

British Crown lashes out at LaRouche in Australia

by Allen Douglas

During early June, the name “Lyndon LaRouche” dominated political discussion in Australia, a phenomenon provoked not by domestic events, but as the reaction of a terrified British Crown-centered international oligarchy, to LaRouche’s growing policy influence worldwide—particularly in Russia, China, and the United States, as chronicled in recent issues of this magazine. Australia, being a key Commonwealth country and home to a very active, LaRouche-associated organization, the Crown launched what LaRouche, in a radio interview with “EIR Talks” on June 6 (see *Documentation*), called “a very savage attack against me . . . figuring that perhaps we were vulnerable there . . . to rid Australia of my influence, and, also, to use that as a springboard for attacks on me, again, here.”

There was a several-day buildup to the explosion of publicity about LaRouche.

On June 1, more than 150,000 people demonstrated in Melbourne, against radical new gun control laws proposed by the Liberal-National coalition federal government; the bills were introduced, following an April 28 massacre of 35 people by a gunman in Tasmania. Counting demonstrations in other cities, *over 1% of the entire Australian population* hit the streets—the largest mass actions since the anti-Vietnam War protests. Sections of Australia’s political establishment were scared.

On June 3, Deputy Prime Minister Tim Fischer, head of the National Party, spent most of the day closeted in “trade talks” with Sir Leon Brittan, vice chairman of the European Commission. Less than a month before, Brittan and his free-trade policies had come under fire at a major international economic conference in Beijing (see *EIR*, June 14), by a delegation led by Helga Zepp LaRouche, founder of the Schiller Institute and the wife of Lyndon LaRouche. That night in

Australia, Fischer emerged from his talks with Brittan to attack the “extremist” LaRouche, as the author of the mass demonstrations. He repeated the utterly baseless charges the next day.

On June 5, Fischer hopped on a plane to the United States to meet with top officials of the Clinton administration, ostensibly about “farm and trade” matters. That same day, the Hollinger Corp. -owned *Sydney Morning Herald* ran a front-page article attacking LaRouche. It displayed the logo of LaRouche’s Australian co-thinkers, the Citizens Electoral Council (CEC), on the front page, and LaRouche’s picture and two additional major articles devoted to LaRouche, on the inside pages. Similar attacks appeared all over the country, most prominently in Hollinger’s *The Age* in Melbourne, the country’s largest daily, and Rupert Murdoch’s the *Australian*.

On the following morning, Australians across the continent heard Lyndon LaRouche on the ABC’s Radio National program, an interview played throughout the day. On June 7, Fischer’s 6:30 p.m. press conference at the Australian Embassy in Washington, D.C. was devoted largely to LaRouche (see *Documentation*). And on the morning of June 8, LaRouche appeared live (by satellite), for the first time ever, on Australian TV, on the “Today on Saturday” show, and dismissed the absurd allegations about his “gun lobby connections.” He laid out, instead, his vision of Australia’s crucial role in the Asia-Pacific region in the years ahead.

Her Majesty’s ministers

Queen Elizabeth is the sovereign of both Britain and Australia, whom Brittan and Fischer therefore serve as “Her Majesty’s ministers.” But it was the role of a member of her Canadian Privy Council, Conrad Black, which stamped the whole attack as “made in Buckingham Palace.”

Orchestrators of the attack against Lyndon LaRouche in Australia, left to right: Australian media magnate Rupert Murdoch; Conrad Black, chairman of the Canada-based Hollinger Corp., a front for British intelligence; Queen Elizabeth II.



The Hollinger Corp., chaired by Black, was originally formed in Canada during World War II, when it was known as the Argus Corp., as a front organization for the British Ministry of Munitions and Supplies. When Black, the son of its co-founder, took over in 1985, he renamed it Hollinger, and started buying up press worldwide, led by the *Daily Telegraph* in London.

Hollinger's board is a "Who's Who" of British Intelligence, and includes, among others: Baroness Margaret Thatcher; Sir Henry Kissinger, KCMG; Lord Peter Carrington, director of Kissinger Associates and former secretary general of NATO; Henry Keswick, chairman of Matheson & Co., a pillar of the Jardine Matheson-Hongkong and Shanghai Bank complex which still runs much of the world's drug trade, according to the bestseller *Dope, Inc.*; and Sir Evelyn de Rothschild, chairman of N.M. Rothschilds & Son Ltd.

Hollinger's *Telegraph* and associated publications have, for the past several years, concocted scandals against President William Clinton in an attempt to drive him from office.

The old 'anti-Semitism' canard

Fischer also charged that LaRouche is "anti-Semitic," a calumny frequently made by Anti-Defamation League-linked circles in Australia and internationally. Asked, on his June 8 TV appearance, about Australian businessman and World Jewish Congress chairman Isi Leibler's claims to that effect,

LaRouche replied, "Well, apparently Mr. Leibler is totally misinformed. I have never had any such views. . . . As a matter of fact, for most of my life, I was raised in a part of the United States, in the Boston, Massachusetts region, and New York region, where I lived afterward, and the largest single definable ethnic, shall we say, quality of my associations, have been Jewish. I am very much against anti-Semitism, and always have been, and it is just nonsense. Mr. Leibler just keeps repeating this sort of thing, but there is no basis for it."

One of LaRouche's closest associates for the past 30 years, Anton Chaitkin, whose father Jacob Chaitkin was the chief strategist and legal counsel for the American Jewish Congress' boycott campaign in the United States in the 1930s against Nazi Germany, confronted Fischer on this and other charges, at Fischer's Washington press conference (see *Documentation*). A visibly destabilized Fischer retreated from the most extreme of his claims, so that by the morning of June 9, even the *Sydney Morning Herald* was reporting, "Meeting with U.S. government and trade officials, Mr. Fischer backed away from his claim that Mr. LaRouche, 73, was behind gun lobby protests in Australia."

The shifting political map of Australia

Fischer carried out the Crown's attack on LaRouche because he is hysterical about losing his rural-centered National Party base to the fast-growing CEC, as even Australia's press

has noted. Now headquartered in Melbourne, the CEC was founded in Queensland in 1988, and still has its strongest support in rural Australia, where many of the 75,000 copies per month of its newspaper, the *New Citizen*, circulate.

But Fischer's party is not the only one in trouble. The Labor Party, which had ruled Australia since 1983, was smashed at the polls in February 1996, because the electorate was enraged at its Thatcherite "economic rationalist" policies of free trade, deregulation, privatization, etc., which have devastated the country. The Liberal-National coalition is accelerating those same policies, and will therefore self-destruct over the coming several months as well, leaving an almost-unprecedented political vacuum in all parts of the country, rural and urban. As for the latter, the CEC is beginning to make its presence felt there as well: In Melbourne, the capital of the state of Victoria, it recently spearheaded a two-week mobilization against Victorian Liberal Premier Jeff Kennett's plans to decriminalize marijuana, which defeated that proposal (see p. 61).

Documentation

Lyndon LaRouche made the following remarks in a radio interview with "EIR Talks" on June 6, regarding the British Crown's vision of Australia's role in world affairs, and his own. LaRouche delivered abbreviated versions of these remarks in an interview with the Australian Broadcasting Corp.'s Radio National broadcast Australia-wide on June 6, and in a nationwide live (satellite) television interview at 8 a.m. (Australia Time) on June 8, on the "Today on Saturday" show.

My policy toward Australia, is that implicit in the close collaboration among a former prime minister of Australia, Mr. Curtin, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, back during World War II. At that time, the British government, Mr. Churchill's government, had a policy of a protracted war in the Pacific, in which the United States would continue to war with Japan, into the middle of the 1950s, approximately.

Under this Churchill policy, Mr. Churchill insisted, that Australia would allow Japan to invade the territory of the continent of Australia, and would reserve only a small portion of Australia, around Melbourne, so to speak, to be defended by the Australians; sort of like a protracted Tobruk exercise.

Now, what happened, of course, is MacArthur arrived on the scene, and said, "Let's have none of that," and Curtin, the prime minister, agreed. And, with Roosevelt's support, and with help from MacArthur's and Roosevelt's allies in the Navy, the battle of the Solomon Islands, and similar battles, were engaged. And, Guadalcanal was key in that. But, the

Battle of the Coral Sea, and things like that: These battles were actually *key* to the war in the Pacific, in World War II; and, led to the most economical, and most efficient, bit of war-making, under the direction of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in modern history. That is, more was conquered, by MacArthur, without the aid of any nuclear bombs, or anything, in that period of time, than by any other commander in World War II, or in previous wars, approximately previous wars.

So, there was a buildup of Australia, under this circumstance, which lasted into the 1960s, and stumbled into the 1970s, since which time, Australia has been economically demobilized—since the late 1960s, 1970s—and is now a mere fragment of what it had been earlier.

So therefore, my policy, is that Roosevelt, and Curtin, and MacArthur, were right: South Asia, East Asia, are the pivots of the future economy of the world. That's where the population is, that's where the economic growth is going to occur, because any growth per capita is going to be reflected, on the grandest scale, in South and East Asia.

So therefore, Australia is one of the outposts of European civilization, in the Indian Ocean and Pacific Basin, which is a proper place in which to engage cooperation, that is, maritime cooperation, with South and East Asia.

The British agree, in their own ways. The British view, which is Chatham House's view, came up to a head, in a China conference, Beijing conference, which my wife Helga recently addressed as one of the invited speakers, in which Sir Leon Brittan, the vice—the man in charge of vice for the European Union—spoke. And, what these guys have done, is, they had a recent conference, sponsored by Lee Kuan Yew, the former Henry Lee, of London, in Bangkok: the Bangkok Asiatic Conference, which is a real evil operation; the worst kind of parasitism. And, in Beijing, Leon Brittan tried to shove that policy down the throats of China; and, it was not well-received by the Chinese government, I can tell you that! My wife observed that at close hand.

But, Britain's idea, as Katherine West, an Australian who participated in this Chatham House conference recently, who produced a paper, has expressed: The British see Australia, as a mere diplomatic launching-point for doing dirty operations in South and East Asia; whereas, our view is different.

So, therefore, what's happened is, that the British who are attacking me from Canada, and every place else the monarchy has a means to do so, using my enemies and Clinton's enemies, such as the Murdoch and Hollinger press, and the London *Times*, and people like that, and the Bush people, to do that, have launched a very savage attack on me, in Australia, figuring that perhaps we were vulnerable there. And, they tried to get something going against me.

But, the motivation, apart from all the lies they're just retailing—the motivation is that I represent, to Australians (and there are many Australians who are like this): Go back to Curtin, MacArthur, and Roosevelt. Let's have American-Australian cooperation, of that type, again, in the new context.

Let's rebuild Australia, and get the job going. A lot of Australians like that.

Whereas, the London-directed, or, as the Australians call them, the "pommie-minded Australians," and the representatives of the British Privy Council, who actually run Australia today; these guys are very unhappy. So, they launched this massive attack on me, in Australia, both to try to rid Australia of my influence, and, also, to use that as a springboard for attacks on me, again, here.

It hasn't worked out too well for them, I should say.

The following are excerpts from the press conference given by Deputy Prime Minister Tim Fischer in Washington, D.C. on June 6 at the Australian Embassy. Anton Chaitkin is the reporter for EIR. Other reporters are designated "Q."

EIR: You said that Lyndon LaRouche had organized the recent gun lobby demonstrations in Australia. And, we got from Mr. LaRouche his responses. I wanted to get your reaction to it. He said, "Why did you tell this lie? Why are you babbling nonsense? How can anyone believe you, when you tell such lies? What makes you think you will have any credibility at all, when you babble such nonsense?"

And then, just to follow that up: Some people have said that you are hysterical about LaRouche, because he has enormous influence in the base of your party, the National Party. How would you respond to that?

Fischer: Well, firstly, the question is based on a wrong premise. I did not say, and I would not suggest, that the LaRouche organization has directly organized the demonstrations. What I did say, is that they have a pervasive influence in the extreme elements, and I don't agree with their agenda.

Some of those extreme elements are attracted to LaRouche. I give one piece of particular evidence: The publication in Australia, *Lock, Stock, and Barrel*, which is a publication out of Queensland, and which is an extremist publication with regards to weaponry in general, as you might believe from its title, and with regard to guns in particular, of course, has carried a number of LaRouche-type articles. And, it is a connection which I don't have to prove, it is a well-known connection, that there is such a connection between the LaRouche organization and extremist elements in Australia.

EIR: Getting back to the LaRouche problem: Isi Leibler said—

Fischer: Yes, he supported me! I thought that should have been put in a frame.

EIR: He said that the LaRouche influences are gnawing away at your party, and areas of your own constituency. Would you say that your party is falling apart, in that section of the country where you're confronting the LaRouche movement?

Fischer: No.

Q: Two questions on this Lyndon LaRouche matter: Is your government doing anything to counter the influence of Lyndon LaRouche, in all [areas]? And, on the anti-gun control rally; as they continue, will they get more support, do you think, for their cause, or do you think the public will just get sick of them?

Fischer: It is early days. There is a need for a lot more information to be circulated; and, the government of Australia is in the process of mounting an advertising, which has not yet taken place, which I think will help ease the burden of the situation, it being such a big change in the state of policy settings on that matter.

On LaRouche and other extremist organizations: clearly, the monitoring of our border entry points, to check on the flow of people who might be of criminal record, or otherwise, between Australia and other countries at any time—I specifically make that comment with respect to LaRouche. I would say, that it's a matter on which there have been some suggestions, that there should be some federal parliamentary inquiry into. That is a matter which is probably more likely to be looked at, at the Senate level, and the Senate has its own jurisdiction in that regard.

Q: If they're just extremists, but not criminal records; can they be kicked out of Australia?

Fischer: It's a difficult call on balance, is always to maintain freedom of speech, and democracy, and that is why I listen very closely to the grassroots of my electorate in Australia, and across Australia, on a range of issues. So, we, nevertheless, and I have genuine concerns about the anti-Semitic approach of a number of these organizations. If I get criticized for expressing that, so be it; but, it is a case that compromise is always in the circumstance of democracy, but if any organization involves illegal activity, obviously it'll be dealt with.

Q: Prime minister, you've had a lot of questions today about Lyndon LaRouche. Are you doing anything to counter his influence? Do you think he's a dangerous presence? Would he be allowed in Australia?

Fischer: Well, I'm not sure he's in a position to travel to Australia. I simply am absolutely underwhelmed and unexcited by the agenda of the range of extremist organizations of that ilk. I'm entirely opposed to anti-Semitism—

EIR: You can't even pronounce it.

Fischer: I simply say, *there is no place in Australia for the type of agenda being pursued by the LaRouche organization* [emphasis added]. I make no apology for doing so. I have legitimate concerns about that. I will not dodge on that.

Q: Do you think he's anti-Semitic?

Fischer: Well, there's some evidence of that. . . .