



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—*

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 0999

Vol. 24 No. 42

November 4th., 1988.

Thought for the Week: "I do assure you, I do not desire to distrust my faithful and loving people. Let tyrants fear; I have always so behaved myself that, under God, I have placed my chiefest strength and safeguard in the loyal hearts and good will of my subjects; and, therefore, I am come amongst you as you see at this time ..... I know I have the body of a weak, feeble woman; but I have the heart and stomach of a king - and a King of England, too, and think foul scorn that Parma or Spain, or any prince of Europe, should dare to invade the borders of my realm; to which, rather than any dishonour should grow by me, I myself will be your general, judge, and rewarder."

Queen Elizabeth 1: to her army at Tilbury, 1588.

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS NOW A "DILEMMA": "The Editorial in The Australian (18/10) dramatically highlights (but unfortunately ignores) the dilemma (our emphasis .... O.T.) which organisations such as the League of Rights present in a democracy."

- Alan Griffiths, M.H.R., Chairman, Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, Canberra.

The above extract is taken from a letter from Mr. Griffiths, published in The Weekend Australian (October 29-30). There is nothing new in his letter, only the old stuff, re-mixed. We are (or rather, The Australian readers) - are intended to be impressed by the number of Federal parliamentarians, of ALL parties, who condemn the League of Rights. To us, all this means is that the moral rot now infects ALL parties. We have the old, old, line:- viz., "The Parliament has an obligation and responsibility to investigate and expose to full public scrutiny the aims and activities of any organisation which by deception, stealth or misinformation could prey on the fears and ignorance of the people."

Mr. Hawke, Prime Minister, not once - but several times, has stated that Australian electors are shrewd people, and can well understand and analyse political and electoral matters. Mr. Griffiths seems not to agree with his parliamentary leader, and opines that these

same Australians are babes-in-the-woods, and must be protected from the Evil League. We are well content to let our fellow Australians judge us on unsullied evidence, and yes, we do most definitely respect Mr. Alan Griffiths' right to air his views on the League of Rights. At least the record, so far, is that the League of Rights is NOT a rat-bag organisation: it must be taken seriously: it has most sophisticated techniques for the dissemination of its views (we know that). What we don't like is the incipient totalitarianism which lies beneath the surface of debate on the existence and function of the Australian League of Rights. Unless there are constitutional safeguards against such evils, then these could surface and give Australia a shove towards the police state. We do make the point that the League of Rights was in the van against the incipient totalitarianism of the Bill of Rights legislation, and the Identity Card legislation. Mr Griffiths' own political party attempted to introduce these pieces of legislation, which were violently rebuffed by Australians, who could, as Mr. Hawke has insisted, separate the grain from the chaff with respect to parliamentary legislation.

This brings us to another matter; the freedom of the press. Despite accusations against us of all the evils of a witch's coven, we do respect and uphold the freedom of the press. Yes, its freedom to berate and vilify us. What democracy we have cannot exist without a free press, and a free judiciary.

The freedom of the press has taken a blow by the recent decision of the High Court which means that newspapers must now reveal sources of information where defamation litigation is being pursued. The traditional "convention", or "gentleman's agreement" has been that newspapers were exempt from such obligations. No longer. The Editor of The Australian was most scathing, on weekend T.V., on this recent High Court ruling. It is probably a political decision, we have come to expect, now, from the Australian High Court. The reason? The appeasement of an influential Asian from the Phillipines? Just a thought.

What about the Koowarta decision of the High Court? This validated the Racial Discrimination Bill (now the Racial Discrimination Act) - which has unleashed all the United Nations "Mickey Mouse" social legislation, such as Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity legislation - which is causing all manner of bitterness in commerce and industry. What about the Franklin Dam decision? This validated the World Heritage Legislation, thus allowing vast tracts of Australia to be "frozen", ultimately for the benefit of International Finance, as revealed by Jeremy Lee in his Enterprise (October 1987, "World Heritage and the International Banks": \$1.00 posted from Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001). What about the freedom-destroying Referendums? Could these "frozen" tracts of Australian by "Heritage" legislation be somehow hooked into Aboriginal Land Rights programmes? There are those who declare that this is more than possible.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen reminded us that the politicisation of the High Court (he may not have used that word, but that was what he meant) - was brought about by ONE MAN, the late Judge Lionel Murphy. The Koowarta decision was 4-3 in favour, with Lionel Murphy ruling against Queensland, of course.

There is no doubt that the more percipient media leaders are aware of the approaching dangers to their freedom of operations. We, ourselves, have asserted from time to time, over the years, in these pages, that we shall, eventually, witness the phenomenon of an approach to the League by media leaders to protect and save them from the rigours of a totalitarian government. A totalitarian state MUST muzzle the press, and the media in general. When the time comes, we shall give the mass media leaders the benefit of our long expertise - despite the attacks on us, over the years, by THEM. We note that the present media critics of the League, after the customary vilification against us, are careful to insist on our right to exist and function. Why? Because they know jolly well that if the League is persecuted by parliamentary "investigative committees", an "odious precedent" (The Australian editorial, 18/10) will have been established which could well turn against themselves in the future. Examples:-

The Australian Editorial, 'A Whiff of McCarthy' - and The Australian's accusation of "an odious precedent" (The Investigating Committee). In the Sydney Morning Herald (25/10) journalist, Milton Cockburn, in his article - "Rights and Wrongs of Being Bigoted" (that's us!), ends his rather long article thus:

"..... Nevertheless, this debate provides the opportunity to rebut the League's absurd claims (they are never detailed....O.T.) and this will obviously be of assistance to M.P.s in responding to the volume of material they say they are receiving from League-influenced constituents. This is likely to be of much greater assistance to them than a detailed and weighty tome provided by a parliamentary committee.

"Tolerance is supposed to be the ideal of a liberal democratic society. As distasteful as it may seem, that tolerance must extend to those who themselves exhibit little tolerance (us again. ...O.T.) - provided they remain within the law. The League of Rights has rights too." (Our emphasis).

This gentleman has got the message. How about this, from him?  
"..... But the establishment of a parliamentary inquiry into the League's activities is a massive over-reaction and establishes a dangerous precedent. What is there now to stop a future Coalition Government establishing a parliamentary committee to investigate the activities of the Spartacist League or some other extreme, but harmless, left-wing group? Or even into the activities of the A.L.P.'s Socialist Left...."

Indeed.

Or into the Editorial policies of the Sydney Morning Herald, The Age (Melbourne), or The Australian? Editors, journalists, subpoenaed? Where could it stop?

"News Weekly", the weekly organ of the National Civic Council, as we would expect of it, stands up, defiantly, for principle.

After the anticipated attack on the League (rather milder than that of other media journalists), we read:

"..... Yet the fact that we are in disagreement with the League of Rights does not exonerate us from the duty to say that the proposed enquiry is a disgraceful abuse of power.

"The League of Rights has expressed its views by speaking, writing, publication. It is entitled to do so. It has not resorted to violence, as others do so frequently. It has done nothing to warrant any enquiry, parliamentary or otherwise, except obviously to criticise the National Party in Queensland, to the discomfort of its Parliamentarians.

"Those who seek to organise this witch-hunt should be ashamed of themselves and deserve to lose their seats, whatever the party of which they are members. The communists and their allies who are successfully destroying Australia's alliances to the profit only of the Soviet Union are not subject to any enquiry.

"Why pick on the League of Rights?"

AUSTRALIA BEING SET UP FOR ASIAN MIGRANT FLOOD? "Australia may host an important international conference aimed at solving the region's most nagging social and political problem - Indochinese refugees."

- The Age (Melbourne) October 29th.

Senator Gareth Evans; remember, the one who said in his early parliamentary days that children had to be "protected" from the influence of Christianity (yes, he did!) - now says that "exploratory overtures" had been made on Australia's attitude and that the Government would seriously consider a formal approach. Well, well. What nations have made these "exploratory overtures"? It sounds like a smelly set-up to us.

Get the simple-minded Australians to "host" the international conference, which then more than half commits them to implementation of its agenda. The Association of South-East Asian Nations is seeking United Nations endorsement for the international conference.

---

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Subscription rate \$20 p.a. posted.