



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.38

October 6th, 1995

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Debt locks up the future against us. It destroys hope. It reduces politics to a futile contest between parties of money slaves for the favour of their money-masters, leading to ever more centralisation of power. It is the very essence of despair."

– Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs in the August issue of the British quarterly, *Home*

THE LIBERAL PARTY TRAGEDY by Eric D. Butler: There is a widespread view, justified on many counts, that Australia is currently in the grip of a deep political malaise. The party political leaders are doing their best to create interest in a Federal election which must be held sometime before Christmas or in the first part of next year. Under what was once regarded as realistic politics, the Keating Government should be doomed. Even the "it's time for a change" factor, the one which played a prominent role in bringing the Whitlam Government to office in 1972, should help to bring the Keating nightmare to an end. But as the latest opinion polls indicate, it is far from certain that the Keating Government is finished. It is no secret that even some Members of the Coalition Parties are of the opinion that they have only a 50 percent chance of wresting government from a Keating-led Labor Party. And the reason? It is not merely the lack of any real leadership from John Howard, but the widespread **perception** that there are no basic differences between the programme of the Labor Party and that of the Coalition Parties. The best that John Howard can suggest is that he is more capable of implementing the same programme being implemented by the Keating Government. At a time when he had been deprived of the leadership of the Liberal Party, John Howard managed to tap into the deep concern about the rate of Asian immigration. But when the subversive forces inside the mass media turned their venom against Howard's "racism", he refused to stand and fight and attempted to adopt a strategy of retreat. He has been retreating ever since, abjectly apologising for what he said about immigration.

It is important to recall that John Howard took over the leadership of the Federal Liberal Party after the media and the Zionist Jewish lobby destroyed Alexander Downer. The central feature of the destruction of Downer was the allegation that he had once spoken on a League of Rights platform. When John Howard took over the leadership he lost little time in making it clear that he found the League of Rights "abhorrent". When the Labor Party formally "proscribed" the League of Rights, John Howard informed the Zionist Jewish lobby that while the Liberal Party did not "proscribe" anyone, he would not tolerate any Liberal Party member appearing on a League

platform. The desperate John Howard has now resorted to circulating the infamous Senator Boswell attack on the League in the Senate on April 27th, 1988. With the full co-operation of the Labor Party, Boswell had inserted in *Hansard* a document which had been prepared for him. The usual allegations of "neo-Nazism" and "racism" were used in the Boswell document. A senior and reputable political journalist rang me on the day of the Boswell attack to say that the manner in which the Boswell material had been introduced in the Senate was the most incredible political event he had ever witnessed at Canberra.

The Boswell attack proved to be the foundation of an on-going national campaign which reached a climax on September 29th, 1988, with Queensland Labor Member Keith Wright, at the time being mentioned as a possible future leader of the Labor Party, proposing an all party investigation of the "sinister" League of Rights. As Wright had a close association with League supporters in his early career, it is legitimate to ask what type of influence was brought to bear on Wright to make outrageous allegations which he knew to be false. The serious character defect which led to Wright being sent to prison was known in his Queensland electorate. By circulating the filth which originated in the gutters of the Australian political underworld, John Howard has demonstrated that he has nothing to offer for the salvation of the Australian people. Even if he is acting only on material provided by his "advisers", he stands condemned as a man of straw. For the record, I have no confidence whatever in John Howard, and I have progressively lost any respect I might have once had for him.

Both the leaders of the Liberal and National Parties have clearly demonstrated that they are terrified of the mass media branding them with being pro-League of Rights. What confidence can Australians have in any political party which bows to campaigns conducted by the mass media and the subversive influences it reflects? If John Howard makes it to the Lodge, he has made it clear that he is a captive of the same forces Keating serves. The Senate offers the one opportunity to break up the threatened monopoly of political, economic and financial power.

BASIC FUND: A slowish stream of modest donations in the week just passed (\$1,390) has pushed the Fund to \$15,205 – a quarter of the way "there" (approximately).

With talk of an unexpectedly sudden Federal Election, we are most anxious to "clear the decks" for sudden action. We need much more than we have so far received. Will those who have been "thinking" about sending that donation, please do it NOW? All donations to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria, 3001.

REPUBLICAN WOMEN TO SEIZE THE MOMENT: Former Victorian Premier, Mrs. Joan Kirner, urges republican women to assert themselves, and play a role in the formation of an Australian republic, and the re-writing of the Constitution. She wants women to "take the opportunity to shape the nation into a republic that reflects our values as women".

Perhaps Kirner is seeking some sort of outlet for frustrations generated as a disastrous Premier, but her suggestions concerning the republic are clearly divisive and reflect the "tribal nation" approach of the philosophy behind multiculturalism. Ms. Kirner also wants Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders to have their "values" reflected in a re-written Constitution, which replaces the present "boring" Constitution.

But why stop there? What about the "cultural and lifestyle values" of the homosexuals? If the

feminists qualify for a role in defining "Australia" through the Constitution, why leave out homosexuals, lesbians, or the new, emerging Asian component of the population? And what about the children? If we are to comply completely with such lunacy as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, perhaps children should also have a hand in drafting a new constitution? Ms. Kirner must have overlooked them.

The reference to the Constitution as being "boring" apparently justifies all kinds of madness being included, simply to relieve the boredom of constitutional law. Perhaps circus clowns should be invited to make a contribution reflecting the "ideas, values, traditions and hopes" of clowns! At least the Constitution wouldn't be boring. The purpose of British constitutionalism was never "entertainment". It was to ensure that the frailty of human nature could be contained when the temptations of political power were confronted. The Westminster system of government depends upon the successful divisions of power, and the accountability of those who exercise power, to the individual. It matters little whether the individual is male or female, single or married, homosexual or Aboriginal; his interests are best served when he is in control of his own like, and responsible for the results. **His (or her) interests** in terms of the exercising of power are the same.

When the time comes that a constitution must reflect the particular interests of every conceivable sector of the population, it becomes an unwieldy, totalitarian, 'discriminatory' mess. Ms. Kirner's contention that women have qualities that are superior to those of men, which will transform the political climate from one of conflict to one of consensus, does not seem to be borne out by the experience. Dr. Carmen Lawrence, a senior Cabinet Minister, does not seem to have brought such qualities to the fore in Canberra. If the W.A. Easton Royal Commission is any indication, Dr. Lawrence's honesty does not seem to be superior to that of her male colleagues. Either her honesty or her powers of recall seem to reflect the failings of her male colleagues.

Even questions of corruption are now being raised around Dr. Lawrence's contest with the W.A. Royal Commission. The Executive Government in Canberra has decided to fund Dr. Lawrence's legal fees, drawing funds from an emergency facility available to the Minister for Finance. The Senate has raised the legality of this process, and suggested that spending such funds should be scrutinised by Parliament. One question considered by the Senate was: could the payment of Lawrence's legal bills for a matter relating to a time before she became a Minister be justified as relating to "carrying" out functions as a Minister"? Dr. Lawrence is one of those whom Ms. Kirner is urging to grasp the opportunity of re-focussing the flagging republican debate, and helping to "create a society in which women share power equally".

THE FAMILY COURT DISASTER: Having now been in existence for 20 years, ex-Senator and late Justice Lionel Murphy's social experiment is surely due for realistic assessment. The Fabian Murphy, being a humanist, took the view that matters such as the sanctity of marriage was a relative moral judgement, which not everyone shared. Why impose such old-fashioned moral restrictions on everyone, including that of the burden of guilt for adulterous behaviour, etc.?

Family Court Chief Executive Officer, Len Glare, offered his own views in a revealingly frank interview with *The Sunday Telegraph* (1/10/95). Glare is quoted as saying that he thought Murphy's

vision of "a friendly family court" was flawed. *"The thesis of it was the friendly, helpful, caring court and taking the fault out of it to get rid of the bitterness. The fact is, it doesn't, and the fact that they can't have a court blame one partner or other often creates a great deal of bitterness."*

*"I think the spirit of the original legislation, both in its background philosophy in some areas and its execution, were a bit naive and misconceived. There was an assumption that the changes would change human nature. The assumption that all bitterness would disappear if fault were removed was **plainly wrong**. I don't think we can talk about it ever having a chance of succeeding, because Lionel Murphy's concept in those aspects was **quite wrong**"*

The history of the Family Court shows that it has generated enormous bitterness, particularly among fathers. In many cases, men whose wives have moved to dissolve marriages against the husband's wishes, have lost not only custody, but contact with their children. In addition to this, the property divisions have often exacerbated the conflict and bitterness, and such men find themselves required by the Court to support a "family" from which they have been excluded against their will. It is not surprising that attempts have been made on the lives of Family Court judges, with tragic results. Murphy will be remembered for his thrust at the jugular of the family.

HOLDING THE EUROPEAN UNION TOGETHER: Even before the European Union is complete with monetary union and the elimination of national barriers, the dream of a united Europe is under intense pressure. Many nations have strong minority protest movements, which often gain majority expression. The Danes originally voted **against joining Europe**, but were eventually persuaded, **by a very slim majority**, to accept Union. A similar French referendum on Europe produced an even slimmer majority in favour of Union, and a number of other countries have forestalled any referendum at all, in case the vote is against Union. Britain is one of these. The Swiss, having the opportunity to initiate their own referendums, have voted convincingly **not to join Europe**.

The Swedes have recently added to the anti-European sentiment, by turning out in large numbers to vote **for anti-E.U. parties** in the nation's first direct elections for the Strasbourg Parliament. As a result, at least seven of Sweden's 22 European Parliamentarians will be opposing the Swedish membership of Europe. It is likely that some of these seven can make common cause with Sir James Goldsmith's 17 members of the Europarlament elected from France, who campaigned strongly against the Maastricht Agreement – 'the constitutional' base for the E.U.

In France, the new Prime Minister, Mr. Alain Juppe, finds that if he is to push France further into the E.U., he must abandon campaign promises made by Mr. Chirac to cut taxes. Speaking to the French Parliament, Mr. Juppe said cuts in public spending, coupled with **a rise in taxes**, would allow him to steer France's economy along the path laid down, by the Maastricht Treaty towards complete political and monetary Union. Union was worth some financial sacrifices, said Mr. Juppe, in a forlorn attempt to convince the French to accept this aspect of his 1996 budget.

The European Union might be a reality on paper, but it is far from reality otherwise. The conflicts that can eventually blow the European Union apart are all present in the Pacific, where Prime Minister Keating lectures the Asians on the necessity for a Pacific Basin Union, in order to maximise the benefits of "trade". If centralised power is a form of insanity, the dream of a Pacific Nation is a form of insanity, as is the European Union, as Europeans are finding to their cost. The main question is whether it can be dissolved again without war.