



GOVERNMENT: THE ONLY ENEMY OF FREE SPEECH

--- By Murray Hopper

(Mr. Hopper is a founding member of Freedom Party now in charge of special projects.)

At its August 1989 meeting, the Middlesex County school board will be considering a draft policy directed at eliminating workplace abuse, harassment, and intimidation. While this might seem to be a worthy objective, it appears to be based on several false assumptions.

To begin with, such a policy may not be necessary. Committee chairman Shannon O'Meara emphasizes that the board is not reacting to existing complaints. In other words, the present system is working well.

This is not enough for O'Meara; she seeks comprehensive preventive measures which would outlaw "any sort of derogatory comment". This is disquieting. Surely derogatory comment is protected under our right to freedom of speech. If this right extends only to remarks which offend no one, then such a right is meaningless.

Even more dubious is the following provision about rights: "Everyone has a right to freedom from slurs against his or her race, ancestry, place of origin, color, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, handicap, age, marital status, family status, the receipt of public assistance, record of offences."

There is, in fact, no right to protection from slurs, which are simply disparaging remarks. Such speech is uncivil, but only mildly so; it is a far cry from being the threat to life and limb which would violate rights. Moreover, such threats are already

prohibited by law, and since that law protects everyone, no further action is needed.

Let the board be wary of involving the Human Rights Commission; if it does, it is possible that freedom of speech may be abridged. This can happen when the usual court procedures are bypassed in favor of quasi-judicial bodies staffed by bureaucrats with political axes to grind.

Consider what another such organization, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (C.R.T.C.), did to John Michael, talk-show host of radio station CJRN in Niagara Falls. It seems that in April of 1987 Mr. Michael was involved in an on-air debate about our aboriginal peoples. In the course of the discussion, apparently Mr. Michael, or some of his callers, made remarks which certain chief of local Indian bands found offensive. The chiefs applied to the C.R.T.C. for redress under paragraph 3(b) of the Broadcasting Act, which reads as follows:

"A licensee shall not broadcast... (b) any abusive comment that, when taken in context, tends or is likely to expose an individual or a group or class of individuals to hatred or contempt on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, color, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability."

(You will note the similarity between this paragraph and the one in the proposal to the Middlesex school board.)

To those who consent, no injustice is done

On September 1, 1987, the C.R.T.C. found in favour of the complainants and censured the station for breach of the Act: "Several times Mr. Michael voiced the view that native Indians are ineffective or irresponsible in making use of the considerable resources, financial or other, at their disposal and are unable to resolve their dependency on the rest of society," the C.R.T.C. said. "He further alleged that any other group of people in Canada would have been much more successful given the land and support available to the native Indian population." A public apology by the station was rejected as "insincere" by the C.R.T.C. and it stated its intention to monitor future broadcasts to ensure compliance with proper standards.

A close examination by the Freedom Party of Ontario of the particulars of the adjudication revealed the following:

(1) only two verbatim quotes by Mr. Michael, both well within the bounds of fair comment;

(2) no verbatim quotes at all from anyone who phoned in;

(3) characterizations by the commission about the unacceptability of certain remarks with no reference whatever as to what was actually said; and

(4) ludicrously self-serving rationalizations by the commissioners in defence of their finding of censure.

Our continuing attempts to make sense of the C.R.T.C. ruling by reference to the logger tapes came to nothing; the C.R.T.C. refused to provide either the tapes or transcripts because it was

against its policy to release such material to third parties; the station, perhaps aware of the lurking presence of "Big Brother", did not answer our letter. So much for freedom of information.

To understand the full meaning and impact of the C.R.T.C. judgement, consider the following proposition for debate: "Resolved that our aboriginal peoples have made good use of the resources at their disposal". Innocuous though the resolution may seem, it probably could not be debated on our airwaves; the mere statement of the negative position would offend the chiefs, who now have immunity (as do all band members) from any public criticism of their actions. Thanks to the C.R.T.C. ruling, the very real problems of our aboriginal peoples cannot be discussed on the air.

We urge the Middlesex county school board to seek private voluntary solutions to any problems involving the fifteen categories mentioned in the policy proposal. Neither additional legislation nor rules and regulations cast in concrete will do the trick.

The best weapon against bad manners is community censure. The reason that nasty racial epithets are not heard in polite society is that polite society invokes severe social penalties against such remarks. As the British say: "It simply isn't done." And the result? The offender is demeaned and degraded; his intended victim is supported and protected.

Governments must never try to legislate civility. To do so would be like using an elephant gun to kill a mosquito.



A REIGN OF IGNORANCE AND IRRATIONALITY Part II

--- By Kenneth H.W. Hilborn

(Professor Hilborn is a specialist on 20th Century international relations in the Department of History, University of Western Ontario, London. The following article originally appeared in the Phoenix, May 1989.)

In the past, the prominence of Third Worlders in UNESCO led to extensive corruption, and much of whatever money escaped being stolen was used for positively pernicious anti-Western propaganda. In an attempt to woo the Americans back into the organization, UNESCO has toned down the propaganda; in the words of one U.S. official, its activities nowadays are "useless rather than objectionable." But it is by no means clear how much progress has been made in reducing the corruption. The current director-general spends most of his time (and therefore a great deal of money) as a sort of itinerant salesman; he flies about from capital to capital trying to keep governments convinced that UNESCO, and with it his job, are worth preserving. Clearly there are worthier projects to which our tax money could be devoted.

I am indebted to a reader of The Phoenix in Headingley, Manitoba for drawing my attention to a Canadian government "news release" last January, announcing that UNESCO is to open an office in Quebec City next autumn. In the words of the release, "the purpose of this office will be to inform the media and the Canadian public of UNESCO's numerous programs and activities," as well as to be the "official representative" of UNESCO in Canada. In short, Canada is to play host to a UNESCO propaganda agency dedicated to maintaining public support for continued Canadian membership in the organization, meaning continued contributions to its budget. And this development results from what the news release calls "sustained and continuous efforts on the part of both the federal and Quebec governments." Apparently the Mulroney-Clark regime lobbied UNESCO to get it to establish an office in Canada as a means of keeping Canadian voters happy with the idea of spending money on UNESCO.

The Third World orientation of Canada's foreign policy has also found expression in such absurdities as aid to the pro-Soviet Sandinista authorities in Nicaragua, despite convincing evidence that high Sandinista officials have been implicated in the international narcotics traffic. The Globe and Mail has been guilty of publishing disinformation designed to make Ottawa's generosity to the Sandinistas appear morally acceptable, and indeed to create a climate of opinion favourable to even more support for Nicaraguan Marxism.

The Globe and Mail has been guilty of publishing disinformation...

A good example is an article that the Globe published on March 6 under the byline of Peter G. Prongos --- co-editor of Latin American Connexions. Denouncing the United States, Prongos portrayed the Sandinistas not only as defenders of "self-determination" but as champions of "social justice, human rights and democracy" --- obvious rubbish, since any group genuinely committed to such admirable principles would necessarily be an enemy rather than a friend of communism.

On March 21, the Globe used much of its op ed page for another left-wing article on Central America, this one accusing the United States of "subsidizing murder, torture and reaction" in El Salvador. On March 23, it is true, the Globe did permit publication of a letter on the other side --- one in which Dr. Maurice Tugwell (director of the Mackenzie Institute for the Study of Terrorism, Revolution and Propaganda) pointed out that Latin American Connexions is a periodical

It is discouraging how many people are shocked by honesty and how few by deceit. --- Noel Coward

circulated free of charge and filled with "propaganda for the Sandinista regime and for Leninism throughout Latin America." (I wonder who pays the bills for printing and distribution; the records of the Soviet KGB or its Cuban counterpart, the DGI, might shed light on the matter, but Gorbachev's glasnost does not extend far enough to let us see such documents.) Dr. Tugwell went on to quote sources on the fraudulent "elections" conducted by the Sandinistas in 1984.

Predictably, the Globe has since published a letter from an academic apologist for the Sandinistas, insisting implausibly that the elections were fair. If anybody is really gullible enough to believe that the victorious Marxist revolutionaries gave counter-revolutionaries a chance to win, with equal access to voters through the media, I wish that person would get in touch with me. I have some choice land I'd like to sell him. Located in central Antarctica, it is suitable for development as a summer resort. (Given a sufficiently attractive offer, I'll even consider throwing in a Hilborn family heirloom called the Brooklyn Bridge.)

Canada's Third World orientation is consistent with the limitations that Ottawa places on its support for the Western military alliance -- in particular on its support of the United States nuclear deterrent, the indispensable foundation of alliance security. On this issue, however, the irrationality of the anti-nuclear "peace" movement is doubtless more important than Ottawa's quest for popularity with Third World "anti-imperialists."

The idiocy of Canada's official position on nuclear weapons is easy to see. On the one hand, Ottawa recognizes the need for nuclear deterrence, and for that reason the government permits testing of U.S. cruise missiles over our territory --- as of course it should. On the other hand, the government prohibits the export of nuclear materials for use in our ally's weapons!

So far this nonsense has been merely a harmless eccentricity; the United States had access to ample fissionable material for weapons without buying it

from us. But, because its production facilities have been carelessly allowed to fall into disrepair, the U.S. has now run into trouble regarding the supply of tritium, a key component of thermonuclear warheads. Tritium deteriorates with passage of time, and even existing U.S. warheads will gradually lose their effectiveness if this ingredient remains unavailable.

Tritium is a by-product of Ontario Hydro's nuclear generating plants. It will soon be possible to concentrate it and make it a marketable commodity, at which time it will fetch a handsome price -- presumably to the advantage of Ontario's electricity consumers. Here is a perfect opportunity to combine good business with sound defence policy -- to help our American ally maintain the all-important nuclear deterrent while picking up a few bucks (about 70 million a year) at the same time.



In the last federal election campaign, however, all three major parties opposed any export of either uranium or tritium for military purposes. In 1986 the Ontario provincial government took an even more extreme position, saying that Ontario Hydro would not be permitted to sell tritium to the United States if that would permit the Americans to use more of their own tritium in bombs or warheads. One might almost have got the impression that David Peterson's cabinet regarded the United States as an enemy country.

In February of this year, the Ontario energy minister reiterated the principle that (as one journalist put it) "tritium sales would not be allowed to contribute to nuclear weapons."

How silly can you get? It is totally illogical to rely as we do on the U.S. nuclear deterrent and yet to treat as unthinkable the idea of supplying material needed to keep the deterrent strong. Of course the nonsense one hears from politicians may well be attributable more to cowardice than to their personal irrationality; the politicians have to face a public that includes groups hysterically hostile to anybody who says anything even slightly sensible about nuclear deterrence. The "peace" movement, in Canada and elsewhere, is a continuing threat to deterrence, and therefore to peace itself.

One problem is that the "peace" movement (except for the Communists within it, and maybe their conscious collaborators) does not know -- and perhaps does not care -- what the term "peace" means under the Communist definition. In the words of a formal policy statement issued in 1970 by the Communist Party in the United States: "The struggle for peace is inexorably intertwined with the revolutionary process. To curb the aggressive drive of US imperialism is to create the most favorable conditions for the further development of revolutionary change. And each revolutionary advance, by weakening imperialism, reinforces the struggle for peace. In the broad historical sweep, the struggle for peace is objectively a struggle to facilitate the transition from capitalism to socialism [that is,

Communist victory] without the catastrophic devastation of nuclear war." (Emphasis added) In other words, the point of promoting the "peace" movement's agenda -- such as nuclear disarmament -- is to create a world safe for Communist advances, to be achieved by any means short of nuclear force.

In one of his early books, A World Restored, Dr. Henry Kissinger drew attention to the danger inherent in all "peace" agitation -- a danger that should have been obvious from the experience of the 1930s, when Hitler's National Socialism (Nazism) was the immediate threat. Kissinger warned that "whenever peace -- conceived as the avoidance of war -- has been the primary objective" of nations that prefer stability, the world has been "at the mercy of the most ruthless member of the international community" (that is, at the mercy of a regime that has no scruples about using force against the militarily unprepared, the cowardly or the pacifist).

The idiocy of Canada's official position on nuclear weapons is easy to see.

In my booklet Threats to Western Values, published last year by the Mackenzie Institute, I devoted about a page to one of the Communist's central ideological obligations -- simultaneously to avoid endangering their revolutionary base by getting into fights they cannot win, and to avoid neglecting opportunities for safe expansion: "Although individual Communists may not be cowards or bullies in their personal character," I wrote, "they are committed as a matter of principle to behaving like cowards and bullies when formulating Party policy. They respect the strong and attack or intimidate the weak."

Instead of alerting the public to the dangers inherent in "peace" propaganda, our media all too often treat "peace" organizations as though they were intellectually respectable. On March 24, for example, The Globe and Mail published an article by a writer associated with Project Ploughshares, which the newspaper

identified merely as a "research group." In reality, Ploughshares is an anti-defence lobbying group linked with the left-liberal officialdom of the Canadian Council of Churches.

In his book Peace with Freedom (Key Porter, 1988), Maurice Tugwell describes the "deceptive agenda" of Ploughshares as "a blueprint for Canadian defencelessness and neutrality." He points out that Ploughshares fails to campaign against the Soviet military build-up, exemplified by Moscow's deployment of SS-20 missiles targeted on Western Europe. The organization preferred to promote anti-nuclear neutralism among Canadians, and to condemn US plans for strategic defense against Soviet missile attack.

The National Citizen's Coalition deserves credit for its efforts to make Canadians more aware of the way in which the government has been misusing taxpayers' money...

By opposing both defence and deterrence as means of protecting the Western world against Soviet nuclear striking power, Project Ploughshares would leave us (meaning the West as a whole) at the Kremlin's mercy. One of the enduring but inadequately publicized scandals of the Mulroney-Clark regime has been its financial support of Ploughshares and like-minded organizations --- an outrageous practice on which Dr. Tugwell's book contains some specific information. The National Citizen's Coalition deserves credit for its efforts to make Canadians more aware of the way in which the government has been misusing taxpayers' money to subsidize not only the "peace" movement but also many other pressure groups for left-wing causes.

At present, even quite a few people not identified with "peace" organizations seem to have fallen for the idea that we can relax and neglect our defences because Mikhail Gorbachev is such a nice man. In fact, we do not (and cannot) really know that Gorbachev's intentions

are benign; he may be seeking merely a limited period of better relations with the West because of weaknesses in the Soviet economy. Zigzags have been a conspicuous feature of Soviet foreign policy since its inception, and they have often misled Western observers in the past. Moreover, even if Gorbachev is indeed an angel of light, he may die tomorrow (from natural causes or otherwise) and be replaced by an angel of darkness. Personnel and intentions can change overnight. Capabilities are more enduring, and Soviet capabilities remain formidable.

Britain's Margaret Thatcher is a realist. She smiles at Gorbachev and flatters him, hoping that the process of change he has unleashed in the Soviet Union will prove irreversible and lead to greater change for the better --- as perhaps it will. But she does not stake her country's future security on such hopes. As she smiles, she arms--- modernizing the British submarine-based nuclear deterrent. She also firmly advocates the modernization of NATO's tactical nuclear weapons in West Germany.

If Gorbachev does genuinely want a permanently non-aggressive Soviet foreign policy, continued Western military preparedness will strengthen his case in any dispute with doctrinaire advocates of a continuing and intensified drive for "world revolution." The West's deterrent capability (both nuclear and conventional) provides the strongest argument in favour of the Soviet restraint that Gorbachev is said to desire.

The well-informed and prudent Margaret Thatcher doubtless understands that point. In view of the reign of ignorance and irrationality in so much of our journalism and public life, however, it seems likely that if Mrs. Thatcher were a politician in Canada, she would find herself in a lonely minority. But genuine conservatives in this country should not despair; their British and American counterparts were once politically lonely too -- a description that nobody would apply to them today.

The selfish wish to govern is often mistaken for a holy zeal in the cause of humanity. --- Elbert Hubbard

WELFARE PIGEONS

--- By Michael Emerling

(Michael Emerling is an activist, writer, speaker and motivator whose Art of Political Persuasion workshops have drawn rave reviews throughout the United States and Canada.)

In the early 1970's, a group of scientists conducted an experiment called "The Pigeon in a Welfare State". They took hungry pigeons and divided them into three groups: a control group, and two test groups. One test group learned to hop on a pedal to get grain. The other test group got the same grain, regardless of what they did. The control group went hungry.

All three groups were then put into cages where they had to learn to peck a lighted key to get grain. The group that had learned to hop on a pedal for grain learned fastest. The control group finished second. And the pigeons who got fed no matter what they did finished last.

Once they had learned this lesson, they were put into new cages where they got fed when they refrained from pecking. Same results. The group that learned that their dinner depended on their efforts did best. The control group was second. The Welfare Pigeons finished last.

Of course, people are not pigeons. People are far more intelligent and

resourceful. But, like pigeons, we are dramatically influenced by our early learning experiences.

Think of a young boy whose parents are on Government Welfare. What lessons is he learning? That you don't have to work for a living. You can passively wait for someone, somehow to provide food, shelter, and clothing. That diligent work, responsibility, and resourcefulness aren't necessary to get on in life. He learns to be helpless. He learns that it pays off.

There are millions of young boys and girls learning these lessons every day. Some day, they'll be parents. They will instill these lessons in their children. By example. And this legacy of learned helplessness will be passed down from generation to generation.

The Government Welfare System is undermining the Canadian way of life. We must make certain that people are rewarded for their work. And that they must work for their rewards.

Otherwise, we're the pigeons.

THE JOKES ON US

A Humorous Look at the Words Which Shape Politics
(Exerpts from: Dreams Come Due, by John Galt; Published by Simon & Schuster (1986)).

Austerity: Higher taxes and more government spending and regulation (austerity for the people, never for the government).

Big: Bad (unless it's government).

Common Good: Individual bad.

Conservative Campaign: Any political campaign that is hard-up for bad ideas.

Diplomats: Spies and terrorists.

Fine-tuning The Economy: massive government disruption and ultimate destruction of the economy.

Helping The Poor: Plundering the productive.

Political Crisis: Not getting reelected.

Property Taxes: Rent paid to the government for property you own.

Transfer Payments: Wealth taken from people who work for a living and given to people who vote for a living.

A WOMAN AND HER CONSCIENCE

--- By Andrea Hanington

(Andrea Hanington is a member of Freedom Party.)

It never ceases to amaze me that in our highly developed and allegedly intelligent society some adults still demand the right to make decisions for other adults --- not with their consent, but by force.

Abortion may be wrong under some circumstances (indiscriminate use as a method of birth control, during the late gestation period, etc.) and it may be right under other circumstances (rape, deformed fetus, health problems, etc.). Whether right or wrong, abortion should not be a public, political or even a legal issue, but a moral issue, between a woman and her conscience. The choice of abortion should belong to the individual and not to the government and/or certain pressure groups.

Church, anti-abortion and pro-life groups have at least two common denominators; they are anti-choice and pro-power (control over others). Church groups, some of which don't even allow birth control, anti-abortion groups who insist on bringing unwanted children into this world, and pro-life groups who wish to speak for the "rights" of the unborn, all claim to be concerned with life--- some with life not on this Earth, some with life at any price and others with life for some fetuses.

What about life for the already living? If these groups were truly concerned with life, they would pool all their energies, efforts and resources and

direct them toward abolishing hunger, disease, child abuse, lack of education, etc. The list is endless.

Education in proper methods of birth control, accepting responsibility for choices and their consequences, and incentives to bring unwanted pregnancies to term should be their primary concerns. If government legislation, bills, directives and regulations, which restrict the individual's freedom of choice rather than protect it, are continually allowed to be established, similar aspects of this anti-choice mentality are possible.

The question of whether the taxpayer should pay for abortions is really redundant in our present health care system. Already this system is grossly abused by people with self-inflicted and/or imaginary problems (i.e., alcoholism, drug addiction, violent sport injuries, needless surgery, obesity, unnecessary expensive medication, etc.; this list is also endless). The taxpayer may not agree with some or any of the above mentioned, including abortion, but once he is forced into supporting a government plan (of any kind), he has little choice over how his money should be spent.

The only solution to the moral, ethical and monetary dilemma of abortion is "freedom of choice" --- with responsibility.

Consent: No. 9, Aug, 1989 is published by the **Freedom Party of Ontario**, a fully-registered Ontario political party. Contributions are tax-creditable. **Subscription Rate:** \$25 for six issues. **Managing Editor:** Robert Vaughan. **Consent** welcomes unsolicited manuscripts, submissions, and comments. **Mailing Address:** P.O. Box 2214, Stn. 'A', London, Ontario, N6A 4E3. **Phone:** (519) 433-8612. **Freedom Party of Ontario Statement of Principle:** **Freedom Party** is founded on the principle that: Every individual, in the peaceful pursuit of personal fulfillment, has an absolute right to his or her own life, liberty, and property. **Platform:** **Freedom Party** believes that the purpose of government is to protect the individual's freedom of choice, not to restrict it.