



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.25

July 5th, 1996

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "When the strong man fully armed guardeth his own court, his goods are in peace. But when a stronger than he shall come upon him, he taketh from him his whole armour wherein we trusted, and divideth his spoils." *St Luke III 21-22*

THE REALITIES OF WAR by Eric D. Butler:

The debate concerning gun control has opened up discussions concerning a wide range of subjects which superficially have little relevance to the gun control question. If, as being claimed by gun control advocates, including some well-meaning Christians, the individual does not have the right to use a firearm to defend himself – and his family – then the logic of this argument is that an association of people called a nation has no right to use force to defend itself. At the height of its influence, the British Empire was the major stabilising international force for peace. A strong navy was essential for the British influence to be sustained. A combination of international financial pressure and a carefully promoted "peace" movement effectively disarmed the British Empire and encouraged those international forces which actively sought a Second World War. So far from a militarily weak Great Britain being a factor for peace, it was seen by both Hitler and his advisers, and the Soviet strategists, as a sign of decadence. A maintenance of British military strength in the thirties would almost certainly have aborted the programme for a Second World War and the continuous worldwide revolutionary ferment which flowed from it.

In his prophetic B.B.C. broadcast, *The Causes of War*, C.H. Douglas, the author of *Social Credit*, stressed that military war was the logical extension of economic war. The famous German military philosopher Clausewitz said that military war was the extension of a policy by other means. As Douglas said, there was no prospect of genuine international peace under a finance-economic orthodoxy which insisted that nations could only be prosperous if they insisted upon exporting more than they imported; of "capturing" foreign markets. Douglas points out that "The use of the word 'capture' indicates the desire to take away from some other country, something with which it, being also without general employment, does not desire to part. This is endeavouring to impose your will upon an adversary".

The story is told of a Japanese businessman, who had as a young soldier been engaged in the bloody military battles to Australia's north, but was now engaged in one of the numerous Japanese takeovers of Australian industries, observing that "This is a much more pleasant way of taking over a nation than risking death in tropical jungles". Under the philosophy known as "economic rationalism" Australia has been openly disarming itself economically for the past quarter of a century. Both Labor and non-Labor Governments have been responsible for what, in more robust days, would have been described as treachery. If the process is allowed to continue, Australians will finish up with not even enough economic capacity to manufacture bows and arrows with which to defend themselves. And even then the John Howards would probably want all bows and arrows to be registered with the stronger ones banned!

In his B.B.C. address Douglas indicated the way Australia should be heading: "A radical modification of the existing financial system would make it possible to build up a strong and united nation free from economic dissension, which would, by its strength, offer a powerful deterrent to aggressive war. And, secondly, the spectacle of a contented and prosperous Britain (Australia) willing to trade but not forced by unemployment to **fight** for trade, would provide an irresistible object lesson in genuine progress and would be initiated everywhere."

Disarming the Australian people, particularly members of the rural community, by forcing them to surrender their legally acquired firearms while at the same time stripping them of the means of defending themselves economically, strikes a deadly blow at the very soul of Australia. In his *Programme For The Third World War*, Douglas writes, "I have spent some of my life on, or beyond, the fringes of 'civilisation' where men carried guns and used them without hesitation. The social atmosphere of those districts was much better than of policed areas. It is not in the wilds that the scum of the earth arises; it is in the towns. The denial of the right of an individual to carry arms is a fundamental infringement of liberty. Just as the bootlegger was the most enthusiastic supporter of prohibition, the gangster, both national and international, is a convinced adherent of disarmament by law."

John Howard and his advisers are strong on the question of trying to ban firearms by law. But what type of a "law" is one which ignores realities, which depends upon blackmailing enough politicians to pass legislation which they and large numbers of their electors either disagree with or do not believe can be enforced. But are Australians expected to accept the relatively modern totalitarian concept concerning the alleged "omnipotence" of governments. As a number of eminent constitutional authorities have pointed out, this concept destroys the Christian Common Law view that there are higher laws than those passed by governments. If not, a government could pass legislation stating that all blue-eyed babies should be put to death at birth. The traditional Christian view is that every individual is entitled to inviolated rights which no government, irrespective of the size of its majority, can take away.

Based on Christ's words, and a Natural Law philosophy reaching back to the days of the famous Greek philosopher, the traditional Christian view has been that every individual has the right to defend himself against all threats to his life, and that of his family. St. Luke records Christ as saying, "... and he that hath none, let him sell his cloke, and buy a sword". A cloke was a most important piece of clothing, sometimes used as a blanket. The suggestion that a sword was more important than a cloke was a most serious one. But the philosophy underlying the Howard firearm legislation directly challenges that of the right to possess the means of self-defence. It is virtually a declaration of war on the individual, one which unless challenged will further a philosophy which seeks to make the individual completely subservient to the State.

HOWARD'S STANDOVER TACTICS CONFIRMED by David Thompson:

Upon hearing the evening news on May 10th, Queensland National Party State M.P's. were stunned. The reason was that their Police Minister, Mr. Russel Cooper, was reported to have accepted the Prime Minister's demands for uniform national firearms legislation, which included a ban on semi-automatic weapons and a firearms register. Cooper had no authority to agree to this, and had attended the meeting prepared to go as far as agreeing to a ban on **military** automatics and semi-automatics. Cooper had agreed that, before making any further concessions to Howard, he would consult with his Queensland colleagues. What could account for Cooper's capitulation?

Mr. Cooper was not the only Police Minister who agreed to far more than he had intended at the May 10th Police Ministers' meeting. Victoria's Police Minister, Mr. Bill McGrath, is also on record as saying that, in his view, Victoria's firearms legislation was quite adequate. Why, then, did the Police Ministers agree to far-reaching proposals that would clearly place their colleagues in diabolical political trouble with their rural constituencies?

The answer appeared in press reports last weekend, in which rumours that had circulated since May were confirmed. The rumours had it that Mr. John Howard had threatened constitutionally elected Members of the State Parliaments with devastating consequences unless they agreed to do what he, Howard, wanted on firearms laws. The most specific report, by Mr. Phil Maguire, was published by Melbourne's *Sunday Herald-Sun* (30/6/96). In his report Maguire reveals that Mr. Shane Stone, the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, was threatened with loss of any move towards Statehood for the Territory, as well as financial support from the Commonwealth.

The press report also reveals that the States were threatened with a referendum to allow the Commonwealth to usurp the States' powers, and enact its own nationwide gun laws. One Tasmanian M.P., who was not named, is quoted as saying that Tasmania had been threatened with "financial ruin" through the loss of woodchip licences if they failed to toe the Howard "line". South Australian Liberal M.P. Sam Bass also confirmed that standover tactics were used to intimidate the States. Mr. Bass is quoted as saying:

"I believe the Prime Minister threatened legally elected State Governments with withdrawal or holding over of Federal funding if they did not comply with his proposals on May 10th. I am not going to stand by and be dictated to by Mr. Howard when I am elected by the S.A. people to legislate on their behalf."

"A FIGHT WE COULD NOT WIN": Chief Minister Shane Stone is quoted from a letter written to a supporter as saying that the Police Ministers were left with no choice but to comply with Howard. *"We felt that was unfair, an interference in our internal affairs, but in the end, to refuse would have cost us dearly,"* he said. *"It could have cost us Statehood or Federal assistance for our railway. The Prime Minister left nobody in doubt as to his likely action in the event that a consensus could not be reached. This was a fight we could not have won."*

The League does not base its reports on rumours, but the *Sunday Herald-Sun* report further confirms both rumours and fragments of factual information that have leaked out since May 10th. The picture formed is of a Prime Minister who abused his authority as the Queen's first Minister of the Commonwealth Parliament browbeating the Queen's Ministers of State Parliaments. It is an account of standover tactics that the Chicago Mafia would be embarrassed to attempt.

Mr. Howard's actions underline a long-standing weakness in the Australian Constitution, which was first pointed out by Alfred Deakin soon after Federation in 1901. Deakin observed that the Constitution left the States *"legally free, but financially bound to the chariot wheels of the Central Government"*. The result of this would be, said Deakin, that when the Commonwealth wanted to intimidate the States, *it could do so with the purse-strings. "Our Constitution may remain unaltered, but a vital change will have taken place in the relations between the States and the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth will have acquired a general control over the States, while every extension of political power will be made by its means, and go to increase its relative superiority."*

John Howard has fulfilled the Deakin prophecy. He has bluntly told the States that he holds the purse-strings, and that they had better conform to his requirements for new firearms legislation. While Queensland National Party M.P's. may have been aghast that Russel Cooper capitulated to Howard, they were soon to hear of the alternative price Queensland would have to pay. No single State in Australia is in a financial position to resist Commonwealth financial threats Howard has made a mockery of the Federal system in a way that his Labor forbears have never dared to do.

ASSIMILATION VERSUS "SEPARATISM": The academic, Geoffrey Partington, was perhaps mainly responsible for re-opening the basis of Aboriginal affairs policy in the 1990s, when he published his recent book *"Hasluck Versus Coombs: White Politics and Australia's Aborigines"*, published last month. What

Partington has done is to re-assess the Aboriginal policy of "assimilation" under the Liberal Minister, Paul Hasluck, in comparison with the more enlightened policy of the 80s and 90s, that of **self determination**.

Discussion on Partington's book has unleashed a vicious rejection of the suggestion that the policy of "self determination" has not improved upon the previous policy of "assimilation", under which Aborigines became Australians first, and Aborigines second. Aboriginal leaders have savagely condemned Mr. Howard when he stated that he did not support self determination if it led to a **separatism**. Howard said, *"Any notion of self determination which intrudes the idea of a nation within a nation is something to which I am totally opposed."*

Mr. Howard's comments herald a dramatic sea-change in the entire matter of the way governments deal with minority groups. If John Howard is to be consistent in his view, we can expect to see the eventual abolition of the experiment of institutional multiculturalism as well, since this is the basis for creating a whole series of "nations within a nation". If Howard is consistent in his view, not only will special departments of Aboriginal affairs begin to disappear, but so also will ATSIC, the peak Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander body, which recycles taxpayers' funds to special interest indigenous groups, assisting in reinforcing the concept of a "nation within a nation".

Mr. Howard may even go as far as noting that the entire concept of "separatism" (or self-determination) which Aboriginal leaders are vigorously defending, was also official policy in South Africa for many years, and widely condemned by all enlightened Western governments. The Afrikaner word for "separatism" was "**apartheid**", which the liberal intelligentsia would equate with "**racism**", and spit it at any who would defend South Africa's right to handle its own massive racial and cultural diversity in its own way. We await with interest the first signs that Mr. Howard will begin to extend his convictions on Aboriginal assimilation to other ethnic groups in the community. But we shall not hold our breath.

THE HONG KONG EXPERIENCE OF BIG BUSINESS: As Hong Kong enters the last 12 months as a British colony, the "R.S.P.C.A." becomes the "S.P.C.A." as the Royal patronage becomes unfashionable. Already school textbooks are beginning to be re-written to either tone down Hong Kong's Imperial past, or eradicate it altogether. A major political struggle is also taking shape over the retention of the British "democratic" structure, under which Hong Kong has prospered so handsomely.

Pro-democracy campaigners have been disappointed to discover that, while smaller domestic businesses are prepared to offer some limited support, big business has shown virtually no interest. To their dismay, pro-democracy campaigners have discovered that big business has no money to invest in political freedom. Most of those running multi-national corporations have alternative passports now, and can easily move on if the Communist Chinese insist that capitalism, like imperialism, is not the Chinese way. Big business is claiming that they are big enough to "deal" with the Chinese Communists, that "democracy" is protected by the constitution, and that perhaps the Communists can be "educated" to respect the Hong Kong attraction to profits and personal freedom.

Those who are happy for Australian public utilities, like the power and water systems, transport and communication networks, etc., to be sold off and run by huge multinational corporations might take note of the Hong Kong experience. Big businesses are **trans-national**, with few, if any, national loyalties. In truth, rather than reflecting free enterprise, the multinationals further resemble government bureaucracies the larger they get. As the Hong Kong Chinese have found, the trans-national corporation has no soul to be damned, and no backside to be kicked by those it purports to serve. It becomes a law unto itself.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,
145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.

Subscription \$30.00 p.a.