



ON TARGET

- PER 320.56 ON 1
- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
 - BACKGROUND INFORMATION
 - COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.8

March 8th, 1996

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "No civilisation is tolerable which suppresses agitation from within its own borders against an existing condition, however mistaken that agitation may be. But no civilisation can survive which will permit members of an alien culture to settle within its borders in order to make the exploitation of grievances real or fancied into a highly lucrative profession."

- C.H. Douglas in *The Brief for the Prosecution*

ELECTION REALITIES by Eric D. Butler:

John Howard should make the most of the warm glow of political success he has received as a result of the electoral victory of last Saturday, because the glow is not going to last very long. It only seems like yesterday that Federal Liberal leader Malcolm Fraser was swept into office with a massive majority, the result of an emotional, electoral backlash against the Whitlam Government. That was in 1975. A type of euphoria swept through the ranks of anti-Labor electors. The writer can claim to have been one of the few political commentators who pointed out that governments are generally voted OUT, not IN, predicting within the first few months of the Fraser Government's term in office that it was already on a disaster course. This view was based on a close study of the character of Malcolm Fraser, his background, and his clear determination not to challenge financial orthodoxy. Malcolm Fraser played a major role in the imposition of the Communist terrorist, Robert Mugabe, on the unfortunate people of Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). He revealed early in his first Government that he was an internationalist, favouring the establishment of a multicultural Australia.

Treasurer John Howard was responsible for progressively increasing taxation, even attempting to impose a tax on books and magazines.

Acting on the advice of a former official of The International Monetary Fund, John Hewson, Treasurer Howard pressed for the de-regulation of the Australian banking system. The type of policies imposed by Treasurer Howard paved the way for the defeat of the Fraser Government in 1983.

It was left to Bob Hawke's Treasurer Paul Keating, following a visit to the Mecca of International Finance, Wall Street, to return to Australia to impose bank de-regulation, something he had previously warned would allow foreign banks into Australia with the loss of Australian economic sovereignty. John Howard complained that Paul Keating had stolen his policy! Paul Keating has correctly pointed

out that the Howard-led Coalition has generally embraced the very economic rationalism and internationalism which the Keating and Hawke Governments had advanced.

It can be predicted with absolute certainty that a John Howard Government will be no more successful in solving Australia's basic problems of mounting debt, unemployment, and loss of national sovereignty, than was Paul Keating. One of his major Achilles Heels is his large backbench majority, whose Members will be the first to feel the coming electoral winds of discontent. It is no secret that a number of National Party members are opposed to the whole philosophy of economic rationalism.

And the problems associated with multiculturalism are going to mount. In his desperate attempt to avoid the charge of being a "racist", John Howard disowned the Liberal Party's candidate for the safe Labor electorate of Oxley, Queensland. The candidate, Mrs. Pauline Hanson, had made the perfectly true statement that the favouring of Aborigines through the welfare system had produced growing community resentment. Following the disendorsement by the Liberal Party, Pauline Hanson continued as an Independent candidate and was overwhelmed with public support. Her election with a swing of over 20 percent against Labor was a major sensation of the Federal elections. John Howard and his Liberal multiculturalists will have the greatest difficulty in explaining away what happened in Oxley. And they also have to face the fact that expelled Labor M.P. Graeme Campbell was re-elected as an Independent with a big majority. Campbell will certainly be the catalyst for a growing criticism of the Howard Government as it fails to improve the national situation, confirming Graeme Campbell's observation that the size of the Howard electoral victory is but a measure of the deep anti-Keating resentment of the Australian people.

The Howard Government will not only have Graeme Campbell to contend with, but a Senate in which the Democrats have increased their strength, this a reflection of the Australian electors not to give the Howard Government a complete monopoly of political power.

Those anti-immigration candidates who campaigned in both the House of Representatives and the Senate elections made a much bigger contribution to the future of Australia than they realise. A nation-wide survey provides convincing evidence that these candidates were well received everywhere. But electors made it clear that they were not going to be diverted in any way from making certain that the Keating Government was demolished. They have made a vital contribution to the growing resentment throughout Australia against the present immigration policy and multiculturalism. The writer is confident that the 1996 Federal Election has laid the groundwork for a movement which will shift Australia off its present disaster course. John Howard will be lucky to survive one full term in office.

THE "BIG PICTURE" ISSUES REJECTED by David Thompson:

When former Prime Minister Hawke was interviewed the morning after the A.L.P. election debacle, he told the A.B.C. that in his view the result has been delayed for three years by the attempt by John Hewson to introduce a goods and services tax. Keating made 'leadership' an issue, Mr. Hawke said, and now he has his answer.

There is clearly more to the election result than this, but Hawke has a point. The opinion polls had consistently shown that Mr. Keating was a "strong leader" in comparison with Mr. Howard. But there

is a great deal in **how** a question is asked in opinion polling. Keating may have been a "strong" leader, but he was also an abrasive leader, and in the end, the electorate said that yes, strong leader he may be, but we don't like **where he is leading us**. It now seems evident that a large proportion of the electorate wants relief from the continuous public tensions and divisions generated by Keating's "big picture" issues, like the republic, being a part of Asia, etc.

The A.B.C. also interviewed A.L.P. President, Mr. Barry Jones, who rather forlornly conceded that "big picture" issues were relegated to a distant second place in favour of more immediate problems like jobs, education, the health system and poverty. Jones, however, made the quite significant comment that "Australia will never be the same as it was in 1983". This the ideologues of the A.L.P. wear as a badge of pride, but it is in fact a measure of the destruction wrought by centralised power.

MAHATHIR ALSO REJECTS "BIG PICTURE": Perhaps the comment was lost in the focus on the election result, but the Prime Minister of Malaysia has also rejected Mr. Keating's "big picture" where it concerns Australia being an integral part of Asia – particularly East Asia. In a rather scathing comment Mr. Mahathir rejected any attempt by an Australian politician to assist the Asians in re-designing their own identities to include a foreign, mainly European, country with pretensions of grandeur. Mr. Mahathir was serving notice that the Malaysians would not countenance the inclusion of Australia in the "Asian" trading blocs now developing.

Mr. Mahathir's analogy of Australia as part of Asia was that of Europe. He said that Australia was as much part of Asia as the Arab nations were a part of Western Europe. The comparison is very apt, and is clearly accurate. As a matter of culture, history, language, religion, and even geography, Australia is not a part of Asia. And on the same basis, the Arab states are not "European". The only difference is that the Arabs are not foolish enough to claim that they are European, but the decadent Western Europeans are probably foolish enough to accept that they are.

ALBERT LANGER AND THE QUESTION OF VOTING:

The case of Albert Langer, again imprisoned for daring to suggest that freedom of choice extended to the right **not to vote** for those whom we oppose, has become something of a celebrated case. For all civil libertarians, the Langer case is very important. Imprisoned originally for contempt of court, having refused to desist from showing voters how they can avoid distributing preferences, Langer has managed to make his case one of principle: the question of compulsory voting.

Langer originally reacted against the Electoral Commission's arrogance in attempting to intimidate voters to do what the Commission regarded as proper, irrespective of the validity of a "Langer" vote. Langer was urging that voters avoid distributing their preferences to candidates of whom they don't approve by voting 1,2,3,3,3, etc. When it came to the courts, Justice Beach ruled that the law "imposes a duty on an elector to express a preference even though he may not have a preference for any of the candidates". The Electoral Commission had obtained an injunction from Justice Beach to prevent Langer and others from encouraging electors to vote by "writing any particular number more than once".

It is most interesting that the Electoral Commission had given, as one of its reasons for seeking the

injunction, that it would prevent "the result that no candidates for election will be returned with an absolute majority of votes as required by the Act, and that a supplementary election will need to be held". What sort of "vibes" was the Commission picking up from the electorate? That there was little enthusiasm for the paucity of choice concerning the major parties? That in sheer frustration, the electorate might simply vote **against** them all by failing to give any candidate an absolute majority?

Langer highlights another important matter of principle. It is that by his ruling, Justice Beach proposes that the law imposes a duty for the voter to express a preference in favour of a candidate that he **would never agree to accept as his representative**. That is, we are forced to vote for that which we may **consciously reject**. If ever there was a case against compulsory voting, this must be it. Even if he is an anarchist, or a Maoist, perhaps Albert Langer has performed a great service for freedom of choice. Mao Tsetung would be horrified.

THE PURSUIT OF NEVILLE GRUZMAN:

Mr. Gruzman is the Mayor of Woollahra Council in Sydney, and has become the subject of motions for his removal from local government office for "anti-Semitic" comments. The charges against Gruzman arise from a letter he had written some time ago, explaining why he would not do business with Jewish clients. An architect, the 67-year-old Gruzman had explained that, having suffered a heart attack, he would rather avoid the tensions generated by dealing with Jewish clients when he could just as easily deal with clients whose sense of business ethics were nearer his own. Gruzman, originally Jewish himself, had converted to Christianity. But this will not protect him from the "anti-Semitism" charges.

ANOTHER VOGEL AUTHOR "OUTED":

A former Young Australian of the Year, and winner of the inaugural "*The Australian*"/Vogel Literary Award, Paul Radley, has confessed that he "never wrote a word" of his award-winning novel, "*Jack Rivers and Me*", for which he won an award in 1980. The book was later published by Allen and Unwin, who also published Helen Darville's "*The Hand that Signed the Paper*" last year. The Radley book, and two others later published in his name, were apparently written by Paul Radley's uncle, Jack Radley. It will be interesting to see whether such a revelation will excite the same interest (and condemnation) as that surrounding Darville's book. Or is the "anti-Semitic" subject matter of Darville's book worthy of greater condemnation than Radley's outright deception?