



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. 29

August 5th., 1988.

Thought for the Week: "Since the Australian Government adopted officially a change in immigration policy on March 9th., 1966, and as a result flooded the country with 'one hundred and forty ethnic groups speaking ninety languages and practising eighty religions', there has been a lot of talk as to how Australia has been improved as a result of the Government's dedication to the multiculturalism programme. No examples have been given, however, of improvements apart from that of population numbers. It must be noted that the electoral wish was not ascertained on this important issue through a properly conducted Referendum..."

Dr. J.C.A. Dique, in Immigration: The Quiet Invasion (1985).

THE CONSERVATIVES GRASP THE NETTLE: "Immigration is set to play a major role in the next (Federal) election campaign, with the adoption of a hardline approach by the Opposition leader, Mr. Howard."

- The Sun (Melbourne), August 1st.

There is much we could write about the dumping of the traditional Australian White Australia Policy and the adoption of the new bi-partisan approach to Immigration by both the Liberals and Nationals, and the "Labor" party. Those who would like deeper information are advised to purchase a copy of Dr. Dique's book, "Immigration: The Quiet Invasion" (\$12.50 posted from all League bookshops).

Mr. John Howard and his colleagues must be very sure of the feeling of the Australian electorate, at large, to have grasped the nettle, as they have. Their "new" policy (in actuality, a partial return to the traditional Australian immigration policy) would be based upon their own private polls: they know they are "safe".

On the other hand, the "Labor" Party leaders know that they themselves are on the defensive on Immigration. Brother Hawke is shrewd enough to know that the best method of defense is attack; and he went on the attack recently on multiculturalism and Asian immigration. What he doesn't seem to realise is that the majority of European ethnics are opposed to Asian invasion. Countries like France, Holland and Germany have "race" problems now as a result of

Asian immigration - and nationals (former) of such countries now living in Australia don't want the problems here. In our experience, some of these people are more bitter in their opposition (above) than the tolerant Anglo-Celts.

We think that Mr. Howard has taken a good line in that of "One Australia". That is a good campaign slogan, meaning increased stress on Australian citizenship; away with the divisiveness of the discredited multiculturalism.

The National Party has adopted a harder policy on greater European immigration, meaning the scaling down of Asianisation, and it opposes the "treaty" with Aborigines. What has brought this "change" about? Desperation, we believe. The so-called conservatives must know that they have lost the propaganda battle. The Libs/Nats simply cannot beat the Fabians in Canberra by attempting to out-Fabianise the Fabians: it can't be done. Otherwise they would have to go for broke and embrace Marxism.

C.H. Douglas once observed that in a two-party system of government, when one party turns socialist, all electoral contests from that point onwards become movements to the Left. A return to traditional values is the correct and only path for the Opposition, and without a doubt, Australian society is screaming out for it.

"Labor" also has a powerful weapon (we wonder how many people understand this) in its ideology. The Fabian ideology sounds good: equality, a fair go for all, the general distribution of wealth, State assistance for the genuine needy, Health, Education, Welfare programmes. Good stuff. But, how many really understand the PRICE, the social price, which has to be paid for these guarantees. To say nothing of the economic price. If the average Mr. & Mrs. Australia haven't realised this yet, then they must have won Tattsлото. Ideology is a most powerful political weapon, and "Labor" has it by the business end, although the grasp is loosening as the political and economic realities are being sheeted home (bigger and much stronger government, at the expense of the individual - along with a decline in the standard of living). The conservative opposition does not have an ideology, really, apart from some general espousal of "free enterprise" economy, freedom of the individual, etc. - which are O.K. as far as they go: but they don't go far enough.

It was the Liberals who ditched the traditional immigration policy. It was the Liberals who ratified some of the United Nations Conventions upon which the Fabians have legislated to the detriment and freedom of Australians (Status of Women, World Heritage, etc.) What about retrospective legislation? (Malcolm Fraser). What about a tax on books and literature (John Howard!) The Liberals and Nationals stand condemned on such issues.

The Fabians understand the "magic" of ideology. Yes, the "magic" turns sour, but they hope, not before the political traps are sprung.

It was Krushchev who, when addressing the Politburo back around 1960

proclaimed, "Comrades", the West is doomed (these are not the precise words, but the general thrust of his remarks). "We have a secret weapon against the West. It is our ideology, and they have no defense against it. Comrades, every piece of Communist ideology is a programme of action."

The pragmatic, dithering Lib/Nat. Opposition is at a severe disadvantage, to say the least, in coping with the aggressive Fabian ideology thundered from On High by the Fabian Brothers, Hawke and Keating. But it is also fallacious ideology and time exposes its fallacies.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SMOKESCREEN: We seldom refer to Letters from various sources in the body of On Target, leaving these generally, to the On Target Bulletin.

We remind supporters that our purpose in (carefully) selecting these letters for (re)publication is to emphasise the key points in current political and social issues, and to give a basis on which supporters may wish to frame their own letters on such issues.

We have already warned in these pages that, with respect to the coming Referendums, that on the issues of Local Government and "freedom of religion" - there are United Nations Declarations/Conventions down the track upon which the Fabian Government in Canberra will legislate, if they can, to yet further infringe the freedoms of Australians. The writer of this letter, a "Betty Moore" of Inverell, N.S.W., gave much hitherto unknown information in her letter to the National Farmers (14/7). We cull the key passages from her letter only (limitations of space):

"Back in the 1970s Gough Whitlam's Government established the Commonwealth Office of Local Government (H.Q., Deakin, A.C.T.), even though our Federal Constitution makes no provision for Commonwealth involvement in the affairs of local government and clearly states that local government is the direct responsibility of the States. "..... A human resource data bank is being set up at the Armidale University by the New England Industrial Development Board. This Commonwealth Office of Local Government promotes the activities of the International Union of Local Authorities (I.U.L.A.) which is partially funded by the Local Government Association of N.S.W. and the Shires Association of N.S.W. to the tune of \$21,000 per annum from subscriptions derived from council rates and ratepayers' pockets. The I.U.L.A. H.Q. are in Prague, Czechoslovakia. At its 27th. World Congress in Rio De Janeiro in September, 1985, a World Wide Declaration on Local Self Government was determined and placed before the United Nations policy makers' for the purpose of firmly establishing the principle and practice of local self government throughout the world.'

"The 1988 World Congress of the I.U.L.A. is to be held in the UNESCO H.Q., Paris, on August 15th. The Declaration is likely to be

listed upon their agenda for ratification on this date. The next World Congress of the I.U.L.A. is to be held in Perth, W.A. in 1989.

"A vote YES could place all Local Government activities under the control of the High Court and United Nations....."

"..... I believe that council funds and ratepayers' taxes should not be siphoned off for such a cause. We should not be obliged to fund our own destruction and the destruction of the existing systems of local government....."

BRIEF COMMENTS: The print dailies are now telling us what we've known, anyway, for some years, viz. that our young people, (not all, of course, but many) - are feeling alienated from society and are turning to drugs, crime, suicide. So the Commission for the Future has found. We say that the Commission for the Future is way behind the times!

We can well imagine that so many young people feel useless and unwanted as they fight for a job. Due to increasing technological sophistication, there is just no place at all for very many unskilled and semi-skilled people. Yes, and so many people are unable to cope with the "new" skills and technology for various reasons, such as - intelligence, lack of general education, inability to cope with responsibility, general unsuitability to the intellectual type of vocation, etc., etc. The generally satisfying employment that so many of the young found once in rural activities, for example, has now long gone.

We know that much the same can be said for many of the retired people. After a lifetime of generally satisfying employment, they suddenly find themselves cast aside, no longer wanted nor needed, and with many struggling to live on pensions and superannuation. Yes, the eventual collapse of the West's economic and social systems is certain; what replaces them is to be the challenge of the future.

* * * * *

The Australian (August 1st.) editorialises in favour of a YES vote for the coming Referendum on One-Vote-One-Value. The Australian dismisses the issue of States' Rights as a credible objection to the support of this Referendum.

We are not convinced. The United States is given as an example: e.g. the rights of the States of the U.S.A. federation. Washington does not allow the same States to keep slaves, or deny the vote, etc. Pretty shonky reasoning, we think. Would the American States want these things? The American Congress and Senate do not have an External Affairs Power to steam-roller all manner of freedom-defying legislation onto the 50 States either.

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