



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance--*

Registered by Australia Post Publication No. VBH 0999

Vol. 24 No. 23

June 24th., 1988

Thought for the Week: "Let us only suffer any person to tell us his story, morning and evening, but for a twelvemonth, and he will become our master." - Edmund Burke.

JOHN HOWARD RIGHT ON PROPOSED TREATY: Opposition leader John Howard may not have used the most appropriate terms when he came out in opposition to Prime Minister Hawke's proposed Aboriginal treaty, but he was correct when he said that the idea of such a treaty was "utterly repugnant" to the ideal of a united Australia. Mr. Howard said that "A treaty will divide the Australian community. It will create hostility among whites where it does not now exist. It will not advance the material wellbeing of the Aboriginal people and in place of accord and co-operation it will sow distrust and hostility.

Mr. Howard made the important comment that the proposed Treaty was "a leap into the dark from a constitutional point of view. It will have as yet unimagined legal consequences. The constitutional implications of the absurd notion of a nation trying to make a treaty with some of its own citizens is quite horrendous." Those promoting the treaty concept are well aware of the far-reaching implications of what is proposed. It has got nothing whatever to do with placing those Australians of Aboriginal background, most of those claiming to be Aborigines, like Michael Mansell, in a better position to improve themselves and their families. It is part of an ongoing revolutionary movement, designed to fragment Australia, as documented by former top Communist Mr. Geoff McDonald in his best seller, Red Over Black. It was not without significance that veteran Fabian Socialist Dr. H.C. Coombs, former Governor of the Reserve Bank, was one of those who quickly joined the orchestrated attack on John Howard when he rejected the treaty concept.

Prime Minister Hawke talks of a government treaty with Aboriginal leaders after they have consulted with Aboriginal communities. But who are these leaders to be, and who will they claim to be representing? This raises the question of who is an Aborigine? Rather than face this question honestly, governments have accepted

that an Aborigine is a person who identifies himself as an Aboriginal, is identified by his community as an Aboriginal and is of Aboriginal descent. This broad and ridiculous definition has resulted in Australians with little Aboriginal ancestry describing themselves as Aborigines. The fact that two Aboriginal organisations in Tasmania, the Tasmanian Aboriginal Descent Association and the Sports Corporation of Tasmania, have declared that Michael Mansell is at best a "border-line" case as an Aboriginal, does not prevent Mansell from presenting himself as an Aboriginal leader. And he is constantly publicised as an Aboriginal leader by the media which have almost unanimously condemned John Howard for talking sense on this matter.

Not surprisingly, The Age, Melbourne, a leader in the cause of liberalism in Australia, has been prominent in supporting Prime Minister Hawke and criticising John Howard. The liberals inside John Howard's own ranks, led by Senator Peter Baume, are also challenging Mr. Howard. Victorian Liberal leader Jeff Kennett quickly adopted his favourite fence-sitting position when questioned about John Howard's repudiation of the treaty concept.

If Prime Minister Hawke's treaty concept ever came into being, it would be the beginning of the end for Australia. As Professor Geoffrey Blainey has pointed out, the multi-racial concept would reduce Australia to a collection of warring tribes. The term "racist" is hurled at anyone who argues that Australia cannot survive as an independent nation without a commonly shared language and commonly shared institutions. We have already been reduced to the level where there is a debate concerning whether residents should be forced to accept Australian citizenship. Judging from a number of letters in the papers, large numbers of residents, who point out that they pay their taxes, and are law-abiding people, do not see much value in becoming Australian citizens.

As our regular readers know, we are not exactly fans of Mr. John Howard, but he must be supported for having taken a stand against a proposal which would be disastrous for Australia. It would also be disastrous for the genuine Aboriginal people.

(Recommended reading: Red Over Black, by Geoff McDonald. \$8.00 posted; Land Rights - Birthrights, by Peter English. \$18.00 posted; Healing a Divided Nation, by the Rev. Cedric Jacobs, OBE. \$6.00 posted. Order from all League bookshops).

Beware of the Pharisees: This was the advice of Christ, who denounced the Pharisees in language which would today have Him charged with being an "extremist" and probably hauled before some Anti-discrimination Court. Leading Jewish authorities are agreed that modern Judaism, irrespective of whether it is "liberal" or "Reformed", has its spiritual roots in Phariseeism. But in spite of the fundamental

cleavage between Christianity and Judaism, there are large numbers of well-meaning Christians who believe there is something called "Judeo-Christianity". The philosophy of Judaism is that of the one way street, with militant Zionists making it clear that the Christian virtues of love, charity and toleration are alien to them. We raise this issue because of Jewish reaction against comments by Mr. Bob Santamaria, well-known commentator, and Mr. Michael Barnard, columnist for The Age.

While disagreeing with both Mr. Santamaria and Mr. Barnard on some issues, we admire their stands on many basic questions, and their courage in taking stands which were destined to bring them within the orbit of Jewish criticism. Both Mr. Barnard and Mr. Santamaria have opposed the "War Crimes" legislation, although in slightly different ways, while Mr. Santamaria has raised doubts about the trial of John Demjanjuk in Israel, and the Zionist-inspired campaign against President Kurt Waldheim. In his Age article of June 7th., Michael Barnard dared to remind his readers that World War II "began not over the killing of Jews but over territorial conquest by Hitler (with Stalin initially as an eager ally)". Mr. Barnard went on to discuss the subject of truth and vengeance in relationship to the coming "War Crimes". His article brought a prompt reply from Zionist leader Isi Leibler, who presented a typical Pharisical line of argument. Liebler is strong on "justice", the type of "justice" meted out to Demjanjuk by an Israeli Court whose principle Judge Levin had been a member of the murderous Stern gang. Liebler finishes his article by stating that "The proposed legislation affirms the view that there ought not to be a statute of limitations anywhere in the world for cold-blooded and brutal murder of any - I mean any - innocent men, women and children." Michael Barnard could respond by asking Isi Liebler does this mean that Israeli Prime Minister Shamir, and former Prime Minister Begin, and other terrorists responsible for ghastly acts such as the massacre of innocent men, women and children, at Deir Yassin, should now be brought to trial?

In News Weekly of June 15th., Mr. Bob Santamaria says that "In one section of the Jewish press, articles written by the present writer on the war crimes have been attacked for using language 'arguably anti-semitic' although he has consistently supported both Israel and the Jewish people for 40 years. After referring to the fact that even Mr. Hawke was criticised for mildly commenting on the Israeli treatment of the Palestinians of the Israeli occupied territories, Mr. Santamaria almost plaintively asks, "Does everyone - even those whose record is of unblemished support of Israel and of Jews suffering persecution - have to suffer 'excommunication' if he expresses a view out of harmony with those of the publishers? The answer, Mr. Santamaria, is YES. Prominent anti-Zionist Jews like Dr. Alfred Lilienthal have also been smeared as "anti-

semitic."

Like the Pharisees of old, the modern Pharisees demand 100% support. 95% support is not sufficient. And their fervour for "justice" is most selective.

BRIEF COMMENTS: The Advertiser of Adelaide, one of Australia's major dailies, editorialises (10/6) that ("Old Labor's Dying Gasps") - Labor has cast off too much ideological baggage to pretend any longer to be a 19th century, working-class party. It is now a pragmatic, industry-orientated, social democratic party. Now we know! All that the above demonstrates is the lack of understanding of the top journalists of The Advertiser, some of whom, we do not doubt, are committed socialists.

"Labor" hasn't cast off any ideological baggage at all! The programme being sedulously followed by the Hawkeating Junta is classic Fabianism. These journalists, who probably imagine themselves to be astute readers of current events, should - for a start - read some of the speeches of these Hawkeian "social democrats" to the Fabian Society (Australian branch). Big Government, swimming in tax dollars, Big Business (fast becoming more centralised as dog eats dog); big union chieftains - in full agreement with Fabianism - and busy as beavers to centralise unions (more and more power!); an obedient population, progressively being stripped of its civil liberties --- this is the steamroller to shove Australia into the New International Economic Order as a prelude to World Government.

We dealt with this in a recent issue of On Target. Paul Keating has proudly confirmed that the name of the game is internationalisation: we are ready (almost) for the World Government jig-saw. Brother Keating will slide us into place.

\* \* \* \* \*

More on John Howard and his objections to Mr. Hawke's forthcoming Aboriginal "treaty".

The Age (Melbourne), June 20th., editorialises that John Howard, "sadly misjudges the mood of the Australian public in vehemently rejecting the idea of a treaty with the Aboriginal population". Indeed: how can The Age be so sure?

Yes, the media people can bring on Dr. H.C. Coombs, and Mr. Don Dunstan, and others of the Left-liberal ilk who let loose with all the land-rights, "we are guilty", propaganda. We shall be interested to see some genuine polls on the matter: we have seen none, thus far. Better still, a referendum. The Australian people have not been asked if they want a "treaty" with the Aborigines. A treaty, surely, is between two disparate nations. John Howard is right in that one does not have a treaty with oneself! If we have a treaty with the Aborigines then this is a recognition by white Australia that the Aborigines are a separate nation. Yes, this is what the revolutionaries want. This is what it's all about.

"ON TARGET" is published and printed by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Subscription rate \$20 p.a. posted.