



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.42, No.10

March 17th, 2006

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:

"Hitler can be beaten; Russian Communism with its soulless materialism and ant-heap idealism can be beaten; American Financial Domination can be beaten; but they can be beaten only by the preservation of our National British Culture and by the expression of those ideas of independence which are peculiarly ours."
– Eric Butler in *"The War Behind the War"*, written in the 1940s.

"Economies come and go over historical time. What survives is that which is basic – fundamental – to the heart of man. And that is why the fight to save our race – the genesis of the creative well – is also fundamental."
– James Reed in "Science and Fundamentalism", *New Times Survey*, March, 2006.

HOWARD AND COSTELLO TALKING TOUGH by James Reed: John Howard and Peter Costello have recently been "talking tough" on multiculturalism. Muslims should assimilate and accept Australia's core values or not come here. This tough talk was used to defuse the One Nation "threat" back in 1998. The illusion is created that Howard is actually "on side" and is doing something about the immigration problem.

Sure he is: this new world order man is replacing European Australia by Asian/Oriental Australia.

The Muslim intake in the annual immigration figures has steadily increased under Howard. When Howard was told (he had to be told?) that in 2003-2004 the overseas-born population rose to 24 per cent and the European portion of the immigration total crashed below 50 per cent Howard said: "Really? I think what it demonstrates is that we have run a truly non-discriminating immigration policy." (*The Australian*, 20/2/06, p.1)

This article says that this is the first time that the European share of the immigration total was below 50 per cent. This is not so. Many articles in this journal (for an extended argument you should not miss out on a *New Times Survey* pack of three issues on immigration) have cited evidence that under Howard Asian immigration has been over 70 per cent for many years. We now have a Yellow Australia policy, as it has been called.

John Howard is continuing Paul Keating's quest to move Australia out of the West and recreate her as an Asian colony. The great difficulty which an anti-immigration movement faces under Howard is that many people seem to think that Howard's opposition to Asian immigration was sincere or that he still

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *Howard and Costello Talking Tough* • *Touching A Raw Nerve* • *Special Three-In-One New Times Survey Pack* • *The Nuisance of "Democracy"* • *How N.S.W. Republican Politicians Mark The Royal Visit* • *More Than A Snub – A Grab For Power*

"ON TARGET"

March 17th, 2006

Page 1 (37)

(secretly) holds to it. He doesn't. Howard – contrary to a recent Newspann which saw him as Australia's best Prime Minister – is our worse.

I would prefer "the greatest loser" than a continuation of the Howard regime. Maybe then people would wake up in fright to what has been happening to this country, their minds cleared of the "Howard illusion".

TOUCHING A RAW NERVE by James Reed: Liberal MP Danna Vale touched the same racial raw nerve that Pauline Hanson touched: Australian (Whites) are "aborting ourselves out of existence". She points out, following the demographics of Europe, that Australia will ultimately be taken over by the "fast-breeding Muslims".

The editorial of *The Australian*, 15/2/06, p.11, responds to Vale by arguing that the country is experiencing a "mini baby boom" with our fertility rate (net reproduction rate) at 1.77. In 2001 it was 1.73 and at present is higher than Italy, Japan and Germany. However this is a fallacious response as all of these nations have a replacement level of fertility – and so does Australia – at 1.77. **A figure of about 2.3 is needed to replace the population.**

Immigration Minister Amanda Vanstone rightly pointed out that Australia's immigration programme draws heavily on non-Muslim countries. Again true but irrelevant. The Muslim component of the intake has steadily risen under Howard. The intake is primarily non-White – at least 70 per cent of the intake has been Asian for most of the time of the Howard regime. **John Howard is Mr. Asian Immigration.**

So what Vale is saying: that Whites in Australia are facing racial oblivion, is true.

Angela Shanahan (*The Weekend Australian*, 18-19/2/06m p.23) says that ANU demographer Peter MacDonald estimates that Islamic women have at least 40 per cent more children than average: making the Islamic net reproduction rate 2.68 compared to 1.7 for the general population.

Thus there are almost double the number of children in Islamic households than in the general population and this high fertility continues into the second generation. Natural fertility – rather than immigration alone – is the major cause of the expansion of Muslims in Australia. In 1981 there were 76,800 Muslims in Australia, but by 2001, numbers had increased to 281,600, constituting 1.5 per cent of the Australian population and rising.

Muslim women marry younger and have children sooner than most other groups, which also increases the Muslim growth rate. Thus, as a matter of statistics, Muslims will eventually take over Australia given the present immigration rate of other groups.

The "bleeding hearts" in the "Letters to the editor" columns welcome the elimination of the Anglo/Christian population as just "evolution". Perhaps they deserve to live under Sharia law, now.

Fifty years ago it would have been unthinkable for the ordinary person to believe that the racial variety on the streets of today would be Australia's future. And the elites – from Arthur Calwell to John Howard – have succeeded. Have a guess what they have in store for the next fifty and a hundred years?

**** SPECIAL THREE-IN-ONE *New Times Survey* PACK – \$3.00 POSTED:** Australians need to understand the elitists' goal of diluting the racial mix of the Australian people in order to fit us into their New World Order. Three issues of the *New Times Survey* are being offered for the price of one:

- "Racial Treason: From White Australia Policy to Yellow Australia Policy"
- "China-Threat: Yellow Peril Revisited"
- "It's Time: For a New Anti-Immigration Movement in Australia".

NTS Special Pack available only from Box 1052, GPO, Melbourne, 3001. Price: \$3.00 posted.

THE NUISANCE OF "DEMOCRACY" by Peter Ewer: The U.S. has justified its military adventures across the world for over a century on the grounds that it is bringing democracy to the world. It is therefore hypocritical for the U.S. to dismiss the results of the popular elections which gave a landslide victory to Hamas in the Palestine occupied territories. Although President Bush and Johnny Howard both said that their rejection of Hamas was based on its policy of the elimination of the State of Israel, Hamas had dropped that policy from its manifesto prior to the election. Hamas had also declared a ceasefire on their terrorist operations in March 2005 to pursue the electoral process.

Shahram Akbarzadeh, senior lecturer in global politics at Monash University, has recently pointed out (*The Australian*, 30/1/06, p.8) that Islamisation is a product of U.S. policies:

"It is often forgotten that the U.S. had a direct role in the consolidation of Islamism in the Middle East because it was seen as an effective bulwark against Soviet influence during the Cold War. U.S. support for the Afghan mujaheddin was instrumental in their success. In the Palestinian occupied territories, Israel saw in Hamas a useful indigenous challenge to the appeal of the exiled Palestinian Liberation Organisation. Hamas emerged and grew in the Gaza Strip as an Israel-sanctioned Islamic self-help community organisation. Now Islamists are biting the hand that fed them."

That is the trouble with hypocritical practices – at some point they turn around and bite you. Democracy can be a damned nuisance to global hegemony.

HOW N.S.W. REPUBLICAN POLITICIANS MARK THE ROYAL VISIT – David Flint, Convenor, Australians for Constitutional Monarchy writes:

Mr. John Paul, the political scientist predicted before the referendum that the republicans would be incapable of magnanimity in victory, but utterly sulphurous in defeat.

In the N.S.W. Legislative Council, the Labor government arranged that the "Perjury Bill" – to remove the requirement that our politicians swear allegiance to their Sovereign – be rushed through all stages on the night of Tuesday, 7 March 2006

The Bill is ostensibly a private members bill. It is hardly that. The government lacked the courage to declare it its own, even trying to ensure the minimum of media attention to the debate. Obviously intended to precede the Royal Visit, and unable to deliver a republic, the tactic was an infantile attempt at an insult to their Sovereign.

The majority of republican politicians are obviously not prepared to respect the people's decision, and will be most unlikely to let the people vote on this. The Reverend Fred Nile's valiant attempt to require that both the new "pledge of loyalty to the people" and the Oath be required was defeated.

The third reading was passed 21:14. The votes cast were:

Ayes: Mr. Breen, Ms. Burnswoods, Mr. Catanzariti, Dr. Chesterfield-Evans, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Della Bosca, Mr. Donnelly, Ms. Griffin, Ms. Hale, Mr. Hatzistergos, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Obeid, Ms. Rhiannon, Ms. Robertson, Mr. Roozendaal, Ms. Sharpe, Mr. Tsang, Dr. Wong.

Noes: Mr. Clarke, Ms. Cusack, Miss Gardiner, Mr. Gay, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Lynn, Reverend Nile, Ms. Parker, Mrs. Pavey, Mr. Pearce, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Tingle.

Pairs: Mr. Costa, Mr. Gallacher, Ms. Fazio, Mrs. Forsythe.

MORE THAN A SNUB – A GRAB FOR POWER – David Flint continues: The action of the N.S.W. government to rush through a bill, ostensibly a private member's bill, to remove the oath of Allegiance for New South Wales politicians, just as The Queen is to arrive in the State, can only be assumed to be a calculated snub. Worse, it is yet another step in a power grab to limit the politicians' accountability to the people.

Only last year we obtained confirmation of what we had long suspected – that the decision to eject the Governor from Government House in 1997 (and to downgrade the position to a part time one to be filled on that occasion unconstitutionally by the Chairman of the Law Reform Commission) was not only that dubious one announced at the time, to return the house to the people.

As we noted (27 November, 2005) Mr.Carr now says that one lesson from the dismissal was the "potentially corrupting role of the vice-regal office". He then admitted this was the reason he had decided the N.S.W. Governor would not live in Government House. In other words the reason the Governor was thrown out was to diminish the office, and weaken any discretionary power the Governor might have over an errant Premier.

Mr. Carr also that the "reserve powers" that Sir John Kerr used in 1975 to dismiss the Whitlam government did not exist. Sir John held that it was unconstitutional for a government to attempt to govern without a grant of supply from the Parliament, which is fundamental to the Westminster system.

As I said [at the time] Mr. Carr's argument that the reserve powers do not exist would have amazed the great Labor leaders, Curtin, Chifley, Evatt (who even now is still a leading authority on them) and Mr. Carr's illustrious predecessor, and subsequently Governor-General, Sir William McKell, as well as Paul Keating and Gareth Evans who spent vast amounts of time trying, unsuccessfully, to codify those very powers.

Mr. Carr claimed the trappings of vice-regal life had drawn Sir John Kerr to the "delusion" that his role was to exercise real power rather than serve as a ceremonial figurehead.

He said: "Living in the gilded cage of Admiralty House and Government House at Yarralumla, being attended on by security chiefs, ambassadors and visiting heads of state, created the illusion in this man that the paper role of Governor-General had a reality."

The reason the Oath of Allegiance is to be abolished is for the same reason the Governor was thrown out – to diminish the office. It is to weaken the discretionary power the Governor, as the representative of the Crown, might have over an errant Premier. It is an attack on the Crown as the constitutional guardian.

For this reason the republican politicians would not accept a compromise proposal by the Rev Fred Nile to keep the Oath of Allegiance and add the new pledge. So the Oath is to be replaced by a meaningless pledge to Australia and the people of New South Wales.

The point is that under the pledge, the people cannot discipline an errant government.

If the politicians were genuine, they would give the people a right of recall. This would involve a certain number of people being able to petition for a recall election. This exists, for example, in British Columbia and California where in 2003, Governor Gray Davis was recalled over mismanagement of the state budget.

This N.S.W. bill is more than a snub. It is part of a campaign to weaken the constitutional guardian, the Crown, with a view to making politicians even less accountable.

It constitutes an attack, a calculated attack, on the checks and balances of our constitutional system.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.
Subscription \$40.00 p.a.