



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.13

April 13th, 1995

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "While it is true that Christians, facing the gathering storm of materialistic atheism, have been huddling together under the banner of the lowest common denominator of their religion, a vague, indulgent do-goodism, which appears to be tolerant of everything except any effective resistance to aggressive and unrepentant vice and wrong thinking, it is by now painfully obvious that this cannot save our civilisation from disaster. Nevertheless, there are still enough Christians, if they would only apprise themselves of what their religion is, and its implications, to restore the continuity of its progress towards human freedom, and to resist the ever-mounting onslaught of the modern forms of paganism and barbarism upon it."

– Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs

IS GLOOM AND DOOM NECESSARY? by Eric D. Butler:

Irrational fear is a most destructive force. While it is as certain as the sunrise that growing social disintegration with worldwide instability will continue as long as orthodox finance-economic policies are pursued, no responsible person should be promoting the view that the international financial system could completely collapse overnight and plunge Australia into a revolutionary situation with a complete break down of law and order. As demonstrated by the recent Barings collapse, and traumatic events in Japan, with headline which states that 'NEW RECESSION FEAR HITS JAPAN', a world-wide collapse of the international financial system could develop almost overnight. But Australia is one of the best placed nations in the world to survive such a collapse.

To paint an extreme scenario, a major earthquake could blow Japan off the map, precipitating the collapse of a financial system on a global scale, with the international investors threatening to withdraw their investments unless Australia accepted the type of draconian measures for which the International Monetary Fund is notorious. But the reality would be that in spite of the damage done to the Australian economy, in the event of a major crisis the Australian people are **physically** capable of feeding themselves, housing themselves, clothing themselves, and operating their industrial system. Self survival would require that the Australian banking system be re-regulated and brought under the control of the elected representatives of the Australian people. It is now becoming increasingly clear to a growing number of people that the de-regulation of the banking system has been a major disaster.

No less an authority than one of those who first recommended de-regulation, Dr. Fred Argy, an economist who was at one time a member of the Federal Treasury, now expresses doubts about the practical consequences of financial de-regulation, stating that "the truth is that financial markets" have become nothing but casinos, the playthings of speculators. Dr. Argy warns that "Unless we can tame this beast that we've created somehow, it will devour government independence completely. It will become extremely dominant in the determination of economic and social policy".

Nothing is more important in Australia at the present time than the generations of a grassroots educational programme not only warning the people of what is now threatening, but of outlining a constructive political and economic programme to insulate themselves against what may be happening internationally. As the famous Chinese sage Confucius is reported to have said, "When struck by a thunderbolt it is too late to consult the book of dates."

Rather than becoming fearful of coming events, Australians should welcome them as an inspiring challenge, opening up the possibility of national regeneration.

THE CORRUPTION OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT by David Thompson:

In the past few weeks the role of the Australian High Court has been placed under the political spotlight by the pressure of events. The unanimous rejection of the W.A. appeal of the 'Mabo' decision, the retirement of Chief Justice Mason, appointment of his successor, a new High Court Judge, and lastly the Court's decision just last week to uphold Federal intervention in the de-regulation of State industrial relations systems has called the role of the Court into question. The most devastating comments on the role of the Court came from the longest-serving Chief Justice of the Court, Sir Garfield Barwick, in an address to the Samuel Griffith Society.

It is almost certain that retiring Chief Justice Mason's interview broadcast on the A.B.C. Four Corners programme will set alarm bells ringing among constitutional experts and academics. Sir Anthony Mason offered the view that the protection of individual rights was better left to judges than to Parliament, and that in areas where Parliament does not act, the Court itself is obliged to act. As a principle this seriously undermines the sovereignty of the Parliament, and elevates the Court's Judges to unelected policy-makers who escape personal responsibility for their actions.

It is now undeniable that the High Court has undermined the ability of State Parliaments to govern in the best interests of their constituents, weakening the federation in the Commonwealth's favour. The Western Australian secession movement is increasingly being bolstered by the view that the "indissoluble" Federal Commonwealth has already been dissolved in practice by the transfer of State powers to Canberra, with the High Court merely directing the traffic.

BARWICK'S BOMBHELL: In a devastating address, the 91-year-old Sir Garfield Barwick demanded a return to the authority of Parliament, implying that political parties, prime ministers with presidential pretensions and even the High Court is undermining democratic government. On the High Court's new position of finding "implied rights" in the Constitution, such as the right

to free political speech, Sir Garfield commented that such decisions have "reduced the sovereignty of Parliament, withdrawn from the community its heretofore democratic control of its liberties and vested it in an unelected and unrepresentative judiciary".

On political parties, Sir Garfield said: *"If a parliamentary party is allowed by any means to compel those members of Parliament who are also members of the party to vote according to the prescription of the executive government, the role of Parliament and its relation to the executive as designed in parliamentary democracy is reversed... The impact therefore of the party system is that the Parliament is virtually turned into a rubber stamp in the hands of the executive. Thus while the party system may have provided some stability in government, it has on the other hand drastically altered the relationship of the Parliament to the executive and the control of its affairs by the community itself..."*

Barwick also pointed out that the United States Constitution, with its Bill of Rights entrenched, was "founded on a distrust of the community and of the Congress to whom unlimited sovereignty was not given". The fact that the community's rights were written down thus placed their application in the hands of the judiciary, denying the community the democratic control of its affairs through the Congress. The American Supreme Court, like our High Court, is unelected, and therefore the judges escape personal responsibility for their decisions. If the Australian High Court is to continue in an interventionist, "activist" manner, increasing pressure for election of judges is the inescapable result. The best alternative is to restore the High Court to its constitutional role of interpreting the Constitution.

SELF-GOVERNMENT IMPAIRED: While the government's ban on political advertising was certainly wrong, it should have been overturned by the Members of Parliament, under pressure from constituents, and free of party or executive control rather than by an interventionist High Court. Where the High Court's interventionist decisions respond more to United Nations conventions than common law principles, the ability of Australians to govern themselves is further impaired.

Colin Howard, former Professor of Law and one of the sounder constitutional authorities, argues that the use of treaties – which the High Court sanctioned – means "we are increasingly being delivered into the hands of incompetent foreigners for short-term political advantage". If this is the result of an interventionist High Court on the American model, it must be abandoned.

INCREASING DEMANDS OF ABORIGINAL 'INDUSTRY': Further evidence that the demands of "Aboriginal" groups are of a revolutionary nature is to be found in the fact that, like the revolutionary "green" agenda, the demands can never be finally met, but as each position is conceded by the majority, minority demands continue to escalate. The highly contentious concession that native title does, in fact, exist in Australian law has not satisfied those who pursue the Aboriginal agenda.

In a radical package of reforms essential to achieve reconciliation between Aborigines and other Australians, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission is making a further 113 demands.

So outrageous are some of the new demands that even Prime Minister Keating blanched when accepting the recommendations.

It is claimed that respect for Aboriginal culture can only occur if a new date for Australia Day is agreed, and new laws are passed to recognise indigenous flags. In addition, seats should be reserved in parliament for indigenous representatives as in New Zealand, where Maori seats still exist. Some of the more revolutionary demands include regional self-government for Aboriginal communities, and changes to the preamble of the Constitution acknowledging prior ownership of Australia. If such demands are ever met, this would provide the setting for even more revolutionary demands, like the establishment of separate black sovereign states.

Other ominous demands made by A.T.S.I.C. in the report include a treaty between indigenous and other Australians and a form of land tax to fund compensation for Aborigines alleged to have been forcibly removed from their families. Following the High Court Mabo ruling, and then the Commonwealth Native Title Act, the Commonwealth is slowly gaining a stranglehold on administration of land tenure at the expense of the States. Such control would be essential if the Commonwealth wanted to levy a land tax for whatever purpose.

BRIEF COMMENTS: While Mr. Bob Carr can command a tenuous majority in the N.S.W. Legislative Assembly, it is almost certain that he has been denied control of the Legislative Council. As we go to press, counting for the Council continues, but we note that reports indicate that Mr. John Tingle, of the Shooters' Party, has an excellent chance of winning a seat, and Mr. Edwin Woodger, of Australians Against Further Immigration, still has some chance of gaining a seat. Such an amazing result would certainly confirm our view that there is electoral "heat" in the immigration and multicultural issues.

* * * * *

It is significant that the High Court's decision upholding the Commonwealth Native Title Act under challenge from W.A. has been welcomed by none other than Mr. Henry P. Schapper. Both Mr. Schapper and Dr. H.C. (Nuggett) Coombs, following their deep influence on economic policy to the benefit of the Fabian movement, transferred their interest to Aboriginal land rights. Dr. Coombs, in championing the 'Aboriginal' cause, called for a treaty between Aborigines and other Australians. Schapper, in a letter to a newspaper (*West Australian*, 21/3/95) describes the High Court decision upholding Native Title Act as "a proud, national and historic event". Both gentlemen have given significant comfort to the Fabian programme to fragment Australia.

* * * * *

In today's Alice-in-Wonderland economics, what was black yesterday becomes white tomorrow. Reducing the unemployment figures was a major objective – at least the "experts" and their political puppets claimed this. But then the economy "took off" and before long there were frenzied warnings that the economy was "overheating". In fact, it was dangerously "on the boil", one of the main causes being the activities of the building industry. Higher interest rates were essential. Now we read an *Australian* headline which states that "SLUMP IN JOB ADS RAISES HOPES OF SLOWING ECONOMY". The story underneath starts with the comment that "The boom in the jobs recovery appears to be over, raising fresh hopes ... that the economy has moved to a more sustainable growth path". We will not attempt to interpret this gobbley-gook, but what it indicates is that the world's economies are at the mercy of complete idiots who would be at home at the Mad Hatter's Tea Party in Alice-in-Wonderland. The world's scientists and engineers are able to put men on the moon and bring them back again. But those directing the world's economies are unable to implement a financial policy which ensures that the true purpose of an economy system is fulfilled: to provide goods and services to consumers at the rate they require them. If there are any economic "experts" who would like to break free from the black-magic enslaving them, we recommend that they enrol for the League of Rights' Social Dynamics Seminar.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,
145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Telephone: (03) 650 9749, Fax: (03) 650 9368.

Subscription \$30 p.a.