



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

Registered  
for posting  
as a periodical  
Category B.

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—*

Vol. 9 No. 31

August 24th, 1973.

**Thought for the Week:** "There is no act of treachery or meanness of which a political party is not capable. For in politics, there is no honour." -- Benjamin Disraeli.

**BRITAIN'S GROWING POLITICAL UPHEAVAL:** Mr. Eric Butler reports from the United Kingdom, where he is at present lecturing under the auspices of the British League of Rights:-  
"Benjamin Disraeli, the famous Jewish Prime Minister of Great Britain, claimed on one occasion that - "I have become intoxicated with my own verbosity." Prime Minister Heath and his colleagues appear to have become intoxicated with their own delusions.

"The two most recent British by-elections have provided striking confirmation of a massive electoral swing against the Heath Government since it forced an unwilling British people into the first stages of the Common Market exercise. Even more striking than the swing against the Heath Government is the loss of support for Mr. Harold Wilson's Labor Party. If the Labor Party cannot achieve electoral successes under existing British conditions, then it has little prospect of winning the next British General Elections. Those British electors who decided to go to the polls at the recent by-elections caused a sensation by electing Liberal Party candidates, one of them being Freud, better known as a professional comedian. The Liberals, led by the incredible Mr. Jeremy Thorpe; sometimes known as 'Bomber' Thorpe, because of his proposal that the Rhodesian rail system be bombed, have now started talking seriously about a big Liberal revival which will sweep them into office. But the truth is that British electors prepared to vote (large numbers abstaining) are using the Liberals as a means of protesting against both the Heath Government and the Labor Opposition. At an earlier by-election, held in West Bromwich on May 24th, there was a national sensation when the small National Front Party (generally smeared by the mass media as an 'extreme Right-wing, racist' movement) polled over 16% of the total vote recorded.

"There has been much speculation on what effect Mr. Enoch Powell had on this vote by his refusal to support the Conservative candidate. Some saw this as an indication that Mr. Powell was indirectly suggesting that Conservatives should vote for the National Front. There is no doubt that the National Front's strong vote was at the expense of the Conservatives.

"There are three major factors progressively eroding the Heath Government's electoral support: coloured immigration; British entry into the Common Market; and the mounting inflation, and other results flowing from acceptance of Common Market policies. Mr. Heath's reaction to the humiliating electoral reverses is not to admit that perhaps his policies were wrong, but to claim that more effort must be made to 'explain' them to the electors. Mr. Heath and his propagandists are also attempting to deny that the astronomical increases in British food prices are the result of acceptance of the Community's Agricultural Policy. But as Mrs. Joyce Mew, Chairman of the British House-

wives League, has pointed out in a letter to the British Press, under the British policy of deficiency payments - a form of consumer subsidy - the British housewife did get the advantage of any fall in prices; whilst under the Common Market policy, there is no benefit whatsoever to the housewife if prices do fall. As Mrs. Mew points out, it costs the taxpayers two-and-a-half times as much to keep prices up, as it costs the British, under their subsidy system, to keep prices down. A deliberate policy of keeping food prices high has a most stimulating effect on the overall inflation now rushing all the Western European peoples towards revolutionary conditions. As I write this report, the Grocer magazine records no less than 444 price rises for this current week, making a total of 6,619 for the year. Mr. Heath's Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Godber, says that:- "There is no need for the housewife to panic at the moment." The British housewives may not yet have reached the panic stage, but I am meeting large numbers of traditional Conservative housewives who are making it clear that come what may, they are determined to defeat the Heath Government at every opportunity they get. They have had more than enough!

"As British politics become progressively more explosive, with the Conservatives desperately expelling all those it regards as 'right-wing extremists', the most discussed politician in the United Kingdom is Enoch Powell. While I believe that Enoch Powell is weak in the finance-economic field (although this shrewd politician may know much more than he says) there is no doubt whatssoever that he could provide the focal point for a major British revival and a change of direction away from current disastrous policies. His addresses are carefully timed and all clearly designed to test the reaction of the electorate. His address on June 9, in which he suggested that Conservative electors might have to vote against the Conservative Government to avoid the final surrender into the Common Market, produced the type of reaction which indicated that once again Mr. Powell was in close contact with British grass-roots thinking. Public opinion polls reveal that Mr. Powell is now the most widely supported British politician; his support cutting right across Party and social divisions. Conservative anti-Marketeer Members of the House of Commons report that whilst for a period they were regarded as untouchables by their colleagues, there has been a progressive change of attitude as the reality of the Common Market replaces wishful thinking.

"A few of their colleagues who voted for the British entry are beginning to admit that they might have made a mistake. Mr. Powell is stressing that the mistake must be corrected at the next British General Elections. These could be delayed until 1975, but the loss of electoral support for the Heath Government is now so serious that it is difficult to believe that it can survive until then. There are more by-elections to come, and even if these are won by the Liberals, who are supporting most of the Heath Government's major policies, the continued anti-Government voting on a clear protest basis, must have its wounding impact inside the ranks of the Conservative Members of Parliament. "As some of us have predicted for years, the stage is being set for the greatest finance-economic-social holocaust in the history of the world. Mr. Powell senses the coming crisis and has prepared himself for it. But in the last analysis, no politician, nor group of politicians, can avert complete disaster without the strong support of a united and informed grass-roots movement. I have a strong conviction that the work of many years by the various Leagues of Rights and associated movements will before much longer be put to a decisive test."

PROVING ALL THINGS: Mr. Jeremy Lee reports: "Even in the middle of the grim battle which engulfs the modern world for the future freedom of men, a merciful Providence provides the odd moment of light relief. Such was the nature of the debate in Goondiwindi on August 17th, between

Mr. Rod Cameron, President of the Goondiwindi branch of the Country Party, and Mr. Jeremy Lee, the Queensland State Director of the League of Rights. Heavy rain in the area, cutting many roads into the town, reduced the crowd to approximately 200, but the keen attention of the audience, and the critical questioning of both speakers in the time provided, made it obvious that the days when unsubstantiated smearing could satisfy the average voter are drawing to a close. Mr. Cameron found himself in an unfortunate position before the debate commenced. Although he had originally charged that the Queensland Country Party was ridding itself of "subversive" members of the League of Rights - a charge which clearly implicated the Country Party - Mr. Cameron issued a press statement prior to the debate that he was speaking as a private citizen, and not as a representative of the Party. A meeting of the Goondiwindi branch prior to the debate voted to declare itself in no way connected with Mr. Cameron's charges. Mr. Lee's opening question as to whether Mr. Cameron had "taken the name of the Country Party in vain" by making charges which had not been authorised by the management committee, or whether the official pronouncement by the management committee in late 1971 that the Country Party had disassociated itself from the smear against the League of Rights had been repudiated, was not answered by Mr. Cameron. Mr. Cameron showed such a lack of understanding and familiarity with the structure and purpose of the League of Rights that it was clear that he had drawn his "evidence" from the biased diatribes of Messrs. K.D. Gott, Mike Richards and Edward St. John. Mr. Lee dealt with the charges and pointed out the simple errors of fact and the ludicrous conclusions which had been based on them. Mr. Cameron completely gave himself away in his concluding remarks, when he suggested firstly that the League of Rights was attempting to take over the Country Party, and then - incredibly - that the League and the Country Party ought to get together to oppose the A.L.P. If Mr. Cameron really believes that the League is 'dangerous, subversive, pro-fascist and anti-semitic'; why would he want to see the League and the Country Party "getting together" for any purpose? It is quite clear that those attacking the League do not really believe the charges they are making. The idea that the League wants to "take over" the Country Party is pathetic. Mr. Cameron's claim is akin to that of the character Justine Putet in Gabriel Chevalier's ribald novel "Clochemerle", the ancient and ugly old spinster, who went round the town claiming that all the young men had improper designs upon her person! Until there has been some repentance, a change of heart and a return to principles, the Country Party, sadly, would be a liability rather than an asset to anyone. The League of Rights is not the slightest bit interested in the Party game as it is now played, but is vitally concerned with the rights of the individual elector: a very different thing."

CONSERVATIVE SPEAKERS' CLUB - MELBOURNE: The inaugural meeting of the Conservative Speakers' Club - Melbourne, will be held at the Hawthorn Football Club premises, Linda Crescent, Hawthorn, Melbourne, on Thursday, the 30th August. Drinks: 7.00 p.m., Dinner: 7.30 p.m. Tariff: \$3.00 per head. Bookings to League office before August 23rd; payment is to accompany each booking. Guest speaker will be Brigadier R.T. Eason, Chairman of the Country Fire Authority, who will speak on 'The Institution of the Monarchy'. Keen interest is being taken in this fresh League venture, so please avoid disappointment by not leaving bookings to the last minute. League supporters are urged to bring a newcomer; wives, naturally, should be given the very nice evening out which this Dinner will provide.

THE FROST-WHITLAM INTERVIEW: Prime time from 8 p.m. to 9.15 p.m. on Saturday night was given to a televised interview between Mr. Gough Whitlam and David Frost, both of whom are currently visiting Australia again.

As behoves a globe trotting Prime Minister, who spends most of his time in other nations' capitals, most of the dialogue was devoted to comment on foreign affairs. Mostly it was superficial stuff, but to the discerning listener some interesting points emerged.

It was obvious Mr. Whitlam was on shaky ground when Frost questioned him on his proposal made at Ottawa for a "Commonwealth presence" to be sent to Rhodesia to "police" any settlement - what is depicted by Mr. Whitlam, along with the left-wing cabal in press and government, as the "rebel" government. Mr. Frost persisted in pressing the point - where does the right to interfere in other countries' affairs finish? He superciliously drew the analogy that the Swiss Government might want to aid the Liberal Party in Australia. Mr. Whitlam skirted and dodged the question and finally defined such interference as being confined to colonial countries. No mention was made of the invasion into the affairs of most countries by the vast red network, with headquarters in Moscow-Peking-Havana.

On his assessment of Mr. Nixon, Mr. Whitlam said he "admired his strategy but not his tactics." Mr. Nixon had made new advances on questions such as China which neither a "liberal Republican" nor a Democratic President could have initiated." Those who understand political principles know that strategy - the overall objective - is all important. Labels like, Labor, Liberal, Republican, have no meaning when their strategy is the same; viz. the centralisation of political and economic power.

To reinforce the point; asked what he admired most about Mr. Heath, Mr. Whitlam said it was Mr. Heath's single-minded determination to take Britain into the Common Market. So the Conservative joins all the other labels in the march to centralism. Mr. Whitlam added, had he been a Briton, he would have agreed with Heath.

Unwittingly Mr. Whitlam pointed to the advantage of the British parliamentary system over the American Republican system, saying Watergate could never have happened in Australia, as he, the Prime Minister, was responsible to parliament, which was a superior form of watch dog over the actions of those in power.

Questioned as to whether Mr. Billie Mackie Snedden was his most formidable adversary in the Liberal Party, Mr. Whitlam said "no". But on promptly being asked who was, he proved very coy. Shifting his ground he talked about those who would command support from "the middle ground". One concluded this was that ground on which both the Liberal and Labor Party agreed. One thing observers have been agreed upon in regard to Mr. Snedden's leadership (?) is that he is only a shadow of Mr. Whitlam, following almost slavishly along behind on foreign affairs and domestic policies (China, the Doctors, Health, Education etc.) initiated by the Labor Government. Therefore it was revealing, if only from the point of view of confirming what we have been pointing out consistently in these pages, that those liberals, whom Mr. Whitlam feels would command support from the Australian people which now support him are Mr. Peacock and Mr. Chipp. In other words there is no real difference between the small "I" liberals and the big "L" Labor politician. Regarding Mr. Chipp, Friday's national radio news carried an item quoting Mr. Chipp as castigating those "clergy and politicians" who believe support and retention of the family unit is essential. The report quoted Mr. Chipp as saying the family unit in Australia was no longer important.

---

"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.