



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 55 No. 32

16<sup>th</sup> August 2019

## IN THIS ISSUE

Neoliberalism Has Met Its Match in China By Ellen Brown	1
Lawyers Commenting on NSW Abortion Law Changes By Neil Foster	2
You Had Better Do What He Says Or... He Will Throw the Constitution in the Sea! By James Reed	3
Letter to the Editor	4

**THOUGHTS OF THE WEEK:** Sir Denison Miller\*, as reported in the Australian press July 7, 1921, "The whole of the resources of Australia are at the back of this bank, and so strong is this Commonwealth Bank... Whatever the Australian people can intelligently conceive in their minds and will loyally support, that can be done".

(\*Denison Miller, first governor of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia)

## NEOLIBERALISM HAS MET ITS MATCH IN CHINA [EXTRACT] By Ellen Brown

Ellen Brown is an attorney, chairman of the Public Banking Institute, and author of thirteen books including her latest: *Banking on the People: Democratizing Money in the Digital Age*.

...President Trump followed the rate cuts by threatening to impose, on Sept. 1, a new **10% tariff on \$300 billion worth of Chinese products**. China responded by **suspending imports of U.S. agricultural products** by state-owned companies and **letting the value of the yuan drop**. On Monday, the Dow Jones Industrial Average dropped nearly 770 points, its worst day in 2019. The war was on...

...America's chief competitor in the trade war is obviously China, which subsidizes not just worker costs but the costs of its businesses. The government owns 80% of the banks, which make loans on favorable terms to domestic businesses, especially state-owned businesses. If the businesses cannot repay the loans, neither the banks nor the businesses are typically put into bankruptcy, since that would mean losing jobs and factories. The nonperforming loans are just carried on the books or written off. **No private creditors are hurt, since the creditor is the government and the loans were created on the banks' books in the first place** (following standard banking practice globally)...This is observed by Jeff Spross in a May 2018 *Reuters* article titled "Chinese Banks Are Big. Too Big?":

...[B]ecause the Chinese government owns most of the banks, and it prints the currency, it can technically keep those banks alive and lending forever...

We cannot win a currency war through the use of competitive currency devaluations that trigger a "race to the bottom," and we cannot win a trade war by installing competitive trade barriers that simply cut us off from the benefits of cooperative trade. More favorable to our interests and values than warring with our trading partners would be to cooperate in sharing solutions, including banking and credit solutions.

**The Chinese have proven the effectiveness of their public banking system in supporting their industries and their workers. Rather than seeing it as an existential threat, we could thank them for test-driving the model and take a spin in it ourselves.** Ref: <http://www.truthdig.com/articles/neoliberalism-has-met-its-match-in-china/> \*\*\*

## WASTING AUSTRALIA'S RESOURCES by Viv Forbes

Foolish politicians driven by extreme green ideology are wasting Australia's resources. Australia's nuclear resources are largely wasted. We have abundant geological potential for uranium and other nuclear fuels, we know how to explore and extract them, but with bans and restrictions that change every election, and approval processes that take either some years or forever, only three mines are operating. And Australia is the only G20 country to ban clean silent low-emission nuclear power. Australia's waste and sterilisation of coal and oil shale resources is also an international disgrace. Solid hydro-carbon resources are very concentrated stores of value, but cannot be used without temporarily disturbing other resources such as soils, vegetation and stored water.

Freehold land rights throughout the British Commonwealth once included mineral rights, *(continued next page)*

*(continued from previous page)* ...and there was no conflict between landowners and miners. But avaricious governments stole those rights, and the royalties that once went to free-holders now go to governments. This separation of surface rights from underground rights is the source of continual conflict. Greens then harnessed landowner resentment into anti-mining crusades.

Expanding national parks and heritage areas has been a powerful green tool to prevent exploration and sterilise coal and oil shale resources. As have the destructive laws that give priority to coal seam gas, water or arable land resources. Farms can be generously compensated to relocate, forests can be replanted, top soils can be set aside or re-created and water and gas can be extracted prior to mining. But solid mineral and energy resources can only be mined or sterilised. All past civilisations have recognised this resource imperative.

Australia's oil and gas resources are largely untested. There was great excitement and headline news in the past when oil/gas was discovered in places like Moonie, Barrow Island, Bass Straight and the Timor Sea. Alas, those exciting days are gone and oil exploration is being slowly killed by green bans, enquiries and the application of death-by-delay to every stage of the process.

Fracking has opened up huge shale-oil and gas resources in USA. We can be sure that China, Russia, India and Brazil will soon follow. But of course it is banned in Australia.

The EU drives the war on hydro-carbon energy. But France can afford to despise carbon energy – they have nuclear power. As can Scandinavia and many other countries with hydro power and Iceland with geo-thermal power. Germany is a green energy poster child - but it is German coal, French nuclear, Scandinavian hydro and Russian gas that keep the lights and heaters burning in Germany. Even the green-EU gets over 70% of its electricity from nuclear and hydrocarbons and about 17% from hydro. No country on Earth can rely entirely on wind and solar power but silly resource-rich Australia is going to try - all in a futile attempt to control global temperature.

Scattered tribes of aborigines once occupied Australia without using the coal, oil, gas or uranium beneath their feet. They mined stone tools and ochres and burned a lot of hydro-carbon fuel (biomass) to clear undergrowth, promote grass, fight enemies, trap and roast wildlife and warm their gunyahs. These fires produced heaps of CO<sup>2</sup> and aerial pollution. Australia's Mega Fauna became extinct on their watch but their regular bushfires created vast grasslands supporting kangaroos, emus, bustards, parrots and finches.

History shows that a much smaller population could indeed survive in Australia without using mineral hydrocarbons, but life with zero man-made emissions would be grim. And, as our aborigines discovered, if we do not use Australia's resources, someone else will. \*\*\*

## **LAWYERS COMMENTING ON NSW ABORTION LAW CHANGES By Neil Foster**

*I am a member of an informal coalition of practicing lawyers and legal academics which goes by the name of the "Wilberforce Foundation". A number of us have signed off on a press release designed to make it clear that comments from the "Australian Lawyers Alliance" supporting the proposed changes to abortion laws in NSW do not represent the views of all lawyers. The statement follows.*

### **MEDIA RELEASE OF THE WILBERFORCE FOUNDATION IN RESPONSE TO THE SUPPORT OF THE AUSTRALIAN LAWYERS ALLIANCE FOR THE NSW ABORTION LAW REFORM BILL**

The Wilberforce Foundation is a coalition of lawyers and legal academics committed to the preservation and advancement of the moral foundation of the common law, rights and freedoms. Recently, the Australian Lawyers Alliance (ALA) came out in support of the Reproductive Health Care Reform Bill. Whilst the ALA is a national organization representing lawyers, academics and other professionals dedicated to protecting and promoting justice, freedom and the rights of the individuals, it is important to note that it does not speak for all of us. Lawyers, like any member of the community, can have diverse views on morally controversial issues like abortion. The Wilberforce Foundation opposes the bill and disagrees with the ALA's claims that there are dangerous consequences for women and doctors from the continued...

ON TARGET

...criminalization of abortion.

Since the Levine ruling in 1971, the law has only become more flexible with regards to what constitutes a grave concern for the pregnant woman's health. One has only to consider how abortion clinics operate freely throughout New South Wales to demonstrate the hollowness of any claim that the current law somehow infringes a woman's access to abortion. The current law does, however, retain the power to punish doctors who betray the ethics of their profession, and fail to satisfy themselves that the woman has a genuine health reason for requesting an abortion. Resulting in only two prosecutions in almost 50 years, the doctors in those cases were roundly condemned for their actions, resulting in no calls to decriminalize abortion. These cases are proof that the law is working to protect women and the community.

The push to force doctors with a conscientious objection to refer for abortion is very worrying. Given that referrals are not required to access abortion, together with the availability of information available on the Internet, a doctor's refusal to assist a woman achieve an abortion does not impede her access to it. Mandatory referral as required in the bill has no practical function other than to unjustly infringe the freedom of health practitioners...

*(continued on page 4)*

## **YOU HAD BETTER DO WHAT HE SAYS OR... HE WILL THROW THE CONSTITUTION IN THE SEA! By James Reed**

That's it; we can see Them really getting down to the democratic spirit of constitutional change, as expressed in the indigenous referendum, the latest gee-whiz thing of our new class elites. Look, let these folks speak for themselves, because, I am what, just a deplorable voter, only deserving to be thrown in the sea:

[www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/fix-it-or-well-throw-constitution-into-sea-galarrwuy-yunupingu/news-story/45709](http://www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/fix-it-or-well-throw-constitution-into-sea-galarrwuy-yunupingu/news-story/45709) dd...

‘One of Australia’s most respected Aboriginal leaders, Galarrwuy -Yunupingu, has made what he describes as a final demand for substantive constitutional reforms, threatening that the Yolngu people of Arnhem Land will throw the nation’s founding document into the sea if change does not come soon. In a strident speech to open the Garma festival on Aboriginal land in the far northeast corner of the Northern Territory late yesterday, Dr Yunupingu issued his warning directly to the face of Minister for Indigenous Australians Ken Wyatt, who was in the front row of the audience. The two men were facing each other and seated almost knee to knee — Dr Yunupingu in his wheelchair — when the Yolngu leader said, “Enough is enough”. “We are thinking of our Constitution, how we can change it and make it a real law for Yolngu people as well as Balanda (non-indigenous) people,” he said. “We are doing that, asking for the rights to be accepted by the commonwealth government and by everybody else.” Dr Yunupingu’s father, Mungurrawuy, was one of the painters of the 1963 Yirrkala bark petitions protesting the loss of land — also known as the Bark Treaty — that hang in Parliament House and are regarded as a form of title.

Yesterday, Dr Yunupingu said the Constitution rejected his people. He told the crowd at the annual celebration of indigenous culture that Mr Wyatt had agreed to tell the government what his people wanted. “If they don’t come to us with an answer, we will tell you what we going to do, what the Yolngu people going to do,” he

said. “We will dismiss the Constitution ... we throw it out of Australia into the saltwater,” he said. “It will be wonderful. The Yolngu people will stand on the land and see if that document will float away into the ocean. That’s what is going to happen.”

Dr Yunupingu is understood to broadly support the 2017 Uluru Statement from the Heart, which includes a call for constitutional recognition and an indigenous voice to parliament enshrined in the Constitution.

Dr Yunupingu has never explicitly called for the voice in public and Mr Wyatt said yesterday that he had not asked for it in their talks, but the Gumatj clan leader’s calls for substantial constitutional reform are likely to buoy Uluru backers. With Dr -Yunupingu’s consent, actor Jack Thompson read the entire Uluru statement to the Garma audience at the opening ceremony yesterday.’

I am not sure exactly what this leader wants, as distinct from the white liberal new class. However, I don’t like the general tone of this “do it, or we throw it in the sea.” Sounds like a threat, rather than a reasoned argument. How has the Constitution rejected indigenous people unless everyone of their problems is our fault? I am tired of this endless guilt trip. Tired of it all.

Go ahead, throw it in the sea. I can still vote, and will vote against it. And, as for claims that giving an indigenous voice in the Constitution is only a “fair go,” how about a “fair go” for everybody? If indigenous people are powerless, then what am I? I have hardly enough money to get by, and people like Len Hart are homeless, like so many Australians: on a given night one in 200 Australians are homeless. Who knows how many Australians suffer in pain because of lack of dental care, or how many homeless people require dental care, and only escape the pain through alcohol?

Who cares about them? Where are the reformers championing their plight?

Vote “No!” to the politically correct referendum! \*\*\*

## **THE GOVERNOR GENERAL FORGETS WHAT HIS ROLE IS! By Ian Wilson LL.B**

The ever-relevant and hard-hitting, Andrew Bolt is spot on with this one, as usual:

<https://www.heraldsun.com.au/blogs/andrew-bolt/governorgeneral-has-no-right-to-play-this-race-politics/news-story/66309...>

‘I’ve been out of the country just two days. Did I miss the memo to tear up the important convention that our (unelected) Governor-General keep out of politics?: Governor-General David Hurley says Australia must move quickly to secure constitutional recognition of Australia’s first peoples through a referendum. Stay

in your lane, GG. It is not your role to play politics. You are the constitutional umpire, not a player. It is certainly not your role to take a partisan stand on such a very divisive political issue, and risk trashing your ability to perform your key function - as the ultimate impartial umpire in the event of a constitutional crisis. (By the way, I suspect you’ll find most Australians are against you on constitutional recognition.)

Will the Prime Minister have the will to advise the Governor-General to keep his nose out of this?” \*\*\*

## PROMINENT RIGHTS GROUP URGES AUSTRALIA TO STOP ARMS SALES TO SAUDI, UAE OVER YEMEN WAR

Human rights groups called on Australia to immediately stop selling weapons to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, the two Arab countries leading a deadly war against the people of Yemen. Unlike many western nations, Australia has decided to ignore international outrage over the war in Yemen and maintained its arms deals with both the UAE and Saudi Arabia, *The Guardian* reported Thursday.

Last week, arms shipments destined for Saudi and UAE forces were photographed as they awaited shipment inside Sydney's international airport.

Mwatana for Human Rights, a group investigating violations of humanitarian law in Yemen, has accused Australia of encouraging the war and "contributing to the worst humanitarian crisis in the world."

The organization says Australia should "immediately suspend arms exports" to Riyadh and Abu Dhabi, arguing that distance did not justify Australia abrogating its responsibility towards the Middle East region and the Saudi-led coalition's crimes. "The behavior of the coalition in committing violations of [international humanitarian law] and war crimes would not continue if the allies of Saudi Arabia and UAE, including [Australia], took a firm position and suspended the arms sales," a Mwatana spokesman, Osamah Al-Fakih, told *Guardian Australia*.

Many countries, including the UK, Denmark, Finland, Germany and Belgium, have all suspended arms exports.

\*\*\*

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

To *The Age* Anthony Albanese is being unrealistic on Aboriginal affairs ("Albanese in Indigenous 'voice' push", 3/8). The "gap" in living conditions between Aboriginals and the rest of us is unlikely to be closed, because of the lower intellectual capacities of Aboriginals as a group. Facing realities of ethnic differences is scientific; not facing them is superstitious and political opportunism.

Asserting that "we are all diminished" if the Constitution is not invaded to satisfy selfish demands from "indigenous" leaders is just hot air, as is the belligerence shown towards the Constitution by an Aboriginal leader at the current Garma festival. As for any manufactured "bipartisanship" among the major political parties, that won't alter the resistance by ordinary Australians to a policy of national suicide. Ken Wyatt should go further than warn of problems if a referendum fails. He should admit that this particular campaign is a dead duck with the punters.

Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic

\*\*\*

(continued from page 2) ...who take a different view about abortion than the state, and penalize them for it with potential disciplinary action. This is clearly inappropriate for a diverse society and sets a concerning precedent for other morally controversial health services the state may endorse in the future.

The adoption of an abortion on demand framework up to 22 weeks raises many complex moral and medical issues. With technology reducing the age of viability for premature babies, and the rise in fetal surgery, the use of a specific gestational age as a threshold for when women can request abortion for any reason is deserving of further expert discussion. The desire to achieve uniformity with other states is hardly a sufficient reason to push through such a radical concept in this state.

Finally, this bill does nothing to protect vulnerable women who are victims of 'abortion coercion'. This is where intimidation is used to force a woman or girl into undergoing an abortion against her will. Recognized as an emerging phenomenon by all sides of the abortion debate, an abortion on demand framework can only work against them, providing less incentive for doctors to "enquire" into this decision.

Law is not made just to empower the strong. The plight of women forced into an abortion, and suffering serious health consequences because of it, raise questions as to how the current laws might be improved so as to protect them. Overall, the bill raises many important issues that are deserving of a fuller exploration. The lack of genuine community consultation, and the rush to debate the bill without it, is far less than any civilized society deserves.

\*\*\*

**Also read here:** <https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/abortion-bill-tony-abbott-says-australians-accepting-death-on-demand-20190809-p52fj3.html>

### BASIC FUND

The Basic Fund is the backbone of the League's finances. Our willing workers are modestly supported in their duties by it. Your contributions are fundamental to the ongoing work of the League. The fund currently amounts to **\$13,250.00**. Please use any of the donation methods from the League Advert below, to further the work of the league. -ND

**Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.**

**NewTimes Survey \$30.00 p.a.**

and **Donations** can be performed by **bank transfer:**

A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

or by cheques directed to:

'Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)'

Postal Address: PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

Telephone: 08 8387 6574

**On Target is printed and authorised by K. W. Grundy  
13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.**