



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—*

Registered by Australia Post — Publication No. VBH0999

Vol. 23 No. 24

June 26th, 1987.

Thought for the Week: "Big Business is by no means antipathetic to Communism. The larger the big business grows the more it approximates to Collectivism. It is the upper road of the few instead of the lower road of the masses. to Collectivism."

H.G.Wells, a former member of the Fabian Society, writing in the London Sunday Express in 1920. Quoted in Eric D. Butler's The Fabian Socialist Contribution to the Communist Advance.

SHOULD WE SUPPORT JOHN HOWARD: Several of our readers have taken us to task for not throwing our full support behind Liberal leader, Mr. John Howard, the suggestion being that something akin to the end of the world will take place if the Hawke Government is re-elected. Our in-depth exposure of the Hawke Government's policies and betrayals of Australia's independence are a matter of record. The League was the first to bring to public attention the Fabian background of the Hawke Government, as clearly outlined in Mr. Hawke's famous 1984 address to the Fabian centenary dinner in Melbourne. We are not aware of one Member of the Opposition parties dealing with this question. But the NSW National Party has issued a scurrilous attack on the League, quoting former Communist and Fabian Socialist, Mr. K. D. Gott, as an authority on the League. Mr. Gott was engaged by the Hawke Government, for six months, for \$55,000, to "monitor" the League of Rights when it was pioneering the anti-Aboriginal land claims movement.

Uncritical support for a Howard Government would mean support for a government many of whose members are obviously tainted with the Fabian disease. We well understand the desperation of those who fear the future if the Hawke Government is re-elected. We recall the national sigh of relief which went up when Governor-General Sir John Kerr withdrew Mr. Gough Whitlam's commission and in effect ordered a general election. Mr. Malcolm Fraser was hailed as a new conservative leader who would reverse the disastrous policies which the Whitlam government had been pursuing. Malcolm Fraser promised much of what Mr. John Howard is promising today. The League was at

that time a lonely voice amidst the euphoria, warning that the Fraser Government was set on a disaster course. We pointed out in response to those who said that Malcolm Fraser could not be worse than Gough Whitlam, that he could be much worse. Mr. John Howard was a senior Minister in a government which did enormous damage, much of it psychological.

We suggest that those involved in a movement whose roots go back over fifty years, and have studied governments and politicians over a long period of time, might with proper modesty claim to be able to offer responsible advice to their fellow Australians. The League is dedicated to the preservation of fundamental values and principles clearly outlined in Objectives which have not had to be changed since the first League of Rights was formed in 1946. As the distinguished British constitutional authority, Professor (later Judge) G.W. Keeton observed in his classic, The Passing of Parliament, "The history of modern political society is ..... the history of the struggle of the ordinary citizen to exercise some influence upon government - and of his repeated failure to achieve that modest ambition .... When the candidate is returned to Parliament, he finds himself controlled by the party system, without the support of which he cannot hope to be returned at a future election. Accordingly, it follows that those who control the machine of the principal political party are the persons who exercise power in a Western democracy."

We are not concerned with parties and politicians as such, but with how to regenerate a type of constitutional democracy which all modern parties have helped to subvert. There is an old saying that those who will not learn from the mistakes of history are doomed to keep repeating those mistakes. With a much bigger majority than Mr. Howard can possibly win - not unless there is a major political miracle - Mr. Malcolm Fraser blatantly broke firm promises, including the one to reduce Big Government. Why should it be believed that John Howard will do what Malcolm Fraser failed to do? In our opinion, John Howard is, personally, a much better man than either Malcolm Fraser or Bob Hawke. But that is not the issue.

Mr. John Howard is a professional politician, a product of his own background, and as Federal Treasurer in the Fraser Government, was a disaster. As Treasurer he was completely subservient to financial orthodoxy. He attempted to impose the outrageous book and magazine tax, stubbornly refusing to listen even to appeals from Church groups who protested that the tax would destroy many small business journals.

Those who talk about defending the Common Law should remember that Treasurer John Howard was a strong supporter of the reprehensible retrospective tax legislation. His deficit budgets would have won the warm praise of John Maynard Keynes, the idol of the Fabian Marxists.

One correspondent refers to the threat of further abuse of the External Powers to "convert Australia into a UNO satrapy ..." if the Hawke Government is re-elected. The League of Rights was warning about the UNO and the threatened use of External Powers to subvert the Constitution, over forty years ago. Mr. Howard was a senior Minister in the Fraser Government which took the first steps to place Australia under UN direction. It was the same Fraser Government which further weakened Australia's traditional pro-European immigration policy, and which set the revolutionary Aboriginal land claims legislation in motion.

If it is argued that Treasurer John Howard strongly disagreed with these, and other destructive policies, then why did he not resign from the Fraser Government as a matter of principle? So far from defending Australia's independence, Mr. John Howard was in the forefront of the campaign to bring foreign banks into Australia, a policy subsequently implemented by Fabian Paul Keating. Like Mr. Paul Keating, Mr. John Howard was initially a strong supporter of a "broadly based" indirect tax to help pay for promised cuts in direct taxation, and appears to have been diverted from this approach by the campaign initiated by Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen. As we have said previously, the taxation policy announced by Mr Howard, even if implemented, offers no solution to Australia's basic problems. Now that the Hawke Government has embraced the dogma of "privatisation", which in practice will mean that State enterprises are taken over by private monopolists with access to billions of international bank credit, Mr. Howard is left without what was once one of his proposals. An objective observer would find it hard to detect much basic difference between Paul Keating and John Howard - except that both want to be in office!

Mr. Howard could still turn his mediocre campaign around by telling the Australian people that he realises that the Westminster system of government and the nation's constitutional safeguards have broken down, that the nation faces a great crisis, and that that crisis can only be weathered by trusting the Australian people, and that, if elected as Prime Minister, his first act would be to legislate for a referendum at which the people could vote themselves the right, by adoption of the Swiss referendum system, to have a direct say in future concerning all unpopular legislation. But Mr. Howard and his colleagues have rejected adoption of the Swiss principle. They do not appear to trust the Australian people any more than does the Hawke Government.

Irrespective of who wins government on July 11th, we trust that the majority is very small, and that the past division of power in the Senate is widened further. Time and time again the Senate has at least slowed down the drive to centralise all power. Not surprisingly, all governments have attempted to weaken the powers of the

Senate. Do the advocates of trusting John Howard recall how, having used the Senate, quite unconstitutionally, to bring down the Whitlam Government, the Fraser Government then conducted its own anti-Senate referendum, with the revealing spectacle of Mr. Malcolm Fraser, supported by his colleagues like John Howard, campaigning for the same YES vote being supported by Mr. Gough Whitlam and his fellow Fabians, along with the Communists?

The salvation of Australia can only start with individuals acting in a responsible way. This means a responsible vote, support being given only to those political candidates who commit themselves, preferably in writing, to support the introduction of the Swiss system of Initiative, Referendum and (if felt necessary) Recall at the earliest opportunity. In some cases it may be much more responsible to go to the polling booth, to avoid being fined, and to write on the ballot paper, "None of the applications for the task of representing me are acceptable," and sign one's name.

The history of modern governments shows that each new government, having inherited the power centralised by its predecessors, naturally tends to hold on to that power and then to increase it. Progressive inflation, irrespective of the rate, and mounting debt, create the impression that further centralisation is inevitable. Economic and political centralisation are the result of financial policy, not because of any natural law. Any government determined to start decentralising power back to the people would have to be prepared to implement basic changes in present financial policies. This would require an electorate fully informed on the realities of the situation and determined to back its political representatives in a battle which would see the full mobilisation of international financial groups, and their local agents to prevent any loss of their power.

There is not the slightest indication that Mr. John Howard, or any of his colleagues, have either the knowledge or the desire to fight the battle which must be fought if traditional Australia is to be saved from even greater disasters. As we have constantly said, conservatives are doomed to fight a series of progressive rearguard actions under present financial policies. It would be irresponsible for us to support any suggestion that the election of John Howard as Prime Minister will change anything basic. The real battle will continue after the elections.

---

All editorial comment authorised by Eric D. Butler, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne.

---

"ON TARGET" is published and printed by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Subscription rate \$20 p.a. posted.