



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –*

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.24

June 28th, 1996

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** "Any people anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better."  
– Abraham Lincoln, 1848

## THE CENTRALIST THREAT THROUGHOUT HISTORY by Eric D. Butler:

As multicultural U.S.A. progressively loses social cohesion, it is not surprising that a number of Americans have been questioning the myth about the cause of the American Civil War being the result of Lincoln's desire to abolish Negro Slavery in the Southern States. The truth is, as C.H. Douglas pointed out, the Civil War was primarily the result of Lincoln's determination, and that of his backers, to prevent the Southern States from seceding from the Union. Before the Civil War the people of the Southern States were the nearest to being what might be termed "a people", being of predominantly Anglo-Saxon-Scottish background. A distinct culture had developed, as depicted in Margaret Mitchell's great classic, *Gone With The Wind*. Douglas quotes the international bankers who said they favoured the abolition of slavery, this subsequently to be replaced by wage slavery. The famous novel *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was blatant propaganda and gave a completely false picture of the general plight of the slaves. Stories of slaves fleeing across ice packs chased by bloodhounds were about as reliable as the stories about gas chambers during the Second World War. Alleged ill treatment of the slaves was akin to saying that a farmer ill-treats his valuable stock. The progressive freeing of the slaves would have taken place without one of the most bitter and destructive civil wars in modern history. The final result of Lincoln's presidency was that no State could leave the Union even if the Federal Government became completely tyrannical and enslaved the whole population.

Writing on the subject in *The Wanderer*, the conservative American Roman Catholic paper, distinguished American columnist Joseph Sobran quotes one critic of Lincoln as saying that Lincoln ranked with Bismarck of Germany and Lenin of the Soviet Union as one of the consolidators of the modern Imperial nation state. Sobran comments, "The other two didn't delude themselves, or their subjects, that they were on the side of liberty. They were less sentimental than Lincoln, and caused less confusion." The break up of Lenin's Soviet Union has seen the constituent parts all seeking independence. The International Bankers are openly opposing any such independence, and have financed Yeltsin in his bloody attempts to prevent decentralisation.

It was a Germany of the different States which produced the best of German culture. Aided by the Socialists, Bismarck turned Germany into a convenient tool for internationalist power groups. Italy



was also once an association of small independent States. Now there is an open revolt against centralism, with the Northern League proposing a type of secession. C.H. Douglas, in commenting on the philosophy of centralism, pointed out that it ran contrary to true evolution, which was towards decentralisation and diversity. Right on Australia's northern doorstep the same issue can be studied as the people of Bougainville strive to be independent of Papua-New Guinea. These people are completely different from the majority of Papua-New Guineans. They are Melanese. They see no virtue in being dominated by a central government which has permitted – in fact encouraged – massive industrial and mining activities from which they have derived little or no benefits. They have been striving to secede, with the Papua-New Guinea government resorting to increasing force. Australian foreign policy has failed to come to grips with the essence of the problem.

Which brings us to a consideration of Australia's current situation. During the Second World War Fabian Socialist Dr. Evatt sought to frighten the sovereign States into handing over vast powers to the Federal Government. There were dire threats of the chaos and anarchy which would develop after the war unless Canberra had vast powers for post-war planning. The current campaign against the States, being conducted by the Federal Coalition Government, enthusiastically aided and abetted by the Labor "Opposition", is centred on "gun controls", but the implications go far beyond allegedly controlling guns. Whatever controls are necessary for the administration of regulations governing firearms can be best left to the States. But the States are being threatened that if they do not comply with Canberra's demands, there will be even more stringent gun controls. "Gun controls" means control of people. National Party leader Tim Fischer warns the rural community that if they do not accept what is proposed by the Federal Government Parties, there could be a referendum at which the rural community could be outvoted by the urban community – as Sir Robert Menzies found in 1951, when he attempted to carry a referendum banning the Communist Party. Much as the Australian electorate was upset by the industrial sabotage of the Communist Party, the Australian people were not prepared to hand over greater powers to the Commonwealth, fracturing the Federal Constitution in the process. It can be predicted that any referendum on giving the Federal Government greater powers would produce an interesting result. The only thing which would ensure the passing of such a referendum would be another massacre with guns.

Every effort must be made to ensure that the basic issue confronting the Australian people, centralised or decentralised power, is not downed in a wave of mass emotionalism. It was the manipulation of such emotionalism, on the slavery question, which has brought the American people to their present plight. Ultimately they may have to use force to break free of the tyranny being imposed upon them. Australia does not need to reach that stage. Australians must strive to hold firmly to their present constitutional rights.

### SENATOR BOSWELL FEARS THE "FAR RIGHT" by David Thompson:

In a development that underlines the increasingly difficult position in which the National Party finds itself, Senator Ron Boswell lamented that the biased press reporting of the firearms issue was driving thousands of "ordinary, law-abiding Australians" into the arms of political extremists. It is a case of political realities finally intruding into the National Party fairyland over the firearms issue. Having refused to successfully distinguish themselves from the Liberals (or even the A.L.P.) on the firearms issue, and more effectively **represent** their constituency, the Nationals are now suffering a backlash far heavier than they had expected.



Boswell found himself in a politically cleft stick, having to argue against the position taken by his leader, Mr. Fischer, who was attempting to further "demonise" the "gun lobby" by associating it with "far-right extremists" like Lyndon LaRouche. Boswell argued in the Senate last week that it is an insult to ordinary people who happen to own firearms to claim that they are merely "ratbag fringe extremists", who should be ignored. To mount such arguments, he claims, is merely to alienate those who identify themselves **against** Mr. Howard's gun-control proposals in the most alarming numbers.

Boswell is, of course, extremely worried about the level of support enjoyed by Bob Katter, National Party Member for Kennedy, in opposing the new regulations. The development of Graeme Campbell's *Australia First* also appears to terrify Boswell. Perhaps his attention has finally been drawn to the possibility that if an alternative political movement is born of the firearms debacle, his own cosy Senate roost may be threatened. It is quite clear that Mr. Howard and the Liberals do not regard the National Party as essential to their political future.

In his Senate address, Boswell accuses the League of attempting to manipulate Graeme Campbell, and does his best, as an "authority" on the "far right" to associate Campbell with some of the wilder elements once associated with Australians Against Further Immigration, American militiaman Jack McLamb, the Ku Klux Klan, and the LaRouche organisation in the United States. Perhaps a more pertinent question may be just who is manipulating Senator Boswell? Most of the research material in his address is quite beyond Boswell, who quotes from the *Australia Israel Review* in an attempt to link Campbell to "American extremists".

**BAN ALL GUNS?** It is clear that Boswell and other senior National Party strategists fear what inroads Campbell and *Australia First* might make into traditional National Party territory. In his Senate address, Boswell said of Campbell, in tones of what may have been awe: "Here you have a Member of the Commonwealth Parliament with the associated profile, resources and political acumen to buy more credibility than (Ron) Owen and his ilk. Here you have a man who was thrown out by the socialists, and who still kept his seat . . ."

Mr. Tim Fischer continues to alienate his own traditional base by bluntly refusing to hear what his constituency is saying to him. He has even managed to further inflame the firearms issue by threatening shooters at the stormy Albury debate, that unless they agree to the Howard proposals, **all guns will have to be banned**. This is exactly what many shooters fear, and why they so vigorously oppose the registration of all firearms. Not only does this set up an ideal "shopping list" for criminals, but it identifies who has which weapons, in order to make it easier to collect **all firearms** later. Many shooters are obviously going to break Howard's new laws, rather than risk placing themselves in this position.

There is no doubt that the backlash against the Howard firearms proposals has been deeper and more bitter than the Coalition anticipated. They had intended that tougher new gun laws would give them "brownie points" that Howard and his Government will need badly in the months to come, when new industrial relations legislation and a severe budget will begin to "bite" in the electorate. Boswell is right to fear Graeme Campbell, but the damage is now done, and no amount of whingeing to the Senate can undo it. One thing is certain: there will be no more talk of a double dissolution of Parliament.



**THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE REPUBLIC:** As the true colours of the new Coalition government begin to become more visible, it should not come as a surprise that some of the nation's leading republicans now believe that a republic under John Howard's leadership is much more likely than it was under Keating's. In opening an exhibition of designs for a new Australian flag in Melbourne last week, Dr. John Hirst, Victorian convenor of the Australian republican movement, said: *"There's a better prospect now that the movement is in the ambiguous hands of the present administration . . . I think a lot of people were republicans, but would not support it while Paul Keating was pushing it."*

Hirst's comments underline the warnings from observers like the League. We have constantly warned those who campaigned for a Coalition election in the belief that Howard could not possibly be worse than Keating, that this is not necessarily so. It is results that matter, not promises, or even **policies**. The shooters are learning this the hard way. Another senior republican who shares Dr. Hirst's view is the Sydney author Tom Keneally. He also believes that Howard, under the seductive pressure of power and fame, may actually come to the view that a republic is not only inevitable, but desirable, and that history may as well record that it was he, John Howard, who had the vision and the political skills to push it through. Just as he has in the matter of firearms legislation!

Meanwhile, republicans are giving further thought to how the States might be forced to abandon their trappings of monarchy in the event that the Commonwealth was manipulated into republican status. It is not as easy as it looks, since every State is a **sovereign kingdom** in its own right. But the further the idea is developed, the more pitfalls appear for the republicans.

Professor Peter Howell, of the South Australian Constitutional Advisory Council, believes it to be important for each State to consider how it could adapt to republican form. They (States) should also insist that if the Commonwealth put a proposal for a change to a republic it should incorporate all the changes for the States to make the move as well, he argues.

*"It would necessitate putting before the people a very lengthy and complex document, bristling with lawyers' language. You may well say that this would doom the experiment to failure, yet . . . the consequences of failing to put the republican proposal in that comprehensive way are so dire that we shall advise the South Australian government to campaign vigorously for a no vote if Canberra fails to comply."*

**ADAMS ON DRUGS:** The double standards of the intelligentsia are instructive when examined. Phillip Adams in his *Weekend Australian* column (15/6/96) deplores the failure of the Victorian Parliament to proceed with their proposal to legalise marijuana. *"Another ugly attempt to populism, it would mean, if taken seriously, that a sizeable majority of Australia's citizens are criminals,"* laments Adams. He later continues: *"Far from pushing drugs, I'm here to peddle the same argument I've been making for decades – that the imp is out of the bottle, that drugs are here to stay, that prohibition never works, that current policies are an immense, tragic joke . . ."*

If one were to re-write Adams' lament on the marijuana legislation in terms of firearms legislation, he would, no doubt, be scandalised. But either drugs/guns are here to stay, or they are not; either regulation and prohibition works, or it doesn't. Adams deplores the criminal status of marijuana growers, but appears completely unmoved by the pending criminal status of illicit shooters.