



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.44

November 17th, 1995

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "The true tragedy of the 'European' Community is that the whole upheaval, the destruction of democratic rights, the constitutional outrages and the imposition of an alienating artificial superstate on the fearful peoples of free nations is all completely unnecessary. Indeed the whole enterprise is a step backwards into the disasters of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia." – *Treason At Maastricht*, by Rodney Atkinson and Norris McWhirter.

MIDDLE EAST VIOLENCE by Eric D. Butler:

The assassination of Israeli Prime Minister Rabin confirms the old Biblical statement that those who live by the sword often die by the sword. Of Eastern European background Yitzak Rabin was closely associated with the creation and sustenance of Zionist Israel by the use of terror tactics against the native Palestinian people. It was the use of murderous terror tactics by the Zionists which played a major role in creating a culture of terrorist tactics in the Middle East. Jews and Palestinians, many of these Christians, had lived together relatively harmoniously over many centuries. The Jews, a minority, were predominantly of Sephardic background and could legitimately claim some historical relationship with Palestine. But Zionism, like Communism, was born and developed among those Askenazim Jews of Russia and Eastern Europe, who, as demonstrated in Arthur Koestler's famous classic, *The Thirteenth Tribe*, were the descendants of the ancient Central Asian Khazar Empire, which had Judaism imposed upon it as a State religion in the 7th century. It was the Azkenazim Jews who, under both Communism and Zionism, exploited the "Chosen Race" myth in the ruthless advancement of power politics.

The injection of Zionist aggression in the Middle East started during and after the First World War, when a desperate Britain accepted the infamous Balfour Declaration. This declaration was a violation of previous promises made to the Arabs, but was made in exchange for promised American and International Financial support at a critical time when the First War looked like having to end in a stalemate.

Successive British Governments were faced with the impossible task of attempting to maintain law and order in Palestine as the Palestinians revolted against the growing Zionist invasion. Zionist terror activities, including the murder of Britain's Ambassador to the Middle East, Lord Moyne, even provoked pro-Zionist Winston Churchill to raise his voice in protest. Although not a major

terrorist figure like Begin and others, Rabin was directly involved in the terrorist campaign which ended with the dispossession of the Palestinians of their own country. Much is made of Rabin's successful handling of the Six Day War, which ended with a major expansion of Israel at the expense of the Arabs. Conveniently overlooked in the welter of comment about the Six Day War, is that, as pointed out by Sir John Glubb and other experts on the Middle East, it was the Soviet strategists who misled the Arabs into a conflict which they were doomed to lose even before it started. Sir John Glubb said that the most amazing aspect of this conflict was that it lasted even for six days.

A combination of factors, including International Zionist pressure, continuing Palestinian resistance to Israel and deep divisions inside Israel, eventually resulted in Rabin's Government agreeing to start exploring the prospects of some type of peace agreement with the Palestinians and other Arabs. The long term strategy of Rabin and his advisers was to take the heat out of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict while making the Palestinians increasingly dependant economically upon the Israelis. But there was violent objection to any concessions to the Palestinians, inside Israel. Reflecting the depth of feeling on the issue, Rabin's widow blames the leader of the Likud Opposition for the climate of violence she said had led to the assassination. Rabin's widow has painted an ugly picture of the violent threats her husband had to endure.

The reality is that Israel, conceived in violence and terrorism, is itself a victim of a terrorist culture it initiated. Still unresolved is the future of the Palestinian people. Reports emerging from Israel suggest that what is required from the Palestinians is an assurance that they have given up their aspirations to return to the properties they were forced to leave during Israel's creation in 1948.

But in the Declaration of Principles signed in Washington in September, 1993, it is stated that the question of the Palestinian refugees will be addressed at the second phase of the peace talks, these scheduled for May 4th, 1996. The right of the Palestinians to return to their own properties is the key question to be resolved if there is to be anything resembling peace in the Middle East. The Rabin assassination is but a symptom of the basic disease in the Middle East. The basic disease remains.

SENATOR BOLKUS ON THE LEAGUE:

In one of the most incredible developments in a year of turbulent politics, the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Senator Bolkus, mounted an extraordinary attack on the popularly elected Mayor of Port Lincoln, in South Australia, Mr. Peter Davis. What was Mr. Davis' crime? He not only chaired a meeting for Eric Butler on the issue of local government, but confirmed that he had been a supporter of the League of Rights for many years. Bolkus was enraged, describing Davis, whom he did not know, as being an "unreconstructable redneck", and stating that there was no place in local government politics for Peter Davis. Mayor Davis was stripped of his powers to conduct citizenship ceremonies.

Mr. Davis and a number of local League supporters have demanded an explanation from Attorney-General, Mr. Lavarch. Such correspondence has been referred back to Senator Bolkus. The

Minister has indicated that under the Australian Citizenship Act powers to confer citizenship rest with the Minister, and is delegated to many players, commissioners and general managers of local authorities around Australia. The Minister's adviser writes:

"The Minister decided to remove the delegation from the Mayor of Port Lincoln because he considered the Mayor's membership of the League of Rights and comments attributed to him in the media indicated that he was not an appropriate person to exercise this important power. The League of Rights was identified in the Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Racist Violence in 1991 as an organisation which holds and promotes racist views.

"Citizenship is, by its nature, conferred on people who come to Australia from other countries. To become an Australian citizen candidates are required to make the Australian Citizenship Pledge which sets out their commitment to Australia. In turn, the Federal Government is committed to ensuring that all Australian citizens live in a tolerant and inclusive society free from racism. Membership of the League of Rights is therefore not consistent with the responsibilities required of the Minister or his delegate in the conferral of citizenship."

This is clearly the most unbelievable humbug from the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs.

1) Senator Bolkus does not know Mayor Peter Davis. Peter Davis' ratepayers and constituents do know him, and know him rather well. It is not the first time he has served on the Council. Such treatment of a popularly elected local figure says more about the A.L.P.'s commitment to representative government than it says about Mayor Davis. Even the Mayor's local critics acknowledge that he is certainly not a "racist". Peter Davis has been unjustly slandered by the Minister.

2) Senator Bolkus' "adviser" knows little of the League, and has clearly not bothered to try to find out what the League stands for. He quotes the Report of the Inquiry Into Racist Violence, conducted by the Human Rights Commission. This was commissioned after the 1988 Parliamentary Enquiry into the League was eventually abandoned as futile. The H.R.C. Report provided no evidence of the League's "racism", and naturally failed to find a single instance in which the League was involved with "racial violence". If anything, the inquiry effectively **cleared the League** of the allegations against us.

3) It is clear that an authoritarian and increasingly totalitarian Labor Party cannot tolerate dissent, and fear freedom of expression. They know their political programme is one **imposed upon** a generally resentful grassroots Australia. The only political sanction that any Member of the Commonwealth Parliament has over a mayor of a provincial city, is in respect to the Mayor's citizenship powers. Other than this, the Constitution provides **absolutely no powers** to the Commonwealth over local government. Senator Bolkus is using the only sanction available to him to attack a political enemy. It is not the first time a Minister for Immigration has done so. The Mayor of Coffs Harbour, in N.S.W., has also had his citizenship powers revoked in a similar political attack.

4) The attack on Mayor Peter Davis is more an attack upon the League than on a thoroughly reputable local identity. If Mayor Davis was a member of the Communist Party, to which Senator Bolkus is not stranger, there would never have been a murmur about his not being an appropriate person to confer citizenship.

COALITION PAINFULLY AWARE OF A "SLEEPER" ELECTION ISSUE by David Thompson:

While Mr. Howard takes every opportunity to ingratiate himself with every "ethnic" group in the nation, there is a growing awareness that such a performance is costing the Coalition considerable support in the electorate where such politically correct behaviour is seen more as hypocrisy. In doing so, Mr. Howard is again being subtly outmanoeuvred by the Prime Minister, a polished professional in the art of political double-dealing. Keating stung Howard into redoubling his ethnic efforts with the acid comment that 'The Chinese are very smart people . . .'. Keating claimed that the Chinese would 'see through' Howard's carefully-crafted credentials on immigration, and "knew" that if the Coalition were elected, Mr. Howard would find a way to send them back to China.

A growing number of Coalition backbenchers, gearing up into election mode, are finding that the immigration issue holds a powerful position close to the fore in the minds of the voters. It may become a question of how the issue is to be dealt with, without appearing to deal with it at all. If this is the case, then perhaps Liberal Senator Nick Minchin, of South Australia, is testing the "line" the Coalition may be preparing to use.

Senator Minchin is quoted by Peter Rees, a senior journalist with Sydney's *Daily Telegraph*, as claiming that the "extraordinarily large" 25 percent increase in this year's immigrant intake makes no sense. Minchin is pointing out that the migrant unemployment rate is an alarming **22 percent**. But instead of calling for further debate about the size of the immigration programme, Minchin is calling rather for a population policy, and "*a recognition of the need for our immigration intake to be determined within the context of that population policy . . .*".

Minchin's comments are construed as a potential embarrassment to John Howard if immigration were to become an election issue. This could be the case, especially if discussion concerning a population policy was broadened out beyond simply employment issues, to encompass social issues. For example, should a population policy establish principles about the **ethnic origins of migrants**? Should the matter of multiculturalism and social cohesion be considered, as **John Howard himself** claimed back in 1988 when he was hounded from the leadership of the Liberal Party as a result?

Senator Minchin is quoted as saying that the nation's population was increasing without any reference to "*the views of Australians themselves*". This is a curious comment, as it implies that Minchin might be prepared to support a consultative mechanism where the grassroots are actually consulted, about immigration policy. What about a referendum?

Senator Minchin's comments may be very significant, since he is also the Parliamentary Secretary to Mr. John Howard. When enquiries were made of John Howard about his attacks on the League, some of these enquiries have been answered by Senator Minchin as Howard's Secretary. Although Minchin accuses the League of "racism" (among other things) he does not specify what form this "racism" takes. If he is referring to the League's position on immigration, then he may be amazed to find that our position is the same as his appears to be: let the Australian people speak on immigration, preferably through a referendum. We certainly support the development on a population policy for Australia, which would naturally have to include the social as well as economic impact on immigration.