

PASSING BY: THE LEGACY OF ROBERT MENZIES IN THE LIBERAL PARTY OF AUSTRALIA

A study of John Gorton, Malcolm Fraser and John Howard

Sophie Ellen Rose
2012

*'A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of BA
(Hons) in History, University of Sydney.'*

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the guidance of my supervisor, Dr. James Curran. Your wisdom and insight into the issues I was considering in my thesis was invaluable. Thank you for your advice and support, not only in my honours' year but also throughout the course of my degree. Your teaching and clear passion for Australian political history has inspired me to pursue a career in politics.

Thank you to Nicholas Eckstein, the 2012 history honours coordinator. Your remarkable empathy, understanding and good advice throughout the year was very much appreciated.

I would also like to acknowledge the library staff at the National Library of Australia in Canberra, who enthusiastically and tirelessly assisted me in my collection of sources. Thank you for finding so many boxes for me on such short notice.

Thank you to the Aspinall Family for welcoming me into your home and supporting me in the final stages of my thesis and to my housemates, Meg MacCallum and Emma Thompson. Thank you to my family and my friends at church. Thank you also to Daniel Ward for your unwavering support and for bearing with me through the challenging times.

Finally, thanks be to God for sustaining me through a year in which I faced many difficulties and for providing me with the support that I needed.

Abstract

This thesis considers the legacy of Robert Menzies in the Liberal Party of Australia, as articulated by Liberal party prime ministers, John Gorton, Malcolm Fraser and John Howard. It challenges the prevailing assumption in Australian historiography that Liberals have suffered from collective amnesia and have therefore not been successful in writing their own history, particularly in regards to their founder, Robert Menzies. It demonstrates that circumstances were key in shaping the way in which each prime minister thought and spoke about Menzies. It discusses how new nationalism hindered Gorton's efforts; how liberalism inspired Fraser's efforts; and how Howard's belief in the importance of history drove his articulation of Menzies' legacy.

Contents

Introduction: Collective Amnesia?.....	5
John Gorton: Menzies' Shadow.....	16
Malcolm Fraser: Menzies' Disciple.....	29
John Howard: Menzies' Remembered.....	40
Conclusion.....	56
Bibliography.....	60

Collective amnesia?

It is almost a faith in Australian historiography that the Liberal Party of Australia (LPA) suffers from collective amnesia; that unlike their Labor opponents, they have not been successful in writing their own history and thus marshalling the past in the service of their political agenda. Historians from both sides of the political spectrum have debated the precise form and extent of this amnesia and thus incorporated this basic assumption into their work.¹ Furthermore, many historians have simply ignored the question of collective memory in the Liberal Party, perpetuating the belief that the LPA have neglected to deal with their own past.² This thesis challenges this view, as it has precluded an in depth study of how the LPA have remembered its founder, Sir Robert Gordon Menzies. This study is the aim of this thesis.

Notable Australian historians that have discussed the supposed collective amnesia of the Liberal Party and proffered some explanations for this assumption, include Gerard Henderson, Judith Brett and the contributors to the book *The Menzies Era*. That the LPA have been 'slow to understand (that) history matters' is a consistent theme throughout Henderson's book on the Liberal Party, *Menzies' Child*.³ Aside from asserting that Labor have outperformed the LPA in nourishing the legacies of their former leaders, he also asserts that in Australia, there is no conservative tradition or Liberal philosophy and that even Howard who had much in common with Menzies,

¹ For example: Gerard Henderson, *Menzies' Child – the Liberal Party of Australia* (Sydney: HarperCollins, 1998), pp. 35, 40 & 79; Graeme Starr, 'The Old Man on the Stairs: The Menzies of Myth and Legend', *The Menzies Era – a reappraisal of government, politics and policy*, Prasser et al

² For example: Philip Ayres, *Malcolm Fraser – a biography*, (Port Melbourne: Mandarin Australia, 1989) – especially 'Chapter 12 – The Liberal Leadership'. (insert references for Gorton and Howard?) For further discussion see chapter 1.

³ Henderson, *Menzies' Child*, p. 40.

clearly admired him and also understood the importance of history, still had ‘little of interest to say about his hero (sc. Menzies).’⁴ The only explanations offered by Henderson for the proposed failure of the LPA to nourish the legacy of Robert Menzies is that the LPA do not understand that ‘history matters’ and that conservatives are intellectually weak.⁵ This circular reasoning has little value from an historical viewpoint.

Judith Brett states more plainly that ‘Australian Liberals lack political memory’ and believes the influence of Menzies on Howard’s political language has in fact been overstated.⁶ She points to Menzies’ contested legacy and believes that his image has been frozen in time, she suggests perhaps as revenge for his political longevity. While a contested legacy may make it more difficult to establish a politician’s legacy, in no way precludes the possibility. Carol Johnson discusses the ways in which Curtin’s legacy was contested, even from within the Labor party, however goes on to describe his successful memorialisation.⁷

An associated myth, is that Labor’s success in venerating their leaders, is proof that Liberals have been entirely unsuccessful. Conservative commentator, Gerard Henderson has written that in creating hero figures the Labor party has ‘outperformed their political opponents.’⁸ Certainly, Labor has been successful in creating their own hero figures. Chifley, Curtin, Whitlam, Hawke and Keating may each be cited as

⁴ Gerard Henderson, *Menzies’ Child – the Liberal Party of Australia* (Sydney: HarperCollins, 1998), pp. 13 & 40.

⁵ Henderson, *Menzies’ Child*, p. 126.

⁶ Brett, *Australian Liberals*, p. 184.

⁷ Carol Johnson, *The Labor legacy: Curtin, Chifley, Whitlam and Hawke* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1989), pp. 92-93 & 95.

⁸ Henderson, *Menzies Child*, pp. 33-34.

modern day Labor ‘heroes’. In particular, the veneration of Curtin in the Labor party has been thorough and successful. In his biography of Curtin, Norman E. Lee writes unashamedly in the preface that ‘this book is an attempt to bring John Curtin back out of the darkness and to show him as he was: the Prime Minister who...(saved Australia)...’ He continues, ‘I named the book *John Curtin: Saviour of Australia*. At one time I considered calling the book *John Curtin: Australia’s Best-loved Prime Minister*, both descriptions being equally true.’⁹ The forward from Bob Hawke is telling. He wrote that ‘the memory of John Curtin was dimmed’ in the years after the war, and describes Lee’s book as ‘a splendid attempt to do justice to this very greatest of Australians, who sacrificed himself in our service...his triumph was the survival of this nation.’¹⁰

James Curran has reflected on this veneration of Curtin, writing that that ‘...the legacies of all past political leaders are somewhat malleable, and politicians will seek to assume the mantle of party icons and heroes when it suits them.’¹¹ In this regard, he writes that ‘since the 1970s Curtin has provided the historical ballast for any number of Labor policy ambitions...’¹² More importantly, he shows that the development of Curtin’s legacy can be traced throughout the post-imperial era, demonstrating the key role that political circumstances play. The Curtin legacy is invoked in a certain way, at a certain time, not simply to support a policy, but to support a view of Australia as a nation and as the ALP as a political party.

⁹ Norman Lee, *John Curtin, savior of Australia* (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1983), preface.

¹⁰ Lee, *John Curtin*, forward.

¹¹ James Curran, *Curtin’s Empire* (Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 123.

¹² Curran, *Curtin’s Empire*, p. 122.

Yet to cite Labor's success in this area is not valid proof that the Liberal Party has not valued its own history or sought to establish the legacy of its founder.

Of most relevance are the explanations provided in the edited book *The Menzies Era*.

While Graeme Starr does similarly believe that the LPA has failed to 'grasp the importance of their history' he also points to the 'myths that have been promoted by Menzies' ideological and partisan opponents' as disrupting the establishment of his legacy.¹³ In the introduction to the same book, Prasser points to presentism (judging the past according to present values) as the explanation for the shape of Menzies' legacy.¹⁴ In a similar vein, Menzies biographer, A.W. Martin points to the 'hindsight industry' as being particularly active against Menzies. In the introduction to his biography Martin explained that:

In writing these books I have sought to mute the inevitable sin of hindsight, and to consider Menzies primarily in the light of his own time and experience. I have also tried to...reach beyond and behind the symbolic caricature of Australian conservatism, as Menzies is so often depicted.¹⁵

That such a 'symbolic caricature' of Menzies' existed, is important in this thesis, and will be discussed specifically in relation to Paul Keating's denigration of Menzies' legacy.

These considerations in regards to the myths surrounding Menzies, and the role that hindsight has played, are much more useful than other assessments that historians have made, as they may help to explain the shape of Menzies' legacy.

¹³ Graeme Starr, 'The Old Man on the Stairs: The Menzies of Myth and Legend', *The Menzies Era – a reappraisal of government, politics and policy*, Prasser et al eds (Sydney: Hale and Iremonger Pty Limited, 1995), pp. 44 & 46.

¹⁴ Prasser et al, *The Menzies era*, p. 16.

¹⁵ A.W. Martin, *Robert Menzies – Volume 2*, (Carlton South: Melbourne University Press, 1999), p. xvi.

Without a doubt, the memorialisation of Menzies in the Liberal Party has been a complex and contested process, however this is not an indication of collective amnesia. Rather than dismiss these complexities as pointing to a failure on the part of the LPA to understand the importance and relevance of their own history, this thesis seeks to examine how the LPA's memory of Robert Menzies has influenced, intersected and/or undercut the LPA's view of its collective identity, political ideology and ideas about the Australian nation. It also asserts that changing socio-political circumstances had a direct influence on the way in which the Liberal Party considered its founder, especially in public rhetoric.

In Australian history generally, Menzies has one of the most contested legacies of any Australian politician since Federation. Some regard Menzies as a backward looking politician who squandered many opportunities to advance Australia's cause in the 1950s and 1960s. Others assert that he was a British sycophant, an American lickspittle and the authoritarian Pig Iron Bob.¹⁶ Yet, still others regard Menzies as a great Australian prime minister that led Australia through a golden age of prosperity and stability.¹⁷ And indeed, this contestation has not confined itself to the halls of academics, it made its way into the political ruff and tumble on many occasions.¹⁸

Yet this thesis is not a re-examination of Menzies as prime minister. Rather, these different viewpoints, and the circumstances that gave rise to them, inform this thesis.

¹⁶ Humphrey Macqueen, *Gallipoli to Petrov: arguing with Australian history* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1984), p. 174; Brett, *Robert Menzies' Forgotten People* (Chippendale: Pan Macmillan, 1992), p. 1.

¹⁷ Prasser et al, *The Menzies era*, p. 15.

¹⁸ Paul Keating, *Interview with John Laws on 2UE*, 28 February 1992.

In examining Menzies' influence, this thesis discusses the three major Liberal prime ministers that followed him; Sir John Gorton, Malcolm Fraser and John Howard. Each of these prime ministers served at least a full term and as leader of the Liberal Party was influential in shaping the party and its memory of Menzies. Each of these prime ministers carved out a unique and often controversial place for the founder of the LPA.

These different memories or ideas about Menzies will be examined through the use of extensive primary records of speeches, press conferences, press releases, electorate and party talks, parliamentary debates, radio and television interviews and private and official correspondence. The following section is a brief discussion of how sources will be used.

This thesis will focus on the public rhetoric of these prime ministers and use private sources and historical context only so far as it is useful in answering the questions posed. Contrary to the age-old adage that suggests a politician is lying whenever his lips are moving, the public speech of politicians provides a plentiful fount of enlightening source material for the study of political history. Rhetoric is not only a way for politicians to garner support, but also is a medium through which they can convey ideas about policy, party tradition and ideology, the nation, and indeed former prime ministers. Historian Michael Bentley has described the public speech of politicians as 'an intellectual art form...which has provided the political structure with a central promotive criterion since the eighteenth century...if thought leaves its mark

somewhere in British politics this is the place to seek the traces.’¹⁹ While he refers to the British context, this idea holds for the Australian Westminster system.

Understanding the characteristics and peculiarities of political language is crucial when employing these sources for historical study. Historian John Uhr asserts that political rhetoric is ‘an important institutional component of the political art.’²⁰ This understanding of rhetoric, as possessing an ‘institutional character’, not only affirms the importance of engaging with this source material but also makes it possible to consider and account for its limitation when drawing conclusions.

Judith Brett, the author of *Robert Menzies’ Forgotten People* acknowledges the tendency to doubt the usefulness of this source material writing that ‘because of the tension between the desire for power and the means of acquiring it in democracies, accusations of inauthenticity and duplicity haunt our politicians.’²¹ Yet Brett clearly values this source material, as her book is an in depth study of the public language of Robert Menzies. With questionable success, Brett supplements this main body of source material with psychoanalytic techniques.²² In the case of this thesis, reverting to such techniques to gain a deeper understanding of the public language of politicians is not necessary. Instead, private correspondence and the work of other historians will be used to supplement the principal source material.

¹⁹ Michael Bentley, ‘Party Doctrine and Thought’ in *High and Low Politics in Modern Britain: Ten Studies*, Michael Bentley and John Stevenson eds. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), p. 237.

²⁰ John Uhr, ‘Political Leadership and Rhetoric’, *Australian Reshaped – 200 years of institutional transformation*, Geoffrey Brennan and Francis G. Castles eds., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 262.

²¹ Brett, *Forgotten People*, p. 25.

²² Gerard Henderson, *Menzies’ Child – the Liberal Party of Australia* (Sydney: HarperCollins, 1998), p. 168. ‘The problem with her much quoted work is that she relied too heavily on the psychoanalysis teachings of Sigmund Freud. So much so that, at times, her analysis is closer to farce than to history.’

James Curran has also successfully employed the political rhetoric as his primary source material, most notably in this book *The Power of Speech*. In his introduction, Curran explains the central role that the public rhetoric of Australian politicians has played in the ‘shaping of national ideals...the voicing of national aspirations’ and ultimately the redefinition of the Australian national image.²³ American historian Carol Gelderman has similarly asserted that ‘speeches are the core of the modern (American) Presidency’.²⁴ For example, Gelderman asserts that Franklin D Roosevelt’s ‘stunning success in mobilising the nation’ was a result of his ‘presidential speechmaking’.²⁵ As can be seen, the public language of politicians is an indispensable source material when examining the ways in which they have thought about and defined images of their nation and of their political predecessors.

Public rhetoric is the primary means for prime ministers to communicate with the public and for this reason will form the bulk of the source material used in this thesis. Constituents do not have access to private and official correspondence but they do have access to the public rhetoric of politicians. Therefore, a question concerned with a prime minister’s use of history for political purposes must primarily examine public rhetoric. In their book, that examines the relationship between the rhetoric of American Presidents and the institution of the Presidency, Campbell and Jamieson look only at the ‘public communication’ of Presidents. The ‘public rhetorical role’ that Presidents must take up ‘is the medium through which the national fabric is woven.’²⁶ Campbell and Jamieson believe that this source material is of such

²³ James Curran, *The Power of Speech* (Carlton, Melbourne University Press, 2004), p. 1.

²⁴ Carol Gelderman, *All The Presidents’ Words* (New York, Walker and Company, 1997), p. 9.

²⁵ Gelderman, *All The Presidents’ Words*, p. 35.

²⁶ Karlyn Campbell and Kathleen Jamieson, *Presidents creating the Presidency* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, p. 9.)

importance that they employ it exclusively. Public rhetoric is of similar importance when the legacies of past prime ministers are woven. This thesis however, will also employ private sources, in so far as they contribute to an understanding of the motives, meaning and ideas that inform public rhetoric. They take a secondary role to the relevant public sources. Additionally, in reaching worthwhile conclusions in this respect, this thesis will examine historical context. This will allow for a fair assessment of the motivations of the three prime ministers and assist in explaining “why” a particular view of Menzies’ legacy was taken.

Michael Bentley proposes a sensible and workable technique of enquiry that will be employed for the use of this source material. In order to ensure the integrity of the sources, as far as possible, Bentley suggests that an appropriate approach is:

one that stands back from party slogan and catch cry and examines networks of assumptions and symbiosis within the public statements of politicians...An enquiry along these lines would seek evidence for correspondence and dissonance between the public language of politicians and the private...The criterion on which a political “idea” might then be recognised would lie not in its capacity to translate into a jingle short enough to fit a banner but rather its potential for sustaining a distinct and definable political language.²⁷

This thesis will seek out such language that has been developed in the Liberal Party to nourish, or in some cases, elide the legacy of Robert Menzies. It will seek out the thoughts and ideas that drive the public language of Gorton, Fraser and Howard in relation to Robert Menzies and in this way provide rich explanations for the shape of Menzies’ legacy in the Liberal Party. In sum, this thesis aims to draw meaningful conclusions that directly answer these questions. Along with a commitment to scholarly standards, this is the governing rationale for the use of sources.

²⁷ Bentley, ‘Party Doctrine and Thought’, pp. 141-142.

This thesis will contain three chapters: one each on Prime Ministers John Gorton, Malcolm Fraser and John Howard.

Specifically, each chapters addresses the prime minister's assessment and articulation of the Menzies' legacy. Each chapter asks three core questions. The first is concerned with the prime minister's particular view of Menzies' legacy. What was this prime minister's view of Menzies legacy? How did this view contribute to a Liberal party tradition in terms of its collective identity, political philosophy and ideas about the Australian nation? What relevance did it have to contemporary political circumstances? The second is concerned with the political purpose Menzies' legacy served for this prime minister. In what way did it legitimate (or undercut) the political agenda of Liberal Party? In what way was it used to justify their political actions or policy agenda? The third question is concerned with the influence of historical, social and political circumstances. Why did they take this view of the Menzies' legacy? What historical circumstances shaped this view? As will be shown, circumstances are key and will be the araldite of this thesis.

Each chapter takes a particular focus in answering these questions. The chapter on Prime Minister John Gorton (Menzies' Shadow) considers the dilemma he faced in an age of uncertainty about the Australian national identity. It is concerned with ideas of 'old Australia' and 'new Australia', and with the emerging new nationalism. Gorton was a major proponent of new nationalism, in fact, the term was coined in reference to his agenda to promote Australian nationalism. It is in this light that this chapter addresses Gorton's approach to the Menzies' legacy as he sought out a new vision for the Australian nation. Of crucial importance in this chapter, is the collective (living)

memory of Australians and Liberal Party members of Robert Menzies; a memory that casts a persistent shadow over Gorton's time as prime minister. Ultimately, these circumstances constrain Gorton's development of Menzies' legacy as he struggles to balance the conflicting images of his vision for Australia and that of Menzies, who had only recently exited national political life.

The chapter on Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser (Menzies' Disciple) focuses on his ideas about Liberalism, as a concern with political philosophy was a fundamental aspect of Fraser's time as prime minister. It also discusses the close relationship between Menzies and Fraser, particular Fraser's respect and admiration for Menzies and eagerness to consult him on a variety of contemporary political issues. This chapter examines how Menzies' legacy shaped and legitimated Fraser's political philosophy.

The chapter (Menzies' remembered) on Prime Minister John Howard's use of Menzies' legacy is considered in light of such socio-political circumstances as the "Australian history wars" and policy issues of reconciliation and multiculturalism. This chapter discusses Howard's complex and well developed articulation of Menzies' legacy and relates these ideas to Howard's own political agenda and vision. In particular it considers ideas of Australian Liberalism and the collective identity of the Liberal Party and of 'mainstream' Australians, whom Howard claims the Liberal Party represents, in the Menzian tradition.

Menzies' Shadow

John Gorton, Prime Minister, 1968 - 1971

*'We will go abroad, a light in our eye, a fire in our heart, as we hold up our heads and say, we are Australians.'*²⁸

When John Gorton assumed the leadership of the Liberal Party, it was in the shadow of the gargantuan figure, Robert Menzies. The Liberal Party of Australia was still very much *Menzies'* party; it was his creation or as Gerard Henderson has referred to it, his child.²⁹ In 1968, the Liberal Party had been in existence for 24 years, and for 22 of those years, Menzies led the party. More than fifteen ministers that served in Gorton's government had first been ministers under the leadership of Menzies, and many of Gorton's other ministers had experienced their political upbringing as backbenchers under the leadership of Menzies.³⁰ Additionally, the structure and organisation of the party remained unchanged and Holt's untimely death cut short his opportunity to leave his own print on the party.³¹ In other words, in the Liberal Party, there was not much change between the end of Menzies' reign and the beginning of Gorton's time as prime minister.

²⁸ John Gorton, *Speech by the prime minister at the Flinders electorate liberal party luncheon*, Mornington, Victoria, 14 October 1968, p. 4.

²⁹ Henderson, *Menzies' Child*.

³⁰ 'Australian Prime Ministers, Robert Menzies – Key people', *National archives of Australia*, available from <<http://primeministers.naa.gov.au/primeministers/menzies/key-people.aspx>>, accessed 2 November 2012.

³¹ Henderson, *Menzies' Child*, p. 25.

By way of contrast, Gorton saw the late 1960s as a time of great change. Gorton's strong belief in and desire to promote Australian nationalism was his *idée*

fixe. At an electorate dinner in September 1968, Gorton spoke on this theme:

I think that perhaps today in Australia we live in the most exciting time that this country has ever known. There have been changes over past years of course, but on the whole they have been gradual...but just recently there has been – not a gradual rate of change – but a sudden explosion in this nation, an explosion which has not yet reached its heights, and the end results of which we can only dream about. Who would have thought that suddenly at this point in this nation's history, all the old conceptions would have to be taken out, and have to be re-examined, to be re-assessed because the world had changed and we had changed.³²

Later in 1968, and countless other times, Gorton spoke along similar lines:

I think the time has come, indeed perhaps it is past time when we, wherever we may live in this nation of ours, should begin to feel a real sense of Australianism. We should begin to feel a pride in the nation to which we belong, begin to look ahead to what this nation should achieve...And this, in a sense, is a watershed. This in a sense is a goal.³³

The language that was employed by Gorton in public speeches was very different to the measured appraisals and considered goals that Robert Menzies had spoken of in previous years. On Australia Day in 1963, Robert Menzies addressed the nation with these words:

we are inheritors of the work of the past... Australia day is an occasion for renewing our determination to build soundly on the existing foundations, to develop new resources, to build up a wider and fuller civilisation.³⁴

In 1965, Menzies assessed his time in government stating that:

after over fourteen consecutive years of political office... we can point to a range of achievement, in industrial justice and peace, in social services, in a

³² John Gorton, *Speech by the prime minister at the Henty Electorate Dinner*, Moorabbin, Victoria, 14 September 1968, p. 1.

³³ John Gorton, *Speech by the prime minister at the Flinders electorate liberal party luncheon*, Mornington Victoria, 14 October 1968, p. 4.

³⁴ Sir Robert Menzies, *Message by the prime minister for Australia Day*, 25 January 1963, p. 1.

growingly successful attack upon poverty, in widely distributed rising standards of house and of living generally...³⁵

Unlike Gorton, Menzies had not expressed a radical vision for the Australian nation, and the Menzies era, was remembered as a time of stability. Prasser et al refer to this view of the Menzies era, explaining that ‘for some it was a golden era of economic prosperity and social stability, for others it was a time of political and social conservatism and lost opportunities.’³⁶ By either account, the Menzies era was not considered a time of vast change and abrupt progression. No one, including Menzies himself, spoke of groundbreaking progress.

Additionally, the image of Gorton as ‘the ordinary Australian’ grated against the image that Menzies built for himself as ‘British to the bootstraps’. The press was quick to highlight this difference, with more than a little help from Gorton himself. In a BBC interview in 1968, Michael Charlton presented Gorton with these two opposite images:

Q: I notice you said the other day that you, when asked to choose between Australia and between the United States and Britain, you said you would be Australian to the boot-heels. It’s only a couple of years ago that Sir Robert Menzies was saying that Australians were British to the boot-heels. Now, can you explain the difference in those two statements?

PM: Oh, perhaps we’ve changed our shoes.³⁷

Gorton’s taciturn response is indicative of the primary difficulty that he faced in building and manipulating Menzies’ legacy. Throughout Gorton’s time as prime minister, Robert Menzies was still a part of the living memory of most Australians.

³⁵ Robert Menzies, *Speech by the prime minister and the Federal Council of the Liberal Party of Australia*, Hotel Canberra, Canberra, 6 April 1964, p. 2.

³⁶ Prasser et al (ed.), *The Menzies Era – a reappraisal of government, politics and policy* (Sydney: Hale and Iremonger Pty Limited, 1995), p. 15.

³⁷ John Gorton, *Interview for BBC “Panorama” programme*, 22 January 1968, p. 3.

Thus, Gorton faced a persistent difficulty in shaping an historical legacy for his party's founder. This chapter will demonstrate the ways in which Gorton struggled to carve out a historical legacy for Menzies that complemented his vision for the Australian nation. The key dilemma that this chapter will explore is Gorton's battle with competing images and ideas about the Australian nation. Gorton believed he governed at a time of unprecedented change, so how was he to honour a leader who was remembered for governing during a time of great stability? As prime minister, Gorton was intent on promoting Australianism, so how was he to honour "Menzies the British"? On consideration of these questions, it emerges that Gorton's attempts to publicly remember and honour Menzies were a great balancing act, as he struggled to downplay the fundamental clash between stability and change, between conservatism and progression. It will examine the situation that Gorton faced within his own party and in a broader Australian political context.

John Gorton became Prime Minister, by virtue of his position as federal parliamentary leader of the Liberal Party. During his time in office, Gorton experienced particular difficulties in balancing these two roles. In 1968, the conflict between Liberal party tradition and Gorton's vision for Australia played out in a dispute between Gorton and Menzies, over the provision of a car during the former prime minister's travels in England. In June 1968, the Liberal Party founder wrote a hostile letter to Gorton, reminding him, no doubt unnecessarily, that:

I was Prime Minister for a total of over 18 years... When I retired voluntarily in January 1966...Harold Holt...gave me certain privileges...(which have) until recently...continued to be provided....This year, I planned my programme on the footing that this privilege would continue . I certainly had no warning to the contrary until the very eve of my arrival in London...that this transport privilege in England had been cancelled by you not, I regret to say, on notice to me, which I would have thought common courtesy would require that I should have received while in Australia and before fixing my

English programme. This treatment by an old friend and colleague puzzled and wounded me.³⁸

A leisurely three months later, Gorton replied that there was no record of Cabinet approval of such privileges and that he would discuss the matter with his colleagues.³⁹

When, after nine months, Gorton finally did write to confirm what privileges would be offered to Menzies, the details in regards to transport were vague; a car would be provided in England ‘on those occasion of significance associated with your visit.’⁴⁰

Robert Menzies responded asking for these duties to be clarified, as his appointments in his capacity as Lord Warden of Cinque Ports (an honorary title bestowed by the British sovereign) were likely to arise once he was already in England. He wrote that ‘it would be embarrassing for me not to have a car and driver at my disposal during this time.’⁴¹ Gorton may have very well have responded in kind, explaining that in light of his dedication to promoting a newfound ‘Australianism’ it would be embarrassing for him to provide such services. However, in the end, Gorton nothed that ‘this year’ Menzies’ stay in the UK was quite short and agreed that ‘in these circumstances’ a car would be provided from Australia House.⁴²

In failing to respond promptly to Menzies correspondence and bestow on Menzies the full range of privileges that he sought, Gorton broke with Liberal Party tradition. Menzies took advantage of this situation, and it is perhaps the reason that Gorton eventually yielded to Menzies’ requests. Menzies sent a carbon copy of his initial

³⁸ Letter from Robert Menzies to John Gorton, London, 28 June 1968, Folder 11, Box 426, Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

³⁹ Letter from John Gorton to Robert Menzies, 13 September 1968, Folder 11, Box 426, Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

⁴⁰ Letter from John Gorton to Robert Menzies, 17 March 1969, Folder 29, Series 29, Box 287, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

⁴¹ Letter from Robert Menzies to John Gorton, 10 April 1969, Folder 29, Series 29, Box 287, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

⁴² Letter from John Gorton to Robert Menzies, 1 May 1969, Folder 29, Series 29, Box 287, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

three-page letter (quoted in the first extract above) to senior Liberal Party figures John McEwen, Paul Hasluck and Allen Fairhall.⁴³ McEwen had joined the parliament in 1939, the same year as Menzies, and Hasluck and Fairhall, like Gorton were ‘49ers’ (a group of Liberal MPs elected in 1949 when the size of the parliament was significant increased).⁴⁴ They had all served in the Menzies government and did not support Gorton as leader. An accompanying letter, marked personal, was sent to Hasluck and McEwen (there is no evidence of such a letter to Fairhall in the collection of Menzies’ papers, although it may have been sent). Menzies wrote that the letter to Gorton ‘explains itself,’ continuing that he ‘can only hope that what has occurred was due to some misapprehension, but you can see how significant it is to me.’⁴⁵ Additionally, Menzies sent the letter to his secretary Miss Craig, with an accompanying note, marked ‘strictly confidential’. He wrote that ‘you will be interested, and no doubt curious, to read this letter.’⁴⁶ Certainly, these additional letters indicate that Menzies understood that the failure to provide car services was a meaningful and significant oversight, rather than an indication of Gorton adhering strictly to Cabinet approval processes. If the latter were the case, Menzies would have had his car and driver without delay.

Ian Hancock believes that Gorton’s failure to adhere to the traditional Liberal image was his downfall, causing him to lose the leadership in March 1971. He wrote that Gorton:

⁴³ Menzies informs Gorton of this: Letter from Robert Menzies to John Gorton, London, 28 June 1968.

⁴⁴ Australian Prime Ministers, William McMahon – Elections, *National Archives of Australia*, available from <<http://primeministers.naa.gov.au/primeministers/mcmahon/elections.aspx>>, accessed 2 November 2012.

⁴⁵ Letter from Robert Menzies to Paul Hasluck and John McEwen, 28 June 1968, Folder 11, Box 426, Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

⁴⁶ Letter from Menzies to L.H. Craig, 1 July 1968, Folder 11, Box 426, Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

was “the problem” precisely because he was prepared to confront “traditional” Liberal approaches. Yet, could he have challenged the past without alienating half the parliamentary party as well as senior members of the state divisions?...Very simply, Gorton sought to take the Liberal party to places where a significant number of its adherents in positions of power and influence were not prepared to travel...It was because Gorton wanted to do it his way that he was set on a self-destructive path within his own party.⁴⁷

Hancock’s focus in this regard is on Gorton’s different leadership style and the apparently divergent policies he advocated, for example in relation to federalism. However, Hancock does not address the fundamental clash between Gorton’s vision for Australia and Menzies’ still fresh legacy in the Liberal Party. When Hancock uses terms such as ‘traditional “Liberal”’, he fails to explain how this image of a “Liberal” has come about. At this stage in Liberal Party history, to be a Liberal, was very much to exist in the shadow of Robert Menzies. Menzies was the defining characteristic of Australian Liberalism – its personification.

Certainly, both Gorton’s style and his policies were significant aspects of the way in which he broke the mould of traditional, or as this chapter asserts, Menzian Liberalism. Menzies had his own opinion on Gorton’s leadership style. When McMahon succeeded Gorton as Prime Minister, Menzies wrote to the new Prime Minister with good wishes for “the great and difficult task of promoting responsible Cabinet Government, established on fundamental Liberal principles...you will undoubtedly maintain the closest contact with your Ministers so that they all feel that they are members of a team of which you are the chosen Captain and the authoritative spokesman.” As Hancock has noted, ‘there was a note both of admonition and of commentary on the alleged Gorton style’ in these comments.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Ian Hancock, *He did it his way*, (Sydney: Hodder Headline Australia, 2002), p. 330.

⁴⁸ Hancock, *John Gorton*, pp. 333-334.

Gorton's leadership style was also the object of criticism from many of his parliamentary colleagues; a criticism which contributed significantly to his removal. According to Hancock, Fraser's disillusionment resulted from his objection to Gorton's autocratic leadership methods.⁴⁹ Yet there is a contradiction in the way in which Hancock represented this distinctive style. His own assessment of the Gorton style was as 'friendly' and 'relaxed'.⁵⁰ However, in adopting this new style, Gorton grated against the approach to the leadership established by Menzies. Many Liberal parliamentarians resented the change, while the public perception and experience of the Gorton style was different. Rupert Murdoch spoke of Gorton as "an independent minded nationalist who represented a great break from what I considered were the stultifying years of Menzies and Holt."⁵¹ For many Liberal parliamentarians this was partially true. Serving in a Gorton government was a substantially different experience from serving in a Menzies government. Yet for them, Gorton was not only dishonouring an *idea* of Liberal leadership in the Menzian style, but was departing from a style of leadership that was in living memory and experience of every Liberal parliamentarian.

Additionally, Hancock is accurate in acknowledging the significance of Gorton's views on policy. It is important to consider the influence that Gorton's thinking on Australian nationalism had on his policy positions. For Gorton, everything was couched in terms of national growth and development. Broadly speaking, this notably influenced his views on federalism, foreign, defence and economic policy. Gorton's policy agenda was inseparable from his mission to promote Australian nationalism.

⁴⁹ Hancock, *John Gorton*, pp. 313 & 325.

⁵⁰ Hancock, *John Gorton*, p. 168.

⁵¹ Hancock, *John Gorton*, p. 347.

He made speeches in this fashion on many occasions. Less than two weeks into his time as Prime Minister In a Meet the Press Interview he spoke on economic policy explaining that ‘we have requirements for development which must take place if we are to grow into the nation that we can grow into.’⁵² In another (this time BBC) interview, he spoke on foreign policy and the British withdrawal from Singapore ‘as a spur towards understanding that it (Australia) had an independent nationhood to fulfill.’⁵³ In September 1968, he spoke at the Henty Electorate Dinner, justifying his policy of federalism; to promote national development, through greater Commonwealth control of resources and other sections of the economy. He expounded his thinking:

It is important to be a Victorian, or to be a New South Welshman, or to be a Western Australian, or to be a Queenslander, provided the overriding feeling is to be an Australian, and that we are going to build a country we will all be proud to belong to...I hope you will all help me in the years ahead to foster this feeling of real nationalism and I believe you will. I believe the Australian people want it, and I believe that with it and with the opportunities that lie within our grasp, we will be able to bring into existence on this continent a nation which will redress the sad balances in Europe and some countries in Asia and which, given wise material management and proper spiritual approach to the responsibilities towards individuals, will become a nation the like of which may never have been seen on this earth before.⁵⁴

At another Liberal party function, Gorton spoke of the importance of increasing the role of the Commonwealth government in order to ensure greater equality between the states, such as through uniform education facilities.⁵⁵

Hancock makes an assessment that the stance of the media was not significant in Gorton’s dismissal. Yet the media did play an important role, as it was the primary

⁵² John Gorton, *Text of the Prime Minister’s “Meet the Press” interview*, 21 January 1968, p. 2.

⁵³ John Gorton, *Interview for BBC “Panorama” programme*, 22 January 1968, p. 2.

⁵⁴ John Gorton, *Speech by the prime minister at the Henty Electorate Dinner*, Moorabbin, Victoria, 14 September 1968, p. 4.

⁵⁵ John Gorton, *Speech by the prime minister at the Flinders electorate liberal party luncheon*, Mornington Victoria, 14 October 1968, p 3.

vehicle through which Gorton sought to portray a particular image and vision for the nation to the general public. Not only did Gorton believe his vision for Australia was the best way forward, he also faced a very different political landscape that made the image of a politician in the Menzian image increasingly irrelevant. Journalist Alan Reid wrote of Gorton he had ‘no pretensions’ and mixed with the ‘rank and file’ rather than with ‘those who aped with varying degrees of success their upper class British cousins.’ Reid also directly compared Gorton to Menzies in this regard who he wrote ‘loved royalty’.⁵⁶ Gorton’s biographer, Ian Hancock also spoke of Gorton’s Australianism, describing it as powerful and aggressive.⁵⁷

Curran and Ward have written extensively about the increasingly irrelevance of British ‘ideas, symbols, motifs, precepts and practices’ as part of the Australian national identity, in this sense making Gorton “of his time”.⁵⁸ It was perhaps not only Gorton’s genuine belief in what he believed was a more authentic Australian identity, but also the ‘wholly positive connotations’ associated with the term ‘new nationalism’.⁵⁹

Gorton did not hesitate in public speeches to advocate for this cause, in fact he vowed to ‘preach’ about the ‘real sense of Australianism’ that he felt was emerging. In his New Years message to the nation in December 1968, he wrote that he felt Australia was at a crossroads, facing the ‘urgent task of national development.’ Looking forward he explained that he was ‘heartened by the fact that we tackle the future with

⁵⁶ Alan Reid, *The Gorton Experiment*, (Sydney: Shakespeare Head Press, 1971), p. 27-28.

⁵⁷ Hancock, *John Gorton*, p. xii.

⁵⁸ Curran and Ward, *The Unknown Nation*, p.5.

⁵⁹ John Gorton, *Speech by the prime minister*, 14 October 1968, p. 4.

a burgeoning belief in our nationalism and a growing faith in ourselves as Australians.⁶⁰

In his Australia day address in 1969, he spoke of a nation ‘on the threshold of a tremendous surge forward...(which) will flow only from the energy, the enthusiasm, the skills and the loyalties of all Australians.’

Internationally, Gorton also preached his cause. At the Australia Club in London he respectfully acknowledged the legacy of Australia’s colonial heritage, for example in her parliamentary institutions but said Australia ‘would take more part in the region in which we live’ and spoke mainly of Australia as ‘a brash, a growing, exciting and exhilarating country (that was) just getting off the launching pad.’

Yet while Gorton did diverge from the Menzian image in this way, he spoke admiringly of Menzies on many occasions, especially in relation to Liberal party philosophy. At a Liberal party luncheon in November 1968:

I want to take you back to the time when this Liberal Party first became the Government of Australia under Sir Robert Menzies. The nation for some time had been suffering controls of various kinds... We had suffered an approach which basically, philosophically held the view that the individual really existed mainly for the purpose of serving the state, rather than, as is the proper approach, the state existed to serve the individual. We believe the state should give the individual the greatest possible chance of developing his own personality, of taking his own risks, of reaping rewards if his judgment is sound, or of accepting the consequence if (not)...That is the basis on which Sir Robert Menzies built, on which Harold Holt built, and on which, given the opportunity, I...will continue to build.⁶¹

Like Menzies, Gorton saw Australian Liberal philosophy as the best way to grow the nation, but unlike Menzies he felt that his view of Australian nationalism was the best

⁶⁰ John Gorton, *New Year message to the nation*, Canberra, 31 December 1968.

⁶¹ John Gorton, *Speech by the Prime Minister*, Greensborough Liberal Party branch luncheon, Bundoora, Victoria, 10 November 1968, pp. 1-2.

way to inspire and promote that growth. Due to this difference, it was difficult for Gorton to build a legacy, his own image, of Robert Menzies, as it was this difference that was so often spoken about in the media. Robert Menzies was never going to be the inspiration for Gorton's national project. The extent to which Gorton admired Menzies political philosophy is also questionable. When asked in 1970 if he was 'determined to make changes within the Party and its philosophy', Gorton responded that he did think that he had succeeded in ensuring the party was 're-thinking' and 're-examining' its 'basic dogma.'⁶² Other references that Gorton made about Menzies in speeches centered on his reputation as an impressive orator.⁶³ But this was also not a serious and sustained attempt to develop Menzies legacy. Due to the limited number of references that Gorton made in regards to Menzies, it is very difficult to make concrete assessments as to Gorton's true thinking in regards to Menzies.

Of most relevance to this thesis, however, is that Gorton faced serious constraints in his time as Prime Minister as a result of the long shadow that Menzies' had cast on Australian political life, particularly within the Liberal Party. This shadow was, as shown, in many ways at odds with the changing social and political circumstances of the late 1960s, which Gorton embraced with open arms. Thus, Gorton tended to ignore the Menzies' legacy, as denigrating it was hardly a viable option, as he sought to articulate his complementary political vision. The change in Australian society, was not matched by change in the Liberal Party. There had not been much renewal since the time of Menzies. Additionally, Robert Menzies was a part of the living memory of most Australians. Gorton, even as Prime Minister, had little influence or scope to

⁶² John Gorton, *Meet the Press interview*, Melbourne, 12 April 1970, p. 4.

⁶³ John Gorton, *Speech by the prime minister at the opening of the National Library*, Canberra, 15 August 1968; John Gorton, *Speech by the Prime Minister*, Liberal Party Speaker's Group dinner, Southern Cross Hotel, Melbourne, 27 February 1968, p. 1.

develop Menzies legacy. The images of Menzies as a conservative Prime Minister, who reveled in Australia's British heritage, were too dominant for Gorton to effectively manipulate Menzies' legacy for his own political purposes.

Menzies' disciple

Malcolm Fraser, Prime Minister, 1975-1983

*'In 1975, as in 1949, the Liberal Party was called upon to revive the national spirit... I appealed then to Australians to retain their idealism. I called upon them for a return to Liberal values. I urged them to recall what they had seemingly forgotten.'*⁶⁴

Australian nationalism was to John Gorton what Liberalism was to Malcolm Fraser. It could be said that Fraser believed that Liberalism was “in the air” during his time as prime minister. It inspired his vision for Australia, it is what he spoke about incessantly at public and private functions and it is what defined his approach to the legacy of Robert Menzies. Unlike Gorton, Fraser spoke frequently and at length about Menzies, most often in relation to their shared belief in the principles of Australian Liberalism. Fraser could barely discuss the Liberal Party without referring to Robert Menzies, whether it was an obvious instance such as on the thirtieth anniversary of the creation of the Liberal Party, or in an obscure speech focusing on trade relations with Japan.⁶⁵ This chapter will examine the importance of Liberalism to Fraser and the ways in which this related to his attitude towards Menzies.

Fraser felt that he was prime minister at a time of revival and renewal, for the nation and for the Liberal Party. The key to this revival was Liberalism. Reflecting on the

⁶⁴ Malcolm Fraser, *Address to Australian Liberal students federation*, 27 March 1980, pp. 2-3.

⁶⁵ Malcolm Fraser, *Address to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the Liberal Party*, 10 December 1979, p. 1; Malcolm Fraser, *Electorate talk*, 4 July 1976, p. 2.

election of his Party in 1978, Fraser explained that he had ‘called for a return to timeless Liberal values’ and that the resulting win was ‘a massive endorsement of the Liberal philosophy.’⁶⁶ Overwhelming in speeches, in reference to his election, Fraser emphasised the importance of Liberalism, rather than of other (related, yet different) factors, such as Liberal Party policy, the Liberal vision for Australia, the competence of his colleagues or his suitability for the position of prime minister.⁶⁷ Fraser’s biographer, Philip Ayres has attested to the effectiveness of this strategy, not only electorally but also in regards to his position as Liberal leader. Ayres basic argument was that Fraser gained the Liberal leadership as a result of his articulation of a conservative Liberal philosophy, that other Liberal parliamentarians could see appealed to the electorate. He wrote:

What really drafted Fraser (into the Liberal leadership) was the political climate of the times, for which he provided the authentic voice. Of course he worked incessantly to promote a conservative mood and to advance himself in the party, but no man by himself can create a political climate. The mood in the Party slowly change until in 1975 Fraser seemed to embody it.⁶⁸

As this chapter will demonstrate, Fraser’s conservative Liberal beliefs and his conviction that they were key to winning the leadership and the 1978 election, were linked to his admiration and respect for Robert Menzies and his observations in regards to his success within the Liberal Party and electorally. In some ways, Ayres has referred to this relationship. In the twelfth chapter of his book, Ayres referred to a manifesto written by Fraser for the Melbourne *Herald* in 1974 as containing a subtext, that the Liberals lacked directed because they lacked a leader with a philosophy. His conclusion on this point reads as such:

⁶⁶ Fraser, *Address to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the Liberal Party*, p. 3; Malcolm Fraser, *Address at the South Australian state council dinner*, 27 October 1978, p. 1.

⁶⁷ For example, similar remarks were also made in the following speeches: Malcolm Fraser, *Address to Australian Liberal Students Federation*, 27 March 1980, pp. 1-11; Malcolm Fraser, *Address to Victorian State Council*, 17 November 1979, pp. 1-10.

⁶⁸ Philip Ayres, *Malcolm Fraser – a biography*, (Port Melbourne: Mandarin Australia, 1989), p. 221.

Menzies had provided a strong sense of purpose and direction which was now absent. A strong leadership and a clear and distinct philosophy were essential if the Liberal Party in Opposition were to gain power.⁶⁹

As Ayres himself has pointed out earlier in his tenth chapter, Fraser knew this, ie. that ‘Menzies had been able to provide a clear sense of direction and purpose and (that) a fresh effort to provide it was needed now.’⁷⁰

In this way, Ayres is making the same assessment that Fraser had made and used to his advantage, as Ayres himself had pointed out, two chapters previously. This essay will seek to go further: to link all these observations together and draw out their significance in relation to Fraser’s view of Menzies’ legacy. Firstly, it will discuss the nature Fraser’s relationship with Menzies, personally and philosophically. Secondly, it will assess and explain the effectiveness of Fraser’s use of Menzies’ legacy for his own political purposes.

Fraser’s relationship with Menzies can be examined through preserved private correspondence and the available public speeches and interviews that Fraser gave.

Private correspondence between Menzies and Fraser was frequent and friendly. Unlike Gorton, Fraser would regularly reply to a non-pressing piece of correspondence, such as a letter wishing him well, or offering congratulations within a week. It is well reported that Menzies’ was a supporter of Fraser. Menzies had encouraged McMahon to return Fraser to the Cabinet as soon as Gorton lost the

⁶⁹ Ayres, *Malcolm Fraser*, p. 228.

⁷⁰ Ayres, *Malcolm Fraser*, p. 188.

leadership and when he was omitted, Menzies wrote to Fraser to say that ‘nothing is more mysterious than your omission from the new Government.’⁷¹ (Menzies did not know, although may have guessed, that Gorton had told McMahon that he would not serve in a Cabinet alongside Fraser).⁷² When Fraser was eventually returned to a Cabinet post, in August of 1971, Menzies wrote personally to Fraser, to say he was ‘delighted to see you back in cabinet where you can have a powerful influence on policy’.⁷³

The relationship between Menzies and Fraser went so far that Menzies wrote to Fraser’s wife, Tammy, on at least one occasion. Prior to the 1975 election, Menzies wrote a letter offering his opinion that this way ‘the most vital Australian election’ in his time and his advice to:

get Malcolm to believe, as is the truth, that his personal prestige will be so great that he can exercise his choice of Minister without feeling that he must please anybody except himself...in my opinion, he will have the same amount of personal authority and prestige as I always hope for in my own case in my own time.⁷⁴

Apart from well wishes and general advice Menzies and Fraser also exchanged thoughts on political events and philosophy. Prior to the dismissal, Menzies wrote a lengthy note on the situation in parliament, which his secretary Miss Craig passed on to Fraser as Menzies ‘thought he would like you to see how his mind is working.’⁷⁵

⁷¹ Hancock, *John Gorton*, p. 333; Letter from Robert Menzies to Malcolm Fraser, 24 March 1971, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies, Folder 899, Box 426, Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

⁷² Hancock, *John Gorton*, p. 333

⁷³ Telegram from Menzies to Gorton, 20 August 1971, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies, Folder 899, Box 426, Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

⁷⁴ Letter from Menzies to Tammy Fraser, 10 December 1975, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies, Folder 105, Box 12, Personal correspondence, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

⁷⁵ Letter from L.H. Craig to Fraser, 19 August 1975, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies, Folder 105, Box 12, Personal correspondence, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

Of most significance to this chapter, is a piece of private correspondence that Fraser sent to Menzies that sought to ‘sum up the basic philosophy of Liberalism today.’ On sending the document to Menzies, Fraser added a respectful disclaimer (as a student might on sending a draft paper to their supervisor, which reviews their original work):

it is probably a little presumptuous of me even to contemplate producing another document along the attached lines, but nonetheless many of my colleagues feel the time has come when we should at least try to put (something) together.⁷⁶

The document proclaimed three key beliefs: in individual opportunity, concern for other and liberalism which was defined as ‘the historic yet developing philosophy that combines our belief in opportunity for every individual and our belief in concern for other.’⁷⁷ These beliefs were followed by seven observations about Australia, such as the size remoteness and location of Australia, the rights and responsibilities of ethnic groups, the historic development of Australia as a colony in a country ‘already occupied by an indigenous race’ and changes in cultural, economic and other relationship within Australia and with the world.⁷⁸ Finally, an extensive lists of institutions and policies that Liberals would advocate for, ranging from a Westminster style of government, to ‘a competitive, honest system of commercial enterprise with opportunity for’ entrepreneurs, small business and large corporations, to an ‘independently determined foreign policy based on our best judgement of Australia’s long terms interests.’

⁷⁶ Letter from Fraser to L.H. Craig, 11 April 1975, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies Folder 105, Box 12, Personal correspondence, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

⁷⁷ Attachment to letter from Fraser to L.H. Craig, 11 April 1975, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies Folder 105, Box 12, Personal correspondence, MS4936, National Library of Australia, p. 1.

⁷⁸ Attachment to letter from Fraser to L.H. Craig, 11 April 1975, pp. 2-3.

Menzies responded to the document with ‘many thanks’. Assuring, a probably nervous Fraser, that “I have no disagreement with this, except that I wish something had been said about “internal security.””⁷⁹

Publically, Menzies and Fraser also spoke in similar ways on the philosophy of Australian Liberalism. They both often spoke of the Liberal belief in freedom and free enterprise. Menzies hoped to ‘help the individual help himself’ - what Fraser termed ‘self-advancement’.⁸⁰ They both spoke of the importance of free enterprise, Menzies for example explaining that the Liberal ‘impulse is always to seek the private enterprise answer’, or as Fraser explained a ‘growing and developing Australia (is one in) which private enterprise is able to thrive and expand.’⁸¹ Menzies and Fraser also spoke of social justice. As a party interested in people, Fraser said that Liberals recognised a persons ‘need for compassionate and effective help when in difficulty.’⁸² Of his government, Menzies boasted ‘we have greatly aided social justice...we have shown that industrial progress is not to be based upon the poverty or despair of those who cannot compete’, rejecting that Liberals advocated an ‘each for himself’ laissez fair approach.⁸³

That Menzies wholly agreed with Fraser’s views on Australian Liberalism, at least on a philosophical level, and his belief that it was an importance and relevant issue, is of great significance. The correlation of Fraser’s views, on the matter of most

⁷⁹ Letter from Menzies to Fraser, 16 April 1975, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies, Folder 105, Box 12, Personal correspondence, MS4936, National Library of Australia.

⁸⁰ Robert Menzies, *Speech at the Liberal Party Federal council*, Hotel Canberra, Canberra, 6 April 1964, p. 2; Fraser, *Address to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the Liberal Party*, p. 5.

⁸¹ Menzies, *Speech at the Liberal Party federal council*, pp. 2-3; Malcolm Fraser, *Address at the South Australian state council dinner*, 27 October 1978, p. 2.

⁸² Fraser, *Address at the South Australian state council dinner*, p.1.

⁸³ Menzies, *Speech at the Liberal Party federal council*, p. 2.

importance to him, with those of his political mentor gave him an opportunity to articulate his vision for the country, using the image of his party's founder, Robert Menzies as support. The power of invoking the legacy of a past prime minister has been examined in many different contexts, but not with Fraser. The following part of this chapter will evaluate Fraser's success in invoking Menzies' legacy for his own political gain.

Firstly, Fraser employed Menzies' legacy as a way of illustrating the beliefs and values of his Government. In short, it helped Fraser to build an inspiring rhetorical framework. References to Menzies assisted Fraser in developing the idea of the Liberal Party and in establishing that he was part of a unified tradition that had served Australia well. In November 1979, Fraser reflected on the origins of the Liberal Party:

Thirty-five years ago last October 13, Robert Menzies brought fourteen fragmented organisations into one. Modern Liberalism was born on that day under on banner with one body of ideas.⁸⁴

Richard Hofstadter, on his book on the American political tradition has written of the 'unity of cultural and political tradition' that has existed 'above and beyond temporary and local conflicts'.⁸⁵ His book traces how this 'common ground' has been sustained across generations in American politics. Essentially, Fraser is attempting to create such common ground, on a partisan basis, that will be able to sustain the Liberal cause. As Hofstadter goes on to explain:

the range of ideas, therefore, which practical politicians can conveniently believe in is normally limited by the climate of opinion that sustains their culture...I have tried, without neglecting significant conflicts, to keep sight of the central faith and to trace its adaptation to varying times and various interests.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ Malcolm Fraser, *Address to Victorian State Council*, 17 November 1979, p 1.

⁸⁵ Richard Hofstadter, *The American political tradition and the men who made it* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977), p. xxxii.

⁸⁶ Hofstadter, *The American political tradition*, p. xxxi

Through binding Menzies legacy together with a set of political ideas, Fraser is attempting to claim these ideas for the Liberal Party. In a speech in which he mentions Menzies on several occasions, Fraser reflects on his own political success, explaining that in the Menzian tradition, he had:

urged them (Australians) to recall what they had seemingly forgotten, that we must “reward personal initiative, encourage investment...and mobilise the imagination and the resources of the Australian people...”⁸⁷

Fraser also linked Menzies in with his use of opposing images, in this way not only further claiming a set of ideas for his own party, but associating the Labor Party with the antithesis of these ideas. In building these opposing images, Fraser also employed Menzies legacy. Menzies, he said, ‘made the triumph of individualism his goal; socialism was his enemy’.⁸⁸ He associated the Labor Party with excessive controls, by referring to the lifting of wartime controls by the Menzies government, and explaining that ‘this unleashed the enthusiasm, energies and creativity of the Australian people’.⁸⁹ On another occasion, after referring to Menzies opposition to 1940s socialism, Fraser went on to criticise Labor’s current tax policy. These rhetorical techniques seek to build the Liberal image, denigrate Labor’s philosophy and promise change and renewal for the future.⁹⁰

In this way, Fraser’s discussion of Menzies’ legacy demonstrates the important role of ideas in politics. For Fraser, political philosophy was central, not only affecting his policy positions, but also fundamentally shaping the way in which he spoke about his

⁸⁷ Malcolm Fraser, *Address to Australian Liberal Students Federation*, 27 March 1980, p. 4.

⁸⁸ Malcolm Fraser, *Address to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the Liberal Party*, 10 December 1979, p. 2.

⁸⁹ Fraser, *Address to Australian Liberal Students Federation*, p. 2.

⁹⁰ Malcolm Fraser, *Address the businessmen’s lunch*, Coolangatta, 16 February 1981, p. 1.

vision for Australia, his understanding of the party he represented and his views on his party's founder. Bentley and Stevenson attest to the importance of ideas in political parties, rejecting the notion that political is primarily about pragmatism and expediency.⁹¹ Fraser's discussion of Menzies' legacy and his belief in Liberal philosophy is a case in point. In considering a politician's public rhetoric, Bentley and Stevenson suggested seeking evidence of 'correspondence and dissonance between the public language of politicians and the private.'⁹² As demonstrated in this chapter, the private correspondence between Menzies and Fraser is very much congruent with Fraser's public speech, verifying that Fraser's use of rhetoric about Liberalism was not merely for political gain but represented his true beliefs and political philosophy.

In the task of promoting Liberal philosophy, Fraser was assisted not only by Menzies similar political philosophy but also by the situation he faced. The Fraser government succeeded the Whitlam government, in a landslide election, and thus Fraser could rely on the powerful rhetorical tool of 'change'. While Gorton was promising a change with no antithetical image that he could condemn openly (as Alan Reid put it, Gorton was restricted to 'obliquely mocking' Menzies, by declaring for example that he was 'Australian to the boot heels'), Fraser did not have to hesitate when opposing the former Labor prime minister, Gough Whitlam.⁹³ John Uhr wrote of the rhetorical power of being able to establish such an opposing image, in relation to Keating, who

wanted to be understood as replacing not only his Labor predecessor Bob Hawke but, more pointedly, prime minister Menzies and Menzies' influential promotion of the "Britishness" of Australian citizenship.⁹⁴

⁹¹ Bentley, 'Party Doctrine and Thought', pp. 123-128.

⁹² Bentley, 'Party Doctrine and Thought', p. 141.

⁹³ Reid, *The Gorton Experiment*, p. 28.

⁹⁴ John Uhr, 'Political Leadership and Rhetoric', *Australian reshaped – 200 years of institutional transformation*, Geoffrey Brennan and Francis G. Castles eds., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 264.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Gorton faced a disadvantage of sorts, in that he could not draw out (at least as openly as Keating did) the differences between Menzies and himself. Fraser took full advantage of the opportunity he had to distance himself from Whitlam, commonly labeling Whitlam as an incompetent leader and taking every opportunity to denigrate the former government. In late November 1975, Fraser published a statement entitled 'Whitlam dodges the issue' detailing the past 'sins' of Whitlam's government, which Whitlam pretended did not exist. In contrast, Fraser spoke of the policy of the Liberal Party as dedicating to solving the problems of the future and dedicating itself to responsible government, 'with a sense of purpose and direction.'⁹⁵ Fraser clearly wished to be understood as fundamentally different from Whitlam. It was for this purpose that Fraser used Menzies' legacy, as a tool to distance himself from Whitlam.

Fraser also employed Menzies' legacy to bolster his own claim for Government. He made these claims directly, for example he compared the elections of 1949 and 1975 as years in which 'the Liberal Party was called upon by the people to revive the national spirit.'⁹⁶ Combined with Fraser's use of opposing images, Fraser's promise of renewal for the future, in the Menzian Liberal tradition created a powerful rhetoric. Fraser understood that the promise of change was an inspiring political tool and he took advantage of it, especially in the way in which he spoke of Menzies' government and in the opposing images he created.

⁹⁵ Malcolm Fraser, *Whitlam Dodges the Issue*, 25 November 1975, p. 1.

⁹⁶ Fraser, *Address to Australian Liberal students federation*, pp. 2-3.

As has been made clear, Fraser spoke extensively on Menzies' contribution to Liberal Party philosophy. Clearly, Fraser did not suffer from collective amnesia, as historians have assumed. Rather, Fraser took advantage of his party's history in demonstrating the origins of modern Liberal philosophy in Australia, and using the success of Menzies' government in implementing this philosophy to support his attempts to bring renewal to the Liberal Party. In many ways, Fraser was Menzies' disciple. His political philosophy was not particularly original; he drew on largely the same concepts and ideas that Menzies had in his time as prime minister. Additionally, Fraser's relationship with Menzies was one of a student and his master, one founded on respect and admiration and the recognition that there was much to learn from the more experienced Menzies. Fraser believed that Menzies had already done what Fraser hoped to do, that is, inspire the Australian people with the ideals and vision associated with Liberal Party philosophy. That is not to say that Fraser did not himself truly believe in the ideas he was promoting. As has been demonstrated, he clearly did and his use of Menzies' legacy was more idealistic than it was pragmatic. Fraser's achievements in promoting and developing the Menzies' legacy were significant, if one-dimensional. When Fraser became prime minister, the Liberal Party had only been in power for less than five years, since the end of the Menzies' era. And as discussed, Gorton, did little in his term as prime minister to promote or develop Menzies' legacy. Thus, in many ways, Fraser was starting from nothing and as will be shown in the following chapter, he began the tradition of developing ideas of Australian Liberalism in tandem with Menzies' legacy.

Menzies' remembered

John Howard, Prime Minister, 1996 – 2007

Having finally got back into Federal Government...let us sensibly consolidate that win, let us sensibly build for the future. And one of the things we must sensibly do is to honour our history and to treasure our past. We have a very rich and honoured past and we ought to honour the contribution of our great Prime Ministers of the past.⁹⁷

By 1996, when John Howard became prime minister, the Menzies era had all but passed into historical memory. Unlike Gorton and Fraser, who were both ministers in the Menzies government, Howard had only met Robert Menzies once.⁹⁸ Thus, the way that Howard remembered and spoke of Menzies was substantially different to Gorton and Fraser's personal recollections. For Howard, building Menzies' legacy was an important task, one that linked in to his more general views on the role and importance of history and historical memory in politics. In 1998, conservative political commentator Gerard Henderson wrote that 'Howard has had little of interest to say about his hero', Robert Menzies.⁹⁹ This chapter will dispute this claim, demonstrating that Howard articulated a well-developed and complex assessment of the Liberal Party founder. Firstly, this chapter will discuss Howard's views on the role of history, especially in the context of the history wars, and how this related to his

⁹⁷ John Howard, *Speech at the Liberal Party of Australia Victorian division state council meeting*, Camberwell, Victoria, 11 May 1996, p. 2.

⁹⁸ Henderson, *Menzies' Child*, p. 13.

⁹⁹ Henderson, *Menzies' Child*, p. 13.

understanding of the importance of developing Menzies' legacy. It will then examine Howard's contribution to Menzies' legacy and consider the influence of the circumstances in which Howard was prime minister, particularly in relation to the issues of reconciliation and multiculturalism. Finally, it will consider the similarities between Howard and Menzies, especially in relation to their categorisation of "mainstream" Australia.

Throughout his time as Prime Minister, Howard spoke of the need to ensure that 'our history as a nation is not written definitively by those who take the view that Australians should apologise for most of it'; what Howard often called the 'black arm band view' of Australian history.¹⁰⁰ His approach to Australian history was informed by his belief that 'there is a story of great Australian achievement to be told.'¹⁰¹ For the most part, historians and commentators have spoken of Howard's views on history in relation to Indigenous issues, specifically reconciliation.¹⁰² For Howard, however, these attempts to 're-write' history, have extended to 'important parts of Australia's political history', the highpoint of which Howard believed came in the form of the 'sustained, personalised and vindictive assault on the Menzies legacy orchestrated from the highest levels of the then national (Keating) government.'¹⁰³ Howard felt that to 'sensibly build...the future' of Liberalism, it was necessary to 'honour our history and treasure our past,' something he believed the Labor Party had been

¹⁰⁰ John Howard, *The 1996 Sir Robert Menzies lecture: The Liberal tradition – the beliefs and values which guide the federal government*, 18 November 1996, p. 9.

¹⁰¹ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 10; John Howard, *Speech to the Marion City Council Australia Day citizenship ceremony*, Hallett Cove, South Australia, 26 January 1997, p. 2.

¹⁰² For example, see: Stuart Macintyre and Anna Clark, *The History Wars* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2003), p. 221.

¹⁰³ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 2, John Howard, *Sir Thomas Playford – memorial lecture*, Adelaide Town Hall, 5 July 1996, p. 1.

‘extremely good at...they have built failures in to icons.’¹⁰⁴ Howard believed these attempts to re-write Australian political history in a partisan fashion were motivated not only by opposing political values, but also in order ‘to establish a form of historical correctness as a particular offshoot of political correctness.’¹⁰⁵ Again, this is similar to the way in which Howard often spoke of Indigenous history, and contemporary Indigenous issues, as being affected by political correctness.¹⁰⁶ It is in light of these views on history, that Howard felt a need to ‘redress the balance’, which ensured that, despite Henderson’s claim, he did speak meaningfully and at length about Menzies. History to Howard was important for several reasons. He explained:

It is from the history of our political tradition that we can build on acquired wisdom. It is from our history that we learn for the future from the lessons of past practical experience. It is from our history that we can understand the scale of what our predecessors achieved. And it is from our history that the elements of both continuity and evolution in our political philosophy become apparent.¹⁰⁷

Michael Bentley’s work supports Howard’s assessment, particularly in relation to building the tradition of Liberalism. In reference to the rationale for building traditions of political philosophy, Bentley explains that ‘behind this need to create tenets lies an imperative about identity rather than a wish to educate.’¹⁰⁸

By referring to the history of the Liberal Party and its founder Robert Menzies, Howard defined the Liberal Party and articulated a workable identity. Creating continuity in the identity of the Liberal Party was important as:

¹⁰⁴ Howard, *Speech at the Liberal Party of Australia Victorian Division state council meeting*, p. 2.

¹⁰⁵ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, pp. 2-3.

¹⁰⁶ John Howard, *Interview with Fran Kelly on the AM Programme*, 2 April 1996, p. 2.

¹⁰⁷ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 3.

¹⁰⁸ Bentley, ‘Party Doctrine and Thought’, p. 146.

Doctrine defies the erosion that simple passage of time inflicts on a party's image of itself and its purpose; by placing beyond question or argument certain facets of party outlook it provides a core of continuity.¹⁰⁹

More generally, for Howard the history of Liberalism was 'an important part of the broader history of Australia' that Liberals must understand in order to relate 'the values of Liberalism to the challenges of Australia's future.'¹¹⁰ As part of this, it was important to Howard to put the 'achievements of Menzies into their proper historical perspective.'¹¹¹ For Howard understood that to denigrate Menzies, was to denigrate the Liberal cause and that to venerate Menzies was to do the opposite.

Additionally, of special import for this chapter, is the relationship between Menzies legacy and Howard's claims about Australian national identity. As John Uhr has discussed:

Australian politicians anchor their responsibilities of leadership in one policy task, which is a prerequisite to all others – the promotion of a sense of national citizenship...citizen-building is a prerequisite for nation-building.¹¹²

On this front, Howard felt that 'one of the most perverse myths about Menzies was his alleged subservience to Britain', a view that implied that those that did not share this view of Menzies 'were somehow lesser Australians and less patriotic than those who did.'¹¹³ Additionally, Howard's claims in regards to national identity were important because just as Menzies had, he claimed that the Liberal Party represented

¹⁰⁹ Bentley, 'Party Doctrine and Thought', p. 146.

¹¹⁰ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 3.

¹¹¹ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 2.

¹¹² John Uhr, 'Political Leadership and Rhetoric', *Australian reshaped – 200 years of institutional transformation*, Geoffrey Brennan and Francis G. Castles eds., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 266-267.

¹¹³ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, pp. 6 & 2.

“mainstream” Australians. Thus, to define “Australian” was to define whom the Liberal Party stood for.

Howard’s self-reflective approach to the issues of political history and historical memory and also his genuine admiration for Robert Menzies ensured that the way in which he spoke of Menzies was in no way one dimensional (as was the case with Fraser) or restrained (as was the case with Gorton). Howard’s discussion of Menzies’ legacy considered ideas as varied as modern Liberalism, nation building, the qualities of a great leader, Australian identity, the collective identity of the Liberal Party constituency and the values of Australians. Howard’s lengthiest and most detailed discussion of the issue of Menzies’ legacy was in the 1996 Menzies’ lecture entitled *The Liberal tradition – the beliefs and values which guide the federal government*. However, Howard spoke on the same themes and issues on many occasions. The following section will piece together a variety of sources to provide a picture of what Howard believed was Menzies’ legacy.

Just as Fraser had, Howard referred to the centrality of Menzies contribution to developing Liberal party philosophy. However, Howard emphasised the uniqueness of what he termed ‘modern Australian Liberalism’; a fusion of both ‘liberal and conservative traditions’, of which he believed Menzies was the ‘Founding Father’.¹¹⁴

Howard felt that he fit squarely into this model, often describing himself as an economic liberal and a social conservative.¹¹⁵ Howard explained that Menzies:

¹¹⁴ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 7; John Howard, *Sir Thomas Playford memorial lecture*, Adelaide Town Hall, 5 July 1996, p. 3.

¹¹⁵ Howard, *Playford memorial lecture*, p. 3; John Howard, *Address to the Centre for Independence Studies*, 14 November 1996, p. 3; John Howard, *Speech to the New South Wales Liberal Party State Convention*, Sydney, 26 September 1997, p. 3.

knew the importance for Liberalism of upholding people's rights and freedoms as individuals. He also knew the importance of values and priorities that had both a proven record of past achievement and a relevance to advancing Australia's national interest into the future.¹¹⁶

Unlike Fraser, Howard addressed the criticism that Menzies was subservient to the British head on, by not only declaring it a 'perverse myth' but also explaining Menzies relationship with Britain and British institutions. Despite the 'distinctive Australian form of the liberal political tradition', he emphasised Menzies conservative belief and:

deep respect for the political freedoms and personal liberties, the parliamentary democracy, the rule of law and a free press that were Britain's great gift to Australia....¹¹⁷

By declaring that he believed 'these principles constitute the foundations on which Australia's strength as a nation are built', Howard did not shy away from Menzies' association with Britishness. Rather, he defended Menzies' legacy against the attacks of Keating, who commonly made declarations along the lines that 'Menzies had us in this sort of time warp and torpor' as a result of his dependence and subservience to Britain.¹¹⁸ This approach allowed Howard to articulate a fuller legacy for Menzies, demonstrating his true admiration for the Liberal founder, but also the usefulness of Menzies legacy for Howard's political agenda, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

¹¹⁶ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 7.

¹¹⁷ John Howard, *The 1997 Sir Robert Menzies memorial lecture: "Australia and Britain – the contemporary partnership in a new international environment"*, United Kingdom, 23 June 1997, p. 4.

¹¹⁸ Paul Keating, *Interview with John Laws on 2UE*, 28 February 1992, p. 2.

Howard also spoke of Menzies achievements in building the Australian nation, in this way addressing the common criticism that Menzies ‘put the place in a torpor.’¹¹⁹ With Howard admired the Menzies era as an ‘unparalleled period of stability and prosperity...that contributed so much to modern Australia.’ With Keating’s words in mind, he declared ‘let us never be ashamed of our past, let us always defend it with great pride.’¹²⁰ And Howard did. He spoke of Menzies as:

above all...a great Australian nation-builder...He understood better than any political leader of his generation the nation-building capacities of private enterprise and a strategic but limited role for government. That is clearly evident in his record of achievements in government in areas as diverse as national development, economic growth, trade and foreign policy, science and educations and the arts.’¹²¹

For example, Howard attributed the development of Canberra as a capital of ‘national and international standing’ to the ‘foresight and commitment’ of Menzies.¹²² He spoke of the stability of the Menzies era as providing an ‘institutional and economic framework which encouraged foreign investment.’ Howard also often referred to Menzies role in promoting post-war immigration and in beginning engagement with the Asia-pacific region, for example with the Colombo plan and trade agreement with Japan.¹²³ In this way, Howard did not deny that the Menzies era was one of stability, but rather spoke of the achievements of the Menzies government in such a way that this stability was an achievement to be proud of, rather than something to denigrate.

¹¹⁹ Keating, *Interview with John Laws on 2UE*, p. 2.

¹²⁰ John Howard, *Speech at the Liberal Party of Australia Victorian Division state council meeting*, Camberwell, Victoria, 11 May 1996, p. 2.

¹²¹ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 6.

¹²² John Howard, Statement by the Prime Minister – “Rebuilding regional Australia – The case of the capital region”, Canberra, 13 December 10996, p. 4.

¹²³ Howard, *Menzies memorial lecture*, p. 6.

Howard also believed Menzies to be a great leader in the democratic tradition, demonstrating ‘consummate and... unrivalled skill as a political practitioner.’ He spoke admiringly of Menzies’ commitment to democratic constitutionalism, parliamentary democracy, the authority, standards and traditions of Parliament, the separation of powers, the process of Cabinet decision-making, honest and accountable government and public service. By claiming these qualities for Menzies, Howard claimed them also for the Liberal Party and for his government.

Finally, Howard believed Menzies to be a great Australian, often referring to Menzies understanding of the values and identity of the Australian people. Howard was convinced that:

Menzies intense Australianness was highlighted in the political relationship he had with the Australian people. He articulated the hopes and concerns of the Australians of his time...Menzies’ political genius lay in that basic affinity with the aspirations of the Australian people...Menzies had his finger on the pulse of the Australian nation in a way that few other leaders have matched and none have surpassed.¹²⁴

By claiming that it was Menzies’ ‘essential Australianness that underpinned his unequalled period of dominance in Australian political life’, Howard linked Menzies electoral success with his understanding and identification with mainstream Australia.¹²⁵ In this way, he defended Menzies identity, claiming that in a true sense, he was “Australian”. Howard acknowledged that much had changed in Australia since the time of Menzies and warned of the dangers of using ‘hindsight’ to judge the past. This assessment is in line with that made by Prasser et al; that Menzies was the victim of ‘presenteeism’: the use of present standards and values to assess the past.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 7.

¹²⁵ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 6.

¹²⁶ Prasser et al, *The Menzies Era*, p. 16.

Menzies' Australianness was defined by Howard according to the accuracy of his representation of 'the great mainstream of Australian society.'¹²⁷

Howard has spoken at length and on many occasions about Menzies' particular definition of "mainstream" Australia, as the forgotten people. Howard himself used a similar definitional framework that served as a powerful rhetorical device – of course, known as Howard's "battlers". The congruence of these ideas can perhaps be explained by Howard's upbringing, his own parents were 'part of the "forgotten people"...they neither belonged to organised Labor, nor were rich and powerful.'¹²⁸

Menzies' biographer, A.W Martin believes that Menzies' upbringing also contributed significantly to the development of his thinking in regards to "the forgotten people".

He wrote that Menzies' reference to the "forgotten people":

did not embody, as has sometimes been implied, a telling new idea whose exploitation would become a turning point in Menzies' career. It was simply an elegant exposition of moral principles which he had learned as a child and a view of social life and stability which as a political he had consistently advanced and built upon ever since his apprentice days in the 1920s.¹²⁹

Australian historians have discussed these similarities between Menzies' "forgotten people" and Howard's "battlers". Judith Brett wrote on this that:

Like Menzies' transformation of the forgotten class into the forgotten people, Howard's battlers transcend class identities and include both the employed and the self employed as they struggle to raise a family and make ends meet...It not only claimed to represent the mainstream or the whole, but did so in a way that directly challenged Labor's core historical identity. It also showed that class had all but disappeared as a basis of ordinary Australians' political identity and understanding.¹³⁰

¹²⁷ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 4.

¹²⁸ John Howard, *Lazarus Rising: a personal and political autobiography* (Sydney: HarperCollins, 2010), p. 12.

¹²⁹ Martin, *Menzies – vol. 2*, p. xiv.

¹³⁰ Judith Brett, *Australian liberals and the moral middle class: from Alfred Deakin to John Howard* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 189

Howard's biographers Errington and van Onselen make a similar assessment claiming that 'in the battlers, who had no interest groups representing them, Howard had found his "forgotten people."' It was a case of "the more the merrier" when it came to defining this group of Australians. This broad definition was crucial to the success of both Menzies' and Howard's rhetorical strategy. Howard acknowledged this, explaining that 'Menzies political success lay in building an enduring and broadly-based constituency... "the forgotten people"' ¹³¹

Of most importance for Howard however was the unifying power of such language. On many occasions he spoke out against what he saw as poor attempts to divide Australians against other Australians. ¹³² For Howard, 'another aspect of Menzies' legacy (was) that Liberalism has focused on *national* interests rather than *sectional* interests.' ¹³³ Liberals was 'a political movement owned by no special interests, defending no special privileges' and 'was not brow beaten and intimidated by vocal minority groups.' ¹³⁴ Howard saw this concept as crucial to his own political program, as demonstrated by his political slogan 'For All of Us'. Howard vowed that he would 'continue to listen to the Australian people and to address key issues of concern to them' just as Menzies had listened to and addressed the concerns of the forgotten people. ¹³⁵

These ideas of liberalism, nation building and the identity of mainstream Australia, were crucial for Howard in the way that he approached many of the contemporary

¹³¹ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 11.

¹³² Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 2.

¹³³ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 8.

¹³⁴ Howard, *Menzies lecture*, p. 13; John Howard, *Address at the Herbert Electorate Dinner*, 19 July 1996, p 2.

¹³⁵ Howard, *Menzies memorial lecture*, p. 5.

policy issues that he faced in his time as prime minister. In turn, Howard's political circumstances informed the way in which he developed and used these ideas about Menzies, for his own political advantage. In particular, relevant circumstances include that Howard succeeded Paul Keating as prime minister, the policy issues of reconciliation and multiculturalism, the history wars, and the passing of Robert Menzies into historical (rather than living) memory.

Howard's decisive victory against the Keating government, which was one of the worst defeats of an incumbent government in Australian political history, gave Howard the space and opportunity to set himself apart from Keating.¹³⁶ Howard took this opportunity on himself with no hesitation, no doubt, not only because he saw himself as a remarkably different politician than Keating, but also because in the current political climate, it was an advantageous move. As shown above, Howard took full advantage of Menzies' legacy to define his own beliefs. Keating, as discussed, often denigrated Menzies. In fact, Howard believed he had led the attack on the Liberal founder. Keating had already created an image of himself and the Labor Party that was starkly different from that of Menzies. Thus, Howard only had to speak of Menzies admiringly; his Liberalism, his skills as a nation builder and national leader and his understanding of the Australian people, to distance himself from Keating. In short, by invoking Menzies' legacy and promising that his government would continue in this tradition, Howard distanced himself from Keating. Besides this, as established previously, Howard understood the political importance of venerating past party leaders as a way of ensuring the future of the party. For this

¹³⁶ Errington and van Onselen, *John Winston Howard*, p. 236.

reason, Howard was determined to defend the Menzies' legacy against what he saw as Keating's vicious attacks and he was determined to memorialise him as a great leader.

In relation to the issues of reconciliation and multiculturalism, Menzies' legacy was also of political use to Howard, primarily in explaining and justifying his thinking on these issues. Many felt that Howard was opposed to the policies of reconciliation and multiculturalism and many journalists questioned him on this. When asked by Fran Kelly reconciliation would regress under his government, Howard confirmed his complete commitment to the policy. He went on to refer to the views of mainstream Australians, explaining that 'we are ashamed' about Aboriginal standards of health, education and employment opportunities and believe that something must be done to fix these things. Interestingly, he then explained that mainstream Australians:

are also saying that...we as taxpayers are entitled to value for our dollars and...to debate and ask questions about whether programmes are helping the targeted areas of need without being accused of prejudice or bigotry...or racism.¹³⁷

Additionally, he explained that mainstream Australians:

are not going to be scared off doing things that are necessary in the interests of Australian taxpayers by some kind of politically correct quarantining of certain activities from any kind of scrutiny...we should understand that all are accountable before the laws of Australia and you have to treat all Australians equally.¹³⁸

Howard held this view throughout his time as prime minister. Reflecting in his biography he wrote on the issue that when it came to Indigenous affairs, it was best to:

¹³⁷ Howard, *Interview with Fran Kelly*, pp. 2-3.

¹³⁸ Howard, *Interview with Fran Kelly*, p. 2.

Avoid the perception of special privileges for Indigenous Australians, as this frequently aggregated less well-off people from the rest of the Australian community...I did not have a politically correct approach to Aboriginal issues. I did not believe in separate development for the Indigenous people of Australia. It remains my opinion that the best way of helping Indigenous Australians is to include them within the mainstream of the Australian community...'¹³⁹

This thinking linked in with Howard's discussion of Menzies' representation of the "mainstream" or national interest, rather than minority groups and sectional interests. The importance of rhetorical concepts such as Howard's "battlers" and Menzies' "forgotten people" is crucial in promoting this thinking. In this way, Howard used Menzies' legacy to justify his political positions on issues such as reconciliation, by referring to Menzies' similar thinking and by employing similar rhetorical structures.

Howard also made similar statements in regards to multiculturalism and immigration: that all Australians are equal, and that political correctness was being used to shut down debate on the issue.¹⁴⁰

On many occasions, Howard spoke of Menzies' achievements in promoting post-war immigration and the inclusion of these immigrations into Australian society, thus building the Liberal Party's credentials of presiding over sensible and workable immigrations policies that are in the national interest.¹⁴¹ On Australian Day in 1997, Howard spoke of the diversity, tolerance and openness of Australian society and also the importance of 'remedying disadvantage' and achieving 'complete reconciliation'.

¹³⁹ Howard, *Lazarus Rising*, pp. 270-271.

¹⁴⁰ John Howard, *Interview with Derryn Hinch, Radio 2GB*, 14 October 1996, p. 5.

¹⁴¹ Howard, *Menzies memorial lecture*, p. 6; Howard, *Speech at the Liberal Party of Australia Victorian Division state council meeting*, p. 2.

He ended his speech however by explaining that Australia Day was ‘a day to celebrate things in common. It is a day to celebrate the unity of the Australian people.’¹⁴² Howard preferred to emphasise the unity of Australians and their common values rather than the ways in which they were different.

In his autobiography, Howard spoke of the policy of multiculturalism and reconciliation, explaining that his thinking on both these issues was the same:

that Australia should emphasise the common characteristics of the Australian identity. We should emphasise our unifying points rather than our areas of difference.¹⁴³

Menzies’ legacy was a way of promoting and explaining this preference, through promoting the Liberal Party as concerned with mainstream Australians, a concept that tended to absorb the identities of minority groups. Bentley study of doctrine in political parties supports this conclusion. He has attested to the ‘role of a “canon” or “tradition” in political explanation’, in lending ‘practitioners of party politics’ the ‘self-legitimacy’ that they require, as popularly elected leaders.¹⁴⁴ While Bentley does qualify that ideas are important, and that politics is not only about pragmatism and expediency, he also asserts the power of tradition. In the case of Howard, political explanation was grounded in the tradition established by Robert Menzies.

Finally, the combination of Howard’s interest in political history, with the passing of the Menzies era into historical memory gave Howard great scope in developing Menzies’ legacy. While Howard was still affected by the relative closeness of the

¹⁴² John Howard, *Speech to Marion City Council Australian Day citizenship ceremony*, Hallett Cove, South Australia, 26 January 1997, p. 2.

¹⁴³ Howard, *Lazarus Rising*, p. 174.

¹⁴⁴ Bentley, ‘Party doctrine and thought’, p. 128.

Menzies era to his own, particularly with regards to Keating's derogatory references to this era, he was much less constrained than Gorton had been, governing only a couple of years after Menzies' retired when almost all Australians remembered Menzies well. In reference to Franklin D. Roosevelt, Torbjorn Sirevag has discusses this concept writing that:

what must undoubtedly have intrigued the President and quickened his interest in historical analogy was the simple surmise that the further back in history he went, the less constraining influence there was likely to be on his interpretation and consequently the more room for unimpeded response to contemporary problems.¹⁴⁵

To some extent, this concept applies to Howard. However, of course, the history of Australia, and even more so, the history of the Liberal Party, pales in comparison to the long American political tradition. Howard was not reaching that far back into the past, and he was not building on an already well-established political legacy.

However, Howard's interest in history and the thirty years that had lapsed since the end of the Menzies' era aided, rather than hindered his cause. Howard built a multidimensional legacy for Robert Menzies, one that considered the complexities of his political philosophy and placed his achievements in their historical context.

Howard also shared much of his thinking about Australia with the Liberal founder, employing the same explanatory and rhetorical frameworks in his discussion of policy issues and the national identity. In some senses, he was aided by his circumstances, Keating's attacks on Menzies and the prominence of the issues of reconciliation and multiculturalism ensured that Howard's discussion of Menzies' legacy was relevant and engaging. On the other hand, Howard was in many ways on the defensive.

¹⁴⁵ Torbjorn Sirevag, 'Franklin D Roosevelt and the use of history', *Americana Norwegian*, Vol. 2, 1968, p 319.

Keating himself had been a powerful narrator and had contributed significantly to denigrating the public image of Menzies. Additionally, the issues of reconciliation and multiculturalism were surrounded by controversy for the Howard government. This often led Howard to qualify his statements about the Liberal founder; to tread carefully, rather than make the bold, inspired statements. On balance, however, Howard made a great contribution to the nurturing of Liberal Party history and the legacy of Menzies.

Conclusion

This thesis has demonstrated beyond doubt that the Liberal Party does not suffer from collective amnesia in relation to their founder, Robert Menzies. The political circumstances and personal beliefs of Gorton, Fraser and Howard were to varying degrees amenable to the propagation of political ideas inspired by Menzies. Gorton had not “forgotten” Menzies, or neglected to nourish his legacy as a result of some form of historical memory-loss. Rather, he was conscious of the incongruence between his political agenda and the dominant images of a prime minister that in many ways overshadowed his time in government, at the very least, within the Liberal Party. Gorton’s three years as prime minister paled in comparison to Menzies’ extraordinarily long tenancy of the position. The few images that Gorton did briefly attempt to propagate were overwhelmed by other much more dominant and evocative images of Menzies.

Fraser’s focus during his time as prime minister in relation to Menzies’ legacy was primarily one-dimensional. It focused on Menzies’ conservative Liberalism, a political philosophy that was relevant and popular in the political climate of the time. While Fraser did develop a dedicated and relevant conception of Menzies that supported his political program, political philosophy alone will never build a truly stimulating rhetoric, nor will it truly venerate a leader in an enduring and inspiring fashion. However, Fraser did achieve what he set out to; he successfully associated himself and his government with Liberal philosophy, in the tradition of Robert Menzies. Fraser’s efforts laid important groundwork for Howard’s more detailed articulation of Menzies’ legacy.

Howard's determination to contribute to the history of the Liberal Party ensured that he developed a thoughtful and complex legacy for Menzies. He used Menzies' legacy not only in his development of ideas about Liberal philosophy and the characteristics of good government and good leadership, but also to support his own thinking on the policy issues of reconciliation and multiculturalism. What hindered Howard's attempts to venerate Menzies however was the controversy surrounding these issues. They were not Howard's most inspiring policies, nor were they those of which he was most proud. Perhaps, if Howard had been able to relate Menzies' to his highly successful push for comprehensive national gun law reform, for example (a policy popular among Australians across the political divide), or to a policy that he worked hard to convince the Australian public of, such as the GST, his attempts to establish Menzies legacy would most probably have progressed in leaps and bounds. This was not the case, yet it is important to consider that Howard's contribution to the Menzies' legacy is not yet over. In his role as a public figure and former prime minister, Howard still has a contribution to make and it seems that he will continue to build Menzies' legacy, particularly through the release of his upcoming book, a history of Australian politics from December 1949, which will include a comprehensive section on the second Menzies government.¹⁴⁶

Other factors that have affected the memorialisation of Robert Menzies include the relative youth of the Liberal Party and the extraordinary length of time that Menzies was prime minister ensured he had a strong presence in terms of the living memory of

¹⁴⁶ Stephen Romei, 'John Howard's new book', *The Australian online*, available from <http://blogs.theaustralian.news.com.au/alr/index.php/theaustralian/comments/john_howards_new_book/>, accessed 4 November 2012.

Australians. Since Menzies, there have only been three Liberal prime ministers that served at least a full term, and their combined time in office is only just longer than the time that Menzies himself was prime minister. For a long time, the political memory of Menzies was shaped primarily by the living memory of his extensive tenure as prime minister, rather than primarily by the party leaders that succeeded him. The nature of political memory has been shown as important to the memorialisation of Menzies. Howard articulated a much more comprehensive legacy for Menzies, partly due to the passing of Menzies by this time into historical memory, giving Howard greater scope. Also, the length of time that Menzies was prime minister ensured that he was the target of much criticism from the Labor party especially, and the victim of the hindsight industry, especially because he was governed over a time of stability that preceded a time of great change.

This thesis has raised some potential avenues of further research that would contribute to a greater understanding of political memory in the Australian Liberal Party. Firstly, this thesis has only considered a relatively limited set of primary resources, as some sources were not accessible, due to distance or access restrictions. Additionally as discussed, Howard is still in the process of writing what is likely to be his most comprehensive appraisal of Menzies' thus far. In answering the questions this thesis considered, that source material would have been indispensable. Secondly, this thesis posed a narrow question in relation to Menzies' legacy, it did not consider the views of other minor Liberal prime ministers, other liberal politicians and party members or the public legacy of Menzies as it stands today.

The findings of this thesis would suggest that with time, the legacy of Robert Menzies will become more firmly established as his time in government passes further in to history. Additionally, future Liberal prime ministers will be able to build on the firm foundations of the Menzies' legacy that have already been established, primarily by Fraser and Howard. As time passes, the power of invoking Menzies' legacy will increase, as a tradition of reference to this legacy is established among Liberal prime ministers. The more powerful a tradition, the greater self-legitimacy it will gift a politician. The conclusions reached in this study of Liberal prime ministers, would suggest that Menzies' legacy will continue to develop, with some signs that a snowball effect will ensue. As Menzies' legacy becomes more firmly established and increasingly shaped by the Liberal party, the political benefits of invoking his legacy will be heightened, further contributing to the canon of references to Robert Menzies.

In sum, Menzies' role in the creation of the Liberal Party and his achievements as prime minister have been too great for past Liberal prime ministers to ignore, despite hindrances that have arisen as a result of their political circumstances. The future Liberal Party and future Liberal leaders will be able to build on this tradition that has been discussed in this thesis. Hopefully, the study of the Menzies' legacy will continue, as it is an important avenue of enquiry that will assist in the historical outstanding of the Australian Liberal political tradition and of Australian political history more broadly.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Fraser, Malcolm, *Address at the South Australian state council dinner, 27 October 1978*, pp. 1-6.

Fraser, Malcolm, *Address to Australian Liberal Students Federation, 27 March 1980*, pp. 1-11.

Fraser, Malcolm, *Address to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the Liberal Party, 10 December 1979*, pp. 1-5.

Fraser, Malcolm, *Address to the businessmen's lunch, Coolangatta, 16 February 1981*, pp. 1-7.

Fraser, Malcolm, *Address to Victorian State Council, 17 November 1979*, pp. 1-10.

Fraser, Malcolm, *Electorate talk, 4 July 1976*, pp. 1-3.

Fraser, Malcolm, *Prime Minister on "Talk to the Giants", Perth, interview by school children, 27 April 1979*, pp. 1-20.

Fraser, Malcolm, *Text of address given by the Prime Minister at the Liberal Party Federal Council, 19 September 1976*, pp. 1-12.

Fraser, Malcolm, *Whitlam Dodges the Issue*, 25 November 1975, pp. 1-2.

Gorton, John, *Australia Club Address*, Dorchester Hotel, London, 17 January 1969,
pp. 1-5.

Gorton, John, *Australia Day message*, Canberra, 24 January 1969.

Gorton, John, *Interview for BBC "Panorama" programme*, 22 January 1968, pp. 1-4.

Gorton, John, *Meet the Press interview*, Melbourne, 12 April 1970, pp. 1-9.

Gorton, John, *New Year message to the nation*, Canberra, 31 December 1968.

Gorton, John, *Speech by the prime minister at the Henty Electorate Dinner*,
Moorabbin, Victoria, 14 September 1968, pp. 1-7.

Gorton, John, *Speech by the prime minister at the Flinders electorate liberal party
luncheon*, Mornington, Victoria, 14 October 1968, pp. 1-5.

Gorton, John, *Speech by the Prime Minister*, Greensborough Liberal Party branch
luncheon, Bundoora, Victoria, 10 November 1968, pp. 1-3.

Gorton, John, *Speech by the prime minister at the opening of the National Library*,
Canberra, 15 August 1968, pp. 1-3.

Gorton, John, *Speech by the Prime Minister*, Liberal Party Speaker's Group dinner, Southern Cross Hotel, Melbourne, 27 February 1968, pp. 1-7.

Gorton, John, *Text of the Prime Minister's "Meet the Press" interview*, 21 January 1968, pp. 1-14.

Howard, John, *Address at the Herbert Electorate Dinner*, 19 July 1996, pp. 1-7.

Howard, John, *Address to the centre for independent studies*, 14 November 1996, pp. 1-3.

Howard, John, *Interview with Derryn Hinch, Radio 2GB*, 14 October 1996, pp. 1-8.

Howard, John, *Interview with Fran Kelly on the AM Programme*, 2 April 1996, pp. 1-10.

Howard, John, *Lazarus Rising: a personal and political autobiography* (Sydney: HarperCollins, 2010).

Howard, John, *Sir Thomas Playford – memorial lecture*, Adelaide Town Hall, 5 July 1996, pp. 1-13.

Howard, John, *Speech at the Liberal Party of Australia Victorian Division state council meeting*, Camberwell, Victoria, 11 May 1996, pp. 1-7.

Howard, John, *Speech to the Marion City Council Australia Day citizenship ceremony*, Hallett Cove, South Australia, 26 January 1997, pp. 1-3.

Howard, John, *Speech to the New South Wales Liberal Party State Convention*, Sydney, 26 September 1997, pp. 1-5.

Howard, John, *Statement by the Prime Minister – “Rebuilding regional Australia – The case of the capital region”*, Canberra, 13 December 1996, pp. 1-10

Howard, John, *Statement by the Prime Minister designate*, 8 March 1996, pp. 1-8.

Howard, John, *The 1996 Sir Robert Menzies lecture: The Liberal tradition – the beliefs and values which guide the federal government*, 18 November 1996, pp. 1-13.

Howard, John, *The 1997 Sir Robert Menzies memorial lecture – ‘Australia and Britain; the contemporary partnership in a new international environment’*, United Kingdom, 23 June 1997, pp. 1-10.

Howard, John, *The inaugural prime ministers on prime ministers lecture*, Old Parliament House, 3 September 1997, pp. 1-10.

Keating, Paul, *Interview with John Laws on 2UE*, 28 February 1992, pp. 1-5.

Menzies, Robert, *Message by the prime minister for Australia Day*, 25 January 1963,
p. 1.

Menzies, Robert, *Speech by the prime minister and the Federal Council of the Liberal
Party of Australia*, Hotel Canberra, Canberra, 6 April 1964, pp. 1-4.

Attachment to letter from Malcolm Fraser to L.H. Craig, 11 April 1975, Papers of Sir
Robert Menzies Folder 105, Box 12, Personal correspondence, MS4936,
National Library of Australia, pp. 1-3.

Letter from John Gorton to Robert Menzies, 13 September 1968, Folder 11, Box 426,
Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia, pp. 1-2.

Letter from John Gorton to Robert Menzies, 17 March 1969, Folder 29, Series 29,
Box 287, MS4936, National Library of Australia, p. 1.

Letter from John Gorton to Robert Menzies, 1 May 1969, Folder 29, Series 29, Box
287, MS4936, National Library of Australia, p. 1.

Letter from L.H. Craig to Malcolm Fraser, 19 August 1975, Papers of Sir Robert
Menzies, Folder 105, Box 12, Personal correspondence, MS4936, National
Library of Australia, p. 1.

Letter from Malcolm Fraser to L.H. Craig, 11 April 1975, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies Folder 105, Box 12, Personal correspondence, MS4936, National Library of Australia, p. 1.

Letter from Robert Menzies to John Gorton, London, 28 June 1968, Folder 11, Box 426, Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia, pp. 1-3.

Letter from Robert Menzies to John Gorton, 10 April 1969, Folder 29, Series 29, Box 287, MS4936, National Library of Australia, p. 1.

Letter from Robert Menzies to L.H. Craig, 1 July 1968, Folder 11, Box 426, Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia, p. 1.

Letter from Robert Menzies to Malcolm Fraser, 24 March 1971, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies, Folder 899, Box 426, Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia, p. 1.

Letter from Robert Menzies to Malcolm Fraser, 16 April 1975, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies, Folder 105, Box 12, Personal correspondence, MS4936, National Library of Australia, p. 1.

Letter from Robert Menzies to Paul Hasluck and McEwen, 28 June 1968, Folder 11, Box 426, Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia, p. 1.

Letter from Robert Menzies to Tammy Fraser, 10 December 1975, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies, Folder 105, Box 12, Personal correspondence, MS4936, National Library of Australia, p. 1.

Telegram from Robert Menzies to John Gorton, 20 August 1971, Papers of Sir Robert Menzies, Folder 899, Box 426, Series 17, MS4936, National Library of Australia, p. 1.

Secondary sources

Ayres, Philip *Malcolm Fraser – a biography*, (Port Melbourne: Mandarin Australia, 1989).

Bentley, Michael, 'Party Doctrine and Thought' in *High and Low Politics in Modern Britain: Ten Studies*, Michael Bentley and John Stevenson eds. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), pp. 123-152.

Brennan, Geoffrey and Francis G. Castles eds., *Australian reshaped – 200 years of institutional transformation*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Brett, Judith, *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Campbell, Karlyn and Kathleen Jamieson, *Presidents creating the Presidency* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008).

Curran, James, *Curtin's Empire* (Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Curran, James, *The Power of Speech* (Carlton, Melbourne University Press, 2004).

Curran, James and Stuart Ward, *The Unknown Nation- Australia after Empire*
(Carlton, Melbourne University Press, 2010).

Errington, Wayne and Peter van Onselen, *John Winston Howard* (Carlton, Melbourne
University Press, 2007).

Gelderman, Carol, *All The Presidents' Words* (New York, Walker and Company,
1997).

Hancock, Ian, *John Gorton –He did it his way*, (Sydney: Hodder Headline Australia,
2002).

Henderson, Gerard, *Menzies' Child – the Liberal Party of Australia* (Sydney:
HarperCollins, 1998).

Hofstadter, Richard, *The American political tradition and the men who made it* (New
York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977).

Johnson, Carol *The Labor legacy: Curtin, Chifley, Whitlam and Hawke* (Sydney:
Allen & Unwin, 1989).

Lee, Norman, *John Curtin, Savior of Australia* (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1983).

Macintyre, Stuart and Anna Clark, *The History Wars* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2003).

Macqueen, Humphrey, *Gallipoli to Petrov: arguing with Australian history* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1984).

Martin, A.W. *Robert Menzies – Volumes 1 and 2* (Carlton South: Melbourne University Press, 1999).

Prasser, Nethercote and Warhurst, *The Menzies Era – a reappraisal of government, politics and policy*, Prasser et al eds., (Sydney: Hale and Iremonger Pty Limited, 1995).

Reid, Alan, *The Gorton Experiment*, (Sydney: Shakespeare Head Press, 1971).

Sirevag, Torbjorn, 'Franklin D Roosevelt and the use of history', *Americana Norwegian*, Vol. 2, 1968, pp. 288-342.

Uhr, John, 'Political Leadership and Rhetoric', *Australian reshaped – 200 years of institutional transformation*, Geoffrey Brennan and Francis G. Castles eds., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 264-267.

‘Australian Prime Ministers, Robert Menzies – Key people’, *National archives of Australia*, available from
<<http://primeministers.naa.gov.au/primeministers/menzies/key-people.aspx>>,
accessed 2 November 2012.

‘Australian Prime Ministers, William McMahon – Elections’, *National Archives of Australia*, available from
<<http://primeministers.naa.gov.au/primeministers/mcmahon/elections.aspx>>,
accessed 2 November 2012.