



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.34, No.6

February 27th, 1998

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"It is possible so to twist the meaning of words, that policies which result in conditions which are progressively obnoxious to the majority of persons affected by them, can yet obtain a considerable amount of support, by an appeal to high-sounding words such as democracy, justice and equality. The emotion to which appeal is made, is that which was invoked to justify witch-burning . . . There is probably more nonsense spoken and written around the words freedom and liberty, than in regard to any other two words in the English language . . . 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*

THE DEADLY VIRUS OF MULTICULTURALISM by Eric D. Butler:

There is an old saying that today's party politicians rely upon the notoriously short memories of electors to get themselves re-elected. It was only a few years ago that the world's media was carrying eulogistic stories about the emergence of some type of a new golden age in South Africa as a result of the first democratic elections ever, bringing Nelson Mandela to office, where he was going to preside over a harmonious multicultural society. As every realist knows, the election was a major fraud, but accepted in the belief that if Mandela and his Communist allies were not declared the winners, there would be some type of a revolution. No one can now dispute that since the law and order, harsh though it may have been at times, provided by the Europeans has been removed, violence of all kinds has escalated. The unfortunate blacks have been the worst victims of what has taken place. Through most of "liberated" Africa, there have been killings on a massive scale as Africans revert to tribalism. The mass killings are temporarily forgotten as the world braces itself for more convulsions and destruction.

Those whites seeking to escape from the horrors of the new South Africa are finding that the Australian Government appears to have double standards concerning refugees. *The Sunday Age* of February 22nd published a story concerning a white South African woman seeking to obtain political asylum in Australia. She says she has been robbed 12 times and mugged five times, and that it is not possible for whites to live under black rule. Cheryl Kennedy has told the Australian immigration authorities that she has been driven from South Africa by crime and reverse discrimination . . . She says that she has had three cars stolen and her house burned down. Her daughter has had a gun held at her head and her father and brother had both been shot – her brother fatally. There is nothing unusual about what has happened; it has become the norm in the new South Africa. The white woman who sat next to me on the plane from Singapore to Perth last December also described herself as a refugee, thanking God each morning that she was still alive.

Now living in Broome, Cheryl Kennedy, after she entered Australia last year as a tourist, has claimed refugee status. The authorities have refused her application, stating that she does not meet the Government's criteria concerning qualifications and wealth. She is a cleaner. She is now taking her case before the Refugee Review Tribunal. She cites the affirmation action policies of the South African Government, which discriminates against whites. The case is causing considerable interest among white South Africans trying to leave the country.

As these comments are being made, one of those who was prominent in the campaign to turn South Africa into a multicultural and multiracial society, President Clinton of the USA, has not yet used the USA's sophi-

sticated technology to blast Baghdad. A growing number of Americans are being unkind enough to ask searching questions about the President's integrity. They recall how Clinton involved American troops in an attempt to end violence in multicultural Yugoslavia. He promised that he would have American troops out of explosive Bosnia by the end of 1996, and that the American mission in Bosnia would be "precisely defined with clear realisable goals" that could be achieved within the year. Clinton reneged on that promise only a few days after he had been re-elected in November. President Clinton then made yet another promise, that American troops would be home by July, 1998. But by December 18th, 1997, he was also backing away from that promise and called for an open ended commitment to keep American troops in Bosnia indefinitely. It appears that Clinton's advisers had discovered that if American troops were withdrawn from Bosnia, there would be an inevitable renewal of conflict between the Serbs, the Croats and the Moslems. These three different religious and cultural groups are not prepared to live under the programme imposed upon them by the Clinton Administration. The Americans have spent over \$8 billion in a futile attempt to pretend that Bosnia is a nation. The "peace" that exists in Bosnia is only because of the military programme of the Clinton Administration.

As one studies that Clinton Administration's programme, it becomes clear that all major policy decisions are designed to advance the concept of some type of New World Order. Numerous international treaties are directed against national sovereignty. It is probably true that Clinton, like so many Western political leaders, is but a pawn in a game he does not understand. In Benjamin Disraeli's famous novel, *Coningsby*, there is the entertaining dialogue between the International Bankers and Coningsby, who is surprised that the British Chancellor of the Exchequer should be made Minister for Finance, as he knew nothing about the subject. "Exactly, my dear Coningsby, that's why we made him Chancellor of the Exchequer." The facts concerning the massive build-up of the "Asian Tigers" by the International Banks are readily available. Citicorp extended over \$60 billion in Asian loans, Chase Manhattan over \$39 billion, J.P. Morgan \$23 billion, the Bank of America \$16 billion. The International Monetary Fund has already poured out over \$100 billion for the Asian crisis, and is asking for still bigger investments. Those with reasonably good memories will recall how Mexico lost control of its oil supplies as a result of the 1984 bail-out by the International Bankers. The Mexican Middle Class was virtually wiped out and a grassroots revolution took place.

In spite of the events of recent history, President Clinton originally stated that the Asian crisis was but a little "glitch" – nothing really to worry about. Whatever the outcome of the current Iraqi situation, in view of the pattern of past events, it is legitimate to ask how much can Clinton and his advisers be trusted concerning what they claim to be about. As the world scene becomes progressively more chaotic, all multicultural societies are increasingly at risk, as witnessed by the Australian situation where the Islamic community has openly expressed its opposition to John Howard's policy concerning Iraq. If open conflict emerges between Western nations and the Moslem world, what would the attitude of Moslem communities inside Western nations? What is required from Australia's politicians supporting the American Middle East policy are firm assurances that there is coherent strategy designed to deal with all emergencies, including the possible flood of refugees into Northern Australia.

It is a fact of life that every form of life discriminates in favour of itself; otherwise it does not survive. White refugees from South Africa would be preferable to many others who are coming into Australia under refugee programmes. Australia is fast approaching the most testing time in its short history. The first essential for survival is a repudiation of the policy of multiculturalism and multiracialism and a rejection of any international agreement which undermines Australia's independence.

'MAI' SLOWLY BECOMES AN ISSUE by David Thompson:

"While debate about Australia's symbolic sovereignty occupies the headlines, a debate over its actual sovereignty is taking place in the boardrooms of Paris." - Matthew Townsend, writing in the Business section of *"The Australian"* (19/2/98).

Although negotiations are confidential, the OECD progress towards a Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) is gradually becoming a public process because of the magnitude of importance of the new treaty.

Details are leaking out, and those who understand the implications are variously horrified, or going to lengths to justify the proposal.

While little is being said by Australian officials, the two Ministers who are on record are both trying to justify Australia's negotiation of the secret treaty. Foreign Minister Alexander Downer has defended the new agreement during a visit to London recently. Senator Rod Kemp, Assistant Federal Treasurer, argues that the MAI will "provide investors with greater certainty as to the 'rules of the game' when investing in foreign countries".

Kemp's comment is true, but offers little comfort, because the "rules of the game" (some "game"!) insist that the victims of foreign investment are completely powerless to defend themselves from giant trans-national corporations (including banks, insurance companies, etc.).

Matthew Townsend, a Melbourne barrister, writes that signatory nations to the MAI must agree to:

- * Open all economic sectors, including real estate, broadcasting and natural resources, to foreign ownership
- * Treat foreign investors no less favourably than domestic companies
- * Remove requirements that investors behave in a certain way in exchange for market access, among other things.

Signatory nations can set their own exception to the treaty rules ("reservations") but these are to be eliminated over time. The result of outlawing 'discrimination' against foreign firms in Australia would be far-reaching. For example, consider the following:

- it could force Australian governments to fund foreign universities in this country on the same basis as we fund our own universities.
- it could force us to pay public funds to foreign health companies on the same basis that we fund our own hospitals.
- local government could not patronise Australia-owned, local firms instead of giant multinationals for council work.

"CONSTITUTION OF THE GLOBAL ECONOMY": Australia is said to have submitted 29 'reservations'; areas where Australia would be (temporarily) exempt from the treaty provisions. Although secret, these are believed to be in the fields of banking, airlines, fishing, preferences for Aborigines, communications media, real estate, social services, Telstra, research and development, all government procurement, etc.

It is essential to note that the above reservations **are only temporary, and** the programme for eliminating them is vague, but signatories to the treaty must agree to roll back these exemptions. If foreign firms are 'discriminated against' under the terms of the treaty, significant compensation demands would have to be met by government.

Negotiations on the treaty are expected to be complete by April this year, and the international bureaucrats regard it as so far-reaching that World Trade Organisation director general Renato Ruggerio says the OECD is actually "writing the constitution of a single global economy". It is perfectly clear that as the single global economy takes shape, the governments of the nation-state will be forbidden to interfere, even in the best interests of their own people. Perhaps **especially** in the interests of their own people.

The MAI treaty illustrates as perhaps no other has the truth that the nation which is not prepared to discriminate in its own favour is doomed. Australian Governments have shown in the past that they do not have the courage to discriminate in favour of Australians. Left to Government, Australia will sign this treaty, driving perhaps the final nail into the coffin of national sovereignty. It depends entirely on what ordinary Australians are prepared to do to resist this abomination.

CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE – FOR THE WORSE? While Australians debate the shape of any proposed republic, its proponents like Malcolm Turnbull, Neville Wran and Janet Holmes a Court hold a supreme

confidence in their ability to "get it right", irrespective of the legal and constitutional difficulties involved. There is perhaps the arrogance of the immensely wealthy that money cuts through all obstacles. But if Australians need a demonstration of constitutional change gone wrong, New Zealand is in the unique situation of providing just such a bad example.

In a referendum in 1993, New Zealanders voted to change their electoral system from a "first past the post" system, to what is known as MMP - a type of mixture between "first past the post" and proportional representation. This provides for members of parliament for each electorate in the normal way, as well as each political party appointing additional MPs according to their proportion of the vote.

Although New Zealanders have only had one election since its commencement, the MMP system is now widely regarded as an absolute disaster. In a recent book, *"Why MMP Must Go"*, journalist Graeme Hunt claims that New Zealand now has an alien and undemocratic voting system. Hunt claims that the then Labour Prime Minister, Sir Geoffrey Palmer, had stacked a 1985 Royal Commission into electoral change to give him the result he wanted.

"Parliament took the bait, and the most ill-thought-out measure ever to go to referendum was placed before the country. . ." Hunt wrote. He describes it as "the constitutional disaster of the century".

Australians might reflect on the process by which we are being forced toward a republic. Rather than an idea that has gradually gathered momentum from the grass-roots, it was spawned by an arrogant and abrasive Prime Minister Keating, and fostered in the hot-house of the disaffected left of Australian politics.

A reluctant Prime Minister Howard has been manoeuvred into permitting it onto the political agenda, an agenda manipulated by internationalist press barons. At the only point at which they have been invited to be involved, only about 40% of the public bothered to vote for delegates to an intensive ten-day convention. This was a poor parody of the pre-federation conventions, and a contrived result will go to referendum in 1999.

Perhaps the 1999 Australian question will, in retrospect, become "the most ill-thought-out measure ever to go to referendum". As yet, Australians still have the chance to learn from the New Zealand experience - **before we have our own disaster.**

FRUITS OF MULTICULTURALISM: Whatever the United States hopes to achieve from a "strike" at Saddam Hussein, it is certain that the stocks of the United States in Gulf countries is as low as ever. On his return to the United States from Australia, the negro Muslim leader Louis Farrakhan pointed out that the world's 1.5 billion Muslims were not exactly enthralled by the impending military action.

In Australia, many are surprised to discover that there are quite deep divisions of opinion about Australian involvement in attacking Iraq. But although the "benefits" of the multicultural society are perpetually parroted, the very real difficulties are glossed over. Last weekend about a thousand Muslims demonstrated outside the US Consulate, against Australia's involvement in the Gulf, and warning that the anti-Arab feeling generated by the last Gulf war was already evident again.

The problems begin in the schools. In Victoria, one school has been denied the right to rehearse the songs for an Easter passion play, because a "non-Christian" parent complained. Premier Kennett even contemplates ramming legislation through the parliament to permit the play to go ahead.

In NSW school parent bodies are being forced to "review" whether the Lord's Prayer was appropriate for their multicultural student bodies. The fruits of multiculturalism are everywhere evident in a shattering of spiritual cohesion. Any nation that permits this is firmly on the road to decline. It is the Christian revelation that has provided Australia with it's inspiration towards the free, tolerant and open society. We need to return to our Christian roots, not abandon them in the name of "tolerance".