



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.22

June 13th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"The primary characteristic of the slave is not bad treatment – it is that he is without any say in his own policy."*

– C.H. Douglas in *The Land for the (Chosen) People Racket*

JOHN HOWARD'S DILEMMA by Eric D. Butler:

Events are forcing the Howard Government into a type of political corner from which it is proving increasingly difficult to escape. Under normal circumstances, the next Federal elections would not take place until some time early in 1999. Under normal circumstances the next half Senate election would take place next year. But, as the League of Rights has predicted, normal circumstances can no longer be predicted; like every industrialised nation, Australia is in the iron grip of a deepening crisis. It is the same type of crisis which is throwing the internationalists' programme for a "united Europe" out of kilter. Chancellor Kohl of Germany finds himself struggling to cling to political power. The massive French electoral upset was a backlash against the harsh results of finance-economic orthodoxy.

While centralisation has badly damaged the Australian Federal system, there is still sufficient decentralisation of power to give the Australian people some protection. The problems inside the Liberal Party reflect a natural diversity of interests. While John Howard was able to "persuade" the West Australian Liberals to exclude the controversial Creighton Brown from their Senate team at Canberra, he was unable to prevent the arrival of rugged individualist Lightfoot as a Senate replacement. Lightfoot has been so independent that he even defended the League of Rights as a member of the West Australian Parliament. John Howard also has the problem of a number of Queensland National Party members who are in semi-open revolt against the programme of economic rationalism.

And there is the nagging problem of a Senate which the Government does not control. The suggestion that the Government might eliminate the difficulty with the small parties and the Independents by changing its method of election has been so generally condemned that the proposal appears to have been dropped – for the time being, at least. The proposal itself has merely increased a growing cynicism concerning party politicians which is feeding support for Pauline Hanson and Graeme Campbell. As we have constantly pointed out, the problems for the Government must increase. Which raises the question of what can it do?

The retreat on the immigration and tariff issues may give some short term political relief, but the Government is haunted by the fact that, as the latest economic figures show, there are no improvements in the area which politically is the most sensitive: unemployment. The best that tariff freezes can do is

to prevent a devastating increase in unemployment. As John Howard and Peter Costello have had to admit the long awaited overall increase in economic activity has not eventuated. Foreign debt has reached a new record level, increasing the burden of servicing that debt. In spite of his brave words, Peter Costello knows that the next set of quarterly economic figures could be even worse than those recently released. Which lends credibility to the view expressed publicly by Graeme Campbell that John Howard has been forced by events to consider an early election. A double dissolution would be required to achieve this. John Howard and his strategists are well aware that Pauline Hanson has not yet had her party registered, still less organised to contest an election. Even if the Pauline Hanson party does not win one seat in the House of Representatives, its preferences could decide the fate of a number of Liberals who won at last elections with very slim majority. And there is the Senate threat.

What, then, can John Howard offer the electors if the gamble is taken to settle for an early election? His handling of the debate concerning Aboriginal affairs may do little if anything for the Coalition in rural Australia, but could be decisive where the majority of voters live: in urban Australia. Howard's conversion to the view that the G.S.T. should be considered as part of a "tax reform" programme is an indication of how desperate the Government has become. One thing is certain: such a reform will not start with an area where an enormous increase in tax revenue is possible. Through failing to give the real figures, governments and their advisors have managed to disguise how much foreign companies operating in Australia fail to pay in taxation by sending their profits out of Australia. But enough is known to be able to say that the total amount is astronomical and, if collected, would make some tax relief in Australia possible.

The use of statistics to mask reality has become commonplace for a long time. Older students of Social Credit will recall that at one time the Year Book provided statistical evidence concerning the overall deficiency of purchasing power in the community. The figures gave total prices for the year alongside total wages, clearly demonstrating that there was a deficiency which could only be overcome by progressive injections of debt finance. The Howard Government and its "advisors" will not touch any tax reform which raises any questions about foreign investments. This subject is a type of sacred cow.

Those who argue that if Australia had to make any serious move against the internationalist programme, immediate international financial pressure would be brought to bear, should be reminded that when the Government of Rhodesia declared independence in 1965, it was generally felt that the application of economic sanctions, including a complete cessation of foreign investments, would bring the country to its knees in a few weeks. Exactly the opposite happened. It is time to recall how the massive Australian war effort during the Second World War was financed. Australia is at war again. Clearly the present set of Federal politicians have little to offer. If John Howard calls his early election, a start can be made to force a change to the agenda of progressive surrender.

RUDDOCK SMEARS THE LEAGUE by David Thompson:

It is perhaps a mark of the desperation of the Howard Government that it feels it necessary to attempt to counter the influence of Pauline Hanson among its own branches by smearing the League of Rights, and attempting to associate the League with Hanson. Mr. Stewart McArthur, the Liberal Member for Corangamite in Victoria, asked Immigration Minister Philip Ruddock in Parliament on June 3rd about the Government's reaction to a publication widely circulated by the League.

The publication in question was a copy of the League's *Intelligence Survey* of December, 1996, in which we reproduced Pauline Hanson's speech to the House of Representatives replying to the cowardly and malicious attacks upon her following her maiden speech. It is true that this speech has been widely circulated by League supporters, apparently to the discomfort of the Coalition, who now realise that much of the support for Hanson's views comes from their own constituency – even from within their own branches. They have more to lose from a Pauline Hanson party than the A.L.P. How to shut Hanson up? Accuse the League of being "behind her", as the Treasurer, Mr. Costello, did after releasing the 1997 Budget. Accuse the League of "masterminding" her programme, as Malcolm Fraser has several times. It must be a conspiracy.

This was not simply an idle question without notice from Stewart McArthur. This was a "Dorothy Dixer", cooked up in advance in the party room with an objective in mind. The objective was clearly to attempt to further "demonise" the League of Rights, and to attempt to embarrass Pauline Hanson. The (rather limp) hands of the Liberal Party strategists are clearly to be discerned in this. It is of further interest that Ruddock was asked this question as the **Acting Attorney-General**, on the somewhat facile pretence that the Attorney-General is responsible for the Racial Discrimination Act.

COWARDLY AND DISHONEST ANSWER: Ruddock's answer is instructive. It is clear that he had carefully studied the League's brochure, which included details of how to obtain Denis McCormack's tape, *"The Grand Plan to Asianise Australia"*. He said, in part:

"It is disturbing indeed to me that the League of Rights is providing a platform for the honourable member for Oxley. I am sure that members know that the views of this organisation are abhorrent, and are certainly not supported by any right thinking people. The organisation promotes views which are racist, divisive and morally reprehensible. It is clear that all but the fringes of Australia's society would accept the views of that organisation. It is clear that the coalition rejects those views – and those views absolutely. I welcome the approving nods from members opposite . . ."

That Ruddock's comments are dishonest and cowardly almost needs no expression. He makes no attempt to state **which** views the League promotes that he finds so abhorrent. He gives no example of the League's "racism" which might be debated or challenged. As a knee-jerk reaction reminiscent of Pavlov's dog, he absolutely rejects all the League's views. Does he so vigorously reject support for the Crown, and the flag? Does he reject our objectives of observation of the rule of law, defence of free enterprise and private ownership? Perhaps he is offended by our support for the Senate, and State Upper Houses, and British common law? Does the Liberal Party feel threatened by our rejection of government-by-regulation, and bureaucratic interference with the individual, or support for the written Constitution? These are questions I intend to ask Mr. Ruddock.

It is evident, however, that Mr. Ruddock is unaware of the size and extent of the "fringes of Australia's society" that he blithely risks further alienating them. Our answer to Mr. Ruddock is to simply step up our service to the "fringes" of society – the fringes which he and his party political companions have alienated by their arrogant attitudes – by further and wider distribution of our material. Mr. Ruddock would be horrified to know how many Liberal Party branch members are willingly circulating the very same material of which he complains! Let the political parties squirm or panic as much as they like; the sooner they discover that their M.P's. are our servants rather than our masters, the better.

CREATIONISTS VERSUS SCIENTISTS IN COURT: Last week the case in the Federal Court between Melbourne University Geology Professor Ian Plimer and the Christian Allen Roberts came to a conclusion. At issue was Professor Plimer's claim that under the Trade Practices Act, Allen Roberts was deceiving people by selling material arguing that the remains of Noah's Ark could be identified on Mt. Ararat in Turkey. Incensed by the Christian's claim that the world was created by God, Plimer had attempted to discredit Roberts, and force him to cease making his claims that science actually tends to confirm the biblical account.

While both sides are claiming a victory of sorts, it is clear that the biggest winners will be the lawyers. It appears that Plimer will lose his home unless he can find some group to come to his assistance, and Roberts may be bankrupted by the time the legal costs are paid. What should be noted, however, was Justice Ronald Sackville's judgement. Apart from cautioning that some issues, no matter how great the passion they arouse, are more appropriately dealt with outside the courtroom, he made the following point: *"Considerable care must be exercised before making orders (by a court) restraining statements made in the course of public discussion on issues regarded by many people as important to their religious or ideological beliefs."*

Perhaps similar care should be exercised in the process of deciding which exponents of various differing views of history should be permitted to visit Australia. Clearly the courts have been used (and abused) in a so-far successful attempt to permit David Irving visiting.

PARTINGTON ON THE "STOLEN GENERATION": Last week's edition of *The Bulletin* (10/6/97) carried a thoughtful article by Professor Geoffrey Partington on the question of the "stolen generation" of Aboriginal children. Partington, author of the book *"Hasluck versus Coombs"*, studies the claim that the process of removing these children from their families was "genocide".

Partington notes that under the new definitions, "genocide" no longer requires "one corpse, let alone a massacre". He also notes that not all cultural units are eligible for protection. "In contemporary Australia it is Aboriginal cultural units that have been issued with preservation orders." Partington writes: *"By virtue of a peculiar inverted racism, all children of Aboriginal descent are now defined as Aborigines, even if their ancestry is mostly non-Aboriginal. In our brave new world a single Aboriginal forebear confers Aboriginal identity and enables ATSIC to claim a growing constituency."*

Partington points to a particular piece of hypocrisy that demands an answer in the case of the Hindmarsh Island bridge, proposed for South Australia. He points out that in the "women's business" used to oppose the bridge's construction, it was claimed that the island was a special place for **"infanticide perpetrated against children found to be of white paternity, and for abortion of foetuses suspected of being so"** (our emphasis). Was the Aboriginal industry arguing that the bridge would disturb something sacred about the deliberate slaughter of part-Aboriginal children? Is the "Bringing them Home" report on the "stolen generation" claiming that the European answer of "removing" part-Aboriginal children from their parents a form of "genocide", while infanticide of **the same class of children** by their Aboriginal elders was acceptable?

Partington concludes: *"The real disgrace in 'Bringing them Home' is that it defames Hasluck and others whose prime concern was the well-being of Aboriginal people."*