



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.34, No.19

May 29th, 1998

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"The traditional Utopia is essentially a Christian heresy The motive idea of our Utopians was that of imposing moral and ideal justice through the compulsory institution of a new social order. They were heretical, not Christian, because they blamed the Creator instead of the defective human will, and ignored the warning that 'My Kingdom is not of this World' hence Utopian aspirations all too easily have become identified in practice with ruthless destruction and terrorism, for it was found that to create a new world you must destroy the old world and to do this root out by terrorism all possible agents of counter-revolution."*

– Sir David Kelly in *The Hungry Sheep*

WHAT COMES NEXT IN AUSTRALIA? by Eric D. Butler:

Those who have read *The Asian Mind Game* know how absurd and dangerous it is for Westerners to attempt to analyse Asian situations in terms of Western value systems. Discussing the Indian situation against a background of working as a consulting engineers in the sub-continent of what is now known as India and Pakistan, C.H. Douglas pointed out that terms like "decency" and "fairness" had little impact on the Asian mind. The first major mistake being made concerning the Indonesian situation is the claim that the basic cause of the crisis has been the corruption of the Suharto regime, and the lack of human rights. The new President is being lectured on the necessity to introduce "full scale democracy". Many Asians are contemptuous of what they perceive to be the humbug and hypocrisy of the West. Consider the background of the deposed President Suharto, who first came to power when he and fellow Indonesian military leaders thwarted the threatened Communist-inspired takeover in 1965. The fact that the Communist threat was clearly inspired by Communist China resulted in the relatively small, but commercially strong, Chinese minority being brutally treated in a military action which resulted in at least 500,000 being killed. Generally speaking the West, headed by Washington, expressed its relief that the threatened Communist expansion in South East Asia had been defeated. Strong man President Suharto was warmly welcomed by the West as he set about "modernising" a nation which consisted of a sprawling archipelago of islands and a variety of people and cultures.

It was at the end of the long morally exhausting Vietnam War, which the Americans and its allies were not allowed to win, that the man who had been groomed by Rockefeller and other International Bankers, Dr. Henry Kissinger, negotiated a peace settlement which ended with South Vietnam being overrun by the Communists. It was not long afterwards that the world was astonished when Kissinger arranged for President Richard Nixon to welcome Communist China into the United Nations, anti-Communist Taiwan being expelled to make way for Communist China. David Rockefeller of the Trilateral Commission, along with his fellow International Bankers, moved in to finance Communist China. This was the signal for a programme of massive international financial investments into Asia. The vast economic potential of Indonesia was with its population of 200 million. Suharto readily took advantage of what in essence was a massive transfer of Western technology into his country. He became one of the much publicised "Asian Tigers". It cannot be disputed that living standards increased. And, not surprisingly, Suharto acted to ensure that he and members of his family also benefitted from Indonesia's upsurge of economic growth. Observing the ways of the West,

where the new God was economic growth and massive industrialisation, like most other Asian leaders Suharto followed suit. What he failed to see was that a programme of economic expansion under debt finance made him increasingly vulnerable to the dictates of the international debt merchants. The demands by the International Monetary Fund, particularly those concerning the abolition of subsidies on basic items like food and cooking oil, were a signal for revolutionary action triggered by the very students who, while learning about the wonders of Western technology, were also absorbing Western political theories concerning "democracy".

But obviously no one has pointed out to the Indonesian student protestors that what is generally described as democracy in Western nations has not led to the individual having more effective control over his own affairs. Protesting Indonesian students merely provided one more example of how mob violence operates. All mobs are a manifestation of madness. There were well authenticated reports of Chinese businesses being destroyed by mobs who will require such businesses in the future if they are to survive. Irrespective of how much "democracy" the new Indonesian regime introduces, under international pressure, it can be predicted with complete certainty that the Indonesian situation cannot improve if the dictates of the International Monetary Fund are obeyed. Like a man "hooked" on drugs, more convulsions are inevitable in Indonesia unless it can start to free itself from being dependent on the debt drug. The Indonesians are not going to be offered any realistic advice by an Australian Government which is also in the grip of the same debt drug. John Howard and his colleagues continue to insist that without foreign investments, Australia has no future.

Every Asian economy is now paying the price of accepting the massive financial investments from the International Bankers. As this commentator has warned over many years, the first of the Asian economic miracles, that of Japan, was ultimately doomed to end in disaster. Every day brings new reports of leading Japanese businessmen committing suicide as bankruptcies soar. The desperate Japanese are being pressured by the internationalists to expand their economy while at the same time opening their domestic markets to the exports of other nations. Such a programme can only result in internal social disintegration and revolution.

It is significant that there is one major factor in the ferment now threatening all the "Asian Tigers", and that is every effort is being made to ensure that Communist China is preserved. While the Zionist dominated Clinton regime does a little harmless wrist tapping concerning China, there is no suggestion of any type of realistic sanctions against a regime which is far more corrupt and brutal than that operated in Indonesia. There is a flood of low priced Chinese production into the West, the result of what is slave labour. President Clinton is assisting in every way with the provision of the latest American technology. There is a blind-eye attitude concerning China's massive military build up.

What is happening in Indonesia and other Asian countries does however provide valuable lessons for Australians willing to learn. The story is told by one of the Australian families fleeing from a disintegrating Indonesia, the wife clutching her children and complaining that "We are lucky to have got out with our lives. We were numbered amongst the many who heeded the advice of our Government and attempted to establish ourselves and our business in an Asia which we were told was the hope of the future". It is to be hoped that returning Australians who suffered in the Indonesian upheaval inject a note of realism into the Australian scene. As ferment increases throughout Asia, with a growing demand that Australia takes more Asian refugees, this is a moment in the nation's history when hard realism must replace flabby rhetoric concerning globalism and New World Orders. In responding to the Indian action in testing its nuclear weapons system, Pakistan says that it proposes to do likewise, putting self interests ahead of "world opinion".

All over the world the chickens of the starry eyed idealists are coming home to roost. The media can no longer disguise the truth about "democracy" in Nelson Mandela's South Africa. One journalist prominent in the Anti-Apartheid campaign has returned to South Africa and provides a grim picture of how crime and corruption threaten the future. With being sorry now in fashion, all those Australian Federal politicians who have misled the Australian people about their future being in Asia, should be asked to apologise. Only a person with a proper pride in himself and his own culture can really respect the value of a person of a different background. Any candidate for public office who keeps bleating about Australia's future being in Asia, should be put last on the voting papers. They are a much greater threat to the nation than Pauline Hanson, who at least does appear to put Australia first. The motto of Australian patriots well might be Shakespeare's words, *"To thine own self be true; thou can'st not then be false to any man."*

WHY ARE WE NOT SO SORRY? by David Thompson:

Last Tuesday was designated as a national "sorry" day by private groups who appear to be milking the aboriginal guilt industry for all it is worth. While it is not quite clear just who is sponsoring the "sorry" day, it appears to be mainly groups of two types. The first type is based exclusively in the cities, and is composed of small 'l' liberals, who have convinced themselves of the nobility of the original native lifestyle over the corruption of modern materialism. They have designated guilt to be superior to pride in national achievements, and as Glen Milne writes in his column (*The Australian*, 25/5/98) they can afford to wallow in symbolic but ultimately pointless gestures because they never have to deal with the practical consequences of their actions - or inactions.

The second group are much more practical and focused on their exploitation of the guilt factor. This group is based mainly in country areas, but is pitching their plea for sympathy to the same city audiences who have never met an aborigine, and as a result have no idea of the reality of relations with aboriginal people, warts and all. This group, consisting of aboriginal land councils, ATSIC functionaries, and Marxist-oriented intellectuals, have a long-term programme in which the aborigine is to be exploited in a campaign to fragment the Australian nation.

Few have bothered - or dared - to ask publicly just for what we are asked to be sorry. The polls show that a majority of Australians are "sorry". How reliable are these? If it was a poll asking "do you smack your children?", would the pollsters receive an accurate response, upon which government would dare to establish political policies? Of course not. In the same way, it is now politically correct to be "sorry", so those who feel only slightly sorry, or not sorry at all, will consider carefully where and how loudly they will express these sentiments.

On national sorry day, we were asked to be sorry for removing aboriginal **and part-aboriginal** children from their families. Apart from the fact that very few living Australians were involved with this programme, we are being asked to be repentant on a racially biased basis. We are not being asked to be sorry for the non-aboriginal children so removed by various welfare agencies. Apparently suffering is one of those emotions becoming monopolised by only certain racial or ethnic groups.

But are we really sorry that people like Lois O'Donohue and Robert Riley were 'stolen' from their families, thus ensuring not only their survival, but providing them with educational opportunities which have subsequently been used to denigrate such altruism? Are we sorry we managed to save thousands of children from malnutrition, glaucoma, diabetes, low survival rates and early death expectations?

The Reverend Cedric Jacobs, himself "stolen" at the age of nine, once said he has never regretted being "stolen" - "It saved my life," he said. "I would have died of malnutrition for sure." Jacobs went on to excel in academic, sporting and political pursuits, as well as offering hope to a generation of his people in W.A. Having formed a friendship with Cedric, I have never dared to risk his contempt by suggesting that I was sorry for his circumstances. He has always been quick to praise God for his circumstances, whatever they might be.

SORRY DAY FOR COMMONSENSE: In a press statement about national sorry day, Independent Graeme Campbell claims that the author of the "stolen generations" report, Sir Ronald Wilson, mainly interviewed cases of aboriginal people brought to him by the Aboriginal Legal Service - a highly partial group.

"Sir Ronald Wilson's report was an absolute disgrace, as by his own admission he never sought to verify any of the stories he got," said Campbell. He claims that Wilson "never sought evidence from the many aboriginal people who would testify that what happened was in their best interest.

"It is insulting to the intelligence to apologise for taking children out of often desperate circumstances, and in many cases saving their lives. There were many more children taken off white mothers at the same time, basically for the same reason," Mr. Campbell said. He described the 'sorry day' as "a sorry day for common

sense', and that it was "guilt-ridden emotional nonsense that did less than nothing for aboriginal advancement".

In his excellent critical analysis of the 'stolen generations' report, *"Betraying the Victims"*, Ron Brunton notes that the inquiry admitted that it made no attempt to "distinguish possibly false or exaggerated claims". Sir Ronald Wilson betrayed his own judicial training by failing to ask for corroboration for heart-rending stories by the 'victims'. This is not to say that there was no corroboration, but that it was never sought.

In one particular case of a 'stolen' child, Robert Riley became a high-profile aboriginal activist in Western Australia, campaigning for land rights and other issues. Riley committed suicide at the age of 42, and in his eulogy Pad Dodson stated that Riley had been 'forcibly taken', although "his mother asked Sister Kate to take him because she was in a relationship with a man who couldn't stand Robert and whose bashings would probably have killed Robert."

Sir Ronald Wilson was a board member of Sister Kate's home for aboriginal children, and claimed not to have known that it was wrong to take the children!

In the lather of recriminations now demanded, few have stopped to think what might have happened to aboriginal Australians if, for example, the Japanese had prevailed during the Second World War. The record of their treatment of other peoples before, during and even after the war indicates that the lot of the aborigine under Japanese occupation would not have been bright. The Japanese treatment of the Chinese, Korean, Burmese, and Indonesian people, for example, has been harsh. Their treatment of prisoners of war is legendary, and the use of "comfort women" for Japanese troops indicates an unconcern for other than Japanese racial groupings. The only "land rights" the aborigines could expect under Japanese occupation would be communal graves.

WHEN RECONCILIATION TOOK PLACE: The "sorry day" precedes an official Reconciliation Week, beginning last Wednesday. But the misrepresentation of issues such as the 'stolen generation' jeopardises any true reconciliation. The question of forced reconciliation is in itself doomed to failure. It is not "reconciliation" that is demanded by the strategists of national fragmentation. What is being demanded is concessions to the activists, irrespective of the true situation.

The truth is that "reconciliation" already took place thirty years ago. This took place at the time of the Constitutional referendum in 1967, in which certain constitutional changes were proposed, allegedly for the **benefit of aborigines**. Many Aborigines campaigned for a **Yes** vote at this referendum, and were ecstatic when a staggering 97% of Australians voted "Yes". This was a recognition that Australians wanted **one people**, treated fairly and equally, and were fully prepared to extend the hand of brotherhood, citizenship and reconciliation to aboriginal Australians.

That the reconciliation of the 1967 referendum was not a lasting, successful relationship was not the fault of "whites" or "aborigines" at all. It was undermined by the activists - some black, some not - who have their own agenda to this day. It was undermined by outrageous demands for land, recognition as original owners, entitled to all sorts of privileges, and special treatment. Some activists even go so far as setting up an Aboriginal Provisional Government, and others demand compensation for "invasion". Glen Milne reports that there are "800 litigants queuing in the courts, wanting compensation as the victims of the stolen generation".

He also reports that our government is alarmed by the US situation, where activists like Jesse Jackson are asking for more than President Clinton's apology. They want an estimated **US\$400 billion** in compensation. No wonder Australians are reluctant to be sorry!

Recommended reading: *"Betraying the Victims"* by Ron Brunton: \$12.00 posted. *"The Australian History of Henry Reynolds"* by Geoffrey Partington: \$6.00, or \$8.00 posted, from all League bookservices.