



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.30, No.44

November 18th, 1994

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "It was Douglas's great achievement to discover the relation between Finance, Centralisation, and World Hegemony. Until the outbreak of the first phase of war (the First World War) money appeared to be more mechanism. But the arrangements made to finance the war revealed to Douglas that the money system was in fact the vehicle of a policy, and that that policy was the centralisation of power leading progressively to World Government."

– Dr. Bryan Monahan (1969)

THE APEC STEP TOWARDS THE WORLD STATE by Eric D. Butler:

The basic feature of the world scene is the attempt by the most industrialised nations to solve their growing internal problems by "capturing" one another's markets. It was the genius of the author of the movement known as Social Credit, Clifford Hugh Douglas, which demonstrated that, under orthodox finance-economic policies, it was impossible for developed nations to purchase their own production without recourse to mounting debt, both national and international, and becoming increasingly vulnerable to pressures from the competing nations to form themselves into "Common Markets". While there have been shortsighted politicians who genuinely believe that it is "inevitable" that the developed nations organise themselves into bigger and bigger Common Markets, with higher living standards resulting from what is termed Free Trade, there is documented and other evidence demonstrating that there are powerful international groups who seek to exploit the defects in the finance-economic system to further a long-term strategy designed to create an idealistically-conceived World State.

For a number of reasons, the Anglo-Saxons have always been in the forefront of a defence against all policies of centralisation which have threatened the liberty of the individual. At a time when the blatantly centralist policies of the Keating Federal Government are creating the spectre of secession in West Australia, it is appropriate to recall that the basic cause of the American Civil War was not slavery, but the attempt by the Southern States, peopled mainly by people of Lowland Scottish background, to exercise what they thought was their constitutional right to secede from a

Union becoming increasingly oppressive. The ultimate defence against tyranny is the right to contract out from an intolerable situation.

The old British Empire, with all its defects, an association of sovereign nations, sharing a common heritage, was a major barrier to the establishment of a World Government of any kind, and was the target of international powerlusters. The establishment of the European Common Market was the first major step towards destroying that association. Now comes the concept of the Asian-Pacific Common Market, including the U.S.A. Like Bob Hawke before him, Paul Keating has enthusiastically promoted the concept, claiming that Australia's destiny is in Asia, where there are allegedly vast untapped markets. In more robust days, those advocating that Australia be absorbed into a structure like APEC would be described as traitors. Australia has been developed by peoples of Anglo-Saxon-Celtic background, who in that development have furthered the constitutional and cultural principles of their forebears. For a number of reasons, the Australians have been well placed to provide an example of the very best of British culture to their Asian neighbours. For the reasons which C.H. Douglas so clearly outlined, the finance-economic policies being pursued by the developing Asian nations, must result in catastrophic social and ecological disasters.

Australians who wish to preserve their national soul in the turbulent days ahead should welcome any unrehearsed events which may throw the Grand Design of the internationalists off course, but not rely too much on, for example, an American election result which saw a massive electors' rebuff to internationalist Clinton. Some Republicans are making favourable comments about the possibility of the new Congress refusing to endorse the GATT Agreement and to reject Free Trade as an economic policy. But unless the Republicans come to grips with finance-economic realities, they are vulnerable to the ongoing policy of centralisation. It is significant that only 40 percent of the American electors felt it worthwhile voting. In the absence of genuine alternatives to what all modern American governments have imposed on the American people, there is no certainty how the Republicans may fare at the 1996 elections. The emergence of a proposed third Party might, however, divide political power and result in a rejection of APEC, and similar internationalist proposals. In the meantime Australians would be well advised to concentrate on looking after their own affairs and reject APEC and other blandishments.

U.S. ELECTIONS: LESSONS FOR AUSTRALIA by D. Thompson:

To Australians, the election process in the United States always seems to involve a certain amount of madness. But even if we might not completely understand the process, there are lessons to be learned from the results. As a nation where voting is voluntary, it is notable that only about 40

percent of those qualified to vote did so. Therefore, although the talk of a Republican landslide is borne out by the changed face of the Congress, it has been achieved by little more than 20 percent **of those qualified to vote**. This leaves the President, the Head of State, isolated as a Democrat President facing a hostile Republican House of Representatives and Senate. Because Clinton is also the Chief Executive of the U.S. Government, this clearly submits the Head of State to two years of damaging inter-party brawling before the next Presidential elections in 1996. The status of the Head of State must suffer as a result. The attitude of the American voter must also suffer, which helps to explain why only 40 percent bothered to vote, and those who did perhaps voted **against politicians** rather than specifically against the Democrat Party.

If the United States is the leading example of a successful republic, would Australia wish to abandon the Monarchy to follow this shining example? Even those who aspire to an Australian republic cannot agree on the dilemma about the selection process for a Head of State-President. Popular election, or appointment by, say, a two-thirds majority of Parliament? The truth is that **neither option** can give us a Head of State above **the corrupting process of party politics**. Is it any wonder that there is strong support for the monarchy in the U.S.A.? Only the hereditary monarch is truly above party politics, and if the process of installing a President of the U.S.A. (inauguration) is compared to the process of installing the hereditary monarch (the Christian church service of holy communion) only the culturally and spiritually barren could prefer the inauguration.

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDA IN THE U.S.A.: It should not be forgotten that the mid-term Congressional elections in the United States are also accompanied by voting for other offices, like governors of States, judges, etc. And with this is the opportunity for the electorate to force votes on burning issues to which politicians or governments give no satisfactory expression. In California, Proposition 187 has caused uproar, because it attempts to deal with the problem of illegal immigrants from Mexico.

This problem has been lightly glossed over by political parties, although with increasing discomfort in recent years. The Los Angeles riots are still fresh enough in the minds of most to give a genuine 'edge' to the illegal immigrant problem. With something like **2 million illegal Mexican immigrants**, feelings ran high enough to initiate a referendum on the issue – Proposition 187. An amazing 60 percent of votes cast for Proposition 187 saw the initiative adopted, and ensured immediate court challenges to have it overturned. The outrage of liberal America to this result has been muted, because it is clear that the referendum simply gives expression to a general feeling in the United States. The referendum results require that public servants refuse services to those suspected of being illegal immigrants, and report them to the authorities. The opponents of Proposition 187 have called it a "racist witch-hunt", but this didn't prevent 60 percent of Californian voters from supporting it.

THE MULTICULTURAL FALL-OUT IN AUSTRALIA:

In Australia the combined policies of high immigration and forced multiculturalism are building the same sort of pressures as in the United States. In order to attempt to reduce the "racist" friction, such things as "racial hatred" legislation is being introduced, which will force every Australian to think twice before expressing his views on the problem. While conceding that it is not possible to legislate to change social attitudes, the A.L.P. is attempting to do just that, arguing that the racial hatred legislation will not actually be used to prosecute, but to "**educate**" the **community** on the new politically correct standards.

Archbishop Peter Hollingworth, of Brisbane, last week warned about multiculturalism emphasising difference, to the exclusion of what we hold in common. "I believe that issue needs to be challenged vigorously, on the grounds that if we fail to articulate a commonly agreed set of goals and directions, we are likely to move down a path towards further fragmentation and social disintegration," he said.

THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE MINORITY: The greatest pressure for racial vilification legislation is not coming from "mainstream" Australia, but from minority groups – the professional ethnic lobbies. For example, the Liberal Party dilemma over the Lavarch legislation comes about because of strong pressure from Mr. Victor Rebikoff, of the Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils, and Mr. Mark Leibler, of the Ethnic Coalition of Australia. These gentlemen bluntly **demand** that the Coalition agree upon a 'bipartisan' approach to the racial hatred bill.

The N.S.W. Liberal Party is particularly sensitive about the racial hatred legislation, and has been pressuring Downer on the issue, because the N.S.W. elections must be held by April next year, and there are up to **2 million voters** in N.S.W. whose first language is **not English**. Thus the Liberals find themselves the victims of their own inaction: when they could have opposed institutionalised multiculturalism, creating enclaves of ethnic tribes to whom the A.L.P. now panders, they did not do so. Instead of integrating alien migrants into the Australian mainstream, we have created a **nation of tribes** which can destroy traditional Australia.

There is an enormous difference between "solving the ethnic problem" and avoiding the problem altogether. It could have been avoided in Australia with an intelligent immigration policy that made "Australians" first out of all migrants. Now it must be "solved" somehow, and while political parties refuse to act under the cover of "bipartisanship" it may require the facility of referendums initiated by the voters themselves. Racial hatred legislation will intensify the friction and the resentment.