



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.47

December 2nd, 2005

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "In his famous 1984 George Orwell has one of his characters comment that 'Who controls the past controls the future'. While it is true that people who do not learn from the mistakes of the history are doomed to repeat those mistakes, it is also true that if people are denied information concerning those mistakes, they are unable to heed them. Much of written history has suppressed vital information concerning how the present crisis of Civilisation has developed in such a relatively short time.

Written history is at best the view of the historian. His facts may be correct. But real history is crystalised politics, not the listing of a series of disconnected episodes. If it is clear that over a period of time there has emerged in events a consistent pattern, then behind that pattern there is conscious design. Writing about the French Revolution, Lord Acton said that behind all the smoke and chaos, there was design. Where there is design, there are designers... The plight of the world has not 'just happened' *it has been made to happen...*"

– Eric D. Butler in "*The Red Pattern of World Conquest*", 1985.

SEDITIONOUS MEDITATIONS ON SEDITION by Ian Wilson, LL.B.: I have collected an index finger length high pile of clippings from various newspapers about the recent "terrorists in Oz" crisis. It is a truly amazing file of material that a few short years ago would have been incredible even in an Australian novel. Five hundred police were involved in a great Muslim terrorist round up in Melbourne and Sydney and police media units supplied to the media professional footage of helicopter surveillance of fleeing terrorists captured by the magic of thermal technology. A plot to blow up Australia's only nuclear reactor, possible attacks upon various government offices and shoot-outs with "former bit-part actors" now terrorists. This threat emerges just as the new terrorist laws and industrial relations reforms are kicked through parliament.

Page 1 of *The Australian*, November 3rd, 2005 has a headline "Cities on Terror Alert". In the middle of the page is a colour photograph of a Muslim cleric preaching "hatred of the West". In the right column, the story "Bosses Get the Right to Sack Any Time". Both of these are a threat to the West and to our way of life, but I personally rate the industrial reforms as a greater terror threat. The police are bravely coping with the minor terrorists' threats.

I do not doubt that the individuals captured may be "terrorists": that I will grant even given the happy

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *Serious Meditations On Sedition* • *The Wisdom Of Peter Davis* • *Property Rights Australia* • *First Mai And Then ... GATS?* •

coincidence that this all occurred at the time that crucial Howard legislation was passing through the bowels of parliament.

But were the new terror laws necessary to save Australia from this alleged threat? Attorney-General Philip Ruddock said (as reported in *The Australian*, November 10th, 2005, p.4) that the new preventive detention and control orders were "crucial".

It is hard to see how these measures were crucial. Typically once there is a threshold degree of evidence sufficient to enliven a threat, there are sufficient grounds for an arrest on some charge. If there are grounds for preventive detention, there are usually grounds for arresting even if there is no clear indication of a target and a date. In other words, without the new terrorist laws, Australian police could have still dealt with the alleged threat. Control orders might 'nip planning in the bud', but maybe it is better police wait a little longer and secure an entire network of terrorists instead of alerting the "big fish" by detention of the small, allowing the sharks to plot for another day.

As a case in point, under the new sedition laws all that is necessary for prosecution is that a person "urged" another person to commit violence: it is no longer necessary to show that the person intended for that other person to commit violence and nor is it necessary that violence resulted.

This means as a number of legal critics of the new terror laws have made clear, that if some writer is the source of information that encouraged another, even if unbeknown to the writer, to commit violence, then the writer faces sedition charges and seven years in goal. Already a Monash University student, researching terrorism for an essay has been questioned by Australian Federal Police.

If academics needed an excuse to avoid controversial topics, then here is one: universities will be under surveillance like never before. That may not matter much given the slush that flows from these places. Still, it's the principle that counts.

Legislation 'ill defined': "Terrorism" is ill-defined in the legislation and so is what it means to encourage and incite violence. Essentially any political activity that the State doesn't like is "terrorism" and violence is any sort of threat to legitimacy. Thus in July of this year anti-globalisation campaigner Scott Parkin was held in solitary confinement in Melbourne and then deported. He was charged over \$10,000 for his holiday in goal. Parkin was a peaceful protestor and no evidence was given of his incitement to violence. I don't particularly like the leftist-Parkin types but I can see that when their rights to free speech go, then so does mine.

'Seditious' legalese: "Sedition" is defined so broadly as to include almost any criticism of the government. Indeed "seditious intention" means an intention, among other things, to urge disaffection against the "Sovereign", "the Government of the Commonwealth", and "either Houses of Parliament". There goes by definition the Republic debate, but with it, all political criticism as well.

Of course the government may not choose to become openly as nasty as the Soviet Union was overnight, but again, it is the principle that matters.

From the gun ban, to rapid Asianisation and Africanisation, John Howard has, step by step, worked to prepare Australia for its place in the new world order as a colony of China. To do this requires making Australia into a police state. Although I hate to quote the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission as authority, the president John van Doussa has said that the stop, question and search provisions (which require no search warrant) follow that of a police state:

"The defining characteristic of a police state is that the police exercise power on behalf of the executive and that the conduct of the police cannot be effectively challenged through the justice system of the State. Regrettably, this is exactly what the laws which are currently under debate will achieve." And that is what we have now.

The long-term vision of Howard is, I conjecture, bit by bit, to deliver Australia, bound and gagged, into the Asian new world order. Oops – that's "seditious" isn't it – it is against the law to bring Howard into disrepute. Our hope for freedom now lies in the politically correct High Court. We live in strange, paradoxical times.

THE WISDOM OF PETER DAVIS by James Reed: Peter Davis, the Mayor of Port Lincoln, South Australia, recently had an article about him published in Adelaide's *Advertiser* (Review, November 5th, 2005), entitled "There's method in his madness." The article was, surprisingly, fair to Peter Davis. He was quoted as saying the League of Rights is "not a racist organisation" and that he is "proud of my association with the League of Rights".

As well Davis was quoted as saying, "It [the League of Rights] does argue, and for good reasons, that it is disputable whether or not Jews were consciously gassed in concentration camps."

Throughout his successful career as a Mayor, Peter has been outspoken on the really important issues. He has been much more fearless and coherent than all the Pauline Hansons and he has not backed down.

The truth hurts says Peter, "I'm facing reality." "If you mix races, which is miscegenation, or multiculturalism, you finish up with one or two things; either you finish up with ghettos or enclaves of people who choose their own type, or you finish up with mongrels."

And: "they [Asians] don't want to multicult, and why should we? We're incompatible with Asians. Multiculturalism is an ideal concept, but it doesn't work. There is enough history to prove it."

As a mere contributor, I cannot speak on behalf of the League, but my own view is that Peter Davis is an inspiration to us all, a truly decent Aussie type who sees his own land under threat. If only there were more men as courageous as him.

PROPERTY RIGHTS AUSTRALIA by Betty Luks: Queensland property owners are 'up in arms' against Peter Beattie, his government and bureaucrats over the Vegetation Management Act 1999 and the Water Act 2000 and are taking their problems to the High Court. A recent meeting of 'Property Rights Australia' drew more than 150 people to a public meeting in Queensland's town of St. George. The meeting's chairman, Mr. Jeff Moon, observed that under the legislation a person receives a greater penalty if he knocks down a tree than if he is caught drug running or has murdered someone. Fines of up to \$312,000 apply for breaches of the Integrated Planning Act and \$124,000 under the Vegetation Management Act.

More media 'compassion' for convicted drug dealers than farmers: Mr. Moon could have pointed out convicted drug dealers also receive national media attention when their lives are in jeopardy but there is no concentrated media attention focussed on the numbers of farmers who have taken their own lives when their life's work is in ruins and their families destroyed through financial pressures, or they cannot face eviction day or bankruptcy.

The 'great divide' between city and country: Queensland's new Senator, Barnaby Joyce, attended the meeting which was held in his hometown of St. George. The *Baloo Beacon*, October 27th, 2005, reported on his message to the gathering:

"We live in a society of middle management who don't own any real assets and live in large urban electorates with no connection to right of ownership like you have. They have a chip on their shoulder, they own nothing and their only goal in life is to take that asset away from you."

He likened the government's attack on the property rights of Queenslanders as "communism with a suit and happy smiley face". He saw the land as the "fundamental calibrator of wealth and the effort of farmers, their parents and grandparents before them. The calluses, skin cancer and family break up are designated in that title deed. That is why land is so sacred, it designates who we are." Senator Joyce encouraged his country Queenslanders to take the message to all sectors of the political and social spectrum and especially saw the need 'to change perceptions in metropolitan areas.'

Never mind 'middle management' Senator Joyce – what about Corporate Capitalism? But wait a minute, isn't this the man who, as the Senate representative of all Queenslanders, voted for "Corporate Capitalism" to take over our national communications system Telstra, and in doing so, miserably failed his first test as a Senate Representative?

Yes, there is an agenda to take away all property rights, it applies to city as well as country. But rather than do what the Soviet's did in the Ukraine (that is, confiscate the production through brutal force and starve the remnant peasants into submission) the 'one worlders' are tying the farmers up with debt-finance, poor returns, oppressive legislation and red tape.

Now that I think about it, never mind 'middle management' – what about the Banking System Senator Joyce?

Come on, wink wink, nudge nudge; you know as well as I do, Governments everywhere are the Banking System's Agents.

FIRST MAI AND THEN... GATS?: Remember the MAI? The Multilateral Agreement on Investment? It reared its ugly head just a few years ago. It seems the MAI was merely a rehearsal for what the transnational corporations have on their global agenda. The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) has a wider impact. Services cover everything from McDonald's hamburgers to international Bankers. Health care, education, accountancy, advertising, media, even municipal services such as sewerage and water are all services. By bringing these services into the WTO ensures they are 'liberalised'. This means promoting 'privatisation' of public services – such as Telstra!.

It also means deregulation of services at the local, state and federal levels and subjecting them to the WTO's global rules for the benefit of the transnational corporations.

The end result of such a scenario would be government of the corporations, for the corporations, and by the corporations. What services remained would be forced into constant competition with the corporations, leading to slashing of labour costs and services.

If there are disputes, to whom are they referred for adjudication? Certainly not your local Arbitration Commission or Foreign Investment Review Board. No, no, no, the disputes will go before a world body. Disputes would be resolved between national governments or between investors and allegedly offending governments. "The likely forums are the Washington-based International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes for conflict between investors and governments and new panels similar to those used in the World Trade Organization for disputes between governments." (*Business Review Weekly*, January 26th, 1998).

Do we know what our government has committed us to? Not really. These trade deals are very 'hush hush'. It is only when things go wrong, such as with the Toll Roads and the Lane Cove Tunnel, do we find out what the fine print says.

"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.