



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.21

June 12th, 1998

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"Some Christians support the institution of private property only on the grounds of expedience. They deny that private property is a natural right of man, that it has any metaphysical value. Their general argument is that without private property man will not have sufficient incentive to work and produce. This argument is important, but much more fundamental is the Christian view that man is more than a higher animal living in society, but a person whose personality should transcend that association of individuals called society. The development of personality requires the use of free will, the making of decisions, through which the individual spiritualises his life."*

– Eric D. Butler in *The Essential Christian Heritage*

THE QUEENSLAND POLITICAL TIME BOMB by Eric D. Butler:

The wise Sir Raphael Cilento used to caution about making firm predictions about future political events, stressing that if you are right few will want to remember, while if you are wrong this will never be forgotten. Generally speaking I have heeded Sir Raphael's advice. But after a week in Queensland, during which I was able to assess at first hand the State's political situation, I was able to confirm a view about our northern State which had been crystallising in my mind for some time: Only an unforeseen miracle can save the National Liberal Party Coalition from the biggest electoral backlash in Australian history. These notes are being prepared nearly a week before the actual election on June 13th. But the evidence is overwhelming that former National and Liberal supporters are going to lodge what in essence will be a massive protest vote. Those responsible for the hysterical anti-Pauline Hanson campaign have, generally speaking, ignored the fact that such attacks merely confirm their perception that Pauline Hanson represents their deepest concerns about what is happening to Australia. The greater the abuse of Pauline Hanson who, to her credit, has refrained from making personal attacks on her numerous political and media opponents, the more support she obtains. I was not surprised to see public opinion polls reflect my view. Former Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser, one of the most disastrous of Australian Prime Ministers, is so arrogantly stupid that he does not realise that he is regarded with contempt by genuinely conservative Australians. That strong advocate of multiculturalism, Victoria Premier Jeff Kennett, has apparently yet to grasp the fact that he is on the road to the political scrapheap. Pauline Hanson should send Premier Kennett a letter of thanks for his support by attacking her. Pauline Hanson will poll heavily in the Queensland elections and could even win one or more seats.

The overall situation in Queensland is that there will be a massive protest vote with chilling implications for the Federal Howard Coalition Government. Members of the Queensland National and Liberal

Parties have appealed to John Howard to reverse his stand on the GST and Free Trade policies. John Howard's visit to Queensland was disastrous and it is no secret that Queensland Coalition Members felt his short visit was counter productive. It is difficult to persuade pig producers that free trade is a splendid idea when they are going bankrupt as big quantities of cheap pig meat floods in from North America. In desperation Queensland Coalition Premier Borbidge promised in his policy speech that certain Queensland industries would get preferential treatment if he is re-elected. This runs contrary to the policy laid down in the Hilmer Report concerning competition. But the current political reality in Australia is that electors are openly cynical about the promises of the political parties. John Howard's backflip on the GST has added to the cynicism.

The massive Queensland protest vote must flow to Independents, Pauline Hanson's One Nation or to Graeme Campbell's Australia First, which basically is an association of Independents sharing a core policy on basic issues. There is little doubt that the Queensland Independent for Gladstone will be re-elected in spite of a determined Labor effort to recapture what was once a safe Labor seat. A strong supporter of Citizens' Initiative Referendum concept, Mrs. Cunningham has proved what good Independents can do in a parliament. I anticipate that she will be joined by at least one or two other Independents. What, then, about Australia First? My assessment of their candidates is that they are of high calibre. Unlike One Nation, which has accepted virtually anyone prepared to offer themselves, Australia First has been most selective. Australia First spokesman in Queensland, Don Pinwill, wisely says, "We are looking beyond this election. We want candidates of quality who can perform competently as parliamentarians. How they perform will be a major factor in the coming Federal elections."

While the spoiling tactics of the directors of the One Nation movement, which have included blunt refusal to exchange preferences with Australia First, could prevent Australia First from winning several seats, ironically they are assisting Labor. It is now clear that the mass national media have been determined to destroy Australia First by the silent treatment technique. I am in possession of evidence which reveals that even when several journalists wrote stories mentioning Graeme Campbell, references to Campbell were edited out. A dirty tracks campaign resulted in the *South Burnett Times*, based in Kingaroy, running a sensational front page article claiming that Australia First might be de-registered because of a lack of adequate members. Threat of legal action resulted in a profuse apology in the next issue of the paper. There is keen interest in what happens in what was Sir Joh Bjelke Petersen's old electorate.

In an interview with Graeme Campbell at his excellent Bendigo meeting last Friday night, June 5th, the leader of Australia First, who had just returned from Queensland, said that if Australia First won only one seat in the Queensland elections it would "ignite a national upsurge of support for Australia First". Listening to Campbell at the Bendigo meeting confirmed my opinion that he is the most outstanding politician in the Federal Parliament, a man qualified to become an outstanding Australian Prime Minister.

Based upon my first hand study of the Queensland situation, including discussions with those campaigning at the grassroots, I expect the present Coalition Party to be routed, and would not be surprised if a Labor Party is elected, even with only a small majority. Queensland Federal National Members will be forced to leave a sinking ship. Australia First offers the only prospect of the birth of a new type of political force. Campbell's insistence that the CIR is necessary to control all politicians is destined to contribute to a watershed development in Australian history. The Queensland elections will demonstrate that a major political refolution is under way in Australian politics, one which will sweep away many of the Canberra traitors.

Having made my predictions, I now step back to await what I believe is now certain. We are witnessing developments which will have international as well as national implications.

IS HANSON "DERANGED"? by David Thompson:

In an extraordinary column in last weekend's press, Michael Duffy documented some areas in which Pauline Hanson has been misquoted, misrepresented or misinterpreted. In particular, he examined the accusation of "racism" now almost universally levelled against her, concluding that it was a dishonest accusation. Duffy even went as far as examining the book attributed to Hanson, *"Pauline Hanson, The Truth"*, and taking Robert Manne to task for failing to support his charge of Hanson's "anti-Asian racism".

However, Duffy is the exception to the generalisation that the press has universally decided that Hanson is "bad" - in the same way that politicians lack the courage to tell the truth, and concede that Hanson is correct in her analysis on a number of issues. In the week leading up to the Queensland election, it is all they can do to reluctantly concede that Mrs. Hanson has filled a vacuum that is entirely of the making of the political, intellectual and social elites. It is a vacuum of **representation**, wherein those Australians who were never consulted about rationalist economics, orientation towards Asia, immigration and multicultural policy, etc., have been expected to meekly endorse such dramatic change without question. The resentment felt at the grass-roots of Australian politics has built up as if behind a dam wall, and Pauline Hanson's appearance coincides with a peak in that resentment, which is capable of sweeping away even the most established of political parties who seek to belittle it.

What, then, is to be made of Prime Minister Howard's demeaning and condescending response to Hanson's outspoken address to Parliament in the second last week of campaigning in Queensland? Howard was widely reported as dismissing Hanson as "bordering on deranged". But this is **exactly the sort of attitude** that has produced the 'Hanson phenomena' and One Nation party in the first place.

What did Hanson say that Howard found almost 'deranged'? Howard didn't say, and there is a reason why he was not specific: many would agree wholeheartedly with Hanson, and the "deranged" tag would backfire. A study of Hanson's speech revealed a number of politically incorrect themes. For example, she referred to the aboriginal industry, claiming that they were less interested in 'reconciliation' than 'remuneration'. She referred to the UN Draft Treaty on the Rights of Indigenous People, and the possible creation of tax-payer funded separate aboriginal states within Australia, which has probably drawn the 'deranged' comment from Howard.

All the available evidence supports Hanson's concerns, rather than the Prime Minister's dismissive comments. The fact is that the draft UN treaty really does lay the ground for separate black states, as envisaged by the Communist Party in the 1930s. This treaty is a seriously subversive document, and Howard's only defence is that it is merely a **draft** treaty.

The fact is that an Aboriginal Provisional Government already exists, under the leadership of one Michael Mansell, as we have previously reported. Mansell, in his *"Towards Aboriginal Sovereignty"* (August, 1990) actually claims the whole of Australia, but generously offers perhaps half of Australia to non-aborigines **in exchange for massive financial compensation**.

In his column (*Sunday Telegraph*, 7/6/98) Piers Akerman claims that in August 1996, Labor historian Henry Reynolds discussed the tactics required to bring about an aboriginal state with Mick Dodson. There is widespread evidence that this proposal is taken extremely seriously by activists, and Hanson is entirely justified in referring to it. It is the shameful response of Howard, Beazley, Fischer, etc., who refuse to discuss the hard issues, that has produced a groundswell of support for Hanson, Campbell, and others who dare to deal with the real issues.

GST BECOMING HOWARD'S HINGE: As the Federal election looms as the next major event on the political agenda, the GST takes on ever greater significance for Mr. Howard and the Coalition. It is clear that his backbench is extremely nervous of the GST, and Mr. Howard has been forced to challenge them to "keep their nerve". They respond, **in private**, with the observation that John Hewson "kept his nerve"; indeed he kept his nerve to the point of snatching defeat from the jaws of victory. The view among Mr. Howard's backbench that the GST is electoral poison is gradually spreading, and every attempt to defend the GST in lieu of details about how it might work becomes impossible.

Increasing information emerges that makes the GST ever harder to "sell" to a reluctant electorate. For example, last weekend the Bureau of Statistics published information that leads to the conclusion that Australians are already effectively paying \$46 billion in GST every year, which amounts to about 28% of the tax take. National Tax and Accountants Association president Ray Regan confirms that the individual, as opposed to big business, is shouldering more and more of the tax burden. "In direct and indirect tax, the average man on the street is paying 50c in the dollar tax," he said. "You would be lucky if big business paid 7c or 8c in the dollar."

Retiring taxation commissioner, Brian Nolan, agrees that companies always attempt to minimise tax, regarding taxation as a business expense to be reduced. While Mr. Howard is claiming that the GST will crack down on the black market economy, Nolan thinks that other factors are more important. He suggests that the real threat to revenue is **globalisation**, in which governments are under pressure to provide tax breaks to lure foreign investment.

Last year Treasurer Costello avoided a question in Parliament from Pauline Hanson, when she quoted an Australian Tax Office study, indicating that 60% of Australian or foreign multinationals were declaring losses, or paid no tax, and the great bulk of the other 40% were only marginally profitable.

This only serves to suggest that Mr. Howard, committed globalist and economic rationalist, is not going to pursue the multinationals whose profits escape the Australian tax net, but is going to permit a new, all-pervasive taxation system under which "the battlers" will pay when the multinationals go free. It will be interesting to see how he proposes that his nervous back-bench "sell" this to the public. Mr. Howard's future as Prime Minister may well hinge on how he approaches the deadly issue of the GST.

REFERENDUM IN CALIFORNIA: The case for the public to initiate referendums which bind politicians would be enhanced if Australians were aware of how the referendum system works in some States of the USA. Last week in California, voters passed a referendum which bans the bureaucracy's attempt to force bilingualism on California. Such is the state of the United States immigration debacle, that California now has a large and growing population of Mexican (Hispanic) people. The major parties, together with education bureaucrats, were keen to establish Spanish as **an alternative language** in California.

Such was the discomfort with the suggestion, that a petition for a referendum was mounted. When the vote was taken, 60% of Californians voted against Spanish in what was known as Proposition 227. Exit polls showed that 40% of Hispanics, the largest non-English speaking minority, also voted to reject Spanish, perhaps feeling that bilingualism would condemn their children to live in 'linguistic limbo'.

If the major parties really want to destroy Pauline Hanson, the mechanism of the referendum is freely available to them. Let her views be put to the test if anyone can get sufficient signatures to force a referendum on, say, whether there should be different social security provisions for aborigines and other Australians. Let us see whether there are sufficient signatures for a vote on the levels of Asian immigration, or the signing of another treaty like the MAI. But would Howard and Beazley really like to tackle the policy issues, or would they rather ridicule Ms. Hanson personally? We know which is easier.

INDIA ON PROTECTIONISM: Interesting news from India: Finance Minister Yashwant Sinha increased import duties by 8% in last week's budget. The new duties are in line with the ruling Hindu nationalist pledge to promote swadeshi (**economic nationalism**). Indian business leaders have supported the protection, which is in line with the election pledge by Hindu nationalists to delay globalisation until Indian industry became more competitive. Perhaps someone should tell Mr. Howard?

The Indian Budget also increased military spending by 14%, and boosted spending on nuclear energy and space programmes by 60%. How much foreign aid is Australia providing to India?