

THE NEW TIMES

\$20 per annum.

Box 1052J, Melbourne.

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" - John 8:31.

VOL. 61, No. 10.

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

OCTOBER 1997.

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland.

CAN THE HOWARD GOVERNMENT SURVIVE?

by Eric D. Butler

Half way through its first term in office, the Howard Coalition government is in deep trouble. Earlier strong speculation that John Howard would call an early election has, at least for the immediate future, been quashed. While seriously damaging John Howard, the rorts affair has provided him with the opportunity to re-shuffle his Cabinet and to claim that his new one can be a winning team at the next election. But in the absence of major policy changes, no re-shuffling can remove the factors, which have progressively eroded support for a government elected with a big majority.

The basic cause of the massive defeat of the Labor Party at the last Federal Elections was not only the policies being imposed by the Keating government, but also Keating's blatant arrogance.

John Howard made the mistake of believing that the election results were a mandate for his programme. He and his advisers skilfully exploited the Port Arthur massacre, but in the process started to alienate much of his traditional electoral support base. This would have been offset if the Coalition had been able to fulfill its promises on economic issues like unemployment. But it has failed, primarily because it has adhered to the economic rationalist policies of its predecessors.

John Howard's new Minister for Employment, Dr. Kemp, boldly states that there will be a fall in unemployment figures before the next elections. But, very wisely, he declines to be too specific. No doubt he recalls how the firm promises of his predecessor, Senator Amanda Vanstone, failed to materialise. The most that can be achieved under present finance-economic policies are some cosmetic changes on the employment front.

The critics of Pauline Hanson have claimed that her opposition to multiculturalism and high levels of immigration from Asia was affecting trade with Asia, and consequently greater employment prospects for Australians. But this type of absurd nonsense has been swept away, with developments, which reveal that the "Tiger economies" are, under pressure of debt finance, little more than tame pussycats. As yet Pauline Hanson has not been blamed for what is happening to the Asian economies!

Not so long ago it was Thailand, which was being held up as a shining example of the "Tiger economies", one that offered bright prospects for the Australian economy. Now the Australians have been called upon to help finance a shaky Thai economy out of its problems. The oldest of the "Asian Tigers",

Japan, is still making desperate attempts to "kick start" its depressed economy. The "experts" of the International Monetary Fund are virtually demanding that the Japanese make a greater contribution towards stimulating global growth, which is required to overcome the depressed Western economies.

OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum cooperation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.

To defend the free Society and its institutions - private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited decentralised government

To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

To oppose all forms of monopoly, either described as public or private.

To encourage all electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting natural (God's) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

John Howard and his senior colleagues have insisted, ever since gaining office, that unless Australia accepts the philosophy of globalism it is doomed. Already Australians are being conditioned to accept the inevitability of a lower standard of living as the Asian economies fail to continue "booming". The financial gurus are busy assuring worried people that what is happening is only temporary, a type of "correction" which eventually will see a new burst of expansion.

A study of investment figures shows that the "Asian Tigers" have not been able to expand their economies because of foreign investments, the biggest share of these investments going to Communist China. Investments into the economies of Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan increased 24 percent over 1995. The flow of investments into four of the major Asian economies, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand in 1996 provided an estimated \$US77 billion. Investments have also poured into Vietnam. The programme of international investments is controlled directly and indirectly by the international bankers.

In insisting that Australia's future is governed by what

happens in Asia, the Howard government is placing Australia's future at the mercy of the international bankers. Already the betrayal of its independence has cost Australia dearly. It has been estimated that over the last twenty years Australia has lost 420,000 manufacturing jobs. Rural debt has exploded, now standing at \$16 billion. Meanwhile, Federal Treasurer Peter Costello dismisses the possibility of Australia suffering a deepening of depression conditions because of what is happening in Asia.

Australians must face the reality that the longer they permit their economy to be governed by what is happening in Asia, the greater will be the damage to their own economy. But it is encouraging to note that the erosion of electoral support for the Howard government is not flowing to the Labor opposition, but to the smaller parties and to the Independents. The stage is being set for Australians to use the next Federal elections to strike a major blow to recover control of their own nation.

All politicians who have either actively or passively contributed to the present crisis should be voted from office. They should be put last by all patriots.

TRINITARIAN GOVERNMENT

by Edward Rock, of the Christian Alternative Movement

The Australian Constitution is the product of our Christian heritage. We can no more deny that fact of history than deny our own parentage, even if some may now wish to do so.

Our constitution was written to preserve the Christian principle of Trinitarian government. Power at both State and Federal levels was shared between three institutions, the Monarchy, Upper and Lower houses. This trinitarianism has one objective, to restrain any use of power, which might destroy the freedom of the individual citizen. In God's creation the individual is the unit of primary importance, created by Him as a unique being exercising free will, capable of having a one-to-one relationship with Himself. This is not power imposed, it has the nature of a gift which can either be voluntarily surrendered, or destroyed when freedom to choose is destroyed. Centralised power destroys free will and seeks the destruction of Trinitarian government.

In creation God's signature is written in different forms of trinitarianism. The world itself was created in time, space and matter, Time itself is past, present and future. Space is measured as height, width and depth, and matter is made of solids, liquids and gas. The power and majesty of God is expressed in the Holy Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. These are trinities beyond the control of man, he can interfere with them, disobey the laws on which they are founded, but he cannot destroy them, but there is a particular trinity God has given to man to administer to either compliment the gift of free choice or destroy it, the trinity of politics, economics and finance.

If Australian governments adhered to the spirit of the constitution there would be no problem. Politicians would not exercise power over their fellow citizens; they would be their servants. The crucial principle involved in Trinitarian government is subsidiarisation, i.e. government at a particular level should not exercise power that can be exercised at a lower level, and no government interferes in functions individuals can either perform individually, or in voluntary association with other individuals.

In the trinity of politics, economics and finance, the key mechanism is finance. Our constitution gives us the right as a nation to create our own money supply in order that we may monetise our economic capacity. Australian governments have surrendered our national financial sovereignty to a centralised world power, which creates all money as a debt, then selectively distributes it in the first instance to those who in return for preferential treatment will not challenge that power. Governments are the first in line for such preferential treatment. They become immersed in unserviceable debt and are then directed by the debt merchants to lift taxation levels to meet their demands. When all money is created as a debt, the debt can only increase. Governments are forced to find more and more ways to increase taxation. The present push for a G.S.T. is to leave no product or service untaxable in order to appease the demands of the debt merchants.

The simple alternative to selective distribution of debt created money is the democratic distribution of money created free of debt, which can rightfully be described as a Christian Financial Policy. This policy would stop the debt cycle and control of the economy would then be "by the people" at the optimum point of decentralised control, eliminating all other parties other than the consumer and the producer, and where necessary the agents of the producer. This policy would take a government composed of individuals determined to return to the spirit of the constitution, determined to build a sovereign nation, which could be an example to other nations. True international peace and harmony cannot be imposed by a central power; it can only grow from a basis of expanding freedom and sovereignty enjoyed by all nations.

The restoration of Australia's financial sovereignty and the adoption of a Christian Financial Policy would also enable government to vacate the welfare state jungle, becoming increasingly impossible to administer. Government could then return to administering those things the people see as the rightful role of government, defence, diplomacy, the courts of justice, public transport facilities, waterways etc. Government would then become a blessing, not a source of division, friction and hatred.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN EVALUATION OF IAN SMITH'S "THE GREAT BETRAYAL"

The betrayal of the Southern African nation once known as Rhodesia, now described as Zimbabwe - this leading to the collapse of South Africa, is one of the major historical events of modern times. We have already published our own evaluation of the autobiography of the former Rhodesian Prime Minister, Ian Smith, followed by a critical assessment by an English woman with considerable first hand experience of Southern African affairs. The following evaluation of the Ian Smith book appeared in the August/September issue of *Impact*, by a former South African politician, Mr. Jaap Marais. In an attempt to provide a balanced evaluation of the Rhodesian disaster, we publish what in essence is an Afrikaner version.

The main interest in Ian Smith's biography, *The Great Betrayal*, centres on his dealings with the British and South African governments of the 70's and to a lesser degree with the Black African leaders and Henry Kissinger of the USA.

Smith's account of the duplicity of the British leaders and John Vorster of South Africa is well founded and makes for good reading. But for an Afrikaner who was closely involved in the political history of the time - and who was actually arrested, held in custody over a weekend and subsequently criminally charged for protesting against Vorster's betrayal of Rhodesia - there are aspects of this biography that need historical assessment

Beyond Comprehension

That, in reflecting on the history of Southern Africa in the 1960s, a biographer could suppress the name and political achievements of Dr. H.F. Verwoerd - Prime Minister of South Africa from 1958 until 6th September 1966, when he was struck down by the Communist assassin Demetri Tsafendas - is beyond comprehension, especially in an autobiography of the man who, through UDI, broke the colonial connection with Britain and had to look to South Africa for moral and economic support to stabilise conditions.

Verwoerd it was who from the outset welded the South African Whites in solid emotional identification with the Smith government of Rhodesia. Less than three months after UDI (the Unilateral Declaration of Independence of Rhodesia from Britain), Verwoerd made a speech in the South African Parliament in which he clearly expressed his government's sentiments in support of White rule in Rhodesia. He took the position that he was not going to interfere in the trade relations between South Africa and Rhodesia, and would therefore not consider joining in economic sanctions against Rhodesia. Furthermore, he emphatically refused to be drawn in as a mediator between Britain and Rhodesia. These were the two conditions insisted on by the British Government in their efforts to undo Rhodesia's political independence.

This position taken by Dr. Verwoerd immediately stabilised conditions and allowed the Smith government to find its feet in the knowledge that the Verwoerd government stood behind them. This was the solid foundation on which the Smith government could thereafter build.

What might usefully be speculated on is what developments in Southern Africa might have been if Dr. Verwoerd had lived longer. At the time he was assassinated, he was not only at the peak of his power, but in the face of a comprehensive onslaught on South Africa he had upheld the country's integrity, and had led it to a position of unprecedented economic, political, diplomatic, military and juridical success, as

even *The Rand Daily Mail*, an outspoken liberal antagonist of Dr. Verwoerd, had to admit on 30th July 1966, five weeks before the assassination, when its editor wrote:

Surfeit of Prosperity

"At the age of nearly 65 Dr. Verwoerd has reached the peak of a remarkable career. No other South African prime minister has ever been in such a powerful position in the country. He is at the head of a massive majority after a resounding victory at the polls. The nation is suffering from a surfeit of prosperity and he can command almost unlimited funds for all that he needs at present in the way of military defence. He can claim that South Africa is a shining example of peace in a troubled continent, if only because overwhelming domestic power can always command peace. Finally, as if that were not enough, he can face the session (of Parliament) in the knowledge that, short of an unthinkable show of force by people whom South Africans are rapidly being taught to regard as their enemies, he can snap his fingers at the United Nations. Thanks to the recent judgment of the Hague Court (on the South-West African issue), he can afford to condescend to the world body, graciously remaining a member as long as it suits him. Indeed, the Prime Minister has never had it so good."

Apartheid

This powerful position was achieved by Dr. Verwoerd under a policy of separate development ("apartheid"). The living standards of Blacks were rising at 5.4% per year against that of the Whites at 3.9% per year. In 1965 the economic growth rate was the second highest in the world at 7.9%. The rate of inflation was 2% per annum, and the prime interest rate 3% per annum. Domestic savings were so great that South Africa needed no foreign loans for normal economic expansion. And new labour was accommodated in the formal sector at a rate of 73.6% per annum.

A few months before the assassination, the editor of the British periodical *Statist*, Paul Barea, wrote:

"At the rate at which South Africa is now expanding, the term 'miracle' is likely to be appropriate to its development over the next few years."

So, expectations were that in the next few years South Africa, under a policy of separate development, would be in a very strong position against any economic or military threat.

South Africa becoming dominating force

It was plain that in these circumstances, South Africa was poised to become the dominating and unifying force in Southern Africa against the British/American-supported

terrorist onslaught on the Portuguese territories of Mozambique and Angola and on Rhodesia and South-West Africa.

The powerful rise of South Africa ran counter to British/American plans for this region, which were primarily to break White political power in each of these territories and to prevent a consolidation of Whites over territorial boundaries against British/American objectives.

It is worthwhile to recall that, for instance, the Frelimo terrorists in Mozambique received substantial financial support from the Ford Foundation of the USA, acting most probably as a front for the CIA and the State Department; the ANC, although banned in South Africa, had its head office in London, almost every Communist who left South Africa for safer ground, went not to Moscow but to London. And, unquestionably, the Anti-Apartheid Movement (more correctly, the Anti-Afrikaner Movement) in Britain was a British Secret Service operation against South Africa; not forgetting that the US and Britain had in an act of war already in 1961 instituted an arms boycott against South Africa; and that the USA was behind Liberia and Ethiopia's application to the International Court at the Hague in 1961 to break South-West Africa's ties with South Africa. These were the early hallmarks of an undeclared war against South Africa.

Massive Boom

Time Magazine of August 26, 1966 - eleven days before the assassination of Dr. Verwoerd - wrote:

"South Africa is in the midst of a massive boom. Attracted by cheap labour, a gold-backed currency and high profits, investors from all over the world have ploughed money into the country, and the new industries that they have started have sent production, consumption, and the demand for labour, soaring. Such are the proportions of prosperity . . ."

Certainly a remarkable admission by this publication well known for its bias against the Verwoerd government.

In the same vein, another political opponent of Dr. Verwoerd, Jan Botha, in his book *Verwoerd is Dead*, wrote:

Whites Forged Together

"By the time he died, Dr. Verwoerd had built his own monument which was there for all to see: the Republic of South Africa. The White people had been forged together in unity, the country was militarily strong and resilient, the police and security forces were effectively dealing with all attempts at subversion and infiltration, the country's economy was dynamic, expanding and had become largely self-sufficient.

" . . . In the history of South Africa, his name will live forever as the leader who, when his country was threatened with internal disorder and with economic sanctions, boycotts and open aggression from overseas, stood as a symbol of defiance, and the will and determination to survive."

It was evident that the British/American tactics had failed and that the very opposite of what they were trying to achieve was actually taking place. And, of course, this created favourable conditions for the Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) by Ian Smith. But he seems completely to underestimate the significance thereof.

Apartheid vs Racial Integration

The problem facing the British and American power

brokers was not only the rising power of the South African state in the Southern African context, but also the demonstrable success of a government following a policy of separate development (apartheid), as opposed to the unmitigated failure of the policies of racial integration espoused by the British and American enemies of Dr. Verwoerd and his government.

An article in the Afrikaans Sunday newspaper, *Rapport*, of the 22nd May 1994, was most revealing in this respect. Dealing with the anticipated return of South Africa to the Commonwealth after the 27th April 1994 election, the author Jack Viviers said that if F. W. de Klerk would be party to such a decision

" . . . It would remove much of the hatred by a considerable number of influential Britons towards Afrikaners."

This animosity is a seldom-acknowledged fact, the usual thing being to accuse the Afrikaners of 'still fighting the Boer War'. The article reads further:

"The attitude of the Brits, particularly the mandarins of the British Foreign Office, who were in the vanguard of the fight against the National Government, was explained to me by an equally influential Brit . . . Lord Deeds, former editor of the *Daily Telegraph* . . ."

So the British government was conducting a silent war against the South African government - in a continuation, by other means, of the Boer War.

Spite and Envy

"Lord Deeds . . . said that in the eyes of those Brits, South Africans, and especially Afrikaans-speakers, had made two big mistakes. One was to leave the Commonwealth - and in addition to survive."

This constitutes the height of spite and envy, implying that these Britons had hoped that South Africa would not survive, with all the dire consequences for the entire population. Only a deep-seated and incurable animosity could produce such sentiments. What followed this remarkable admission by Lord Deeds was even more noteworthy:

"While South Africa grew to become the economic giant of the continent, the other members of the Commonwealth virtually sank into poverty."

That South Africa, under an Afrikaner government with its policy of apartheid and having no relations with Commonwealth, should have become the economic giant of Africa was unthinkable to the British Foreign Office and the US State Department. And what made this even worse, was that countries following policies opposed to that of South Africa's "apartheid" were sinking into poverty.

White-controlled Sn. African bloc

It was evident that Dr. Verwoerd was winning the cold war conducted against the Afrikaner government of South Africa by the British Foreign Office and the US State Department.

South Africa's increasingly powerful position on the sub-continent foreshadowed a Southern Africa of White-controlled government, economically and militarily equal to any threat or adventure from outside, and to the challenge of communist-led and British/American-supported terrorists operating in Southern Africa. (Significantly, the first terrorist attack by Swapo in South-West Africa took place within three

weeks after the assassination of Dr. Verwoerd, as if they were waiting for the event.)

It was evident that the peace and prosperity enjoyed in South Africa and the development of a White-controlled Southern African bloc were serious obstacles to the British/American objectives in Southern and South Africa, and had therefore to be ended. And in this, Dr. Verwoerd was at the core of their problem. If he could be removed, it would trigger a whole series of events.

From this historical resume, it becomes clear that with the backing of such a strong South African government, Ian Smith "could snap his fingers" at the Harold Wilson government of Britain. And it is therefore utterly mystifying that in the Ian Smith biography the name of Dr. Verwoerd is mentioned only once - in a passing remark - not even justifying naming him in the index. In terms of historiography, this is absolutely unforgivable, and it is cause for serious misgivings. Is it due to an effort to be "politically correct" in the current fashion of suppressing anything complimentary of the towering figure of H.F. Verwoerd?

Whatever the reason, it is dismaying that the sins of omission in history writing can be just as serious as those of commission.

Sympathetic treatment of Kissinger

While this omission is astonishing, Smith's sympathetic treatment of Henry Kissinger raises serious doubts about his political judgment. Kissinger is portrayed by him as an almost benevolent power on the side of Rhodesia against Vorster! Kissinger's play-acting even went so far as to admit his wife to the negotiating chamber, just to introduce her to Smith as "one of your great admirers". That Smith was evidently unaware of Kissinger's infamous political role in international politics seem clear. And Smith's credulity was alarming.

Early in the book, there is a one-sided speculative discussion about the 1948 general elections in South Africa in which Gen. Smuts's United Party was defeated by the then reunited National Party of Dr. D.F. Malan. Smith speculates about the possible effects of an alternative outcome, in which Smuts would have retained political power.

Because Smith allows himself to speculate on the effects of the 1948 general elections, it is permissible to speculate on another event of paramount importance in the 1970s. This is Mr. Smith's own reaction to the Vorster-Kissinger gauntlet thrown down in September 1976, when Smith was challenged to accept almost instant Black rule for Rhodesia and to go back on his assurance to the Rhodesian people: "Not in my lifetime!" and even "Not in a thousand years!"

As is well known, John Vorster betrayed Rhodesia in instalments and by 1976 was introducing economic sanctions on that country by withholding oil supplies and military support, and allowing Rhodesian exports to pile up at the Beit Bridge border. A momentous decision had to be made by Ian Smith when he was thus challenged. He had either to go back on his oft-repeated assurance to his supporters, *or* tell Vorster and Kissinger that he would not accept their conditions without first holding a referendum in Rhodesia on the issue.

On page 237, this dramatic situation is dealt with by him:

"I was incensed at the humiliating situation in which I

found myself. I had a compelling urge to say publicly that it was unacceptable, and together with those Rhodesians who felt the same - and there were many black as well as white - make a stand. Better to go down standing and fighting, than crawling on our knees. But I was not an ordinary individual, free to act according to my heart. I had to think of our wonderful country and its people, especially the young people, of what future generations would think and say about those who had gone before. That was my life."

Naturally, the option of calling a referendum was fraught with danger, but if this course had been followed, Vorster would have found himself in an intolerable situation, because the South African Whites would have been almost solidly on the side of Smith, and he would have got a resounding 'No' to the Vorster/Kissinger terms.

Such a decision might have triggered violent reaction from Kaunda of Zambia and other Black leaders in Southern Africa, and an international uproar would probably have been instigated by London.

Heroism

But such a decision by Smith in the prevailing circumstances was the stuff of which heroism is made. White solidarity would have been forged in the whole of Southern Africa, and Smith - not Vorster - would have been at the centre, as the leader of the Whites on the sub-continent. Quite possibly, Vorster would have been compelled to resign or to call general elections in South Africa, in which his coercion of the Rhodesians would have been the central issue.

In the light of Smith's brave challenge by declaring UDI, it would have been consistent of Smith to take up the challenge for leadership of the Whites in Southern Africa, and to pull the rug from under the treacherous Vorster. However Smith may argue to the contrary, this is what political honour demanded.

Shortly after Dr. Verwoerd had announced his intention to hold a referendum on the issue of whether South Africa was to become a republic, he was shot twice in the head at short range by David Pratt. But he was not diverted by this attempt on his life and he proceeded to make South Africa a republic.

Afterwards, at the Commonwealth conference in March 1961, he was challenged to make concessions to Black Africa if he wished to remain in the Commonwealth. He had to decide whether to accede to these demands or to break South Africa's ties with the Commonwealth and go it alone. He refused to budge, as honour demanded. And however fraught with danger this option was, Verwoerd, from outside the Commonwealth, lifted South Africa to a level of national efficiency and performance never before equalled in this country, and probably very seldom, if ever, in history. This was why at his death even one of his opponents wrote that Verwoerd was a hero in the true sense of the word.

Smith's betrayal

Whatever appreciation one may have for Ian Smith's gallant challenge to the British powers of the time, in the end he failed to live up to the standard of heroic statesmanship foreshadowed by his UDI. And, as Vorster betrayed Rhodesia, Smith betrayed the Rhodesian Front, the political party of which he was the trusted leader when, in repudiation of his previously

held position on Black rule, he accepted the Vorster-Kissinger conditions. In addition, Smith betrayed the White nation of South Africa who would have supported him in defiance of Vorster if he had made a stand.

The betrayal of the Rhodesian Front was not a sudden decision in September 1976, but was in the form of a gradual process of weakening the hard core of White resistance against capitulation. Having ousted Winston Field from the party leadership, he set about getting rid of the strongly motivated leaders of the former Dominion Party who formed the ideological backbone of the Rhodesian Front. First victim was Mark Partridge, then John Gaunt, and thereafter even Lord Graham. Eventually, it was the chairman of the Rhodesian Front, Des Frost.

And when, in the final stages of capitulation, a number of former MPs and others formed the Rhodesian Action Party

(RAP) under the leadership of Dr. Colin Barlow to oppose the politics of surrender, Smith called a snap general election to prevent them from building a viable organisation, and consequently they were defeated.

The point is that he was prepared to call a general election to crush White Rhodesians opposing his betrayal of trust, but he was not prepared to call general elections or a referendum when Vorster and Kissinger coerced him to renege on his promises to his supporters.

Smith's autobiography is to a large extent an apologia for his betrayal of his own people. He could have altered the course of history if - as Verwoerd and, before him, Paul Kruger had done - he had had the courage to defy his antagonists.

History knocked at Ian Smith's door in September 1976. But he was listening to other voices.

PAULINE HANSON SPEAKS OUT ON IMMIGRATION RORTS

The Independent Member for Oxley, Pauline Hanson, continues to experience a constant smearing campaign. Her contributions to debates in the Federal Parliament are consistently ignored. The following valuable speech was delivered on September 1st:

Ms HANSON (Oxley) (11.55 a.m.) - The government's immigration policy released prior to the last election contained a promise to review the efficiency of immigration decision making. The policy also stated that access to courts for the review of tribunal decisions should be restricted in all but the most exceptional circumstances. In the case of illegal immigration, the government has been not only too lenient but also all too willing to squander taxpayers' money and far too slow to deport illegal immigrants.

There is no obligation by law to provide both an administrative review and a judicial review of applications, so why are you doing it? Why are illegal immigrants and criminals getting legal aid to delay their deportation when thousands of Australians are denied this taxpayer-funded privilege?

Approximately 60 per cent of administrative cases before the Federal Court concern immigration matters. In the 1995-96 budget, litigation cost the immigration department \$7.4 million. This figure did not include legal aid, court costs or the excessive costs of housing and feeding illegal immigrants during lengthy and unnecessary legal processes. This is expenditure you cannot reasonably justify and it is a bill the Australian people do not want. It is an affront to the Australian people that so much time and money is spent expelling from our shores people who, in most cases, are little more than opportunistic invaders taking advantage of our reputation as a soft touch.

The Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, Philip Rudduck, hit the nail on the head when he said in March that too many people are using court action to delay departure. This is an urgent matter requiring not just words but action. The Australian people have had enough.

As at 25 March this year, there were over 600 cases of immigration related matters before the Federal Court, the Full Court and the High Court. Many of these matters will be withdrawn before the hearing, and only about 10 per cent of cases that go before the court are successful. I repeat: we cannot

afford the luxury of providing illegal immigrants - those who sneak across our northern borders - with unlimited legal aid and assistance when our own people go without.

In a recent case involving illegal immigrants arriving by boat, our government provided legal aid to these criminals to resist deportation through the Federal Court, the Full Bench of the Federal Court and the High Court, without success at any stage. What an unwarranted, inexcusable and disgraceful waste of the hard-earned money of decent Australians, who expect the government to be more responsible with their taxes.

We have seen people delay their departure while seeking work rights and access to Medicare. What sort of lunacy is this when our unemployment is so high and hospitals are stretched to the limit? Perhaps you will excuse your actions by claiming some relationship with humanitarianism. But this nonsense you pursue is nothing but an international invitation take the Australian people for a ride.

As at February this year, over 300 people in our prisons came within deportation provisions. What are you waiting for? How long do we have to feed these foreign criminals for, when so many of our own people are hungry and 40,000 young Australians live on the streets? The answer is to tighten up the system immediately, stop all the rorting, stop the waste of our hard-earned taxes and help restore public confidence in government decisions.

We should be negotiating treaties with other countries to have these criminals deported so they can serve their sentences in their home country, instead of in the luxury of Australian prisons, where it costs \$40,000 to \$65,000 per prisoner per year. You and the governments before you have been extremely successful at signing deals that export Australian jobs. Let us see if you can get it together to export other countries' criminals to their place of origin.

The government needs, firstly, to act immediately to stop foreign criminals from entering Australia in the first place

and, secondly, or provide a quick and a cheap means of deporting foreign criminals should they manage to waltz through the gap in your security arrangements. These criminals should not get legal representation unless they pay for it. They should not be treated like well-meaning tourists who have lost their way. They must be treated like the criminals they are.

It is incumbent on you to ensure that anyone entering Australia is a decent, law-abiding person who will in some way benefit those who are already here. If they are not in some way going to benefit Australia and Australians, then we do not want them. Australians are sick of being the world's soft touch. Australians are sick of imported problems - be they crime, disease or aspects of cultural difference that will never be able to accept the Australian way of life.

It is not for us to change, but for them to assimilate. We do not want Australia to become like the places so many people want to leave. So listen to the people and take heed. Fix these problems now or the people will take your positions and give them to those who truly represent Australia.

On many occasions I have been called a racist. The fact is that I am a patriotic Australian who believes in Australia and the Australian people. I want to see our unemployment queues dwindle down to what they should be and give Australians the jobs first, instead of allowing other people onto Australia's shores. It is just senseless and lunatic.

People should have knowledge of how to speak English. They must know how to assimilate. They must respect our laws, our flag and what Australia stands for. We must take heed of which people we are going to allow onto our shores. We do not allow in people who have diseases and we do not allow in people who have criminal records. We must have people who have something to offer Australia. We do not bring in people with health problems who are going to put such a strain on our

hospital system when our own Australians cannot access our hospitals because they are overflowing.

We have a country that so many people want to come and live in. Yet we seem to be bending over backwards to change our ways, our values and what we believe in to accommodate these people. The member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Campbell) was right in what he said. Go and ask some of these other countries what their immigration policies are and what their beliefs are. No one seems to point the finger at them and call them racist. We respect their views, their cultures and the way they want to run their countries. Yet, because I and many other Australians believe in the same rights for our own country, we are called racist.

Patriotism is something that we are losing in this country. It is not being taught in our schools to our children. We must be proud Australians and we must all be Australians together. Immigrants come to Australia for a better way of life. Why else would they leave their own country? That is why we must all be Australians together.

The Minister for Trade (Mr. Tim Fischer) accused me and my views of affecting trade, yet he made a statement in this House last week saying that trade was up by over \$100 billion. I call on the government to please address the immigration issues of this country. People who do not and should not have a rightful place in this country should be sent back immediately, at no cost to the Australian taxpayer. If these people can afford to pay their own way back, then they should be paying for it.

People are going through the legal system to come to Australia. They should be the ones who are considered first and foremost for being allowed to come to Australia, not those who enter our shores illegally. I believe with this bill the government is actually tightening up a lot of areas. It is not the end, but it is a start and it is pleasing to see.

CHRIST AND ANTI-CHRIST

From *The Social Crediter*, November-December 1982.

The evidence of conspiracy as the controlling factor in world events is now so palpable that its general non-recognition can only be attributed to the success of the greatest brain-washing endeavour in the whole of human history. Against this, the much-vaunted 'reason', which is supposed to govern human affairs, has proved a paper sword. Every triumph of industrialisation is swallowed by an accelerating inflation, which in turn is utilised as an excuse for increasingly totalitarian controls, all leading to the imposition of World Government maintained by force.

In the Sixth, most recent edition, of Nesta Webster's *World Revolution**, the following appears: "Thus from 1776 onwards the plan we now know as 'Communism' has existed and throughout 191 years successive groups of adepts have been perfecting a method for achieving power over the whole human race, a process which might be compared to ju-jitsu whereby the strength of a man's body is turned against himself. In some amazing way they have mastered the art of what Weishaupt called 'winning the common people', exploiting their grievances, rousing their passions, gaining their confidence and so achieving control over their minds as to make them

completely impervious to reason. In every country a large proportion of organised manual labour has been turned from all sane and practical plans of reform and made to use their strength for their own enslavement.

"Thus Trade Unionism, in its origins a wholly pacific system for the protection of the workers, has been largely captured by the conspirators and the industrial disputes which form the ostensible purpose of each succeeding crisis are often engineered by their 'Communist' leaders. It is useless to tell them that under the system these men representing Trades Unions as they know them would cease to exist and would become simply departments of an all-powerful State without the right to strike or to have any voice in their conditions of labour.

"In the same way the conspiracy has been able to enlist the intelligentsia in its service and to acquire control over all forms of publicity. Journalists even in the employ of the so-called 'Capitalist Press' devote long and important notices to every book that is calculated to serve the cause - works ranging from heavy treatises on intellectual Socialism to the lowest form of demoralising fiction. No book subversive of order or immorality ever passes unnoticed in the Press, while the

contrary view is carefully ignored or derisively dismissed as out of touch with modern thought.

"Of course the greater part of this organisation is carried out by the power of gold [i.e. International Finance - *Ed. T.S.C.*]- not necessarily by bribery but simply by making agitation a 'paying job' or by offering the most lucrative posts to adepts or at least agents of the conspiracy

"But by far the most potent inducement offered was the *promise of power*. The pupils are convinced that the Order *will* rule the world. Every member therefore becomes a ruler.' Robison quoting this passage adds: 'we all think ourselves qualified to rule. The difficult task is to obey with propriety but we are honestly generous in our prospects of future command. It is therefore an alluring thought, both to good and bad men. *By this lure the Order will spread*'. "

It is now abundantly clear that we have reached the culmination of this age-old Conspiracy, and must suffer the consequences. The late C.H. Douglas remained convinced that it must *ultimately* fail; but that failure may, and probably will, be spread over many decades, if not centuries. We think the situation is even worse than envisaged by Douglas, because of the rapid development of techniques of control. But in the meantime increasing carnage and destruction - inseparable from the advance of Communism in all its history - is certain. To imagine that the ballot box can protect us from this is infantile, but in keeping with the prevailing fashions of thought. We warned the British that electing a 'Conservative' Government to replace the Wilson Administration would be worse than useless, as simply providing a fresh mandate for a continuing policy; and another election would simply have the same effect. (The most practicable answer at this stage would be a massive boycott of the election).

Against this background, we quote a note by C.H. Douglas published in *The Social Crediter* for September 30, 1950. "We rate the intelligence of the readers of this review highly. It is not written for morons, whom we recognise are catered for in productions of much larger circulation.

"The full recognition of these facts enables us to dismiss at once any idea that there is some stratum either of society or Government composed of individuals who, if only we could penetrate it, would see the light, and work effectively towards it.

"Let us make this point as clear as we are able, because it appears to lie at the root of widespread misapprehensions. World Politics are (irrevocably, we think) committed to the centralisation of Power. We are committed irrevocably to the decentralisation of Power *to the limits of the capacity of the individual*. The first Policy postulates the equality of all men and women; the second recognises the absolute individuality and increasing differences of every human being.

"There can be no greater practical mistake at the present time than to suppose that Social Crediters can engage usefully in what Lord Keynes called Essays in Persuasion, directed at the conversion of conscious opponents.

"The die is cast; whether the phrase 'the war between Christ and Anti-Christ' is taken to be symbolical or literal, one side must win.

"Now, the practical effect of this is to put to some extent technical arguments into cold storage. Not the least of the fallacies of Fabianism was that Economics preceded and

conditioned Politics. Precisely the opposite is true, and our task is, *not to capture politics*, but to fragmentise them "

Since Douglas's Note was written, much more hard evidence of the relation between Finance and Communism has become available, and has been collated and published in a series of books, to which we have given publicity over the intervening years, as well as facilitating their distribution. Gary Allen's *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* has sold more copies in Britain than any other book distributed through K.R.P. Publications. A *sufficient* distribution of this book, and the companion volume, *Alternative to Disaster*, in conjunction with the exposure of the Conspiracy, which may be achieved in the U.S.A. through the efforts of the John Birch Society, offers the only visible hope of turning the tide of the disaster, which already is engulfing us.

But it seems most improbable that analysts of the situation can be carried any further than it has been carried in these pages. In consequence, publication of *The Social Crediter* will be reduced, *pro tem.*, to a monthly basis, being maintained mainly to keep open a line of communication with those who have recognised the nature of the task - vigorous exposure of the *fact of conspiracy* as the mainspring of world politics.

BASIC FUND PASSES \$19,000

Reflecting the growing realisation that Australia is approaching the greatest crisis in its history, there has been a magnificent response to the League of Rights' 1997-98 Basic Fund Appeal with a minimum target of \$65,000. A relatively small number have contributed or pledged over \$19,000. But there is a long way to go yet. Please send your contribution as quickly as possible. AH donations to Box 1052J, Melbourne 3001.

1997 NATIONAL WEEKEND A TREMENDOUS SUCCESS

The 1997 National Weekend of the League of Rights was an outstanding success in every way. One of the major highlights of *The New Times* Dinner, held on October 3, was a powerful address by guest of honour Bishop John Hepworth, defending the institution of Constitutional Monarchy. Bishop Hepworth's address can be obtained from M.E.A. Tapes, Box 184, The Basin, Victoria 3154. \$6 posted.

Those present at the National Seminar of October 4 queued to buy autographed copies of Jeremy Lee's blockbuster, *"What Will We Tell Our Children?"* (\$20 posted from all League addresses).

Sixty actionists met on Sunday, October 5 for an all day programme concerning action reports and discussion on strategy and tactics. Dr. David Mitchell and Bishop John Hepworth provided valuable information concerning the coming convention on the Monarchy or Republic question.

"Probably the best and most important action seminar in the history of the League," was one comment.