



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.43, No.18

May 11th, 2007

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "How can the process of accelerating centralisation be stopped? Only when sufficient informed individuals learn how to associate together to use their social power to impose their will upon their political institutions, insisting that the policies of the Money Power be broken. It is certain that the formation of more political parties merely assists the Money Power to extend its control of the people. Putting marks on pieces of paper every few years, without doing anything else, only serves to help legalise the policies of the centralisers."

– Eric D. Butler in "The Money Power Versus Democracy", 1940. Reprinted 1975

ERIC BUTLER AND THE IMMORALITY OF CENTRALISED POWER by James Reed: To be intellectually armed to understand the underlying philosophies at work in the world today, one needs to be educated by reading the most insightful of books. Eric D. Butler (1916-2006), one of the founders of the League of Rights in South Australia in 1946, penned many brilliant, highly readable books that penetrated into the realities lying beneath the surface. There is a cover on a book about science that I once read which had a scientist breaking through the surface of the earth (i.e. reality) to glimpse the gears and levers that ultimately move the universe. That sketch accurately describes Eric Butler's philosophy as well.

Required reading for this week is a little booklet "The Moral Implications of Centralised Power".

I have heard some young social crediters criticise Eric for the part he played in the 1944 Powers Referendum. Wouldn't a nationalisation of the banks have produced a social credit economy?

Eric rightly saw that this drive was based on a totalitarian philosophy of centralised power and, as Lord Acton observed, power corrupts and absolute power corrupts, absolutely. The Attorney-General at the time, Dr. H.V. Evatt, a Fabian Socialist, was a good example.

Further, social credit is about decentralisation of power, and bank nationalisation is a movement in the opposite philosophical direction.

So, what is wrong with the centralisation of power, of "new world orders"? Why fear them?

We should fear them because these forms of social organisation stifle human freedom, individuality and creativity. Thus they are contrary to the law of life and the natural law – God's law.

Power is a capacity to impose one's will over others : to make them do things. Some degree of power is necessary for civilised order, but centralised power requires an enormous administrative

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *Eric Butler And The Immorality Of Centralised Power* • *Eric Butler, Yes; Bob Santamaria, No!* • *'The Dismissal' And The Role Of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen*

"ON TARGET"

May 11th, 2007

Page 1 (69)

order and bureaucracy. But the essence of freedom is freedom of choice for individuals, to "accept or reject one thing at a time." As Eric observes:

"Under our present economic arrangements, instead of gaining access to the free time potential, from our industrial progress, we are increasingly robbed of that freedom. The increased knowledge is used to increase our enslavement by compelling us to engage in the type of activity which has produced the environmental pollution and other problems."

Democracy tends to break down without a great deal of local self government to create healthy citizens. Centralised power though makes robots out of citizens and becomes a vast social machine, too vast for an individual to survey. That is the philosophy of power. Eric contrasts it with the Christian philosophy of love which affirms individual worth, value and dignity.

In a nutshell, that is what is wrong with the philosophy of centralised power : it enslaves and dehumanises both us and the controllers. And that is what the League continues to fight against.

Copies of Eric Butler's magnificent booklet, "The Moral Implications of Centralised Power" are available from all Heritage Book Services. Price: \$8.50 including postage.

"The Money Power Versus Democracy" by E.D. Butler, price: \$7.50 including postage.

ERIC BUTLER, YES; BOB SANTAMARIA, NO! by James Reed: In the context of this discussion about freedom and centralised power, it is interesting to consider the case of B.A. Santamaria, the Catholic intellectual who was also influential at the same time as Eric Butler. Santamaria had as his mentor Daniel Mannix, Archbishop of Melbourne from 1917 to 1963. No doubt both men did much good in combating the communist threat. Santamaria in the latter part of his life did excellent work attacking economic globalisation and economic rationalism.

However, on the dark side there is an anti-Anglo Saxon strain running through the Mannix-Santamaria stream of politics. They didn't like a WASP Australia and they did their bit to end it through immigration. Along with Arthur Calwell they wanted to bring in more Catholics whatever their colour. That ideology produced the multiracial/multicultural Asian Australia that we have today. It negates in one sweep any good work they did. Sorry Santamaria fans, it has to be said. Do you recall all of his pro-immigration pieces? Race didn't matter for this Italian, only Catholicism.

The pieces always were the same. Australia has teeming Asian masses to the north. We are underpopulated. *So increase immigration (from Asia) or they will come anyway. Santamaria repeated this type of article many times over the years. It became standard copy.

Beyond this though, as Michael Sexton has recently analysed Santamaria and Mannix were anti-democrats. ("A man and his dogma : In 1950s Australia, democracy and devout Catholicism made for an uneasy mix, writes Michael Sexton." [The Weekend Australian, 14-15/4/07, p.28])

Santamaria in 1952 said that the birth of the liberal democratic state was one of the great evils of modern history. Whereas Eric Butler saw the Westminster system of parliamentary democracy as a major human achievement, both Mannix and Santamaria rejected it. Would things have been different for them if democracy was a creation of the Irish or Italians, rather than the Anglo Saxons? In any case, this rejection of fundamental liberal principles puts Santamaria and Mannix in the centralised power camp. Would both have gone for a new world order with the Pope as world emperor?

For me, this is a philosophical and theological perversion of the true spirit of Christianity. The rejection of centralised power goes, I think, to a rejection of centralised power in the Church as well. That is why I am not a Catholic, although my family has been.

Thus I acknowledge the good work which B.A. Santamaria did, but I see his centralism as contrary to the true spirit of freedom that Eric Butler defended. Eric Butler then, in my opinion, was the better intellectual.

* In the context of the above it is worth reproducing a section of a flyer the League produced and circulated widely in the early 1960s.

"Church of Rome's Apostolic Delegate Supports 'White Australia' Policy":- "Opponents of Australia's immigration policy, which ensures that Australia remains a European nation, and which prevents racial friction to be exploited by the Communists and other subversives, falsely charge supporters of the policy with being "racialists" and anti-Christian.

It is significant that Churchmen who express caution against altering Australia's immigration policy, receive very little publicity when they give their views. A classic example of this suppression was provided late in 1961 when the Church of Rome's Apostolic Delegate to Australia, New Zealand and Oceania, the Most Rev. Maximilian de Fustenberg, D.D., said it was "wise" for Australia to retain its present immigration policy. His Excellency was addressing a layman's dinner in Ballarat, Victoria on November 20th...."

For those with access to the internet, view the following important articles on the League website:

'THE DISMISSAL' AND THE ROLE OF SIR JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN by John Brett: The ABC produced a TV series on Australia's earlier history, including one segment on the 1975 dissolution of the Whitlam government by Sir John Kerr, which was followed by a federal election. In a letter published in David Flint's *Opinion Column*, John Brett brings our attention to the role Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen played in those events of 1975.

"[The] most forgotten about incident in the whole affair concerns the role played by Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen. Sir Joh [had] arrived in Melbourne late to attend the Liberal-Country Party Coalition meeting to discuss the withholding of Supply. On arrival the chairman Malcolm Fraser told Sir Joh, 'They had decided to allow Supply to pass in the Senate and Tony Eggleton was in the next room drafting a statement for the media'. ('Don't you worry about that', Joh's Memoirs, p.136.)

Sir Joh's response was immediate: 'You people must be bonkers.....'. He warned them that if Whitlam stayed we would get his republic, about which Whitlam said, "Whether you like it or don't, I'm still going to be the first president of the republic of Australia, and what's more you can call me Mr President any time you like, because that's exactly what I'm going to be". (Page 107-108.)

I think people like Dennis Shanahan, (*The Australian* journalist...ed) should be asked, 'Why do they ignore the massive amount of material written by those who were there'?

Furthermore, if these participants are wrong why are they not challenged or exposed by our media intelligentsia?

There has to be another agenda somewhere. But we should be ever thankful for these Knights of our realm, who did their duty so honestly and conscientiously and left us their account of this pivotal point in our history. Two have now departed in Honour, but to Sir David Smith we can still extend our thanks for his continual fidelity in this affair."

John Brett continues: "The 'Dismissal' revival reminded me of a pile of *Queen and Constitution* brochures I had in the cupboard. These were the remnants of thousands we distributed tramping around the streets of New England towns in 1973. We seem to have forgotten 1974-75, which was the year that Whitlam was laying the foundations for his republic, to be thwarted at every crucial step by Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

You won that round Joh: When Joh decided the Federal Opposition was incapable of containing Whitlam, he took a delegation of State Premiers and representatives to London to forestall Whitlam.

Meeting in Canberra a few weeks later Whitlam told Joh: "Well, Joh, I've got to admit you won that round, but I must tell you this Joh: whether you like it or whether you don't, I'm still going to be the first President of the republic of Australia...".

Joh knew that Whitlam's gross arrogance would eventually destroy him at the polls. Australians will not tolerate arrogance from anybody, least of all a politician.

When Whitlam appointed Vince Gair a DLP senator for Queensland as Ambassador to Ireland, Joh knew Vince would ordinarily be the last person Whitlam would give the job to, so what was he up to? With Gair out of the Senate, Whitlam hoped to gain control with an ALP candidate.

Gair neglected to resign from the Senate on the last day available to him, so with less than 12 hours to accomplish it, Joh had all the writs for the Queensland Senators in the coming senate election issued. Whitlam was furious, Joh had foiled him again and not for the last time.

It was this failure of Whitlam to get a majority in the Senate that allowed Fraser, with the Coalition majority, to block Supply in 1975 bringing about the dismissal, followed by the landslide election victory to the Coalition and the destruction of Whitlam.

Queenslanders voted Whitlam out: It was the vote in Queensland that destroyed Whitlam, there were hardly any Labor members left, for all Queenslanders remembered Whitlam publicly calling Joh, "A bible bashing bastard", a "contemptible man", etc., each time Joh outmanoeuvred him. All this while the Coalition sat on their hands – with Fraser denying the fact that Joh played any part in the dismissal!

The 'Loans Affair' and Whitlam's scheming: There is no doubt Whitlam's scheming was first discernable on the night of the 13th December 1974. The Governor General and his secretary were in Sydney for a function at the Opera House. The Parliament had risen for the Christmas recess and Whitlam was leaving for overseas next day – the 14th December.

On returning from the Opera late on the 13th, the Governor General's secretary, David Smith, received a message to contact an official in Canberra, who finally was contacted about 2am on the 14th.

Executive Council: In the absence of the President and Vice President, and without notice, a meeting of the Executive Council had been called on the night of the 13th to approve of the Government borrowing \$4,000,000,000 as a temporary loan outside of Australia. This was to become known as the "Loans Affair".

At 8 am on the morning of the 14th, Whitlam rang the Governor General to inform him of this unusual meeting, requesting that the absent GG should sign the minute of the meeting. He would despatch the document with a courier, who arrived at Admiralty House about 9am on the morning of the 14th. A temporary loan of this magnitude for the very dubious reasons stated by Whitlam, fortunately was to remain embedded in the GG's memory.

We could safely bet David Smith, (now Sir David) would not forget this unusual meeting and its purpose became obvious nine months later.

If ever political events cast their shadows before them, this "Loans Affair" is surely one of the darkest shadows in Australia's political history, just as today there are other shadows being cast. Or should it be caste?

"Oh what a tangled web they weave, when first they practice to deceive".

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.

Subscription \$40.00 p.a.