



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. 31

August 19th, 1988.

Thought for the Week: "Monopoly of Power is the Enemy, and all Power maniacs are his Servants. 'All power (over men) corrupts, and Absolute Power corrupts absolutely. If Finance governs the State, the Banker is the Satanic incarnation. If the State is Supreme, Socialism is the Devil The remedy is exactly what you would expect it to be, once it is admitted that the disease is monopolistic. It is de-centralisation."

- C.H.Douglas in "Whose Service is Perfect Freedom."

CAN JOHN HOWARD GRASP THE NETTLE? The great Edmund Burke observed that prejudice is often the wisdom of the unlettered man. It is appropriate to recall Burkes words at a time when Liberal leader John Howard's moderate comments about immigration have triggered a highly sophisticated and orchestrated campaign to head off any threatened change in an immigration policy which is causing growing unease among the great majority of the Australian people. The reaction to John Howard's stand, as with the reaction to Wilson Tuckey's frank comments about AIDS, and his supporting comments for John Howard, is most illuminating, and the developing situation indicates that there is a possibility that Australia is witnessing one of those unrehearsed events which could start to change Australia off the disastrous course on which it is travelling. What is upsetting the Howard and Tuckey critics is that they fear that Howard and Tuckey have the support of the overwhelming majority of the Australian people. John Laws, described as "Australia's most famous radio personality", writing in the Sunday Telegraph, of August 14th., writes that "Whether we like it or not, the typical Australian ... is racist." Like so many of his kind, Mr. Laws does not bother to define what he means by "racist", a political swear-word used to discredit those who dare to offer any opposition to the programme of multiculturalism. Unable to deny that John Howard has the support of the majority of the Australian people, the media pundits, many secular humanists, assisted by their spiritual fellows of academia, refer to what one describes as "the darker side" of Australian politics, while John Howard is not only "unprincipled"

but is "splitting" the Liberal Party. As most of the critics are Labor supporters, their dominant theme that Howard is splitting the Liberal Party, and is therefore destroying all prospects of a "credible" and "united" opposition, must be seen either as sickening hypocrisy, or the expression of a deep seated fear that John Howard, aided by Wilson Tuckey and similar members of the Liberal Party, might start to build a political movement dedicated to putting the "One Australia" concept into reality.

While the reaction of the media and academic critics was foreseeable, the most revealing reaction was that of two groups which most people would associate with conservatism. Mr. Rick Farley of the National Farmers' Federation along with the Confederation of Australian Industries, have criticised John Howard's immigration policy on the grounds that it will retard Australia's prospects of exporting to Asian markets. There is enthusiastic talk about the establishment of a Pacific Common Market. We have been warning Australian dairy farmers for years about the far-reaching implications of the Closer Economic Relations (CER) agreement with New Zealand, a first step towards creating a Pacific Common Market, this in turn associated with the New International Economic Order programme. Now that the "crunch" has come with the CER, Australia's dairy industry leaders are suddenly shocked.

So far from Australia's Asian neighbours being concerned about a restricted immigration policy, they have an even stricter policy. It is virtually impossible for a European to become a citizen of any Asian nation. The Japanese and Chinese, for example, wisely adopt an immigration policy designed to produce social cohesion. Malaysia has a "racist" constitution designed to cope with the problems of multi-culturalism. Multi-culturalism is disastrous for both the peoples of the host nation and for those immigrants of a different racial and cultural background. It is significant that a number of Asians living in Australia have also warned about the dangers of a continued high level of Asian immigration. No doubt they have observed what happened in Fiji.

One of the most revealing aspects of the storm which John Howard has created, is the relatively small number of his critics inside the Liberal Party. These critics belong to that group which philosophically is much closer to the Labor Party. Running true to form, Zionist Peter Baume, NSW Senator, dismisses public opinion polls showing overwhelming support for a policy of less Asian immigration. Baume says that public opinion is not always right. But this is no excuse for attempting to impose policies in the face of public opposition. If the Baumes of the Liberal Party do not believe that the Australian

BOOK NOW FOR LEAGUE'S ANNUAL NATIONAL WEEKEND. DETAILS IN "BULLETIN".

people should be consulted about the most basic issue a people have to face, their future as a people, then they should say so openly. The Grassby's glibly argue that immigration has never been an issue which gains or loses votes at elections. This is true only under a bi-partisan immigration policy where it is submerged in party programmes. What is required is a national referendum on the issue and if John Howard can bring himself to take one further step, and promise that if elected at the next Federal elections, he will permit the Australian people to have a direct say on this one issue, he will be on the way to political victory.

Now that former Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser, has openly attacked John Howard, he should not only hit back, as he has, but should seize the opportunity to publicly apologise for the disasters of the Fraser years and promise a retreat from all international entanglements which damage Australia's sovereignty. If this creates an even bigger split in the Liberal Party, then the Baumes, the Steele Halls, the Macphees and the others should be asked to resign from the Liberal Party to make way for men and women pledged to a genuinely "One Australia" policy.

John Howard has many limitations, but he may yet go down in Australian history as the political leader who played a major role in jolting Australia off a disaster course. Whether he will "grasp the nettle" and go as far as we suggest, we doubt. As we go to press, there is evidence that John Howard is looking for a way to retreat in the face of a campaign of vilification not witnessed for a long time in Australian politics. John Howard now says he is "re-assessing" the situation. But let us be thankful for small mercies. John Howard may have provoked an open debate out of which genuine leadership could emerge.

BRIEF COMMENTS: Mr. John Howard should be heartened by the type of critics he is arousing, the most vociferous of these being Mr. Al Grassby, who has been described as the "father of multi-culturalism" in Australia. Grassby says that the campaign against multiculturalism is "linked with an upsurge of primitive racism." In any popularity poll Al Grassby would be lucky to score more than a few points. That is one reason why John Howard should warmly welcome the Grassby criticism.

* * * * *

The Anglican Dean of Sydney, the very rev. Lance Shilton, has warned his congregation to vote "NO" to the "freedom of religion" question in the coming Referendum.

He sees possible quicksands ahead if this question is carried: "... But if there is an alteration to the Constitution it could open up a Pandora's Box of conflicts and confusions eventually restricting the freedom of religion we already enjoy"... Further controversial litigation could revolve around such issues as State

aid to independent schools, religious instruction in State schools, prayer at public occasions, etc.

Dean Shilton also criticised the lumping together, with the religion question, of trail by jury, and property compensations; such a practice creating unnecessary confusion. (that's not the real purpose ... O.T.) A Catholic Church spokesman has stated that the issue is confusing many Catholics.

Our earnest hope is that the great numbers of Australian voters who don't really understand the issues, and who resent being forced to go to the polls unnecessarily; will be guarded and vote 4 Nos.

* * * * *

David Lange, New Zealand's Prime Minister, has ruled out (politically) unity with Australia "in the near future".

We don't have to be told that the New Zealand Fabians want eventual political unity. Of course they do; as Fabians they are One Worlders. We can well recall the late Clement Attlee, Prime Minister of Britain at the close of World War 2, stating boldly that ... "our goal is World Government". Attlee headed a Fabian Socialist Government for some years, in which there were many hard-line Fabians, such as Sir Stafford Cripps, Herbert Harrison, Dr. Hugh Dalton, Aneurin Bevan, Ernest Bevan, Hugh Gaitskell, and many others who pushed Britain on the path of Socialism and into decline.

Interestingly, David Lange has stated that "we could not have done what we have with a different political structure". Yes, New Zealand is further down the track towards Socialism than is Australia. David Lange is right: New Zealand does NOT have a Senate to block Fabian Socialist legislation. If Australia had no Senate, then Australia would now have the Bill of Rights, AND, the Australia Card! With severe inroads into our personal liberties.

David Lange seems a realistic politician in many respects, but the Fabian ideology is there, ticking away, ready to thrust forward when the opportunity presents itself.

* * * * *

"News and Views" (Queensland) the Voice of the Queensland Immigration Control Association, raises the question (July, '88) which we have missed, ourselves, in the past, but which is assiduously evaded by the mass media mob. And of course, the politicians. The question?

"... On how many other peoples could reliance be placed in the case of international conflict? Would people see themselves as Australians - even if they had citizens certificates ---- when people of their ethnic group were in conflict with Australians?"

We'll go one further; and there is more than facetiousness in our question. Would Justice Marcus Einfeld, of the Human Rights Commission, fine us, or even throw us into prison, if we called the race of people dropping bombs on us, or shooting us --- nasty names? Names calculated to throw that race of people, killing us, into disrepute?

"ON TARGET" is published and printed by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Subscription rate \$20.00 p.a. posted.