the 'New World Order One World Government' conspiracy, publishing details of their supposed meetings and describing the methods by which the New World Order exerts control ...."

The article then went on to criticise Neil Baird, editor of the online newsletter *The News Report*, and also Edward Wall, a Perth lawyer he has accused of representing two 'holocaust deniers', and who is now the One Nation vice-president in Western Australia.

Glenn Milne wrote, *inter alia*: ".... According to the Jewish Anti-Defamation Commission publication *B'nai Brith*: 'Wall, of the Perth legal firm E.J. Wall and Associate, has acted as the Australian solicitor representing UK-based Holocaust denier, David Irving, in his ongoing attempts to overturn the Australian Government's ruling, refusing him an entry visa' ...."

**IN THIS ISSUE:** • *Thought for the Week* • *Stereotyping with the Political Tar-Brush* • *When it Comes to Sources* • *How Much Debt is Too Much?* • *The Escalating Cost of Insurance*

"ON TARGET"

March 22nd, 2002

Page 1 (37)



Wall had also acted for Fred Toben of the Adelaide Institute while he was in a German prison in 1999 for the crime of Holocaust denial.

Milne added: "... *Wall has also spoken at forums of the (anti-Semitic) Australian League of Rights....*" – which, presumably, is enough to damn him for ever, together with others such as current Foreign Minister Alexander Downer, the late RSL chief Brigadier Alf Garland, well-known former Victorian RSL chief Bruce Ruxton, one-time Defence Minister Jim Killen, full-blood Aboriginal church minister Cedric Jacobs, former Federal MP Graeme Campbell and former Senator Flo Bjelke-Petersen.

Historian David Irving, as we understand it, has never been a 'holocaust-denier' – although he has contested many factual distortions in the history of events associated with the Holocaust. Even his most trenchant critics have admitted his enormous capacity for research.

**WHEN IT COMES TO SOURCES:** It was interesting that Milne quoted from the Anti-Defamation Commission in his article. The following notes, by veteran League supporter and Secretary of the League's NSW book-mailing service Mr. Roy Gustard are worth considering:

### BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING

After the passage of the Racial & Religious Tolerance Bill in Victoria, all States now have legislation that ensures that only those with a politically-correct image can be tolerated in our society.

The provisions of this legislation make it an offence to disseminate ideas that are considered likely to incite racial hatred. Who will determine what material can be judged as likely to provoke racial hatred? Australian law already covers what constitutes violence or terrorism. The new laws will ensure that freedom of speech will be curtailed to ensure that expressions of opinion conform to what is acceptable to the establishment.

The legislation will be exploited by those groups regarded as "self-appointed" guardians of their own particular viewpoint on world issues. Within Australia a Jewish organization known as B'nai B'rith has already established an anti-Defamation Commission which is devoted systematically to researching as what they regard as "far-right" groups which includes those with a nationalist agenda, and opposed to One World Government. Included in this list are the One Nation Party, the Australian League of Rights, and other politically active groups, in particular those opposed to Zionism and the State of Israel.

The ADC has published a series of Briefing Papers analyzing what they consider are racist groups. These papers are distributed to members of parliament and others, likely to be receptive to their prognosis.

During his visit to Australia in 1994, well-renowned Jewish writer Chaim Bernant observed "... that any critic of Israel, Zionism or Zionists, would be immediately denounced as an "anti-semite" or, if Jewish, as a self-hating Jew". It is legislation of the nature of the anti-vilification laws that have been vigorously promoted for many years by Zionist lobby groups world wide.

In their literature, the ADC claim contact with B'nai B'rith chapters overseas, and the United States based "Anti-Defamation League". The tactics of the Anti-Defamation League, if identical with the Australian Anti-Defamation Commission, should be of some concern to Australians. In 1991, their methods of operation were disclosed in a prominent Court case in New York City, which revealed their methods of discrediting opponents, which included infiltration, the use of spies, illegal entry and theft of private documents. The ADL exchanged information with a Foreign Power, the Israeli Government. This information was confirmed in a book written by an ADL agent, "Square One" by Arnold Forster, who was associated with the ADL for 50 years.



The well-known linguist and political activist and writer, Professor Noam Chomsky, himself a Jew, was one of many US citizens targeted by the ADL because of their opposition to Zionism. Another, Professor Alfred M. Lilienthal, an expert on the Middle East, and author of many books on the subject, was also vilified. The ADL circulated dossiers of material to discredit them. Similar tactics were used against groups considered by the ADL as "right wing extremists".

Australians are tolerant of the views expressed by all persuasions, and preservation of our code of free expression is one of the attributes of our democratic society. But we should regard with real concern any group that exists solely to denigrate the opinions of others, and use underhand tactics to achieve their ends". (end of comment)

**HOW MUCH DEBT IS TOO MUCH?** Max Walsh, economist and the recent editor of *The Bulletin*, posed this question in the issue of February 26th. He started by saying that this question would predominate the first decade of the 21st Century.. He pointed out that household debt in Australia had grown by 16.5% in the six months to December, and had doubled to over 100% of household income in the last decade. He went on: *"...The Reserve Bank's cautious observations about local debt apply with even greater urgency to the three largest global economies, the US, Japan and Germany, where the accumulation of debt - in the corporate and public sectors and at the household level - has been even faster than here. Japan and Germany have more rapidly ageing populations which exacerbates any excess debt problem ...."*

Dr. Susan George, in her explosive book "The Debt Boomerang", published in 1992, forecast that the Third World Debt, which haunted the world in the eighties and nineties, would finally rebound on the industrialized nations. She pointed out that in the 108 months from 1982 to 1990 the Third World had been forced to pay an amount of interest equivalent to \$US1,000 for every man, woman and child in North America and Europe. This did not include the repayment of any principal, which doubled the amount. Yet this money never reached ordinary people, who saw their taxes spent on bolstering banks whenever Third World countries could not pay.

Now we all wallow in debt, living today by committing tomorrow's income. And still no one dares question how this world-wide debt starts and accumulates. How do the trillions of dollars now clogging budgets world-wide come into existence? The fact that they are simply created out of nothing during the lending process is kept well out of any discussion.

So we are left with an absurd riddle – unless people keep borrowing, we have a recession. Yet the borrowing now threatens to collapse economies round the world! Nobody knows what the right mix is between "borrowing" and "not borrowing". Reserve Bank Governors try to adjust the mix by raising or lowering interest rates. They are the architects of "boom-bust" economies which crunch up mortals and spit them out.

Why should not required money expansions be credited to national economies? Wouldn't this balance an otherwise un-balanceable situation?

Max Walsh, without offering a definite answer, concluded his article with this observation: *"... That's why the question of how much debt is too much is critical. But it's one that will only be answered by discovery, not theory."*

Pardon me, Max, but you're wrong. The answer is known. Trying to "borrow the world into growth and prosperity at a rate which eliminates recession" has now run out as any sort of valid policy. The only ones yet to catch up with that fact are orthodox economists, to whom the existing money



system, with its spin-offs of debt, bankruptcies and despair, is still a sacred idol which should never be challenged.

What a world it could be if we stopped worshipping Mammon!

### **THE ESCALATING COST OF INSURANCE** by Anne Crosson:

The escalating cost of insurance is grinding the whole country to a halt. Employers, doctors, clubs, community events and facilities, even the humble cake stall, are being held to ransom by insurance companies. If you can't meet the increased premiums then tough. You shut up shop.

It must be time to get back to basics.

There are two kinds of insurance, there's the insurance we take out on things of an agreed value. Our homes, possessions, lives, etc. We nominate a figure we believe will cover the loss, pay the premiums and hopefully, if the worst comes to the worst and we lose the thing insured, we get paid the sum agreed on.

The other kind of insurance is compensatory. And it seems to me that this type of insurance is the cause of the trouble. I think the basic premise on which it is based is flawed, since it implies that all injury and loss can be compensated for with money.

Of course people who have been injured or suffered loss through the negligence, incompetence or criminal acts of others should have recourse to the law. But these days the notion seems to be that all loss, injury and grief can be cured by the application of huge monetary poultices.

A patient claiming negligence against a medical professional may be awarded immense damages. The insurance company pays up, puts up its premiums and the doctor gets a rap over the knuckles. Tobacco companies carry insurance. So class actions aren't going to injure them, although the publicity may do so. But they don't go out of business. A dangerous driver causes an accident. His insurance company pays up and sooner or later the driver is back on the road.

If a doctor, company, driver, whoever, is charged with causing injury or loss then the purpose of legal action should be establish guilt or innocence and determine how best to prevent a recurrence of the offence.

**About punishment and deterrence:** In the case of a doctor or lawyer, for instance, it could be the withdrawal of their licence. Drivers who commit serious offences are already open to loss of their licences and even gaol terms. Companies should be fined out of their own profits. Organisers of shows, parades, and all those community events would, if they were careless about public safety, lose their right to operate.

And in the case of companies, paying appropriate fines into Consolidated Revenue would hurt them much more than upping their insurance premiums. The market place doesn't approve of company losses.

I believe that if the safety net of insurance payouts were removed people would go back to doing what they once did. Take responsibility for their actions.