



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –*

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.43

November 10th, 1995

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** "Since nationalism is inseparably joined to a people's cultural heritage, it follows that all attacks on nationalism must include cultural sabotage and subversion – which is what we see today on both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, promoted with equal zeal by super capitalists and communists."

– Ivor Benson in *This Age of Conflict*

## THE MYTHS OF 1975 by Eric D. Butler:

The 20th anniversary of the tumultuous events of November, 1975, which resulted in the Australian Governor-General, Sir John Kerr, withdrawing the commission of Labor Prime Minister Gough Whitlam to continue in government, and insisting that the Australian people be given the opportunity at a Federal Election to decide whether or not they wanted the Whitlam Government to continue in office, has resulted in a flood of articles and statements about the matter – a type of publishing growth industry concerning the events of November, 1975, highlighted by Gough Whitlam's call for those opposed to Sir John Kerr's action to "maintain their rage". The sense of rage which Whitlam and his supporters sought to promote has long since passed, to be replayed with a type of mythology which has been skilfully fostered through the mass media and by sections of academia.

The essence of the mythology is that on November 11th, 1975, the "Democratically elected" Government of Gough Whitlam was "sacked" by Governor-General Sir John Kerr. The mythology has been embellished by suggestions that the Whitlam Government was the victim of a plot by the American C.I.A., which disliked the alleged nationalist policies of the Whitlam Government. The type of completely unsubstantiated nonsense was endorsed by some American publications like Willis Carto's *Spotlight*. The La Rouche movement, which operates in Australia under the Citizens' Electoral Council, with its fanatical opposition to the Monarchy, suggested that Whitlam was the victim of the machinations of the Royal family, particularly Her Majesty the Queen, who according to one of the more bizarre claims of the La Rouche movement, is the centre of the world drug business.

One of the most significant features of the many different versions of what allegedly happened are the contradictory versions. It is not suggested that there is anything particularly sinister about these differing versions. But assuming that those making the contradictory allegations genuinely believe them to be true, merely demonstrates the notorious unreliability of the human memory after a period of time. How then can the allegations relating to "war crimes" be reliably assessed after

50 or more years. But there is little doubt that Prime Minister Whitlam completely mis-read the crisis he had produced in 1975, when he insisted that he was going to continue in office in spite of the fact that the Senate had constitutionally refused to grant him supply.

It is legitimate to argue that the Coalition-dominated Senate was motivated by a will to power when it refused to grant Supply to the Whitlam Government. But it is plain humbug to argue that this was "unconstitutional" and violated "convention". Whitlam himself as leader of the Labor Opposition had once raised the possibility of the Opposition using the Senate to check financial measures advocated by a Liberal-National Party Government. The Federal Constitution states quite clearly that the Government of the Australian Commonwealth shall consist of three Parts: The Governor-General, representing the Crown, the Senate, originally conceived as a States' House in which all States are equally represented, and the House of Representatives. The Federal Constitution was conceived as a reflection of the traditional British trinitarian form of government, with power divided. The founders of the Federal Constitution sought to have the power of the Central Government limited by checks and balances.

The philosophy of the Federal Constitution is anti-monopoly. Unable to argue against the fact that the Whitlam Government was decisively rejected by the electors following the events of 1975, some of those writing about the affair, argue that while it is certain that the Whitlam Government would have been defeated whenever it faced the electors the use of the Senate to force a premature election violated the "spirit" of the Constitution. The hypocrisy of those Labor supporters advancing this type of reasoning can be judged by the manner in which Labor Governments have blatantly misused the External Powers to subvert the Constitution, and who are currently involved in attempting to subvert Municipal Government as part of a long-term strategy to emasculate the States and ultimately to create the completely centralised Planned State.

**WHY THE CHURCHES PLAY POLITICS:** Victoria's elected Dictator, Mr. Jeff Kennett, has recently denounced the right of Christian clergy to express any views on political issues, particularly when these conflict with his policies.

*The Age* (Melbourne) columnist, Gerard Henderson, prominent League of Rights basher, has taken the same view. In the following letter published in *The Age* (November 3rd) the Rev. Tim Costello, former Mayor of St.Kilda, fights back with some telling comments:

"Question: Why do the churches involve themselves in matters of state? Answer: Because that is what their Founder, Jesus of Nazareth, did and that is mainly why he was executed by the state.

"Gerard Henderson (*The Age*, 31/10) asserts that the churches lecture about politics because it is easier than lecturing about religion. Nonsense.

"Start at the beginning, Gerard, and you will notice that Jesus was frequently outspoken on political matters. He called King Herod a fox and told the Roman procurator, Pilate, that he had no authority over him.

"He also dabbled in economics. Notice also how He tipped out the money-changers in the temple,

declaring that this was a house of prayer. In reality, it had become the stock exchange, controlling much of the Judean economy.

"Similarly, those curious church terms like predestination and transubstantiation (that you mock) were religious concepts with a highly political dimension in the Middle Ages.

"The notion of divine election, divine right of kings and control of the sacraments were the political issues of their day. He who controlled the sacraments controlled salvation – the ultimate power question in the Holy Roman Empire, where citizenship was conferred with baptism.

"Thankfully the constitutional provisions to ensure a church-state separation finally occurred. When the church had too much temporal power, it was corrupted. Neither church leaders then nor today speak infallibly on political matters, but to suggest that they should, therefore, stick to private religion is breathtakingly naive.

"Henderson's philosophy of privatisation believes that the churches must stay out of politics and only speak of private beliefs that remain hidden in the heart. The big, public, political matters can be safely left to experts like Mr. Kennett and Mr. Keating. And this silence is demanded despite the churches remaining the biggest non-government provider of welfare.

"Perhaps Mr. Henderson could re-direct his column to calling for new protocols to ensure a big-business state separation.

"The recent history of Governments (State and Federal) being in thrall to powerful private business interests is potentially corrupting.

"Many of us in the church who work with the victims of gambling addiction are deeply disturbed by the mutual admiration between our Premier and Crown Casino....

"The Premier keeps reminding us that Crown Casino's profits are the way of financial salvation for our State. Is that a political or religious question, Mr. Henderson?"

The Rev. Tim Costello is now Minister of the Collins Street (Melbourne) Baptist Church.

### **REPUBLICANS REVEAL TRUE COLOURS** by David Thompson:

The Fifth Annual Dinner of the Australian Republican Movement (A.R.M.) in Sydney last week served to confirm the true colours of Australian Republicanism. The A.R.M. has been at pains in the last few months to stress that it is not an elitist cabal of the Sydney glitterati dinner set, or Chardonnay-swilling socialists bent on revolution, but a broadly-based grassroots surge of Australian patriotism that demands expression in the form of a republic with an "Australian head of State". But the Annual Dinner merely highlighted the former, and the latter was conspicuous only in its absence. Even the dinner chairman quipped that on the night of the A.R.M. event, Sydney dinner-tables would be bereft of the elite – they were all at the A.R.M. dinner.

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the A.R.M. dinner was the Prime Minister's acid comment

that it was time for the republican movement to go into high gear, and that from now on, should **"take no prisoners"**. Keating's address confirmed his influence on the republican movement, and his very appearance underlined the perception that it is *the 'Keating Republic'* that is the subject of debate, and which is supported so enthusiastically by the Sydney dinner-set elite.

But what does Keating's "take no prisoners" comment imply? It conjures images of the Red Army assault on eastern Europe in the latter part of the Second World War, in which city after city was plundered and pillaged by a bestial horde that more resembled the savages of Ghengis Khan than the ally of a Western (Christian?) force bent on freeing Europe from totalitarianism. The Red Army attitude was that prisoners were simply a menace, as they had to be cared for, fed and guarded. Under the Communist philosophy, not only German troops, but civilians were only (enemy) matter in motion, and the Versailles Treaty a nuisance in the pursuit of their objective, which was conquest for communism.

It is now clear that the messianic Keating holds a similar philosophy. The pursuit of his objectives: power and recognition – are far too important for the views of traditional, British-oriented Australians to be permitted to stand in his way. Such objectives are so vital that the niceties of political debate, the views of perhaps a majority of Australians, the facts of history, and even the reality of modern politics all have to be swept aside in the service of glorifying Mr. P.J. Keating. Take no prisoners. It is an attitude born of a totalitarian philosophy. No wonder other republicans, like the poet Les Murray, would prefer the monarchy to Keating's republic.

**THE INFLUENCE OF HUMANISM:** To complement Keating, the other major speaker was expatriate art critic and 'historian' Robert Hughes, who now lives in New York, and brother of Tom Hughes, the Sydney Q.C. Hughes implored Australians to **"stop looking up"**, and instead **"we should be looking sideways, first of our fellow citizens, who are the reason for the State"** and to other nations . . . To whom do we look up? Hughes was speaking of the Queen, but the attitude of "looking up" is something rejected by the revolutionary. Children "look up" to parents, teacher, and sporting and other role models. Socially we "look up" to genuine leaders, who set themselves apart by distinguishing qualities placed at the service of their fellows. Philosophically we "look up" to a higher Power – to God.

The only alternative to "looking up" to leaders or the supernatural is not so much "looking sideways" at our fellow 'citizens', but looking at ourselves, and seeking our salvation **in our own abilities**. Robert Hughes' plea to "look sideways" is, in reality, the age-old plea of the humanist to elevate man into his own God. The tenor of Hughes' address was precisely that: even to the use of the language of the French Revolution – "citizens", throw off the stifling influence of monarchy; liberty, equality, fraternity . . .

It would be puerile to claim that republicans are non-Christians, or anti-Christian, and that monarchists are Christians. This is obviously not so. But nevertheless, kingship is an ancient Christian institution, and the Australian monarchy is distinctly Christian in character, beginning with the coronation during a Christian service of Holy Communion. Conversely, the republican philosophy is distinctly humanitarian, as was well expressed by both Keating and Hughes at the A.R.M. annual dinner.

---

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,  
145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.

Subscription \$30.00 p.a.