



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.10

March 24th, 1995

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Instead of being self-contained units, we are more and more becoming components of a function, masquerading as 'economics' but accurately described as 'full employment'. Five minutes consideration will convince anyone not mentally infirm that a policy of full employment means and can only mean, direction of labour. Combine that with egalitarianism, and you have the slave state – you cannot possibly have anything else."

– C.H. Douglas (1948)

MORE MABO MADNESS by Eric D. Butler:

With the feeding frenzy of a pack of hyenas, the mass media, with few exceptions, has responded to the High Court decision rejecting the West Australia's Court Government challenge to the Keating Government's legislation based on the first Mabo decision, by mounting a massive campaign against Premier Richard Court and his Government. Premier Court is correct when he says that the High Court decision supports the most far-reaching erosion of the Federal Constitution since Federation. The High Court's original Mabo decision was criticised by a number of highly respected and responsible authorities. West Australia Labor Member, Graeme Campbell, was one of the most scathing about the High Court's Mabo decision, pointing out that the High Court was not some type of god whose edicts should not be criticised.

But perhaps the most telling criticism came from Australia's most distinguished historian, Professor Geoffrey Blainey, who made the charge, amongst others, that the High Court judges were weak on the subject of history. He made the point that while there was a lot of quiet criticism by lawyers, they were loathe to be too public as one day they might be appearing before the Court. However, he quoted the opinion of Mr. Peter Connolly, for 13 years a Supreme Court judge, who concluded a 27-page analysis of the Mabo judgement by saying that the High Court had indulged "in sheer invention".

Professor Blainey has again rendered traditional Australia an outstanding service by refusing to join in the national campaign against Richard Court. He responded to the High Court's rejection

of the Court Government's appeal by warning that Australia could be divided into two separate nations, with Aborigines owning more land than everyone else put together. No responsible Australian denies that Australians of Aboriginal background have serious health and educational problems, but the Northern Territory provides striking evidence that the ownership of land has not solved this problem. The political activists, most of these only part Aboriginal, have skilfully exploited the situation to their own benefit and to further a long-term political agenda. None of the vast sums of money flowing to these activists is used to build hospitals or schools.

Professor Blainey points out that the Native Title Act would not reconcile Aborigines with other Australians. He could have added that the situation has all the ingredients of a type of civil war, with the rank and file of Aborigines being the main victims of a backlash. Already there is an anti-Aboriginal sentiment developing, particularly in rural Australia, which did not exist in the past. Well known activist Pat Dodson has responded to the High Court's rejection of the Court Government's case by lodging a number of claims on behalf of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation. These include guaranteed seats in Federal Parliament. The Council also recommended giving official recognition to the Aboriginal flag and the Torres Straits Islander flag, and the shifting of Australia Day because January 26th was not accepted by the Aborigines.

Professor Blainey is right: Australia is on the road to a divided nation. Premier Court of West Australia should be given every support by all Australians who want to prevent the destruction of traditional Australia.

DAVID THOMPSON'S W.A. ITINERARY

| Date | Town | Details |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Friday March 24th: | Conservative Speakers' Club "Immigration: The Sleeping Election Issue" | (09) 574 6260 |
| Monday, March 27th: | Moora Geraldton | (096) 549 030 (099) 251 040 |
| Tuesday, March 28th: | Morawa Koorda | (099) 715 042 (096) 841 237 |
| Wednesday, March 29th: | Katanning | (098) 268 055 |
| Thursday, March 30th: | Albany | (098) 447 389 |
| Friday, March 31st: | Northcliffe Busselton | (098) 268 055 (097) 522 880 |

PRESS RELEASE FROM WESTERN AUSTRALIA STATE DIRECTOR, AUSTRALIAN LEAGUE OF RIGHTS – "University Students Victims of Attack on Free Speech:

"The conservative League of Rights suspects foul play in a campaign to have League literature banned from the U.W.A. (University of Western Australia) campus.

"State Director, Robert Nixon, said, The League of Rights had not distributed the packages to U.W.A. student clubs and associations and suspected some ulterior motive. Some of the material had been sourced outside the League. To describe the alleged distribution of packages as an insidious attempt to infiltrate the University was clearly outrageous.

"I have written to Professor Fay Gale, Vice-Chancellor of the University of W.A., raising a number of questions arising from allegations by the Australasian Union of Jewish Students. These include whether the League is permitted to send material to university clubs and associations to correct the public record and to confirm that the University supports in principle the right of free speech and association in the quest to seek truth in history free from intimidation.

"It is reprehensible and totalitarian to suggest banning literature because it does not confirm the A.U.J.S. (Australian Union of Jewish Students) version of history. Fortunately, the passage of time is continually vindicating the League's position in the light of historical evidence.

"The banning of British historian, David Irving, from entry into this country, by the Keating Government, is a classic example of the intolerance of those who prefer to censor, rather than have opposing views responsibly discussed and debated.

"Racial vilification legislation is the unfortunate manifestation of the totalitarian approach to history, and the sledge hammer approach to improving community relations."

(Authorised by Robert S. Nixon, State Director for Western Australia,
Australian League of Rights)

HAS THE KEATING GOVERNMENT A LAND CONTROL AGENDA?

David Thompson, National Director of The Australian League of Rights, will be highlighting the significance of the recent High Court ruling on the Commonwealth Native Title legislation in a lecture tour of Western Australia. The decision has been described by Premier Court as the 'most significant stripping of power from a State by the Commonwealth since Federation'.

David Thompson will outline the totalitarian nature of the Keating Government's legislation programme which transfers more and more power to Canberra, making it increasingly difficult for electors to control their affairs.

Will we see increasing control by the Canberra bureaucracy in land administration in the same way it has increased its control over Agriculture, Education, Transport, and Local Government?

WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE TO SECESSION?

These and other questions will be discussed by David Thompson.

BRIEF COMMENTS:

Over the years the small Australian National Socialist Movement has attracted a number of pathological types who can always be relied upon to damage a basically sound cause. Last Saturday in Melbourne the National Socialists staged a public protest against the Federal Government's Race Hatred legislation, scheduled to be debated in the Senate this week. Did those responsible for this protest by an estimated 37 people really believe that such a protest would have the slightest effect on Senators' voting intentions? Or was it someone's intention to stage such a rally knowing that it would certainly result in a counter rally by Jewish demonstrators? If that was the intention, it was highly successful with the T.V. cameras ready to record a violent confrontation which large numbers of police were required to control. Zionist spokesmen have seized upon this affair, and alleged attacks on Jewish properties, as evidence for the need for the Anti-Hate legislation. The police have no evidence to confirm Zionist allegation that attacks on Jewish properties are racially motivated. The League of Rights deplors all acts of violence, which only serve to prevent civilised debate concerning immigration and associated issues.

* * * * *

A good cartoonist gets an important message across with a minimum of words. "Jeff on Sunday", in the Melbourne *Herald-Sun* of March 19th, shows a dejected looking Aboriginal couple and their baby responding to the High Court ruling on Mabo: "Well, at least that should eliminate poverty among lawyers..."

* * * * *

"Budget cuts will be tough" reads the headline to the latest statement by Federal Treasurer Willis. This is all part of the "softening up" tactics of the Keating Government. Eventually it will be seen that the much publicised "cuts" will not be as horrendous as being suggested.

* * * * *

The "inevitability" theme is now being orchestrated on the Monarchy issue. Even National Party leader Tim Fischer has allowed himself to be placed in the position where he is joining a false debate concerning whether in a Republic the President should be directly elected by the people, or by Federal and State Parliaments. Also caught offside, Victorian Premier Jeff Kennett has now come back by insisting that the Liberals are "solid" on the Monarchy. It is simply not true that there is complete unanimity on the Monarchy issue in the Liberal Parties. In a tour of country Victoria last week, Premier Kennett is quoted as having said that while he remained "fundamentally" a Monarchist it "was inevitable the republic debate would gather strength and that change might be appropriate". If the Liberals are genuine in their defence of the system of Constitutional Monarchy they will mount a fullscale campaign explaining exactly why the retention and strengthening of the Constitutional Monarchy is essential for Australia's future.