



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.12

April 4th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"Our 'Western' Civilisation is tending to disintegrate through the gradual rejection of the spiritual values on which it was built - the values represented by the fusion of the Greek form and Roman character with the central tradition of historic Christianity; and the disintegration can only be arrested by our conscious re-acceptance of those values."*

– Sir David Kelly in *The Hungry Sheep*

THE REAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CHINA FACTOR by Eric D. Butler:

Long before the current interest in Asia emerged, C.H. Douglas predicted that the centre of gravity of world politics would move from Europe to Asia. Douglas was able to make this prediction because of his understanding of how a finance-economic system linked to expanding financial debt, made the progressive centralisation of power appear "inevitable", this fostering the will-to-power in the human drama. In his famous B.B.C. broadcast on "The Causes of War", the text of which is published in *"The Monopoly of Credit"*, Douglas predicted that another great war was certain while the industrialist nations of the world persisted with the view that their internal economies could only be sustained by aggressive exporting. In the preface to the third edition of *The Monopoly of Credit*, published after the Second World War, Douglas wrote, "to anyone who will take the trouble to analyse the course of events ... it must be obvious that the Monopoly of Credit, which means the effective domination of human activity, is being pursued with relentless persistence. On the outcome of this policy depends the earthly destiny of the human race." At the time (June, 1950) Douglas made this comment, the Communist grip on China, one of the results of the U.S.A's. betrayal of the Chinese Nationalist forces led by Chiang Kaishek, was being consolidated.

The global expansion of Communism and the Chinese Communists' intervention in the Korean War, resulted in American public opinion hardening against Communist China. International forces were, however, persistently operating to end Communist China's "isolation" from the global scene, with Dr. Henry Kissinger dramatically "breaking the ice" when he persuaded President Richard Nixon that the time had come to bring Communist China into "the international community". It was argued that Communist China would be less of a danger to world peace if welcomed by the West. Prominent among those promoting this view were prominent members of the international banking world. Having established the Chase Manhattan Bank in Communist China, David Rockefeller returned to the U.S.A. with a remarkable eulogy of Communist China. According to Rockefeller the Chinese Communists were the greatest "reformers" ever to appear on the world stage. Big business representatives, lured by a report of a huge export market which awaited development, started to move in. Reports started to appear of Zionist Israel's growing links with China. It was therefore not surprising when Zionist leader Isi Leibler started to make visits to China.

Which brings us to the current visit to Communist China by Australian Prime Minister John Howard. Most Australians have probably forgotten that John Howard is following the same path taken by Labor leaders before him. First there was a typical Whitlam spectacular. But it was Bob Hawke who, following his election of 1983, decided that Communist China should be the object of his first overseas visit. Hawke painted glowing pictures of how the Australian economy would benefit from closer economic links with China. Those Liberals who believe that John Howard is pioneering new economic policies with his proposal of joint economic ventures between Chinese and Australian organisations, should carefully study what Hawke proposed. Hawke proposed, among other ventures, a joint Australia-Chinese steel manufacturing organisation. All this was in keeping with the philosophy of internationalising the global economy. John Howard has merely taken over where Bob Hawke and Keating left off. In spite of his brave words about defending Australian culture, John Howard is an internationalist who continues to make it clear that he believes, like his predecessors, that Australia has an Asian Destiny. While in Singapore he was claiming that Australian development depended upon Asian investments, particularly from those coming through Singapore.

During his China tour, John Howard has been accompanied by those representatives of Big Business which are locked into the "international economy". Arch internationalist Rupert Murdoch is naturally most enthusiastic about John Howard's mission. But he was also enthusiastic about the Bob Hawke mission, and the blatant Asianisation programme advanced by Paul Keating. While there are a number of international groups running in the international will-to-power game, they all see Communist China as a major factor in the shape of things to come. But what is to come? Judged by conventional finance-economic rules, China is a tremendous success story. John Howard says that he is overwhelmed by the rate of economic growth currently running at 10 percent. But a number of problems are already starting to emerge. Inflation is, as Douglas predicted, rising in the wake of massive capital development. With most of the development being financed by external investors, the debt structure is starting to create problems. There are massive environmental problems. But the major question is, how is China to service its massive international debts by exporting into a world where all developed nations are attempting to export? China's Asian neighbours are conscious of the threat of Chinese expansion, backed by one of the biggest military machines in the world.

Right throughout Asia there are large numbers of Chinese, generally dominating trade and commerce, whom the power men in China naturally regard as a type of advance force in any global expansion programme. If John Howard and his advisers had even the slightest understanding of economic realities and geo-politics, they would be asking how can Australia's long term survival as a European nation, rooted in the traditional European culture, be guaranteed if they link Australia's future with what will certainly develop in Communist China. Eventually the issue of Taiwan is going to reach a crisis point. The Chinese of Taiwan will have to decide whether they are going to be absorbed progressively into mainland China by economic pressures, or whether they are going to resist Peking militarily. Where will Australia stand? Taking John Howard's words at their face value, he has already opted for support for the internationalist "One China" policy. Rather than upset his Chinese hosts before his current visit, he blatantly snubbed the government of Taiwan by declining to meet with one of their representatives.

The commentators stress that one of John Howard's most difficult tasks is to persuade the Chinese that his defence arrangements with the U.S.A. are not designed to support the U.S.A. in what is seen as a programme of anti-Chinese encirclement by the American "imperialists". The Chinese view is dominated by clear evidence of growing economic conflict as the Americans try to solve their internal problems by exporting into China. The whole world drama is dominated by attempts to operate a finance-economic system which is badly flawed. Australia's only chance of long term survival is to break free of a deadly

dogma, stressing that it wants to solve its internal problems without trying, in essence, to export them to other nations. At the same time as indicating its peaceful intentions, Australia should be building up a defence programme as quickly as possible. Clearly John Howard will not take this course, in an endeavour to ensure Australia's future. The only solution is to remove, as quickly as possible, from office those who think as he does. Australians must ensure that they are not embroiled in the problems associated with China.

THE HANSON ONE NATION PARTY by David Thompson:

Press announcements that the Independent Member for Ipswich, Pauline Hanson, intends to launch her own political party comes as a surprise to those who have closely observed her progress and political fortunes. When addressing an *Australia First* rally in Albury late in February, Hanson is reported to have acknowledged that her constituents in Oxley had elected her as an Independent, and that she would remain so. Others inquiring about her intentions have been assured that another political party was not contemplated.

The major political parties have restructured the electoral system in such a way that, particularly in the case of the Senate, it is extremely difficult for Independents and small groups to gain Parliamentary presence. Pauline Hanson has demonstrated in a rather spectacular way that it is possible to break this stranglehold on political power. Her whole career in Parliament has been based on a rejection of the political status quo which has marginalised the majority, and forced "bi-partisan" policies like those on immigration and multiculturalism upon us.

But an analysis of Hanson's success reveals that she has provided the best service to Australians when she has acted as a type of catalyst, and united Australians **against** that which threatens their best interests. It is possible to reach across all party divisions, social, economic, religious and even racial divisions, to unite Australians **against** something which threatens them. A political party is not necessary to achieve this and, in fact a political party begins to divide loyalties, and destroy that unity.

Many serious questions need to be asked about the formation of the Hanson One Nation party. The first question is who has advised Ms. Hanson to take this step? When Pauline Hanson threw down her challenge to the big parties in her maiden speech, they threw everything possible back at her to silence her. She was ridiculed, abused, patronised and insulted. She was threatened so that she hid her family for weeks. The press, as a generalisation, were vicious in their condemnation. It would not be true to say that Hanson never wavered in her determination to hold her ground. She would not have been human if she did not. A few individuals, like Graeme Campbell, urged her to "hang in there", and the fact that she was literally swamped in public support sustained her.

Having withstood all that her opponents could hurl at her, could it be that Hanson might be undermined by her "friends"? Those who have urged her to form her own party, capitalise on the public support she generated, and assault the Australian Parliaments with "Hanson" members, might mean well, but their advice is poor to the point of being dangerous, and may eventually undo all that she has so far achieved.

Who will administer a Hanson party? What role will the Hanson Support Groups play? And most important of all, **what policy will a Hanson party pursue?** How will that policy be agreed upon? With the utmost charity, it must be admitted that having attracted a large cross-section of loyal, decent Australians, Pauline Hanson has also attracted some strange and unsettling characters.

Pauline Hanson makes no pretence of intellectual status. In fact, she makes a virtue of being an ordinary, hard-working person. The formation of a political party will certainly require hard work.

N
335.405
ONT

But it will also require extraordinary leadership qualities to hold such a strange mixture of people together. It will require negotiating and diplomacy skills, the patience of Job, and many years of experience in the murky world of party politics. There is no denying that Pauline Hanson has the capacity for hard work, but does she have the other skills?

It is much easier to unite people in the things they are **against** than to unite people in what they are **for**. The formation of a political party must do the latter. The attempt immediately begins to undermine the unity produced by the former. The more policy issues that are embraced, the further and deeper the divisions are. It requires immense skill and experience to surmount such difficulties.

In our view, the best chance of forming a political party directed to achieving the kind of national unity Pauline Hanson envisages, is that of Graeme Campbell's *Australia First*. Graeme Campbell has demonstrated that he can work hard, attract committed and experienced people, offer the necessary leadership, and produce a limited number of key policy objectives to unite others. Most of all, Campbell has had nearly 20 years experience with the machinations of party politics in the toughest school available: the Australian Labor Party.

Political parties are a menace, and a blight on the political landscape. At the very best, they corrupt the process of representative government. At the very worst, they will destroy it completely. By their very nature, most political parties are essentially destructive because the seduction of political power makes parties **an end in themselves** rather than a means to achieving constructive results. *Australia First* has sought to present a strictly limited-objective policy goal, and has focussed on achieving those policy goals, rather than the goal of achieving **power**.

In the formation of a Pauline Hanson party, our long experience observing party politics suggests the beginning of a disaster for Pauline Hanson. As yet, her objectives seem confusing. Her own motivation may well be quite beyond reproach, but what of those around her? At best she has been badly advised. By whom? What motivates them? We have nothing but the greatest reservations, and a sense of foreboding about the formation of Pauline Hanson's One Nation party.

FARMER ON HOWARD & IMMIGRATION:

We have previously made the point that Prime Minister John Howard has traded whatever principles and convictions he once held for political power. Political journalist and columnist Richard Farmer has recently reached similar conclusions, as demonstrated in his *Sunday Telegraph* column last weekend.

We would often disagree sharply with Farmer's analysis of politics, but in his observations on Howard, there is much merit. He observes that Mr. Howard, as is understandable in the era of mass marketing and television, has submitted to minor cosmetic changes to improve his "image". But Farmer then observes that Howard has also been prepared to adapt his views and beliefs. *"The first sign was bowing to the unthinking cries of 'racist' which greeted his commonsense comments about the majority of Australians' resistance to too rapid an increase in Asian migration."* APR 1997

How many others regard Howard's 1988 comments on Asian immigration as being "commonsense", but have shrunk from saying so?