

# THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper.

\$5.00 per annum post-free. Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

*"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"*

Vol. 39, No. 3

MARCH 1974

## HOW GENUINE IS THE WORLD'S ENERGY CRISIS?

**It goes without saying that, unlike money, the world's reserves of oil and coal are fixed in quantity: they are fixed commodities. It is, again, obvious that the time must come, at least so long as the existing finance-economic system obtains, when these reserves of oil and coal will dwindle to bring on a really genuine energy crisis. We doubt whether the "crisis" of 1974 is genuine at all.**

Australia's own Professor Sir Ernest Titterton is a world authority on energy, and energy sources: he is Professor of Nuclear Physics at the Australian National University, Canberra. Addressing a symposium near Melbourne, Victoria, recently, he stated that the world was not faced by an energy crisis. He said "There's an awful lot of fuel available—the only problems are political".

As we write, the dailies are announcing that oil will once more be flowing from the Arab wells to the U.S.A. (no doubt at a markedly increased price) which will, as fully anticipated, and intended (by the World Manipulators) give inflation in the U.S.A., and throughout the world, a mighty wrench upwards (see article The International Monetary System—Inflation's Cyclotron in this issue). This little surprise package was wrapped up in Moscow, as was reported in *On Target* last year (October 19). Well, what now?

It is certain that the collapse of the West's finance-economic system is already planned, and, we feel, planned to occur in the not-too-distant future. After a period of social and political upheavals, during which time the political arm of the Conspiracy, the Communist apparatus, will be extremely busy, and probably successful—the "era of S.D.R.s" is to be ushered in (our thanks to Dr. Emminger), the World State with World Government will have arrived. That's the Plan. Will it succeed? On paper, it should. But the "best laid plans of mice and men gang oft aglay".

Will the energy crisis be used as a ruse to trigger the collapse of our finance-economic system? It has already commenced to do just this by building up a tidal wave

of inflation which must engulf the West. Such will be denounced by the Conspiracy's brainwashing machines, the mass media, as a most horrific phenomenon, for which no one is responsible. It will appear as an accident; as planned.

If the current "energy crisis" isn't sufficient to do the job, then others can be "arranged". Henry Kissinger and his colleagues, and successors, will be there at the ready to do the bidding of their Masters.

The sole hope of free men, and men who love freedom, is that these "best laid plans will gang aglay". There is a growing number of skilled Social Crediters coming forward to make this, at least, a real possibility.

### THE BATTLE OF 1974 HAS BEEN JOINED

Enclosed with this issue of "The New Times" is the second of a series of special educational and campaigning brochures being produced by The Australian League of Rights for national distribution. The League has already launched a major 1974 offensive on several fronts; this designed to fit into an overall programme directed towards the critical Senate Elections, these to be held probably on May 11.

No matter how well organised the League programme, it cannot be carried through without adequate finance. The League of Rights' 1973-74 Basic Fund has advanced by approximately \$2000 over the past month. But this is not fast enough. It is imperative that the balance, now \$1 000, be provided as quickly as possible. The rapidly deteriorating situation calls for more dedicated efforts by all. Northern N.S.W. and Queensland contributions to Box 64, Maleny, Queensland. All others to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne 3001.

**NEW TIMES ANNUAL DINNER  
FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20**

## THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM—INFLATION'S CYCLOTRON!

**Social Crediters are aware that the basic cause of inflation, that unwelcome, ever-worsening "phenomenon" which attacks the economies of the West like a disease, resides in the finance-economic system itself. However, there are other complicating and exacerbating factors, and not the least of these is the International Monetary System, which has the effect of accelerating the already-accelerating inflation rate throughout Western economies, as the modern cyclotron accelerates the particles of matter - - to fragment matter, Thus does the International Monetary System similarly function: to accelerate the System's "particles" (currencies) which must ultimately fragment the System itself.**

In June 1973, the Per Jacobsson Foundation convened its tenth annual series of lectures; on this occasion at the University of Basle, Switzerland. The Per Jacobsson Foundation is a body created to perpetuate the memory of Per Jacobsson, a former Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, and also to promote "informed international discussion of current monetary problems and affairs".

The tenth annual proceedings were given over, principally, to a lecture entitled Inflation and the International Monetary System, which was delivered by Dr. Otmar Emminger, Deputy Governor of the West German Central Bank. There were also criticisms and commentaries by two prominent economists, viz. Dr. Adolfo Diz, of Argentina, and Dr. Janos Fekete, of Hungary. Dr. Emminger began his address by referring to what he termed the breakdown of the old system, that is, the recurrent monetary crises of the late sixties. He is emphatic that these crises did not occur because of unrest in the exchange markets: indeed world trade has increased by leaps and bounds. It broke down because "the limit of tolerance for the inflationary effect of currency inflows had been reached".

What is the relationship between the world monetary system and inflation? Many eminent experts, says Dr. Emminger, consider that the System is the perfect inflation machine. The prevalent view, in the two decades after Bretton Woods (foundation of the International Monetary Fund—1944) was that the International Monetary System had a deflationary bias. Actual developments have belied this view, states Emminger, and it is now clear that adjustment to payment imbalances has resulted, not in a deflationary, but in an inflationary bias of the System. His approach to inflation is that of the orthodox economist, which Social Crediters know so well. However, he does assert, "universal propagation of price inflation has been facilitated by the transmission mechanism of fixed parities". In other words, the various nations export their internal inflation to each other via the prices of their goods and services and movements of capital. Parity adjustments (devaluations) may temporarily lower the prices of goods and services in importing countries, but overall, the inflationary curve is ever ascending. Amongst the O.E.C.D. countries (Australia is now a member) the average price increase in the early fifties was 2.4 percent; it is now in double figures in the early seventies; and from now on the rate will rise even more sharply before the onset of the quite inevitable collapse of the System.

Dr. Emminger refutes the economists, of the type we know so well, who blame excess liquidity for an escalating rate of inflation by asking them to explain the dangerous acceleration of worldwide price inflation in the second half of the sixties at which time the creation of international reserves was very modest.

### CONTRIBUTION OF THE I.M.S. TO WORLD INFLATION

The question is put whether the fault (for inflation) has been with deficient national policies in major countries, the inflationary effects of which were propagated throughout the world by the transmission mechanism of fixed parities (currency exchange rates), or whether indeed, the system itself contributed to, and reinforced inflationary tendencies. The Governor of the Dutch Central Bank, Mr. Holtrop, at the 1961 International Monetary Fund meeting in Vienna said "our present problems are not due to any inherent deficiency in our institutional set-up, therefore we cannot hope to solve them by changes in our institutions, but by changes in our policies". If this gentleman only knew how garbled were his words! Social Crediters know that the only policy which can avert the eclipse of society as we know it, is to change the function of institutions; and above all, the institution of Banking! We recall the assertion of C. H. Douglas that no solution to our ills is possible which does not transgress the tenets of orthodox Finance.

Dr. Emminger is definite that the International Monetary System itself has been generating inflation; and we believe him. As he says, the transmission system of fixed parities has worked more and more as a one-way street only; namely in the direction of inflation. The "discipline" of the balance of payments mechanism has not worked; and it has not worked because of the resistance to, or even the inability of, deficit countries (those with an adverse balance of trade) to adjust by domestic stabilization, let alone the mildest form of deflation. The U.S.A. was an outstanding example of this. As the reserve centre of the System (the U.S. dollar being the West's strongest reserve currency) the U.S.A. had practically unlimited external financing available, (very strong demand on U.S. goods and services) yet the System broke down: the U.S.A. in 1973 had a heavy deficit. Thus, says Dr. Emminger, whilst some academic economists were still theorising about the presumed "deflationary bias" of the adjustment process (balance of trade), in actual practice its bias was in the opposite direction (inflation). The U.S.A., as well as all of the major trading countries are

suffering a high level of inflation—so much for the view of the classical economists concerning the "discipline" of trading deficits! So the mechanism of rigid parities (rates of exchange) "not only transmitted inflation from one country to another, but even converted non-inflationary structural deficits, like those of the U.S.A. during part of the post-war period into a source of inflation for the rest of the world".

We take the above words to refer to such give-away financial programmes as the Marshall Plan, which ostensibly provided millions of U.S. dollars for post-war reconstruction in Europe, but the real reason for which, of course, was the prevention of the utter collapse of the American economy after peace had broken out! As Dr. Emminger points out, most industrialised countries defended their fixed parities with the U.S. dollar by "intervention": i.e. by buying up U.S. dollars with indigenous currencies, which led to large "structural imbalances" (balances of payments flowing in one direction: viz. to the U.S.A.); the implications of which were to force more imported inflation, because of devaluations and "excessive liquidity creation" in European and other countries to "finance" these devaluations. All such liquidity thus created carried interest for the public and private borrowers and ultimately was pushed forward into the prices of goods and services.

### THE SYSTEM IS A "WITCH'S BREW"

Considerable emphasis is placed upon capital flows; part and parcel of today's International Monetary System: and without entering into fine detail these "flows", which have assumed undreamt of proportions, have magnified the pressure of imported inflation in recipient countries, and have under-cut anti-inflationary policies in many countries which formerly exercised a restraining, moderating, even "disciplinary" role, as what the macro-economists term "islands of stability".

A real "witch's brew" of inflation has been concocted by mixing one-sided processes of balance of payments adjustments, rigid parity systems based on the structurally weakening U.S. dollar, "destabilizing" capital flows, and uncontrolled expansion of international liquidity. Dr. Emminger comments: "It (this inflation-charged bomb) has helped to pervert fixed parties from an instrument disciplining deficit countries to one forcing monetary debauchery on surplus countries". Time and space will not allow us to follow Dr. Emminger's text very much further; but he has provided Social Crediters with enough insight into the explosive potential of the International Monetary System itself to drive the point home; and this process would still be taking place even if "domestic" inflation were held right down in industrialized countries, which of course, it isn't.

Now Dr. Emminger speaks of "the inevitable internationalization" of our money system and we firmly believe that this is just what the Money Power has in store for us; among some other little odds and ends! We have

enlarged on this aspect elsewhere in this issue of *The New Times*: so read now what the Deputy Governor of the West German Central Bank has to say: "I do not think I need to stress that once S.D.R.s (International Monetary Fund Special Drawing Rights—"Paper Gold") come into their own as the principal reserve asset, it will be particularly important that decisions on S.D.R. creation conform strictly to the principle of global reserve need, and that this need be measured primarily against the criterion of whether the world economy is suffering from deflation or inflation."

Notice that there is no doubt at all in Dr. Emminger's mind that S.D.R.s will be the principal reserve asset; the irritating unknown for the macro-economists is when this situation will obtain!

The system of fixed parities has broken down and must be soon swept aside to make way for internationalization of the world's monetary system: there is not the slightest doubt at all that this is what is impatiently desired by the Masters of International Finance. Mr. E. M. Bernstein, one of the founding fathers of Bretton Woods (you have never heard of him? That will please.) Bluntly put it: "It is virtually impossible to operate a system of fixed parities in a world of chronic inflation". We are apprehensive that a world recession of great severity will shortly be "triggered" to usher in the era of the S.D.R.s, with all the global political centralisation, which such a policy would necessitate.

### HOW YOU CAN HELP A HERITAGE SOCIETY PROJECT

The Australian Heritage Society proposes to publish a 1975 pictorial diary, which will promote some theme of the Australian heritage. The Society is therefore making a request for slides of high technical standard and not smaller than full-frame 35 mm format, on any subject which could illustrate some aspect of Australia's heritage.

Send slides to:

J. D. Malan, 35  
O'Keefe Street,  
Mackay,  
Queensland 4740

Please mark slides with sender's names and address and include return postage. Slides will be handled with care but no responsibility is accepted for damage or loss. Sender must be prepared to grant copyright to Australian Heritage Society for use in production of "Heritage Pictorial Diary" for 1975. Slides may not be returned to sender before June, 1974.

Some description of subject matter of each slide would be appreciated.

We request readers who can assist in this most important project to do so immediately.

## KARL MARX'S TEN STEPS FOR COMMUNISING A STATE

The following appeared as a pamphlet, issued by the Victorian League of Rights over 20 years ago. A reading of it now will give a reliable assessment of the progress of political and economic centralisation in the intervening period.

How many people who claim they are opposed to Communism are fully informed on the political and economic policies, which the Communist leaders advocate as necessary for the creation of the Communist State? Comparatively few. This helps explain why Communist policies are being increasingly introduced in all non-Communist countries without many people realising what is happening.

The basic Communist doctrines were outlined by the Communist leader, Karl Marx, in association with Engels in *The Communist Manifesto*, first issued in 1848. In this basic Communist document Karl Marx outlined the following ten measures necessary for the communising of a State, which he claimed would "be pretty generally applicable" "in the most advanced countries":

- "1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
- "2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
- "3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
- "4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
- "5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
- "6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
- "7. Extension of the number of State factories and instruments of production; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
- "8. Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
- "9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of distinction between town and country, by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.
- "10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc."

It is significant that Marx, in introducing his 10 steps, made it clear that they were only means to an end, not an end in themselves. He said that while these measures "**appear economically insufficient and provisional**", they will "**in the course of the movement . . . necessitate further inroads upon the old social order . . .**" Marx, unlike many today who think it is possible to compromise about centralised controls, was well aware that centralised controls like high taxation inevitably produce results

which can then be used to justify the imposition of still more controls. John Hladun, a former Canadian Communist Party Member who had been sent to Moscow for special training, stated on November 26, 1948, that ". . . **one control tends to cause another, until, as a logical result, the State controls and finally owns everything.**"

A close study of Marx's programme reveals that centralised control is the basic feature. Every supporter, either active or passive, of the centralisation of power, is therefore helping further the Communist doctrine. This is why Socialists who claim, the majority of them probably sincerely, that they are opposing Communist conspiracies directed from Moscow, are deluding themselves and others. The very policies they advocate are those of the same Karl Marx whose works are considered basic by the Moscow Communists.

The late Professor Harold Laski, probably the most influential Social writer and lecturer of this century, in his *Appreciation of the Communist Manifesto for the Labour Party*, published in 1948, asked "**who, remembering that these (policies of high taxation and centralisation of credit) were the demands of the (Communist) Manifesto, can doubt our common inspiration.**" It was Laski who after visiting Stalin in 1946, said that British Socialists and Russian Socialists were approaching the same Socialist objective by different roads. Many Socialists bitterly attack the Moscow Communists because they claim that Stalin and his associates have betrayed Marx! These misled idealists appear to ignore that fact that centralisation of power eventually leads to a complete tyranny in which the individual is prevented by force from revolting. Consider also the example of Nazi Germany.

It is generally overlooked that Hitler's Germany was a **National Socialist** regime based upon most of Karl Marx's programme. In his book *Hitler Speaks*, Rauschning, an intimate associate of Hitler's for many years, quotes Hitler as saying that he not only admired the technique of Communism; he claimed to be a competent executor of Marx's policies. Although the actual means of production in National Socialist Germany were left in private hands, the production programme was decided upon by the central planners, who used Marx's policy of centralised credit, taxation and other controls to ensure that their plans were obeyed.

In our booklet, *The Fountainhead of the Socialist Conspiracy*, we exposed in detail how the Fabian Socialists started their programme of "Sovietisation by Stealth" in the English-speaking world because it was realised that the Anglo-Saxon peoples would never accept a violent revolution. The Fabians have followed a subtle policy of infiltrating all political organisations and encouraging a policy of "gradualness". They suggest that central planning is "inevitable", "modern", and "progressive". Speaking at the Fabian International Bureau's Conference on March 15, 1942, the chief speaker said: "**There is not much difference between the basic economic techniques of Socialism and Nazism.**" A brief examination of the

policies of most modern Governments, irrespective of their labels, will convince any unbiased person that they are all implementing at least portion of Karl Marx's programme of centralising power. And every new step to centralise power, irrespective of the reason advanced—it is generally one, which seems rather harmless to most people—invariably results in the further expansion of the bureaucracy, which is the natural environment for the production of Communists.

To define a Communist merely as one who loves Soviet Russia is most misleading. **Communism is the transference of power from the individual to the State.** Anyone, no matter what his reason may be, who advocates this weakening of the power of the individual, is to that extent helping the Communist programme. Many will violently reject this view and claim that it is possible to increase the State's power without danger; that this power can be strictly limited. This claim is contrary to common sense and history. The State is an anti-social organisation whose primary concern is power. And the more power it gets, the more it wants. The bureaucracy grows bigger

and bigger as its members strive to increase the size of their various departments and "sell" them to the public. These members inevitably develop a Communist mentality, while the new recruits to the bureaucracy, mostly from the Universities where in recent times students have learnt from their Socialist tutors how Governments can do all sorts of wonderful things—if they have adequate power and taxes!—readily accept the idea of a governing elite who believe that because of their "superior" training they are qualified to control "selfish" businessmen, farmers, and other who are engaged in essential economic activities.

Those who would fight Communism effectively must first clarify their own understanding of what the Communist programme really advocates. They can then give a lead in advocating a reversal of the Communist policy of transferring power from the individual to the State. **The power of the State must be drastically reduced and the power of the individual increased.** Unless this is done, the Communist programme will continue to succeed even if it is not called Communism.

---

## UNDER WHICH KING?

*By C. H. DOUGLAS*

**The following critique appeared in the pages of "The Social Creditor" almost 30 years ago.**

There is no single aspect of political economy, which deserves more attention, and receives less, than the nature of an order. Like so many other matters of importance and subtlety, most people understand so little of the subject that they are practically unaware that it presents any problem; still less, a problem on which the whole structure of society depends. The immense success of mediaeval civilisation (and its ultimate failure) can be seen to be linked with one conception of an order and the sanctions which sustained it; the different, but notable, achievements of the nineteenth century, and the chaos which has succeeded that short-lived adventure, are plainly the outcome of another. The problem is often stated by the use of the word "sovereignty"; and we have an indication of that identity in the title of the gold coin which ruled the nineteenth century, the English sovereign, as well as in the declared intention to remove national sovereignty to an international centre.

The essence of Mediaevalism (often, it may be noted, referred to as the Mediaeval Order) was the existence of the Church as a sanction, as an organisation for making effective certain checks and balances upon the use of physical force to carry an order from its utterance to its execution. The Church claimed to be, and was to quite a considerable extent, a living body of Superior Law, not different in intention but far higher in conception, to the Constitution of the United States. And it is important to notice that the breakdown of nineteenth century English prosperity can be seen in retrospect to be contemporaneous with the decadence in social prestige of the village parson.

Now the nature of the problem presented to political economy, as distinct from ideology, by an order, is simply this: Either Brown gives orders on his own behalf, or Mr. Pink-Geranium gives them for him. That someone has to give orders on Brown's behalf is not in dispute. And the decision between these two courses is ultimately dependent on which source of authority succeeds in making results most accurately and rapidly eventuate from orders, in reasonable identity between specification and product. And the problem is complicated for Mr. Pink-Geranium by the fact that he has no one but Mr. Brown to whom to give orders, and Mr. Brown is convinced that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

There was a period, say between 1850 and 1914, in which the economic aspect of this problem was in a fair way to solution. The gold sovereign was a complete order system. Mr. Brown had only to tender his yellow warrant of sovereignty and he got what he wanted. He set in motion the most marvellous train of self-acting psychological sanctions. Factories sprang to life, trains ran, and ships sailed, all concerned not merely to do his will, but to do it better than anyone else. It is quite irrelevant to this particular argument that a large and increasing number of Mr. Browns had no sovereigns; it is a fact of history that the man who had one always wanted two, and in consequence, if every Mr. Brown had possessed a sovereign it would still have been effective. **It is perhaps unnecessary to observe that the virtue of the gold sovereign lay not in its material but in its sanctions.**

Now the **political** equivalent of the gold sovereign is the vote, and the merest glance at our life and times is suf-

ficient to establish the conclusion that it fails to work. There is nothing in the possession of a vote, which remotely approximates to the power of choice and the certainty of delivery enjoyed by Mr. Brown with his golden sovereign in the latter days of the nineteenth century. No one outside the walls of a mental hospital would contend that the individual voter gets what he votes for, or voted for what he is getting. So obvious is this that the greatest difficulty is experienced in getting people to vote at all. The vote costs nothing; and it is worth precisely what it costs. If it cost ten shillings to vote, how many votes would be registered?

But the matter does not end there. While the political vote is valueless to the individual, it enables the Satanic Powers to claim a mandate which it in fact does not confer, and which it is powerless to enforce. The situation is so satisfactory that the ballot box is a cardinal provision of the World State, and it is clear for any

ordinarily intelligent person to see that it is the intention—and in "Britain" the rapidly developing fact—that the economic vote will be destroyed in its nineteenth century effectiveness, and substituted by the political vote as exercised in Russia.

It is urgently necessary to realise these matters because they dominate our future. British Governments now hold office by a trick; no British Government has any genuine mandate. Our whole political system is not merely irrational; it is a fraud and a usurpation. We have allowed the vicious nonsense which derided the values established by a thousand years of unique political experience to destroy in our name every safeguard against tyranny provided by historic continuity in the Three Estates, and we welcome the people who spawn this nonsense when they desert the Europe they have wrecked. Nothing can save us but a drastic de-hypnotisation. It is coming; but it may kill us.

---

## ANTI-NATIONALIST JINGOISM

*By D. WATTS*

**In "Scope", the Australian Broadcasting Commission (29/1/1974), as an introduction to Australia Day, presented some trite anti-nationalist rant. It was mostly a recitation of what has been said by the safely daring for many a year. All the old stuff about the breeding by nationalism of chauvinism, jingoism, national egotist and arrogance and the rest was repeated or was implied in the affirmation that nationalism has been the cause of all the wars that were ever fought. We were not spared even the hackneyed saying that patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel. No scoundrel in these days would be fool enough to take refuge from condemnation in patriotism. He would make for the respectable sanctuary of anti-nationalism.**

One of the first lessons in the primer of philosophy is that, from particular points of view, any physical or psychological thing can be good or bad. Some thoughtful persons may be interested in examining a statement of opposite values.

- (a) Anti-nationalism can be just as jingoistic as can nationalism.
- (b) There can be ideological chauvinism as well as nationalistic chauvinism.
- (c) Most anti-nationalism is as sentimental and irrational as is a good deal of nationalism.
- (d) Nationalism should be looked at in its peacetime as well as in its wartime aspect.
- (e) When a people loses its sense of nationhood a nation dies and the international vultures and the worms of the homeland soil gorge themselves on the carrion.

After analysing and testing those propositions it may appear that anything which in one set of circumstances is good may be bad in different circumstances, but that evil is not to be eliminated simply by replacing one thing by its opposite. The wrong idea that it can be has been exploited in an endeavour to avoid the issue of Value. The very crude argument is that since the good or evil value of a thing is determined by the frame reference, men are free to pronounce a thing good or bad according

to preference or convenience. With the delight of a tiny child tearing up his picture books, the indiscriminating reformers declared that what had been held to be good by recent generations was really bad and that what had been thought to be bad was, in fact good. It would have spoiled the sport of debunking to have admitted that frames of reference have themselves but a relative value. By taking their own frame to have an absolute value of rightness, the debunkers were merely transposing false absoluteness. Consequently, most of the debunkers failed to realise that sometimes their terms of reference were not valid.

### FALSE REFERENCES

A glaring example of that last was the using of service to the communist cause as an absolute point of reference. A point is absolute, but a frame is not, so that by using a frame as a point there is committed a double error. The same transposition of false absoluteness is noticeable in the realm of morality. Noting correctly that evil sometimes can from past assumptions that certain moral customs were absolute criteria of the value of conduct, the debunkers declared that the opposite kind of behaviour was good. Loyalty to one's nation was one of the casualties.

We do not slough off the evils sometimes associated

with nationalism by turning to anti-nationalism, for the same evils very soon attach themselves to the new objects of devotion. The jingoistic nature of much anti-nationalism generally remains unnoticed because it has been assumed that that fault is the emotional product exclusively of nationalism. Theatrical rhetoric, bombast, exaggerated devotion and anything else jingoistic are generated, not in nationalism nor in anti-nationalism, but in the human breast. That brings us to examine the statement that nationalism has been the cause of every war that was ever fought.

Nationalism is sometimes a second cause of war. Also, when people have become a nation any war takes on a nationalist colour; but that development is contingent. The true, universal cause of war is men's love of physical combat. Usually that love is accompanied by the love of the spoils of war in some form, material, political or ideological. Before men ever develop a national or tribal consciousness, they fight. Many a barbaric man has preferred a hero's death in battle to a straw death. The minstrels' songs were of heroes, not of national triumphs. To be sure, even though men who did not think of themselves as fighting for their nation, yet fought in coalesced bodies. That was a necessity of war action; but there does not seem to be any evidence that, say, the Goths, the Huns and the Vandals had any patriotic feelings that moved them to sweep over Europe. Spoils, conquest and the joy of battle, but not patriotism, were what inspired many another ravaging host.

Sincere pacificists would do what they can to sublimate the urge to engage in physical warfare. They will get nowhere by condemning this and that war objective, for as soon as one is discredited another presents itself. If wars were not fought for spoils or glory or national aggrandizement, they will be fought for religion or political ideologies or even for peace. So far there has not been much success in convincing professed peace-lovers, on the whole, of such an obvious thing that enjoyment of physical violence in riots or revolutions or entertainment goes very unpleasantly with expressed hatred of war. Nor is it always recognised that peace is served, not by destroying nations, but by maintaining their internal order. Most anti-nationalism has for its aim the clearing away of the impediments, in the form of nations, to the establishing of a One World Order. A nationless world would be a Universal Disorder unless other kinds of areas of stability were to take the place of the nations; and may Providence preserve us from that.

Nations are the products of peace. The reason why wars are fought between nations is that evolution and development are not segmented. A growing thing does not come to the absolute end of one stage before entering upon another, but development takes place in a flowing movement, the old mingling with the new. This accounts for the fact that barbarous war and civilised peace are both present in the first stages of peaceful development. The

growth of peace will be retarded so long as misguided pacificists line up with violent revolutionaries, terrorists wearing ideological haloes and rioting "idealists" who believe that they know it all and so, having nothing to learn, have no curiosity about the different idea or below the surface realities.

Next formulae, rule of thumb political methods, virtuous stupidities and commonplace ideals must be tolerated and often have their use, so long as they do not clog the channels of serious thinking, as they have been doing. Going, in the name of peace, a little way past the blockage caused by today's conventional thinking, it is seen that our universe is a motional one. By the Law of Complements, if one of a pair of complements exists, so must the other. Therefore our universe is also one of stabilities. All creating, including organisational creating, is a stabilising of motion. There is never absolute stillness in any stabilised form. The internal motion makes possible change and growth and eventually the dissolution of the created forms. An organisation is, of course, less stable than is, say, a rock or even a functioning human form but, when properly ordered, its stability provides the condition in which the contained human beings can create physical and psychical things of use and beauty.

#### **NATIONAL STABILITY REQUIRES PEACE**

Nations are stable organisations and peace is a state of stability. Some nations are internally less stable than are others. These function less efficiently than do the well-ordered nations. Also it is to be noted that in an over-stabilised national form, cultural creation is painfully impeded. In a well-ordered nation in which stability, though the dominant complement, yet allows the motion that freedom needs, civilisation is a healthy growth.

War is a state in which motion is the dominant complement, so that though in it are stabilities that serve the efficient conduct of war—tactics, strategies, weapons, etc.—it is in its total effect destructive. Sometimes an unruly State is pacified by military action, but though forcible pacification may clear the ground for planting the seed of civilisation, the motion is stilled to a large extent, not regulated. Any subsequent civilising is not really the logical result of the war-action. It is rooted in the stability.

Unstabilised motion is formless. If, then, in a World Body, the areas of stability, that is the nations, were eliminated, even if the World Body could exist at all, it would have simple limits within which there would be but a kind of fluid formlessness. Naturally that state would not last long. Something of this formlessness is uncomfortably noticeable in the creations of many who dream of a World order and who do all they can to break down distinctive national forms and racial identity. Their aim is to create an international culture. They produce, as nearly as they can, formless sculptures and paintings, which are supposed to reveal abstract realities divested

concrete limits. That is nonsense. A form without content is an impossibility, and so is content without a container; but the cruder the form, the poorer is its abstract content. In the same way, the moral forms are being enthusiastically broken down and replaced, not with better forms, but with the moral formlessness called permissiveness. With the aesthetic and moral slithering back from comparatively well developed forms towards formlessness there is a consistent trend towards venerating poorly civilised peoples and criminals and a marked tendency to sacrifice more advanced people and their strenuously won civilisation to lagging nations and individuals. With this abandoning of political, moral and aesthetic stabilities runs parallel increasing war-like violence in the shape of riots and unprovoked attacks on innocent people. In certain districts in Britain and the U.S.A. civil instability dominates over stable order.

It is not merely fortuitous that many wanting only to do good support criminals in their uncivilised belief that there is virtue in, or at least excuse for, despoiling the alien tribes of law-abiding citizens. Most of the comforters of these atavistic heroes join with the daring or sneaky freebooters in holding up to hatred and contempt those performing the essential duties of administering and enforcing the law. The mentality behind that conduct, call it humanitarian if you will, could not be improved upon were the general aim to be the creation of a state of perpetual war. A first step towards that state would be the dissolution of nations by means of a complete breakdown of internal order.

The peculiar idea that the elimination of nations would be a clearing away of impediments to the creation of world peace is like a belief that since lifeboats ride on stormy seas, if only lifeboats were abolished there would be no more storms. On the contrary, to serve peace we must, as said, safeguard and extend those areas of peace, the stable nations. They must be purged of the love of violence, which has been sedulously cultivated by a certain species of ideologists and exploited by some who should be classed with drug-mongers and slave traders. Without a doubt, whatever we do for love of God or man must be done under the assumption that the possessors of nuclear weapons will not put the world to death. Efforts to create world peace must include in their aim control of the modern Giants. That, it seems at present, will take a long time. Let us pray for time. How in detail the task is to be accomplished we cannot know; but we can know that the first step is to cure society of the violence habit. Violence is a psychological drug. People who become addicted to it develop a tolerance of small doses and so require progressively larger doses to give them the stimulus for which they crave.

Another step is to change the policy of easily inciting backward nations to yearn for power over the more civilised into one of helping them to civilise themselves.

This does not mean industrializing the countries or increasing their material wealth, though this may usually be desirable. True civilisation is the product of an appreciation of the higher values. That last cannot be developed by either education without peace or peace without education.

---

## FUTILE SOUTH AFRICAN ANTI-INFLATION POLICY

*South African Digest* of February 15 outlines a five-point world plan for countering inflation, put forward by the South African Minister of Finance. Dr. N. Diederichs. The plan was published in a recent article in the London-published journal, *Euromoney*.

As we have so often stressed, financial orthodoxy is the Achilles heel of the South African situation. Dr. Diederichs seriously suggests that gold could fulfill the monetary role of the new special drawing rights of the International Fund, and that South Africa is therefore prepared to negotiate with the International Monetary Fund to stabilise the international gold market. The I.M.F., established by communist agent Harry Dexter White and his colleagues, is one of the principal instruments being used to attempt to establish the World State. Digging a metal out of one hole in the ground, called a gold mine, to place it in another hole in the ground, called a vault, and then arguing that the nations of the world cannot exchange goods and services to their mutual advantage unless enough gold has been removed from one hole to another, is a form of dangerous superstition.

Most of the feverish stress on international trade stems from internal finance-economic policies which force nations into export "drives" in order to try to make their economies operate. A "favourable balance of trade" simply means that those achieving this result have exported more real wealth than they have imported. They have experienced a loss, not a gain. Instead of slavishly following the madness of other nations, the South Africans could be giving a lead by correcting their internal inflationary financial policies, thus freeing themselves from the necessity of worrying unduly about exporting except for necessary imports.

The inflation rate in South Africa must continue to move upwards irrespective of the policies suggested by Dr. Diederichs. His argument in favour of "the gradual increase in the role of special drawing rights (of the International Monetary Fund) to win world confidence" is an open concession to those attempting to establish an international credit monopoly. If this is established, all national sovereignties will be completely obliterated.



# Enterprise

Organ of the  
INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY  
Post Office, Kingstown, N.S.W., 2350

No. 17

MARCH 1974

## DARE THE STATES RESIST?

The Queensland Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, recently told the Burnett Local Government Association conference that local authorities would have to decide whether to deal with the Commonwealth Grants Commission or through the traditional channels of the State Government. He was attacked by the Queensland Local Government Association secretary, Mr. Max Armstrong, for bringing politics into local government, and for the inadequate funds, which the State had provided for local authorities over the past twenty years.

In New South Wales, the recently published Barnett Report—a State Government production—has recommended the abolition of 223 local councils, which would be replaced with 97 "districts", in each of which "community councils" would represent the wishes of local communities. It is interesting that the Barnett Report quoted with evident approval the suggestions of Professor Harold Laski the Marxist who so assiduously fashioned the Fabian planning machine through the London School of Economics and P.E.P. It was Laski who, in 1948, wrote that no one who had read the Communist Manifesto could doubt the common aspirations of the Communist Party and the Fabians.

These recent events in Queensland and New South Wales, together with similar "trends" in other States, had their origin in the war and post-war period, when two prominent Fabians, Dr. H. V. Evatt and Dr. H. C. Coombs laid the groundwork for what is happening now. Dr. Evatt, the wartime Attorney General, through his famous 14-Powers referendum held in 1944, tried to achieve in one step all that his "conspiracy by stealth" Fabian training should have told him might take a little longer. His political off-sider, Dr. Coombs, at that time Director-General of the Department of Post War Reconstruction, was perhaps more adept in the arts of gradualism. In 1949 his department issued a report entitled "Regional Planning In Australia"—a history of progress and review of Regional Planning throughout the Commonwealth, issued by the Commonwealth Department of Post-War Reconstruction, in conjunction with State Departments responsible for Regional Planning in each State.

Reading through the report, printed twenty-five years ago after much preliminary work had already been done, one cannot help but marvel at the step-by-step consistency of those who had devised it in the time of Curtin and Chifley, kept it intact and expanding through the eras of

Menzies, Holt, Gorton and McMahon, to ripen and mature in the hands of Whitlam and Uren.

To those grappling with Regional Planning for the first time, it may be difficult to grasp that today's policies were devised in the 'forties. If it amazes some that Mr. Uren, recently-knighted Sir John Fuller and Mr. Murray Byrne, ostensibly in opposing parties, should be sabotaging the respective sovereignties of Victoria and New South Wales with the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation It may also surprise them to know that the publication "Regional Planning in Australia" was also the work of such a triumvirate, a committee of three public servants, Mr. H. W. Allen, of the Regional Planning Division in Canberra, Mr. C. G. Hartnett of the Premier's Department in Sydney, and Mr. W. Jungwirth, of the Premier's Department in Melbourne. These gentlemen met in Canberra in September 1947, and had the publication ready by June 1948. Beneath its veneer of departmental platitudes, it is a ruthless document. It pays lip-service to local participation, but in reality it aims to place every aspect of social life, from such questions as how and where people earn their living to how and where they spend their leisure under statutory authority. It places great emphasis on full and planned employment.

There is one significant omission—the question of finance. While some vague references are made to co-operation between the States and the Commonwealth, specific details are nowhere included. The same omissions occur in the Barnett Report. It is therefore impossible for any council in New South Wales, or anywhere else for that matter, to evaluate current proposals without a deep understanding of all that has gone before.

If, by chance, there is any State parliamentarian who believes that the decisions of his own government on regional planning have been reached independently, and resemble those propounded by the Department of Urban

and Regional Development by coincidence alone, part 2 of "Regional Planning In Australia" should dispel such abysmal ignorance. State-by-State the Regional details are outlined, with maps, names and areas. The Regions outlined in 1948 are synonymous with those now being presented in each State. It is a "fait accompli" of the Fabian Society through its agent Dr. Coombs.

What about Finance? Well, that, it is hoped, will be taken care of in the referendum, which will accompany the next Senate election. Amongst other questions we will be asked to sanction the financing of Local Government direct from the Commonwealth, by-passing the States. Legislation in anticipation of a "yes" vote has already passed both the House of Representatives and the Senate, with the introduction of the Commonwealth Grants Bill last May. Those who have been heartened by the overwhelming defeat of the referendum last December, and who consequently believe that future attempts to centralise power will meet the same fate, should not be too complacent. At the last referendum the Liberal-Country Party campaigned both in the States and in the Federal sphere for a "No" vote. But can they be depended on in the next one? The States, it is true, may put up a fight, although it is not axiomatic that they will resist financial relief whatever the strings attached. But having voted for the Commonwealth Grants Bill in May, 1973, can the Federal Opposition be expected to do an about face? Knowing the contortions, which party politicians can achieve, perhaps anything is possible, but any deviation from their previous position would leave the Opposition parties mercilessly exposed to the barbs of Mr. Whitlam. For the moment, betrayal would be so much easier.

What sort of campaigning, then, can we expect on this referendum question? The Labor States can be expected to conform obediently to the Whitlam dictates. Mr. Hamer in Victoria is likely to conform also, as is the Askin government, which always capitulates when the heat is on. Mr. Bjelke-Petersen can be expected to put up a vigorous resistance, supported by the Liberal/Country Party Opposition in Western Australia under Sir Charles Court. But if he finds himself opposed by his own party in the Federal sphere, and if he cannot provide an acceptable alternative to Commonwealth finance, whatever strings are attached, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen will be out on his own, and intensely vulnerable.

These, then, are the step-by-step stages for the Fabian-Socialist conquest of Australia:

- (1) Get State taxing powers handed over to the Commonwealth, even temporarily. They can always be made permanent later. (Achieved as a temporary measure under defence regulations during the war.)
- (2) Nationalise the banks. (Attempted and failed by Dr. Evatt in the 1948 referendum, but later successfully achieved in disguise by Dr. Coombs when promoted to chairman of the Reserve Bank by the Menzies government, through Reserve Bank lending controls.)
- (3) Prevent the States from using their own banking

powers under Section 51 of the Constitution. (Partially achieved by restrictive agreements on Savings Bank lending between the States and the Commonwealth, and by intimidation through the Loan Council. The example of Jack Lang, who was dismissed from office for challenging the Otto Niemeyer-Professor Copland financial monopolists can always be resurrected to cow recalcitrant State politicians.)

- (4) Establish a Regional Planning Authority to permeate both State and Federal government departments to prepare the groundwork for the "coup de grace". (Achieved in 1948-49 as described.)
- (5) Encourage the increased use of "tied grants" in which, by use of Section 96 of the Constitution, the States are conditioned to accept Commonwealth direction of State expenditure, and finally Commonwealth usurpation of State functions. (The use of "tied grants" actually tripled during the 23 years of Liberal/Country Party domicile on the Treasury benches.)
- (6) Once the Regional Authorities have been established in each State, press for direct financing of such Authorities from the Commonwealth, by-passing the States. (Enacted under the Commonwealth Grants Bill in June last year and the subject of the coming referendum in May.)
- (7) Dispense with the States altogether, handing over their functions to the Regional Authorities, which have no constitutional safeguards, and which would be completely amenable to Commonwealth control. ("It is my firm conviction that the decentralisation of power will be effected in this country not by shoring up indefinitely the existing States with their irrelevant and ineffectual boundaries, but by providing local authorities with the means and incentives to freely associate one with another on the basis of shared urban and regional interests..." Mr. Whitlam, addressing the Annual Conference of the Local Government Association in New South Wales in 1970.)

Ever since Professor Arnold Toynbee coined the classic description of Fabian tactics when he said "and all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands", men like Coombs, Uren and Whitlam have masked their real intentions with affability and sweet reason. Nobody could be more soothing than Mr. Uren in his public relations with the States through the Department of Urban and Regional Development. Mr. Whitlam has tenderly wooed local government leaders, and has, for some at any rate, allayed their worst fears. How hard it is for bankrupt aldermen and councillors to detect the iron hand in the velvet glove. Thus can Mr. Whitlam talk of "liberating" local government from their hard taskmasters the States. In his annual speech to the Local Government Association of Queensland late last year, Councillor F. A. Rogers, who is also President of the Australian Council of Local Government Associations illustrated the difficult situation well. Dealing first

with the relationship between Local Government and the State government, Mr. Rogers said: "I well recall Sir Gordon Chalk's words to our 1970 Annual Conference when he addressed the Conference on the subject of Local Government Finance. We had asked the Treasurer to give us some financial assistance in conducting an investigation into the matter of Local Government Finance when he flatly refused to do so and told us to go and do our own work." The Association did so, and produced the Stuckey Report, which outlined the drastic position of Local Government finance throughout Queensland and Australia. Mr. Rogers went on: "While Mr. Stuckey's reports were based largely on published figures compiled by the Bureau of Census and Statistics with some little help from Sir Gordon Chalk's own Department officers, we find the Treasurer flatly refusing to accept the Bureau figures, which to my understanding must surely be supplied to the Bureau by his own department . . . In a recent letter to me, the Treasurer has quite clearly and positively stated that he is not prepared to meet us to discuss any aspects of the Stuckey Reports and that he does not accept any part of the findings of Mr. Stuckey into Local Government Finance." However, it was a different story when Mr. Rogers met the Prime Minister: "I must also make special reference to the Hon. E. G. Whitlam, Q.C., M.P., Prime Minister of Australia. I am sure Local Government throughout Australia owes a debt of gratitude to the Prime Minister, and I would like to place on record the appreciation of Local Government representatives to the (Constitutional) Convention, for the manner Mr. Whitlam worked for the interests of Local Government. On the morning of Friday and at very short notice, Mr. Whitlam gave our delegation one hour of his valuable time for informal discussions on the question of Local Government representation on the Loan Council. Mr. Whitlam gave us some very valuable information and as our discussion with him was quite informal and completely off the record, I again say thank you Prime Minister for the opportunity you have given Local Government in helping us to attain some of our objectives."

To which one can only say: "Beware the Greek who comes bearing gifts." But it is quite true that the various State Governments have treated Local Government with little sympathy through the years.

So Mr. Whitlam, by cleverly playing States against Commonwealth, Local Government against the States, and exploiting the centralist hypocrisies of his Opposition, sees the Fabian prize within his grasp.

Who, then, is to meet the onslaught? Perhaps Local Government itself can yet save the day. The most modest and least ambitious of our three-tiered system of government still contains a minority leadership of a quality conspicuously absent in its senior partners. Local Government men still serve with little or no remuneration. The Local Government arena is still largely, though decreasingly free of party corruption and the will-to-

Power. In Victoria there is a widespread revolt amongst many councils at being led like lambs to the slaughter. It may be enough to force Hamer into thinking again. In northern New South Wales there is entrenched opposition to the Barnett Report, and some fiery meetings have been held. In one or two instances, Councillors have even returned to their own electors the ratepayers for support and direction, which is a healthy sign indeed. And if men like Mr. Rogers can see through the Whitlam overtures in time, and demand from Mr. Bjelke-Petersen something more than mere opposition to centralism, we could yet see a move towards, rather than away from, a system of equal federal partnership.

Assuming, then, that Local Government rejects regionalism and Commonwealth control, the ball is firmly back in the States' court. A well-organised grass-roots campaign led by Local Government could contest the seats of all State politicians who would not take positive action. "A reduction in rates, an alleviation of Local Government debt, and a fair and unconditional allocation of finance for future services" would make a suitable base on which to campaign. It would surprise many complacent State and Federal politicians if they knew what support such a move would generate.

The Minister for Local Government and Electricity in Queensland, Mr. Henry McKechnie, in a letter written last August made the following comments:

- (1) **The Grants Bill**—While financial necessity compels us to go along with this Bill because of the money we hope it will provide for local authorities, I agree with you that it is designed by the Commonwealth to undermine the States and consequently move closer to centralisation which we abhor. My government has protested and will continue to do so.
- (2) **Queensland operating its own banking system**—is undesirable if we have a good system of Federalism administered by a responsible Commonwealth Government. However, as things appear at the moment, I would like to keep my options open until we know more of the Commonwealth's intentions. At the moment I find it impossible to get factual decisions from them and consequently believe that they don't know where they're going themselves."

On the contrary, Mr. McKechnie, the facts are that they know where they are going and have known for many years. If there is any confusion, it lies with the States.

Sir Robert Askin has also conceded in a letter that the use of Section 51 to operate a State banking system is perfectly legal and constitutional, although he feels it may be "inadvisable". Which is begging the question unless Sir Robert has an alternative.

The President of the Narracan Shire Ratepayers' Association, in a circular prepared in October of last year, made the following apt comments: "The one way in which Local Government can remain LOCAL is for alternative finance to be obtained from another source.

The means of doing this is contained in Section 51 (xiii) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, which excludes State Banking from Commonwealth control. We suggest that the State Government legislates to change the State Savings Bank from a Savings Bank to a bank of issue (trading bank) and that grants and loans be used from this source to finance local government.

In 1948 the N.S.W. Government reacted to the proposal to nationalise the Australian banking system, by rushing a short Bill through the State Parliament, which changed the Rural Bank from a Savings Bank to a Bank of Issue—that is, a bank with the power to create credit. In 1948 the Rural Bank had assets totalling \$37 million, and through its normal operations as a bank of issue its assets amounted to \$69 million in 1958.

The Federal Treasurer of the day Mr. McMahon said in his budget speech on 12/8/69: "Loans and advances by the banks will again add to the money supply." Now if loans from banks "add" to the money supply, they must create additional money. Any economics textbook will describe how this happens—let us quote from *Australian Economic Framework*, by Drohan and Doubleday (1968), page 217, "The Creation of Money":

"Whilst all institutions in the finance market mobilise savings, banks are peculiar in the sense that they may create money as well." Page 220: ". . . bank lending creates deposits. For example, when a client arranges an overdraft from his bank, he is authorised to draw cheques up to a limit of, say, \$10,000. Now suppose he buys a new machine from a producer. He will tender his cheque to the seller and the first record of the transaction in the banking system will be a deposit to the credit of the machine producer. The cheque forming the basis of the deposit will eventually be charged to the debit of the borrower's account in the lending bank's book that Deposits and Advances have increased by the same amount. **Existing depositors are not affected by this transaction, and the nett affect is an addition to the volume of bank deposits.** As bank deposits are one of the components of the total volume of money, then by its action, which resulted in a new deposit being created, **the lending bank has increased the volume of money.**"

*The Warragul Gazette*, 27/6/72, reported the final payment of a 20-year loan of \$18,000 by the Buln Bum Shire Council at an interest rate of 4¼%. One Councillor commented: "I wish we could get money at that rate now." As a public institution, the State Bank ought to be able to issue loans to Local Government at the actual cost of administration of the loan. High interest rates are only used by the Central Bank (or Government) as a means of political control, allegedly to control the economy." (End of circular.)

Here, then, is the sphere in which the States must start preparing for their own defence. Quite apart from the collection and allocation of taxation revenue, the present iniquitous annexation of which must be strenuously

fought and changed, the process of lending to governments will continue. Loan funds will continue to constitute a considerable part of expenditure in the budgets of Federal, State and Local Governments. Either the States and Local Government can continue to borrow monies under conditions laid down by the Commonwealth and the Reserve Bank to their own ultimate demise. Or the States can initiate a new system by the use of their own constitutional rights, saving themselves and Local Government in the process.

One cannot help but admire the brave fight put up by the Queensland Premier Mr. Bjelke-Petersen against the centralisation of power. He has put the other State premiers to shame. His achievements in the case of the Privy Council and in cementing the position of the Queen as Australia's Monarch will not be forgotten. But a new feeling is tempering the massive support, which Joh Bjelke-Petersen has generated in Queensland and other States—a feeling that centralism cannot be blindly resisted unless reasonable and practical alternatives are found. There is a great deal of justification for such a feeling. The ultimate question is the question of financial sovereignty. Prime Minister Whitlam understands this, and until he advocates the decentralisation of financial as well as political power, his lip service to decentralisation remains nothing more than platitudinous hypocrisy.

The coming Senate Elections, and the four proposed referendum questions mark a great watershed in Australian history. Centralisation or Federalism? Only the States and Local Government can decide the question.

## THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

(A division of the Australian League of Rights)  
P.O. Kingstown, via Armidale, 2350 N.S.W.

Back numbers of Enterprise still in stock (10 cents each posted):

AN UNHOLY DEITY. The story of centralised banking power in Australia.

BLEED, BLEED POOR COUNTRY. The battle through Australia's history for decentralisation.

THE DRIVE TO SMASH THE STATES. The tragic story of the Commonwealth Grants Bill.

THE IRON HAND OF PRICE CONTROL. The use of inflation to centralise power in Australia.

### Important books available:

THE CREATION AND CONTROL OF MONEY. 40c posted.

A PROGRAMME FOR REVERSING INFLATION, by Eric D. Butler. 35c posted.

Comprehensive booklist also available. Associate Membership of the Institute may be obtained on application—\$10.00 per annum.

## SENATOR MURPHY'S FRAUDULENT "HUMAN RIGHTS" BILL

Few Australians had heard about Senator Lionel Murphy's Human Rights Bill, 1973, until some of the Church leaders protested that the wording of the legislation could result in a restriction of the freedoms of the Churches. And although the Human Rights Bill is designed to bring Commonwealth legislation into line with the requirements of the United Nations Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, it was pointed out by the Church spokesmen that the Covenant clause concerning the rights of the family had been deleted from the Murphy legislation. While the protests of the Churches are legitimate, they have tended to obscure the more far-reaching implications of the Bill.

The Human Rights Bill recalls the famous satire, *Animal Farm*, by the former Communist George Orwell, in which the animals find that their Bill of Rights, written up on the farm barn door, did not protect them against the ruthless exploitation of the pigs after they had overthrown the farmer. It was true that it was still stated, "all animals are equal", but now it also read "some animals are more equal than others!"

Under the guise of protecting Australians' rights and freedoms successfully, protected until now through the division of power and common law rights upheld by an independent judiciary, the Human Rights Bill seeks to expand enormously the power of the Commonwealth at the expense of the States, and the individual. It is an attempt to violate the Federal Constitution by the use of the External Affairs power. Clause 5 of the Human Rights Bill "binds Australia and each State". If implemented Federal officials will be able to force the States to conform to the pattern of law established by the Commonwealth. The implications are explosive.

The roots of the Human Rights Bill go back to the establishment of the United Nations, and the dominant role of the Communists. In the numerous conferences concerning human rights, there was a clear-cut cleavage between the Western and Christian view that certain rights are inalienable, derived from God the Creator and not from the State, as argued by the Communists. Dr. Charles Malik, Chairman of the U.N. Human Rights Commission, has pointed out that a study of the discussions of the Commission reveals how the Soviet influence dominated. He observed, "The concept of property and its ownership is at the heart of the ideological conflict of the present day. It was not only the Communist representatives who riddled this question with questions and doubts; a goodly portion of the non-Communist world had itself succumbed to these doubts."

The Communists reluctantly permitted the right to own private property (clause 17) to appear in the wordy Declaration of Human Rights, but by the time the Covenant was drafted, clause 17 had disappeared! There is no reference to property rights in Senator Murphy's Human Rights Bill. It reflects the humanistic philosophy of those who drafted the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. If individual rights are granted by the State, then it is obvious that what the State grants it can also take away.

In view of some of the actions of the Whitlam Government, it is rather hypocritical for Senator Murphy to be stressing how concerned he and his colleagues are about the individual's rights. They have mastered George Orwell's "double-speak".

Section 11, sub-section (2) states "Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression, including freedom to speak, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless

of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice."

One of the first acts of Senator Murphy and his colleagues when they came to office was to attempt to close down the Rhodesian Information Centre in Sydney. They also tried to deprive the Rhodesian Information Centre of postal services. Here was a blatant example of an attempt to deny Australians the right to receive information "regardless of frontiers". That right was only protected by a decision of the High Court.

Further evidence of Senator Murphy's philosophical double-standards is found in his Family Law Bill, which provides a married person with the right to obtain a divorce with a mere one year's separation from his or her partner. The wife or husband can be perfectly innocent of any wrongdoing, but has no rights. Not only does the Murphy Family Law Bill debase the traditional concept of marriage; it makes a mockery of the professions of the Human Rights Bill.

Article 23(1) of the U.N. Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966, states that "the family is the natural and fundamental group of society, and is entitled to protection by society and the State". This clause was not included in Senator Murphy's Bill, one of the points, which caused concern amongst Church leaders. Church leaders prepared to accept Senator Murphy's minor alterations to his Bill are ignoring the fact that the inclusion of the statement concerning the family is meaningless while the Family Law Bill remains.

Introducing his Race Bill Senator Murphy said that it proposes that "racial discrimination shall be made unlawful throughout Australia . . . Discrimination has had its effects on migrant groups in our community." The Senator Murphy who made this statement was the same Senator Murphy who spearheaded the vicious campaign against the unfortunate Croatians! What rights did they have?

Section 12 of the Human Rights Bill states that "Any propaganda for war is prohibited." It is not so long ago that Prime Minister Whitlam attempted to justify armed violence against South Africa and Rhodesia. And what if Australia were attacked? Would this mean that no one had the right to advocate military resistance?

Section 14, sub-section (1) states that "Everyone shall have the right to freedom of association with others, including the right to form or join trade unions for the protection of his interests..." There is no reference whatever to the rights of those individuals who do not wish to join a trade union.

Section 16, sub-section (2) asserts, "Everyone shall be free to leave Australia." The Whitlam Government has informed all public servants that those intending to visit Taiwan or Rhodesia will not be given Australian passports. Prime Minister Whitlam has threatened that Australians sympathetic to Rhodesia may be deprived of their passports. Clearly some have more freedom than others!

Part III of the Bill makes provision for the appointment of an "Australian Human Rights Commissioner". The Commissioner will have what has been described as a "dubious arbitrary power". Just how far could this power be exercised? No one is certain. Victorian Attorney-General Vernon Wilcox raises this question:

"All these questions can arise under the provisions of the bill—

"Are judges to perform their work knowing that the Human Rights Commissioner . . . may call them to account for decisions they took?"

"Can the Human Rights Commissioner require judges to explain themselves!

"Are judges to be named as defendants in actions by persons who claim that their rights have been infringed? The bill allows such an action and this question arises as an example—if a judge refuses bail is he to be cited as defendant in a claim for a declaration and damages before the Industrial Court—of all courts!"

These and many other questions confirm the view of those who see Senator Murphy's Human Rights Bill as a source of never-ending litigation with lawyers and criminals some of the principal beneficiaries. There are numerous unanswered questions, such as what would be the effect of clause 22, which states, "Anyone charged with a criminal offence shall be tried within a reasonable time." All will agree that this is excellent. But first the courts must decide what is "reasonable". That is difficult. And what if the lapse of time is not reasonable? Does the court then discharge the accused without trial?

The system of law, which Australians have at present, may not be perfect. But can Senator Murphy point to any examples of people enjoying a better system? Do the people in those countries, which have a Bill of Rights, enjoy any more protection of their rights and freedoms than do Australians? The most outstanding example of the futility of a Bill of Rights as such is the Soviet Union, which boldly proclaims all the equal rights and liberties of Soviet citizens. But as Alexander Solzhenitsyn has dramatically demonstrated, paper pledges are useless in the face of the all-powerful State. The millions of Soviet citizens in the concentration camps are an example of the Orwellian observation that some members of Soviet society are more equal than others! It is significant that Australian Communists are supporting Senator Murphy's Bill, which they believe "can contribute to the deepening of mass understanding of democracy in Australia".

Sir Reginald Sholl, former member of the Victorian Supreme Court, and Australia's Consul-General in New York for three years, has charged that Senator Murphy's legislation would disrupt the administration of criminal law, strengthen organised crime and make "peaceful citizens as insecure as in the United States". Sir Reginald warns, "The social discipline in Australia is already breaking down. A Bill of Rights would completely remove some powers from all organs of government." He points out that Section 42 of the Human Rights Bill would remove the right to prosecute even on conclusive evidence of crime uncovered during an illegal search.

Section 42 of the Bill reads: "Evidence obtained in contravention, or in consequence of any contravention, of a provision of Part 11 is not admissible in any court or before any tribunal for any purpose." Along with other eminent jurists, Sir Reginald Sholl has pointed out how the stability of American society has been seriously imperilled through interpretation of the American Bill of Rights by the American Supreme Court. "This has placed the protection of individual criminal suspects too far ahead of the security of society." Other eminent jurists have also drawn attention to the American situation. While still Victoria's Chief Justice, Sir Henry Winneke wrote to the Victorian Attorney-General, Mr. Wilcox, expressing his "grave concern for the administration of the law and public confidence in the judiciary" if the Human Rights Bill is passed.

The classic American example confirming the warning of Sir Reginald Sholl is the case of the murderer with a body in the boot of his car that was stopped at a police block, the boot of his car opened and the body discovered. But, incredible though it may appear to Australians, the murderer was allowed to go free because it was held that the police had contravened the U.S. Bill of Rights in that they had no proper right to open the boot of the murderer's car!

Mr. Stanley W. Johnston, head of the Criminology Department at Melbourne University, and chairman of the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations Association of Australia, is concerned that the Murphy legislation does not go far enough. He provides, however, a picture of how the internationalists plan to give individuals the "right" of direct appeal to the U.N. Human Rights Committee. An example is the eleven European States who have agreed to allow 150 million Europeans to approach directly the European Commission on Human Rights. No evidence is provided to show that Europeans with this right are any better off than Australians. But Mr. Johnston does see the Murphy Bill as a step in the right direction because "It might effect a transfer of certain, mainly criminal, lawmaking powers from the States to Canberra". It is this prospect, which has caused even Dr. Bray, Chief Justice of South Australia, well known for his liberal views, to join with other jurists in expressing concern about the impact of the Murphy Bill upon criminal law in Australia.

Although Geoffrey Sawyer, Professor of Law in the Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian University, favours "the insertion in the Australian Constitution of a comprehensive Bill of Rights", he also states that "I am against the mealy-mouthed exceptions and rhetorical declarations of policy in the United Nations Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 1966, and surprised at the adulation accorded that document by defenders of Senator Murphy's proposed Human Rights legislation". In a constructively critical article in *The Age* of February 12, Professor Sawyer makes the important point that "The U.N. document is the result of a long process of compromise between about a hundred negotiating governments, most of which have no respect for or intention of protecting Individual liberties . . ."

And yet Senator Murphy's supporters claim that Australia must accept his Human Rights Bill in order to "keep face" with the "international community". Do they really think that the Communist dictators, or perhaps "General" Amin of Uganda, are impressed with the passing of a Human Rights Bill in Australia!

The biggest threat to Australians' rights and liberties is the policy of centralising all power at Canberra and the destruction of the Federal system of Government, which was designed to keep power divided between the Federal and State Governments. Senator Murphy's Human Rights Bill, introduced into the Senate on November 21, is an attempt to further the centralising process through a misuse of the External Affairs powers of the Commonwealth Constitution. Australians concerned about their real rights and liberties should insist that their representatives at Canberra reject the Bill completely as un-Australian.

#### **AN AUSTRALIAN LEAGUE OF RIGHTS (NON-PARTY) PUBLICATION**

Further supplies of this brochure available for distribution from The Australian League of Rights at the following addresses: Box 1052J, G.P.O. Melbourne 3001; Box 16, Inglewood, Western Australia 6052; Box 1297, Adelaide, South Australia; Box 2957, G.P.O. Sydney, N.S.W. 2001; Box 64, Maleny, Queensland.

Prices, including postage: 10 cents for 1; 35 cents for 12; \$1.25 for 50; \$2.75 for 100; \$16 for 1000.

"I do not favour any attempt to insert what are called guarantees of personal freedom of speech, thought or action in a constitution . . . In a democratic community, the only true guarantee is the sense of the people itself."

—Sir Isaac Isaacs distinguished High Court Judge for 25 years, Australia's first native-born Governor-General (appointed by a Labor Government) in Australian Democracy and Our Constitutional System, March 1939.

**W. & J. BARR (Printers) PTY. LTD., 424-430 George Street, Fitzroy, Victoria.**