



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—

Registered
for posting
as a periodical
Category B.

Vol. 8, No. 42

November 3rd, 1972.

Thought for the Week: I always tell my Opposition friends that the only difference between us is that I am **theoretically** non-Socialist, yet an amazingly practical Socialist, while they are theoretical Socialists. People will take things from us they wouldn't take from the Labor Party..."

- R. G. Menzies, The Age, Melbourne, March 3, 1941.

"What Conservatives must emphasize... is that while everyone is quaking at McGovern's mad-dog proposals, Mr. Nixon is actually in the process of accomplishing what McGovern is only talking about".

- Gary Allen in American Opinion, September, 1972.

FEDERAL COALITION BLACKMAIL OF ELECTORS MUST BE CHALLENGED: A number of our readers who are also members of the Federal Coalition parties, have mildly taken us to task for what they describe as "dangerous" criticism of the Federal Government during an election year. It has been suggested to us that it is "unthinkable" that Labor should win the Federal elections. Some frank and realistic comment is necessary.

After Mr. Eric Butler recently addressed a Victorian country meeting at which the local Country Party M.L.C. was present, it was suggested to Mr. Butler that his address had been full of criticisms of the Federal Liberal-Country Party Coalition, with very little reference to the A.L.P. Mr. Butler replied that while the Australian League of Rights was strongly opposed to the policies of the A.L.P., the very same policies had been promoted by the Liberal and Country parties. He could not very well blame the A.L.P. for the Liberal and Country parties violating their own principles over the past twenty-three years. For far too long the Liberal and Country parties have virtually blackmailed their own supporters, threatening them with the dreadful consequences of a Labor Government if they objected electorally to the broken promises of their own parties.

Mr. Arthur Calwell, former A.L.P. leader, made a telling point last week when he exposed how a Liberal Party press advertisement had blatantly misrepresented him with the caption that he had said **that** the Government's 1972 Budget was a "wonderful budget". Mr. Calwell commented: "What I actually said was: **This** is a wonderful Budget because anything that is good was pinched from the Labor Party's policy." Mr. Calwell no doubt recalls most vividly how during the 1961 Federal Elections he was barely kept from the Prime Ministership by the Menzies campaign which charged that a Deficit Budget to overcome unemployment would be "disastrous" and "wildly inflationary." One of the first post-election acts of the shattered Liberal-Country Party Coalition was to introduce an even bigger deficit than the one proposed by Mr. Calwell! The inevitable result, under present financial rules, was more inflation. Recalling their near-defeat in 1961, the Coalition have taken

desperate measures before this year's elections to reverse what they have been doing for the past two years - allegedly to stop inflation. Every informed reader of this journal knows that the inevitable result of this is another major inflation crisis next year.

The regeneration of responsible Government must start with the regeneration of individuals who must be prepared to accept personal responsibility for their actions. Those who put "party loyalty" ahead of those truths they have grasped, are being disloyal to themselves. If after twenty-three years parties have violated most of their own principles, how can it be logically expected that they will do any better if given "one more chance?". Then there is the problem of those "good blokes" we also hear about from party supporters. There are a number of "good blokes" in all the political parties, but to date they have offered no real resistance to the accelerating growth of the totalitarian State. We have heard that the Hon. R. Katter, Minister for the Army, is regarded as one of the "good blokes" by some of our Kennedy Electorate readers. Bob Katter is indeed a quite pleasant fellow. He even made a strong criticism of the 1971 Budget - as a back-bench Member. Mr. Katter correctly observed that the Budget was going to hurt the electors he represented. But having delivered himself of strong words, as politicians often do, how did Mr. Katter represent his electors? He voted for the very measures he had verbally condemned! He did not even abstain. If Country Party members in the Kennedy electorate are prepared to accept this type of performance uncritically, and if the Coalition Government is re-elected, then they will have no grounds for complaint next year as Mr. Katter and all the other "good blokes" vote for more Socialist controls and restrictions.

The implementation of the stated policies of the Federal Liberal and Country parties would start to take Australia away from the totalitarian threats now looming so menacingly. Surely Liberal and Country party candidates of integrity, who say that they are determined to attempt in the next three years what they have failed to do in the past, should have no objection to giving electors a signed contract concerning fundamental issues? Can any candidate be trusted who will not enter into a firm contract with those he is asking to employ him?

The best advice we can give to readers who are also members of their respective parties, is for them to say to their party candidate, "Unless you are prepared to give me a firm written assurance that you are determined to implement our own party's policy, how can you expect me to work and to vote for you? As a responsible elector I must accept responsibility for my actions. If you cannot give me a firm written assurance on the policy issues I am raising - inflation, death taxes, crippling debt, excessive interest charges, high taxation and mounting rates - then I can neither work nor vote for you." If enough members of the Coalition Parties took this positive stand, we have no doubt that some candidates would give the written assurances required. This would be a tremendous step forward in the campaign to save freedom in Australia.

One final point: It is a false argument that if party members are unable to obtain a signed contract with their party's candidate, they then have no alternative but to vote for candidates who may also have refused to sign a contract. It is compulsory, if electors wish to avoid being fined, for electors to attend a polling booth and have this recorded. But they cannot be compelled to vote for anyone if no candidate meets their requirements. Those who vote for the "lesser of the evils" have in fact failed to act in a responsible manner. Until such time as sufficient electors, which need only be a minority, start to act and vote in a responsible manner, it is as certain as the sunrise that the problems

besetting Australia must get rapidly worse - irrespective of the label of the politicians at Canberra.

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS DISCUSSED AT CANBERRA: "We on this side of the Senate - and I am sure the public at large - have become confused as to the real attitude of the members of the coalition Government towards the fascist body known as the League of Rights." - Senator James McClelland (Labor, N.S.W.), speaking in the Senate on October 24th.

Such is the background of Senator James McClelland that we regard any smear by him as high praise. He is sometimes featured favourably in the Marxist press of this country, and is consistently on the wrong side on all basic issues.

Speaking on the adjournment, Senator McClelland set out to try to embarrass the Government by quoting Mr. Anthony's "pro-Nazi" address in South Australia last year, his subsequent partial retreat, and then the "more forthright" Wesley Church (Melbourne) address of Deputy Country Party leader Ian Sinclair on August 21st. After quoting the favourable comments of Mr. J. Corbett, Country Party Member for Maranoa, and those of the Queensland Prime Minister, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, and his wife, Senator McClelland quoted what On Target reported on the Hon. Ralph Hunt, Minister for the Interior, in its issue of August 20th. Some of the disclosures in this issue set many telephones running hot:

Senator McClelland asked towards the end of his address, "What is Senator Greenwood's line on the League of Rights?" The unfortunate Senator Greenwood had to resort to some smart verbal contortions, claiming that On Target of October 20th, mentioned by Senator McClelland, had quoted a letter to Mr. Eric Butler in which "was a passage quite out of context." For the record we quote the complete paragraph in Senator Greenwood's letter of October 6th: "You ask whether I have any evidence to dispute the statement made by Mr. Snedden, when Attorney-General, that there is no evidence to suggest that the Australian League of Rights is other than a reputable organisation. So far as I am aware the Australian League of Rights is not engaged in activities that are proscribed by law and in that context it is capable of being described as a "reputable organisation". However, repute is to be measured by the community acceptance of the views and policies of an organisation and its members and, as you appreciate, this is a subjective matter and can vary with changing community standards." Senator Greenwood's last sentence is, of course, a blatant example of double-talk. Does he seriously suggest that if the Attorney-General were asked about the Nazi Party or the Communist Party, he would reply that as they are permitted legally to operate, they are therefore "reputable organisations"?

Senator Greenwood continued his verbal weaving, but eventually forced Senator McClelland, who claimed to speak for the Labor Party, that "We would not ban them (the League of Rights), but we would not speak in their favour." Senator Greenwood said that he was "not at all convinced that the Labor Party would not come down with a heavy hand on organisations like the League of Rights to which it objects."

On the following day, October 25th, the controversy concerning the League of Rights shifted to the House of Representatives, when Labor leader Whitlam asked Mr. Ralph Hunt, Minister for the Interior, had he been "correctly reported as saying that he personally believed the League was doing a good job? As the Minister with responsibilities covering sensitive questions of race relations, is he willing to dissociate himself from the views of this racist and anti-Semitic association, as his Leader has described it?"

Mr. Hunt said that he wished to make a "personal explanation". He started by saying that On Target reported him "as having dissociated himself from statements made by my Deputy Leader, the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr. Sinclair), on the League of Rights. This is untrue." If Mr. Hunt wishes to deny what a group of responsible men of character and integrity reported he said after a West Australian meeting, that is his responsibility. This group of men had no axe to grind by reporting what Mr. Hunt had told them about the League doing a good job and that Mr. Sinclair had made his charge about the Nazi Party and the League being linked because he had been "brainwashed". They were in fact impressed with Mr. Hunt's apparent candour and knowledge. And they certainly would not invent Mr. Hunt's statement, made to impress the group with his sympathy for the League, that he had once subscribed to The New Times for three years.

Just in case Mr. Hunt also wishes to deny that he said he had been a New Times subscriber, we record that he was a paid subscriber from 1951 for the following thirteen years, during which time he also donated. His background knowledge is such that he knows what the League of Rights does stand for, and he was only telling the truth when he told League supporters what a good job the League was doing. The case of Mr. Hunt is but another tragic example of a man of good background, of considerable ability, armed with more background knowledge than most when they enter Parliament, being trapped in the treacherous political atmosphere of Canberra and eventually finding himself in the embarrassing position where he felt he had to ally himself with his Deputy - Leader, Mr. Sinclair, even though he knows that there is not one word of truth in the foul Sinclair allegation of the link between the Nazi Party and the League of Rights.

The final act in the Canberra discussion on the League of Rights came on October 26th when Senator Greenwood was apparently stung into action by Senator McClelland's suggestion on the previous day that because of his "reluctance to uncover right wing activities", he would allow Senator Little's question of September 14th to remain unanswered until the end of the session. Senator Little had asked if the Attorney-General's Department had any evidence to substantiate Mr. Sinclair's allegation that the Nazi Party and the League of Rights were "closely linked". A most embarrassing question, but the Senator once again showed his capacity for verbal sidestepping: "It is clear from the context in which the Minister made this statement... that he was talking about the policies and philosophies of the 2 groups. He was obviously not referring to organisational links between them. I have no evidence that there are any such links." If Senator Greenwood actually read Mr. Sinclair's address, he would know that he did not discuss the League's support for the Christian philosophy of freedom, nor did he even mention one League policy. As Senator Greenwood is not an illiterate, he knows what "common English usage" means, and that the Oxford Dictionary defines "link" as follows: "Connex, join (together, to, with); clasp or interwine (hands, arms); be joined in or into a system, company." Mr. Sinclair, or his speech-writer, knew perfectly well the impression he sought to create when he not only used the word "link", but re-inforced it with the adjective "closely."

But reality is that the Attorney-General has at last denied any links between the Nazi Party and the League of Rights. This is a victory for truth.

All Election comment authorised by Eric D. Butler, 273 Lt. Collins Street, Melbourne.

"ON TARGET" is published by the Australian League of Rights, Box 1052J, G.P.O. Melbourne, 3001.
Subscription rate \$4-00 per annum.

W. & J. Barr (Printers) Pty. Ltd.