

4

The Contributor.

A journal of articles published by the
Policy Committee of the Liberal Party of Australia (WA Division)

Neil Van Drunen | David Honey | Timothy Glover | Bettina Arndt | Nick Goiran | Satya Marar
Alyssa Hayden | Peter Wertheim | Lisa Olsson | Peter Abetz | Moshe Bernstein | Liam Staltari
Jeremy Buxton | Josh Manuatu | Anthony Dillon | Phillip Twiss | Ghil'ad Zuckermann

The Contributor.

Fourth edition, August 2018.

Copyright © Liberal Party of Australia (WA Division).

All rights reserved, including the right of reproduction in whole or in part in any form.

Policy Committee: Chairman Sherry Sufi, Jeremy Buxton, Murray Nixon, Alan Eggleston, Monika Dunnet, Ahmed Suliman, Bianca Cobby, Dean Wicken, Phillip Twiss, Jeff Ash, Claire McArdle, Steve Thomas MLC, Zak Kirkup MLA, Peter Katsambanis MLA, Senator Dean Smith, Senator Linda Reynolds and Andrew Hastie MP.

The intention of this document is to stimulate public policy debate by providing individuals an avenue to express their views on topics they may have an interest or expertise in.

Opinions expressed in these articles are those of their respective authors alone. In no way should the presence of an article in this publication be interpreted as an endorsement of the views it expresses either by the Liberal Party or any of its constituent bodies.

Authorised by S. Calabrese, 2/12 Parliament Place, West Perth WA 6005.

Printed by Worldwide Online Printing, 112-114 Mallard Way, Cannington WA 6107.

“

If Liberalism stands for anything ... it's for the passion to contribute to the nation, to be free, but to be contributors, to submit to the discipline of the mind instead of the ordinary, dull discipline of a regimented mass of people.

- Sir Robert Menzies

27th July 1962

Contents

3.	Foreword	Sherry Sufi
4.	Seize the Battery Mineral Opportunity	Neil Van Drunen
6.	New Battlefield in Urban Development	David Honey
8.	Blockchain: The Way of the Future	Timothy Glover
10.	Feminism and Male Disadvantage	Bettina Arndt
12.	Born Alive, Left to Die	Nick Goiran
14.	Let's Get Vaping, Australia	Satya Marar
16.	Gearing Up for 2021	Alyssa Hayden
19.	Age of Polarisation: Will the Centre-Right hold?	Peter Wertheim
22.	Fixing Sex Trafficking in Western Australia	Lisa Olsson & Peter Abetz
24.	Israel's Nation-State Law	Moshe Bernstein
26.	The Enemy Within	Liam Staltari
28.	Century After Fusion: 100 Years of the Liberal Party	Jeremy Buxton
31.	Showing the Colour of Our Mettle	Josh Manuatu
33.	Overrepresentation not needed	Anthony Dillon
35.	Defending Western Australia for all Australia	Phillip Twiss
38.	Hebrew Revival: Lessons for Australia	Ghil'ad Zuckermann
40.	Letters to the Editor	



Foreword

Good policies come from the interplay between competing ideas. That's why it's important for us to maintain a strong culture of free and frank debate. To this end, the establishment of this publication in 2014 by the Policy Committee has come a long way.

We remain committed to ensuring that this modest expression of free speech continues to bring you quality content. In putting this edition together, I have as usual kept my editorial intervention to a minimum.

The stats, facts and assertions contained in these articles remain the sole responsibility of their authors. If you disagree with a viewpoint put forward by one or more of our authors then feel free to make a submission for a future edition presenting the other side of the argument. That after all is the whole point of this publication.

I am grateful to our eminent authors for submitting articles, to the members of the Policy Committee especially Jeremy Buxton for the regular feedback, to our readers for the on-going interest and to Chris Garner at Liberal Party HQ for his tireless work.

Be sure to send me your feedback on Policy.Chair@wa.liberal.org.au once you have had a read. Enjoy.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sherry Sufi'.

Sherry Sufi BA DipIS MA MHist

Policy Chairman

Liberal Party of Australia (WA Division)



Seize the Battery Mineral Opportunity

By Neil van Drunen

In 2014, the number of hand held devices, such as mobile phones, were estimated to have exceeded 7 Billion, more than the number of people on the planet at the time. Powering the vast majority of these gadgets was a lithium ion battery. First commercialised in 1991 by Sony for cameras, the lithium battery has grown from a niche to ubiquity. Batteries are now found in everyday objects such as toothbrushes all the way to powering cars and buses.

In the last year, China, and many European countries (including England) have set clear timeframes to move from petrol combustion engines to purely electric vehicles in the future. A commitment that is being reflected in the plans of global car makers and is driving up the demand for lithium batteries.

In 2016, Elon Musk, the CEO of Tesla, is said that for Tesla to meet its target of 500,000 cars a year, they alone “would basically need to absorb the entire world’s lithium-ion production.”

To meet this rising demand, battery makers are scrambling to increase production capacity and secure the necessary minerals. Some estimates suggest that the lithium value chain, valued at \$165million in 2017 will grow to \$2Trillion in 2025.

This presents an enormous opportunity for Western Australia. Western Australia mines 60% of the world’s lithium by value. Western Australia also has nearly all of the other minerals necessary for battery production.

Lithium may be the most branded battery mineral, but there is also a lot of nickel, copper and graphite in a battery- actually a lot more than the namesake lithium. Western Australia has a long history of successfully mining, so beyond extraction, the question is how far down the battery value chain can we go?

While I am not prepared to advocate that Australia

can move the entire way down the value chain and have a Tesla-esque battery farm in Perth, I do think we can move slightly further down than where we are.

In many ways, this is a safe bet. Tianqi, one of the world's largest vertically integrated lithium battery firms is in the process of setting up a lithium hydroxide factory in Kwinana. They are now looking to double it. There are also three other companies that are looking to build their own facilities. So, clearly, the economics stack up sufficiently.

The market is stepping beyond mining and onto processing to hydroxide. The next step is to create the battery precursor materials. Admittedly, to do so moves beyond the traditionally perceived comparative strengths of Western Australia as one of the world's leading mining jurisdictions. This will be a step into manufacturing and electrochemical processing.

Rather than reinventing what is already being successfully done elsewhere it may be easier to attract a company with the technology, and the patents, to create battery precursor materials. By way of example, as stated the lithium ion battery was commercialised in 1991, in 1998 the Japanese Government started funding research and development into the batteries manufacture. That was 20 years ago, and during that time a lot of intellectual property has been generated. A further advantage of attracting an existing producer of battery precursors is that they have already established contracts within the global market for a commercialised product.

Such a step down the value chain is not impossible, and does not mean Australia cannot compete. Battery precursor manufacture is a process of robots rather than cheap labour, and while capital costs may be higher, our low sovereign risk profile must surely assist.

Furthermore, currently, roughly 90% of the lithium electro chemical processing occurs in China. So there may be advantages of geopolitical diversity to offer an alternative location. Finally, with the entire battery mineral value chain in such a state of rapid growth, it is not yet determined where the value adding will occur, so why not here?

It is tempting at this point to leave the allocation of resources along the battery value chain to the market. To step back and defer to an "invisible hand" of the market decide. Such an approach ignores the possible jobs, growth and unforeseen consequences of actively attracting further

investment would bring.

It also ignores that the Government sets many of the parameters that determine whether a company invests in a jurisdiction or not. State and Federal Government have the capacity to speed approvals, prioritise projects, and ensure the necessary infrastructure is available.

While the WA State Government has recently announced they are developing a Strategy, the key roles of attracting investment and showing leadership is well within the remit of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government is better equipped to attract investment than the State Government and companies. The Federal Government has more refined mechanisms available, such as AusTrade, specialised in promoting the opportunities in Australia.

The first step that precedes this process of attracting investment is one of policy. It is for the Federal Government to make a clear statement identifying a national interest in facilitating a further step along the battery mineral value chain. Sending a signal of intent will provide certainty and transparency to the market, and hang the proverbial "open for business sign" on the door.

Neil van Drunen is a Policy Manager at the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies.



New Battlefield in Urban Development

By David Honey

Most Australians and people moving to Australia dream of owning their own home, with a yard for the kids to play in and a pet or two. It is clear that the key figures in WA Labor have a deep, even bitter, dislike of this dream and are determined to force us into high-density, collective accommodation that we don't even own.

The Labor Minister for Planning, the Hon. Rita Saffioti and her Parliamentary Secretary, John Carey, have made it clear that they intend to compel an increase in housing density in suburban Perth that completely ignores the rights of local communities and Councils to decide on the type of community they wish to enjoy.

At the end of the last session in State Parliament, the Labor Government introduced new legislation aimed to further their obsessive goal to impose increases in suburban housing density. They introduced three Bills – the Strata Titles Amendment Bill 2018 (1), The Community Titles Amendment Bill 2018 (2) and the associated Communities Title Amendment (Consistency of Charging) Bill 2018 (3).

The Strata Title Amendment Bill 2018 (1, “the Bill”) should especially concern all Members of the Liberal Party. There is considerable detail in the Bill. Two areas I wish to highlight as especially concerning are:

- The ability to compel the dissolution of a strata scheme without an absolute majority, and
- The introduction of a new form of land title called a Leasehold strata title scheme.

Under the proposed changes, an existing strata scheme may be dissolved with the following majorities:

- For schemes of four or more lots: 75 per cent of lot owners must vote in favour.

- For three-lot schemes: owners of at least two lots must vote in favour.
- For two-lot schemes: one lot owner must vote in favour.

There are major concerns with this aspect of the Bill. Strata title was introduced as a way of providing certainty for owners in a multi-dwelling lot. In effect, making sure that strata owners had the same rights and privileges as single-dwelling lot owners – if you like - making their home their castle. Under this proposal, no strata owner has any certainty that they may continue living in their apartment. A speculator simply needs to obtain control over part of the total dwellings to compulsorily acquire the other apartments. There is no requirement for the speculator to pass on any improved value to the owners of the compulsorily acquired apartments.

For example, a speculator may compulsorily acquire single story residences for the purpose of building a multi-story development without passing on any of the uplift value to the previous owners.

Effectively identical legislation has already been adopted in NSW and has badly affected people, in particular, older people. Speculators have acquired the minimum required number of apartments in the older strata schemes, especially those in more desirable areas such as those near a river or the ocean. Remaining owners with perfectly serviceable apartments are then forced out and only compensated for the unimproved value of the property. Often, the payment they receive is not enough to afford an apartment in the new development and they are forced to move to less desirable suburbs or poorer quality accommodation.

In essence, the compulsory acquisition powers of the State are being used for the profit of private speculators to the considerable disadvantage and

distress of the original apartment owners.

This aspect of the Bill seems to me to be completely contrary to the principles espoused by the Liberal Party which champions the rights of individual above the collective.

The introduction of the Leasehold strata title scheme is the most alarming aspect of this legislation. This is essentially the same form of title that is common in the UK, with the majority of people not owning the property that they live in. People have a lease for a fixed period - say, 99 years which reduces over time. The lease owner may then sell the residual of the lease to another lessee. The principal motivation is apparently around ease of redevelopment of strata schemes on Government owned land (the example given with the explanatory memorandum on the Bill). However, nothing limits this form of title to Government owned land.

It is not any stretch to say that the introduction of this new form of land title will herald the end of private house ownership for the great majority of people. Australians have had a shared dream of home ownership from the inception of the colony. It has been the principle means of saved wealth and inheritance for the next generation for most families. The Leasehold strata title will inevitably drive land ownership into the hands of a wealthy few, with the great majority simply being leaseholders.

This new title should be offensive to all Liberals and we must mount a vigorous campaign against its implementation.

The Labor party has a dystopian view of housing density and land ownership that is completely at odds with the dreams of most Western Australians. We need to be at the forefront of warning the public about their plans and use every means possible to prevent their implementation.

David Honey is the Member for Cottesloe.



I am certain...that nothing has done so much to destroy the juridical safeguards of individual freedom as the striving after this mirage of social justice.

- Friedrich Hayek



Blockchain: The way of the Future

By Timothy Glover

When we think about blockchain, three things typically come to mind: Bitcoin, cryptocurrencies and Initial Coin Offerings (ICOs). No doubt, we live in interesting times. These days IT students are becoming millionaires before they've graduated from university, while experienced traders are leaving Wall Street and turning to crypto exchanges that offer 24/7 market trading with high returns on investment.

It would be naive to assume that these people are solely seeking temporary monetary gain. What they're really betting on is where they see the future of the world heading. Let's face it, blockchain has already started to touch on each industry around the globe and it's not difficult to see why.

Blockchain technology essentially allows for decentralisation and transparency of data, backed by complex cryptography and mathematical algorithms. At the core of blockchain's philosophy is a peer-to-peer network, where users who are connected send, receive and verify transactions, all on a ledger that cannot be altered or erased.

In short, blockchain technology allows for us to remove the "middle man". Think of what Uber has done to the taxi industry. This means saving an incredible amount of time and money, particularly for larger organisations with vast amounts of data, all whilst providing a new range of accessible opportunities to the consumer.

In a world shifting away from traditional methods of transaction and heading towards this form of modern digital technology, if ever there has been a time Australia needed to come on board and lead the charge in supporting and encouraging this monumental transition, it is now.

There are a range of areas where blockchain can work wonders. Money transfers are the prime example that comes to mind. It's hard to imagine

in 2018, we still live in a world where it takes on average 3 to 4 business days to send money from the United States to an Australian bank account, yet we do. Thanks to Bitcoin and other Alternative Coins (Altcoins), such as Ethereum, Litecoin and Stellar, that process on average can now take minutes, if not seconds, depending on the speed of the network.

Other common use cases include smart contracts, Internet of Things (“IoT”), supply chain logistics, intellectual property and real estate.

For example, consider the idea that a physical asset like a block of land, physical bullion, or ownership of intellectual property (i.e. rights to a book or movie) is put on the blockchain with ownership divided into a million tokens. Up to million people from all across the world could own a single allocation in that asset, and no one could dispute each owner’s stake.

The technology allows for new and exciting possibilities. It is little to no wonder why many authors have described blockchain to be the New Internet, or “Internet 2.0”.

Unlike an Initial Public Offering (“IPO”) for public companies looking to list themselves on the stock market, businesses in the blockchain space run what is referred to as an Initial Coin Offering (“ICO”) when seeking startup capital.

ICOs are typically run by a core unit of half a dozen people with a bold, innovative idea to disrupt the industry they are in.

To date, ICOs are banned in China, whilst the Securities and Exchanges Commission (“SEC”) in the United States has officially declared Coin

Offerings as securities, leading to stringent red tape and complex legalities. As a result, ICOs have sought havens such as Singapore, Switzerland, Gibraltar, Estonia and Malta for business registration, funding and lower taxation.

Despite these hurdles, ICOs haven’t been short of funding opportunities. At the timing of this article, investors have spent a collective 13.6 USD Billion on ICO investments globally across 394 projects in 2018 alone, a collective figure already 2.5x more than the ICO funding in all of 2017 combined. That’s an average of 35 USD Million per 2018 ICO.

With these astonishing figures is clear to see Australia has an opportunity to bring millions, if not billions, of dollars into our economy. Australia should put its hand up to be that haven and encourage foreign companies to invest here, and local companies to remain here through incentivisation, easy registration and clear, concise regulation.

The fact is that Blockchain is here to stay. Yet other countries are currently ahead of us in this game. We presently have a Prime Minister with a background in digital technology who happens to be a successful businessman himself. It is high time Australia got on board this way of the future and our Liberal leadership is well-placed to lead the charge on it.

Timothy Glover is an American-Australian science fiction and fantasy writer, creative director and viral marketer with degrees in archeology, biomedical science and public health. Since 2014 he has been contracted by Universal Pictures to develop and manage creative content for the Jurassic World series.



All government, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue, and every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter.

- Edmund Burke



Feminism and Male Disadvantage

By Bettina Arndt

Last year feminist activists persuaded the Australian Human Rights Commission to spend a million dollars of taxpayer's money trying to prove there was a rape crisis on university campuses. The result was a total fizzer. A blessedly small 0.8 percent of women being sexually assaulted each year, even including gropes by strangers on public transport. All they really came up with was a lot of unwanted staring. All this was hardly surprising given that NSW Bureau of Crime statistics show university campuses to be 100 times safer than the rest of the community.

Far from celebrating our safe campuses, none of our lily-livered Vice-Chancellors dared expose the emperor's new clothes. Instead they kowtowed to the activists and introduced new sexual assault measures across the county. It's all part of a major push for universities to be involved in trying date rape cases – I spent last year trying to protect a young PhD student under investigation Adelaide University. The feminist aim is to shift the burden of proof to insure more convictions.

The damaging results of this madness is on display in America where hundreds of universities are being successfully sued for failing to protect the legal rights of young men wrongly convicted of sexual assault by university tribunals.

Yet here no challenge to the feminist narrative is permitted. Later this month I'd been invited by the La Trobe Liberal Club to speak about this issue. My gig has just been cancelled, allegedly because it doesn't "align with the strong campaign the university is running against sexual violence."

That's today's feminism – neatly eschewing evidence or reason and focussing entirely on silencing opposition to their male-bashing ideology. Feminists are no longer interested in promoting equal rights but rather unfairly advantaging women at the expense of men. It's not surprising that less

than 30 per cent of Australians are now willing to label themselves “feminist” and that percentage is diminishing as feminism veers increasingly off the rails. When feminism is defined as promoting equal rights for men and women then the numbers push up over 60 percent but every day we see fresh evidence that’s no longer the real agenda.

A glaring example of this was last year’s Canberra public service study of blind recruiting, where gender was stripped from all job applications. The assumption was this would help women overcome discrimination, but the opposite proved to be true. Blind recruiting was found to advantage men because there’s already a strong bias in favour of women in our feminised society. Naturally the public servants were then advised that blind recruiting had to go.

Every day there are further examples of feminist extremism. The #MeToo campaign morphed from an expose of serious harassment of women to a witch hunt where unethical journalists are using unproven accusations from vengeful women to destroy the careers of prominent men.

What about that dreadful television advertising campaign where the little boy slams a door in a girl’s face? Its stream of nasty images of violent males and cowering females has been shown for years now - a typical feminist whitewash of a complex social issue.

Rational people object to the central deceit being promoted by the campaign and by our virtue-signalling Prime Minister – that domestic violence is all about “respect for women”. Last year Senator David Leyonhjelm called out that lie by grilling bureaucrats in Senate Estimates Committee demanding evidence to support the television campaign. The bureaucrats couldn’t produce any research showing misogyny is the cause of domestic violence. Not in egalitarian countries like Australia. Afghanistan and Saudi Arabia, yes. But not here.

Key institutions across the country have been captured by this misleading feminist narrative which denies over 40 years of international research showing most family violence is two-way, involving both male and female perpetrators, and fuelled by a complex mix of factors like drug and alcohol abuse, poverty, mental illness and childhood experience of violence. A few months ago, a Perth counsellor was forced out of his job with Relationship Australia for posting a link on his private Facebook page to an article I wrote

summing up this research. The government-funded counselling organisation, which boasts a feminist domestic violence policy, looks set to lose an unfair dismal case over their action.

People know the politicians are telling porkies about this issue. Every week I hear from adults who grew up with violent mothers, grandparents who watch their ice-afflicted daughters terrorize their children, social workers trying to help male victims, police who go into homes and witness dangerous women as well as men.

Recently I received this message from an older woman: “I have a father, husband, 2 sons and 4 grandsons who are all the finest human beings and don’t deserve to be so maligned because of being born a male.” Women like her cringe when the WA police minister boasts of “tilting the law in favour of victims” – knowing that means denying men basic legal rights. They are appalled that the world’s most privileged young women are being fed feminist lies about discriminatory wage gaps.

Whilst they applaud the achievements of girls in schools they worry about boys dropping out, disengaged by an increasingly feminised curriculum. They wonder how their granddaughters will find educated mates when already 60 percent of graduates are women. Many have watched their sons turfed out of marriages and false accusations of violence used to deny them access to their children. They don’t understand why our national suicide bodies won’t research the reasons why five of the seven people killing themselves in Australia every day are males.

There’s a growing realisation that feminism has become a divisive force in our society and we’re seeing the start of a fight-back. Lifeline recently cancelled a domestic violence seminar after 15,000 signed a petition protesting the involvement of man-hating feminist Clementine Ford who tweets regularly about killing men. Police in Brisbane refused to join White Ribbon’s pledge against violence against women, instead making pledges to “Stand up against violence against everyone” – which White Ribbon then refused to use.

When will our conservative parties realize they do themselves no favours aligning themselves with feminist male-bashing policies? Somehow these politicians failed to notice it was white men, the deplorables, who put Trump into power – with a huge number of women supporting them.

Bettina Arndt is an Australian Author, Social Commentator and Columnist.



Born Alive, Left to Die

By Nick Goiran

The objects of the Liberal Party of WA include the promotion of justice and equality of opportunity among all people and the maintenance of the rule of law. Evidence from prolonged questioning in Parliament suggests these essential principles are absent for a vulnerable group of Western Australians. At present, there is a two-tier system for children born in our State. Most are treated as first class citizens. A small number are treated so poorly it would be an insult to classify them even as high as 'second class' citizens.

Between July 1999 and December 2016, 27 Western Australian infants were born alive after surviving an abortion procedure. In each case Parliament has been told that there is no record of any treatment or medical intervention being performed. It is also now known that the Department of Child Protection was not notified about any of these children. Tragically this trifecta of systemic abuse has been confirmed in the further advice that these child deaths were not reported to the Coroner's office.

Regardless of one's views on abortion, this issue is at its core about equality before the law. Section 269 of our Criminal Code states that "a child becomes a person capable of being killed when it has completely proceeded in a living state from the body of its mother". In addition the 'born alive rule' is well-established in common law. These 27 infants were citizens and were entitled to the same rights, privileges and protections as any other Western Australian child. That includes the provision of the necessities of life as entrenched by Section 262 of the Code. Equal treatment must be shown regardless of the circumstances of a child's birth and any actions to the contrary are against the law.

The Department of Health did not report the live births to the Department of Child Protection despite an agreement between the two departments to notify "when an unborn or newborn baby is identified as at risk of abuse and/or neglect". This agreement serves no purpose if it is not adhered

to. Sadly, the identification of this systemic failure is of no comfort to the 27 children.

Compounding this systemic breakdown in the protection of children-at-risk, the Department of Health also did not report the subsequent deaths to the Coroner's office. Instead officials self-determined that the cases were not reportable because the death of the infants was expected, conveniently initially stating "there were significant foetal abnormalities that were incompatible with life".

Yet upon further interrogation, the same Department informed Parliament that no data is collected on whether these diagnoses are correct after the birth and that due to "patient confidentiality" the Department could not reveal whether in any of these 27 cases the baby did or did not have a condition compatible with life. Indeed further data obtained from the Department reveals that many late term abortions have been undertaken for conditions compatible with life. Consequently it is a statistical improbability that all of the 27 infants had a condition incompatible with life.

Even if that were found to be true, the complete lack of any medical care is in itself inconsistent with the Department's ordinary practice documented in its Perinatal Model of Care. Regardless it is now almost two years since the Coroner informed a Parliamentary Committee that these deaths "could be considered a reportable death".

Indeed the approach by the Department of Health is even more troubling when one considers a coronial inquest in the Northern Territory delivered on 10 April 2000. In that case, baby Jessica Jane was delivered alive between 22-23 weeks gestation following an abortion procedure on 14 July 1998 at Darwin Private Hospital and died 80 minutes later.

The attending nurse was left alone and was shocked when the baby she delivered began to cry and showed strong signs of life. She wrapped the baby in a blanket and called the doctor, who dismissed her concerns for the baby. During the inquest, the nurse said "I desperately wanted to do more, but felt my hands were tied."

The Coroner found "there was no procedures or protocols in place for her to refer to. None of her supervisors were available to help her; she tried to telephone them but to no avail." The Coroner made the point that the public have a right to be informed and take part in any debate and the coronial process is the means by which they are informed, saying "this is why it is important that

these deaths be reported to the Coroner".

The Coroner concluded that "the fact that her birth was unexpected and not the desired outcome of the medical procedure, should not result in her, and babies like her, being perceived as anything less than a complete human being... The fact that her death was inevitable should not effect her entitlement to such care and attention".

In a further attempt to expose and remedy this systemic abuse of children-at-risk, last year I delivered the largest petition tabled in the Legislative Council in 2017. The petition addresses these facts: at least 27 premature babies did not receive the same standard of care as normally provided in our State; the Department of Child Protection was never notified about these 27 Western Australian children at risk; these 27 Western Australian babies were left to die; none of these 27 deaths were reported by the Department of Health to the Coroner; and the Ombudsman has said he has no jurisdiction to inquire into these child deaths.

In response, Labor's Minister for Health wrote to the relevant Standing Committee saying that he "will not be recommending a review on the process or an inquiry into individual cases". Distressingly this type of obstructive response has now become the norm for the McGowan Government in various areas of governance. This is precisely why a parliamentary inquiry is needed and why I have implored the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs to resolve to do so.

Hon Nick Goiran MLC is the Shadow Minister for Child Protection; Prevention of Family and Domestic Violence.



Let's Get Vaping, Australia

By Satya Marar

19,000 Australian smokers succumb to a premature death every year. In a strange paradox, ours is the only first-world Western government to keep a proven safer product, electronic cigarettes or vapes, out of the hands of those looking to quit or improve their health.

It is even stranger that this illiberal approach is maintained by state and federal governments despite government data showing that our historic smoking decline has stagnated while the smoking rates of the United Kingdom, continental European countries and the United States – all nations that have legalised vaping, continue to plummet.

That smoking cessation has stalled on our shores despite punitive anti-smoking measures including plain packaging and taxes which have made our cigarettes the most expensive in the world, highlight the need to rethink our current approach to tobacco control.

Legalising vaping is a compassionate approach that is not only a proven tobacco harm reduction strategy embraced by eminent public health bodies and medical experts worldwide, but upholds the Liberal principle of informed consumer choice. Unlike most of our expensive public health programs, allowing smokers to access these products won't cost the taxpayer a single cent and will save lives.

Tobacco leaves combust when a cigarette is lit, releasing tar and carcinogens which are injurious to smokers and those around them. Vapes allow smokers to access nicotine to satiate their cravings in a vapour-based medium, without exposure to these toxins and tar. By imitating the action of smoking and delivering nicotine far more efficiently, they provide a more desirable and effective alternative to conventional nicotine patches and gums.

Nicotine itself is a mild stimulant that is recognised as no more dangerous than caffeine. Vapes are also good news for non-smokers since research has

shown that second-hand vapours have a negligible health impact on those who are exposed to them, unlike the fumes from a cigarette.

The UK-based Royal College of Physicians concludes that vaping is at least 95% less harmful than smoking and is likely to be even less harmful. Studies have found that smokers who switched to vaping nicotine managed to drastically lower the build-up of carcinogens and toxins in their own bodies, potentially adding years to their lives. As of 2014, over 6 million smokers had given up smoking by switching to vaping in Europe alone, and millions more have made the switch since. Why should Australians be denied the right to improve their health enjoyed by the citizens of other first-world countries?

Sceptics contend that vapes could act as a 'gateway' to cigarettes by helping to normalise smoking. Nearly a decade of evidence from the United States and Europe shows the opposite – teenage and adult smoking prevalence continues to plunge despite the widespread uptake of vaping, confined almost exclusively to former smokers. Rather than acting as a 'gateway' to smoking – vaping is a gateway away from smoking. In the UK, public health agencies and medical professionals actively advise smokers to switch to vapes while advertising regulations ensure that these products cannot be marketed to non-smokers or the underaged. These regulations could easily be implemented in Australia if vaping was legalised.

Unfortunately, the current ban on possessing or selling nicotine solutions has some perverse and cruel results. Vapers are treated like criminals, risking fines of up to \$45,000 (in WA) or even imprisonment for possessing the solutions at state law. Unlike Europeans and Americans, Australians cannot obtain nicotine solutions from trusted local retailers subject to product safety regulations. Instead, many are forced to order products from sometimes dubious overseas websites, transferring wealth that could go to innovative local businesses out of the country.

The rapidly innovating vape industry also supports a social community that brings together former smokers who motivate each other to quit. A cursory internet search will take you to a number of online forums where vapers not only discuss the latest developments, but advise each other on products tailored to their individual needs and preferences. This advantage is unique to vaping and does not come with any other quit smoking strategy.

Some smokers prefer to quit cold turkey – indeed,

many manage to quit 'cold turkey' over 40 times before they finish relapsing. Others prefer to quit with the help of patches and gums. Providing another option that has proven its effectiveness can only be beneficial at a time when governments worldwide recognise the importance of tobacco harm reduction. Providing an effective quitting option is also important as tobacco taxes are regressive in that they disproportionately affect our poorest citizens who are less likely to quit and more likely to smoke as relief from stress or depression than the wealthy.

Recent polling in Perth and Fremantle shows that almost 70% of voters support the legalisation of vaping, confirming the adage that good policy is good politics. Legalising vaping offers state and federal Liberal governments nationwide the opportunity to enact a meaningful, life-saving change for the better while bringing Australian public health policy into line with our Liberal values and international best practice.

Satya Marar is the Director of Policy at the Australian Taxpayers' Alliance and the former president of Macquarie University Liberal Club.



Gearing up for 2021

By Alyssa Hayden

Fifteen months ago the State Liberal Government had completed the biggest investment in health, education and transport infrastructure this State had ever seen.

However the public didn't know what was next under a Liberal government.

At a time when unemployment was high and issues like household bills and mortgage stress were front of mind, the public turned towards Labor's policies like more apprenticeships at Western Power and local manufacturing of train carriages.

Fifteen months later, the important question is, have we, the Liberal Party, learnt from our mistakes and started to implement the changes required well in advance of 2021?

Whilst I know we have started, we still have a lot of work to do. I believe the campaign in Darling Range demonstrated that we are on the right path and there are many key attributes which should be noted.

The National Party

Yes, I know.

Working with the Nationals in WA probably doesn't invoke the best memories. The past eight years in Government didn't demonstrate unity between our two Parties and sadly a strong partnership wasn't achieved.

However, I believe we are on the road to putting that behind us. The past is water under the bridge and we need to focus on building a strong alliance.

We may not see eye to eye when it comes to every policy and nor should we, but we need to recognise that at a campaign level we have to be united. We have to have our sights set on our common enemy.

The Labor Party have a myriad of union backing along with organisations such as Get Up! and support from various left wing Parties. They outspent us 5 to 1 during the Darling Range Campaign.

National MPs and their party members were out at Pre-poll and doorknocking in the days and weeks prior to Election Day. They created the very effective “Put Labor Last” campaign and engaged with the “Save Moora College” Campaign.

For too long we have watched the unions play the game of wearing shirts with a slogan and no Labor branding, and for too long we have taken the high ground and remained focused on traditional campaigning methods.

Well this time we didn't – and it worked!

We are in a time where the public are unfortunately not so trusting of the major parties, with votes bleeding to the many new single issue minor parties. We witnessed that a straight forward message on one issue, devoid of branding was welcomed by voters.

The additional attention the “Put Labor Last” campaign created made a significant impact, not only in Darling Range but across the State.

Getting back to our grassroots

If you were to compare and contrast our campaign against Labor's, based on our online presence alone, the difference could not have been greater.

For every selfie my opponent had with a cute dog, I had posted several of my community visits that day which included the Byford Child Care Centre, Volunteer Fire Brigades, Serpentine Jarrahdale CRC, community gardens, local orchard growers and several small businesses.

To be out and about at the grassroots level is more important now than ever. The general negative opinion of politicians can only be overridden from face to face engagement. It also provides the local content that is required to run a successful social media campaign.

Community groups are the front line of local service delivery and are well aware of the negative impacts the McGowan Government is having. I was able to listen, learn and understand the local concerns and needs, which guided my campaign.

Grassroots is not confined to the electorate boundary, it is also a wider community sentiment. As was proven, cuts to core services like School of the Air and Moora College pulled on the heart strings of the community across the State, with many people having a personal connection to rural WA. A quick look at The West's letters to the editor confirms that the issue is being felt in the suburbs as well as the regions.

The community events and BBQs I hosted through

the campaign included these issues and we had the “Save Moora College” and “Put Labor Last” campaign volunteers join us, including their quokka mascot.

The media footage of us down in a suburban park surrounded by local families was in stark contrast to my opposition's campaign launch the day before, surrounded by a sea of Members of Parliament, Labor Party faithful and unionists in red shirts.

Swinging voters shared their thoughts with comments like, “I'm voting for Alyssa because I've seen her around”, “I'll vote Liberal cause the Liberal candidate seems to be everywhere in the community”, and “I met Alyssa when she knocked on my door, she's listening”.

Being part of the community is vital and can only be achieved by being involved at the grassroots level.

A Strong and United Party

Darling Range traverses the Federal divisions of Canning, Hasluck, Brand and Burt and the support of local branches are vital to ensure local intelligence, support and manpower.

It is also important to note that many of the volunteers during the campaign travelled from outside of the Darling Range electorate. They included members from across the State as far reaching as O'Connor and Durack.

Of course, this can only be the case during a by-election when our volunteers can focus on one seat, but nevertheless it demonstrated the true strength of our Party. That when the time arises, the WA Liberal Party state-wide came together to achieve our great win.

It is also worth noting, since the last election the State Parliamentary Team have had a strong focus on reconnecting with the Party Members and have also set up open dialogue with the State Director and the Policy Committee.

In conclusion, fifteen months later, we have certainly made some major changes and the win in Darling Range is a testament of that.

Since the last State Election, our campaigning has undergone significant modernisation, we're working as a team, reconnecting with our members, the local community and partnering with our friends in the National Party.

We need to embrace the steps forward we have made and continue to be united and listening.

What a difference fifteen months makes, imagine

our strength by 2021.

Alyssa Hayden is the new Liberal Member for Darling Range having won the seat in the recent by-election. She was previously an upper house

member for the East Metropolitan Region for eight years. Prior to entering politics, Alyssa and her husband worked in their own small business, with her husband still operating the business today.



*Nothing is more wonderful than the art of being free, but
nothing is harder to learn how to use than freedom.*

- Alexis de Tocqueville



Age of Polarisation: Can the Centre-Right hold?

By Peter Wertheim

Minuscule far-right political groups have for decades inhabited the murky fringes of Australian politics. The last 10 years have seen a burgeoning of such groups. They represent every conceivable gradation of far-right political opinion, from anti-immigrant and anti-globalist groups who seek to ‘restore’ Australian democracy, to secretive cabals of Hitler-saluting neo-Nazis who are intent on overthrowing it. Young white males in search of meaning and purpose seem especially susceptible to their call, the mirror opposites of their jihadi counterparts.

The insecurities engendered throughout the Western world by technological disruption, financial collapse, political scandals, mass migration and the spread of terrorism have convinced these groups that the international and supranational institutions that have formed the political, economic and military architecture of the post-World War II world – including the UN, NATO and the EU – no longer work. In their place, they have sought refuge in nationalism and a re-assertion of state sovereignty.

With the electoral success of Donald Trump in the US on a platform of “America First”, of Brexit in the UK and of ultra-nationalist parties in Europe, it is little wonder that these groups feel that they have the political wind in their sails. Each in their own way taps into “a deep current of anger, resentment and nostalgia for an imagined past that was orderly, predictable and patriarchal”.

Still largely hidden from the wider community, but destined to burst into open acrimony at some stage, are the ideological fault-lines that divide these groups. My colleague, Julie Nathan, has discerned three categories of far-right groups who she identifies as “civic patriots”, “nationalists” and “racialists”.

“Civic patriotism” is the stream that is closest to the views of Australia’s mainstream political parties, except that it is overtly and implacably anti-Islam and favours an immigration policy that explicitly excludes Muslims. Civic patriots, in common with many conservatives, believe that Australia’s constitutional, political and legal foundations have been distorted and undermined by a concatenation of global and local forces - “international bankers”, “cultural Marxists” and “global Islam” - which they believe have operated to enrich a small elite at the expense of the many. They seek a restoration of the integrity of “compromised” traditional Western institutions.

Civic patriots subscribe to the stereotype of Muslims as having a supersessionist theology and proselytising history, which makes them incapable of assimilating into Australia’s secular society. However, the concern of civic patriots is to preserve what they see as Australia’s traditional political and civic culture, not a biological race. Civic patriotism thus differs from much of traditional far-right discourse by distancing itself from antisemitism. Indeed many civic patriots see Israel as Western civilisation’s front line of defence against the threat of “global Islam”.

Australia’s “nationalists” share the anti-Islam and anti-globalist creed, but they differ from the civic patriots in that they see traditional Western institutions as part of the problem. While criticising “cultural Marxists” for poisoning society with “identity politics”, they loudly promote the identity of Australia’s majority racial or ethnic group, aping their counterparts in the US with the slogan “white power”. They define themselves primarily as members of a perceived race and ethnicity, not as citizens of a State. For the moment, Muslims are their main target, but their bigotry extends to all minority ethnic communities. Jews are earmarked as a long-term target.

The “racialists” are a more extreme version of the nationalists. They seek the violent overthrow of democracy and the imposition of an explicitly Nazi dictatorship by “Aryan” whites. The newest such group, Antipodean Resistance, whose Hitler-saluting members hide behind the anonymity of “death’s-head” masks in all their videos and photos, actively promotes and incites hatred and violence. Its anti-Jewish and anti-homosexual posters include graphic images depicting the shooting of Jews and homosexuals in the head. One poster called to “Legalise the execution of Jews”. Other posters urged homosexuals to commit suicide; one of these was widely distributed during the

same sex marriage debate.

There remains an ideological bright line that divides the mainstream right-of-centre parties in Australia from the far-right. A cornerstone of the Liberal Party in particular is its commitment to the freedom of the individual, which takes priority over the demands of any collective - State, social class, ethnic group or “race”. The Liberals are also ideologically committed to democracy, the rule of law and the equal rights of all Australians regardless of race, gender or sexual preference. There are elements within the thinking of all three categories of far-right groups which are incompatible with these values.

Yet Australian history suggests that some followers of the contemporary far-right will adopt the tactic of “entryism” (or entrisism) of the centre-right parties, if they have not already begun to do so, if only to push the latter’s policies further rightwards. The tactic was invented by Trotskyists in the 1930s in their attempt to make social democratic parties more militant, but it has also been adopted in Australia over the years by the far-right.

The presence of several hundred Nazi collaborators and war criminals among the 2 million migrants who arrived in Australia from Europe in the first 20 years after World War II has been well-documented. They came from the Balkans and central and eastern Europe and were fanatically nationalist, anti-communist and anti-liberal in their politics.

Several of them and their sympathisers allegedly went on to commit terrorist and other violent acts on Australian soil. Some became active in the Liberal Party from the 1950s onwards. László Megay, who had been listed as a wanted war criminal by the UN War Crimes Commission, was a leader of the Liberal Party’s Migrant Advisory Council in the late 1950s, sharing a speaking platform with senior Liberal politicians, including a Federal Minister. As mayor of Ungvár in wartime Hungary, Megay is accused of enthusiastically aiding the Nazis in rounding up the town’s 18,000 Jews and confining them to a ghetto in appalling conditions before they were transported to the Auschwitz death camp where most of them were murdered.

Another figure, Ljenko Urbančič, presided over the Liberal Ethnic Council in the late 1970s and was a member of the Executive of the NSW Liberal Party. His rise within the Liberal Party was interrupted in 1979 with public revelations about his role in wartime Slovenia as an anti-Western, antisemitic

propaganda broadcaster for the Nazis.

Urbančič nevertheless escaped expulsion from the party. He and his associates, who included other extreme-right emigrées with histories of collaboration with the Nazis, were among the 'Uglies' faction and continued to be active within the NSW Liberal Party well into the 2000s. Their openly declared mission was to push party policies and operations further to the right, and at times they turned on moderate Liberals who stood in their way.

Another notorious attempt to infiltrate a Coalition party was the push in the early 1970s by the antisemitic, white supremacist Australian League of Rights to flood the National Party of Australia with its members and effect a takeover. After a struggle lasting several years, mainstream Nationals under the leadership of Doug Anthony defeated the League.

Looking back, one can say that in the climate of the Cold War those on the centre-Right of politics, who were understandably pre-occupied with Soviet aggression abroad and Soviet espionage within Australia, were blind-sided on the opposite political flank. They were often oblivious to the threat to democracy and individual freedom posed by those on the extreme right.

In our own time, one can only hope that this kind of mistake is not repeated. Legitimate concerns about Islamist terrorism and threats to democracy ought not to become pre-occupations that leave us with a blind-spot about the gathering threat to our democracy, freedoms and safety emanating from the far-right of politics.

Peter Wertheim AM is co-CEO of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry.



*How do you tell a communist? Well, it's someone who reads
Marx and Lenin. And how do you tell an anti-Communist?
It's someone who understands Marx and Lenin.*

- Ronald Reagan



Fixing Sex Trafficking in Western Australia

By Lisa Olsson and Peter Abetz

Western Australia is at a crossroad when it comes to tackling the sex trade and human trafficking; which is the consequence of a prostitution-industry left to it self and driven by excessive demand. Bills legalizing prostitution are debated across the nation and have been adopted in some states – even though statistics from other countries show that this leads to a massive increase in demand for sexual services and consequently also to an underground market of human sex-slaves trafficked into Australia.

In Queensland, where prostitution and brothels have been legalised, the Crime and Misconduct Commission has stated that after legalizing prostitution “sex trafficking was one of the unfortunate consequences of an industry driven by excessive demand.” The pattern is the same in all the countries where prostitution is legalised. The Netherlands legalised prostitution year 2000 and since then organised crime has kept control over the legal sectors of the industry and according to the national police force 50-90 % of the women in licenced prostitution are trafficked into the industry against their will.

The consequences of legalising prostitution are being recognised around the world. The Council of Europe recently published a report on prostitution and human trafficking stating that, “legalization has proved ineffective, unable to either protect the victims involved or to break the ties between prostitution and organised crime.” In order to tackle the problems connected to the sex-trade many countries turn to what is know as the “Nordic approach” to prostitution, which instead of legalising prostitution criminalises the purchase of sex.

This targets law-enforcement measures at sex buyers rather than the already vulnerable persons in prostitution. The legislation does not criminalise

the persons selling themselves, as they are often desperate and susceptible to exploitation, and it makes available significant funding for programs to assist those wanting to leave the sex-industry.

The Nordic Approach, first adopted in Sweden, has been so successful that the European Council now has recommended all member-states to adopt the legislation. In Sweden it immediately led to a drop in demand for sexual services, and street prostitution was reduced by 50 % in just a few months. Another positive effect was the public's attitude towards purchasing people for sex. Today the majority of Swedes, especially young people, support the ban.

The law is said to have made a clear statement about respect for women and gender equality – women are not commodities to be sold or bought – and it was part of a bill on violence against women supported by the feminist movement as well as Labour and the Greens. Their view was that prostitution is inherently violent and unequal, driven by men with money exploiting those that are most vulnerable and in need of protection.

The Australian Federal Government has quite recently launched a nationwide initiative combating and preventing violence against women which stresses the importance of a society where women are respected and which aims to: "Advocate for respect, gender equality, inclusion and nonviolence" and "Make sure the nation is free from disrespect and violence against women". Both sides of politics in Western Australia acknowledge that the current legislation on prostitution is inadequate. Legalising prostitution, however, does nothing to promote gender equality, inclusion and nonviolence, nor does it lead to a

nation free from disrespect and violence against women. It is contradictory to invest large amounts of taxpayer's money into an initiative to combat violence against women, and at the same time consider legalizing prostitution where 68-80 % of the women experience regular physical and sexual abuse.

The sex-industry throughout the world opposes the Nordic Approach as it destroys the bulk of their otherwise lucrative business. One organisation that has been very successful in spreading misinformation about the Nordic Approach in Australia is Scarlet Alliance, which purports to be the voice of sex workers in Australia, but in practice is a mouthpiece for the sex industry. However, as more and more countries around the world adopt the Nordic Approach to prostitution with positive results, the sex-industry lobbying organisations are losing influence.

It is encouraging that the Liberal Party Conference in Victoria recently passed a motion calling on the party to take the Nordic Approach as a policy to their next state election. The fact that Liberals in Victoria, the first Australian state to legalise prostitution, have adopted this position should encourage Western Australia Liberals to do the same. By adopting the Nordic Approach we can move closer to being a society that stands for respect, gender equality, inclusion and nonviolence. The choice of which path to take at this political crossroad should not be a difficult one.

Peter Abetz, former Member for Southern River (2008-2017), Secretary, Adopt Nordic WA inc

Lisa Olsson, Legal representative for Scandinavian Human Rights Lawyers in Australia



Criticism may not be agreeable, but it is necessary. It fulfils the same function as pain in the human body. It calls attention to an unhealthy state of things.

- Winston Churchill



Israel's Nation-State Law

By Dr Moshe Yehuda Bernstein

On July 19, 2018 Israel's Knesset adopted the Nation-State Bill as Basic Law, its equivalent of a constitution. This declarative law reaffirmed the State of Israel as "the national home of the Jewish people" and the uniqueness of the latter's "right of national self-determination". It confirmed a "complete and united Jerusalem" as Israel's capital, the Israeli flag as the national banner, the menorah as its official symbol, Hatikvah as its anthem, and Independence and Memorial Days as national holidays. The bill upheld Hebrew as the official language, while downgrading Arabic from its official standing held during the British Mandate, yet, rather contradictorily, insuring that this relegation "does not harm the status given to the Arabic language before this law came into effect."

The mainstream media depicted this law in direful terms as an "end to Israel's democracy". Turkey's strongman Recip Erdogan claimed that the law proved "the re-emergence of Hitler's spirit" in Israel. The usual chorus of left-wing detractors, both domestic and foreign, bellowed "apartheid" and "fascism", charges that have been hurled at Israel long before the bill came into effect. Finally, Mahmoud Abbas suggested that, based on this law, the UN should once again definitively label Zionism as racism.

Despite the harsh verbal protests, it should be noted that Israel's Nation-State Law closely resembles those in effect in other European countries claiming national rights of self-determination. Spanish nationality and language is prioritised over other ethnic minorities, as is the case in the Baltic states, where Estonian, Lithuanian, and Latvian language and culture are legislated as cornerstones of national identity, despite the existence of substantial Russian minorities. The clause expressing the unique right of Jews to national self-determination in no way negates the individual rights already granted to Israel's minorities in prior Basic Law: Human Liberty

and Dignity. While some decry the formalisation of Israel as a Jewish state, no similar objections are heard to the 27 nations which specify Islam as an official religion, the 13 European countries which do the same for Christianity, or 40 others which allot preferred status to a specified faith.

Given that this law was largely explicative, reiterating elements stated in Israel's Declaration of Independence, UN Resolution 181, and the Preamble to the British Mandate for Palestine, why did the government need to enshrine these principles into Basic Law? Some argue that this was merely a domestic ploy by Netanyahu to energize his constituency. However, Netanyahu enjoys a significant lead in the polls: it is doubtful his coalition would risk the negative reactions triggered by its passage simply for gaining another percentage point or two. Others argue that since Israel's Supreme Court—which embraces a post-Zionist, progressive worldview—has ruled that its Declaration of Independence cannot serve as a precedent for judicial considerations, it was necessary to enshrine the Jewish character of the state into Basic Law. I believe, however, there is a deeper, strategic consideration that transcends the more tactical motives.

Seven years ago, MK Avi Dichter, then Chairman of the Foreign Affairs and Defence Committee, first filed the proposal for "Israel as the Nation-State of the Jewish People". Dichter formerly served as Director of the Shin-Beit, Israel's internal security services, as well as Minister of Internal Security and of Home Front Defence. Of all the members of the Knesset and Cabinet, Dichter is probably the most qualified in assessing Israel's security requirements. As a nation that has been in a state of war since its inception, Israel has nonetheless managed to develop its successful, innovative economy. It has also been forced to extend both its offensive and defensive military capacities. In that regard, its army, air force and intelligence services are among the world's best. It has created the notable Iron Dome missile defence system and provided every Israeli citizen with shelters in the event of missile attacks, which occur in Israel with appalling regularity. Israel, however, not only confronts the physical threat of rockets and missiles. Increasingly, the Palestinians, and its Western lapdogs of the left, threaten Israel politically by delegitimising its status as a Jewish state. One of the main tools in this campaign, carried out primarily but not exclusively by the BDS movement, is the Palestinians' bogus claim to a 'Right of Return'.

Today there are no more than 20,000 Palestinians who lived in present-day Israel prior to the 1948 War of Independence. While Palestinians claim that the original 700,000 Palestinian refugees were driven from their homes by Jewish soldiers, there is substantial evidence that many fled on instructions broadcast by the Arab armies to temporarily abandon their homes for what was wrongly assumed to be a swift victory against the Jews. Others fled out of fear to live under Israeli rule. Those who remained became Arab citizens of the State of Israel, their descendants currently comprising 20% of Israel's population and, through its Basic Law, enjoying the same individual rights as Israeli Jews.

Unlike the refugee status granted to any other peoples, through the establishment of UNRWA, Palestinians bequeath their refugee status to their descendants in perpetuum. Thus, today there are over 5,000,000 Palestinian 'refugees' claiming the Right of Return. Many of these live in the US, Canada, Europe, Australia and the UAE and would probably never consider leaving their jobs and homes to rebuild their lives in the Jewish state. Yet, even as a hypothetical fantasy, the myth of the Right of Return is used as a tool to delegitimise Israel and defame it as a racist, apartheid and genocidal country. (Considering the growth rate in the West Bank and Gaza stands at 3%, the latter charge is particularly spurious.)

Thus, the Nation-State bill serves as a strategic bulwark against the ongoing delegitimization of Israel as a Jewish state. While the law will not stop its detractors from expressing their ongoing contempt, which they do not display toward other nations with similar laws, it draws a line in the sand and boldly embraces its esteem of nationhood against those who seek to dismantle it. For Australians who appreciate the value of a national culture, despite the shrill outcries against it, support for Israel's nation-state law should be unequivocal and unquestionable.

Dr Moshe Yehuda Bernstein is a Rabbinic Scholar with a PhD that examined the Jewish community of Kaifeng, China. He is a current Research Fellow at Curtin University.



The Enemy Within

By Liam Staltari

In 1994, James Kurth's *The Real Clash* set out to challenge the seminal work of his mentor, Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilisations*. Where Huntington saw a post-Cold War world defined by conflicts between civilisational groupings, Kurth fixed his eyes on the battle that was rapidly emerging within the ascendant West – between defenders of the capitalist and liberal democratic Judeo-Christian order, and the denizens of the post-modern Left. Twenty-four years after Kurth put pen to paper, in the age of the 'baby Trump' balloon and the shocking violence and repression of 'Antifa', it's clear that his contention was nothing short of prescient.

Across the Western world and increasingly within Australia, the terminal decline of the centre-left and its replacement by radical elements threatens to upend the moral and institutional mix that has underwritten modern peace and prosperity. While we see this most clearly in Europe and North America, Australia is not immune. Whether it's in the escalating attacks on our national symbols, the outright rejection of the rule of law by the likes of ACTU Secretary Sally McManus, or the insidious creep of the 'Safe Schools' program into too many classrooms across the country, the far-left is bolder than it has been for decades.

For many Young Liberals and centre-right activists on university campuses, this anti-civilisational push is nothing new. In student union offices, far-left activists have long toiled towards the overturning of the capitalist system, the excision of faith from the public sphere, the atomisation of the traditional family unit and the silencing of intellectual dissent. I will never forget the madness of the National Union of Students' 2015 National Conference at Mannix College in Melbourne – the whoops and cries of Labor Left-aligned delegates as one of their number took to the stage and laid the world's issues at the feet of "...white, Western European Ashkenazi Jews" and the raucous applause that met the Young Labor Unity leader who claimed as his "human right" the ability to spend his dole "...on booze and darts." That Young Labor Unity is typically regarded as the more 'sensible' faction

within Labor's youth wing, and that the speaker has a bright political future ahead of him beggars belief. But that is precisely what is so new – not the radicalism of elements of the left, but their growing influence, confidence and improving prospects within organisational politics.

For all of their ideological ills, many of these activists are talented and, over the course of decades, will scale the greasy rungs of the student and trade union ladders, ultimately seeking to wrap their hands around the levers of state and federal power. While it lacks the speed and brutality of the Corbynista takeover of British Labour, this quiet push will lead to the same outcome – a polarised Australian political scene that pits the mainstream centre-right against a far-left alternative that despises all those things that make our country great. Already, we can see the ideological tectonics shifting. Under Bill Shorten's leadership, the Party of Hawke and Keating increasingly succumbs to the worst economic impulses of Sally McManus and John Setka, and to the social agenda of Roz Ward. Shorten hopes that this Faustian Pact will deliver him the keys to the Lodge, but win or lose it may cost him the soul of the Labor Party and steer Australian politics into dangerous waters.

Where once both major Australian political parties differed mainly on issues of tax and welfare, today new fault lines emerge around our national pride, our foreign policy commitments to the United States and Israel, and our basic faith in the organising power of mixed-economy capitalism. We need to reckon with a future in which only one reliable advocate for Western Civilisation remains standing among the major parties: the Party of Menzies. In one sense, this presents great short-term political opportunities – the no-nonsense pragmatism of the Australian electorate will likely punish a radicalised ALP. But in the long-term, when the pendulum of power begins its inevitable swing from right to left, our way of life will face an unprecedented threat.

Where does this leave everyday Liberals? It leaves us, more than ever, with a civic and moral duty to fight and win elections, and to do so on a policy platform of unabashed and unapologetic conservatism. Examine those who cling to Shorten's coattails and it quickly becomes clear that the stakes are higher than ever. As mundane and trivial as everyday political debate can sometimes seem, it now forms the frontline in the broader fight for the soul of our country and, ultimately, our civilisation. Importantly, the times also demand that we emphasise the political contrast between the Liberal and Labor Parties, putting forward a mainstream and patriotic conservative vision that champions our country and its values, just as our opponents set about their destruction.

In some respects, Kurth's prediction returns our Party to the setting of its creation – an age in which Australian Labor was wracked by a communist insurgency, and in which Menzies spoke with unmatched moral clarity to a listening nation. In this, we can take hope – those circumstances gave rise to the Menzies Era and twenty-three years of uninterrupted conservative governance. Now more than ever, the time has come for Liberals to step forward and be counted.

Make no mistake – the 'Real Clash' is here.

Liam Staltari is the President of the WA Young Liberal Movement and Federal Treasurer and Campaigns Director of the Young Liberal Movement of Australia.



Century after Fusion: 100 Years of the Liberal Party

By Jeremy Buxton

1909 was a year of crucial importance in Australian political history. Alfred Deakin led his Protectionist Party into a union with Sir George Reid and Joseph Cook's Anti-Socialists (formerly the Free Trade Party), ousted the minority Labor Government of 1908-09 led by Andrew Fisher, and formed the first united non-Labor federal government.

Deakin's third and last Government lasted only from May 1909 until it was defeated at the elections of April 1910. Some historians give greater significance to the fact that 1910 saw the election of the first majority federal Labor government. But the popularly-named 'Fusion' of 1909 created the first official Liberal Party.

In so doing, Australia was saved from one of the most negative features of British politics; the persistence of two antagonistic middle-class political parties, with neither able to destroy nor absorb the other. The liberal-conservative party of British politics, the Conservatives, must constantly look over their shoulders at a hostile Liberal Democrat Party that threatens their safe seats.

Although in many respects a party of the Left, the British Liberals are a far greater electoral threat to the Conservatives than to Labour, because they compete for rural and upper middle class suburban seats.

The positive legacy of the 1909 Fusion is even more important. Firstly it brought together the sundered non-Labor forces that represented a fracture on state and regional lines. The Anti-Socialists held 26 of the 75 seats in the House of Representatives in 1909.

They drew their main electoral strength from NSW, dominating Sydney and its surrounds and held most of the non-Labor federal seats in Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania. They held six Victorian



seats in rural or in wealthier suburban areas. There were 17 Anti-Socialists in the 36-member Senate.

Deakin's Protectionists had 16 official MHRs, eight of them in their stronghold of Victoria where there were also four Independent Protectionists. Protectionists rather than Anti-Socialists held five outer rural seats in northern and southern NSW.

Sir John Forrest and another Western Australian conservative MHR were aligned with the Protectionists but had withdrawn from the 1905-08 Deakin minority Government on account of its reliance on the votes of Labor members. There were only three Protectionists in the Senate.

In hindsight the unification of non-Labor forces appears as logical and necessary as the melding of the sundered liberal-conservative parties and lobby groups by Menzies into the revived Liberal Party of 1944. Yet in 1909 it required a great deal of courage and self-sacrifice.

The Deakinite 'true believers' at the core of the Protectionists had seen Reid's party rather than Labor as their chief opponents, and their social liberalism was compatible with many Labor policies. Indeed in 1901-04 and 1905-08 Reid led the Opposition to Protectionist governments that in turn were reliant on Labor support.

Outright opposition to Labor would threaten the electoral prospects of those Protectionists holding working-class Melbourne seats. Indeed these seats were lost in 1910. Three other Protectionists including former Cabinet Minister Sir William Lyne attacked the decision to merge and aligned themselves with Labor.

Although providing the majority of the members of the new Liberal Party, the former Anti-Socialists had to make a significant concession: Sir George Reid as a long term antagonist of Deakin left Parliament, with his successor and former deputy Joseph Cook giving way to Alfred Deakin as party leader and Prime Minister.

The new Liberal Party had to face a strong and popular Labor Party in a difficult electoral climate. The 1910 election was a severe defeat that wiped out many of the former Protectionists, whose electors did not accept the 'Fusion'.

Deakin's health gave way and he left Parliament in 1913 when Cook subsequently led the Liberal Party to a one-seat victory and a year in Government. Labor retained a massive Senate majority in 1913 and comfortably won the first double dissolution election of 1914.

However when the political landscape changed dramatically in 1916-17 the Liberal Party displayed the same adaptability that had brought about the Fusion of 1909. In the crisis over conscription for World War I, Labor Prime Minister Billy Hughes led 24 of his Parliamentary colleagues out of the Labor Party into a merger with the Liberal Party.

Once again Joseph Cook as the leader of the larger component of the renewed liberal-conservative party gave way to a more charismatic leader. Billy Hughes led the new Nationalist Party from 1917 as Prime Minister until 1923.

The Liberal Party had in effect absorbed the right wing of the Labor Party, bringing a return of those centrist voters who had deserted them in 1910 and reinforcing the tradition of Deakin's social liberalism and nation building.

After 1922 the Nationalist Party in turn adapted to the new Country Party that had deprived them of voters and seats to seize the balance of power in the House of Representatives. A basic liberal-conservative unity was maintained though the Bruce-Page Nationalist-Country Party Government of 1923-29 that set the pattern for future stable Coalitions.

The liberal-conservative practice of ingathering and amalgamation probably saved Australia from socio-economic implosion in 1931 when the Nationalist Party rebranded itself as the United Australia Party under the leadership of the former ALP Cabinet Minister (but natural conservative) Joe Lyons.

John Latham who had led the Nationalists in Opposition from 1929 followed Cook's example of standing aside for Joe Lyons as a more electorally popular exponent of liberal/conservatism.

Lyons brought with him only a few ALP defectors. The real achievement of the new UAP was to defeat Labor extremism and to absorb the energies and direction of thousands of angry, threatened middle Australians who had been drawn into potentially destructive citizens' movements –forerunners of One Nation and PUP. Under Lyons and Menzies (after 1939) the UAP held power with substantial electoral support until its collapse in the early 1940s.

Robert Menzies in both founding and reviving the Liberal Party in 1944 was continuing the tradition begun by the 1909 Fusion, drawing together fragmented liberal-conservative groupings after earlier disunity and electoral defeat.

Menzies' particular achievement was to give

the Liberal Party a sustainable grass roots organisation and financial independence. Unlike its predecessors the Liberal Party has not needed to rebrand itself after electoral defeats.

When the ALP split in 1955 the largely Catholic, anti-Communist dissidents formed the Democratic Labor Party in preference to joining the Liberals. Nonetheless Menzies adopted the principles and tactics of inclusion through his 1963 decision to extend state aid to Catholic and other Independent schools, a body blow against what remained of sectarian exclusiveness in liberal-conservatism.

The history of the Liberal Party in its different incarnations over more than 100 years is to a large degree a history of amalgamations, which depend upon pragmatic compromise and inclusiveness. It is an honourable record. John Howard has spoken with great conviction on the importance of the Liberal Party's "broad church", it was the original "broad church" of nineteenth century Anglicanism that was less preoccupied with dogma and ritual and was thus seen as more authentically Christian.

On the other hand, Australian Labor Party history has been defined by acrimonious splits, engendering a sectarian pride in the casting out of traitors and the enforcement of loyalty and conformity. Whenever Labor is invoked by some 'true believers' as a substitute religion, we know that it is not a religion of forgiveness and tolerance.

The second enduring legacy of the 1909 Fusion lies in the intellectual and policy strands of liberal-conservatism that meet in the current Liberal Party. George Reid's Free Trade/Anti-Socialist Party has in retrospect finally won the policy battle in favour of economic rationalism and the modern global economy, with the realisation that the protectionism championed by Deakin had for many years deformed and shackled the Australian economy.

There would have been no enduring future in 1909 for a Party negatively labelled as Anti-Socialist. Reid was nevertheless a successful, reforming Premier of NSW in 1894-99 who replaced tariffs with income tax and reformed land policy in the face of ultra-conservative opposition. As a Premier who recruited Joseph Cook and others from the ranks of Labor, he was as much a liberal as a conservative.

Deakin however has an equally important legacy of liberalism, social democracy and nation building. He enjoyed the support of pragmatic conservatives like Forrest as well as that of left of centre radicals. His contribution as a framer of the Australian

Constitution in the 1890s far exceeds that of Reid.

The Fusion of 1909 has cemented Deakin's place as a liberal-conservative icon. If Fusion had not occurred, and if the Protectionist Party had decayed after Deakin's death, it is all too possible that his legacy would have been appropriated by the ALP. Economic liberalism and social liberalism may sometimes clash but they are far from incompatible.

The Fusion of 1909 is not just some event in distant Australian political history. In a very real sense, it created the Liberal Party of today and should make us aspire to continue in its most vital tradition, that of the liberal/conservative broad church.

Jeremy Buxton is a Liberal Party Life Member and its Selection Committee Chairman who has been an Adviser on Electoral Affairs since 1995. He is also a member of the Policy Committee.



Showing the Colour of Our Mettle

By Josh Manuatu

As conservatives, it goes against every instinct to speak up and to make the case on the issues that are important, but unless we do we will continue to see radicals capture the imagination of middle Australia.

Today in Australia, people have more access than ever before to news and opinion – be it through print media, 24 hour TV news stations, social media and websites but despite this, there has never been a bigger shortage of centre-right voices putting forward cogent, mainstream and sensible views that speak to Menzies’ Forgotten People. At a time when there is a resurgence of socialist thought being pushed through many of our institutions and, importantly, through free media, this is deeply troubling.

A prime example of the group-think being pushed by the elite media was the complete overreaction to the Young Liberal Movement’s motion at the Liberal Party’s Federal Council to privatise elements of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation.

It is entirely unremarkable for the Young Liberals to bring forward a fresh approach to a Liberal Party’s Federal Council. For my part as the Young Liberal President, it is my job to speak up for Young Liberals around Australia in line with the policies that they elected me to prosecute. It is also entirely unremarkable for the Government and Ministers of the Crown who are guided by the national interest, to disagree with those ideological policy suggestions that we have brought forward.

It was right for the Young Liberals to draw to the fore the fact that we have \$1.2 billion dollars a year being dished out to a lop-sided Australian Broadcasting Corporation that gives it staff millions of dollars in bonuses, spends millions on trying to draw people away from other news outlets and the best they have to show for it is half an hour a day of Tom Ballard trying to be funny, backing Yasmin Abdel

Magied's self-promotion rampages and the daily 4 against 1 on The Drum. This gargantuan amount of money is being spent at time where we have half a trillion dollars in debt that my generation will have to pay back with interest for today's excesses.

On this front, while Communications Minister Mitch Fifield has done a good job at trying to rein in the ABC's excessive spending and indulgences, there is a feeling within the Young Liberals that more can and should be done including drastic actions like privatisation in circumstances where the ABC is seemingly so unselfaware that it can't take corrective action itself.

But instead of this motion bringing about a discussion on whether the ABC should rein itself in, many in the media (mostly in the ABC and their friends in Fairfax) went on a tirade about how this topic shouldn't have even been discussed – that's right, the authoritarian left have now become so self-assured that they are dictating to the party of freedom and smaller government what we can and can't talk about. Spooky stuff.

The reason this is important is because it highlights the one-sidedness of political opinion given air-time in Australia and the way in which the media elite close ranks to protect their own – something that is near impossible to break through.

On the other side of the equation, we see many people drawn to the cult international personalities of Milo Yiannopoulos and Lauren Southern who, while speaking some sense, often do so in such a way that is crass, crude and deliberately offensive. That said, it is difficult to be critical in circumstances where there is a clear void that we are failing to fill.

And I say this as someone who for a long time sat back waiting and hoping for someone to come forward and to put forward the views that I hold in the public domain in a thoughtful and articulate way. For me though it came to a point where I got tired of waiting for others to lead the charge and thought that if I, as someone who had worked for Senior Ministers and who had been elected to leadership roles within our party, was unable to find my voice how could I be critical of others? When I wrote my first opinion piece, published by Fairfax in late 2015, I was surprised at the high levels of support and encouragement I received from not only fellow Liberals but from ordinary members of the community who shared my view. Indeed, I quickly found that by showing my preparedness to speak out that there were many others who in turn were encouraged to do the same.

Now more than ever, it is vital that more Liberals

find our individual voices to make the public case for sensible centre-right policy in line with our uniting Liberal values as espoused by Sir Robert Menzies in the We Believe statement. Because it's easy to be disappointed and despondent about decisions that the Parliamentary Party makes from time to time but unless we are prepared to stand up and to make the case and lead the charge, how can we be critical of such back-downs.

It is important that we as the organisational wing and the true custodians of our values, seek to do more in our own ways to make the case for our values which can then in turn allow the parliamentary wing who work hard to deliver for all and are guided by the national interest to deliver.

It's this formula that has seen the Liberal Party be the most effective political force in Australian history and something that will continue to do so.

Josh Manuatu is the Federal Young Liberal President.



Overrepresentation not needed

By Anthony Dillon

Earlier this year I was privileged to attend the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in New York. I was nominated to attend by our government and did so as an independent participant.

The overall mandate of the Permanent Forum covers economic and social development, culture, the environment, education, health and human rights. Such a mandate provides an ideal forum for debating issues that affect Indigenous people around the world. While I saw much good input at this international forum, I noticed some recurring themes that are similar to those that dominate the Indigenous affairs discourse here in Australia.

This is perhaps not surprising given that Indigenous speakers can make claims which may then become the subject of investigation by a UN Rapporteur who may then bounce them back to Australia in the form of a scathing report. Such reports or comments typically take on an aura of infallibility and authority.

In this article I discuss two themes that I often observed in discussions at the forum that I believe hinder the advancement of Aboriginal people. I do so in the hope that it will improve future participation with the UN Forum that will ultimately contribute to outcomes that have real benefit for Indigenous people both here in Australia and around the world.

The first theme was the use of the term 'We' when discussing Australian Indigenous people as if they were all one homogenous group all affected by the same problems and having the same priorities. Repeatedly I heard how we Indigenous Australians are 'oppressed', but was less likely to hear the myriad stories of Indigenous Australians achieving greatness in all fields of endeavour. Such stories could have been a great way to show how solutions to the problems affecting too many Indigenous people can be real and achievable, not

just hypothetical. Some of the people who claim that 'we Aboriginal people are oppressed' have achieved much themselves, so I question their motives.

An example of a real and serious problem that does not affect all Indigenous Australians and was discussed at the forum, is the loss of Indigenous languages. For those communities where grandparents speak a native language but their children and grandchildren do not, then I think this requires attention. However, it should not automatically be assumed that any group of Indigenous Australians who do not speak a native language require an intervention that seeks to revive or promote an Indigenous language. And where a response is warranted, the focus should not just be exclusively on language, but well-being more generally. When the people are well nourished and living in safe environments, native language is more likely to be maintained.

The second recurring theme I observed was the excessive use of rhetoric. In my experience, very few things characterise Indigenous affairs in Australia more than over-the-top statements. Terms like 'racism', 'genocide', 'assimilation', and so on have been so overused that they are not only meaningless but dangerously misleading. I abhor rhetoric because it is simply a convenient way to avoid tackling the tough issues. For example, claims of 'sovereignty never ceded' are far easier to make than addressing serious problems like employment, housing, and violence.

As an example of rhetoric in this country when discussing Indigenous affairs, look at any Indigenous protest march and you will see 'Stop the Genocide' signs and banners. Naïve onlookers (or participants at a UN forum unfamiliar with the real-life Australian context hearing about these protests) may be left with impressions of mass killings as in, say, Rwanda. In reality, when the term is used at protests, it is used as an emotive weapon to sensationalise both history and the present and to demonise white Australians.

The issues I would like to see raised at UN forums are that while many Indigenous Australians are doing exceedingly well, there are still far too many who live in unsafe environments that lack access to modern services and fresh food. The problems of child abuse and violence in Indigenous communities, along with poor health, unemployment, substandard housing, and sickness, should be front and centre at these forums. And accompanying discussions on these problems should be an acknowledgement of the

many success stories.

Not every Australian can talk at the UN, but we all can and do have a voice here in Australia; we have influence. When discussing Indigenous affairs, let's safeguard against misrepresentation through over-generalisation on the basis that all Indigenous Australians share the same problems. This not only exaggerates the seriousness of problems, but also, and worse, masks success and opportunity. And let's say what we mean and mean what we say using precise descriptive language, because rhetoric ruins.

Anthony Dillon is a Commentator on Indigenous affairs and an Academic at Australian Catholic University.



Defending Western Australia for all Australia

By Phil Twiss

Thirteen years ago the then Minister for Defence, Robert Hill, visited the Pilbara port of Dampier to announce the forward-basing of an additional two of the new Armidale Class patrol boats recognising the vulnerability of the billions of dollars of offshore and onshore oil and gas infrastructure in the region. Over a decade later, and with half a trillion dollars of additional oil and gas investment there is no sign of a patrol boat base in Dampier and little increase in Defence assets consistently deployed in the more than 4,000 kilometres of coastline stretching between Perth and Darwin.

If anything, there is less as the Dampier based police patrol vessel, Delphinus, is retired with no planned replacement. One could be forgiven for thinking that the broader regional and global threat to Australia through this part of the world was significantly diminished, negating the need for an increased active military presence in the region. However, the 2016 Defence White Paper, numerous strategic assessments, parliamentary reviews, and many other national and international sources assessing both state and non-state actors in the broader region indicate that this is not the case.

Why it is then that, despite major Defence spending announcements in recent Federal budgets, so little is earmarked for the sparsely defended but strategically vulnerable offshore zone to our North West? The reasons behind the budget decisions will no doubt be explained as complex part of a bigger strategic picture, however in this writer's view, they are the product of two broader perceptual drivers.

The first being influenced by long standing tensions over strategic priorities inherent in Australia's Defence establishment and the second, a limited appreciation for the vulnerability of the North Western approaches and the economic significance they hold for all of Australia. Until these two issues

are at least partly resolved it will remain all too easy for Canberra based decisions regarding security in this region to remain in the too-hard basket. It is time to take the North West out of this basket and address the Defence issues with the appropriate gravity and urgency before it is too late.

To explain the first issue, one need only immerse themselves in the seven Defence White Papers produced between 1976 and 2016 in which it becomes readily apparent that widely divergent views on Australia's Defence have a significant role to play in why a "defence lite" approach dominates the 4,000 kilometre gap between Perth and Darwin.

The White Papers reveal an ongoing tension where self-reliance and defence of Australia doctrines clash with the currently fashionable "rules-based" approach, in which Australia is said to play a role on the wider regional and global stage. A simple summary of which is that, if our region and the world in general is more stable, due to the enforcement of the global order, then Australia's general strategic risk is reduced and therefore threats to the mainland or littorals are reduced to something close to non-existent.

While this writer agrees in part with the rules-based approach, history has proven its limitations when various state or non-state actors simply stop playing by the established rules and conventional enforcement measures cease to be effective. There is no question that Australia's cooperation and participation with other middle and great powers is critical to its broader strategic objectives and its ability to defend itself in a conventional war scenario.

However, the assets and capabilities necessary to successfully participate in the enforcement of a global rules-based system or conventional war are of limited practical efficacy to cost-effectively maintain border security on a consistent and ongoing basis. To react with the necessary speed and provide a credible deterrent to hostile state actors at short notice, defence assets need to remain on station or forward deployed on and around the remote coastal areas of the North of Western Australia.

Neil James, the executive director of the Australian Defence Association, has been a strident critic of arguments for any buildup of defence capabilities and infrastructure in the North West of the state, citing in the third issue of *The Contributor* a misunderstanding among many of the difference between perceived "threats" [sic] and general

strategic risk. James, in effect, dismisses the concerns of Western Australians as being mostly driven by strategic ignorance and economic self-interest.

While James is quite right to point out that the deterrent value of the Australian Defence Force (ADF) needs to be maximized and that 'overall strategic utility,' operational capabilities, sustainability, economic factors, and so on are necessary in considerations of where bases are located and assets deployed, his approach fails to integrate the realities of relatively localised threats with the strategic security of Australia in a more general sense.

As effective as Australia's infantry, armoured and support units are when deployed into the field in places such as East Timor, Iraq and Afghanistan and likewise, our Super Hornets and frigates or air-warfare destroyers in neutralising enemy assets in the Persian Gulf region, it is questionable how effective these actions are in protecting Australia's interests closer to home.

The arguments behind strengthening the defence of the North Western approaches and littoral zone in Australia cannot simply be seen in terms of an isolated and merely perceived threat but must be considered as they apply to Australia's broader strategic aims – primarily, but by no means only, the defence of Australia's interests on and around its own vast coastline.

In the last ten to fifteen years, investment in oil and gas onshore and offshore assets between Exmouth and Ashmore Reef alone has been around half a trillion dollars, from which billions of dollars of royalties and revenues will continue to flow into state and federal coffers. Iron ore and other onshore resources, although naturally far less vulnerable, are still wholly dependent on safe and clear shipping lanes. Future oil and gas developments, now entering a new phase of investment evaluation and ultimately execution, are highly dependent on the perception of long-term security remaining a key competitive advantage for Australia's economic future.

The sheer size and value of these developments means that they are assets critical to Australia's prosperity and economic security and not just a benefit to Western Australia and its regions. The protection of not only the existing infrastructure but the ongoing development of the region is critical to Australia's future security and success. Australia has spent billions and lost precious men and women deployed in the Middle East for the

very purpose of keeping the sea-lanes open and critical energy resources flowing from the Persian Gulf and into Singapore. It makes no sense to leave sea-lanes and infrastructure relatively unprotected in our own backyard.

The 2016 Defence White Paper identifies Northern Australia as an area that needs to be strengthened and identifies a growing level of sophistication and scale of the terror threat to maritime resources. Despite this, the current plans to upgrade defence capabilities in the region are either vague or non-existent and current defence assets provide very limited capability against difficult to detect asymmetric threats that may be able to act faster than conventional forces can deploy.

The recently completed Ichthys and Prelude fields, with their massive gas and condensate processing facilities and hundreds of personnel on board, are within 200 kilometres of Ashmore Reef which is frequented by hundreds of Indonesian fishing boats. The nearest naval base, HMAS Stirling, is over 1700 kilometres away - or two days' sail. HMAS Coonawarra, the Patrol Boat base, is around the same, while the only permanently manned air force base north of Perth is RAAF base Tyndale in the Northern Territory - its FA-18 Hornets out of effective combat range of the offshore installations. While coast watch surveillance measures are in actual fact very good for the region, they are unable to intercept or interdict possible threats.

Air assets are limited in capability and unable to effectively stop any identified threats short of conventional military targets. Without armed

naval vessels in relatively close range at all times the offshore assets and ports remain vulnerable to opportunistic attacks which, in themselves, could be devastating to the Australian economy but this is only part of the broader strategic picture for the region and Australia.

As mid-Twentieth Century history shows us, threats to our North West are real and, given the vast investment and resource wealth discovered and developed since, makes those threats something we should be even more mindful about. This by no means calls for us to approach defence of the region in an isolated manner, and James' argument that we need to have a 'holistic' focus considering the Defence of Australia in a geo-political and geo-strategic context remains true.

However, one needs to be realistic in terms of the limitations a rules-based doctrine provides when the rules no longer apply. As isolated and remote as the North West of Western Australia is, there is no denying how critical its on going security is for all of Australia both in peacetime and war. Building credible security and deterrent capabilities within the region that involve both Defence and broader government policy strategies should be a key priority despite the logistical and operational challenges.

Phil Twiss is a current member of the Liberal Party of Australia (WA Division) Policy Committee and has served in both the Royal Australian Navy and Army Reserve.

“

If you set out to be liked, you would be prepared to compromise on anything at any time, and you would achieve nothing.

- Margaret Thatcher



Hebrew Revival: Lessons for Australia

By Professor Ghil'ad Zuckermann

In our globalised world, more and more groups are losing their heritage. Language revival is becoming increasingly relevant as more and more people seek to reconnect with their ancestors, recover their cultural autonomy, empower their spiritual and intellectual sovereignty, and improve their wellbeing and mental health. Therefore there is an urgent need to offer comparative insights, for example from the Hebrew revival, which is so far the most successful known linguistic reclamation.

I was born and grew up in Israel, and eventually became an expert of the Hebrew revival. I fell in love at first sight with Australia in 2001, when I was invited to deliver a public lecture at the University of Sydney. At the time, I was a visiting professor at the National University of Singapore, while on sabbatical from the University of Cambridge in England. I returned to Singapore and Cambridge, but decided to look for an academic position in Australia. When I arrived in Melbourne in 2004, I asked myself how I might contribute to Australian society that was hosting me so graciously.

I identified two pressing in situ issues: (1) the exasperating bureaucracy (there are democracies, and then there are aristocracies; some people might define our Israel as an adhococracy; modern Australia was founded as a bureaucracy, and today is a professionalized one); and (2) the suffering of the Aboriginal people. I said to myself: How could an Israeli professor assist in reducing Australian bureaucracy?!? I decided to invest my efforts in the Aboriginal issue.

Had I been a dentist, I would have tried pro bono to improve dental health among the Aboriginal people. I once offered a toothpick to an Aboriginal friend of mine after I shouted her a tender steak, to which she replied: "What is this?" "It is a toothpick", I said. "I don't have any teeth", she retorted. (I had not noticed that she had chewed the steak with her gums.)

Had I been a psychologist, I would have tried to assist some Aboriginal people break their addiction to alcohol or smoking. But I am a linguist specializing in the revival of Hebrew and the emergence of the Israeli language, a hybrid language based on Hebrew, Yiddish and other languages spoken by revivalists.

So, I found a fascinating niche, in totally virgin soil: reclamation and empowerment of Australian Aboriginal languages and cultures. I decided to act in three fronts: macro, micro and “MOOCro”:

In the macro: since 2004: establishing “revivalistics”, a global, trans-disciplinary field of enquiry surrounding language reclamation (no native speakers, for example Hebrew, and Barnjarla Aboriginal language of South Australia), revitalization (severely endangered, for example Shanghainese, and Adnyamathanha of the Flinders Ranges, South Australia) and reinvigoration (endangered, for example Welsh, and Te Reo Māori in Aotearoa, i.e. New Zealand).

In the micro: since 2011: reclaiming the Barnjarla Aboriginal language of Eyre Peninsula (e.g. Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Augusta; South Australia). This is not a laboratorial enterprise. I asked the Barnjarla community if they were interested and they told me that they had been waiting for me for 50 years. How do I – a Jewish Israeli, son of a Holocaust survivor – help Aboriginal people undo what I call “linguicide” (language killing) done by English colonizers and reclaim the Barnjarla language? By means of a dictionary written in 1844 by a Lutheran Christian German, Clamor Wilhelm Schürmann! This is, then, a patently cosmopolitan enterprise.

In the MOOCro, so to speak: since 2015: creating and convening a free MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) entitled Language Revival: Securing the Future of Endangered Languages. So far I have had 11,200 learners from 190 countries (including Syria and Afghanistan).

I have detected three types of benefits of language revival: The first benefit is ethical/moral: Aboriginal languages are worthy of reviving, out of a desire for historic social justice. They deserve to be reclaimed in order to right the wrong of the past. These languages were wiped out in a process of linguicide. I know hundreds of Aboriginal people who were “stolen” from their parents when they were kids. I believe in what I call “Native Tongue Title”, which would be an extension of “Native Title”. I propose that the Australian government grant financial compensation for the loss of

languages – to cover efforts to resuscitate a lost language or empower an endangered one. In my view, language is more important than land. Loss of language leads not only to loss of cultural autonomy, intellectual sovereignty, spirituality and heritage, but also to the loss of the “soul”, metaphorically speaking.

The second benefit for Aboriginal language revival is aesthetic: Diversity is beautiful, aesthetically pleasing. Just as it is fun to embrace koalas (in the hope that they have had their nails cut short) or to photograph baby rhinos and elephants, so, too, it is fun to listen to a plethora of languages and to learn odd and unique words. For example, I love the word mamihlapinatapai, in the Yaghan language, spoken in Chile’s Tierra del Fuego archipelago. The word is very precise and to the point in its meaning.

Any attempt to translate it cannot be performed in fewer words than the following: “a look shared by two people, each wishing that the other will offer something that they both desire but are unwilling to suggest or offer themselves”. Despite the fact that any word in a language is translatable, there is a difference, at least aesthetically, between saying mamihlapinatapai and saying “a look shared by two people, each wishing that the other will offer something that they both desire but are unwilling to suggest or offer themselves.” As Nelson Mandela said, “If you talk to a man in a language he understands, that goes to his head. If you talk to him in his language, that goes to his heart”.

The third benefit for Aboriginal language revival is utilitarian: Language reclamation empowers individuals who have lost their sense of pride and at times also a reason to live. This wellbeing empowerment can save the Australian government millions of dollars that would otherwise need to be invested in mental health and incarceration, not to mention the various cognitive and health benefits of bilingualism.

Finally, if you, by any chance, encounter a person reckoning that if all people in the world spoke only one language (say, American), there would be no wars, kindly ask them to Google ‘Rwanda 1994’ or ‘Syria 2018’.

Professor Ghil’ad Zuckermann (DPhil Oxford, PhD Cambridge, MA Tel Aviv, summa cum laude) is Chair of Linguistics and Endangered Languages at the University of Adelaide; President of the Australian Association for Jewish Studies; Expert Witness in corpus lexicography and forensic linguistics.



Letters to

Dear Editor

We as Australians with a South African heritage wish to thank the Liberal Party of Western Australia for the support shown to our efforts to highlight the plight of victims of crime in South Africa and especially our family members, often farmers, that are targeted.

Since March 2018, we organised four marches in Brisbane, Perth, Adelaide and Sydney to express our concern about the unacceptable levels of violence in the South Africa, especially the high levels of brutality associated with hate crimes against minorities. The marches also expressed our support for calls by party leaders to address concerns by fast-tracking the immigration of South African farmers to Australia on humanitarian and protection visa programs.

We appreciate the support from members of Federal and State parliaments and the Senate. In particular, we are extremely grateful to the Liberal Party in Western Australia for ensuring that the Government considers the dire position of minorities in South Africa and continuing to highlight the issue in mainstream media.

We noted with particular appreciation the adoption of a policy motion by the Federal Council in June 2018 calling on Federal Government to enable the South African minorities targeted by hate crimes to seek asylum in Australia.

Australia was actively involved in bringing about the peaceful democratic transition in South Africa and, like all its peoples, subscribed to Nelson's Mandela's vision of a prosperous rainbow nation. As South Africa reintegrated into the global community commercial and other ties between South Africa and Australia deepened. Many South Africans migrated to Australia and Australian businesses moved to South Africa, as a portal to Africa. More than as 100 000 Australians visited South Africa last year.

Nearly 25 years later the picture is more concerning. High levels of corruption and mismanagement resulted in low economic growth and high levels of unemployment. Institutions that were established to protect minorities are under pressure and radical politicians create political instability, chanting "Kill the Boer, Kill the Farmer" and "One Settlor, One Bullet." With the governing party adopting a policy of expropriation without compensation, we are very concerned about our families and the peoples and future of South Africa.

We appreciate the continuing engagement and support of Australian political leaders in the political and economic development of South Africa, the well-being of its peoples and the concerns of its Australian citizens with a South African heritage.

Yours sincerely,

Arno Nel, South African Community

the Editor...

Dear Editor,

Right now the Liberal Party has an issue in the wider community. The general public aren't listening to us anymore – I believe I know why.

As a new member of the party I was excited to attend last year's State Conference. I had hoped that it would be somewhere to present fresh ideas and policies. Possibly even put forward ideas that would counter the general public's stereotypical view of who we are. Instead I was astounded at the number of empty motherhood statements masquerading as policy, designed to only appeal to the branch members.

The policy motions ended up in the media within hours of being emailed from head office. They were savaged. This was no case of the "left-leaning media" beating the party up. They were just reporting on the motions presented.

Those of us that make the effort to join the Liberal Party are not the people that we should be seeking to win over with policy motions at State Conference. It is the people that identify with the classic broad church Liberal Party views. These are the Forgotten People of today. These voters are being sent directly to Labor and the Greens because we are endeavouring to cosset party members.

So much valuable energy is being devoted to "signature" issues that have no relevance to actual Liberal voters in our communities. Take Section 18C. Tony Abbott fought for changes to be made to the act, yet conceded after his failure - "Leadership is about preserving national unity on the essentials and that is why I have taken this position,". Indeed. Seemingly every year since 2014 there is another push to amend 18C. I don't know how many of you have read the judgements handed down under the current wording of the act. If you're fighting for the right to taunt someone with racial slurs then I know there are minor parties looking for members.

Modern Australia is changing. Take the same sex marriage plebiscite results. Voters in Liberal held seats voted yes at higher rates than in Labor seats. In Tony Abbott's seat of Warringah 3 out of 4 respondents voted yes. Many thousands of Western Australian Liberal voters voted yes. Why are we not tailoring our message to the centre right of the political spectrum? Elections are never won on the fringes, they are won in the middle. John Howard knew this, look at how it worked for him.

I understand the desperation coming out of Queensland with the strength of the One Nation vote there. Is it worth losing the support of moderate Liberals in a rush to appeal to the xenophobic low information voter? Surely we are better than that.

The general election is still months away. We are able to change the proposition that we are putting to the Australian people. If our message doesn't appeal to the political centre then there will be a long political wilderness. We will be resigning ourselves to political oblivion. Let's get that message right.

Yours sincerely,

Jeff Ash, Perth Division

WE

WANT

YOU

*This journal belongs to you.
So write an article or a letter!*



Email Policy.Chair@wa.liberal.org.au to find out more.



In Australia, its people and its future.

In the innate worth of the individual, in the right to be independent, to own property and to achieve, and in the need to encourage initiative and personal responsibility.

In the basic freedoms of thought, worship, speech, association and choice.

In equality of opportunity, with all Australians having the opportunity to reach their full potential in a tolerant national community.

In a just and humane society, where those who cannot provide for themselves can live in dignity.

In the family as the primary institution for fostering the values on which a cohesive society is built.

In the creation of wealth and in competitive enterprise, consumer choice and reward for effort as the Proven means of providing prosperity for all Australians.

In the principle of mutual obligation, whereby those in receipt of government benefits make some form of contribution to the community in return, where this is appropriate.

In the importance of voluntary effort and voluntary organisations.

In parliamentary democracy as the best system for the expression and fulfilment of the aspirations of a free people.

In the separation and distribution of powers as the best protection for the democratic process.

In a federal system of government and the decentralisation of power, with local decisions being made at the local level.

In a constitutional head of state as a symbol of unity and continuity.

In Government being sufficiently responsive so that it can meet its proper obligations to its citizens.

In Government keeping to its core business and not competing with the private sector.

In the rule of law and justice, giving all citizens equal rights under the law, responsibilities to maintain it, and the freedom to change it.

In Australia playing a constructive role in the pursuit and maintenance of international peace in alliance with other free nations and in assisting less advantaged peoples.

In Liberalism, with its emphasis on the individual and enterprise, as the political philosophy best able to meet the demands and challenges of the 21st century.



*We want to assert the very principle that truth is absolute,
truth is supreme, truth is never disposable in national
political life.*

- John Howard