



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.43, No.8

March 2nd, 2007

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "There are many counsels and schemes which are being advanced, and which play on fear, allegedly to help people "save their financial skins" *at the expense of others* - and if they are successful, I suspect that it will be at the expense of losing their souls.

I want to devote my efforts and talents, limited as they may be, to exposing the fallacious nature of the orthodox financial system and to promoting the appropriate corrective measures in the interests of *all* people. This, to me, means a continuous and accelerated promotion of C. H. Douglas's ideas of Social Credit which become ever more relevant with the passage of time.

When the crisis is sufficiently deepened to cause general alarm to overtake smug complacency, it is of paramount importance that these ideas are widespread so that serious attention may turn to them when 'men are grasping at straws'."

- Wallace Klinck, Canada, February 2007

AUSTRALIA'S WHEAT AND THE SINGLE DESK POLICY by Patrick O'Shea: It is interesting that the Australian wheat growers have at last had the opportunity to publicly express their support for the Australian Wheat Board (AWB) single desk marketing structure - albeit in a roundabout way. Meaning of course that this whole serious business of AWB's monopoly role in exporting wheat is the big question.

After the Cole Enquiry, AWB's monopoly was withdrawn, and for the time being, limited licences were granted to other parties to export grain.

Effectively, the essential aspects of this debate have now been openly discussed throughout Australia by wheat growers. From Central Queensland to Victoria, from New South Wales through to West Australia the opportunity was given for all growers to attend forums to air opinions for or against AWB's future role.

Twenty community consultation meetings: The forums were conducted through twenty Wheat Exporting Marketing Consultation Community meetings, ably chaired by John Ralph, an experienced corporate businessman. John Ralph and his group will pass on a summary of all deliberations to the federal government Minister Mr. McGauran.

Perhaps the pundits were a little surprised what a majority of farmers had to say at these meetings. Starting with Central Queensland, sentiments were actually expressed that the single desk selling system

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *Australia's Wheat And The Single Desk Policy* • *And Now For The Good News* • *Catholic Church Confronts Blair* • *A Related Matter* • *Another Napoleon?* • *The Dark Side Of Ali?*

was a much-needed bulwark which provided security and protection for farmers. That is not to say concerns weren't raised about the past conduct of AWB management.

Points were made about perceived AWB conflicts of interest. Some of these were put forward in very strong terms. For instance, with such a massive corporate structure as AWB is now, with large and diverse interests outside of grain marketing, it has great responsibilities to its shareholders.

An outsider may say all this could be confusing. On the one hand maximising profits for shareholders. And, on the other hand fixing charges and fees in grain receivals and storage and overall management, these costs are recovered from the farmers' pools. How best can all this be handled?

We were told: 'We now no longer live in a perfect world'. We were told often enough that Australia must move with the times. 'Competition in everything' became the big catch cry. Competition must rule. Monopolies must be challenged and changed. And so the Federal Competition Policy evolved.

However, there have been scant suggestions or thoughts about why the AWB statutory pooling system for selling Australia's wheat was set up in the first place.

It was established to protect farmers and induce stability and maximise income. Grain traders were perceived to be having too much sway on what farmers received for their grain and farmers were very unhappy.

- So, are there acceptable answers and can they be implemented?
- Also, what are those wheatgrowers saying who sell their entire crop on the domestic market?

Dealing with the first point: A division of AWB focussed solely on marketing and exporting grain is the answer, with its capacity to hedge, seek out markets and use all its intellectual experience to keep the Australian wheat industry a front line trader. Moreover, transparency to justify its operating costs.

The second point: Surprisingly, there is an endorsement coming from growers that sell only to domestic markets. Many have intimated they would not be unhappy if a token levy or toll was put on all wheat sales within Australia.

This would be in recognition that the single desk *does* play a crucial role in marketing Australia's wheat crop and the levy would assist financially all the functions needed to maintain a viable single desk marketing structure.

AND NOW FOR THE GOOD NEWS by Ian Wilson LL.B: Often in these periodicals we report much 'bad news'. Here is some good news. The South Australian *Equal Opportunity (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2006* has been dropped by the S.A. Labor Government. In a nutshell, this Bill, through its clause 61, threatened freedom of speech like never before. It extended Victoria's Racial and Religious Tolerance Act 2001 to new levels.

Even 'vilifying' professions, like lawyers and academics could have led to one being flung into irons; see www.willyouvisitmeinprison.com Freedom of speech would have stopped overnight.

Fortunately Christians rose to the occasion and forced the otherwise useless Liberals to take a stand against the Bill.

As Family First and the drug reformer Independent Ann Bressington opposed the Bill, Labor will now put the Bill on ice and try again when they think the good people of South Australia are sleeping. As the RSL motto goes: "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance". Good work everybody - a real victory for freedom! Don't go back to sleep!

CATHOLIC CHURCH CONFRONTS BLAIR: In the United Kingdom, the Equality Law, which condemns discrimination against homosexuals in the provision of goods and services will come into force next April 1st.

On 23 January, Cardinal Cormac Murphy O'Connor, archbishop of Westminster and primate of the Catholic Church in England and Wales sent a letter to Prime Minister Tony Blair, and all the members of his government, urging them not to enforce the laws for Catholic Adoption Agencies.

For "to oblige our agencies in law to consider adoption applications from homosexual couples as potential adoptive parents would require them to act against the principles of Catholic teaching," and it would then be an "unreasonable, unnecessary and unjust discrimination against Catholics" which would condemn these agencies to act against their own consciences.

Indeed, continued the cardinal, "It would be an unnecessary tragedy if legislation forced the closure of these [Catholic] adoption services." These agencies represent one third of the voluntary adoption sector in the country.

Archbishop Mario Conti, Vice-President of the Scottish Bishops Conference also wrote to the Prime Minister giving his full support to Cardinal Murphy O'Connor.

The Anglicans Rowan Williams, Archbishop of Canterbury and head of the Anglican Church, as well as John Sentamu, Archbishop of York gave their support to the Catholic Church by making the same request to Tony Blair:

"In legislating to protect and promote the rights of particular groups the government is faced with the delicate but important challenge of not thereby creating the conditions within which others feel their rights to have been ignored or sacrificed, or in which the dictates of personal conscience are put at risk."

Tony Blair's 'politically correct' response: "I support the right of homosexuals to present adoption applications like any other couple. This is the reason why religious adoption agencies providing services for which they receive public funds cannot be exempted from the dispositions preventing discrimination," answered Tony Blair in a communiqué dated January 29.

However, during a transition period of 20 months these agencies may recommend other agencies to homosexual couples.

Archbishop Murphy O'Connor said he was "deeply disappointed" by the Prime Minister's decision not to grant an exemption to Catholic agencies.

Source: <<http://www.dici.org/actualite.php?cat=2>> >

A RELATED MATTER by Betty Luks: Regarding the recently 'shelved' South Australian "Equal Opportunity (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill": The website willyouvisitmeinprison.com (wyvmip) reported that on the 26th October 2006, the S.A. Labor Government introduced through the Attorney General Michael Atkinson the *Equal Opportunity (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill*.

Rightly the folk at wyvmip observed that if the bill had been legislated into being:

- It would have brought in sweeping changes to the way we think and how we act;
- It would have reduced freedom of speech;
- It would have broadened the definition of "victimisation" to include "vilification" (and thus make the S.A. laws more draconian than the Victorian legislation);
- It would have increased the powers of the Equal Opportunity Commissioner; and
- Provided for State sponsored legal action.

Whilst recognising "Western liberal democracy requires a series of civil and political rights in order to function" wyvmip appealed to the United Nations' *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* for the honourable stand they took.

My view is that the very legislation against which they were appealing was based on the United Nations' *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*!

ANOTHER NAPOLEON? by **Betty Luks**: Talking about the French Revolution. In the Foreword section of *The Australian Magazine*, 17-18/2/07, Liberal – up and coming up – Malcolm Turnbull was interviewed by Douglas Aiton. Photographed for the occasion, his stance reminded me of another politician who saw himself as an emperor. Former lawyer and Goldman Sachs banker, Malcolm Turnbull, needed to bend right arm at elbow and place right hand on chest in front opening of jacket for us to have got the full picture.

And the reference to banker takes us back to Edward I's substitution of the Italian word bankers for moneylenders. ("History in English Words" by Owen Barfield).

Some snippets from the interview:

- Thanks to his business success (= a self-made man) he is possibly the wealthiest member of federal Parliament.
- Yes, money was very important to him. 'Financial independence gives you freedom... you can't do things unless you have a bit of brass.' (*Brass* = a working man's turn of phrase – identifying himself with 'the common working man'?).
- Was senior prefect at Sydney Grammar School. (It) 'wasn't a school for going around engaging in imperial jingoism. Bible study was non-sectarian. And there was a large proportion of Jewish boys...' (In every case he wants to present himself as 'of the people'. = no class, race, or creed 'discrimination' here!)
- The reason he got involved with the Liberals? 'Didn't and doesn't believe socialism is the answer'. But firmly believes that 'politics is increasingly about management (= financial, political and economic management Malcolm?), people and vision.'

Just like Napoleon of Animal Farm? Malcolm considers himself a small-l liberal. 'The things that are important' – to him are – 'individual freedom and egalitarianism'. Just like the animals in "Animal Farm" Malcolm?

At first there were Seven Commandments for all the animals on 'Animal Farm'. Over the years these commandments mysteriously disappeared – as Napoleon worked his way to the top-pig position – till only one was left.

It read: "All animals are equal – but some animals are more equal than others."

THE DARK SIDE OF ALI? by **James Reed**: When I first saw the title on the front page mask of *The Australian* I thought : how puny. The inside article by Matthew Syed (11/7/07, p.12) comments on how the conservative U.S. establishment has claimed Muhammad Ali as an all-American hero and man of peace.

Is this the same Ali that called White people "blue-eyed devils", that was an activist in the civil rights movement and anti-Vietnam movements and who was buddies with dictators like Idi Amin?

Is this the same Ali who changed his name from "Clay" and who was devoted to the radical Islamism of the Nation of Islam? Or the Ali that preached the virtues of sexual abstinence whilst being promiscuous?

Yes, Syed says, it is. But Syed says, the cause to which Ali put his dimes has failed: "The 2000 Census was unequivocal regarding the enduring concentration of poverty, drug abuse and criminality among Black Americans. Is it any wonder that liberal intellectuals discern the rancid whiff of tokenism in the accolades that continue to rain down on the former champion?"

"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.