



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -*

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.27

July 21st, 1995

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** "When Europeans were rich, you Australians were Europeans. Then you became Americans when America was rich. When Asians get rich, you become Asians - is that what you're saying?"

- Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir *"The Australian"*, October 25th, 1994)

## THE QUEENSLAND ELECTION AND THE FEDERAL OPPOSITION by D. Thompson:

The Queensland election cliffhanger intensifies Prime Minister Paul Keating's own election dilemma. The massive swing against the A.L.P. would make an early Federal election now appear suicidal, but he well knows that the longer he leaves it, the more intense the economic and financial problems will become. Mr. Goss attempted to make a virtue of **attacking Mr. Keating** during the election campaign, but even this may not have saved the Goss Government. One feature of the Queensland poll was the election of the first independent to the Queensland Parliament for 25 years, Mrs. Liz Cunningham, who took Gladstone with a five percent swing against the A.L.P. Irrespective of who is Queensland Premier next week, increasingly nervous Federal A.L.P. Ministers will be looking to Mr. Keating to begin producing rabbits from some magical political hat if they are to survive yet another election.

But it is also clear that there is little genuine enthusiasm in the electorate for Mr. Howard and his Coalition colleagues. The Coalition stocks in the opinion polls are only impressive **in comparison** to the Government's poor record, and increasingly alarming economic statistics, like the balance of payments. There is no evidence that a Howard-led Government would dare to grasp the political nettle, and begin to reverse the most damaging economic policies that have devastated the Australian economy for the last decade. It must be remembered that the de-regulation of finance, the "floating" of the Australian dollar, and the commitment to the global market were policies propounded by Mr. John Howard as Treasurer before the election of Mr. Hawke in 1983.

In order to ensure that his stocks are as high as possible in quarters where it counts, Mr. Howard has taken the precaution of condemning the League of Rights. No doubt with an eye to campaign funding, Mr. Howard has attacked the League as an extremist, anti-semitic organisation that promoted views **unacceptable to both himself and mainstream Australia**. He did not make it clear exactly what those "unacceptable views" are, and should be challenged to spell it out. Obviously the terms "extremist, anti-semitic" are simply political swear-words designed to communicate contempt. But where does Mr. Howard stand on the real issues, issues for which the League is well-known to stand?

For example, the League is well-known for our long background of support for the Crown. Is Howard specifically rejecting this? He has certainly compromised his support for the monarchy since regaining the Liberal leadership. And what about the flag? Is the League's firm stand in support of freedom of speech, and against the racial hatred Bill "unacceptable"? Does this lead to charges of "anti-semitism", since the racial hatred legislation is assiduously promoted by the Jewish/Zionist lobby? In our view, the Coalition's alternative racial hatred bill is little better than Mr. Lavarch's poisonous effort.

Is the League's insistence that all Australians have the right to determine what type of people migrate here "unacceptable", as opposed to an open-door immigration policy imposed on us by political parties? Again, Howard found it necessary to go begging to the ethnic lobby for forgiveness for his relatively mild comments about immigration in 1988.

And what about the Australian economy? Howard flays the Prime Minister on the atrocious balance of payments figures, but has no known strategy to reverse them. The League has campaigned for a restoration of some form of industrial protection to arrest the melt-down of the industrial base. This is why we supported the Australia First campaign. At the very least, some strategy for an import replacement programme, in which Australian industry is encouraged, by incentives, to produce some of the things we presently import, is essential. Mr. Howard apparently rejects all this as "unacceptable".

The League supports the traditional (heterosexual) family, free enterprise, and private ownership of property. Do the Liberals? Mr. Howard has some explaining to do. We are entitled to take him at his word when he says ("*The Australian*", 11/7/95) that the League promoted views that are unacceptable to him. As the frustration with party politics further intensifies at the grassroots, it is possible that the League could become a catalyst for drawing attention to fundamental political changes that are essential for the survival of Australia as a 'free' nation. At present, the Coalition is still what the Americans call "part of the problem", rather than "part of the solution". Any repeat on a national scale of what happened last weekend in Queensland could produce the enormously satisfying prospect of seeing the end of Mr. Keating, but **without providing a genuine alternative.**

**MR. GERARD HENDERSON ON THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS:** As a constant, carping critic of the League, Mr. Gerard Henderson, of the Sydney Institute, does not have a reputation for being careful with the truth. In his column in "*The Sydney Morning Herald*" last week (11/7/95), also carried by "*The Age*", Mr. Henderson took another opportunity to attack the League, under the heading: "*The growing influence of the League of Rights*".

Henderson has almost made it his mission in life to attempt to ensure that the League is 'marginalised' as a political force, and relegated to the dustbin as "the Lunar Right". The fact that the League refuses to co-operate is clearly a source of permanent frustration for Henderson. In his column, he repeated the assertion that the League's "infiltration" of the W.A. Liberal Party is "frightening", according to former Fraser Minister, Ian Viner. Henderson claimed that Sir Robert Menzies' strategy for "handling" the League was to ensure that Mr. Eric Butler was "off-limits" to the Liberal-Country Party senior figures. He also repeats David Greason's assertion that, according to Mr. Fraser, Menzies' opposition to the League was "extraordinarily strong". According to Henderson, this makes the W.A. Liberal Party's position quite inexplicable, because in February, the State Council rejected a motion that membership of the Liberals be regarded "as incompatible with association to the League of Rights".

**THE LEAGUE REPLIES:** In response to the Henderson column, the League sent a reply to the editors of both "*The Age*" and "*The Sydney Morning Herald*", which, as we go to press, has never appeared. For the record, we reproduce the League's response, from Mr. David Thompson as National Director:

"Gerard Henderson (SMH 11/7/95) claims that Sir Robert Menzies placed Eric Butler of the League of Rights 'off limits' to senior Liberal and Country Party people. A curious assertion in view of the fact that he later notes that Butler and Jim Killen (a Menzies colleague) campaigned together in Britain with the support of Sir Alexander Downer (a Menzies Minister).

"Unfortunately, the truth spoils another good Henderson story. Butler also had a good relationship with many other Menzies colleagues, like Sir Arthur Fadden, who moved a vote of thanks to Butler at a Brisbane public meeting after his retirement, saying that he had learned more from Eric Butler in two hours than in all the time he'd spent in Canberra.

"Sir Billy Snedden met with Butler on a number of occasions, and as Attorney-General, stated that using material provided by ASIO, there was no reason to believe that the League was other than a loyal and reputable organisation. Menzies' Minister for Air, Athol Townley, Minister for Housing, Wilfred Kent Hughes, and Minister for External Affairs, Percy Spender, also had a close relationship with Mr. Butler. Townley had been a long-time subscriber to League journals.

"As for the apocryphal position attributed to Menzies, that his opposition to the League was "extraordinarily strong", perhaps Mr. Henderson should check his sources. Not only is such a comment quite against the available evidence, it comes from the most unreliable Mr. David Greason, who claims to have it from Malcolm Fraser. As such, it is much more apocryphal than the suggestion that even before the Fraser years, Sir Robert could not bring himself to vote for the party he founded.

"In fact, even Fraser was not averse to meeting with Butler when he thought the League could assist him electorally. Before seizing the leadership from Snedden, Fraser sought a lengthy luncheon meeting with Butler not far from Nareen, at which both their wives were present. As a result, Eric Butler subsequently wrote a pamphlet "Fraser Government on the Road to Disaster" immediately Fraser won the election.

"Finally, it is ludicrous to suggest, as Henderson and Ian Viner do, that the League has 'infiltrated' the W.A. Liberal Party. It is true that some W.A. Liberals are League supporters, as are some members of the Anglican Church. Has the League 'infiltrated' the Anglicans? Turn it up, Gerard.

"The fact that the State Council of the W.A. Liberal Party refused to pass a motion making support for the League incompatible with membership of the Party has more to do with the W.A. Liberals' commitment to freedom of association and speech than League 'infiltration'. I didn't think Henderson believed in conspiracy theories."

**THE DEMIDENKO AFFAIR:** The controversy surrounding the award-winning novel, by Helen Demidenko, has not gone away. If anything, it has intensified, with visiting United States lawyer, Alan Dershowitz, accusing the author of using fiction to smuggle anti-semitism into the mouths of her characters. Australia's leading Ukrainian organisation threatened to sue Dershowitz for racial vilification,

racial vilification, which prompted an even more inflammatory statement from Mr. Isi Leibler, which even the editor of *"The Australian Jewish News"* hesitated to publish.

The result of the vitriolic debate is that the book, *"The Hand that Signed the Paper"*, has now gone to the top of the current best-seller's list, and divided the literary world and ethnic communities alike. But in the entire debate, no comparisons have been made between this book and, say, *"Schindler's Ark"*, another work of fiction set in the allegedly factual historical background of the holocaust.

It is clear that both sides of the debate, the Jewish lobby and the Ukrainian-community, would like to make use of racial vilification legislation to defend themselves. In her *"Weekend Australian"* (15/7/95) article, Kate Legge comments that *"Both sides count their corpses, and question the other's monopoly on suffering"*. The lawyers would have a field day, and freedom of speech would suffer.

The contribution of U.S. celebrity lawyer and Jewish activist Dershowitz is interesting. While in Australia Dershowitz referred to Theodore Herzl's prediction that "if the Christian communities left us in peace for two generations, we would assimilate" . . . "can we survive love?" Referring to this as a subtle danger, *"The Australian Jewish News"* (23/6/95) quoted Dershowitz: *"Our external enemies kept us united for centuries. The challenge of the 21st century is to ensure that the dream of peace does not turn into a nightmare of assimilation"*, Dershowitz urged Australian Jewry *"don't be ashamed to use your moral, financial, educational and media power. No-one handed it to us on a plate . . . I'm proud that the Jews control Hollywood and "The New York Times". No one gave it to us . . ."*

**IRRATIONAL RESPONSE TO FRENCH TESTING:** While the fury continues to rise against the French following their decision to resume nuclear testing in the Pacific, little attention is given to the suggestion that any gaggle of international protesters should be able to undermine the sovereignty of a nation-state of which they disapprove. It is ironic that the dangers to Australia from France come not from nuclear testing, but from foreign control of our public utilities. It has apparently gone almost completely unnoticed that Electricite de France (E.D.F.) is one of four foreign bidders for Victoria's billion-dollar United Energy distribution company, recently "privatised" by Mr. Kennett. Other French companies are bidding for contracts to operate Australian municipal water and sewerage systems. As for E.D.F., this is the French state's monopoly electricity supplier, which generates **seventy-five percent of France's electricity capacity from 65 nuclear power stations in France**, apparently quite safely. It would be the final irony if the anti-nuclear protesters concentrate their attention on Mururoa Atoll, while a French nuclear company buys up Australian electricity systems with the benefit of previous nuclear testing programmes on Mururoa!

If Australians wish to make a constructive protest about the French influence, perhaps they could demand that the (French) metric system of measurement be abandoned in favour of Australia's traditional imperial system. Or is British imperialism even worse than French colonial imperialism?