



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.1

January 17th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "There are some ideas so preposterous that only an intellectual could believe them."
— George Orwell

CAN WE TRUST THOSE "ASIAN TIGERS" by Eric D. Butler:

As Australians and New Zealanders have been told for many years, ever since the end of World War II, that they have an "Asian destiny", as a New Year dawns it is perhaps appropriate to recall one piece of advice by the famous Chinese sage Confucius, who said that it was no use running even harder if you are already on the wrong road. Western nations, including the U.S.A., have been on the wrong road for most of this violent century. The great Roman Civilisation took hundreds of years to die. Western Civilisation reached its peak at the dawn of the present century. All the signs indicate that it will be dead by the end of the century. The guns had hardly stopped smoking from the first major disaster of what has become an increasingly violent century, when the genius C.H. Douglas, a product of the best of Western Civilisation, predicted that unless there was a change to the finance-economic policies which were the basic cause of the First World War, Western Civilisation was faced with one convulsion after another as it went the same way as the Roman Civilisation. He demonstrated that it was mathematically impossible to operate an economic system with social stability if a system of debt finance was continued in an attempt to provide "full employment" and "growth". Continuous monetary inflation was inevitable. Consider the state of the world today. The business section of *The Australian* of January 13th carries the headline, U.S. INFLATION JITTERS TO RESTRAIN TRADING. The article which followed starts, "Warnings about an overheating U.S. economy and the inflation demon will ensure local financial markets have a jittery start to this week when they open this morning".

The disasters which have convulsed Western nations are certain to be repeated as the Asian nations follow the same policies. The first "Asian Tiger" was Japan, resurrected after a disastrous military defeat by the very nation which defeated it. American technology was freely made available, and financed by International Finance. The programme helped to sustain the American economy. For a period the hardworking and disciplined Japanese were regarded as a great economic success story. But to sustain their programme, the Japanese had to develop a massive export programme. This inevitably brought them into a growing trade conflict with the U.S.A. A headline in *The Age* business section of January 13th reads, JITTER OVER U.S. AND JAPAN. There is fear that the state of the American economy seriously threatens the massive Japanese investments in the U.S.A. The Japanese economic success story has suffered a bad setback in recent months with desperate measures being taken in an attempt to lift the Japanese economy out of depression conditions. *The Australian* of January 8th headlines an interview between ex-Japanese Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa and

Greg Sheridan, TOKYO TEETERS INTO A CALM BEFORE THE STORM. The writer predicted years ago that if the Japanese continued running harder on the road they were on, there would be increasing convulsions ahead. People who should have known better kept holding Japan up as the economic success story Australians should seek to emulate.

The second "Asian Tiger" to emerge, also financed by International Finance, was South Korea. It was assisted also with Western and Japanese technology. There was yet another "economic miracle". But as was inevitable, the restrictive financial policies which the Koreans imposed in an attempt to prevent excessive inflation, have resulted in the current industrial unrest with police using tear gas in an attempt to force workers to accept government policies. The reality is that at present every "Asian Tiger" is in trouble as it tries to run harder on a disaster road. The biggest "Asian Tiger", China, originally also financed by International Finance and supported by imported technology, much of it from Japan and South Korea as well as Western nations, is increasingly regarded with apprehension by fellow Asian nations. The Chinese are geared to the same philosophy of "export or perish" as other "tigers" are aware that China is rapidly building one of the world's biggest military forces. Harmony between the "Asian Tigers" is an impossibility while they adhere to the very policies which have ruined Western nations and brought them into conflict with one another.

If Australia had any statesmen instead of shallow shortsighted party politicians, they would be taking careful note of what is happening, and likely to happen in Asia, and make every attempt to ensure that Australia develops complete economic independence. Instead of reducing expenditure on defence, as the Howard Government is doing as part of its "cost saving" exercises, Australia's defence capacity should increase, this helping to stimulate the nation's industrial base. Instead of trying to compete with "Asian Tigers", which are protecting their own industries with adequate measures, Australia should be doing likewise, always making it clear that it was willing to engage in trading programmes which were mutually beneficial. Australia is earning no respect in Asia by falling over backwards to reduce the protection of Australian industries.

From an international perspective, the feverish growth of the "Asian Tigers" merely increases global instability as the international power groups desperately try to make the unworkable work by progressively centralising power on a global scale. There are speculations that Russia and China may seek to build a closer alliance in an attempt to curb what is perceived to be the expansion of American imperialism. The Russian situation merely adds to the growing global tensions. It is no secret that a "reformed" Soviet Union has been taken over by the former Communist operators, now known as Social Democrats. The last Russian elections were a gigantic fraud, with the International Bankers openly insisting that another "reformed" Communist, Yeltsin, must be re-elected. Adequate finance was provided to achieve the required result. The International Bankers, through their numerous stooges, have been looting Russia of vast natural resources. Not surprisingly the oppressed Russians are becoming increasingly restive.

As the world moves towards the end of the century, it is much more dangerously unstable than ever before. Australia's biggest problems are internal, and it can only come to grips with these by breaking free from nonsense about its "Asian destiny". The headlines read that Treasurer Costello's "Budget forecasts start to look shaky". What is new? The Howard Government can only preside over increasing social unrest as it clings to the myth that the solution to Australia's problems can only be found in Asia. It was said a long time ago about the eyes of the fool being on the ends of the earth. One of the first basic requirements are economic policies which provide Australia's young with some faith in the future. Unless this achieved, Australia could be faced with the type of social unrest now sweeping every nation, including the much publicised "Asian Tigers".

FISCHER BLUNDERS ON REPUBLIC by David Thompson:

The most charitable assessment of Acting Prime Minister Tim Fischer's holiday statement on the National Party's "fall-back" position on a republic is that it was a massive blunder. A less charitable assessment is that Mr. Fischer is "feeling the water" for a betrayal of the Monarchy by the Naioknals. He must have known that in a holiday period, when "hard news" is a little scarce, when he was Acting Prime Minister during the Queen's New Year's honours period, his statement would receive the most widespread coverage, and considerable sympathetic attention from the republicans.

Mr. Fischer continues to weaken the leadership of the National Party with statements such as that on the republic. His stocks are already low following his capitulation on the question of firearms, where the Liberals, particularly Mr. Howard, were seen to be leading the Nationals by the nose. Rather than seek a politically acceptable compromise position on the Monarchy, Fischer could have made a considerable virtue of standing his ground on the issue. In an environment where the Liberals become less and less of a "conservative" political party, and more and more likely to betray the Monarchy (many have done so already) the National Party needs a viable issue on which to distinguish itself thoroughly from the Liberals. Why bother to exist otherwise? Support for the Crown is the perfect issue for the nationals to stake their claim to a reason for existence.

If the question of abandoning the Monarchy ever does come to a constitutional referendum, Fischer knows full well that constitutional referenda are notoriously difficult to win. He also knows that such referenda are very much easier to win when there is "bipartisan" political support for the measure proposed. That is, when all major political parties declare support for a constitutional change, there is every chance of it being passed by a majority of people in a majority of States. However, where one major party campaigns vigourously against a new change, the chances of it being accepted are diminished. By even contemplating abandoning the Crown, Fischer makes considerable concessions to the republican cause.

The practical shortcomings of Fischer's proposal, that the Chief Justice of the High Court should be responsible for appointing the Governor-General as Head of State, cast Fischer in an even more difficult light. Is he simply casting about for **any alternative** simply for the sake of **having** an alternative? Such a "minimalist" suggestion risks the charge that Fischer is prepared to politicise the office of Chief Justice. But perhaps more importantly, he ignores the clamour from the majority of those who would be prepared to abandon the Crown for a **democratic selection process** for choosing a head of state. If he is prepared to ignore this, then why not scorn the call for a republic completely?

The National Party would generate much more respect, and probably political support, if they made it clear that they are prepared to defy political correctness and support the Crown as a matter of conviction, because they **know** it is a better system of government. If the Nationals were prepared to go to the trenches for something of enduring value, they may yet be able to re-establish themselves, rather than simply an unnecessary appendage of the Liberal Party.

DUKE OF EDINBURGH ON FIREARMS: Comments by Prince Phillip in a radio interview on the question of firearms before Christmas, were condemned by the press as being offensive, and led to an apology on the Duke's behalf. However, little attention was given by the press to three surveys which were taken after the Duke's comments were aired, **which showed strong agreement with his views**. Prince Phillip had said, *"If a cricketer, for instance, suddenly decided to go into a school and batter a lot of people to death with a cricket bat, which he could do very easily – I mean, are we going to ban cricket bats?"*

The results of the surveys were dismissed by the press as being "rigged by the gun lobby", with little apparent concession to the unlikelihood of **all three** surveys being rigged. On the available evidence, it would appear that the British press has campaigned very strongly for the banning of as many firearms

335-405
ONT

as possible in the U.K. This would reflect the Australian experience where, almost without exception, the press united in support of Mr. Howard's firearms restrictions, or even more draconian firearms bans.

It is interesting to note that in Australia the statistics suggest that rather than minimise the number of firearms in the community, the new restrictions are leading to better firearms sales than ever. Gun retailers report that many of those who are handing in firearms are using their compensation payments to replace old, worn firearms with new weapons.

IMMIGRATION POLICY SUBVERTED: Cabinet documents declassified after 30 years confirm that the Australian immigration policy was changed by subversion, rather than by conscious intention. The 1966 papers record the decisions of the Holt Cabinet in a period when immigration policy began to shift from the "White Australia" policy, to a less restricted policy. Under Immigration Minister Sir Hubert Opperman, Cabinet was urged to lift some of the restrictions to non-European immigrants. Opperman had asked Sir Robert Menzies' Cabinet for similar changes only a few years previously, and been rejected.

The Opperman submission said, in part: "Australia's restricted immigration policy with respect to the admission of non-Europeans for residence is based on the need to maintain a predominantly and socially homogenous population the **fundamental soundness of a policy directed towards social homogeneity is not in question.**" (Emphasis ours) Indeed, the reason why Cabinet was adamant that the objective of homogeneity was to be maintained was stressed in Parliament after the changes were announced: **public opinion would not have tolerated any such change.** It is clear, in the absence of any firm indication that public opinion has changed since then, that the immigration policy was subverted.

It appears that Cabinet was influenced by a strongly-worded note from a deputy secretary of the Prime Minister's Department, Sir Peter Lawler, who urged that non-European immigrants be "kept to an absolute minimum". The Cabinet note of the decision for a relaxation of the immigrant criteria says: "The Cabinet wished it to be clear that the basic principles of Australia's immigration policy **are not in question**, and that no reduction of those principles in any policy sense is intended. It follows that the changes now approved should not be the means of giving rise to new admissions of non-Europeans in large numbers."

Why, then, did the immigration policy unravel as seriously as it has? Having begun to retreat on the question of a restricted immigration policy, politicians (particularly Coalition politicians after Menzies) found it impossible to draw a halt to that retreat.

Sir Hubert Opperman is recorded as proposing that the admission of non-Europeans "as immigrants in limited numbers would depend upon their **ability to integrate into the community, their general suitability for settlement**" etc. (All emphasis added). Those who have studied the Cabinet documents concede that it is obvious that non-Europeans were not being accorded the same entry status as Europeans. But non-European migrants were to be accepted according to the Minister's discretion. In retrospect, this was a major mistake, as successive Ministers were drawn into damaging debates concerning the merits of some of their exclusions, until it became impossible to exclude almost anyone on any basis. Even Opperman seemed to concede that it was unlikely that administrative difficulties or controversy in certain cases could be avoided. All such controversies were skilfully exploited by such groups as the Immigration Reform Association, until the Whitlam administration was able to formalise what had become a defacto "open-door" immigration policy.

For a more complete picture of the subversion of the Australian immigration policy, obtain a copy of the tape *The Grand Plan: Asianisation of Australia*, by Denis McCormack, researcher for Australia First. \$6.00 posted from all League book services.