



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.39, No.30

August 8th, 2003

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"The invasion of Iraq was not about oil. Of course not! So why did the Financial Times of 10th July, 2003, slip in a little note that 'US, UK groups win Iraq oil contacts'?" The second auction of Iraqi oil since the ousting of Saddam Hussein has seen the US and UK companies winning most of the contracts...'*

"Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher inspired a British stake in the other dominating activity, the Military-Industrial Complex, hence the double standards of sanctimonious, so-called 'ethical' foreign policy of the British 'New' Labour Government, economically 'hooked' on the 'killing' industries. But even now these look like being sucked into the voracious vacuum of much larger American corporations as takeover proposals are mooted in the business pages... This spiralling vortex must be sustained by more war, so the talk-up has already begun against Iran... this ploy was invoked by then Foreign Secretary Malcolm Rifkind in the 1980s, and we are now witnessing a replay, significantly by the Zionist Daily Telegraph of 5th July, 2003, with the heading 'Israel 'in the range of Iranian missiles'.'"

– British *On Target*, Vol.33, July, 2003

THE PARLIAMENTARY IDEA IN TATTERS by Jeremy Lee:

Without anyone quite realizing it, parliamentary decision-making has shifted out of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The real debate takes place outside, in the party rooms, without the public scrutiny which is an integral part of our system. There may or may not be some real debate about policy in the party rooms. We'll never know. But when members reassemble on the benches of their respective chambers, the decision as to how each member will vote has already been taken – and woe betide any member who breaks party solidarity.

The traditional view always was that each member was duty-bound to vote *in public on the floor of the house on his conscience*, and nobody could lawfully interfere with that duty. The public could know what his conscience said by reading in *Hansard* how he voted.

The result of this disastrous change is that backbenchers are now 'faceless men and women', and the only media attention is focused on the leaders and the cabinet.

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought for the Week* • *The Parliamentary Idea in Tatters* • *Public Polling Taking Over* • *Running Local Polls* • *That Grotesque Israeli Wall* • *The Dangers Of The New European Constitution* • *Money More Important Than People*

What does this mean for the public? Simply, that only a very small percentage even know who their State and Federal Members are. A large bulk of the population sees no connection between their 'faceless' representatives and the issues that concern them.

Many interpret this as ignorance and apathy in the electorate. Such a view is wrong. Ask people their views on one thing at a time, and they express firmly-held, strongly-expressed opinions. Ask them whether their Member of Parliament can fix those issues and they laugh derisively. And because they don't know of any other mechanism to take note of their views and solve pressing problems, they 'turn off' from politics.

One result is that opinion polls now show an overwhelming revulsion against politicians, who are now ranked below all other occupations in terms of honesty and service.

PUBLIC POLLING TAKING OVER: Without a reliable one-to-one 'touchstone' with their own electorates, politicians are increasingly obsessed by opinion polls. Apart from national polls, each party runs its own internal polls from time to time, concerned with but one thing – how popular they are, and what their chances are in the next election.

Even the big polls show something of the cynicism in the electorate. Recent polls on the Iraq war show that nearly 70 percent of Australians believe they were deceived by the Howard Government in its reasons for going to war – but don't care! Why? My own view is that they are so used to being deceived and disappointed that it has become a universal expectation.

Polls run in February, before the war started, amidst the biggest demonstrations ever seen in Australia, showed the majority against a possible war, although 75 percent accepted that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction.

Once the war started, and scenes of young Australians in uniform were portrayed in emotional farewells as they left for the Gulf, the polls showed Australians swinging behind the war. This was to be expected. Supporting the home team is an Australian tradition.

But now 67 percent believe the reasons for the war were untrue. You might expect a national sense of outrage. It might yet come if we suffer Australian casualties. But at this stage the general feeling is that deception is an integral part of the electoral process. And that's sad.

RUNNING LOCAL POLLS: Where local polls are being run on an electorate-by-electorate basis, some interesting insights emerge. Ask people who their State or Federal Member is, and less than ten percent have any idea. But ask their views on topical issues, and the majority have firm, often well thought-out views. Questions such as **"Should the remaining 51% of Telstra be sold?"** **"Should an elected member of parliament represent his party? Or his electorate?"** **"Should people have the right to defend their homes and property from unlawful invasion with a firearm?"** **"Should the first home-owner's grant be extended?"** and a host of others receive clear answers from the great majority, in both rural and metropolitan areas. There are a whole host of things people want. They simply don't believe that our political system, as it presently operates, is designed to give it to them.

These, of course, are the questions every member of parliament should be regularly asking his voters, and committing himself to "re-presenting" those views in parliament. But he'd have to buck his party to do so. So he never asks, thus choosing to remain silent and faceless and anonymous as far as his electorate is concerned. Meanwhile, the national polls concentrate on the popularity or otherwise of

the elected leaders, never realizing that most voters are turned off by the process and, if they have to choose, wonder cynically which one will do the least damage.

We're not going to change things by throwing another party in with the existing ones.

THAT GROTESQUE ISRAELI WALL: Started in 2002, the Great Wall of Israel already stretches 150 kilometres, with 500 bulldozers working frantically to extend it further and make it impregnable. President George Bush has already declared it a stumbling-block in the "road map" for peace; but Ariel Sharon is turning a blind eye to its extension and the injustices it is causing.

According to a summary of editorial opinion round the world, *The Weekend Australian* (26-27/7/03) said: *"The West Bank wall being built by Israel was portrayed by Le Monde diplomatique as a land grab and a device that would strike at Palestinian economic infrastructure, creating enclaves and ghettos ... Gadi Algazi wrote that prime farming land under Palestinian ownership had been hived off in the north, none of the promised gates had materialized and, under Ottoman law still in force, Palestinians with land on the Israeli side stood to lose it after three years if left untended. But more than 'annexation', the wall was part of a 'bigger project', 'Refusing the Palestinians access to their fields and wells causes long-term changes to their economic system and breaks their links with the land,' wrote Agazi, 'if all these plans are realized, the creation of a viable Palestinian state will be inconceivable.' This would lead to the dispersement of the Palestinian people as a 'gradual process, steady and silent'. Palestinian society would be stripped of its human resources and its dreams of independence."*

Surely, that's Sharon's real intent – isn't it? What chances of Bush taking a stand? Eight feet of concrete wall, razor-wire, regular guard-posts, mined approaches and electronic sensors – some "road-map"!

THE DANGERS OF THE NEW EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION: Details emerging on the proposed European Constitution, signed on June 20th and due for ratification next year, show the full horrors of what is proposed. A few random clauses make it clear:

Article 1-10: "The Constitution, and law adopted by the Union's institutions in exercising competences conferred upon it, shall have primacy over the law of the Member States."

Article 1-53: "The Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives."

Article 1-11: "The Union shall have competence to promote and coordinate the economic and employment policies of the Member States."

Article 1-14: "The Union may adopt initiatives to ensure coordination of Member States' social policies."

Article 1-11: "The Union shall have competence to define and implement a common foreign and security policy, including the progressive framing of a common defence policy."

Article II-21: "Any discrimination based on any ground such as sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, membership of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age or sexual orientation shall be prohibited."

The proposed Constitution also ensures shared jurisdiction in such varied areas as internal markets, justice, agriculture, transport, energy, the environment and consumer protection (Article 1-13). The National veto is to be abolished in 47 areas. A full-time European President is to be appointed, along with a full-time European Prosecutor.

Commenting on this the latest arrival of the bi-monthly English magazine *Right Now* said: *"This combined document is clearly intended, as the preface puts it, to make the EU 'united ever more closely' in order 'to forge a common destiny'. There can be no doubt that it succeeds in both aims. By transferring even more powers from national parliaments to Brussels, by force feeding us yet more antidemocratic political correctness, by forcing us all into a common mould, the Constitution,*

if passed, will indeed succeed in uniting all of us who live on this continent in a common destiny – a common destiny of drabness, neuroticism and mediocrity – a common destiny so restrictive that eventually it will almost certainly breed radical reaction"

The same disease – which is essentially religious – runs through all western countries. It could well be termed "Bureaucoercion" – an attempt to mould, direct and control all human beings, eradicating any excellence, privilege, merit and distinction, to be replaced with "common man" in the likeness of Huxley's "Brave New World".

The directors of this programme know exactly what they are doing. They see themselves as gods. The technicians for the programme, the legions of faceless bureaucrats already indoctrinated in the new religion, believe themselves part of a righteous blueprint, whose responsibility it is to ignore and if possible correct the primitive and outmoded claims to individuality and diversity. To them "the good of mankind" does not equate with the good of individual men, women and children, but the cohesion of an amorphous mass – the lemmings or the gadrene swine of a glorious future.

Heaven help us all!

MONEY MORE IMPORTANT THAN PEOPLE: An article by the Rev'd Janice Hughes in Anglican newspaper, "*Focus*" (date unknown), highlights the impact Howard's economic rationalist policies have had on this country.

"Economic rationalism', writes Rev'd Hughes, "places money at the head of all considerations...There is no place for God and certainly no place for our neighbour...Economic rationalism is 'a false god'." Quite right Rev'd Hughes! Surely there is no better description of a man's god, than to say that his god is the power in whom he trusts? As Senior Corrections Chaplain and member of the Social Responsibilities Committee in Brisbane, the cleric would have concern for those, in one way or another, in need of help.

But to put Mammon back where it belongs, in its rightful place, is going to take more than complaints in a church newspaper. It will mean another battle with the Caesar and Mammon of the day – and the Church once more insisting that money is simply a means by which we should deal with the abundance God provides.

We were told how we were to prioritise our personal and social life aright: "*Life* is more than food and the *body* more than raiment...Where your treasure is, there will be your heart..."

C.H. Douglas wrote: Society is primarily metaphysical; its foundation, "that Faith, that Credit (from *credo*, i.e., *belief*) based on the unity-in-diversity of human needs, which in sober truth, has moved mountains. Into the temple of this Faith the money changers have entered and only when they have been cast out shall we have peace."

Gentle reader, you need to do some serious reading. You need to be 'deprogrammed'. The League Book Services carry a range of books explaining how the 'money changers' (Mammon) usurped the powers of government and now lord it over us all.

Must reading: "*The ABC of Social Credit*" by Elizabeth Holter; "*Australia 2000 – How Bright the Vision*" by Jeremy Lee; "*The Truth About Social Credit*" by Eric D. Butler; "*The Money Trick*" by Institute of Economic Democracy; "*The Breakdown of the Employment System*" & "*The Use of Money*" by C.H. Douglas. For the beginner the "*Introducing Social Credit*" series. Details and prices for all books are available on request from all League Book Services.

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