



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.16

May 2nd, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"If ever there was a Constitution which has been **proved**, on a vast scale, in its virtues, it is the British Constitution of balanced powers, ensuring that none of them become a tyrannous monopoly. Consider, for instance, what power it was, which united in a balanced peace and unity the diverse peoples, races and creeds of India and Nigeria and what has happened after it was removed. Compare the size of the armed forces, the police, and the bureaucracy, which was necessary to maintain the scattered British Empire with that of the great monolithic Empire of Socialist Peoples Republic whose inhabitants are kept from escaping by the armed guards, minefields and barbed wire of the iron curtain . . . The fatal weakness of this great association, in its later days, lay in its surrender of the Christian idea of **equity** . . . denying the unique nature of every man, and reducing him to the status of a political and economic unit."*

– Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs in ***Responsible Government In A Free Society***

CAN AUSTRALIA BE DEFENDED? by Eric D. Butler:

The front page headline of *The Weekend Australian* of April 26th-27th read, PREPARE FOR ASIA THREAT, P.M. TOLD. Defence writer Don Greenless writes, *"The Australian Defence Force would be much more assertive against potential military threats in Asia and would need a significant expansion of air power and weapons under plans for the biggest shift in defence strategy since the early 1970s."* Greenless writes that *"Strategists are particularly concerned about the greater capabilities of Asian countries with the purchase of advanced fighter aircraft, surface vessels armed with anti-ship missiles and high-tech command control and communications equipment"*. Like all big organisations, there is little doubt that Australia's defence organisations suffer from a degree of bureaucracy resulting in the argument that there are too many "armchair generals". But unfortunately most of the discussions concerning defence are conducted inside a framework of finance-economic orthodoxy. In times of military conflict, Australia's military leaders generally have demonstrated outstanding qualities. But preparation for military defence measures, which require adequate lead time, are invariably dominated by financial considerations. The Howard Government's approach to military defence is governed by its current obsession with

cost-cutting designed primarily to fill deficit "black holes". Every student of Australian military history knows that Australia's military defence capacity was badly depleted before the Second World War, primarily because it was claimed that the nation "could not afford" what was proved to be so essential. Much of the opposition to any form of national military training is based on financial considerations. This is one of the main arguments advanced against Pauline Hanson's proposal for some type of national service training.

Any comprehensive assessment of Australia's defence requirements must obviously start with a consideration of the realities of today's world, particularly that region of the world in which Australia is situated. While nations are dominated by the orthodox economic dogma that a nation's internal economic well being is governed by its ability to gain export markets, it is as certain as the sunrise that there must be growing conflict between the Asian "tigers" as they attempt to drive their economies at a faster rate. Japanese car manufacturers are expressing their concerns that the relatively new Indonesian car industry threatens the Japanese car industry. With yet another display of the double standards which have dominated American foreign policy, the Clinton administration manages to close its eyes to any abuses of human rights in China or Indonesia, while calling for economic sanctions against Burma and the banning of this relatively small country from joining the South East Asian Nations. But the Asian nations are bluntly defying the ban while indicating that they will seek to benefit economically from the U.S.A. sanctions. Dominated by the Zionist Jewish lobby, the U.S.A. refuses to endorse the U.N. condemnation of the violation of Palestinian rights in Jerusalem, this act increasing Middle East instability.

As the world becomes progressively more unstable, a realistic defence strategy for Australia demands that every effort be made to promote economic self sufficiency in every sphere. But the very "globalisation" which, with few exceptions, most Australian politicians enthusiastically endorse, undermines the nation's defence capacity. Assuming, for example, that Communist China, now developing closer links with a Russia still dominated by fellow Communists, becomes the major military threat in Asia, and that the Australian economy is closely linked with the Chinese economy, what does Australia do? Under "globalisation" Australia could find itself cut off from vital equipment being produced tens of thousands of miles away. "Globalisation" is a treacherous policy ultimately leading to surrender without resistance. Nationalism versus internationalism is the basic issue now dominating the struggle for the world. As this column has persistently stressed, Australia can only give a lead towards global stability by first putting its own economy in order so that it is not in conflict with its Asian neighbours by attempting to force them to take Australian exports at the expense of their own economies. It should be stressed that a build up of Australian defence is only for the defence of Australia, not for aggression outside Australia. Trading arrangements should be on the basis of mutual advantage.

But, in the last analysis, if one day Australia is required to defend itself militarily, could a nation

fragmented by the divisive policy of multiculturalism come together as a cohesive unit? In the afterglow of the recent Anzac celebrations, it is appropriate to point out that the Anzacs were not multiculturalists. In-depth defence of the nation demands that multiculturalism be firmly rejected, along with all other manifestations of internationalism.

"SELLING" THE GLOBAL MARKET by David Thompson:

Whatever the result in the British general election held this week, the election campaign has made one issue quite clear. Perhaps largely as a result of the new Referendum Party sponsored and financed by Sir James Goldsmith, both the Conservative and Labor Parties have pledged to hold a referendum on the question of Britain submitting to the European currency and monetary measures, subject to Parliamentary approval.

The Conservatives, contemplating a thorough rout at the ballot box, seem to have suddenly become the new champions of British sovereignty, presenting themselves as the party most opposed to the single currency in particular, and European integration in general. The Home Secretary, Mr. Howard, has now warned that the proposed unification treaty was "so far-reaching that it would indeed put our survival as a nation State at risk". This follows opinion polling showing that the British overwhelmingly oppose monetary union and any European federal union. Why has it taken an election campaign for the political parties to concede that sentiment runs strongly against the erosion of British sovereignty?

The truth is that those who manipulate the political process strongly favour every possible further centralisation of power. All the major banking groups support the single European currency (as well as European union). As a general consensus, all the major press organs, particularly those controlled by internationalists like the Murdochs, fully support the same process, not only in Europe, but around the world.

In Australia, it has become virtually an article of faith that we can only profit from "the global market" and our natural home now is "in Asia". Current affairs programmes parrot this "line", as do newspaper opinion columns. For example, *The Weekend Australian* (26/4/97) carried Terry McCrann's column headed ***"A globalised world is good for all of us"***. The International Monetary Fund is quoted with approval as helping to direct the transition to the brave new world, where Australians no longer produce their own shoes, clothes, etc., but rely upon Third World nations to do it for us.

Those who doubt the wisdom of the new global order are dispatched with contempt. One of the strongest reasons for the savage reaction to the publication of ***"Pauline Hanson: The Truth"*** is that the Member for Oxley not only opposes the new internationalism, but campaigns against it, and

generates alarming support. Editorials in last weekend's press are scathing of her as "negative insular and divisive". *The Weekend Australian* self-righteously claims that "we are part of the global economy, and the economic nationalism Ms. Hanson preaches – with its end to overseas aid, withdrawal from the United Nations, recasting of immigration policy and ending tariff reductions – will hurt Australia Populist perhaps, but not a recipe for a modern, liberal Asia-Pacific democracy".

Such extraordinary paternalism from this Murdoch flagship almost defies reason. Page 1 of the same edition carried the headline "**Prepare for Asia threat, PM told**", which warned of increasing military threats from our north. If Australia continues to merge with Asia, and export our manufacturing industry, we will find to our horror that we lack the military capacity to respond to any Asian military threat. An independent military requires a strong manufacturing base, without which no military defence can be sustained. If that military base is in "Asia", then Australia has **no effective military defence**. Already much of that Australian manufacturing base has disappeared.

While Hanson is lampooned by the press on the one hand for suggesting that in the future Australia may be dominated by a "United States of Asia", groups like the Murdoch press fully support Australia's integration with "Asia", with *The Weekend Australian* describing us as a "liberal, Asia-Pacific democracy". The drive toward the World State continues, with the patronage of powerful groups. Ordinary people who question the wisdom of such madness are encouraged to accept it as inevitable, and those who purport to know what is best for us are scathing of those such as Hanson who defy their agenda. But as British political parties have discovered, sentiment is running strongly against further erosion of national identity. If Australians can find ways of expressing their views, the same sentiments will be reflected in no uncertain terms.

THE MULTICULTURAL GAME:

- 6 JUN 1997

As a result of an "open-door" immigration policy, the number of different racial groups playing sport obviously reflects the new racial diversity of Australia. The multiculturalists claim that such diversity is "good for us". It adds exotic flavour and cultural colour to an otherwise "boring" and bland Australian culture.

But no-one could describe the Victorian football scene as bland or boring. Australian rules football almost substitutes for religious belief in Melbourne, as in some other southern cities, with tens of thousands of devoted fans routinely attending weekend matches. Is it a surprise to the dogmatic multiculturalists that on-field friction sometimes finds expression in racial taunts as well as boots, fists and swearing?

The truth about the multicultural society is that, irrespective of whether it is described as "successful" or not, under pressure, the racial and cultural differences find expression. If a few relatively juvenile taunts on the football field, under the competitive pressure of a game of sport, disturb the multiculturalists, then they are in for a serious shock. Although described as a "successful" multicultural country, the cultural and racial friction will certainly appear under any serious pressure, economic or military. Why do Australians persist in the arrogant view that we are immune from such expressions of cultural friction, when the rest of the world clearly is not?