



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—

Vol. 7 No. 37

October 1st, 1971.

Thought for the Week : "much as worthy friends add to the happiness and value of life, we must in the main depend upon ourselves; and everyone is his own best friend or worst enemy." - Lord Evebury.

THE HON. D. ANTHONY'S DOUBLE-TALK : "This was a time for all country people to get behind the Country Party so that it could do the job it must do for all country people and for Australia, the Party's Federal leader, Mr. Doug. Anthony, said in Perth in July. Opening the Party's annual State conference, he believed there was no other organisation that had the capacity the Country Party had to understand farmers' problems and work out solutions that were sound and acceptable to the community. He said he was more convinced than ever after his most recent trip abroad how essential it was to decentralise population and industry." - West Australian Country Party Country News-Bulletin, September.

Deputy-Prime Minister Anthony is emerging as one of the greatest exponents of double-talk seen at Canberra for a long time. Under nation-wide pressure Mr. Anthony has back-stepped from his charge in South Australia that the League of Rights is "pro-Nazi". But he still attempts to justify his sweeping charges against the League, while continuing to attack what he describes as the inflationary financial policy of The League of Rights. It is a fitting commentary on the state of the world that a Deputy Prime Minister in a Government which has been responsible for over twenty years of disastrous inflation, charges the League of Rights with advocating inflation when in fact the League has consistently urged that inflation be ended! Will Mr. Anthony please tell the hard-pushed rural community just what is HIS solution to the cost-price squeeze which is driving an increasing number of people from the rural communities into the already over-swollen cities? It is no use Mr. Anthony mouthing platitudes about the 1971 "anti-inflation" Budget, because it is clear that inflation is still continuing in exactly the same way that it continued after the 1970 "anti-inflation" Budget.

The same Mr. Anthony who said in Western Australia how essential it is to decentralise population and industry, is playing a major role in imposing policies of increasing CENTRALISATION. What audacious double-talk for a Country Party spokesman to speak about decentralising population when he knows that the flight from the rural communities has reached flood proportions. Mr. Anthony may not be the brightest politician at Canberra, but we refuse to believe that he does not understand that the Rural Reconstruction programme is one for REDUCING, not increasing, the number of people of Australia's rural areas. The Melbourne Sun of September 13th, reported Mr. Anthony as stating at Wesley Church's Sunday Forum that "Many woolgrowers would be forced to leave the land because they could not make a living." Mr. Anthony did not mention that it was twenty years of the cost-price squeeze which had driven the wool industry into the present desperate situation. He offered no

solution to the cost-price squeeze, but warned that "there is no escaping the fact there must be and will be many changes in the industry." He also warned that "In many cases the changes will have to be violent and sudden." This is strange talk for a man who preaches decentralisation!

Further insight into Mr. Anthony's use of double-talk is provided in one of his recent letters sent to a Victorian grazier. Mr. Anthony writes, "No doubt you are aware that the economy at the moment is running close to capacity. . . ." Business men have for some time been flatly disputing the claim that the economy is operating anyway near capacity. The President of the Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia, Mr. H.N. Herford, is the latest to draw attention to the truth. The Age, Melbourne, of September 28th, reports Mr. Herford as stating that manufacturers require an "injection of activity". Mr. Herford mentions the necessity for lower interest rates. But Mr. Anthony will have no truck with lower interest charges. He states that "the interest on the National Debt is currently about 2.1% of our gross national product - a very small cost element indeed." Mr. Anthony is not quite honest. The National Debt is only a part of the total Australian indebtedness. Let us take the indebtedness of the wool industry. Mr. Anthony's Country Party colleague, Senator Drake-Brockman, recently said in Parliament that the total debt of the wool growers is now \$2,630 million, and that the interest on this debt, \$100 million, will absorb one quarter to one third of the total net income for woolgrowers for the 1971-72 season. Some of Mr. Anthony's colleagues in the State Parliaments have complained that when the States pay the Commonwealth interest on taxes borrowed, a \$1 million highschool eventually costs the States \$2½ million. The claim that high interest rates are not a substantial contribution to inflation is either a manifestation of ignorance or sheer dishonesty.

Not only does Mr. Anthony dispute the serious impact of high interest charges on costs; he has the effrontery to claim that indirect taxes only "add marginally to costs". Every business man knows just how ridiculous Mr. Anthony's statement is; that all taxation imposed on industry if possible be recovered in higher prices.

The concluding statement in Mr. Anthony's letter is most revealing. The answer to the farmer's problems "lies in a redistribution of the existing wealth in the community in favour of the farmer and this is precisely what the Party is attempting to do through its vast array of assistance measures to primary producers from within the Budget". This statement is, of course, a clear declaration in favour of the Socialist concept of organising a society. Allowing for the fact that Mr. Anthony equates "the existing wealth in the community" with the amount of money in the community, Mr. Anthony's "solution" to the rural crisis means that those farmers left after "reconstruction" will be given some assistance out of money taxed from the rest of the community. As the whole community is now suffering the increasing impact of inflation, Mr. Anthony's proposals can only foster further cleavages between different sections of the Australian community. This is all grist to the propaganda mills of the Marxists, but is disastrous advice from a man who is supposed to be leading the Party representing the rural community.

The Institute of Economic Democracy, a division of The Australian League of Rights, has put forward a limited objective programme for halting the rural crisis without penalising other sections of society. Instead of engaging in more double-talk, and attempting to smear the League, Mr. Anthony would be better advised to discuss rationally the I.O.E.C.'s programme. Unless he does this, he is heading for some severe electoral shocks.

COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY-GENERAL ON LEAGUE OF RIGHTS : "The Australian League of Rights had a dangerous economic policy, the Federal Attorney-General, Senator Ivor Greenwood, said in Horsham yesterday. It also had a politically unyielding foreign policy no Government could afford to adopt, he said. But the Liberal Party was not worried about the League's activities. 'Australia is a democratic country, and they're a democratic organisation', he said. 'I don't think they are anti-Australian', he said. Senator Greenwood visited Horsham on his way to Nhill to address a Liberal Party branch meeting yesterday." -Wimmera Mail-Times, September 24th.

Senator Ivor Greenwood's remarks about the League of Rights make interesting reading. In stating that the League is a democratic organisation and is not anti-Australian, the Attorney-General merely confirms what previous Attorney-Generals have said; that the League is a reputable organisation. If Senator Greenwood means that the League's "unyielding foreign policy" is firm, unrelenting opposition to recognition of Marxist conspiracies dedicated to destroying what is left of the free world, he is quite right. We do not believe in the myth about "peaceful co-existence", we do not believe that either Moscow or Peking is "mellowing, and we accept the Marxists' stated view, confirmed by events, that economics is one of the most important weapons in the Marxist global strategy. Senator Greenwood might care to take us into his confidence sometime, and tell us just when the present Federal Government decided that the policy of non-recognition of Red China was wrong, and why.

BOOK OF THE MOMENT

A Programme For Reversing Inflation, by Eric D. Butler, Text of Paper given at Queensland Country Party Seminar. The Treasury "experts" were given the task of trying to refute this Paper, but have only demonstrated both their ignorance and dishonesty. The second edition of this powerful booklet now available. Essential for all actionists in the anti-inflation campaign. Price 31 cents, post free. 6 copies for \$1.50. 12 copies for \$2.50. From 1052J, G.P.O., Melb.

If the economic policies supported by the League of Rights are "dangerous", then what can be said about the policies of the Government in which Senator Greenwood serves? The League of Rights supports genuine free, competitive enterprise, widespread private ownership, consumer control of production, lower taxation and the abolition of the most destructive force operating in favor of the Marxists against the free world; continuing inflation. Senator Greenwood's Party once talked boldly about these policies, too. But when Senator Greenwood first went to Canberra he was the "white hope" of Victorian Liberals struggling to preserve the Federal system against the Canberra centralists. However, he apparently does not believe in being too "unyielding." We must confess that the League is quite unyielding on matters of principle. Presumably that is what makes the League "dangerous".

ISRAEL AND JERUSALEM : "New York, September 26th - The Security Council last night called on Israel to rescind all measures it had taken in the occupied sector of Jerusalem which might purport to change the city's status. The 15 nation Council adopted by 14 votes to nil, with one abstention, a resolution asking the Secretary-General (U Thant) to report within 60 days on the implementation, and if necessary send a representative or mission to Jerusalem for that purpose". - The Age,

Melbourne, September 27th.

The U.N. instruction to Israel must be regarded as mere wrist-slapping, with no real intention to make Israel cease changing the character of Jerusalem. Israel has thumbed its nose at all previous U.N. resolutions because they have not been backed by any threat of sanctions. Now if Israel were Rhodesia, or South Africa, what a difference there would be! The powerful Political Zionist machine in the USA ensures that Washington does not take steps to cut off the flow of funds without which Israel could not long survive.

Unnoticed except by a few in-depth observers, has been the steady flow of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel in recent months. The Soviet masters refuse to allow any other group to leave the Soviet Union. Then there was the visit to Israel some time back by that most interesting Soviet operator, Victor Louis. We hope to report on significant Soviet-Israel developments in the near future.

VITAL COMMON MARKET DECISION LOOMS : "As the 'Great Debate' limbers into action, the British people, stoically mindful of the duties inherent in democracy, struggle manfully in the dog days to get to grips with basic issues. . . They want the answer to two questions : will entry to the Community entail a substantial surrender of sovereignty? And, if so, would it be worth while? "

-- The Rt. Hon. Sir Derek Walker-Smith, Q.C., M.P., in The Times, July 23rd.

As an eminent constitutional authority, Sir Derek Walker-Smith, stresses that acceptance of the Treaty of Rome means a start towards the progressive surrender of British sovereignty. Writing in his book The Common Market - The Case Against, produced on the eve of the House of Commons battle, Mr. Enoch Powell writes on the last page :

"Opinion has been right to fasten upon sovereignty as the central issue. Either Britain's entry is a declaration of intent to surrender this country's sovereignty, stage by stage, in all that matters as a nation, and makes a nation or else it is an empty gesture, disgraceful in its hollowness alike to those who proffer and to those who accept it: "

The Second Battle for Britain is as much concerned with the balance of world power as was the first Battle for Britain. All that is different is the weapons being used in a desperate attempt to bring the United Kingdom into that United States of Europe which Leon Trotsky was one of the first to advocate. In a recent statement in Adelaide, not widely publicised, the British Conservative M.P., Sir Angus Maude, said that by their influence Australians might well prove to be the decisive influence in the vote scheduled to take place in the British House of Commons on October 28th. In last week's On Target we provided a list of British M.P.'s who are regarded as waiverers. A flood of letters from the old Commonwealth nations, particularly from Australians, to these Members could move sufficient of them in the right direction. Just a simple appeal is all that is necessary. "Do not let the Commonwealth team down. Do not surrender British sovereignty. Let us all make another effort to pull together in a desperate world situation". We are informed that even if Mr. Heath wins on October 28th, a small majority will not be sufficient for him to carry through his proposed betrayal. Therefore let us strain every effort at this critical moment.

"ON TARGET" is published by the Australian League of Rights, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001. Subscription rate \$4.00 per annum.
