

ON TARGET

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY ON THE COLD WAR

"We will bury you . . . your children will grow up under Communism . . ." Krushchev.

FALSEHOODS
DISTORTIONS
SUPPRESSION

Registered at the G.P.O. Melbourne for transmission by post as a periodical.

Vol. 3 No. 18

May 19, 1967.

Thought for the Week: "Hitler will never smash the British Empire, but our socialist-minded bureaucracy will."

Dennis Wheatley, in "Traitors Gate."

A "NO" VOTE NEEDED FOR BOTH QUESTIONS IN THE REFERENDUM:

The Commonwealth Government in the referendum on May 27 is asking for a simple Yes or No to the following two questions.

1. Do you approve the proposed law for the alteration of the Constitution entitled: "An Act to alter the Constitution so that the number of members of the House of Representatives may be increased without necessarily increasing the number of Senators."?
2. Do you approve the proposed law for the alteration of the Constitution entitled: "An Act to alter the Constitution so as to omit certain words relating to the people of the Aboriginal race in any State and so that Aboriginals are to be counted in reckoning the population."?

Most of the argument advanced in favour of increased representation in the House of Representatives is based upon the concept that increased population demands increased representation in the popular chamber. There is the added inference that the House of Representatives is the most important institution in Parliamentary system and the business conducted there is vital to the welfare of each of us above that which is dealt with in the Senate or in other Parliaments. We believe this to be far from true and that electors problems will not decrease if the proposal becomes law.

If it was the purpose of our Federal Representatives to act purely as Social Service workers, looking after complaints regarding pension or tax anomalies, or being used as the avenues through which grants to education, roads, hospitals, etc., is obtained the argument could be sustained, but purely on the basis of upholding the socialist structure which has already been erected. The fact is the function of the Federal Parliament has been perverted from what was originally intended, and increased representation will do nothing to correct the perversion which has taken place, but will only aggravate it.

When the present government was originally elected in 1949 one of the promises which figured prominently in its election propaganda was "to remove the burden of government." It was intended to curb the growing bureaucracy and return to the States their rightful taxing and financial powers.

The Liberal Party at that time rightfully recognised that these factors were destroying individual liberty and making Australians a race of mendicants to the central authority.

It is this usurpation of power which is the cause of the breakdown in representation. The individuals to whom Australians should be directing their queries in regard to social problems are those parliamentary representatives who are better placed to know about and deal with community problems, our State Parliamentarians.

In Australia the place where reforms in representation should take place is in the local and state government spheres. As population expands and the strains of representation begin to tell, new shires, cities and councils and above all new states are needed. This referendum which seeks to concentrate increasing growths of central control at the centre is a further attack upon the genuine basis of freedom, and another part of the process of whittling away our constitutional rights.

Against this fundamental issue even the argument of the D.L.P. against breaking the nexus (the Constitution lays down the principle of the House of Representatives and the Senate having a two to one ratio of representation. The D.L.P. stand to gain electorally if the Senate is enlarged with the House of Representatives) is not of great importance. The principle Australian electors must consider first on May 27 is that of concentrating additional power at the peak of our governmental structure which is already top heavy.

THE ABORIGINAL QUESTION: It is proposed in this proposal that two provisions of the Constitution be altered which makes explicit references to people of the Aboriginal race. One provision is quite harmless and it is doubtless that those pushing for the proposed alterations could care less. That is the proposal for alteration of Section 127 of the Constitution, which if altered will make it the responsibility of the Commonwealth to include the Aborigines in any census. At the moment it is merely the question of compiling the figures available from six separate states to give the same result.

It is the first part of the proposed changes on the Aboriginal question to which we should give our attention. Inherent within this proposal is the exploitation of the Aborigines not for their genuine welfare, but as the raw material in the political warfare which is using the race question to destroy civilization.

At the moment under Section 51, (paragraph xxvi) the Commonwealth has no power to legislate in regard to the Aborigines. These powers are specifically retained by the States. The alteration proposes to give the Commonwealth power which will be equal to those of the States. We do not believe this will be in the best interests of the Aboriginal. If everything which is said by the proponents of this change were true, the Northern Territory which is administered by the Commonwealth should be a shining example of the benefits derived from such a proposed change. But this is not so, in fact the lack of state sovereignty is a strong argument advanced by the indigenous inhabitants of the Northern Territory for the lack of progress in all directions in this their State. There is a strong resentment of the long

distance bureaucratic control exercised from Canberra. Such control is neither responsible or progressive, and there are continual eruptions from the irritations caused by the irresponsible bureaucrats at Canberra.

The American situation has a parallel for Australians in this case if we can learn from it. The more political power can be concentrated at one central point instead of being dispersed, the more it is open to corruption by petty tyranny. Just as in America where it was the forces behind socialism which brought through the "Civil Rights" bill a greater concentration of power at Washington, so there are similar forces in Australia working to use the Aboriginal for the same end in Australia.

The Communist Party itself is running a full scale campaign to have this proposal accepted. The April 19, issue of Tribune carried a special supplement calling for full rights for Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders. The articles contained the usual charges of exploitation oppression and discrimination. The same theme is taken up by those organisations purporting to speak for the Aboriginal. But Australians should not be misled by emotional arguments into accepting constitutional changes which have far reaching implications. Sir Raphael Cilento, one of Australia's greatest authorities on the problems of race, gained a deep political insight into the international forces operating within the U.N. seeking through the use of racial minorities the destruction of national strengths. Sir Raphael has warned repeatedly of the proposal to establish an exclusively black state incorporating the north of Australia and the Torres Strait. Could this explain the inordinate interest of the Communist Party and such organisations as The One People of Australia League (OPAL) in promoting political agitation in these areas? Already moves have been made to "appeal to the United Nations" against "discrimination" by the Queensland Government. But the UN must deal with the Australian Government, and while the Commonwealth has no constitutional rights in dealing with the Aboriginal their hands are tied.

The importance with which key figures, agitating the race question place on this referendum can be gauged by the remarks of Mr. Charles Perkins before he went off to America to confer with Dr. Martin Luther King and Stokely Carmichael, leading revolutionaries in the explosive race agitation in America. In The Age April 12, Mr. Perkins addressing university students claimed racial riots were a possibility of the situation of the Aborigines if it didn't improve, "If the May referendum fails, anything could happen."

Millions of pounds of taxpayers money has been spent to improve the lot of the Aboriginal. That he has not achieved the same general standards followed by the whites is no reflection on a proud and unique race. That much of his culture and tribal structure has been destroyed in the clash between two civilizations is true. The differences will only be reconciled by time and patience. But the policies which form the guide lines of such progress must come from sources which are intimately aware of the problem. This is more likely to come from the States where there is a closer association between interested parties than from the Commonwealth operating from the ivory tower of Canberra spending vast sums of the taxpayers money on all sorts of nefarious schemes.

The development of irresponsible spending by government as it becomes more and more centralised is most graphically illustrated in the so-called "Civil Rights" movement in USA where militant organisations actually are subsidised by the government.

Common sense as well as a genuine desire for the real welfare of the Aborigines should persuade Australian electors in the best interests of their country's future to Vote No to both proposals on May 27.

DID YOU SEE?

Those "brush" collisions between Soviet and USA destroyers in the Sea of Japan, and U Thant's hysterical forecast of a third world war, ie. the "hot" variety.

Comment: In case anyone really believes the balloon is about to go up we suggest they take a line through the recent request of Mr. George Ball that Britain should renounce her nuclear deterrent. The Australian May 5, Mr. Ball was L.B.J.'s Under Secretary of State and knows that Britain is tied by treaty to come to the aid of the U.S.A. if attacked. Appeasers such as Mr. Ball are still in the ascendency in U.S.A. and there is little of any real challenge to Communism under the present administration.

The attack on the Australian League of Rights by two university papers On Dit and Farrago, (Adelaide and Melbourne respectively,) as racists, extremists, and anti-semitic.

Comment: We saw no reply from the Christian churches to the charge made in The Australian April 26 made by Mr. Gerald Falk of the Jewish Board of Deputies that "Jews generally believe that most anti-semitic prejudice stems from Christian teachings to children." The League has never failed to uphold the Christian heritage enjoyed by all those who live in Australia. Nor has it failed to point out the forces seeking to destroy that heritage. We have reached that point in the gobbledy gook, double talk of the twentieth century where those opposed to Communism are automatically labelled anti-semitic, and the Christian Church is in such a disorganised retreat that such accusations as Mr. Falk's go by without any challenge. Such statements as Mr. Falk's are hardly likely to endear either himself or his co-racialists to their Australian brethren.

That Britain set no special conditions when formally applying to join the Common Market. The Australian, May 12.

Comment: This should set the mind of Mr. McEwen at rest as we reported him saying just four days previously in last week's On Target that "he accepted as a declaration made in good faith the often repeated words of the British Prime Minister, Mr. Wilson, and other Prime Ministers who preceded him, that essential Commonwealth interests would be safeguarded." The Australian May 8.

ON TARGET is published by the Australian League of Rights, Post Office Box 1052J, Melbourne.
Subscription rate: \$4. per annum - W. & J. Barr (Printers) Pty. Ltd.
