



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

PER PR 320.56

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS ON 1
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.42

November 8th, 1996

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Liberty is really a simple thing, although difficult to come by. It consists in freedom to choose or refuse one thing at a time."

C.H. Douglas in *Social Credit*

RACE AND ECONOMICS by Eric D. Butler:

The current controversy concerning Australia's immigration and multicultural policies sheds a revealing light on how the basic issues are clouded by finance-economic considerations. Amongst the many absurdities which have emerged as a result of the furore triggered by Pauline Hanson's famous "maiden" speech, is the charge that foreign investment, particularly from Asia, is threatened. One can understand that potential Asian tourists to Australia might be discouraged from visiting Australia if they believe the type of nonsense appearing in their local papers, most of it originating from Australian journalists who while generally ideologically bent towards support for collectivism and multiculturalism, are also well aware of the politics of the media for which they work. This is particularly true of the print media. Rupert Murdoch makes it clear that he is an internationalist, as is Conrad Black. Should Pauline Hanson be responsible for halting foreign investment in Australia, this will be one of her greatest and most positive achievements. There has been growing unease for some time about the increasing loss of ownership and control of Australian resources to overseas interests. But the financial witchdoctors, the so-called experts, have been insisting that without foreign investments, the Australian economy must stagnate. This deadly myth has to be exposed if those concerned about immigration and multiculturalism are to be effective.

C.H. Douglas stressed that so long as the philosophy of economic determinism is accepted – that there are economic dogmas which must be accepted uncritically as a type of holy writ – then political considerations will always be subordinate to economics. The history of what is often described as the "White Australia" policy is one which concerned Australians might with great profit carefully consider. This policy emerged as the result of a cleavage between the economic rationalists of the day, those who insisted that cheap foreign labour was required for the development of Australian industries, particularly the sugar industry in Queensland – and those with a vision of a nation of homogeneous people.

The "White Australia" policy was a misnomer, as there was always provision for non-Europeans living in Australia before Federation to stay as Australian citizens. Earlier clashes on the goldfields between Europeans and Chinese did not lead to any campaigns to expel the Chinese. Several prominent Australians can trace their origins back to Afghans who were allowed to stay after Federation. The only non-Europeans not allowed to stay were those Pacific Islanders who had been brought in as cheap labour for the sugar industry. Those who beat their breasts urging that Australians express their shame and guilt for the "White Australia" policy might consider what happened, for example, in Fiji. Those developing the sugar industry came to the

conclusion that the indigenous people were not as suited for work in this industry as were Indians imported from India. Here was the beginning of a problem which has bedevilled Fiji ever since. As a result of the wisdom of their forbears, Australia has avoided the racial problems which can be studied in other parts of the world. If short-term economic considerations are to be placed ahead of racial and cultural realities, future Australians will curse this generation for having left them with a bigger legacy.

It is instructive to note that right around the world Big Business, the product of Big Finance, invariably opposes any restrictions on immigration. In the U.S.A. it is the multinationals who support the economic rationalism which they see as a means of making use of the cheaper labour to be found south of the border in Mexico and other Latin American countries. Those trying to plan the United States of Europe spare no thought for the indigenous peasant cultures of Europe. The basic cleavage around the world is between the Internationalists and the Nationalists, between those who wish to retain and develop their own cultures, and those whose only measure of human progress is the profits shown in bank balance sheets. But it was said a long time ago, what shall it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his soul. The Australian soul is at risk today.

A starting point for regaining the soul of the nation is for a concerted effort to be made to regain sovereignty over the nation's financial policy. Instead of continuing to "sell off the farm", steps should be taken to bring control of the farm back under those who originally developed it. Those who have freed themselves of the influence of the black magic of finance know that foreign investment in the main is the transfer of figures from outside Australia into Australia. There is relatively little in the form of real capital which Australia needs to import. The informed person knows that when "foreign capital" is invested in Australia, what are technically known as "contra credits" are included in the books of the Australian banking system. Why cannot those same credits be written without sacrificing Australian sovereignty? These are the questions which, hopefully, the supporters of Pauline Hanson will start to ask in order to defend themselves against the wild allegations being made against Pauline Hanson.

Those who consider Pauline Hanson as being absurd by claiming that unless there are changes to current Australian policies this would lead to civil strife carefully ignore the fact that a growing number of responsible Australians are issuing similar warnings. An increasingly volatile situation is developing in Australia. It is not Pauline Hanson who has created this situation. She is the messenger bringing the news which must be faced if the nation is to survive. Attacking the messenger cannot alter the reality. Race, culture and national sovereignty must be put ahead of the black magic of economic dogma.

BI-PARTISAN HUMBUG ON "RACISM" by David Thompson:

The extraordinary spectacle of unctuous, self-righteous politicians from both sides of Parliament taking a "bi-partisan" approach to "racism" is a classic, if sickening, case of sheer humbug. As has been observed (by Pauline Hanson), it is strange that the Howards and Beazleys, etc., can spring to attention on the question of "racism", while on the really important issues of unemployment, foreign investment, or national debt, no such co-operation is possible. Politicians have the effrontery to lecture Australians on what our attitude to race and immigration **should be**, without once making an effort to **find out what our views are**. The response from both Hanson and Campbell has been to challenge the Parliament to hold a referendum on immigration, which has been imperiously rejected by both Howard and Immigration Minister Ruddock. To call the chamber the House of **Representatives** is now little more than a farce. Pauline Hanson is criticised for being absent from the "debate", conveniently ignoring the fact that when she delivered her own maiden speech, the chamber was nearly empty!

It is obvious that politicians would very much like the Hanson/Immigration issue to go away. John Howard hopes that, in a few months, it will all just fade away, like a bad dream. Others, observing that the genie is

well and truly "out of the bottle", seek ways to squash the issue, favouring intimidation to do so. Every effort has been made to enlist the spectre of a disapproving "Asia" which might button its investment wallet into its hip-pocket at any minute, and "punish" Australia for saying that, on the whole, we would rather not become an "Asian" nation just yet, thank you very much, and that we would rather like to be consulted before we accept large numbers of Asian migrants.

But Howard's bad dream promises to become a nightmare next year, because politicians on both sides of the House have **failed to address the shortcomings of Australia's immigration policy**. Those shortcomings have been glaringly obvious to most Australians as "boat people" move in at will, and the traditional European immigrant source has been deliberately supplanted by Asia. At present, people like Howard and Beazley conveniently ignore the fact that by **July 1997 Hong Kong reverts to Communist China**, and many Chinese want to leave. As we reported in *On Target* in July, **about 165,000 Chinese now either hold Australian passports, or qualify to apply for permanent residency**. How will Mr. Howard handle this? What sort of community backlash can we expect in 1997?

JOHN HOWARD'S DILEMMA: Mr. Howard, heavily criticised for not firmly rebutting Ms. Hanson's position, is in fact on the horns of a dilemma. As an experienced politician, he knows that a huge proportion of Australians agree with Hanson; perhaps well in excess of 50%. How to tap into those sentiments without being accused of "racism"?

In 1988, when asked a question about Asian immigration, Howard answered: *"I do believe that if... in the eyes of some in the community it's too great, it would be in our immediate term interest and supportive of social cohesion if it were slowed down a little, so that the capacity of the community to absorb was greater."* Mr. Howard knows that his 1988 comments were correct, but how can he now say so without being politically savaged by the ethnic lobby and the thought-police? As with the firearms issue, Howard reveals a major political shortcoming; when he adopts a political position which turns out to be demonstrably wrong, he is incapable of correcting it. Howard is sacrificing the essentials of good policy to short-term pressures of political correctness, which although he claims to ignore, clearly holds him captive. He ties himself into painful contortions in attempting to shift his ground on the immigration issue.

HYPOCRISY FROM OUR ASIAN NEIGHBOURS: The craven grovelling to other nations to our north on the question of our immigration policy has become the new definition of the cultural cringe. Why does Australia feel compelled to define itself in terms of what other nations think of us? Because we hope to **trade with them**? Is it any wonder that the "Asians" – with their own highly-developed sense of national honour – hold Australians in absolute contempt? No other country in the world would seek permission from other nations before debating matters of internal policy, such as immigration policy. To fail to set sound policy on such fundamental matters as the type of migrants we want to settle here because some tourists from Asia might be offended is ludicrous.

If Australians were to study the record of some of our Asian neighbours concerning immigration, or race, the results are illuminating. We cringe when the attitude of our largest trading partner, Japan, is contemplated. We apologise for "Pauline Hanson", but do the Japanese even contemplate an apology for what was done to Australian servicemen **(and women)** only 50 years ago? Do we demand that Japan scrap its rigid immigration policy designed to keep others out? This policy can be summarised as the "yellow Japan policy", and is more rigid than the "White Australia policy" ever was.

What about the record of India? We fear that the \$6 million "New Horizons" trade promotion might be jeopardized, but do we condemn India for the abominable caste structure? Or for the race/religious conflict which almost amounts to a civil war? In Indonesia there is a firm **official policy** of not debating racial issues, for fear of inflaming the indigenous Indonesians against the Chinese, who dominate the economy.

Singapore is a Chinese country because as the British Empire began to break up, Prime Minister Lee Kwan Yu expelled the Malays in Singapore back to Malaya, and demanded that the Chinese in Malaya be permitted to settle in Singapore. The truth is that our Asian neighbours are almost exclusively more conscious of the realities of "race" than are we Australians. We should learn from their experience.

The "bi-partisan motion" passed by the Parliament *"reaffirms its commitment to maintaining an immigration policy wholly non-discriminatory on grounds of race, colour, creed or origin . . ."* But when has such a commitment been submitted to the Australian people? The only speaker against this motion, Independent Member for Kalgoorlie Graeme Campbell, focussed on this point: *"The truth is there has been a bi-partisan policy all these years, and that is the problem. There has been no discussion on the issue. Bob Hawke said that one of his great achievements was to liaise with the Liberal Party and the ACTU to keep immigration and multiculturalism off the agenda. The truth is that the Australian people have never had the chance to speak or to have their opinions valued."*

Either our political "representatives" must face this issue of the Asian component of the immigration intake, or prepare for an even more emotionally-charged environment in the future.

REPUBLICAN CRUSH TO DINE WITH DIANA: Perhaps one of the most incongruous aspects of the Sydney dinner with the Princess of Wales was the lengths to which even "republican" social climbers will go to be seen in the presence of "royalty". It is notable that former ALP Premier Neville Wran not only agreed to "use" the royal allure of Diana to raise funds for the Victor Chang cause, but agreed to escort the Princess, and to dance with her at the dinner. All of which could only be regarded as good manners, really, but this is a commodity notably lacking among republicans when it comes to constitutional matters. However, it is obviously a very different matter if perceptions of social status are involved. Dr. John Hewson and his wife, Caroline, were among others who paid up handsomely to be present, even although Hewson could never give a straight answer to the question of whether he was a monarchist while leader of the Opposition. Perhaps Hewson is a "closet monarchist"? Perhaps he was dragged along, reluctantly, by a wife who covets a social standing that only royalty can confer? Or perhaps he is another shamefaced republican who cannot resist being bracketted with the "elite" social circles graced by royalty, no less.

ADELAIDE CHOKING ON PRIVATISED WATER: Less than a year ago, the merits of "privatisation" were being touted for a complete range of state infrastructure from transport facilities to communication technology. Municipal water systems were included in the "market-driven" quest for increased efficiencies in providing water services, and the Adelaide Metropolitan Water System was the first to be privatised. In order to ensure that "private enterprise" did not exploit a water monopoly by charging higher prices, the State Government retained control of water prices. When details were announced of the new \$1.5 billion contract to United Water to "outsource" the Adelaide water system, the Infrastructure Minister, Mr. Olsen, pledged that water price increases would not outstrip the rate of inflation.

Last week, however, the South Australian Government announced **the first price rises** for water in Adelaide. With inflation running at approximately 3.1 percent, the water price rise is to be **4.8 percent**. How can this be justified? Well, all sorts of excuses are trotted out, such as an environmental levy to clean up the Murray River and to install filtration plants. And anyway, the price of Adelaide water was still among the cheapest in mainland capitals. Presumably this means that Hobart's water is cheaper than Adelaide's, as are the prices in one or two other capitals. **The Market** is already tyrannising South Australians, and is preparing to attack the rest of us. Economic rationalism demands that the interests of The Market come first.