



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.41, No.42

October 28th, 2005

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "There is small doubt that (we) are handicapped by a system of political thought which takes its immediate rise from Puritanism, although Puritanism, as well as what is commonly called "capitalism" which is an ally of Puritanism, can be traced much further back.

Philosophically, one of the characteristics of Puritanism is the transcendence of God, as distinguished from the immanence of God. Arising directly out of this philosophy there has grown up a convention, to use the mildest description, that, to be respectable it is necessary to be "other-worldly". "Thy Kingdom come" is noble, but "Give us this day our daily bread" is vulgar, and "Let me get at the bread which is going to waste" is downright immoral...

If all history and all observation has not been misread, there is implanted in the individual a primary desire for freedom and security, which rightly considered are different forms of the same thing.

There is no such thing as a freedom and security which is held upon terms, whether those terms are dictated by the State, by a banking system, or by a World Government... Until it can be shown that, with the resources which science has placed at his disposal, the individual is incapable of making freedom and security for himself, the multiplication of organisations whose interference he cannot avoid will only make a world catastrophe the more certain."

– Clifford Hugh Douglas in "The Enemy", *"The New English Weekly"*, 1933

FREEDOM AND INDUSTRIAL REFORMS by James Reed: Thousands of words of propaganda have been written and spoken about the Howard government's industrial relations reforms. The promoters of economic rationalism and integration with Asia are all for it. From where we stand there is not the same kind of resistance seen over a lesser issue such as the sale of Telstra – lesser because "IR" will change the Australian way of life itself. Over the years the League of Rights has been critical of organised labour because of the collectivist culture which dominated it. One of the League's policies is "To defend the free Society...". If freedom means anything, it means the right of every man to choose or refuse one thing at a time, including his employment terms. This is not to say that industrial reform is not needed, for the system is at best complex and costly.

Howard though is going much further. The change to workplace relations laws and the 'freer' market in labour is part of the ongoing plan of globalisation as seen in our immigration policy, financial deregulation and the selling off of assets as illustrated by the sale of Telstra.

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *Freedom and Industrial Reforms* • *Labor's 'Lethal' Rift?* • *The 'Dogs' Bark But The Globalist Agenda Rolls On* • *The Just Price And The National Dividend* • *Howard's Appointed Chairman Of The New 'Wages' Tribunal*

"ON TARGET"

October 28th, 2005

Page 1 (165)

This is not designed for the long-term benefit of Australians workers, but to make Australian labour more competitive with Asia - and soon, Africa. Entitlements fought for by our ancestors, through the shedding of blood will be gone, as all workers of the world will be truly united – at the bottom!

Vicki Watson, in a letter to *The Australian*, 11/10/05, summed it up "... these institutions are not ours to dismantle. They were fought for and won by generations of Australians refusing to give up on universal rights. They are not the preserve of the Liberal Party, the Labor Party or the various chambers of commerce. The real problem is that most working people today, having not studied any history in our emasculated education system, have absolutely no idea what they stand to lose." They stand to lose everything.

LABOR'S 'LETHAL' RIFT? Australians need to be reminded the Australian Labor Party did not arise from within the broader community but was the party of organized Labour and was early 'captured' by Fabian Socialism. Probably the main reason for Mark Latham venting his spleen on those he now 'hates' among his former ALP colleagues comes to light upon rereading a 25th June 1999 article by Jeremy Lee in Vol.35 No.24 *On Target*.

At the time, Jeremy was writing of "the soul-searching' within the NSW National Party concerned with the dwindling primary vote. He wrote:

"The same death-wish faces the ALP. There is now an open rift between one group, represented by Martin Ferguson and Simon Crean, who believe that the Party should go back to its traditional base, and another, comprising international socialists such as Mark Latham, with Kim Beazley wavering somewhere in the middle. The publication of a new book, *Labor without Class, the Gentrification of the ALP*, by Michael Thompson, and launched by Martin Ferguson, has widened the rift.

A review in *The Sydney Morning Herald* (18/6/99) explained: '...the essence of Thompson's argument – supported by Ferguson in the book's preface – is that Labor has been hijacked by a new middle class more interested in multi culturalism, migration, feminism, Aborigines, welfare and the environment than working class values of 'family, hard work, independence and patriotism'...'

At the time Jeremy noted: "Opposition leader Kim Beazley is trying to keep a foot in both camps. But, as former Queensland Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen once graphically pointed out, 'If you try to keep a leg each side of a barbed-wire fence, you'll do yourself a mischief.' Beazley has recently said (that is in 1999...*ed*) he is in favour of free global trade, but not at the expense of living standards! Why can't he face the truth? Free trade is synonymous with the 'lowest common denominator' when it comes to wages and job opportunities.

The position was made quite clear by former Cabinet Minister Clyde Cameron, now in his eighties, in an interview on the 7.30 Report. Cameron, who sounded like a million dollars compared with the current mob of stooges in the major parties, was scathing in his description of the betrayal of Australian workers by the globalists..."

There you have it, there is no fundamental difference between Labor and Liberal, both are centralist parties despite the hot air gushing forth from various spokesmen.

THE 'DOGS' BARK BUT THE GLOBALIST AGENDA ROLLS ON: Mike Charlton, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15/10/05, had his say in "*Kleptocracy rules us all*": "In the crowning moment of his political career, Howard is within an ace of crushing a century and more of trade unionism, cheered on by his boardroom cronies. Most tragic of all, a fumbling and dispirited Australian Labor Party appears set to let him get away with it..."

(Mike they are committed to the same globalist agenda, we can expect no change of direction despite

your forlorn hopes. I would think they are looking to the long-term when they hope the political pendulum will swing their way...ed)

For a glimpse of John Howard's rosy future of industrial sweet reason, let us look at the strike by Boeing aircraft maintenance workers at the air force base at Williamstown, near Newcastle.

On June 1, 35 of them downed tools because they were unhappy with individual work contracts the Boeing company wanted them to sign. The nuts and bolts of the dispute are complex but, in short, they suspected they were being duded on pay, penalty rates, skill allowances and the like.

With some reluctance, they asked the Australian Workers' Union to go through the figures; reluctance because, before they worked for Boeing, many of them had been in the Defence Force, the sort of loyal service personnel who felt, instinctively, that trade unions were a bit bolshie...

The union discovered they were being paid up to \$20,000 a year less than technicians doing a comparable job for a competing company, British Aerospace, working across the other side of the Williamstown tarmac. So the Boeing people joined the union and, as is their right, asked it to represent them in collective bargaining with the boss. That is as far as they got. The company refused to talk...

Not a few of our forefathers were transported in chains to the colonies for fighting for the right of workers to bargain collectively with an employer. They must be spinning in their graves."

A CENTURY? AND MORE OF THE SAME? Still the same problems, still the same terms of reference, over a hundred years later! We hear about the right of workers to bargain collectively with an employer, but what of the employer's rights? Have we heard his side of the 'problem'? Not all employers want to bring their employees down to slave labour terms and conditions, but they also have to operate within the political/economic/financial framework affecting the workers – so what gives? There are arguments for and against on both sides of the "problem".

It appears there is no resolution within the terms the "problem" is set. It would seem we are destined to forever remain on the same old treadmill. Grant a rise in wages, necessary because of the reduced purchasing power from the last inflation cycle. Costs and overheads rise again for the employer and have to be included in prices for goods when they appear in the market place. Employers then demand more productivity from their workers to make up for the added financial/cost burdens (or they seek lower wages and poorer conditions for their workers), leading to a further rise in prices, workers then demand another pay rise, and so on and so endlessly on.

When "the problem" is tackled along these lines, there arises all manner of confusing and contradictory issues and questions:

- Should wages be adjusted to the time worked?
- Or to the amount and quality of work done?
- Or to the needs of the worker?
- What of the terms of the present awards?
- But what of the employer? If he can't cover all costs and overheads and at least get a little profit for himself, doesn't the employer go out of business and the worker lose his job anyway?
- What about the Work itself?
- Is the Work worth doing or not?
- Is the workman to find satisfaction in the doing of the Work, or only in the fact of being employed and receiving his pay-envelope?
- Is the Work *necessary*?
- If the (human) Work is not necessary, how will the 'unemployed,' with no other means of financial support, gain access to the necessities of life other than through the present system of 'dole' money?
- When is the Production of a nation considered 'enough'?

What about the philosophical debate?

- Should a man Work in order to get enough money to enable him to cease from working?
- Or should he demand only such payment as will enable him to live in order to carry on his Work?

If the former is true then "blessed are the rich" for they are the flower of a leisured civilisation!

If the latter is true, then blessed is the worker who gets no more than a living wage!

You would think that after a hundred or more years Australians would have realised that the 'problem' is not soluble within the terms in which it is set.

THE JUST PRICE AND THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND: If only Australians could free their minds from the cant that flows from the ruling elite then maybe, just maybe, they could think creatively. Instead of forever striving to solve "the problem" they could embark on the creation of a new way of life!

What of the "problem" of working conditions and wages with the interconnected "problems" of industrialisation, mechanisation and automation resulting in an excess of production, etc. – and "unemployment"?

C.H. Douglas widened his sphere of reference and showed us a direction to take, through the Just Price and National Dividend mechanisms; a technique designed to make up the difference between the cost/price/wage/inflation treadmill, satisfying all parties concerned and at the same time, showing us how to use the money system to distribute the goods of the earth – to all the citizens, to those needed in the workforce and to those not needed!

Further essential reading:

Clifford Hugh Douglas – Social Credit; The Tragedy of Human Effort.

Anthony Cooney – Clifford Hugh Douglas; Social Credit-Obelisks; Social Credit-Asterisks.

Eric D. Butler – Social Credit & the Christian Philosophy; Releasing Reality.

Michael Lane – Human Ecology & Social Credit; Charles Ferguson: Herald of Social Credit.

HOWARD'S APPOINTED CHAIRMAN OF THE NEW 'WAGES' TRIBUNAL: We are informed by *The Australian*, 14/10/2005, that in order to stifle the protests of the churches and the unions and to further his Industrial Relations globalist agenda John Howard has appointed Professor Ian Harper, executive director of the centre for business and public policy at the Melbourne Business School, as Chairman of a new five-person Tribunal charged with the task of setting the minimum wage for Australian workers.

Again it is a case of the sphere of reference being too narrow in this day of industrialisation, mechanisation and automation with the resultant "unemployment problem". Surely it is a good result of a modern production system? Surely a leisure 'bonus'?

At present the good professor's "working hours are spent in the material world as a financial markets economist..." At first glance I would have said his thinking would be governed by the 'capitalist' spirit (or intent): Systems, calculations and expediency.

But we read, "Professor Harper is a devoted parishioner of St. Jude's Anglican Church in Melbourne's inner-city Carlton.... And like another business associate "he believes in tithing 10 per cent of his earnings to the church". He said, "That's what I believe the scripture calls me to do."

"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.