



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.45

November 29th, 1996

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "The psychological approach to the racial problem has been so crudely mediaeval in its ignorance and fanaticism, that one cannot help wondering what sinister motive it is serving among a presumably enlightened people."

— Doris Watts in *The Dangerous Myth of Racial Equality*

BEHIND THE CLINTON CIRCUS by Eric D. Butler:

Those Australians who have a proper respect for their British racial and cultural heritage are often charged with "cringing" by the same type of people who urge Australians to treat a debauched "pop star" Michael Jackson as some type of success symbol for the young, while others, including many politicians, treat visiting U.S.A. President Clinton as some type of a demi-god whose words and advice on "racism", "tolerance" and "multiculturalism" should be treated as something approaching Holy Writ. As an Australian I must confess to a feeling of nausea when I witness the genuflections of politicians, both past and current, to Bill and Hilary Clinton. Those genuinely concerned about the sick plight of a Western Civilisation that is dying, can only be saddened by the plight of the U.S.A. being blatantly used to serve an international programme which unless halted will result in a global convulsion on a scale never previously experienced. Because of their background, the American people generally are over-idealistic. This idealism has been cynically exploited for most of this century, using the U.S.A. vast economic strength and technology to back great disasters. European colonialism was evil and should be abolished. The Roosevelt Administration made no secret of its determination to end British colonialism forever. American policy was primarily responsible for the destruction of Palestinian sovereignty and the imposition of a poisoned thorn, in the shape of Zionist Israel, at the very heart of the Middle East. What has happened since, with the development of an anti-West hatred among the Islamic peoples everywhere, has stemmed from this disastrous act.

During his Australian visit, President Clinton waxed eloquent about the success of multiculturalism in the U.S.A. He referred to the "vibrancy" of the two multicultural cities of Sydney and Los Angeles. There was no reference to the race riots which have rocked Los Angeles, or the crime rate. And being a modern "liberated" man, Clinton did not mention that Sydney and Los Angeles have one thing in common, with their big homosexual communities and high rates of AIDS. It is breathtaking to have President Clinton telling Australians that the U.S.A. has been a successful example of multiculturalism. The truth is that responsible conservative Americans have become increasingly critical of what is happening in their nation. The feelings of the American people may be judged by the fact that less than 50 percent of the Americans felt it worth voting at the recent elections, Bill Clinton being re-elected by a minority of the electors. Clinton was re-elected as President primarily because of the moral bankruptcy of the Republican Party, and because a slick advertising campaign persuaded American women to support glamour boy "Slick Willy". The Clintons have tarnished records and informed Americans believe that Bill Clinton could eventually go the way of Richard Nixon.

Openly backed by the Zionist Jewish community, Clinton's global strategies reflect Zionist Jewish strategy. Clinton is the arch internationalist. He invites Australians to share a "common vision". That vision includes the dream of Free Trade with Asia. The globalists backing Clinton regard him as but one more puppet who can be manipulated to serve their programme. The short visit to Australia was a classic, well produced political circus, not primarily for the benefit of the Australian people but for the American television screens. Australia was merely the location for screening purposes, with Australians little more than bit players and providing some necessary crowd scenes. Those forces attempting to break down still further Australia's immigration policies were, of course, delighted with Clinton's remarks on Australia becoming a successful multicultural nation. Long time advocate of Australia submerging itself in the planned Asian Common Market, Greg Sheridan of *The Australian* drooled with delight, stating that Clinton's Canberra address was "The speech that all Asia hoped to hear", *The Australian* front page headline of November 23rd, reading, OUR SHARED DESTINY.

Lyndon Johnson became a Congressman as a result of criminal manipulation of voting rolls in Texas and became Vice President after striking a deal with John F. Kennedy, helping to carry the Southern States for Kennedy. During the Johnson circus in Australia, much was made of Johnson's war record while based as an airman in Australia. This was great theatre, masking the fact that Johnson's war record, as outlined by Johnson, was almost completely phony.

The Australian League of Rights supported the necessity of Australia making a contribution to countering Communist aggression in Vietnam, as it had supported General McArthur's valiant effort to halt Communist-backed aggression in Korea. But the League stressed the McArthur warning that there was no substitute for victory, and that unless the war was won in Korea, it would be fought all over again in another part of Asia. While supporting military resistance in Vietnam, the League warned that the Americans and their allies were being forced to fight a no-win conflict, making widely available the documentation of Dr. Antony Sutton which proved that Communist aggression from North Vietnam was being sustained by the Soviet as part of a global strategy. The League had published an Australian edition of Sutton's classic, *National Suicide*, in which he showed that the Soviet industrial system had in the main been provided by Western based Big Finance. *National Suicide* contains the text of the chilling address by Sutton to a sub-committee of the Republican Party at Miami Beach on April 19th, 1972. The essence of the address was that Communist North Vietnam was being sustained by Soviet equipment, this reaching North Vietnam through the port of Haiphong with ships that were a product of American industry and technology. Discussing the matter later with a senior Republican Congressman, I was told that the general reaction of Republican delegates who were present, was one of deep shock, with the general view being that if the address was publicised, Richard Nixon would lose the coming Presidential elections. The major news wires refused to carry the Sutton address. These services were controlled by influential Zionist Jews, whose major media in America had made the anti-Vietnam war movement possible.

When the Australian Consul-General to New York, the late Mr. Justice Sir Reginald Sholl, returned to Australia and gave an address to Australian doctors, he stressed the vital role of the Zionist Jewish lobby during the Vietnam war which, of course, finished in complete disaster. Sholl was criticised as an "anti-semite". The collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of more "moderate" Communist Regimes in China and Vietnam, saw open moves by International Finance to build up the former Communist nations under the guise of "free trade". Prime Minister John Howard says he welcomes President Clinton's "shared vision" in Asia. Open globalism is now the name of the game being played in Asia. But this "vision" can only lead Australia into one disaster after another. Under orthodox finance-economics, there must be growing friction between the Asian "tigers". Because of its size and vast resources, China must be regarded as the major factor. (*National Suicide* is now a collector's item for all serious students of modern history. \$17.00 posted from all League addresses.)

REALITY DRIVES RACE ISSUE, NOT "RACISM" by David Thompson:

It is becoming clearer that the issues raised by Independent Pauline Hanson since her election to the Parliament continue to generate friction within the Liberal Party in particular, and the Coalition in general. This highlights a long-running problem within the Liberal Party – the fact that it is really **two parties** rolled into one. The two wings of the Party consist of those that pass for "conservatives", and those who could correctly be called small "I" Liberals. The issues Hanson raised simply emphasise the tensions between the two elements.

One wing of the Liberal Party insists that Mr. Howard must publicly condemn the Hanson views in order to quell "racism", while the other wing (at least in private) applauds what Hanson says, and claims that Howard has handled the issue correctly by failing to condemn Hanson. This has the dual merit of offering tacit approval without having to articulate such views, and bear the political odour for doing so. Hanson bears Howard's odour.

Nevertheless, the Liberals have also been niggardly about Hanson, in that they have claimed the \$50,000 in public funding due to her by virtue of the number of votes she polled. Hanson must take legal action to recover the funds, if recovery is possible. In addition to this, some Liberal M.P.'s., when asked by constituents for a copy of the Hanson maiden speech to Parliament, also receive a highly poisonous article about Hanson published in the most extreme Jewish publication in the nation. The office of the Liberals' Bob Baldwin (Paterson, N.S.W.) for example, distributes copies of an *Australia/Israel Review* article by Adam Indikt, condemning Hanson as a racist bigot, and retelling her personal background in order to place her in the worst possible light. Perhaps this is Mr. Baldwin's idea of even-handedness.

The power and the passion generated by Pauline Hanson's views is further underlined by the fact that, despite their revulsion, the press continues to agonise over "the race debate". John Howard's reported view that *"It will all blow over in a few months"* once the "genie" was crammed back into the bottle, could not be further from the case. Professor Austin Gough, quoted in the Hobart *Mercury*, notes that the press attempts to control the "debate" by calling it "the racism debate" as though it were "an immoral and divisive thing shunned by all right-thinking people".

"ASIANISED TOO QUICKLY": The truth is that the "debate" will have tremendous durability, because it is driven not by bigotry and hatred, **but by reality**. Two examples from the last week illustrate the point. The first is the release of a report confirming Hanson's contention that people worry that Australia is being "swamped by Asians". A joint Australian Catholic University and Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology study conducted last year among over 300 teachers, 427 Year 5 students and 803 Year 8 students last year, indicated that **one in four teachers believed that Australia is being Asianised too quickly**.

The report, *Immigration and Schooling in the 1990s*, concedes that there has been a "discernible rise in racist behaviour in schools" and that "racism has a persistent presence in most schools". It denies, however, that Australian schools are "hotbeds of racism, inter-ethnic or sectarian violence or vilification". This report was compiled well before the election in which Hanson was elected in Oxley.

The second example comes from a most unlikely source, in the views of Mr. Gary Foley. Foley is well-known as one of the more "extreme" Aboriginal activists over almost two decades, upon whom we have reported critically in the past. But on Monday, November 11th, Foley issued a most significant press statement as widely as possible, **which was scarcely reported anywhere**. In this extraordinary statement, Foley said he agreed with some of the views of Pauline Hanson, concerning the "Aboriginal Industry" and that ATSIC should be abolished because of the billions of dollars of wasted funds.

DEAD SILENCE ON FOLEY: Foley claimed that since the Whitlam Government, about \$25 billion to \$30 billion had been spent, much of it wasted, and that a whole army of white anthropologists and university professors were making a good living out of Aboriginal suffering.

"I was saying that a long time before any of these characters were, and it's obvious there must be an Aboriginal industry to be spending that level of money.

"I'm saying – unlike Pauline Hanson – that it's obvious the money's not going to Aboriginal people. It's not

Aboriginal people who form the Aboriginal Industry – it's the vast army of non-Aboriginal parasites who seem to infest our communities.

"ATSIC's a fraud. it's not what it pretends to be. It's not Aboriginal democracy in action at all. Less than 30 percent of Aboriginal people participate in ATSIC elections. It has no mandate – simple" Of wasted funds, Foley said, *"There is no evidence of that level of expenditure in Aboriginal communities. We can therefore only assume vast amounts of that money have been maladministered. The vast majority of it has gone into the pockets of non-Aboriginal Australians."*

Foley has suggested a variation of what others (like the League, and genuine Aborigines like Rev. Cedric Jacobs) have been suggesting for 12 years – that the funds would be much better administered by those at a local level. Foley suggests local Aboriginal communities, the League suggests local municipalities.

"The only bureaucrat you need in Canberra is a bureaucrat with a cheque book, a pen, a pile of envelopes and a list of addresses, and he just sends the money directly out to communities," said Foley. If such assistance was available to local government, under proper supervision, as has been available to ATSIC, the problem of Aboriginal disadvantage would be totally different today. But **why were Foley's remarks unreported?** Is this not a most significant statement, in the present climate? Would "the press" dare to justify the omission by noting that the views of a radical part-Aboriginal stirrer were swamped by the Clinton caravan, Michael Jackson mania, and the Australian Open Golf Tournament? It was left to Piers Ackerman (*Sunday Telegraph*, 24/11/96) to record Foley's statement.

Such examples serve to illustrate that **Pauline Hanson is merely a catalyst** who has expressed what many Australians know to be true, at just the critical psychological moment. This "genie" won't be crammed back into any bottle; **the issues must be addressed**, not swept under the carpet.

CONTINUING "RACISM" HUMBUG FROM MALAYSIA: As Mr. Howard and a number of his Ministers gathered in Manila in the Philippines for the summit of Asia-Pacific leaders, Malaysia turned up the diplomatic heat on the Australians by referring to the "racism debate". Both Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir and his Foreign Affairs Minister Badawi expressed concern about Australian attitudes to Asians and Aborigines. Mahathir noted that it appeared that there were still people in Australia who wanted to return to the White Australia policy, and the days when Aborigines did not have "full recognition as human beings".

At least Mahathir is correct concerning the White Australia policy. Rather than bleat about tolerance, Foreign Minister Downer might have pointed out to Mahathir that the Australian people were never consulted about our previous "bi-partisan policy" on immigration, now known as "the White Australia policy". It was changed without our consent. If prepared to follow the Malaysian lead, and abandon diplomatic niceties, Downer might also have referred the Malaysians to their own double standards concerning "racism". In Malaysia even today the ethnic Chinese are ruthlessly "discriminated against" by the native Malays.

It obviously takes someone of more moral fortitude than either Downer or Howard to remind the hypocritical Asians that their own record on racial bias is very far from what they demand from us. The Japanese, for example, continue with a highly restrictive immigration policy, which might be known as "the Yellow Japan policy", and which is far more restrictive than our "White Australia policy" ever was.

The comments from Malaysian Ministers should be placed in their correct context: that of diplomatic one-up-manship. Some of the Asians resent the Australian (and U.S.) role in the Asia-Pacific Economic Community summit. The charge of "racism" is used as a very much tongue-in-cheek gambit to force Howard and Downer onto the "back foot" for the summit. If Downer and Howard had read *"The Asian Mind Game"* by Chin-ning Chu (\$23.00 posted from any League bookservice), then such psychological warfare would be properly understood.