



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.26

July 14th, 1995

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "There can, I think, be no appreciation of the problem with which humanity is faced, and therefore no hope of a decisive and satisfactory outcome from it, without a recognition that States – Great Britain, France, Germany, the United States – are simply 'Counters', in the sense that the word is used on the Stock Exchange. Exactly as shares are operated by the big Operators, the destinies of whole people are played with by the same type of Group, with as little compunction or respect for the results to the population concerned as the big share promoter has for the public, where no question of legal danger is involved. M. Coty, the French millionaire, entitled his expose, which dealt with some aspects of the situation, *Financiers Who Sport With The World.*"

– C.H. Douglas in *The Big Idea*

THE TABOO SUBJECT OF IMMIGRATION by Eric D. Butler:

The author of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas, expressed the view that any nation which could maintain its basic character could, given time, resolve its problems. He often quoted the famous statement by Karl Marx, that the English would never make their own revolution, that foreigners would have to make it for them. The Marxists were consistently in the forefront of every movement to break down the cohesive nature of Anglo-Saxon-Celtic communities everywhere. While the Constitutional Monarchy issue is of vital importance concerning the future of Australia, as is the erosion of the Australian economy to fit it into the Global Economy, and while no concerned Australian can ignore the conservation question, these and other questions will eventually be resolved by the composition of the Australian people. Public opinion polls have consistently shown that immigration and unemployment are the issues which most concern the Australian people. Both these issues are directly linked.

Those who still support the retention of the system of Constitutional Monarchy are doomed to waging a progressively defensive campaign if the existing character of the Australian population is further diluted by bringing in immigrants who do not share the culture out of which the present constitutional system grew. But, as Ita Buttrose said in her recent address labelling Australians as having become a nation of wimps, immigration is one of the subjects which Australians have

been conditioned to believe is too dangerous to discuss. Speaking recently on the 20th anniversary of the introduction of the Racial Discrimination Act of 1975, Prime Minister Keating warned that "Prejudice was still ingrained in Australian society". Prime Minister Keating went on to say, "By making an Australian our head of State at the turn of the century, we can say to the world and to our children, this is a country which believes in its contemporaries". This statement is typical of those who insist that the past has no relevance to the present or the future citizens who are in fact rootless. When Paul Keating speaks of "the evil of prejudice", he ignores the words of a much wiser man, the great Edmund Burke, who said that prejudice is often the wisdom of the unlettered man. Prejudgements are often essential for survival. Much as been written recently about the relationship between Australia's wartime Prime Minister John Curtin and General Douglas MacArthur. John Curtin led a Labor Party which frankly stated that it believed in a restricted immigration policy, one designed to maintain a homogeneous nation. Douglas MacArthur said he would not have any man on his staff who was not at least a third generation American.

Immigration Minister Bolkus has recently said that unless Opposition leader John Howard "doesn't tackle this issue of race properly, I think he can write away the next federal election". If John Howard could find the courage to speak out boldly on the immigration issue, and state that he is not going to be bullied by Ethnic Community organisations, he would be amazed at the electoral support he would generate. With the major political parties now all kow-towing to minority ethnic groups, the only way available to Australians to have a vote on immigration and associated matters, is to elect a group of Senators who can check the destructive madness now being promoted across Australia by the mass media.

The wisdom of their forbears left Australians with a constitutional system through which they can rate the arrogance of governments. None of the major parties like the Senate and the checks it provides. Even those who vote for the major parties in the House of Representatives instinctively vote differently in the Senate. The constructive use of the Senate may be the only way in which traditional Australia can be saved, as a preliminary to re-generation.

RECOGNISING THE REVOLUTIONARY FLAG by David Thompson:

Mr. Keating's proposal to confer official recognition on the flags of the Aborigines and the Torres Straits Islanders under Section 5 of the Flags Act, 1953, does nothing to further the process of 'reconciliation'. In the same way that the High Court's Mabo decision on Native Title divided Australians, so does the decision concerning the 'flag'. In reality, this decision simply gives political comfort to a long-running revolutionary programme to shatter Australian sovereignty, and undermine national cohesion, playing into the hands of hard-line revolutionaries who manipulate the Aboriginal people.

The concept of "an Aboriginal flag" is misleading in itself, and implies that historically the Aboriginal inhabitants of Australia made up an Aboriginal 'nation'. This was never the case. The native inhabitants observed by Captain Cook, and later explorers and settlers, consisted of a series of warring tribes, strongly territorial, and with a strong sense of their own totems, or tribal identities.

By contrast, the Maori inhabitants of New Zealand encountered by Cook and others, while bedevilled by internal conflicts, were able to negotiate with the Europeans as a people, if not a "nation"

as such. The result was the Treaty of Waitangi of 1840, which is still recognised today. But even as a people, the Maoris had no flag, as this was foreign to their heritage. What has become well known as the Maori flag was drawn up for them by the Scottish administrator, James Busby, in 1834, and was flown at the coronation of the first Maori king in 1858. Note: the concept of Maori royalty was borrowed from the British, as was the concept of the flag. In New Zealand today the militant Maori movement has taken up the use of the Maori flag as a symbol of protest, and it is proposed in radical circles that the Maori flag should replace the New Zealand flag.

A DELIBERATELY DIVISIVE FLAG: Mr. Keating's formal recognition of the Aboriginal "flag" has been bitterly condemned by the man who designed the emblem, Mr. Harold Thomas, who produced the design in 1971. Thomas rejects the Keating proclamation, in which he was never consulted, claiming that formal recognition would dilute the potency of the "flag" as a symbol of protest. He promises legal action, claiming intellectual copyright over the design.

Mr. Thomas' objections demonstrate further that this is an inappropriate proposal. The suggestion that any national or official flag should be subject to a design copyright is ludicrous. And it is quite clear that Mr. Thomas' design was deliberately intended to be divisive.

It should be noted that the present proposal bears out Mr. Arthur Tunstall's objection to Miss Cathy Freeman using the Aboriginal banner at the Commonwealth Games as a breach of protocol. Tunstall was roundly condemned for pointing out what is now readily admitted. As a leading administrator of the Australian Commonwealth Games team, this was Tunstall's responsibility. If the boot was on the other foot, and a white Australian athlete was to do a victory lap at the 2000 Olympics in Sydney with a Union Jack to demonstrate his cultural heritage, there would be predictable uproar over the breach of protocol. The uproar would be all the louder if Australia was to become a republic as well.

Mr. Howard is quite correct to claim that recognition of the Aboriginal land rights banner is divisive. Even by the standards of "multiculturalism" there is no suggestion that Greek, Turkish, Irish, Croation or Latvian Australians should have their own flags. Such an absurd proposal would simply underline Professor Geoffrey Blainey's warning that multiculturalism is breaking the country into a nation of tribes.

Mr. Keating's proclamation is not only inappropriate, but dangerous. It gives recognition to a revolutionary movement that has manipulated the Aborigines, and still aims at the destruction of the Australian nation, and the creation of a separate black state in Australia's north. The revolutionaries claim this flag as their standard.

DESECRATION OF GRAVES AND RACIAL VILIFICATION:

The desecration of Jewish graves in a South Australian cemetery last weekend has been seized upon as yet another example of the necessity for the Racial Hatred legislation to be pushed through the Senate. Attorney General Lavarch, in particular, is insisting that Senators should 'do the right thing' and demonstrate to the Australian community that such racially-inspired desecration is totally unacceptable. But it has always been unacceptable. And where the perpetrators have been apprehended previously, they have always been dealt with under existing laws.

It should be noted that, as yet, no motive can be ascribed to the desecration of Jewish graves, since no-one has been charged with the offence. Perhaps Australians should be reminded that a similar desecration a few months ago led to loud allegations of "white racism". When the grave of the late Eddie Mabo was daubed with paint in Townsville, the outrage against European Australians was almost vengeful. It even led to a special ceremony, in which European Australians apologised for their "guilt" – even though a police investigation was inconclusive.

It might be noted that the investigation into the Mabo grave desecration has been completely dropped by the press, since one small report, never repeated, alleged that two Aboriginal children had admitted daubing the monument. But the Mabo desecration was, and is now, attributed to "white racism".

It is quite beyond any argument that desecration of graves of any sort is grossly offensive, and offenders should be dealt with by the law. The law is adequate for this now, and matters of racially motivated violence can be readily dealt with, as the case of the imprisonment of Mr. Jack van Tongeran has demonstrated in W.A. But let the culprits of the desecration of Jewish graves be apprehended, and their motives studied before such acts are attributed to "anti-Semitism".

RENEW IMPORT TARIFFS, OR BACK TO RECESSION?

The suggestion by the Liberal Party that some tariff reforms should be halted, or even reversed, has been supported by a trenchant opponent of "economic rationalism" – John Carroll. Together with Robert Manne, Carroll edited the book *Shutdown – the Failure of Economic Rationalism*, published in 1992, in which they forecast massive balance of payments blowouts, like that now occurring. In a recent article for *The Weekend Australian* (8/7/95), Carroll speculates that if the Liberals were to propose a tariff on all imports, "this would be a virtual guarantee of election victory – given that polls show that 90% of Australians favour protecting local industry"

In his article, Carroll reflects upon the recent \$2.9 billion trade deficit, and writes: "*The grand rationalist strategy that ruled 1980s policy has failed on every front. Its driving assumption was that reducing protection here would wipe out inefficient, feather-bedded industry, and in the rejuvenated soil of our economy the green shoots of new internationally competitive factories would sprout, fertilised by the ashes of the old, leading to the exports that would balance the books.....*"

"Given that we are not going to export our way out of this mess, two options remain. Either we rebuild industry here – geared to import replacement – or we go back into recession."

Under conventional financial rules, John Carroll is quite correct. But if a new, more creative financial policy could be explored, encompassing the creation of new credits without corresponding debt by a sovereign Australian Government, for the benefit of the individual, other options appear. This would require a substantial change in the policy of integrating the Australian economy with the global market, to a policy of national economic self-sufficiency. This could extricate Australia from the "export or die" mentality, and place us in a situation where foreign trade was on the basis of the exchange of genuine surpluses. Australia could provide an example for the world.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,
145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.

Subscription \$30.00 p.a.