



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

Registered
for posting
as a periodical
Category B.

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—

Vol. 9, No. 35.

September 21st, 1973.

Thought for the Week : "We have nearly all fallen into the clutches of six myths. . . . the myth of of equality. . . . the myth that work is good and beneficial to the worker's soul, whereas it is the Curse of Adam. The myth that hereditary is in some way (hard to define) superseded. Shall we call this the illusion of merit? The myth that there are no rare spirits whereas society is held together and all good things are advanced by exceptional individuals. Mass movements are the perpetual movement of the Gadarene swine. The myth of the more the merrier. The myth of. . . . the desirability of uniformity. Whereas individualism is the basis of all equality, and can only flourish in freedom. Equality of the great enemy of quality."

- Robert Fordyce Aikman in the magazine Nineteenth Century, 27 years ago.

THE PHONEY "BATTLE" AGAINST INFLATION : "The Prime Minister last night sounded the call to battle against inflation. 'It must be fought on all fronts', he said. 'We have to tackle it head on'. And with these stirring words he announced a two-pronged attack: the dollar will be appreciated and the Government will mop up possibly hundreds of millions of dollars by increasing interest rates."

- Editorial in The Age, (Melbourne), September 10th.

Since Prime Minister Whitlam sounded the call to arms against inflation, using the same type of empty language employed by his predecessors, when they were declaring their determination to rout the inflation enemy, the Australian people have been subjected to a form of shock-and-confusion treatment. But as we have persistently warned, the "war" against inflation ("it must be fought on all fronts", cries Mr. Whitlam) is completely phoney. It is a smokescreen under which the Canberra power men plan to advance their strategy of obtaining a further increase in centralised power. This is the real meaning of the campaign to gain Commonwealth control of prices. Mr. Whitlam argues that in other countries central Governments have the power to control prices. But he neglects to mention that these Governments have failed disastrously to halt inflation.

Opposition leader Snedden followed Mr. Whitlam's call to arms with the charge that the Government "is anxious to appear to be doing something about inflation while refusing to take the difficult and necessary decisions. . . . They must have a total package of measures which include fiscal responsibilities, proper demand management and in the current serious circumstances, an appropriate income and prices policy. They are running away from these necessary policies for purely political reasons". (vide The Age, September 10th).

Having delivered himself of this type of meaningless numbo-jumbo, without explaining why the Liberal-Country Party Coalition did not implement these "necessary policies" during the period of twenty-three years of progressive inflation over which it presided, Mr. Snedden then said, "It is sheer hypocrisy for the Government to complain of excessive liquidity while it insists on pumping vastly increased spending into the economy with a deficit Budget providing for expenditure nearly \$700 million in excess of income".

But Mr. Snedden's hypocrisy easily matches that of Mr. Whitlam and his colleagues. Only just over twelve months ago, Mr. Billie Snedden, then Federal Treasurer, ate his own words and cynically reversed the Government's previous restrictive financial policies, a major feature of this reversal being a deficit Budget of \$650 million, in a desperate attempt to keep the Coalition Government in office. During the last six months of the Coalition Government there was a spectacular increase in the nation's money supply; 6.8 percent in the first quarter and 9.2 percent in the second quarter.

The major cause of the present wave of inflation was the massive credit expansion set in motion by the Liberal-Country Party Coalition. If this credit expansion had taken place along the lines we suggested, a portion of this new credit being used to lower prices via consumer subsidies, and if at the same time a start had been made to eliminate some of the more inflationary indirect taxes, including petrol tax, a depressed economy would have been stimulated without further inflation. If the Post Office had been relieved of the absurd policy of having to pay 7 per cent interest on loans provided from tax revenue, there would have been no need to increase postal charges. But the coalition politicians would have none of these constructive proposals, blindly following the advice of the Treasury, Central Bank and other official "experts". The "experts" have no need to worry about the political casualties resulting from their policies. They merely have another set of politicians to advise. And as Mr. Whitlam has dramatically demonstrated, he is prepared to do as advised. Like Mr. Snedden, he now conveniently forgets what he and his colleagues said when on the other side of the House.

The removal of Mr. Snedden, Mr. Anthony and their colleagues to the Opposition benches has had no perceptible impact. They appear to have forgotten nothing and learned nothing. There is not the slightest sign of humility. Those who believe that the Opposition should be united under the leadership of either Mr. Doug Anthony or perhaps Mr. Malcolm Fraser, in order to have a chance of defeating the Whitlam Government, overlook that more than a "new image" is required to stem the Socialist drive. As a man Mr. Anthony may be a big improvement on Mr. Whitlam. But we fear that a Government led by Mr. Anthony would be ideal for the further imposition of disastrous finance-economic policies. On the platform, in Parliament, and in a large volume of correspondence, Mr. Anthony has shown an appalling ignorance of even the most elementary finance-economic truths. And the manner in which he allowed himself to be used, as was his deputy Mr. Sinclair, to attempt to smear the Australian League of Rights and patriotic Australians, revealed, at best, a frightening gullibility. The record of Mr. Malcolm Fraser offers no greater hope. In correspondence with electors Mr. Fraser has been careful not to express any views of his own on finance-economics, but to refer the correspondence to the Treasurer of the day. His newspaper articles, which might fairly be described primarily as public relations exercises designed to improve Mr. Fraser's leadership prospects, present no answers to the central weapon of the Marxists: continuing inflation. As a man we much prefer Mr. Fraser to the "trendies" of the Liberal Party, the Peacocks and the Chipps. But wars are only won by those who understand their enemies and how to deprive them of their most dangerous weapons.

The Opposition at Canberra may need a new leader. But much more important, it needs a new policy, a genuine anti-Socialist, anti-centralist, anti-inflation policy to rally the Australian people.

Perhaps it was good party politics for the Opposition to use its superior numbers in the Senate, as it did on September 12th, to censure the Labor Party for its failure to curb inflation. But the same Opposition must have the greatest contempt for the Australian people, believing their memories to be non-existent, when they point out that Labor's increased interest rate will add to price increases and diminish purchasing power. Electors who protested when the Coalition increased interest rates, petrol tax and postal charges, and asked how could inflation be curbed by increasing financial costs, were told that they did not understand the long-term value of what was being done - or that they were the victims of wicked League of Rights propaganda.'

The phoney war about inflation can only be ended when sufficient electors get rid of their party blinkers, broaden their vision, and unite to defeat their common enemy. Unless inflation is constructively ended, the coming disasters will affect everyone irrespective of what party label he is wearing.

DOUBLE-TALK CONCERNING BILL OF RIGHTS : "Having the right to postal and telephonic services is an extremely important matter and to be deprived of that right by some arbitrary political direction would not be in conformity with the civil liberties of the community. There is no doubt about that principle, but then we come to the application of it. What the High Court of Australia said was a judgment on the question of power. The Court was divided on the question of whether there was power under the Act and the regulations as they stand to carry out the Government's policy in regard to the Rhodesian Information Centre. The fact is that the Government of Australia is endeavouring to carry out the repeated statements and resolutions of the United Nations - its General Assembly, its Security Council and its other bodies - in order that this illegal racist regime in Rhodesia shall not be able to propagandise around the world.... The Australian Government will do all in its power - if necessary, by amending the appropriate laws - to ensure that the will of mankind, as expressed through the United Nations in its abhorrence of the operation of this regime, is carried out as far as we can do it." - Attorney-General Lionel Murphy, answering a question from Senator Ivor Greenwood in the Senate on September 12th.

Senator Murphy has been talking a lot about the necessity of an Australian Bill of Rights. But typical of his kind, he clearly does not believe in rights for those who happen to disagree with his rather warped outlook on some subjects. Like a brain-washed parrot, Senator Murphy can start to answer the case for Rhodesia put forward by Dr. Walter Henderson in his booklet on Rhodesia (57¢ from all League addresses), and refute the famous international liberal, Mr. Dean Acheson, former American Secretary of State, his views may be heeded as something more than the rantings of a totalitarian Socialist.

When Senator Murphy talks about "the will of mankind, as expressed through the United Nations", he is talking the most absurd and dangerous nonsense. In fact, he demonstrates just why he is a major national menace. It would be instructive to learn just how the one thousand million victims of Communist tyrannies have expressed their "will" concerning Rhodesia. Unlike the Communist barbarians in the Soviet Union, the Rhodesian Government does not throw its intellec-

tuals into concentration camps, or put them in mental hospitals and attempt to deprive them of their sanity. There is no Iron Curtain around Rhodesia. Senator Murphy might also tell Australians just how the victims of the African dictators, men like "General" Amin, express their will at the United Nations. No nation calling itself civilised has been prepared to go as far as the Whitlam Government in assisting with the attempt to destroy order in Rhodesia and to produce chaos.

If the Whitlam Government can change the law so that it can arbitrarily deny postal and telephone services to those putting a view with which Senator Murphy and his Socialist friends disagree, then of course what is done to the Rhodesian Information Centre can be done to other groups. The Australian League of Rights, for example, has for years put the case for the abolition of sanctions against Rhodesia. The League holds the view that Rhodesia is holding a vital front-line in Southern Africa against the global strategy of International Communism. Does Senator Murphy believe that the League should be arbitrarily deprived of postal and telephone services because of its pro-Rhodesian activities? We would be interested to have the Senator's answer to this rather important question.

THE REPUBLICANS BACK AWAY : We have no doubt that the nation-wide campaigning by the Australian Heritage Society had a marked bearing on the decision of the Labor Government not to force a confrontation with the Senate over the Australian Citizenship Bill. Although Mr. Al Grassby, Minister for Immigration, had originally stated, along with other Government Ministers, that no amendments to the Citizenship Bill would be accepted, when the moment of truth came the Opposition's amendments were accepted. It was originally proposed that the Queen's title be changed from "Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II" to only "Queen of Australia". It is this type of proposed change which is designed to attempt in a subtle way to downgrade the Crown. Mr. Grassby and his friends have tried to water-down the traditional oath of allegiance to the Crown. Mr. Grassby claims, without much evidence, that 71 percent of all Australians wanted to swear allegiance "to Australia and the Australian constitution". The Crown symbolises something far more important and permanent than a written Constitution which politicians are for ever attempting to tinker with, to increase their own power.

Migrants who will not accept that their first allegiance is to the Crown, have clearly been badly instructed on the fact that Australia is a Monarchy. Those who cannot accept this are not compelled to stay in Australia. We trust that when our Queen visits Australia for the purpose of opening the Sydney Opera House, and for other functions, the Australians will through a massive demonstration of loyalty make it clear to the sneaky Republicans amongst the politicians that they prefer a Monarch to a Republic in which the power-hungry politicians fight to become the President. Instead of insulting the great majority of Australians, who want Australia to continue as a British nation with British institutions, Mr. Grassby would be better advised to do something to make good his pre-election promise of hundreds of millions of long-term rural credit at 3 percent. Have you forgotten, Mr. Grassby?

DR. "HO CHI JIM" CAIRNS COURTS THE COMMUNISTS : "Tokyo - September 14. The Minister for Overseas Trade (Dr. Cairns) today promised Australian examination of the possibility of concluding a formal trade agreement with North Korea." - John O'Farrell in The Age (Melb.)-September 14th.

Dr. Cairns has a clear cut policy: Opposition to trade links with anti-Communist nations like South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal, but close ties with all Communist nations.

"On Target" is published by the Australian League of Rights, Box 1052J G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

Subscription rate \$4.00 per annum.

W. & J. Barr (Printers) Pty. Ltd.