



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

PER 320-56
ON 1

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.27

July 19th, 1996

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "No method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty could be divorced from self-government. No plan of centralisation has ever been adopted which did not result in bureaucracy, tyranny, inflexibility, reaction and decline Unless bureaucracy is constantly resisted it breaks down representative government, and overwhelms democracy. It is the one element in our institutions that sets up the pretence of having authority over everybody, and being responsible to nobody."

- U.S.A. President Calvin Coolidge, 1926

JOHN HOWARD AND SHADES OF 1944 by Eric D. Butler:

As Prime Minister John Howard strives to persuade the States to grant him the draconian gun laws he seeks, one is reminded of the infamous attempt by Australia's Fabian Attorney-General, Dr. H.V. Evatt, during the Second World War to stampede the Australian States to surrender vast powers to the central Federal Government. The on-going debate concerning gun laws tends to obscure the fact that the basic issue is not about guns, but about power. Under the Federal Government John Howard and his Government have no constitutional right to legislation on the subject of gun registrations. Neither have they the right to legislate on housing, education, municipal government and other matters. But over the years Federal Governments of all labels have used the Fabian technique of gradualness and their monopoly of finance to expand centralised controls at the expense of the States and the Australian people. This development was predicted by the great Alfred Deakin.

Early in the Second World War Dr. Evatt used every possible pressure to persuade the States to surrender vast powers to the Federal Government. Dr. Evatt told the States that if they failed to grant him the powers sought, they would be guilty of failing to ensure that the post-war period was one in which the grandiose post-war planning of prominent planners like Dr. H.C. Coombs, would make certain that there would be stability and prosperity for all. Those opposing the Evatt vision were charged with betraying the future of Australia's returning soldiers. John Howard implies that those who oppose his gun laws will be guilty of any further massacres with guns in the future - although he says that he can give no guarantees that his gun laws will prevent violence in the future. Obviously no such guarantee can be given in an increasingly disintegrating Australian society reeling under the policies of "economic rationalism" which John Howard has enthusiastically endorsed.

Dr. Evatt's attempt to seduce the States, with even non-Labor State Governments reluctantly yielding to the pressure applied to them, only failed because of the opposition of the Tasmanian Legislative Council, with former Australian cricket test captain Joe Darling mobilising the opposition. Darling never played a finer innings for Australia than when he inspired his colleagues to refuse to yield to Evatt's threats and blandishments. The result was the famous 1944 referendum, with Dr. Evatt's

spiritual bedfellows, the Communists, playing a leading role. It should be recalled that during his campaign to centralise power, Dr. Evatt made every effort to neutralise those he regarded as his major opponents, Social Crediters like the author. First he attempted to intimidate them with threats of internment, then sought a meeting, at which he said he agreed with the Social Crediters that "What was physically possible should be made financially possible", but what was financially possible was not constitutionally possible. This ploy did not weaken the Social Credit opposition. Evatt and his associates then resorted to the type of smearing used against the League of Rights today. John Howard says that a movement formed by Australian patriots, some who served during the Second World War with outstanding distinction, and supported by some of the nation's most distinguished leaders, is "reprehensible" and that he could not be associated with them. Nothing has changed over half a century.

When the Australian electors firmly rejected Dr. Evatt's 1944 Referendum, Evatt's close friend, the notorious Marxist theoretician at the London School of Economics, expressed his deep disappointment subsequently stating in *The Social Justice Review* (U.S.A.) of December, 1944, that "once there has been a division of power under a Federal system, it took something like a political or economic earthquake to change the categories of the division". This reflected an earlier Fabian view that "only in war or the threat of war will the British people accept large scale planning".

John Howard has been using both financial and emotional blackmail in his attempt to by-pass the Federal Constitution. It was the Tasmanian Legislative Council, led by Joe Darling, which saved Australia from a major assault on the Federal Constitution. Perhaps history can repeat itself, with several of the States so badly weakening John Howard's bid for power via gun legislation, that he has no alternative than either leave the subject of gun regulations to the States, or go to a referendum. John Howard and his supporters talk loosely about having "overwhelming" public support. Let him put this claim to the test. The writer's view that if a referendum were held, John Howard would have the greatest difficulty in obtaining a majority of electors in a majority of States to vote to give any increased powers to the Commonwealth. A referendum would permit the basic issues concerning growing violence in Australia being brought into the open and rationally discussed. What about it, John Howard? Have you the courage to go to the Australian people and allow them a real say?

State Members reluctant to support John Howard's gun controls should be encouraged to press for a referendum.

ORCHESTRATED ATTACK ON AUSTRALIA FIRST by David Thompson:

Our expectation that Graeme Campbell's new *Australia First* would ring the alarm bells in the corridors of real power has been confirmed with all the speed and viciousness that could be expected. A garbled and inaccurate report by Mr. Gerald McManus (*Sunday Herald-Sun*, 14/7/96) claims that *Australia First* originated from a "secret gathering of extremist groups" at a Christian Retreat near Lithgow in the N.S.W. Blue Mountains. McManus then "reveals" that senior members of the League of Rights, Australians Against further Immigration and people associated with other "extreme right" groups were present, and claims that "the leaking of details of the top secret Lithgow meeting is likely to blow apart any chance of all the far right groups coming together . . . The location of the meeting was secret, as were details of the groups involved".

This extraordinary piece of mischief needs placing into proper context, even if only for the historical record. It is clear that this meeting was never "top secret", and nor was the location. Those who were invited were told where to gather. The meeting was **private**, but hardly "secret". Many groups meet in private for many reasons. The Reserve Bank of Australia holds its Board Meetings in private, but

McManus could hardly describe this as "secret"! At the Lithgow meeting's conclusion, a **public press statement was issued**, which the press appeared to routinely ignore. The League, however, aware of the significance of the events unfolding, reported the press statement in *On Target* on May 3rd. The opening lines of the text read:

"At a meeting held deep in the Blue Mountains over April 26th/27th, Graeme Campbell met with some 24 people from across Australia. The outcome is a shared vision for Australia . . ." The press statement closed by announcing that Campbell believed that the creation of a party to represent the views of mainstream Australia was likely. Hardly a secret! McManus has either described it as such either because he has only just found out about it, or **he wishes to place this construction on the meeting for a purpose**. In either event, it reflects no credit on him. The fact that the League and A.A.F.I. were represented at the meeting is also regarded as sinister. But it is a matter of public record that Campbell has appeared on platforms provided by the League and A.A.F.I. This report is obviously a rather unprofessional "beat-up" for the purpose of denigrating Campbell and *Australia First*.

WHAT ARE TED DRANE'S MOTIVES? A second, and perhaps more vicious report appeared in Brisbane's *Courier Mail* (13/7/96), in which Sporting Shooters' President Mr. Ted Drane is quoted as saying that Campbell has attempted to introduce a "secret society" of right-wing racists into Federal politics. Drane accuses Campbell of trying to seize control of his Reform Party, and is reported to have told the *Australia Israel Review* that Campbell was a supporter of the "radical League of Rights organisation, known to hold anti-semitic views . . .". He accuses Campbell of "associating" with the League and A.A.F.I., as though he has only just discovered this.

There is some doubt about the accuracy of the *Courier Mail* report, which quotes Drane as making the hilarious claim that the League is a "secret society" which had attempted to "take over the Reform Party". Not even Mr. Drane could really believe such nonsense. Drane claims that although he thought he could work with Campbell in a new party, *Australia First Reform*, he later "discovered" that he didn't agree with Campbell on immigration, and didn't want anything to do with the League, which he now believes has links with Scientology.

But Mr. Drane's position seems to change with the breeze. Originally he agreed to a relationship with Campbell in agreement with Campbell's basic policies, including on immigration. He later says he disagrees with Campbell on immigration. At his National Press Club address last week, Mr. Drane is quoted as saying that he was not anti-immigration, but *"we should have no immigration at the moment for a variety of reasons"*. It should be noted that Mr. Drane's position on immigration (if it can be pinned down) is far more "extreme" than Campbell's position, the A.A.F.I. position, or even the League's position! Campbell recommends a "low immigration policy", A.A.F.I. recommends "zero net immigration", the League calls for a referendum on immigration, but Mr. Drane says *"have no immigration"*.

Basic questions must be asked about this mish-mash of turgid allegation. What is Ted Drane's game? It is clear that he is not content to merely part company with Campbell. He appears prepared to be used by other forces in an attempt to destroy *Australia First*. League supporters who know Drane personally report that he has privately expressed respect for Eric Butler, and sympathy with much of the League's policy. But it is clear that Mr. Drane has **political ambitions of his own**. His "image" is not improved by associating with "racists", although when it suits him, he professes similar policies. Mr. Drane is unreliable, and unwisely permits himself to be associated with forces he clearly does not understand well. Campbell has obviously proceeded to form *Australia First* without the erratic Mr. Drane, who, when it came to the point, simply failed to appear. He claims to have thousands of members and hundreds of thousands of dollars, but no-one has yet seen evidence of this. *Australia First*, in our view, is well rid of Mr. Drane.

The role of the League has not changed. As an educational organisation, our services, including experience gathered over half a century, are available in the form of advice to those who are attempting to achieve useful results. Graeme Campbell does not "support the League" as is alleged. He has never subscribed to any League journals, nor offered any contribution to the League programme, except to appear on a League platform to **put his own views**. The League does not "control" Graeme Campbell.

The League supports Graeme Campbell on the **basic issues he promotes**. We disagree with him on other minor issues. We do not support political parties *per se*; as a generalisation they are a corrupting blot on the political landscape. But any group pursuing the right **issues** is worthy of support, while ever their objective remains the **achievement of results** on the key issues. In the longer term, Graeme Campbell may prove to have feet of clay, but for the present he stands head and shoulders above his other Parliamentary colleagues. Political realities dictate that any politician providing vision, courage, and leadership on **key issues** is worthy of support.

IMMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS POPULAR: It is clear that Prime Minister Howard and his Ministers have "sniffed the political breeze" on immigration. They have demonstrated that political promises are "pie-crust" promises (made to be broken) on immigration as well as other issues, by altering the immigrant qualification criteria, which will result in fewer migrants, and apparently less from Asian origins. The Government has clearly picked up the national mood on immigration, and a small matter of election promises ("the immigrant numbers and mix is 'about right'") is apparently unimportant.

Following the Ruddock announcement, Melbourne's *Herald-Sun* (5/7/96) ran a telephone poll in which 96.2% of 1,390 callers agreed that "immigration levels be cut". It is also clear that there is considerable discomfort about the origin of Australia's migrants – particularly those from Asia. This may be coloured by the expectation that when Hong Kong reverts to Chinese (communist) control next year, a wave of Chinese immigrants is fully expected.

The Age (5/7/96) reports that up to **95,000** Hong Kong residents could be allowed to enter Australila after July 1st, 1997. Foreign Minister Downer has confirmed that the 95,000 have multiple-entry visas, which gives the holder three months in Australia, then application for permanent residency. **In addition** to these 95,000, up to 20,000 Hong Kong students could also apply to stay in Australia. Statistics show that a **further 50,000 Hong Kong Chinese** carry Australian passports, 30,000 of whom are still in Hong Kong.

Rudimentary calculations reveal that by the middle of next year, up to **165,000 Chinese** could expect to secure permanent residency in Australia. It is known that already tours of Chinese professionals have deliberately secured Australian recognition of their professional qualifications, before returning to Hong Kong. Australian professionals in the field of dentistry are known to expect an influx of "cashed-up" Chinese dentists to undermine established practices. A similar scenario in other professions would be no surprise.

Perceptions that new forms of crime are the result of Asian immigration was expressed by Piers Akerman in his *Sunday Telegraph* column on July 7th. *"If recently arrived individuals abuse the laws of this nation and abuse the obligations of Australian citizenship . . . it should be within the power of this country to expel them,"* he wrote. As Akerman observes, the leaders of the "ethnic industry" would vehemently oppose compulsory deportation for convicted immigrants. But the press continues to report cases of Asian gangs and individuals attacking others in Sydney streets. The advent of "home invasions" appears to be an Asian gang innovation, for which many Sydney residents would prefer to be able to apply for a firearms licence. Personal protection, however, is not a "sufficient" reason for owning a firearm.