



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



IN THIS ISSUE

A New Age of Federalism By Arnis Luks	1
Why Federalism Means Freedom and Security By Professor F A Bland	4
Federalism Limits the Government	6
Liberty Depends Upon Limited Governmental Power	8

Thought for the Week: "In these days of fear and confusion let us remember that the endless repetition of a lie or the multiplication of an empty promise does not make a truth. Truth is something more than the greatest common denominator of mass ignorance and greed. It is never determined or demonstrated by majorities or pluralities of popular error and appetite. Ultimately, with God's will, it always emerges, finally prevails, supreme in its power over the destiny of mankind, and terrible in its retribution for those who deny, defy, or betray it." - Virgil Jordan.

A NEW AGE OF FEDERALISM By Arnis Luks

From the 1840s onwards, the various Australian colonies (later to become states) were acutely aware of the desire for devolution - political power to be administered locally - the dominating New South Wales administration over the various colonies around Australia was resolved with the Constituting of those other colonies.

In parallel, some were also advocating the need for a national approach. This found expression with the Constitutional Conventions held across the 1890s, representation initially by appointment from the colonial parliaments, but eventually, by popular election through the 'Enabling Acts'. <https://www.foundingdocs.gov.au/timeline-b-1837-t-1899.html>

Quick and Garran having recorded those convention 'highlights' that resulted in the establishment of the nation of Australia constituted under the 'Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901', providing a fairly detailed background that included the 'will of the people' into the process. <https://archive.org/details/annotatedconstit00quicuoft>

Australia inherited limited constitutionalism that had evolved across the preceding millennia. Britain was in the forefront, having lost its colony in North America to independence. Taxation without representation triggered the Boston Tea Party - a refusal to pay taxes (royalties) to an overseas entity, which held a monopoly on importing tea to the colonies - the British East India Company. The establishment of an independent USA ushered in Britain's changed-approach to 'evolving independence with eventual nationhood' for its various colonies.

Limiting Constitutionalism grows more so than imposed power. Consider the current 'imposed' constitutions of Russia or China or North Korea, compared to the evolved constitutions of Australia, USA or New Zealand. Putin had their constitution altered to justify his enduring position as President - for life. We are not under communism yet, but we certainly are heading that way with world government - dictates from the communist-established UN without representation.

From The Record

In my research over these past weeks, *'The Australian Citizen'* by Walter Murdoch features strongly. https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Murdoch_W-The_Australian_Citizen.pdf The Australian Commonwealth and its relationship with the British Empire are of vital interest, being a direct comparison to the alternative of Klaus Schwab's world government through the United Nations and its illegitimate offspring the WEF. The UN is a banker driven entity in pursuit of policy to the exclusive benefit of the transnational corporation, and at the exclusion of the host nation and its peoples. A rules based economic order promoting trade and profits as the justification for all decisions made.

Graeme Campbell's 1994 address to the Drummond College, University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales, titled *'The Struggle for True Australian Independence'*, and also Sen Rod Kemp's 1994 address to the Samuel Griffith Society, titled *'International Tribunals and the Attack on Australian Democracy'*, are essential reading to learn of the treachery against Australian nationhood and its peoples, with the imposition of 'some-standing' to allow world government through the UN to speak to Australia.

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Campbell_G-The_struggle_for_true_Australian_independence.htm
<http://corrigan.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/SGSocUphAUCon/1994/22.pdf>

While 1990s Labor policy certainly features prominently in these analyses, recognition must also be directed towards Liberal policy, initiatives that have further compounded onto this effort against our once independent and self-reliant nationhood. All our Commonwealth governments from Whitlam on pursued world government policy through the UN. Only the bankers benefit from these policies. Australia and its peoples are not even given the crumbs from off their table.

Law Or Rules Based Order

In hindsight, both Campbell and Kemp's papers explore the contrasting policies of 'trans-nationalism' and 'nationalism'. The UN, as spokesman for world government, is found in its plethora of committees, conventions and trade agreements dominating Australian law and society. A rules-based order, rather than a law-based framework.

Rules entailing a compensated-implementation, selectively biased across differing nations. Whereas law, at least a just law, a natural law, would be implemented justly across all nations. For instance, human rights can be assessed by a UN committee riddled with members from administrations that operate under tyranny and dictatorships. No question of upholding human rights for North Korea, or Cuba, both Communist regimes, or other despots. Only assessing human rights operating in the free world and usually from a very slanted and vested interest perspective, like Apartheid being abhorrent for South Africa (to bring about the downfall of that government), while Apartheid being promoted for Australia (to also bring about the downfall of that government). A rules-based order, rather than upholding the law-based framework of a limiting constitutional government. Read further – *National and Colonial Questions* by V.I. Lenin here : <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/jun/05.htm>

When we consider the acceleration of world government this past three years under Liberal PM Morrison and Labor's PM Albanese, we must also recognise that same policy-outcome is, and has always been the result under either party administrations. Interestingly Barry Jones penned the title : *Globalisation and Interdependence in the International Political Economy addressing central developments within the contemporary international system*. The key word is 'Interdependence'. We cannot be an autonomous and self-reliant nation. We must be restricted in our economy and managed by others. The ultimate monopoly for world government is exercised by central bankers, with CBDC Central Bank Digital Currency as their preferred surveillance weapon of choice, in contrast to a limiting government promoting 'freedom with responsibility' for its citizenry as was in the British Empire – a Christian Fellowship of Nations.

1975+ Liberal PM Fraser implemented the North-South dialogue - a policy emanating from the Socialist International by former German Chancellor Willy Brandt and the Brandt Commission. This implementation immediately morphed into shutting down of our shipbuilding industry and steelworks operating in South Australia, directly affecting the viability of our four car manufacturers and white good manufacturers – all now shutdown causing 'interdependence' from other entities, not necessarily nations.

Australia was de-industrialised under both Liberal and Labor guardianship. The policy continued regardless of government persuasion or electoral outcome. Nothing will change while we continued to vote for these 'monopolisers'. The voting franchise as a mechanism to influence political policy is found significantly wanting while there concurrently exists a monopoly of media – **the ruling political-intellectual-clericy**. We must find and implement other influencing mechanisms to restore our limiting constitutional government/s – finding other novel methods to ensure legitimate representational outcomes.

Legitimate Authority

Our model of federalism (unity amongst diversity) identifies only certain 'heads of powers' in section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution. It's important to note, as Graeme Campbell and Sen Rod Kemp's 1994 addresses illustrate, that both Commonwealth and State governments have gone to great lengths to implement a world government rules-based order (favouring monopolisers).

ON TARGET

The UN is a privately sponsored entity established by communists and managed by vested interests - think of the WHO/ our TGA and big pharma, similar with the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership CPTPP, and the World Bank Group with their own court and appointed judges to administer these trade agreements above nation states and their constitutions. The age of the Dutch and British East Indies Corporation has returned as world government through the UN and its ancillary departments.

It is not by law that world government operates. It is by rules, which can differ in their interpretation and recommended implementation from one nation to another. Not surprisingly a UN committees' findings are not based on law but rather opinion. Worse than rule by decree, is rule by 'rules'. An unelected, unrepresentative committee originating from the United Nations, answerable to no one and responsible to no one for their rules, is operating in the realm of corporate anarchy. This is our future if we are foolish enough to allow it.

Land Rights and Communism

In the 1967 Constitution-altering-referendum, the Australian people voted overwhelmingly to transfer the 'head of power' under Aboriginal Affairs to the Commonwealth. Upon reflection, and with the advantage of hindsight, this has not resulted in a more equitable outcome for those Aboriginals still held-up in camps living their ancient culture. Substance abuse, violence, cultural degradation through pornography and adherence to their ancient ways, and the general well-being of those still living within the camp environment, are thoughts that readily come to mind. It is not a good result and continuing down this path offers no obvious remedy for these people caught in a time warp of cultural clashes.

What has worked effectively and been repeatedly demonstrated is when the local communities 'are permitted' to manage their own affairs - locally; to ban alcohol and other forms of substance abuse, to ban pornography and other forms of cultural degradation, to optimise personal development opportunities through legitimate-education and self-help work programs. It's not work for work's sake, but rather being given an opportunity to find expression in the modern world, rather than living a subsistence-existence as hunter-gatherer.

Land Rights does not allow personal ownership of the land, allowing each to find their own personal expression, but rather, maintains a corporatised-collective-status ideal for exploitation by the transnational industrialist. Empty rivers and cotton or rice in abundance with little or none to show from this rapine-exploitation. Who really benefits from this commonwealth-policy driven by both Liberal and Labor alike? It is obviously 'not' the local Aboriginal. Serving every individual is the key to helping those who are willing. Ownership of their own plot is a vital start, as is for anyone wishing to exercise their personality and freedoms.

Reverting back to hunter-gatherer is similar to the flower people of the 1960s, rejecting modernity as an attempt to re-establish a perceived utopia, longing for the simple life. In a lot of ways too, the Amish reflect the same perspective - the Mennonites to a lesser degree.

Douglas asked the question 'if modern technology reduces the travel time between two major cities what do you do with the increased available time?' The Amish answer is

to set a barrier, albeit a cultural barrier around themselves, to fend off modernity with all its corrupting influences. Realistically though, utilising horses and basic machinery to remain economically competitive in the modern world is a futile attempt to push back the tide of modernity. Robots are increasingly taking the place of man, and function 24/7/365 until they break. Man is still required, but if only to maintain the machine that does nearly all the work.

Is this a fair consideration, that bringing people into the 20th century is a desirable policy to pursue? Or should they be left adhering to their ancient ways as hunter gatherers, or as the Amish do by setting a cultural barrier to fend off modernity with all its corrupting influences?

I hold no right to answer this question for others, but certainly hold the right to answer this for myself. Those communities living in camps, or separate, are best suited to decide the answer for themselves, not remote Canberra bureaucrats, nor worse still The Hague. Being given the opportunity to answer the question for themselves is vital.

Our cultural (collectivised) answer to this question of modernity, has been repeatedly asked since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, with our (controlled) reply 'to produce more', instead of responding that 'this is actually an opportunity for increased leisure provided we have produced enough'.

Should the traditional hunter-gatherer be required to work, just for works sake? Only he can answer for himself, but not for others.

We, culturally, have missed the boat. What is the purpose of man? Is he just an economic unit, placed on this earth to produce, produce, produce? Or has he been called to live a life more abundant?

The hunter-gatherer must work if he is to eat, so does the Amish if they choose. Modernity can and does produce an abundance, offering, realistically offering, much leisure time to pursue other interests. As a community we hold the right to select that which best suits our cultural needs. It is not up to Klaus Schwab or Bill Gates to make these decisions on our behalf.

Climate propaganda aside, 15-minute surveillance cities and CBDCs are for monitoring and control, rather than lifestyle and the wellbeing of the earth. The financial system is to blame, as the force by which this policy is being imposed. Had not the financial system been monopolised, this question would not even be entertained. Once we have produced enough, there would be ample time available to pursue other interests.

Federalism - As a Legitimate Model

Our Constitution in Section 51, specifically limits the 'head of powers' allocated to the Commonwealth government. This limiting area has been under attack since Federation 1901. All governments, including the bureaucracy, attempt to expand their powers. The Pharaohs, Caesar, Napoleon, Hitler, Stalin, and now Putin and Xi achieve that level of centralised power and none produced a lasting result worth emulating. It is only when that rare individual finds sufficient time for cultural pursuits then progress is assured.

Centralised Control, Localised Administration

The business model of local government bypassing both, state and federal governments to implement world government policy, is our opportunity for work. To my mind
ON TARGET

this is the Achilles-Heel of the Communist movement. Had the State and/or Commonwealth Government/s upheld our limiting Constitution, rather than abrogating those powers of administering the nation to the UN, then the State and/or the Commonwealth would have been our main avenue of finding political expression. Both are currently monopolised by the self-sustaining political party machines. However, at the local level, there is a significant opportunity for active communities to find political expression. This is why there is such a constant push to instil left-wing ideologues from all the major parties, into these positions of responsibility.

CEOs are selected, not elected. Mayors are also selected (by the major parties) and offered significant campaign support through the party machines, at times failing to fully disclose this intimate discourse. Representational government is not one of the political party's objectives, rather, achieving power in the political realm is. If we are to regain the initiative to restore our ancient rights and freedoms, then recognising this antagonism of the political parties against the people is the first step towards a realistic assessment of the true nature of the problem. As Sen Alex Antic never tires to suggest, 'join the Liberal party and work from the inside'. My counter to this statement is; to vote the sitting member last and do your darnedest not to direct any preferences whatsoever towards the major political parties. However, this only occurs one day out of a thousand when elections are held. What occurs in all those other days is the key. One policy at a time, political parties do not deserve your electoral support. They have abrogated their civic responsibility to represent the best interests of the Australian people. It is the common man (experiencing the truth of the policies exercised by these political parties), the genuine Australian people, in their pursuit of the restoration of their ancient rights and freedoms, that political energy must be exercised.

Thoughts Alone Won't Cut the Mustard, But Those Acted Upon and Spoken Words Can

Knowledge and thoughts alone, and without any action (incarnation) achieves close to nothing. However, that conversation, even at the risk of losing friends and acquaintances, must be had. Every conversation is an opportunity to place civic education into the mix. Australia has deliberately been dumbed down. Legitimate civics has been removed from the educational processes. The counter to this dumbing down, is to instil civic education into every personal, private and public conversation.

Discussing such vital subjects as federalism, or limiting constitutionalism, or responsible government, or representative government, or parliamentary democracy are essential subjects waiting to be heard. I cringe listening to conservative groups drifting over to other issues that are less important, some topics appear important, but in the overall scheme of losing the nation and enslaving the people, not of the same standing. We are at war over our ancient rights and freedoms. This battle will continue, possibly for the next thousand years if we fail to do our civic duty today, when it is most needed. Regression back into the dark age of tyrants, which cost millions of precious lives for us to slowly and methodically crawl out of, will be the ends result if we fail to put our shoulder to the wheel.

Monopoly of Finance, Monopoly in The Economy, Monopoly of Political Power

I noted in the current round of news, that local Aus-Post offices and the local bank branches are both being rationalised with increased closures. In combination with the CBDC Central Bank Digital Currency rollout, this further emasculates and diminishes the ability to exercise our independence in the economic realm. If we can't legitimately trade in our national currency, but rather be directed towards CBDCs as the only medium for economic exchange, then our national and state governments have both surrendered (abrogated) their legitimate and constituted political power to the international banking cabal controlling the UN. Not only the surrender of our nation or our empire, but the surrender of the entire world to the 'impoverishing surveillance state' – world communism. This is where they are taking us all.

We are at a crossroads. The choices are straight forward – tyranny through world government; or limited constitutional government with increasing freedoms through a voluntary, independent, but cross-reliant Christian-coalition orientated around the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The British Commonwealth of Nations - A Federalist orientation as Legitimate Authority based on limited negotiated agreement amongst equals, each holding a similar world view in the pursuit of greater freedoms for the individual. Something, both communist Dan Andrews and Justine Trudeau would tear apart if they could.

Watch David Mitchell's '*Spirit of the Australian Constitution*' from our main website 'video' menu item. ***

WHY FEDERALISM MEANS FREEDOM AND SECURITY By Professor F A Bland

Issued by the 1946 Referendum NO Committee

In the paper 'Federalism In Australia', Professor Bland, who is Professor of Public Administration at the University of Sydney, presents a convincing explanation of the merits of a Federal system, and provides conclusive arguments why we must defeat the Referendum if we are to retain our Federal system. Bear these points in mind:

1. In a Federal system, the Commonwealth and State Governments are each allotted certain powers and functions. The Commonwealth is not satisfied with its share of powers and wants to get a monopoly of all powers.

2. The people have repeatedly declared at previous referendum that they do not wish the Commonwealth Government to have any more powers, let alone a monopoly of all powers.

3. By ignoring the peoples clearly expressed wishes in 1944 and in submitting the proposals in another form, the Commonwealth Government is making it clear that it wishes to destroy the Federal system.

4. If the Federal system is destroyed, Australians will be smothered by regulations and orders issued by a Centralised Government at Canberra out of touch with and unable to understand the local needs of the people.

5. A centralised system inevitably inclines to totalitarian methods. World War II was fought to destroy Totalitarianism in all its forms.

6. If the Federal system is destroyed, we shall be saddled with a system of Unification. There will then be no (effective-ed) State Governments, no written Constitution, and no High Court to prevent violations of the Constitution.

7. In that case, any Commonwealth Government will be able to do whatever it wishes. There will be no controls over

its use of power, and there will be nothing to safeguard the liberties of the people.

8. A Federal system automatically protects your liberty by providing legal and constitutional checks to what a government can do. By a written distribution of powers and functions between Commonwealth and State Governments, the powers of all governments are automatically limited.

9. Under a Federal system, a government cannot do just what it wishes, but only what the Constitution allows.

10. If, therefore, you value your liberties, and wish to preserve popular rights against authoritarian government, you will have to fight to maintain our Federal system.

11. The Referendum is not to decide whether or not you are to have your social services, but whether all of those Social Services are to be at the mercy of a Centralised Government at Canberra.

THEREFORE (in the upcoming 1946 Referendum-ed)
Vote •••• NO, NO, NO

FEDERALISM IN AUSTRALIA By F. A. BLAND What Federalism Is

Federalism represents an attitude to and a belief in the desirability of maintaining that form of government associated with a Federal system. When people living in a number of independent States desire to retain all the advantages of political independence while having a common government for specifically defined functions, and where there is a strong sentiment in favour of union for some purposes while retaining the separate identity of the States to deal with other matters, the result is the creation of a Federal system of government. A Federal system thus created will exhibit the following characteristics-

(a) A written Constitution which distributes the powers and functions of government between Federal and State authorities.

(b) A process by which the Constitution may be amended, but which cannot be exercised by one of the members of the Federation, whether Federal or State.

(c) A Court which is entrusted with the interpretation of the Constitution, and with deciding conflicts arising between the several Governments, and the people affected by the actions of those Governments.

(d) A distribution of financial resources that will enable the several Governments to carry out their functions independently of each other.

For the system to work effectively, there must be such a regard for the values of Federalism on the part of the public and the several governments that there will be a sincere desire, as well as a determination to preserve it against competing forms and systems. In Australia in 1900 there was such a sentiment. Can it be said that it exists today? It existed in Germany in 1920, but to achieve his aims, Hitler destroyed it.

Why We Federated

It is true that the decision to federate flowed primarily from an appreciation of the convenience of having a single, Federal Government to speak for Australia as a whole in respect of such matters as foreign affairs, defense, and tariffs. It is also true that there was a vigorous determination on the part of the States to maintain and safeguard their independence in the Federal system, and to that end the Senate was created as the States House, while the financial provisions were so designed

as to ensure that the States would have sufficient resources to maintain their independence. The financial provisions of the Constitution were finally a compromise, but the compromise was accepted because of the most emphatic declarations that no Federal Government would ever be likely to adopt a financial policy which might deprive the States of their financial autonomy.

The Federal Compact

The sentiment which brought the Constitution and the Federal system into being influenced the working of the system during the first two decades. It is true that the sentiment was disturbed, and even shocked by early administrative attitudes, and by the serious inroad upon State autonomy resulting from the decision to avoid paying over surplus revenues by appropriating such surplus revenues to Federal Trust accounts. Nevertheless, the Constitution was regarded as a compact as well as a Statute, and the High Court, by adopting the doctrine of "implied prohibitions" as well as that of the "immunity of State instrumentalities" clearly indicated that it believed its duty was to ensure that the system would work. In other words, the High Court, whose original members had been ardent Federalists, approached all cases before it from the standpoint of whether or not the effects of its decision would be to disturb the Federal compact. It inclined, therefore, to such an interpretation of the Constitution as would ensure the working of the Federal system in the manner contemplated by the Federation fathers.

The Compact Officially Discarded

The Surplus Revenue Act, 1910, which superseded the Constitutional provision for returning to the States three-fourths of the net proceeds from Customs and Excise, and the imposition of direct taxation prior to and during World War I showed that the Federal Parliament, at least, had repudiated the principle of a Federal compact. This was followed by the Engineers' case in 1920 when the High Court also rejected the idea of a compact, and, therefore, the doctrine of "implied prohibitions." With these developments, there disappeared official concern as to whether legislative measures, judicial decisions, or administrative methods disturbed the Federal balance, or even rendered impossible the working of the Federal system. The Uniform Taxation arrangements of January, 1946, mark the farthest point reached in the process of unilateral action on the part of the Federal Government in destroying the substance of the Federal system, and taken in conjunction with the Cowburn case (44 hours case), the Financial Agreement of 1928, and the legislation impounding the revenues of N.S.W. in 1932 has resulted in reducing the States to a position of utter dependence upon the bounty of the Federal Government. Even when the States have struggled to avert their subordination, they have also not been averse from accepting a mess of pottage doled out from time to time by the Federal Government, if only it were large enough to satisfy their current requirements. Their descent to the role of remittance men has been both a cause and an effect in diminishing the force of popular sentiment in favour of Federalism.

But The People Seek to Preserve It

It is true that the people have persistently refused to agree to the enlargement of Federal powers, even though they have not been unaware that those powers have been strikingly extended by legislative and administrative action. Popular

rejection of the 1944 powers referendum may be interpreted as a realisation that the move represented an attempt to end the Federal system. It may also be that the people realised that such a concentration of power entailed a serious threat to popular liberties in an age dominated by theories of totalitarianism. If either or both of these constructions are correct, it would appear that there still remains some sentiment in favour of Federalism. It, therefore, seems desirable to re-state the case for Federalism in such a way as to provoke a revival of the Federal spirit, and to fortify those who wish to retain all the advantages of a Federal system. The need for such a re-statement is rendered the more urgent by the characteristic refusal of the Federal Government to accept the popular desire to maintain the Federal system. Despite the emphatic answer given by the electorate in 1944, it now seeks other powers, the use of which will have equally far-reaching effects as those rejected in August, 1944, would have had.

The Features of Our System

Any proposals that aim either at shifting the balance of the Federal system, or at widening the field of uniformity in legislation and administration should be opposed irrespective of the specific character of the proposals. But to insist upon such an attitude is one way in which we can emphasize the need for a thorough overhaul of the Constitution with a view to a new distribution of powers and financial resources, and thus a return to an effective Federal system. In the first place, it must be realised that the demand for powers that disturb the Federal balance is in itself an explicit denial of the Federal principle, for it aims at a monopoly of, rather than that partnership in government which is a fundamental feature of Federalism. Condemnatory references to the "horse-and-buggy" Constitution and to the need for streamlining our governmental structure also obscure the fact that political principles have no relation to age. Some of our most cherished popular liberties are enshrined in documents such as Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights and are ageless. In the second place, it must not be forgotten that modernising the Constitution in the manner proposed is synonymous with a desire for centralisation of authority. Centralisation in Australia means remote government unrelieved by any of the mitigating influences of a soundly established and smoothly working system of local government. Furthermore, it is futile to imagine that the abandonment of the Federal system for one of unification would inevitably be followed by the institution of real local government. The woeful experiences of Germany and Italy between the two wars prove that the attitudes of mind and the administrative processes that result in centralisation are wholly antipathetic to the ideas that are essential to the fostering of local government.

In the third place, it must be stressed that the economic and social conditions of Australia demand a Federal system if the resources of the continent are to be wisely developed, and if the natural diversities of the people are to be allowed full play. The outstanding advantage of a Federal system is that it allows for concentration upon matters demanding united effort without impacting the ability of the States to promote local diversities, and to apply dissimilar methods to dissimilar circumstances. In our case, a Federal system was deliberately adopted to achieve these purposes.

Federalism Re-stated

With these considerations clearly in mind, we may now

turn to a re-statement of the case for Federalism, and of the principle involved. Federalism is more than a political and an administrative structure. It is more than a means for distributing the functions of government between the Commonwealth and the States upon the basis of capacity. It is not merely a protest against unification or a denunciation of the social and economic wastes of centralisation. It is an expression of fundamental, liberal, democratic principles that stress the significance of the individual, and affirm the need to protect the individual by legal limitation of governmental powers. It brings out better than any other political system the fact that government is only one of the institutions of society, that it is never an end in itself, but always a means for the enrichment of the life of the individual. A Federal system enables government to be so organised as to reduce it to terms that can be understood by the individual. It keeps administration close to the citizen rather than remote from him. By promoting it one and the same time unity and diversity, it prevents the Leviathan State from smothering the individual and from ruthlessly imposing its will upon him in the name of egalitarianism and uniformity. More than any other form of government, the Federal system safeguards the principles that Thomas Jefferson was instrumental in writing into the American Constitution - freedom of worship, freedom of speech and of the press, the right of peaceful assembly, equality before the law, just trial for crime, freedom from unreasonable search or censorship, and security from deprivation of his liberty, or property without due process of law.

Federalism Limits the Government

Because a Federal system requires a written Constitution that legally prescribes the powers of the Federal and State Governments, it best emphasises the central theme of Liberal Democracy that the capacity as well as the powers of government are not unlimited: that there are things that not even a majority of voters may require a Government to do. In a Federal system, not merely are the scope and functions of government limited, but the manner in which those functions are administered is also subject to limitation. If the rights and liberties of the individual are thus protected, the very existence of several governments is a further protection. It is likely that there will always be some of the Governments in a Federal system imbued with a spirit of liberalism: if there is only one Government, the people will not have available legal and political protection against arbitrary action. While the exercise of unlimited power by the Federal Government is prohibited by the Constitution, arbitrary action by member States may in certain circumstances also be restrained by the Federal Government. Freedom from the State and freedom in the State are likely in the future to be very difficult to achieve in unitarian States. The Federal system provides an almost automatic guarantee of such freedom.

Federalism Protects the Individual

It is a commonplace to observe that Government, in freeing the individual from the tyranny of his fellows, has succeeded in subjecting him to an even more ruthless tyranny of its own. Redress of grievances arising from the action of officials is becoming more and more difficult to achieve, since Ministers cannot be aware of everything that is being done by officials. The administration of the large State thus threatens the submergence of the individual in the mass, while the trend

toward totalitarianism is more and more making him merely a means to achieve the purpose of the State. While the small State is not immune from these tendencies, it remains true that the smaller the State the less impotent the individual is likely to feel in the face of authority. General economic and social conditions are better understood, and their treatment by the Government can be more easily supervised, or at least, scrutinised by the individual. Since the closer the Government is to the individual the more responsive it is to criticism, freedom is enhanced. There is likely to be greater freedom from arbitrary action by the Government, and greater freedom in relation to other citizens in the small State than is possible in larger States. It is also more likely that the smaller State will evoke a feeling of responsibility from the citizen than will the larger state whose problems and administration must of necessity be remote from the lives of the majority of citizens. Remoteness tends to produce apathy because a man's interests are always directly proportionate to his understanding. Apathy and indifference upon the part of citizens inevitably tend to produce irresponsibility on the part of a Government. Any constitutional policy for Australia based upon centralisation and unification should not overlook these considerations and if the purpose of liberal democracy is to train the citizen to be responsible, and to be captain of his own soul, it should be the path of wisdom for our statesmen to foster the form and characteristics of Federalism, since the Federal system will achieve that purpose. Who is there who has not contrasted the vital interest displayed in municipal areas by ratepayers in any proposal to increase municipal burdens with the apathy of citizen, generally to the implications of Federal finance? In the municipality, government and administration are stern realities. In the case of the Federal Government these things are invested with a character which distorts their real meaning. Even at the level of Commonwealth State financial discussions, long-term interests are constantly sacrificed for immediate advantages to the detriment of Federalism. And when States are reduced to the role of mendicants, competition for grants and subsidies is inevitable, and it becomes a virtue for each Treasurer to record the highest possible need of his government irrespective of consequences.

Need to Abandon War-time Totalitarianism

One of the most pressing needs for reviving popular faith in Federalism is to demolish the war-time structure erected under the compelling pressure of the will to survive, and to challenge the administrative habits then developed. There appears to be a belief that Federalism can survive under conditions in which the States have been deprived of their capacity to discharge substantial legislative and administrative functions, and their enjoyment of independent sources of finance. During the war, people were willing to accept almost totalitarian system if only they might defeat the totalitarianism of the aggressors. But it would be ironical if the sacrifices of the people were now used to enslave them to the very conditions they were determined to defeat. Only a restoration of the States to a position of independence will provide a check upon the tendency to perpetuate in peacetime the political attitudes and administrative methods that so ruthlessly deprived people of their liberties during the war.

Federalism Promotes State Diversities

It must not be forgotten that the method of distributing

the functions of government between Federal and State authorities is more than a device for limiting the powers of the respective governments. The purpose is to create an organisation that deliberately seeks to promote the maximum freedom of the member States to foster diversity of administration, while ensuring adequate unification in matters of common concern. None will deny the need for complete unity, even the need for uniformity of action in regard to such matters as defence, foreign affairs, and tariffs. But Federalists cannot and will not agree that uniformity should be applied generally. They do not believe that the principle of diversity is something to be overcome at all costs. Rather do they recognise that principles are a sort of natural law to be persistently followed, and, as far as we are concerned, to be intelligently applied to the peculiar conditions of the Australian economy. Between the loose unity represented by the Federal Council of Australia (1885) and the current trend to compel uniformity in everything, there stands the Federal principle of diversity in unity. By insisting upon State autonomy within the Federal structure the possibility is avoided of letting down to a condition of dud mediocrity that a policy of administrative uniformity throughout Australia would almost certainly bring about. Diversity, not uniformity, is the law of life, and a policy which seeks to treat everyone and everything alike cannot be other than disastrous, and especially so in the circumstances of Australia. Even now, there are not wanting signs that people are resenting the compulsory blessings imposed upon them by the Federal Government and are longing to be free to decide for themselves how they shall enjoy these benefits. A renewed faith in Federalism will lead people to insist that they shall be free to do so.

Present Referendum Proposals Will Destroy the States

The proposal to transfer to the Commonwealth control of organised marketing of primary products, and of the terms and conditions of employment denies the principle of diversity, strikes at State autonomy, and would deprive the States of the opportunity to develop their own distinctive economies. The proposal is also an explicit rejection of the Federal principle and represents afresh the desire of the Federal Government to eliminate all necessity for consultation and co-operation with the States in the working out of the problems confronting the Australian economy. Instead of free agreement on the basis of a working partnership, there is to be compulsory conformity.

But Federalism Requires Collaboration with the States

The necessity for consultation and co-operation is indeed one of the most important characteristics of the Federal system. Under it, Governments are compelled to submit their proposals to scrutiny and analysis that the party system tends to render unnecessary where they are only dealing with their own Parliaments. Is there much doubt that had the Federal Minister of Transport possessed exclusive power to proceed with the unification of gauges and railway extensions throughout the Commonwealth, we should have been committed to an expenditure which, far from enhancing the railway assets, might have saddled them with crippling liabilities? The necessity to secure the concurrence of the States in his scheme has resulted in its being thoroughly and critically examined.

No Constitutional Issues Involved

In his more revealing moments, the Minister of Transport has claimed that opposition to his plan has illustrated the “constitutional” difficulties that confront him. The demand for power to control organised marketing of primary products is also stated in “constitutional” terms. This is simply a party tactic. There is no “constitutional” issue in any of the proposals in the sense that without an alteration, the Federal Government cannot work under the existing Constitution. Were there no other argument, it should be sufficient to point out that the Federal system has worked for nearly half a century without the Commonwealth Government having the powers sought. There is nothing to show, and no proof can be adduced to show, that the people of Australia would be better off if the powers sought by the Commonwealth Government were transferred to them. But looking back at the serious consequences that have followed from errors of judgment on the part of officials and Ministers, who have been under no obligation to submit their plans to independent examination, one would be justified in asserting that the people are likely to be worse off if the Commonwealth Government succeeds in persuading the people to agree to its proposals. No one will deny that any Government would be inconvenienced if it were free to do what it wished. Few will agree that such freedom would always minister to the welfare of the people. It is possible to argue that it is anomalous for the Commonwealth Parliament to have power to deal with customs and excise, or with conciliation and arbitration, and yet be unable to harmonise the effects of a fiscal policy or a wage policy with the general terms and conditions of employment throughout Australia. It may be anomalous, but it is not a “constitutional” issue. It is mainly a political issue, and partly an administrative difficulty. But it must not be forgotten that to confer upon the Commonwealth Parliament complete power to deal with the terms and conditions of employment throughout Australia would be so to upset the Federal balance as to destroy the Federal system. Between them, the Commonwealth and the States possess all the powers needed. While the Constitution remains as it is, if they want to exercise their powers, there must be an agreement between the Commonwealth and State Governments. The Commonwealth wants to be able to do what it wishes without regard to the States. It does not want to work in partnership with the States; it wants to ignore or coerce them. We are thus brought back again to the central problem of a Federal system. It provides the means for securing unity and uniformity where that is essential. But it enables dissimilar conditions to be treated appropriately by the States with their knowledge of local conditions. It prevents the concentration of unlimited power in a single government, and thus protects the individual against arbitrary or unwise political and administrative actions. It compels dispassionate discussion of policies and methods, and deliberately emphasises the superiority of the principle of agreement over that of compulsion.

Therefore States Must Be Preserved

Autonomous States within the framework of the Federal structure are a basic condition of Federalism. Opposition to the proposed changes serves notice of an intention to preserve that autonomy at all costs. It is not a denial of the need for unity in essential matters, but a warning that there are definite limits of the extent to which uniformity is to be

imposed upon us. That implies a belief that there is need for a systematic overhaul of the Constitution. But the overhaul must be general; the Federal system must not be destroyed by the process of piecemeal attrition. Furthermore, any redistribution must proceed from the premise that Federalism is a national and an individual necessity. By insisting upon the preservation of the Federal system, Federalists claim the right to examine the current proposals and to appraise their effect upon Federal principles. They will not lightly be swayed by specious arguments that the Constitution needs rationalizing but will give serious consideration to the long-term effects of that policy. On the basis of past experience, there will be no hesitation in discounting the alleged economies of unified control and of large-scale administration. Nevertheless, financial considerations are of far less importance than the preservation of the liberty of the individual and of the social advantages of a Federal system. Indeed, we must be prepared to pay for that preservation in the same coin as we pay for the right to pursue the democratic way of life. No plea for economies, for uniformity or for unification, should confuse those who believe that a Federal system is the best way for limiting the powers of government, for legally protecting the individual from the consequences of his unwise political actions, and for promoting the dissimilar treatment of dissimilar economies in the several States. Nor must we be deluded by any promises with regard to the use to which the Government will put any new powers it obtains.

The Commonwealth Parliament has never shown the slightest concern for the solemn promises made at the time the Federal compact was agreed to. On the contrary it has gone out of its way to find means for disregarding them. It is a fundamental principle of Parliamentary Government that no Parliament can bind its successors. Every Government must be free to act as its conscience dictates. But the creation of a Federal system was a different thing. As we said earlier, we were entitled to expect that Parliaments, Officials, and Courts would accept the obligation to carry out the compact and make the system work. They have not done so.

Liberty Depends Upon Limited Governmental Power

It is therefore wise to recall some remarks of Thomas Jefferson, one of the architects of the American Constitution. He said that "it is a dangerous delusion were a confidence in men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights: confidence is everywhere the parent of despotism. Free Government is founded on jealousy, and not on confidence... It is jealousy, not confidence which prescribes limited Constitutions to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power: that our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which and no further our confidence may go." Fears for the safety of our rights are justified not only by recalling the manner in which promises have been disregarded in the past. They are justified by a realisation of the manner in which Parliamentary Government operates to-day.

Only Federalism Provides an Effective Check Upon Government

Throughout the XIXth Century, Governmental power was limited by the working of traditional checks and balances. The veto power of the King, the revising powers of Upper Houses, and the independence of popularly elected Assemblies afforded an effective check upon the activities of government. All the checks and balances have disappeared

ON TARGET

in unitary systems of government, although many people are under the illusion that they still operate. To-day, a government with a compact majority can do whatever it wishes to do. As in England, it is possible to change the whole social and economic system by ordinary legislative measures. If we lose our Federal system, we shall have a unitary system, and there will be no limit to the exercise of power by the Commonwealth Government. There will be no States, no Constitution prescribing limits to governmental power, and no High Court to protect the people against violations of the Constitution. On the other hand, a Federal system does provide an effective check upon the exercise of powers by both Commonwealth and State Governments. Each can do not what it wishes but what the Constitution allows, to that extent, Federalism means freedom. For not only is the individual protected by the constitutional distribution of powers and functions between the Commonwealth and the States, but the existence of several governments is itself a protection. Furthermore, a Federal system is essential for the preservation of democracy itself.

In recent years there has emerged a debased form of democracy which looks askance at tolerance, compromise, and discussion as ingredients in the democratic way of life. To many of its aspects, the new democracy is akin to dictatorship, in which everything is being determined and controlled by the masses.

And Federalism Safeguards Democracy

Federalism is a force which moderates the absolute power of the masses. And indeed, democracy requires this moderating influence. It requires to be repeatedly reminded that the decision of the majority does not constitute the essence of democracy but is really an expedient. Again, Federalism is democracy between States. Both are expression of the theory of self-determination, both are intrinsically co-operative as opposed to all forms of authoritarian organisation. Thus, in the changed character of parliamentary government and of democratic thought, Federalism remains a most effective bulwark against arbitrary action by political parties, and the incipient dictatorship of the masses. It is a bulwark that we in Australia, warned and informed by the experiences of other States overseas, should strenuously defend. ***

Other important documents to read on this subject are by Prof Geoffrey de Q. Walker here:

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Walker%20G%20de%20Q%20-%20Ten_Advantages_of_a_Federal_Constitution.pdf

and here: https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Senate/Powers_practice_n_procedures/pops/pop35/c02

Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.

New Times Survey \$30.00 p.a.

Donations can be performed by direct bank transfer:

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

or cheques to: 'Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)'

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

Telephone: 08 8322 8923 **eMail:** heritagebooks@alor.org

Online Bookstore : <https://veritasbooks.com.au/>

Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and Freedom Movement "Archives" :: <https://alor.org/>

On Target is printed and authorised by A. J. Luks

13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.