



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.39

October 11th, 2002

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"The individualism which is justifiable and necessary is not that which insists on making the rules of every game, and at the same time, devises methods of compulsion to provide players.*

"It is obvious that advantage is being taken of the orgy of waste through which we are passing to stampede us into mere units in an industrial-financial group...

"I have read many of the attractive writings of Sir Ernest Benn, who is prominent in the Individualist movement, and they never fail to amuse and delight me. But I notice that Sir Ernest is a stalwart supporter of the orthodox financial system. And there is no more future for the genuine individualist if the pre-war financial system is not radically modified in the interest of the individual than there is for the deluded victims of Karl Marx."

– C.H. Douglas, *"The Social Creditor"*, October 2nd, 1943

THE PEOPLES' PRINCE by Jeremy Lee:

It was inevitable, one supposes, that Prince Charles's tacit support for the biggest rally in British history should result in a media attack. The media has had a long history of denigration and innuendo against the Prince of Wales as part of its long-running campaign against the monarchy. Its problem is that an increasing number are seeing through the tirade, and Prince Charles is gaining in popularity. He talks to people, listens to what they say, and speaks out on 'gut-issues'.

The Australian (1/10/02) syndicated a *Sunday Times* (UK) article which questioned the Prince's right to a public opinion:

"Britain has learned a lot about the opinions of Disgusted of Highgrove in the past week. He approves of fox-hunting, hates the compensation culture and has a thing about poorly designed fire doors. The Prince of Wales also decries the plague of lawyers stirring up political correctness. If fox hunting were banned, he has apparently said, he might as well decamp permanently to the ski slopes of Klosters. One Labour MP urged him on his way.

"To some, the outpourings of Prince Charles, revealed in letters he has written to government ministers, seem like the grumblings of a malcontent; to others they are no more than commonsense. Either way, a latent fear has risen to the surface: royalty is meddling in politics"

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought for the Week* • *The Peoples' Prince* • *New Guinea Not As Sophisticated As Oz* • *World Stock Markets Rocking Again* • *Dead-end Escape Routes*

This, I believe, is sophistry. Few subjects of the Crown would want a Monarchy which expressed no opinions at all. The reigning Monarch, after all, has the duty "to be consulted, to advise and to warn". In Australia, as a result of a written Constitution, the Crown has further reserve powers. In Britain the Monarch has no law-making powers, but IS part of the Parliament, as in Australia.

Prince Charles is only the Monarch-to-be. If, until he is crowned, he can publicly drag an increasingly unrepresentative parliament back to the real issues concerning people, he will have rendered a singular service. In doing so he will earn the enmity of many politicians and the huge, multinational-driven, republic-committed media

The article continued: ".... *The prince's comments to the Prime Minister about farmers being more discriminated against than black or gay minorities are also easily construed as an attempt to influence policy. Ministers are nervous of what Charles might say about the prospects of Britain joining the euro or participating in a war on Iraq. He is thought to be hostile to both*"

Why should Ministers be concerned? Because they are much further away from public opinion than he is? The article added: "*....A commission of the Fabian Society, the Labour think-tank, is examining the powers Charles will have as king. Early next year it will produce a report*"

Another *Times* article (same issue of *The Australian*) elaborated further: "*The Fabian Society is already conducting a review into the future of the Royal Family which is expected to examine whether prerogative powers can be justified when a monarch takes a political position on controversial issues...*"

How frightfully decent of the Fabians! If they could get rid of the powers of the monarch, and Britain's Upper House – the House of Lords – Prime Minister Tony Blair, who is a Fabian himself, and his jolly old Labor Party could do what it likes without check or balance. After all, they know what's best for ordinary Brits – don't they?

NEW GUINEA NOT AS SOPHISTICATED AS OZ: New Guinea is not a placid country. Direct action is applied to many activities, from elections to 'pay-back'.

But occasionally it shows it is more sensible and advanced than Australia. Three Supreme Court Judges, led by the Chief Justice, have ruled that the Value Added Tax (the equivalent of the GST) which was introduced in 1999 is unconstitutional. As a result, there is some angst in the Tax Department.

The new Prime Minister, Sir Michael Somare, has also banned any further privatizations, which will unsettle the International Monetary Fund somewhat.

WORLD STOCK MARKETS ROCKING AGAIN: After a breather of about four weeks since the last global stock-market plunge – during which the 'spin-merchants' tried to assure themselves and whatever super-optimists they could find that the market had 'bottomed' – October has heralded more disastrous plunges across the globe. Geoffrey Newman (*The Australian*, 1/10/02) started:

"The UK stock market was heading deep into the red last night, implying another desolate day for Australian shares today after the local bourse sank to its lowest since the September 11 attacks

"The UK FTSE 100 index was 3.5 per cent, or 137 points, lower in early Monday trade at 3765, after sharp losses on Wall Street on Friday.

"Amid growing expectations of war in the Middle East, the local share market fell to its lowest mark since September last year, bringing its losses for the month to almost 5 per cent"

Under the heading HOME OF THE BRAVE HAS MUCH TO FEAR, Robert Gottlieb (The Australian, 1/10/02) elaborated further:

"All major global share markets are now following America and we need to understand what is happening in the US because our markets will not escape any further American share falls.

"Clear forces are pushing US shares lower, some of which are related to the repercussions of the enormous fall that has taken place, while others are linked to fears about what is ahead.

"The magnitude of the US market fall is mind blowing. Over two and a half years, the Wilshire 5000 Index – America's broadest in terms of stocks covered – has fallen almost 50 per cent. That means, theoretically, Americans who had a widespread share portfolio in 2000 leveraged to, say, 50 per cent have lost all their capital..

"If the 2002 decline of about one-third in the overall market from top to bottom becomes the year's fall then it has only been exceeded four times in the last 75 years – 1930, 1931, 1937, and 1973-74...."

And, sadly, there is still a way to go. The period between now and Christmas is going to see some daunting figures, and by then "bread-and-butter" economies will feel the impact.

Gottlieb went on to list further potential dangers – the still obvious corruption and greed in corporate America, the threat of oil price rises from a potential Middle East war, the crumbling value of the United States dollar itself, and the position in Japan, now technically insolvent.

He added: *"The sleeping danger is South America. The seriousness of this was shown when the IMF rescue package to Brazil was simply used by US and European banks to drag some money out of the wreckage.*

"But by withdrawing their cash they killed the Brazilian currency and share market and made it impossible for Brazil to honour its US dollar debts....."

DEAD-END ESCAPE ROUTES: As the "critical moment" engulfs us, there are still plenty of people looking for heroes in shining armour to lead us out of the mess. Another party; another wagon onto which we could hitch our star; another independent; another petition to our existing rulers; another drink, etc.

The hard truth is there is no-one out there except each of us ourselves. We can't do everything, but we can each do something.

We often want from our politicians the things we are not prepared to do ourselves. We want an honest politician who will vote on conscience, against his own compatriots in the House if need be. We want a man or woman who, when the Prime Minister allows an extremely rare 'conscience vote' replies: "But I ALWAYS vote according to my conscience! Who gave you the right to take it away in the first place?"

Only when a number of voters apply to themselves the principles they espouse for their representatives will anyone in parliament listen.

Only when a significant percentage of the voting electorate bands together and declares: "No votes without significant changes!" will the debate open up and reluctant changes made.

Almost as though fearing such a possibility, the Federal Government added to its armoury last election. As well as the non-democratic idea of compulsory voting, it added "compulsory preferential voting" so that your vote, whether you like it or not, ends up with the largest of the minorities contending for power; even if you are right against what it stands for.

That sort of nonsense will go until voters refuse to play that game.

The "critical moment", it seems to me, contains one essential ingredient – a moment when concerned individuals stop looking for another "knight in shining armour" to do the job for them, and start doing the job themselves.

It is the hardest of choices. But there is nothing left that will work.

Lysistrata in ancient Greece gathered the women of the nation into a team that enforced a state of chastity on men until they had effected much-needed changes. Such a possibility would never have worked unless every woman made her own personal decision to stand firm. The one who weakened sold out her sisters.

United, they put forward no technical plans for change. They accepted no promises. They simply judged by results, and relented only when those results were apparent.

A national team of voters, prepared to hold their votes until the right results became apparent, could apply themselves in each electorate with interesting results.

But, of course, we all want someone else to do it for us! So it's only a minority who will ever take a personal stand. Is that minority there? If not, Australia has a bleak future.