



ON TARGET

- PPR
320.56
ON 1
- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
 - BACKGROUND INFORMATION
 - COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.38

October 11th, 1996

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "The philosophy of association is therefore the joining together of all associates for the good of the associate . . . Let us define Social Credit as a system of society at the service of each and every one of its members, in which politics is at the service of each and every one of the citizens, and economics is at the service of each and every one of the consumers."

— Louis Even in *This Age of Plenty*, 1946

CENTRALISATION THE ENEMY: In his masterly survey of the programme of centralisation designed to abolish the sovereignty of the Nation States of Europe by forcing them into a United States of Europe, Mr. Don Martin, National Director of The British League of Rights and himself a small businessman, took his audience back to C.H. Douglas's first book, *Economic Democracy*, in which the man who gave the world what is known as Social Credit, warned that all attempts to resolve the problems of mankind through centralisation must lead to increasing conflicts and disasters. Douglas, writing immediately after the First World War, allegedly fought to make the world safe for democracy, and made what can only be described as a prophetic comment.

At a time when there is a growing propaganda campaign to force nations to join Common Markets and to increase the power of the United Nations Organisation, it is of value to quote what Douglas said: *"Now, unless the earlier portions of this book have been written in vain, it has been shown that the basis of power in the world today is economic, and that the economic system with which we are familiar is expressly designed to concentrate power. It follows inevitably from a consideration that this proposition that a League of Nations involving centralised military force is entirely interdependent upon the final survival of the Capitalist system in the form in which we know it, and conversely that the fall of this system would involve a totally different international organisation . . . The increasing use of mechanical appliances . . . renders the distribution of purchasing power through the medium of wages in particular, more and more ineffective, and as a result individual discontent becomes daily a more formidable menace to the system. It must be evident therefore that an economic system involving forced extrusion of product from the community*

producing, as an integral component of the machinery for the distribution of purchasing power, is entirely incompatible with any effective League of Nations, because the logical and inevitable end of economic competition is war. Conversely, and effective League of Free Peoples, postulates the abolition of the competitive basis of society, and by the installation of the co-operative commonwealth in its place makes of war not only a crime, but a blunder."

As Douglas predicted, the League of Nations, the first attempt to establish the foundations of some type of a World State, proved disastrous because the basic causes of war remained. Those causes remain today. It is therefore inevitable that attempts to organise mankind into bigger and bigger groups must result in increasingly disastrous results. If a desperate British people decide that they can no longer remain in the European Economic Community, this might well result in war – a type of civil war. The American Civil War was the result of the Southern States attempting to withdraw from a Union which they found increasingly oppressive.

The future of what is left of Western Civilisation depends upon whether effective action can be taken to decentralise power, starting with financial and economic power. Douglas saw this clearly and that is why it is appropriate that this question be faced while there is still time for effective action. Every retreat from centralisation is a step in the right direction. The Graeme Campbell Australia First movement basically offers the opportunity for Australians to take such a step. It will be most instructive to observe the attitude of those groups opposed to such decentralisation of power.

THE BASIC FUND: Some magnificent contributions continue to flow in. But still a long road ahead. Latest figures will be provided next week. All contributions to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

SOCIAL CREDIT IN THE U.S.A.: Those attending the *New Times* Anniversary Dinner were inspired by a message from Mr. Michael Lane of the U.S.A., and the distribution of the first issue of a new Social Credit paper, *Triumph of the Past*. We are making this available to all our readers who can, if they so desire, subscribe direct to the U.S.A. Michael Lane deserves every support. It is inspiring to report that Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Poland have authorised a Polish translation of Louis Even's classic, *This Age of Plenty*. An English translation is also now available from Canada and the League of Rights is making arrangements to import a supply of this work.

FISCHER'S FEARS FOR ASIAN TRADE by David Thompson:

It must be a unique form of cultural cringe that leads National Party leader and Deputy Prime Minister Tim Fischer to judge domestic debate concerning immigration by the impact he imagines it might make in Asia. It was reported last week that Mr. Fischer was fearful that Pauline Hanson's comments concerning Asian immigration could jeopardise our trading interests in Asia. This was reported under the major headline on page one of *The Australian* (1/10/96).

But in the same edition of that newspaper, another account was reported of an Asian nation seeking to limit immigration under the headline "Malaysia ponders radical changes to stem immigrant tide". But did Dr. Mahathir consult John Howard or Alexander Downer before his country settled on an immigration policy designed to keep others out? Apparently not. Malaysia appears to have the rather quaint view that its immigration policy has nothing to do with what Australians might think. There is no evidence that Mr. Mahathir is concerned in the least about the impact of such a decision on Malaysia's trading relationship with Australia.

The role of the press in such issues should also be examined. Mr. Fischer's fears were front page headlines. The Malaysia decision was reported on page 24, in terms that indicated that there was little significance in its impact on trade. Why is Hanson's attitude to Asian immigration of such import, when the Malaysian attitude to mass immigration is of little concern? Malaysia, as one correspondent points out, is a multi-cultural, multi-religious, multi-ethnic country: *"The large and growing number of foreign workers in Malaysia is imposing growing strains on society and prompting calls for radical changes to the current system of bringing immigrants into the labor force."*

Malaysia is not the only Asian nation that makes its own policy on immigration, racial problems and social friction without fear of being attacked by other nations as being "racist". Almost every other Asian nation has well developed views about the racial superiority of Asian peoples over European peoples. Mr. Fischer makes a fool of himself, and of us, by deferring to "Asia" on such matters. It is very clear that Mr. Fischer has never read Chin-ning Chu's masterly book, *The Asian Mind Game*, in which she points out that Asians have no scruples whatever in "discriminating" in their own favour concerning racial characteristics, and holding Europeans in complete contempt for purporting to abhor any such discrimination. The Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, etc., are fully prepared to discriminate in their own best interests against **any other** racial or national group.

The Asian Mind Game, by Chin-ning Chu, is available from all League book services, \$20.00, or \$23.00 posted.

NO LONGER POSSIBLE TO IGNORE IMMIGRATION BACKLASH: For many years the League of Rights has warned that community discomfort with Asian immigration should be addressed, rather than ignored, or dismissed as belonging to the "racist fringe". Since Professor Geoffrey Blainey made his own prophetic warning in 1984, every effort has been made to depict resentment to mass immigration as over-stated and un-Australian. But it has now become clear that such concerns can no longer be ignored. Since Pauline Hanson's address to the Parliament raised such issues, it almost appears to have had a cathartic effect, with "ordinary" Australians now beginning to speak their minds about the issue without fear of retribution.

A study published in Monash University's "People and Place" journal shows that two out of every three Australians believe the nation's immigration intake is too high and most are especially concerned about Asian immigration.

In an extraordinary editorial, *The Weekend Australian* indicated that it had finally been forced to face reality, and confront the overwhelming evidence that **Australians do not want Asian immigration**. "Public support for Australia's immigration programme has all but collapsed. This is obvious from the 'Newspoll' published in *The Australian* yesterday. It demands an urgent and long overdue reassessment of immigration to this country. The poll reveals that the immigration programme which has contributed so much to Australia's economic and social progress since World War II and which is integral to the identity of modern Australia is now a target of rejection and hostility Support for more immigrants has as much backing today as the Flat Earth Society . . ."

So at last one newspaper has awakened, albeit grudgingly. The editorial writer cannot bring himself to consider the possibility that the vast majority of Australians **object to the impact** immigration has had on the Australian identity. And large numbers of us would not regard an open-door immigration policy which, in practice, discriminates against our traditional source of migrants, Great Britain, as some form of "social progress", but rather the opposite of social progress. *The Australian* calls for "re-establishing a basis for the programme" of mass immigration. That is, let us now cast about for another reason why we should continue a mass migration, open-door immigration policy now that it is clear that Australians have thoroughly rejected the previous reasons – the establishment of a multi-cultural society. Perhaps the message has not penetrated after all.

SLAMMING THE DOOR ON SKELETONS IN THE CLOSET: An ancient skeleton of a Caucasian person recently unearthed in the Pacific north-west of the United States casts doubt on the prevailing view that the American "Indians" are the original indigenous inhabitants of the U.S. The assumption is that the Indians came across the Bering land bridge from central Asia and Siberia, and much of U.S. indigenous policy is based upon this assumption. But what if the American Indians were **not the original inhabitants**? The whole indigenous industry could be undermined, **especially** if it were shown that the **caucasians** actually pre-dated the Indians, but were driven out, killed off, or eaten by the "Indians".

The American Indians have an answer to this problem: declare the skeleton to be of one of their own, and insist that religious imperatives require that it be re-buried immediately, **and not disturbed**.

A similar situation exists in Australia. Some years ago, archaeologists found what was a most significant camping and living site of an ancient people at Kow Swamp, which raised many questions about just who the original indigenes might have been. Aboriginal groups insisted that Kow Swamp was a sacred burial ground, and that it be re-buried, and no bones or artifacts recovered for scientific analysis. There appears to be a pattern developing here that even a racially colour-blind, politically correct society might identify. But at present, superstition is apparently more important than the truth. What has the "Aboriginal industry" to fear from the truth?