



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.32

August 22nd, 2003

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *Mammon: "Wages, therefore, must be kept down to the lowest possible level. It is the price of bread which, everywhere in Europe, determines this lowest possible level. Cheaper bread means lower wages. When the Money power demanded the Repeal of the Corn Laws and the introduction of a system of free imports it was demanding, in fact, a general reduction of wages, or rather, since wages had already in many cases been forced down below reasonable subsistence level, a higher standard of nourishment – and therefore of working power – for the same wages. The chief obstacle to repeal was the existing House of Commons in which the interests of agriculture were prominent. The Money power, therefore, began to agitate vigorously for Parliamentary Reform and to subsidize the 'Radicals'."* – **"Monarchy or Money Power"** by R. McNair Wilson, 1933

CRUMBLING FAITH IN THE GLOBALIST NEW WORLD ORDER by Jeremy Lee:

There was a period in more robust times when the ideal of world government stemmed from the bosom of the Marxists and Fabians. The conservative side of politics was unashamedly nationalist – not jingoistically so, but in full knowledge that constitutionalism and participatory democracy went hand in hand. Either parliament drew its terms of reference from the people, or it had no legitimacy.

The 'internationalist brigade' drew its inspiration from such unlikely characters as Karl Marx, H.G. Wells and the Socialist International. Even those working to undermine nation-states concealed what they were doing. Professor Toynbee's now famous statement about internationalism, "and all the time we're denying with our lips what we're doing with our hands", summed up the sheer dishonesty of the dialectic approach.

Which was not to say there was no recognition of the need for inter-nation discussion and consultation. But the right of nations to 'contract out' of policies they disagreed with was a tacit part of the libertarian approach with seemed part of the conservative position. This appeared to be reinforced by the UN Charter, which forbade interference in members' internal affairs. Nobody takes that seriously any more.

All that has gone. When it comes to globalism there is no difference between John Howard and Paul Keating. Our Foreign Minister Alexander Downer has been fairly derogatory about the ideal of national sovereignty – even though his oath of office was to that ideal, and the constitution under which he was appointed unabashedly national in nature.

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought for the Week* • *Crumbling Faith In The Globalist New World Order* • **NO!!! to Telstra Sale**

"ON TARGET"

August 22nd, 2003

Page 1 (125)

It was at its 1962 Conference in Oslo that the Socialist International – originally founded by Marx – declared its intentions:

"The ultimate objective of the parties of the Socialist International is nothing less than world government Membership of the United Nations must be made universal, so that all nations, including China, may be represented by their governments in power"

The Fabian ideologues in the Labor Party have never deviated in their pursuit of this objective. This, when Bob Hawke was Prime Minister and the first Gulf War was proposed, the Labor Party pulled its 'anti-American' elements into line. Paul Kelly, writing in *The Weekend Australian* (8-9/12/90) spelled it out clearly: His heading was WHY LABOR WOULD GO TO WAR FOR THE NEW WORLD ORDER. He said:

"This week the Labor Party's left wing, renowned for decades for being anti-American, isolationist and pacifist, gave its authorization to a war, if necessary, spearheaded by the United States Such a move, just six months ago, would have been inconceivable During the left-wing's soul-searchingthe best speech came from Victorian back-bencher Andrew Theophanous 'A new world order is emerging, as is shown by the unprecedented resolution 678 of the United Nations Security CouncilWhen a situation arises in which the UN has gained a tremendous boost in its power, in its prestige, in its authority, and is able to carry resolutions and concrete actions as a result of those resolutions, then people who describe themselves as leftist or socialist should not be concerned about it, but should welcome such developments because the increase in the powers of the UN is a very significant development."

"It is something which the ALP has been committed to for many, many years – ever since the time of Dr. Evatt"

Whatever else is said about such a Labor position, they were at least true to their ideals, as expressed through the Socialist International – and said so.

But when did the Liberals and Nationals take up the socialist agenda, while managing never to spell it out to their supporters in their policies and to voters at election time? It culminated – as far as I'm concerned – with Howard's lame-duck statement in South Africa that "there is now nothing else but globalism".

Perhaps we should be a little sorry for the pathetic idealism of the labor-socialists. They seem to have envisaged a stately world parliament under the auspices of the United Nations, in which the nations of the world took their seats to determine in statesmanlike fashion the orderly and peaceful advance of a civilized world. They obviously knew nothing of the hidden powers to whom the United Nations was a mere plaything, for example, the bankers so well described in Professor Carroll Quigley's *"Tragedy and Hope"*, who were working steadfastly on their programme for a monetary world order of their own.

With the above in mind, it was almost sad to read the disillusion which came through the writings of Paul Kelly – the same man who wrote about Labor and the New World Order in 1990 – in *The Australian* (8/8/03). The new scenario resulting from President Bush's spurning of the Socialist-International paradigms for the New World Order obviously concerned him:

"The decline of national sovereignty as an absolute concept has triggered a new global debate over the terms and conditions that justify the right to intervene with military force."

"The coming decades will witness far more military interventions in the name of humanitarianism, security and saving failed states"

"This will have a profound effect on Australia. Our multiple roles as a US ally, proficient peacekeeper, supporter of the UN and as the metropolitan powering a highly unstable part of the world guarantees

our involvement as national sovereignty is redefined and reduced. The trend is unstoppable – the issue is whether it means more chaos or a better, rules-based global system ..."

"This will have a profound effect on Australia. Our multiple roles as a US ally, proficient peacekeeper, supporter of the UN and as the metropolitan powering a highly unstable part of the world guarantees our involvement as national sovereignty is redefined and reduced. The trend is unstoppable – the issue is whether it means more chaos or a better, rules-based global system ..."

Kelly referred to a speech made by Britain's Tony Blair in Chicago in April 1999, in which he gave five tests to justify military intervention:

- *Are we sure of our case?*
- *Have we exhausted all diplomatic options?*
- *Is the military option prudent?*
- *Are we prepared to commit to the long term?*
- *Do we have national interests at stake?*

Blair had added that he saw the UN as the "central pillar" of the new rules, but warned that "we need to find a new way to make the UN and its Security Council work".

These words must be haunting the tatterdemalion figure who is the Prime Minister of Britain today. He failed to meet all his five tests in slavishly following the New York cabal to war. He danced all over the United Nations that he claimed was the "central pillar" for international decision-making.

With UN authority in tatters, and US nationalistic imperialism rampant, Paul Kelly advocated a new solution to the world's dilemma put forward by former Foreign Affairs Minister Gareth Evans, and Algeria's Mohamed Sahnoun, recently reviewed in the Council on Foreign Relations' *Foreign Affairs*.. It suggests a new list of conditions that must apply to any military intervention anywhere, to be authorized by the UN's Security Council. Shades of Tony Blair in 1999!

But what if someone as powerful as the United States ignores such conditions and initiates war on its own? The question is not addressed. The reason is there is no answer.

As has been pointed out more than once, any New World Order will not be democratic, and will only observe such rules as suit its power-holders at a particular time. It will be the ultimate "might is right". The lovely ideals of the Socialist International are just that – a nonsense when it comes to reality.

How much longer can figures such as Tony Blair and John Howard claim, on the one hand, to be supporters of the United Nations? And, on the other, to slavishly follow the George Bush line, so contemptuous of the United Nations unless it can be used in the US imperialist programme?

All of which bears thinking about as we hear Prime Minister Howard's latest proposal for a European Union-type regional bloc in the Pacific, to deal with the budget and defence needs of crumbling island economies, from the Solomons to Fiji and Papua-New-Guinea. Sprung as though it were a new suggestion, the idea has been around for a long time, put forward at various times by Bob Hawke, Andrew Peacock and Paul Keating. It would obviously involve some sort of Pacific Parliament, with a subsequent integration of trade, defence and tax laws.

In fact, the booklet *"The Pacific Parliament"* was written by former New Zealand Prime Minister and, more recently, president of the World Trade Organisation Mike Moore. Moore, a prominent Fabian and member of the Socialist International (as is current NZ Prime Minister Helen Clarke) was logically following the socialist programme for centralization. It is not so surprising as it was that John Howard and Alexander Downer are tripping down the primrose Fabian path.

The division of the world into politically co-ordinated trading blocs, with their own common currencies, central banks, centralized parliaments and codified uniform laws was the theme portrayed by George Orwell in his *"1984"*. A state of semi-permanent war existed between them, the citizenry regularly whipped up into crisis panics by the latest 'threat'.

There is nothing wrong with help by one neighbour for another when asked for. But taking over the decision-making process on a permanent basis is another. What if local people don't want it? Or must they be forced to accept such a proposition "for their own good"?

It is the question the Iraqi people are asking. What if they don't want George Bush's version of their future? This is the real question the internationalists always sideline in the grand plans for our future.

NO!!! to TELSTRA SALE by Peter Davis:

In a letter to Mr. Alby Schultz, MHR, Member for Hume, Peter Davis wrote:

"I write on behalf of many thousands of South Australians who are opposed to the intended sale of the remaining 51 % of Telstra. I encourage you to vote against the sale rather than simply abstaining from the vote.

"First, you are elected to REPRESENT the will of the people who elect you to Parliament. You are not supposed to represent the views of your party. The truth of this remark can be established by reading the Constitution of our Nation. Nowhere does the Constitution refer to political parties, prime ministers, government and opposition. It repeatedly refers to the Parliament of Australia. Members of the Parliament are elected to carry out the Will of their electors. That is why you are known as a Member of the House of Representatives.

"I strongly suspect your electors desire you to vote against the sale, rather than abstaining.

"Second, it is the responsibility of Government to deliver the necessary infrastructure to ensure the health, welfare, security and prosperity of its people.

"Today telecommunications are critical to this responsibility. A good example of failing to protect the people of Australia can be seen in the contract that relates to Australia's defence satellite. You will know that Optus Australia won the contract to supply services to our defence satellite. Optus was consequently taken over by Singapore Telecommunications. Thus, today our defence satellite is effectively under the control of the Singapore Government that has a controlling interest in Singtel.

"Third, you need to consider the demonstrated effects of privatisation across the range of facilities so far sold or leased out. Electricity is a good example. Unreliable supplies, rising user charges, far lower employment bases particularly in terms of apprenticeships, and a lack of responsibility relative to who fixes what, given a failure.

"Fourth, you need to consider the current annual dividend of some \$4 billion flowing to the Commonwealth. Any short term capital gain from total privatisation will quickly evaporate as Government will need to raise taxation to make up for the dividend short fall. Witness the plight of South Australia where Government now struggles without the cash-flows that came from Ports, Water, Electricity and so on.

"Fifth, under privatization, it is obvious that services to the bush must suffer. It is plain economic common sense that a private business will concentrate effort where maximum profit will occur. The suggestion that \$180 million will flow to the bush given the sale is almost farcical: Perhaps that sum may cover current bush deficiencies... But where will the next massive injection come from given the inevitable advance of telecommunications technology? Industry's business is profit... Government's business is service provision.

"I urge you to REPRESENT THE VIEWS OF THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF AUSTRALIAN ELECTORS AND VOTE AGAINST THE TELSTRA SALE."

"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.