



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.30, No.39

October 14th, 1994

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Consumer controls of production is the only possible basis of freedom; and no method of obtaining consumer control has ever been tried with success which did not ban State control of money and credit and include decentralised individual credit power."
- C.H. Douglas

THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS ROLE IN AUSTRALIAN HISTORY by Eric D. Butler:

In an effort to bolster the image of Dr. H.V. Evatt as a great libertarian, Humphrey McQueen wrote in *The Weekend Australian* of October 1st and 2nd, that "Scholars have shown the Menzies Government was preparing to put tens of thousands of Australians into concentration camps once the Menzies Government's legislation concerning the proposed banning of the Communist Party had been implemented Fortunately most Australians followed Evatt's lead and voted against the proposal to alter the Constitution". This statement is absurd nonsense. It was Dr. Evatt who, during the Second World War, was responsible for the internment without trial of a misguided, but loyal group of Australians of what was known as The Australia First Movement. One of the most prominent of this group, the well known literary figure P.R. Stephenson, was a man I knew reasonably well. Evatt, close friend of the notorious Marxist Dr. Harold Laski of the London School of Economics, tried to threaten prominent Australian Social Crediters like myself that he would have them in prison if they continued to campaign against his proposal to drastically change the Federal Constitution. Labor Senator Richard Darcy of Tasmania told Evatt that he would need much bigger prisons than those available if he was going to imprison all Social Credit leaders. The upshot was that Evatt sought permission to address a meeting of Social Crediters in Sydney. His central theme was that while he was basically sympathetic to Social Credit financial proposals, a change in the Federal Constitution was necessary to implement them.

The reaction of Social Crediters was to intensify their campaigning against Evatt's proposed constitutional changes. No objective student of Australian history disputes that Communist influence in Australia was enormous in the immediate post war years. But Communist creation and exploitation of industrial unrest was aided by the failure of the first Menzies Government to implement its famous 1949 election promise "to put the shillings back into the pound". A

major step was going to be the restoration of the consumer subsidy scheme which had resulted in complete price stability for five years. Dr. H.C. Coombs, claimed by Dr. Laski to have been one of his brightest students at the London School of Economics, and his fellow Fabians in the Federal bureaucracy made it clear that they were not prepared to implement the Menzies-Fadden election policy.

Large sections of the business community started to lose faith in the Menzies-Fadden Government, so much so that they were reluctant to support the Government's proposal to enlarge the powers of the Commonwealth to enable them to ban the Communist Party. Prominent among Australian supporters of the Federal Constitution and opposed to the Menzies proposals was the large Arthur Chresby. There was considerable disquiet among many Liberal Party supporters who were concerned about the long term implications of granting the Commonwealth the vast increase in powers sought. I had heated controversies with anti-Communist friends who were upset because the League of Rights opposed the Menzies proposal, stressing that the Commonwealth Government had adequate powers to deal with a Communist problem which Menzies did not fully understand.

Menzies was basically an honest man with a most limited grasp of finance-economic realities. As a result of the failure to implement his 1949 election promise, inflation escalated. Following the advice of his "experts", the credit squeeze of the early sixties resulted in a massive electoral backlash at the 1961 Federal elections. Labor leader Arthur Calwell had campaigned on a moderate deficit budget to re-stimulate the economy. Menzies was re-elected with a slender majority of one. James Killen was the last Liberal to be elected. League supporters in the Brisbane area conducted a special phone campaign in support of Killen, which certainly played a part in his narrow victory.

At the first Cabinet meeting following the election, Menzies astonished his colleagues by recommending a credit expansion policy exceeding the Calwell proposal which he had denounced during the election. The economy started to improve. And as the League predicted, inflation continued on.

OUTFLANKING THE OPPOSITION ON "RACIAL HATRED" by David Thompson:

Any proposal from some sections of the Liberal Party to oppose the new racial vilification legislation has been closely scrutinised by the A.L.P. strategists. The Attorney-General, Mr. Lavarch, is determined to out-manoeuvre the Liberals on this issue, as he successfully did on the issue of the Tasmanian homosexual legislation.

Instead of blatantly and bluntly framing Commonwealth legislation to strike down the Tasmanian homosexual legislation, the A.L.P. framed **sexual privacy** legislation, and presented it as a "motherhood" issue. How could the Liberals publicly justify opposing "sexual privacy", especially when many senior Liberals, including Mr. Downer, **were against** the Tasmanian laws.

It is quite clear that the new racial vilification legislation will be very carefully framed. Lessons

will be learned from the previous attempt to present such legislation in 1992, which was strongly criticised, and eventually lapsed when the 1993 election was called. This was a godsend for the A.L.P., as it provided a second chance to introduce the same legislation in a different way, without it having been previously defeated.

The new bill will not be referred to as **racial vilification** legislation. Few know what this means, and it provides a few opportunities for the professional P.R. people to place their own propaganda "spin" on it. It is much more likely to be called "**anti-hatred**" legislation, as it has been in Canada, where the racial vilification legislation has been in place for some years.

Mr. Lavarch will set the agenda for the debate, in which he will attempt to place the Coalition in an impossible position. Will the Liberals be comfortable when accused of **defending racial hatred if they attempt** to oppose the bill? How will Mr. Downer respond in the Parliamentary bear-pit, at the mercy of a Prime Minister snidely accusing him of "protecting his mates in the League of Rights"? Every underhanded propaganda weapon will be deployed, from verbal laceration to outright dishonesty to force the unpopular racial vilification legislation through.

HEWSON'S TRUE COLOURS: Already there is deep uncertainty in the Liberal Party over the "anti-hatred" legislation. Dr. John Hewson has dropped his own verbal bombshell, by announcing that the Coalition **should support** the bill, even before he has seen it.

Hewson's position should not come as a surprise. It was Hewson who played a key part in delivering the Opposition support to Mr. Lavarch on the Tasmanian homosexual issue, conceding that the Coalition could not oppose "sexual privacy". This was not only moral cowardice, but intellectual cowardice; little attempt was made to break out of the A.L.P.'s debate agenda, and find alternative arguments which were always available. As a result, the Liberal Party may well lose Mr. Chris Miles' seat in Tasmania, as Tasmanian Liberals are disgusted with Miles' capitulation in order to protect his Shadow-Cabinet position.

It is fascinating to speculate on what course political events might have taken if John Hewson **had won the 1993 election**. The League was frequently criticised for a lack of confidence in Hewson, but, in retrospect, it is clear that a Hewson Government would have been a complete disaster.

EVANS PROPOSES GLOBAL TAXATION:

The relentless pursuit of international power, and the establishment of an embryonic global government has not proceeded without the occasional hitch. The United Nations – prototype of global government – has long been exposed as grossly inefficient. The administration of the U.N. is so universally bad, that many western governments simply fail to pay their membership fees at all.

With the debts mounting, and the gross inefficiencies blatantly continuing, United Nations

budgets are increasingly impossible to observe. But Senator Gareth Evans, with an eye to Secretary-General Boutros Boutros Ghali's job, has proposed a solution to the U.N. members, which he addressed last week: **an international tax.**

Evans suggested that as well as demanding that member nations pay their financial contributions, the United Nations could place a tax on air travel, or foreign exchange currency transactions. It is calculated that a \$US10 surcharge on each international air ticket would raise **\$13 billion per year.** If combined with new global regulations taxing currency transactions, such new taxes would provide such massive revenues that the United Nations could quickly become independent from financial constraints of member nations, and stringent budgetary restrictions. The potential for interfering in the affairs of sovereign nations would escalate enormously. A gradual extension of U.N. taxing powers, in the same ways that Commonwealth taxation powers have been extended in Australia, can produce a new global state, upon which no nation could impose restrictions. The potential for tyranny and evil is demonic.

DAME JOAN RUFFLES FEATHERS:

Dame Joan Sutherland's comments to a gathering of monarchists have drawn the predictable condemnation from the politically correct. The main issues which appear to have infuriated her critics are her alleged "racist" attitudes, and a regret that Australians have been denied the opportunity to describe themselves as "British".

The dishonest suggestion that it is "racism" that motivates those who wish to retain the Crown simply illustrates the corrupting influence of the policy of multiculturalism. The Australian cultural heritage is not identified with China or India – it is identified primarily with Britain, and the clear majority of Australians still identify with our British kinfolk.

The truth is that the vast majority of Australians over the age of 45 were accustomed to being described as "British". The reason for this is that **they were British.** The concept of Australian citizenship was not formalised until 1949, and as such is still a relatively recent change. Thus, the legal and constitutional reality was that until 1949 Australians were British subjects. This quite fundamental matter of **identity** cannot be shrugged off like an old shirt and to pillory Dame Joan because she does not enjoy being deprived of her identity is the height of intolerance. In fact, even today there are something in the vicinity of **one million** British subjects who have never applied for Australian citizenship, who are registered on the electoral roll, and **fully entitled to vote.** Many are not even aware that they are not Australian citizens, because at one time, being Australian was synonymous with being a British subject, under the Crown. Dame Joan simply typifies the best type of Australian, in touch with her heritage, and anxious to preserve it, and artlessly prepared to speak her mind on the matter of a multicultural dogma that insists that Chinese or Indian aliens are more readily accorded "Australian" status than our British kin. She should be congratulated rather than condemned.