

9<sup>TH</sup> PRINTING

# RED OVER BLACK



**Behind the Aboriginal  
Land Rights**

BY  
**GEOFF McDONALD**

# RED OVER BLACK

by

**Geoff McDonald**

**For update on NTA go to the link:-**

<https://www.mannwest.com/australian-native-title-actthis-may-surprise-you/>



Printed and Published by  
**Veritas Publishing Company Pty Ltd**  
ACN 008 931 619  
P.O. Box 42, Cranbrook,  
Western Australia 6321  
Tel (08) 9826 8055 Fax (08) 9826 8051

Copyright © Geoff McDonald, May 1982

First Published May, 1982  
Second Printing August, 1982  
Third Printing October, 1982  
Fourth Printing December, 1982  
Fifth Printing April, 1983  
Sixth Printing August, 1983  
Seventh Printing December, 1983  
Eight Printing July, 1984  
Ninth Printing August, 1998

Printed and Published by  
**Veritas Publishing Company Pty Ltd**  
ACN 008 931 619  
P.O. Box 42, Cranbrook,  
Western Australia 6321  
Tel (08) 9826 8055 Fax (08) 9826 8051

All rights reserved. No part of this book  
may be reproduced in any form or by any  
means without the permission of the  
copyright-holder, excepting brief quotes  
used in conjunction with reviews written  
specially for inclusion in a magazine or  
newspaper.

ISBN 0 949 667 50 1

---

# Contents

Preface .....	v
The Shape of Things to Come .....	ix
Introduction .....	xi
1     Distortion about what the White Australia Policy really meant .....	1
2     Fake Aboriginal Organisations .....	6
3     Radicals admit they want an independent black nation — Australia does not belong to whites .....	13
4     Singling out the Anglo-Saxons for attack .....	18
5     Exploitation of Aborigines to hold back industrial development .....	25
6     The Federal Government versus Queensland .....	31
7     Learning first hand by visiting Aboriginal land areas .....	38
8     The failure of our intelligence organisations .....	48
9     What has been happening on Aboriginal land areas .....	55
10    Listen to the experts .....	70
11    The preparations for violence .....	79
12    An end to appeasement policies is essential .....	87
13    The United Nations as an instrument against Australia .....	92
14    Communists are the people who stirred opposition to migrants .....	99
15    Australia does not have to imitate the mistakes of others .....	106
16    The Australian Tradition .....	114
17    Maintaining a Homogeneous Australia .....	125
18    Defend Australia by Voice and Pen .....	131
19    The Government should end its support for the Grassby's in Australia .....	134
20    Australia does its best for the Aborigines .....	139
Conclusion .....	141



# Preface

I first knew of Mr. Geoff McDonald when last year, 1981, I received a copy of the *Threat Assessment Paper* mentioned in this book. I subsequently heard Mr. McDonald at a Melbourne meeting develop his central theme that Australia's future as a free Western nation was seriously threatened by two movements: one to use the Aboriginal 'land rights' issue to eventually establish a separate Aboriginal nation under Communist domination; and the second to fragment a homogeneous and stable Australia by a breaking down of the traditional immigration policy, and by the deliberate fostering of a multiculturalism which could only end with the Balkanisation of Australia.

Drawing upon his vast experience in the Labor movement, particularly during those years when he was a prominent member of the Communist Party, Mr. Geoff McDonald provides a disturbing picture of Communist influence in Australia, showing how the old-time concept of Communist revolutionaries using force to seize control of the State and its institutions during a crisis, has been supplanted by a movement of insidious infiltration which has penetrated deep into the media, the education system, the government bureaucracy and, the most disturbing of all, into the Christian Church. Mr. McDonald is emphatic that the World Council of Churches is today a front behind which the Soviet operates.

I am pleased to be able to write this Preface because of Mr. McDonald's overall concern with defence in the widest sense, and his warning that defence of Australia could become impossible if the nation is fragmented. It has become fashionable in some circles to sneer at loyalty to kith and kin. But it was that type of loyalty which in two World Wars brought together people from all around the old British world. It is a fact of life that loyalty to a principle, particularly when loyalty means risk of life, is most effective when that loyalty can be extended to others of the "same kind." When what has been called "folk loyalty" is broken down, a society loses its cohesiveness and defence against external threat becomes impossible.

Mr. McDonald's concern about policies which weaken defence are shared by an overwhelming majority of returned servicemen, as witnessed by the unanimous vote on the immigration question at the 1981 Annual Victorian R.S.L. Conference.

I am satisfied from my own experiences since that conference, including the flood of congratulatory messages I have received, that the stand by the Victorian branch of the R.S.L. is endorsed not only by most returned servicemen throughout Australia, but by the overwhelming majority of the Australian people. A national referendum on the issue would demonstrate that the talkative Mr. Al Grassby speaks only for himself and a small minority. Non-British Europeans as well as those of British background do not favour non-European immigration.

It is a striking commentary on the critical plight of the nation when those who have served their nation in time of war should be abused for expressing their view that they want Australia to remain a Western nation, predominantly British in its institutions and culture. It is superficial to claim that Australia is an Asian country. In terms of geography, it is close to Asia. But a nation does not live only in terms of space but much more important, in terms of time. Australia owes nothing of its character to Asia. The people and their values, their institutions, their language, are predominantly British. A nation which ignores its history has no future.

As one who is proud of his British origins, and as President of the Victorian Branch of the R.S.L., I found it intolerable that a man like Mr. Al Grassby should not only make wild and absurd statements about the R.S.L., but should then demand that I answer his inflammatory letters.

Mr. Geoff McDonald does a valuable service in stressing the relationship between homogeneity and defence. He most effectively rebuts the "racist" smear, showing that it is part of psychological warfare. It is encouraging that at this critical time to have a man of Mr. Geoff McDonald's impeccable background, coming forward to warn his fellow Australians in this book. He has had a long and distinguished career in the Trade Union movement. He demonstrates what I have found both in time of war and time of peace: the great majority of Australia's working men have proved to be some of the loyalest citizens we have. The top traitors who have done so much damage to the West serving the Soviet Union, have in the main been recruited from among the so-called intellectuals, many of them men of great wealth.

It is pleasing to see that Mr. McDonald makes the point that the "White Australia" policy was not inflexible. But it did seek to preserve the basic Western character of the nation. It is the natural right of every society to determine its own character, which means the right to discriminate in favour of itself. Mr. Grassby has even

attempted to support his multicultural campaign by claiming that there was ethnic diversity amongst those who came out in the First Fleet. The truth is that the convicts and their guards were predominantly English, Irish, Scottish and Welsh. They and others who followed merged organically together, developed a national awareness who had no difficulty in describing themselves as "Australian." There was no such thing as an "identity crisis," which we are hearing so much about today.

Based upon his own vast experiences, including his visits to Aboriginal Reserves in the course of his professional union duties, and his lifetime of research, Mr. McDonald has produced a book which is a chilling warning to his fellows. Through it shines the spirit of an Australian patriot. I commend the book to all those who want to help preserve Australia, who want to see our Aboriginal Australians get "a fair go," but who do not want to have them exploited to serve un-Australian movements.

Bruce Ruxton

President, Victorian Branch of the R.S.L.

# The Shape of Things to Come

*The Australian* of February 12, 1982, carried a headling "Freehold Land Rights at Last."

The story by Mr. Peter Ward is highlighted with a photograph of an Aborigine holding aloft a leftist invention, claimed to be the Aboriginal flag of red, black and gold. The Australian flag is no longer to be flown over one tenth of the State of South Australia — or so the leftist movement hopes.

Mr. Ward writes:

"... the Pitjanjatjara ... own one tenth of the State's territory, equivalent to the combined area of Austria and Hungary ... The Act puts South Australia in the vanguard of a movement which is profoundly affecting the issue of who owns Australia ...

"According to Federal Government figures, Aboriginal land in some form now extends over 738,032 sq.km. of the 7,686,584 sq.km. total land area of Australia.

"This vests 9.6 per cent of land in 1.2 per cent of the population, and the national total could rise even further ...

"Fines for illegal entry on the land range from \$200 for people entering unintentionally to \$10,000 and \$1,000 a day for illegal mining operations.

"Following the passage of the legislation in March, 1981, the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Senator Baume, hailed it as 'a milestone in the history of Aboriginal affairs'.

"He said he hoped the initiatives could be used as a model for other States."

"The Premier has said his Government intends to hand over lands in the Maralinga area to people now living at Yalata, west of Ceduna ..."

Here is the shape of revolutionary things to come. As the leftist flag indicates — it will be Red OVER Black.

The Author

# Introduction

Towards the middle of last year, 1981, I delivered an address to a group of defence-minded citizens on Communist strategy behind the movement seeking to establish a separate nation for Aborigines in Australia. The notes for the talk were later duplicated and released in June, 1981, in the form of a "Threat Assessment" Paper. Only 200 were produced, with the request that they be copied and passed to others. I was already aware that many people shared the conclusions of my observations, but I was amazed to find how the original 200 copies had eventually been copied and passed to several thousand people throughout the Commonwealth.

The communications since received indicate widespread concern about trends concerning this and other defence-related issues. I was requested to "hurry up" with the suggested papers on Communist manipulation of "multi-culturalism" and the associated issue of what type of migration is best to maintain a homogeneous and secure Australia, all issues of which are related to defence. This book is the result, which above all is a call for action for the defence of Australia against the psychological warfare being waged against us.

My own original concern has naturally stemmed from what I learned about communist strategy and tactics through a lifetime in the Labor and Trade Union movement, and intensified by the years I spent inside the Communist Party. I do not disagree with the concept of special areas of land being kept for Aborigines. But the issue is not really about land rights, as I learned first during my training with the Communist Party. It was while attending the secret Communist training school at Minto, New South Wales, in 1959, when I was engaged in painting Aboriginal murals on the lecture room walls, that I first heard top Communist leaders like J.B. Miles and Lance Sharkey remark how one day in the future, if the party worked correctly, the first step towards making Australia a Communist country would be the establishment of black republic areas of Australia inhabited by Aborigines. Other Communist leaders like Barnard Taft and the Aaron brothers, Laurie and Eric, also explained the party's strategy on the Aborigines.

As a member of the Communist Party I also learned about the communist opposition to the "White Australia" policy. Even now, although it is only a few short years since this policy was abolished,



people have forgotten that a certain migration from other races was always allowed, despite the general description of the policy as "White Australia," which was supported by all the major political parties. A certain amount of migration and assimilation from other races was considered acceptable to those who studied such matters. Australia's policy was in line with the policy of most countries of the world, including those of Asian nations like Japan.

While other countries are far more "race" conscious than are Australians, the issue is largely one of the need for a society to be homogeneous if it is to be stable. With centuries of experience, mankind has learnt how a society that is not homogeneous will lose the societal bonds which ensure its survival. This has absolutely nothing to do with "racism," at least not in the sense that it is used by the preachers of "multi-culturalism" in Australia and by those who advocate abandoning Australia as a European nation to become predominantly Asian. One of the subjects of this book concerns the right of Australians to freely, openly and democratically discuss the full implications of changes in Government immigration policies and the growing pressures for further change. Most important is the particular role and influence of Communist organisations and the direction in which they would like to take Australia.

Inside the Communist Party we were given special Marxist textbooks, such as Stalin's *On the National Question* to study in combination with various publications by Communist front organisations to espouse the cause of eventually changing Australia from an Anglo-Saxon country into one that would be predominantly Asian.

When I joined the Communist Party in 1948, one of the pamphlets used for study on immigration was *China and the White Australia Policy*, written by G.H. Burchett, who had been a lay preacher in the Methodist Church for many years. Burchett was publicity officer of the party's front organisation, "The Australia-China Co-operation Association." G.H. Burchett's son is the international Communist propagandist Wilfrid Burchett. Another son, Clive Burchett, was together with myself an organiser of the Building Workers' Industrial Union and also secretary of the Communist Party faction within the union.

As naive youngsters in the Communist movement we used to ask why the party advocated abolishing the "White Australia" policy while supporting the right of China and other Asian countries to maintain their homogeneous Asian characteristics. We were told that we "did not understand Marxist theory enough," and

urged to make a closer study of Stalin's textbook *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*. Marxist dialectics permit Communists to advocate a policy of separate development for Australian Aborigines while at the same time condemning a similar policy in South Africa. The policy which at any time will best advance Communist strategy, is correct.

Burchett's pamphlet was published in 1944 and used for several years as a basic party document to attack the "White Australia" policy. Because of Burchett's Church background his pamphlet was used as a medium to influence other Church people and those whom the party described as "liberals."

Mr. Burchett argued that the "White Australia" policy should be abolished because it had irritated a number of Indians when Sir Richard Casey, later to become Governor-General of Australia, had visited Bengal. It would seem reasonable to suggest that India try to solve its own racial problems before worrying about Australia's.

Mr. Burchett's pamphlet admits that a certain number of Chinese had always been allowed into Australia under the "White Australia" policy, and that "Italians, Greeks, Albanians and others are admitted without any educational test whatever, with no obligation to learn the English language." Mr. Burchett wrote that "This has led to group settlements and to a definite lowering of educational standards" (pages 5 and 6).

The essence of the "White Australia" policy was that it permitted a certain amount of migration from other races, provided it did not upset the homogeneity of the nation. Contrary to popular belief, it was one of the most liberal immigration policies in the world. But Mr. Burchett claimed that the policy was "resented by the Chinese."

Mr. Burchett argued about the benefits of race mixing between Chinese and Australians, declaring, "It may indeed be found Mongoloid-White unions give particularly interesting and perhaps a desirable combination." Communists have always advocated race mixing, but they seem to forget that the Chinese, like the Japanese and other Asians, view race mixing with absolute horror. The present Chinese Communist Government has a ban on inter-racial marriage with "foreign devils" and have strict rules concerning racial purity. I refuse to describe the Chinese as "racists"; they are entitled to their self pride or to whatever views they have on race.

The subject of race is of great importance because the charge of "racism" against Australia is a major part of the psychological war

being waged against our nation and has important military implications.

Many young people would be surprised to learn that even 40 years ago the "White Australia" policy argument was not concerned with stopping all non-European immigration, but about the extent of such migration and its effect upon homogeneity. It is the natural right of every nation to preserve employment opportunities and the cohesion of its society. The current "official policy" on multi-culturalism lacks responsibility and if persisted with must result in the same type of friction being experienced in other countries such as the United Kingdom, Canada and the U.S.A..

Mr. Burchett made the significant comment that: "There are no arguments that the advocates of the White Australia policy can advance which can justify us in continuing to sabotage the essential spirit of one-world consciousness." The Australian Labor Party Government of the day, against whom Mr. Burchett's attack was directed, never bothered to offer any arguments against "one world consciousness" because such consciousness never existed. Like the much-publicised "world opinion," it has no reality. Since Mr. Burchett's pamphlet was written, the world has been plagued by war, and national racial consciousness is as strong as ever.

Turning Australia into some kind of a racial melting pot, producing a new species as the eventual result of multi-culturalism, is mere dreaming by wishful idealists and would do nothing to help bring peace to the world. But it would take Australia out of the orbit of a rapidly shrinking Western Civilisation. A majority Asian population in Australia would simply mean the imposition of Asian cultural, political and racial attitudes upon Australian Whites. Unlike the wishful idealists, the Communists do not see multi-culturalism or mass non-European migration as some idealistic dream, but as a prelude to the military takeover of Australia. They view the campaign to establish an independent nation of Aborigines in the same way.

Mr. Burchett was upset by a statement by Labor Prime Minister John Curtin in defending Australia's immigration policy: "Australia was very glad there were not 200,000 Japanese in the country after Pearl Harbour." Mr. Curtin made the point I seek to make in this book; that the immigration and Aboriginal "land rights," questions must be assessed from a defence point of view. The reader should constantly keep this in mind.

The reader who has not thought about these matters before would do well to consider the meaning of the following from an

expensively produced publication called *Identity* (Winter issue 1981). Communist bookshops help with its distribution. A message is given to Aborigines from the "Aboriginal Treaty Committee," a group made up of white people headed by Dr. H.C. Coombs.

"We started work in April, 1979, and from the beginning we told Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders what we were trying to do. But some of you may not have heard of this. *Identity* now gives us the chance to tell our story.

"We decided to work for a Treaty between your people and the Australian Government, which would say for the first time that you have been fighting almost 200 years for your land and that people from other countries took that land from you by force.

"We think that the Treaty should give back to you, forever, important parts of your land in every State (as in the Northern Territory and South Australia), and that it should give to you every year a fixed share of the wealth which all the land of Australia produces. The money would be for you to use, as you decide. No government, Federal or State, would be able to tell you how to spend it.

"Also, you would continue to get all the social service money which is the right of all Australian citizens.

"The Treaty should protect your languages, your laws and your ways of living, your dancing and singing and what you believe. It would respect all this.

"The Treaty should allow you to control your own lives in your own way, on your own land. It should help you to keep your own groups for health and housing and legal service and your own clubs, in other parts of Australia.

"Talking and deciding is not our business. Our job is to make all other Australians, who are not of Aboriginal or Islander descent, tell our politicians that they must listen to you and make that Treaty like you want."

Studying these and similar statements advocating the establishment of a separate Aboriginal nation on the Australian continent, takes my mind back 24 years when I was studying all aspects of Marxism-Leninism at the secret Communist training school at Minto, New South Wales. I do not disagree with the concept of special areas of land being kept for the Aborigines. But the debate taking place today is not really about land rights, as I learned during my training with the Communist Party.

All students at the Minto school were aware of the Party's

activities in building organisations amongst part-Aboriginals from the urban areas of Sydney and Melbourne, but few of us had heard of the complete plans for the future. In discussing it again recently with several people who had attended the same classes, we commented to one another how, at the time, we had put the matter into the back of our minds, never expecting that in 1982 we would be discussing how close our former colleagues had moved towards achieving the results for which they had so long and patiently worked.

During the six years (1970-76) that I served as Industrial Officer to the Royal Australian Nursing Federation, I was able to visit the Aboriginal Reserves on my professional duties, and could see unfolding what I had learned at the Minto training school. As one closely involved in the Labor movement, I have seen at first hand how the Communists work. What is at stake now is the future of Australia. The two issues of Aboriginal "land rights" and immigration cannot be divorced from the subject of the defence of Australia. That is what this book is primarily about.

An open indication of the developing programme was provided in March, 1974, when Canberra witnessed the establishment of an "Aboriginal Embassy" on the parliamentary lawns. There were demonstrations, one demonstrator being arrested for having a pistol. The Communist *Tribune* hailed the demonstrations, declaring that "The incident points to the fact that the time has come when blacks will be content with promises, promises, is over. The only way that any real change can begin to occur is by giving blacks control of their own affairs at all levels . . ."

In June, 1974, the National Committee of the Communist Party met in Sydney and updated its on-going programme on Aboriginal affairs. *Tribune* spelt out the programme clearly: "The demands of the Black Moratorium are simple and explicit: land rights now, and full compensation for all land seized since 1770. Black control of black communities . . . Communists believe as do many black militants that these goals will only be achieved through a revolutionary transformation of Australian society . . ."



## CHAPTER ONE

### DISTORTION ABOUT WHAT THE WHITE AUSTRALIA POLICY REALLY MEANT

There is a widespread and extremely dangerous view that because Marxists in Australia are divided into three groups, and because the membership of Communist Parties has declined since the end of the Second World War, there is no real Communist threat to Australia, except perhaps through a few unions. Those attempting to raise the Communist question are subjected to the smear technique. They are "red baiters" and are "seeing Communists under the bed." As a former Communist I understand how the technique is used.

The truth is that Marxist influence in Australia has never been greater and, unfortunately it is growing. Enormous Marxist influence, both direct and indirect, is exercised through the media, as can be demonstrated by studying how the media generally treats the "land rights" issue. The media publicises the statements and activities of radical activists in a way to suggest they are representing the Aboriginal people, which they don't.

A classic example of the pro-Communist bias of the media is provided in the case of Miss Pat O'Shane.

Miss Pat O'Shane, head of the newly created New South Wales Department of Aboriginal Affairs, has been widely publicised as Australia's first Aborigine to become a barrister. A typical media presentation of Miss O'Shane appeared in *Women's Day* of January 27, 1982. Now *Women's Day* is not a Communist journal, but in an article entitled "Fighting for her people," Debbie Coffey presents a eulogy of Miss O'Shane without the slightest hint of her real background. She leads off by telling her readers that Miss O'Shane's New South Wales appointment "means she can fulfil her lifetime ambition — to re-establish the rights of her people" it is

intellectually dishonest to represent part-Aboriginal radical activists from urban areas as representatives of the Aboriginal people of the Northern Territory and elsewhere. They are no more representative of the Aboriginal people than are white Communists representative of the white Australian community.

Miss O'Shane is the former wife of the Northern Queensland part-Aboriginal activist, Mr. "Mick" Miller, and has a long record of involvement in pro-Communist activities. She has been involved with the Soviet Front Organisation, The Congress for International Co-operation and Disarmament and was prominent in activities against visiting American nuclear warships. She was a delegate to the Nuclear Free Pacific Conference in May, 1960. The December, 1980, edition of *Outlook*, the radical Christian journal, reveals that Miss O'Shane has been a member of the Church's Task Force on Aboriginal Land Rights.

In 1977, Miss O'Shane's booklet, *Law in Disorder Politics, the Police and Civil Liberties*, was published by the Queensland State Committee of the Australian Communist Party. In 1980 she attended the Labor and Communist Movement Conference. She has written for the Communist *Tribune*.

*Tribune* reports that on October 5, 1981, a delegation had met the Hon. Frank Walker of the Wran New South Wales Government, and nominated Miss O'Shane to become head of the new Department of Aboriginal Affairs. Miss O'Shane was subsequently appointed at \$48,000 a year. This is another example of Australian taxpayers financing Marxists in Government positions to advance Marxist programmes.

As one who has developed a deep affection for the Aboriginal people, I have been particularly shocked to note how part-Aboriginal radical activists with little or no expertise in health matters are being appointed to Government health organisations. Australian taxpayers are now financing an army of radical activists working to advance a revolutionary programme. The old concept of Communists organising to seize control of a nation's key institutions in a crisis, has been by-passed since the Italian Communist Gramsci, following the advice of Lenin about capturing the minds of the student intellectuals, advanced the strategy of peaceful penetration of these institutions by Marxists recruited at Universities. It is similar to the Fabian Marxists policy of "Sovietisation by Stealth." Large numbers of those Marxists who have penetrated our institutions are not members of any Communist Party. Communists are involved in conspiratorial activities,

as witnessed by the fact that well known traitors like Kim Philby and others were never formal members of a Communist Party.

The divisions amongst Australian Communists are more apparent than real, as witnessed by the manner in which they unite at ACTU Conferences and State Trades and Labor Councils to further Communist objectives, and to seek the defeat of policies put forward by non-Communist union officials like myself. There is complete unity amongst all Communists on the Aboriginal land issue. They all understand the far-reaching implications of the campaign on this issue.

Trained Marxists not only understand organisation, but how to use the media.

Fictitious organisations with names but no members permits a spokesman to readily reach the press, radio and television. The left-wing influence in much of the media ensures that, for example, the statements by Mr. "Mick" Miller, claiming to represent Aborigines through the North Queensland Land Council receives maximum publicity while the views of genuine spokesmen for the Aborigines receive little or no publicity at all. Mr. Miller represents only himself and a small number of radical activists. It is significant that he has been financed by the World Council of Churches, whose financing of terrorist activities in Africa has led to growing numbers of Christians refusing to contribute financially to the WCC.

The biased role of the general media was demonstrated once again following the decision by the Queensland Government early this, 1982, to transfer title of Reserve lands to elected local Councils of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait people. The Communist press was naturally highly critical, featuring statements by radical activists and left-wing Christian clergy. But the same people were also featured in the general media. In the Communist Party we learned about creating and using what are known as "transmission belts." Non-Communists are used to carry Communist propaganda. One had to read some of the Queensland provincial papers and rural journals like *Queensland Country Life* to discover that genuine spokesmen for the Queensland Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders had endorsed the Queensland Government's new legislation.

Repudiating critics like Senator Neville Bonner, described as being "way out of touch," Mr. Les Stewart, Chairman of the Aboriginal Advisory Council, criticised Prime Minister Fraser for not visiting the Aboriginal reserves instead of meeting in Britain those

Aboriginals opposing the Queensland Government's legislation. Mr. Stewart said that "They don't even do a good job in Brisbane so how can they speak for Aborigines and Islanders throughout the State."

Mr. Stewart described the Queensland legislation as "one of the best offers we have ever been made. It's better than total freehold or perpetual leases. We had solicitors look at all of these and we were against freehold because it could be possible for a 'crook' Reserve Council to sell all the land instead of allocating it to the people." Mr. Stewart is Chairman of an elected Advisory Council.

Mr. Stewart's support for the Queensland legislation has been endorsed by both the Chairman of the Torres Strait Island Advisory Council, Mr. J. Nona, and the Chairman of the Woorabinda Council, Mr. Hedly Twaddle. A spokesman for the Woorabinda Council said that "We have discussed the idea with our people and can say with certainty that the offer of tenure is a great relief to us. There is no uncertainty now. The land is secured for us and future generations for as long as it is needed."

As these statements were made by Aboriginal organisations covering reserves in the Torres Strait, Central and Southern Queensland, they represent the feelings of those Aboriginals living on reserves. But urbanised radicals, who do not represent Aboriginals living on the reserves, are being used by the Communists to oppose any policy which will oppose long-term Communist strategy. The media generally publicises statements by these radicals while suppressing the views of genuine Aboriginal spokesmen.

Not surprisingly, the Communist-inspired opposition to the Queensland legislation was soon backed up by the Aboriginal Treaty Committee. Dr. Coombs and his colleagues opened a major propaganda attack with a half-page advertisement in *The Weekend Australian*, March 27-28, 1982. Falsely claiming to speak for the Aborigines, the advertisement claimed that "Existing provisions of the Land Act for such reserves under deeds of trust are wholly unsatisfactory to Aborigines..." The advertisement calls for donations to support "Aborigines and Islanders in Queensland," who "are organising peaceful cultural demonstrations to argue their case against this oppressive proposal." The advertisement also urged that protests be sent to the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

In a statement following the attack upon the Queensland

Government, Dr. Coombs said that unless Australians agreed to the Treaty his organisation proposed, Australia would be regarded internationally like South Africa, a type of leper. This approach by Dr. Coombs, a Socialist product of the London School of Economics, highly regarded by the famous Marxist theoretician, Dr. Harold Laski, reminds me of Stalin's application of dialectics to support nationalism in order that it might eventually be abolished by internationalism.

Dr. Coombs is saying that unless Australia adopts a policy of separate development ("apartheid") towards the Aborigines, Australia will be linked with South Africa, attacked because it encourages separate development. Those who find this contradictory do not understand Communist dialectics.

Stalin summarised the Marxist dialectical approach when, after posing the question of whether these were revolutionary possibilities in "national liberation" movements amongst "oppressed" colonial people which could be used to overthrow "imperialism," commented, "The national movement of oppressed countries must not be evaluated from the viewpoint of formal democracy, but from the viewpoint of real results in the general balance of the struggle against imperialism." (*Marxist and the National and Colonial Question*).

Communists describe the Aborigines as victims of "colonial imperialism," and claim that they must be "liberated." But only to enable the eventual establishment of Communist internationalism to triumph. And so, as I learnt as a Communist, Communist dialectics permits Communists to promote separate Negro States in Southern U.S.A., a similar policy for Australian Aborigines, while at the same time opposing it in South Africa.



## CHAPTER TWO

### FAKE ABORIGINAL ORGANISATIONS

A complete survey of the Marxist influence behind the Aboriginal "land rights" campaign, with the detailed documentation necessary, would require a large work. But I do not propose to quote tediously from Communist journals and books, but to demonstrate that the unfolding Communist strategy on the real objective of the "land rights" campaign can be assessed by carefully analysing what has appeared in the press. The evidence, when brought together, provides a disturbing picture, but one which relatively few people see because they lack the type of background experience which I and others have had. Because the picture is so clear to me, I feel an urgent desire to draw it to the attention of my fellow Australians.

In recent times, the long-term Communist strategy against Australia has moved more into the open. Increasing international pressure is to be applied in an attempt to force Communist-type "land rights" for the Aborigines. In April and May, 1981, the Soviet-manipulated World Council of Indigenous Peoples' Conference was held in Canberra, and backed a resolution from what is titled "The National Aboriginal Conference," calling for economic and political sanctions against Australia on the fabricated charge that Australia denies "the freedom and rights of the indigenous people." The World Council of Indigenous Affairs quotes as the basis for its expanding programme, "principles" proclaimed by the Charter of the United Nations, and its declared objectives are identical to those put forward by Communists over a long period. The Canberra, 1981, conference was its third General Assembly, at which it agreed in principle to develop an "International Law on Indigenous Rights." It calls for the right of indigenous people "To associate their territory and institutions with

one or more states in a manner involving free association, regional autonomy, home rule or associate statehood as self-governing units.'

It was highly significant that the World Council of Indigenous Peoples' Conference should be held in Australia at a time when the Aboriginal "land rights" campaign was being greatly intensified. The Conference provided support for the campaign launched in April, 1979, when the Second National Conference of the "National Aboriginal Conference" passed a resolution demanding a "Treaty" between the Aboriginals and the Commonwealth Government. Immediately following this, as if awaiting a signal, 'The Aboriginal Treaty Committee' emerged, chaired by D.H.C. Coombs, and proclaimed intention of mobilising public opinion amongst whites. Not one member of the Coombs committee is an Aboriginal or a Torres Strait Islander. Some of those listed as supporters of the Treaty Committee are highly respected Australians, but they are allowing their idealism to be exploited. The great majority of them are certainly not Communists — in fact some genuinely believe they are anti-Communists. However, the history of this century has demonstrated time and time again how Communists have been successful in adopting Lenin's famous teaching of exploiting those whom he described as "useful idiots." During my own days in the Communist movement I learned how relatively easy it is for Communists to exploit the idealism and misguided views of non-Communists. Many politicians are, unfortunately, just as easy to mislead as others. The steady global Communist advance over the past sixty years has been achieved primarily by Communists exploiting gullible and mis-informed people. Castro did not come to power in Cuba proclaiming himself a Marxist-Leninist. He promoted himself as an "agrarian reformer." The media in the U.S.A. also presented him in this way, as did officials of the American State Department.

Following support at the World Council of Indigenous Peoples' Conference in Canberra, spokesmen for "The Aboriginal National Conference" announced their intention to continue its attack upon Australia at the United Nations. On September 10, 1981, wide coverage was given in the Australian and overseas press to a statement by the Chairman of the Aboriginal National Conference, Mr. Jim Hagen, after a Geneva conference. *The Age*, Melbourne, of that date reported:

"Mr. Hagen returned from Geneva confident of the support gained from U.N. members. He said he was delighted

with the response from the U.N. and the media and would recommend that the conference establish continuing communications with the United Nations . . . He also said that the conference would consider appealing to the U.N. in any future deadlocks over the land rights issue."

*The Age* also reported that Communist Vietnam was keen "to become involved in the land rights issue in Australia . . . Aborigines have found they can count on international friends and supporters for assistance in their struggle."

The "land rights" campaign prior to the Brisbane Commonwealth Games is designed to create a situation in which increasing Communist pressure can be brought to bear upon Australia through the United Nations. Like all Communists, I was taught in the early days of the United Nations how this international organisation would be used to advance International Socialism. Stalin let it be known that he warmly welcomed the establishment of the U.N. and affiliated international organisations like the United Nations Educational and Cultural Organisation. At one Minto Communist training school we had special lessons on the significance of the United Nations from the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint. One brochure we studied was by Dr. Burton of the External Affairs Department at Canberra, at that time the late Dr. H.V. Evatt being the Minister.

The U.N. today must be regarded as the most successful international Communist "front" organisation ever established. And events have confirmed the early Communist view that the Western powers could be relied upon to provide most of the finance for this organisation. It has been another example of the West demonstrating the truth of the Lenin dictum that it would provide the rope for its own hanging.

Graphic endorsement of this assessment of the U.N. has been provided by former top U.N. officials from the Soviet Union, Mr. Arkady Shevchenko, who defected to the West early in 1978. The one-time Under Secretary-General of the U.N. described it as "the tallest observation tower in the world for the intelligence activities of the Soviet Union" (*Weekend Australian*, September 29-30, 1979).

Easy-going Australians who find it hard to believe that violence and bloodshed are planned to advance the Communists' "land rights" strategy, should consider the implications of statements by radical activists like Mr. Charles Perkins, of the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs, Mr. "Mick"

Miller, and Mr. Gary Foley.

*The Sunday Sun* of February 21, 1982, reported Mr. Charles Perkins as having discussed demonstrations being organised for the Brisbane Commonwealth Games:

"His (Mr. Perkins') announcement that an Aboriginal demonstration demanding land rights at the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane could make the battle of Wounded Knee look like a Sunday School picnic has catapulted him back into the headlines, making him the focal point of a protest that is shaping up to be the biggest and bloodiest Australia has seen."

The fact that a senior Commonwealth public servant, paid by the Australian taxpayers, can openly warn about violence and bloodshed if a major Communist objective, "land rights" for Aborigines, is not agreed to by the Queensland Government, without being severely reprimanded, if not removed from his position, by the Prime Minister, is a sad commentary on the seriousness of our plight. Press reports said that Mr. Perkins was merely told not to make any more statements.

The history of the Communist concentration on how to exploit indigenous peoples can be traced back to that master Marxist strategist Lenin. One of the first Communist documents to be produced on the subject, one still used for discussion amongst Marxists, was the thesis issued at the Fourth Comintern Conference in 1922. The Comintern was the world Communist international organisation to which all Communist Parties gave their allegiance.

The Fourth Comintern Congress declared it "the special duty of Communists to apply the Thesis on the Colonial Question to the Negro problem also and to support every form of Negro movement which undermines or weakens capitalism or hampers its further penetration."

During my visits to Aboriginal Reserves in the course of my professional duties on behalf of the Royal Australian Nursing Federation, I saw evidence of what would be the shape of things to come. Known Marxists were at work. I saw for myself how easily law and order could break down. The theories I had studied as a Communist were being applied. Apart from a number of part-Aboriginal activists, the great majority of those seeking to exploit the Aborigines are white.

Responding to the attacks on his Government by "land rights" activists, the former Premier of Western Australia, Sir Charles Court, issued a powerful statement on September 5, 1980, in which he said that evidence was mounting that Aboriginal groups were

being manipulated by Europeans. Sir Charles said:

"When the Chairman of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, Mr. Ken Colbung, appealed for the lifting of the ban on drilling at Noonkanbah he expressed serious concern about the manipulation of the Aboriginal people there and elsewhere in the Kimberley. His concern was based on information that had come to him over a period of months and which he investigated carefully in the Kimberley before his decision. The same concern was expressed by other members of the Lands Trust at meetings in Perth and Broome.

"It is a matter of record that European activists vilified Mr. Colbung for his courageous stand and tried to discredit him. Now, the Western Australian Chairman of the Aboriginal Conference, the Rev. Cedric Jacobs, has expressed the same concern. He has called for re-examination of the role of white advisers to Aboriginal communities and said he was 'looking at people who are out to make political or financial mileage through these positions'...

"The same view was expressed by Bishop John Jobst, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Broome who has spent 20 years working among the Aborigines in the Kimberley. In a television interview, Bishop Jobst said that white advisers with political motives were distorting the picture at Noonkanbah and misleading the Aboriginal people. He said he was saddened to see the Aborigine used as a political pawn."

Sir Charles Court then turned his attention to the activities of another activist, Mr. Gary Foley, a director of the Victorian Aboriginal Health Services. The various Services established to help the Aboriginal people are swarming with activists like Mr. Gary Foley. Australian taxpayers are subsidising a Marxist-oriented revolution.

Drawing attention to the fact that the propaganda machine exploiting the Aborigines was working both inside and outside Australia, Sir Charles referred to the public admission by Mr. Foley that he had been involved in establishing an international network in Europe, with a permanent office in London. It would be extended soon to the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. Mr. Foley said that the network was funded by overseas sources, but would not name the sources.

The widespread international activities of Mr. Foley and his associates raises the serious question of who is funding the large sums of money required to finance such activities. There is little



doubt that although a large part of it is provided by the Soviet Union, there is considerable evidence, including statements by Mr. Foley and his associates, that some of it is "laundered" through Cuba and Marxist-dominated African States.

Those who, like myself, reached any type of responsible position in the Communist movement, are well aware that although hard to prove, direct and indirect Soviet financial support is provided for Communist or Communist-promoted activities in Australia. I recall another former Communist friend telling me about how he was worried about the large sum of notes buried in his backyard in plastic bags. Both the Victorian Royal Commission into Communism, and the Royal Commission on Espionage, following the defection of the Soviet diplomat, Vladimir Petrov in 1954, found it most difficult to obtain information about the clandestine financial affairs of the Australian Communist movement, although the Petrov Commission Report did find that in 1953, Mr. Lance Sharkey, at that time Secretary-General of the Australian Communist Party, had been given £25,000 by the Soviet through the Soviet Embassy in Canberra. That was the equivalent of at least \$100,000 today.

Hard evidence of the Soviet's financing of revolutionaries creating and exploiting race frictions was provided early in August, 1981, when a Soviet diplomat, Victor Lazine, was expelled by the British Government for acting as a KGB paymaster to agitators organising and exploiting riots in British cities. *The Australian* of August 7, 1981, quoted the *London Daily Express* as saying that evidence compiled by the British Secret Service showed that Lazine regularly flew to Paris where he picked up large sums of money from a man named Kravchencko. It was Kravchencko's job to travel from Moscow to Paris and then distribute the funds to Soviet agents from Western European capitals, including London.

Mr. Gary Foley predicted two years ago that within five years, as the result of the international network he was setting up, some third world nations would impose sanctions — economic, diplomatic or political — on Australia. Mr. Foley also made the sinister comment that the network's activities were based on "the propaganda tactics of Southern African and Palestinian Liberation groups." *The Bulletin*, Sydney, of July 21, 1981, reported:

"The Church of the Friendly People in Devonshire Street, Sydney, was the location for Australia's first National Liberation Conference. It brought together local supporters of the IRA, the PLO and the anti-South African Pan African Con-

gress with representatives of Aboriginal Land Rights Organisation . . . the conference . . . passed resolutions calling on all Commonwealth Governments to assist Aboriginal Lands Rights claims..."

All this should be clear enough for even the most complacent Australian. Australia is facing the most insidious threat in its history.

### CHAPTER THREE

## **RADICALS ADMIT THEY WANT AN INDEPENDENT BLACK NATION — AUSTRALIA DOES NOT BELONG TO THE WHITES**

Even as I write, the movement establishing an independent black nation is being presented more openly in the press. Some journalists are aware of the revolutionary nature of the Aboriginal land rights movement, as reflected in an article, February 6, 1982, of *The Australian* by well-known South Australian writer Max Harris:

"... since the supposedly Aboriginal tribal disputes with Alcoa and other mining groups are for the most part not authentic Aboriginal issues. Aboriginals are being manipulated by white and part-Aboriginal anti-capitalist revolutionary activists.

"There has been a takeover which excludes moderate elements . . .

"I know when the revolutionary manipulators are using supposedly Aboriginal causes to strike against the mixed economy free enterprise system.

"I don't buy the sacred site campaigns because I know more about the workings of animist systems around the world than the radical activists, or de-tribalised urban Aboriginals for that matter. Sacred or diabolist inhabitation of objects can occur with anything or everything depending on event, time, or place. Genuine animist spirit inhabitation is a moveable feast and a recognisable system. De-tribalised Aboriginals are conned into believing that they believe in the particular objects of inhabitation which may have had ritual significance in ancestral times. But not any more."

Some Aborigines have accepted the concept of a Treaty with

the Commonwealth but have not yet been involved in pushing for the ultimate Marxist objective. The Marxists' confidence in establishing an independent nation, allegedly for the Aborigines, is now talked about in left-wing circles "with chalk in hand," a phrase Machiavelli borrowed from the Borgia Pope Alexander VI to describe how easy it was for Charles VIII of France to move into an unprepared Italy. All Charles had to do was to send in his quartermaster with chalk to mark up the billets for those who were able to lay claim to certain parts of Italy.

A conference of the Federation of Aboriginal Land Councils in Alice Springs on November 27, 1981, gave a full airing of the Marxist objective of a sovereign Aboriginal nation. No-one had heard of the Federation of Aboriginal Land Councils until the Alice Springs meeting. It was a self-appointed organisation falsely claiming to represent the Aborigines. The radical activist of the North Queensland Land Council, Mr. "Mick" Miller and the controversial Father Pat Dobson were reported to be the organisers.

Father Pat Dobson, a part-Aborigine, has been in conflict with Bishop O'Loughlin of Darwin for supporting Aboriginal religion. Father Dobson made the revealing statement that the Federation of Aboriginal Land Councils would try "to show the world Noonkanbah is not just an isolated event, that it is part of an on-going system of oppression and exploitation of Aboriginal people in Australia."

On the day following the Alice Springs meeting, the Melbourne Age reported:

"An organiser of the federation meeting, Father Pat Dobson, said there would be no agreement until the Federal Government comes to terms with the fact that we are a sovereign nation."

The Federal Australian law makers seem oblivious to the significance of the "Land Rights" threat and have made one concession after another. Supported by the Labor Opposition they are accepting a doctrine of revolution by instalments. With left-wing control of most activist city-based Aboriginal organisations, the target has been persistently pursued for a stated objective. The situation is moving inexorably towards the cataclysmic climax time when the United Nations will be manipulated to declare the "Land Rights" areas as a separate black nation. These objectives were signalled on the day the black power tent "embassy" was established 10 years ago outside Parliament House, Canberra, when Sir

William McMahon was Prime Minister. The Oxford Dictionary describes an embassy as an "ambassador's function," which means to represent a foreign power.

Father Pat Dobson has candidly explained the ultimate objective, which is not just the establishment of an independent black nation in Australia but also the eventual taking of the whole of Australia from the white man. "This nation belongs to the Aboriginal people, and it has never been handed over or ceded," said Father Dobson. At best the white man is to be given a position something like the Anu in Japan.

The objective of independent nationhood for the Aborigines is not designed for the welfare of the Aboriginal people, whose best future depends upon the development of this continent by all Australians, and not by one inward looking ethnic group. Without a doubt, an independent Aboriginal nation by itself would recede into poverty and backwardness.

A major step towards the ultimate Communist objective was taken by the Don Dunstan government in South Australia, with 10 per cent of the State given to a handful of Aborigines. The white man now has to obtain a "visa" to enter. If the public is not awakened to the emerging dangers, we may well have to write a report recording the words of our illustrious Prime Minister Fraser, somewhat along the lines of Custer's famous observation, "The Indians are getting restless today." This was said just before Custer's last stand. The Aborigines are not in the same position as the Indians who wiped out Custer's cavalry because Australia's full-blood Aborigines do not support the idea of an independent nation, nor do they have sufficient numbers to engage in an uprising and they are not offensively armed. Nothing could be achieved without outside military intervention. The real threat is a white man's Marxist-type revolutionary conspiracy. Those who would take some action to defend Australia's interests must first be educated to the nature of that threat.

The concept of a separate "nation" means exactly what it implies, the right to invite in foreign troops such as Robert Mugabe has done in Zimbabwe with his small army of highly trained troops from Communist North Korea. The proposed Aboriginal nation could claim the right to seek aid from the United Nations, Vietnam or anywhere else as well as grant mineral rights to the Soviet Union. If Australia's enemies were successful with their strategy, the world would soon see finish to sacred sites and goannas being used as an excuse to hold up industrial development on Aboriginal

estates. The Aborigines would not be receiving the benefit of "fraternal aid."

This is looking at a picture on a larger scale, but if Australian's fail to see the forest because of the trees, then we can hardly complain if we are hit for six!

Prominent amongst those supporting a treaty with the Aborigines is Mr. Alan Renouf, an A.L.P. activist from our Corps Diplomatique, which has become worse than useless. In a letter to *The National Times* of December 1, 1979, Mr. Renouf supported the claim for a treaty with the Aborigines and narrated his opinions as carefully as anyone from Foreign Affairs, supporting the objective to show that it was not the end of the matter. His letter declared that "a treaty of peace and friendship which if negotiated, should materially help them to move forward."

In their debates concerning how best to move their strategy forward, it has been decided by the Marxists that the idea of a "treaty" had a more temporary connotation and would be, in itself, almost a concession giving the Aborigines the status of a separate nation, whereas the idea of an "agreement" between the Federal Government and the Aborigines had a note of finality about it, almost as though the struggle had ended — the last thing they want!

Renouf, who is untiring in telling Australians they have no need to fear the Soviet Union, argued in his *National Times* letter that "The alternative title, 'agreement', which is now being sponsored in some quarters, is not in my view satisfactory." Assuming that some "agreement" is necessary, which it isn't, it would certainly have more friendly overtones than a "treaty." A "treaty" is between separate nations and the word itself helps promote the idea of separatism. Renouf tells Australians that a treaty would help Australia's image in other countries, which is contrary to political sense. Here we have a former diplomat who was, in his position as a senior member of the Foreign Affairs Department, supposed to represent Australia in a favourable light before the world, now having to concede that "the Aborigines have over the past 12 years or so made considerable progress." Refusing to concede that white Australians have shown any humanity towards the Aborigines, he says that any gains for Aborigines have been arrived at "largely because of their own efforts."

In their hope that Government "liberals" can satisfy the demands of the Marxist revolutionaries steering the course of the "Land Rights" movement, the Federal Government has fallen for

the trap of conceding negotiations for some type of agreement which has never been attainable, but only provides a platform for those who seek a "treaty" and a completely separate nation.

*The Age* report of November 28, 1981, on the Alice Springs meeting of the "Federation of Aboriginal Land Councils" revealed that:

"Federal Government initiatives for a 'makarrata', or peace agreement with Aborigines were rejected yesterday as a 'confidence trick' by Aboriginal land councils.

"After a week-long meeting in Alice Springs the Federation of Aboriginal Land Councils criticised the Government's Aboriginal advisory body, the National Aboriginal Conference.

"The Federation, in a statement issued after the meeting, said the NAC had no 'authority or mandate (from) the Aboriginal people to negotiate (a) makarratta'.

"The move is a big setback for the Federal Government, which had been urging the NAC for more than two years to orchestrate an agreement between Aborigines and white Australians."

If the Federal Government is successful in negotiating such an agreement it will still be a defeat for Australia. The Communists have only considered the difference between an agreement and a treaty as a tactical question; the object of a separate nation is the same.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### SINGLING OUT THE ANGLO-SAXONS FOR ATTACK

In recent years a carefully co-ordinated campaign, national and international, has been developed, maligning Australia as a country ruled by the "racist Anglo-Saxon majority." Labor's flashy extrovert Mr. Al Grassby and his department, totally financed by the Federal Government, has played a major role in this campaign of denigration.

A special report on "racism" in the *Newsweek International* of February 13, 1976, which quoted Mr. Grassby's Community Relations office as its source, said:

"The immigrant women — who make up 60 per cent of all women working in Australian industry — are usually paid on a piecework basis, barely earning the minimum wage, in many shops they are ordered about by whistles, timed in the toilet and are known to their Anglo-Saxon foremen only by numbers . . . the migrant women are the most victimised."

Leaving aside that 60% of the female working population are not immigrants, it is an absurd untruth to say that they mainly work on piecework, or hardly receive the minimum wage. Only a small number of women work on piecework, and if they do, as with all pieceworkers, they receive more than the minimum award or determination rate. Migrant workers are engaged under the same awards, wages, and agreements and conditions of employment as native born Australians and usually work at the same trade or occupation they had pursued in their country of origin. We also have equal pay in Australia. The newer Australians belong to the same unions as all older Australians. Union officials look after their interests the same as they do the rest of their members. The article was a slander against the union movement and the whole industrial



relations system including the wage fixing tribunals and the governments. It was a smear on the entire citizenry and directed against Mr. Grassby's favourite target — the "Anglo-Saxon" majority of the Australian people. It was also an insult to the migrant women of the community who, as union officials and employers know, would never tolerate being ordered about by numbers or whistles.

I am at present an official in a union where there is a big percentage of migrant women working in factories. They tell us very quickly what they want, and any foreman who tried to behave like the media and Mr. Grassby suggests would soon get short shift. Grassby's media friends see the migrant community as "factory fodder." I have spent the last two years of my union work with production workers, a big percentage being migrants, both men and women. They are active as unionists, and stand up for their rights just as the other Australians do. What is more, they like Australia, and get on well with other Australians.

But when migrants have complained about the only torment they have suffered in this country is from foreign intelligence services, it is met by a deafening silence by the left publicists and the inquisitors of Grassby's Department. Bishop Constantine of the Russian Orthodox Church in Queensland protested over the Russian agents "intimidating and terrifying" immigrants from the Soviet now living in Australia. Bishop Constantine had been the Vicar Bishop for Australia and New Zealand for nine years. He was speaking at a press conference before leaving for New York. The Bishop described how the Federal Government was doing nothing concerning "blatant KGB activity in Australia . . . Why does the Government show alarm over vague charges of past CIA interference and yet do nothing about blatant KGB activity in Australia . . . Many members of the Russian community in this country have been intimidated and terrified by KGB operatives." (Melbourne Age April 1, 1977)

In railing against Australia, the *Newsweek* report declared that the Aborigines are also under the heel of the Anglo-Saxon and are the "most oppressed group in Australia" and "European migrants have undergone what could be called a generation of neglect . . . the Aborigines lot remains black today . . . Living mostly in urban slums or tin and tar humpies in the Outback, they suffer from malnutrition, and a host of diseases."

Left spokesmen and women have joined their voices against this country with a particularly malicious link up with anything their tongues can twist about Aborigines.

Ms. Claudia Wright, in a huge splash in the *Sunday Press* of July 22, 1977, and titled "The Queen of Melbourne Radio," gives an exclusive interview against Australians because of their "racism" from her new residence in the U.S.A., where she has been turning her pen with equal venom against the white people of the United States.

"Australia doesn't want intelligent people . . . just the safe, tongueless mediocre . . ."

Well Ms. Wright, if you don't like Australia, then don't come back!

The entire campaign about Aborigines is allegedly to preserve their culture and way of life, and to avoid their being assimilated into the Australian community. The Aborigines are to be given land under an "apartheid" system away from white areas and industrialisation and to prevent mining or any kind of industrial development; and then to blame the whites because there are not enough jobs for the Aborigines.

"Bias Blamed Over Black Jobless" heads an article by Tonie Blackie of the *Melbourne Age* of June 20, 1978:

"Unemployment among Aborigines is now six times the national average . . . and discrimination is said to be the major cause.

"Figures released by the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations yesterday show that more than 33 per cent of Aborigines are unemployed. This means Aborigines have the highest unemployment rate in Australia . . . Discrimination by employers was a major reason for the high unemployment rate a departmental spokesman said yesterday."

Union officials from all over Australia, along with employers, can confirm that irrespective of any differences, they are united in a willingness to do everything practical to find jobs for Aborigines. White Australians generally have every desire to see Aborigines bettering themselves.

Along with other opponents of the apartheid system I do not disagree with land tenure for Aborigines where it might prove beneficial, and unionists most certainly agree with their right to jobs along with all Australians. The Aborigines cannot find employment in the "land rights" areas because every excuse is used by non-Aboriginal political manipulators to declare possible areas of development and the provision of jobs as being "sacred sites," which they are invariably not.

At the same time we are hit with such imitations of American

anti-white films. The carefully prepared anti-white film "The Chant of Jimmie Blacksmith," is designed to build up hatred of the whites and encourage Aborigines to violence. Films like this are shown to Aborigines all over Australia and have been exported overseas to besmirch the good name of this country.

"THUNK' goes the axe into the white lady's neck, as oppressed, down-trodden and cheated half-caste Jimmie Blacksmith starts on his trail of revenge.

"This is followed by 'chonk' — white kid's skull; 'thud' — white teacher's breast and all manner of onomatopoeic mayhem as the sound-effects man does his thing.

"Thick, red dye — as originally designed by Sam Peckinpah and Arthur Penn — splatters the lonely homestead's kitchen, staining the crisp linen and the half-prepared meal.

"'Bang' goes the rifle, and the white station boss's back is torn open by an exit-wound some six inches in diameter. Peckinpah, filmdom's high priest of violence, admitted to using the chunky variety of peanut paste, with cochineal, for this particular effect."

So writes Bruce Wilson in the *Melbourne Sun* of June 21, 1978.

Mr. Wilson commented that "high school students, many of whom throughout Australia are studying Thomas Keneally's original novel as part of their curriculum are a vast market at stake . . ."

"Hoyts and Mr. Schepisi himself appealed to the Films Board of Review, a body chaired by former diplomat Mr. Dudley McCarthy and with Caroline Jones, of Four Corners' fame, academics Dr. Margaret Middleton and Mr. Gordon Hammer, and Mr. David Ditchburn (Junie Morosi's husband) as members.

"After consideration, this board of review changed the status of 'Jimmie' from 'R' to 'M' — thus ensuring its box-office takings would be vastly higher than if the original 'R' tag had stuck.

"Two Government-backed film-makers helped finance 'Jimmie' — the Australian Film Corporation and the Victorian Film Commission.

"Mr. Schepisi said yesterday they played no part in activating the appeal. However, industry sources said that having this kind of Government backing could not have harmed the case put in the appeal.

"These same sources said that usually a film had to make

about four times its cost to reach a break-even point. The more or less captive audience of high-school students, for many of whom the film will save reading the book, will help push 'Jimmie' towards the \$5 million or so it needs to take.'

Government financing of these types of left-wing propaganda films with their anti-white bias, continue apace with millions of dollars of the taxpayers money going into their production. They have been widely used in the United States and other countries as part of what is a psychological war against Australia.

One of the most forthright spokesmen on Australia's behalf has been Premier Joe Bjelke-Petersen of Queensland, who sets an example of how politicians should carry out their responsibilities. The Melbourne *Sun* report of February 20, 1978, quotes the Queensland Premier:

"White Australians would become second-class citizens if mineral rights were not removed from Aboriginal land legislation, the Queensland Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen said the legislation, which gives mineral and land rights to Aborigines, was pure 'Alice in Wonderland' and had been drawn up on a misunderstanding."

Bjelke-Petersen cut quickly to the heart of the problem and highlighted the strategic objective of those manipulating the land rights issue:

"Aboriginal control of a vital resource like uranium could lead eventually to an independent black state in the Northern Territory."

The Premier's reference to the possibility of "an independent black state in the Northern Territory" shows that at least one Australian political leader understands the real meaning of the "land rights" campaign. The media reported the Premier as illustrating how "mineral rights had been included in the legislation because they were contained in the Woodward Commission's terms of reference as a fait accompli . . .

"A small group, prey to militant and do-gooder advisors, could hold not only mining companies to ransom, but also the entire nation on a vital resource . . .

"They could use uranium and land control to demand an independent state — and China or Russia would be eager to step in and help," he said.

"It was denial of basic democratic rights that any group could exclude other people from going anywhere in Australia.

"What would be the reaction if a Government banned

Aboriginals from entering the cities?" he asked.

"There would be cries of apartheid. Yet we now have apartheid in reverse with demands for separate land, separate development or self-management."

Because of the persistent stand taken by the Queensland Government for equality for all Australians, and in opposition to the type of "apartheid" system advocated by the left, and being pushed by the Federal Government, they have been increasingly labelled as "racist." The childish, yet perniciously serious attitude of their chief spokesman, Mr. Al Grassby, is indicated by a statement of his published by the Melbourne Age of July 24, 1978: There were supposed to be 25 "racist organisations dedicated to spreading hate and disharmony . . . in Australia . . . Our assessment is that there are only a couple of hundred people in Australia who stand for hard core racism in Australia."

If there are only a couple of hundred such people out of all the millions in Australia it would be hard to understand how Grassby and his Department give such backing to the Marxist controlled World Council of Churches in their filthy slogan that "Australia is the most racist country in the World."

A "racist" is either a "racist" or not. There can be no difference between a "hard core racist" and a "racist." However, the opponents of Australia are not dealing with facts but are conducting a smear campaign.

Nevertheless, Senator Neville Bonner, who plays along with almost anything the opponents of the Queensland Government choose to say, has declared "The Queensland Government is racist." Bonner had been attacking the expulsion of four white community advisors from Aurukan.

Again, to give just credit to the Queensland Government, it had the political acumen and sense of responsibility to take action against revolutionary agitators who have been planted among Aboriginal groups to work for "political and social change" towards the objective of eventual secession of Aboriginal land areas from the rest of Australia. In taking the slogans of "Black Separatism" where Aborigines would not receive the benefit of industrial development with its parallel of jobs, housing and prosperity, Bonner said:

"The Federal Government should buy the Aurukun and Mornington Island land and give it to the Aboriginals.

"Unless they finally have the intestinal fortitude to exercise (that) power, then I can assure you that my people in

Queensland will forever be at the mercy of a bureaucratic and racist Government," he said.

Bonner's indecent remarks about the Queensland Government being "racist" were followed by another pronouncement by Mr. Charles Perkins, who attacked the State Government's policy of assimilation, which means equality of opportunity and economic advancement by industrial development. Perkins endorsed the Fraser Government's "apartheid" doctrine, which he no doubt had a big role in formulating:

"There was a policy conflict between the Queensland Government which sought assimilation and the Federal Government which advocated a choice of lifestyle for Aborigines.

"The Communities had 'accepted with reluctance' the arrangement whereby they became shire councils. They had done so on the basis that it would be a trial period.

"Mr. Perkins said he could not comment on an incident in which a federal official and three Uniting Church officials were ordered by the State Government to leave Aurukun.

"But, he said, the Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, was familiar with the situation and prepared to act 'if the crunch comes'."

---

## CHAPTER FIVE

### EXPLOITATION OF ABORIGINES TO HOLD BACK INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Reference has already been made to international campaigning by those who claim to represent the Aborigines. Much of this campaigning is also linked with opposition to industrial development, mine and oil exploration. The Melbourne *Sun* of November 22, 1978, carried an article headlined, "Aborigines Take Protest to Scotland."

"Three Australian Aborigines travelled to Scotland today to protest against the way they say they are treated by Australian Governments and by multi-national mining companies.

"The delegation, which includes Mrs. Joyce Hall, a mother of 12 children, is campaigning against the giant Rio Tinto Zinc company over damage to Aboriginal land and culture it claims has resulted from Rio Tinto's mining operations in Queensland.

"The delegation was going to Glasgow trade union leaders as part of its campaign against mining of Aboriginal land, especially of uranium and bauxite . . .

"A Rio Tinto spokesman in London said the issue was complex and sensitive.

"The delegation is being sponsored by the charity group War on Want, and by an organisation representing indigenous minorities. It has already visited Holland and West Germany and hopes to have representations made at the Human Rights Commission in Geneva."

The opposition to industrial development and mining as well as oil exploration, stems from the belief of the Marxist movement that a prosperous Australia stands in the way of their revolutionary

objectives. One of those placed in prominence by the Leftist movement for virtually every revolutionary outfit from the Pacifist to the Neutralist, disarmament, anti-free enterprise united-front is the much publicised Joseph Camelari. In Camelari's book *Civilisation in Crisis*, published in July 1977, by Cambridge Press, he wrote:

"It may be that we will not get a breakthrough in peoples thinking until we have that crunch . . .

"Maybe the only hopeful possibility to look forward to is when the crunch comes there will be enough people who have been preparing for it, thinking about it and how to meet it, so that somehow we'll be able to pick up the pieces and start afresh.

"The main thing we have to do is ensure that the crisis is not of such magnitude that there will be no pieces to pick up."

In talking to Paul Ormonde of the *Melbourne Herald* on July 2, 1977, he says:

"The disorder in the world . . . is manifested in the way most advanced industrial nations are organised — with a kind of unthinking reckless expansion which leads inevitably to an arms race and to large defence establishments to secure what has been achieved."

This Marxist gabble means that if our economy is allowed to develop through the free market it will increase its wealth sufficiently to be able to defend itself and its prosperity. But "Cheer up! A Depression might help!" says the headline of Ormonde's article.

"What the book tries to say is that many of our problems — the inequality between nations, within nations, problems of local and international violence, problems of racial conflict and the environmental problems of our finite resources, combined with our unlimited growth patterns — are inter-related."

We are urged to hold up Australia's industrial development and defence capacity while the Soviets build up their already superior military might so that they can overtake the West, which includes Australia. Exploiting the Environmental Movement is one way of dragging Australia under.

"The key point I make" continues Camelari, "is that there is hardly any problem of any significance in the world which can be looked at in isolation. I am really saying that our global problems require global solutions."

In another book Camelari propagandises for young people who will develop loyalty to international Communist movements



and not to their own country. Ormonde describes Camelari as of "migrant stock — father Maltese, mother Greek. He himself was born in Egypt, coming here at the age of 12 . . . he is an irrepressible organiser with a flair for organising movements:"

Ormonde lists other of Camelari's identification points: "He is single minded. He chooses to be identified as a Christian rather than a Catholic . . . He seeks common cause between Marxism and Christianity."

Like others in the leftist movements he takes "an active role against the Australian military alliance and against uranium mining and the development of nuclear technology.

"More broadly, Dr. Camelari sees the rise of the Third World to independence and power as a sign of hope for justice." Note that the so-called Third World should rise to greater power, but we should not. Our economy needs to be broken into pieces and picked up by the elite of a new revolutionary society.

Camelari is further quoted: "We are gradually seeing a shift in the balance of power away from the rich industrial nations."

The signs of the shift include:

- The defeat of U.S. military power in Vietnam.
- The changed relationship between oil producers and oil consumers.
- The recent successes of Africans against colonial rule in Mozambique and Angola — the looming success in Rhodesia and Namibia and the deteriorating position of South Africa.

The "recent successes" in Mozambique and Angola were not victories against colonial rule, but were pro-Russian Communist conquests by violence over governments that were already independent.

"These things are encouraging," he says. "They help break down the great power systems of the world . . . in terms of overall politics of the world. I think power and influence is becoming more evenly distributed than it has been."

The truth is that Camelari and the forces he represents are the growing power of the Soviet Union towards a supreme military position.

Ormonde says: "Dr. Camelari sees the present economic difficulties of Western economies as offering some hope towards a more just world order.

"I suppose I am making the rather unusual point that we are witnessing the politics and economies of disorder on a global scale.

"The politics of growth — the notion that the next year will

always be better than last year — cannot go on."

He repeats the Marxist economic formulae — that the world does not have the resources to produce a better life which he and his friends who control the environment movement are suggesting: "In the past three or four years the world has begun to reach the limits — political, environmental, social, of what can be achieved by expansion." They do not paint this picture for the Communist countries — only for us.

His job is to see that Australia does not expand. Some left-wing unions have stooped so low as to join forces with him despite the fact that it is supposed to be their responsibility to work towards full employment and rising living standards for the members they are here to represent.

Camelari concludes: "I have made a conscious decision to stay in the system, challenge it and where necessary to attack it. To operate within the system effectively."

This is the gramsci line now being followed by Western Communists in the name of Euro-Communism. Here is one of the men who helps train our school teachers, who in turn educate more students, who are infiltrating our major political parties. From his position as a senior lecturer in politics at Latrobe University, he has ample time to write his propaganda against Australia. "I go to four or five night meetings a week," he says.

Apart from the ready access the Camelari's have to the daily press, with their destructive revolutionary message, they are pandered to by the trendy journalists who are taking the professionalism out of their occupation. Ormonde tells us "Dr. Camelari has a passionate commitment to world peace and justice."

Camelari has even been boosted as a "Black Leader" by the press. Like other leaders of the anti-uranium, conservation, environmental, unilateral disarmament, neutrality, peace movements, Camelari is linked with the Left controlled fronts claiming to represent Aborigines. The Melbourne *Sun* article was headed "Black Leader Hits Out." The Federal Government had increased the budget allocation for certain Aboriginal causes from \$122 million to \$138 million over the previous year. This so-called "black" leader was criticising the Government over the amount not being enough. The front organisation Camelari was speaking for was the "Action for Aboriginal Rights Group."

As one of those who has helped along the Communist-Christian dialogue which has done so much to bring the Churches onto the Communist bandwagon, in particular by doing Com-

munist work among the Aborigines, he has had much success. We are not investigating just a few individuals, but the "left," as it is generally called. We are concerned with a vast conglomerate of Organisations including the various Communist Parties and Front organisations, to which should be added the unions they control, but not the rank and file of those unions, who have no say in the making of the political decisions designed to bring down this country. Following 1956, with the particular events of Khrushchev's secret speech denouncing Stalin, and the Hungarian Revolution, the Communist Movement split from the monolith it had been with only one Communist Party in each country controlling the whole Marxist apparatus, in a rigid discipline, where almost all ideas for action came from a handful at the top of the party, and who in turn acted strictly in accordance with instructions from Moscow, the movement has actually become much more influential. The splits that followed led to competing Communist parties and mushrooming groups in the universities and elsewhere, whose new-found rights to free initiative led to an enormous increase in strength and effectiveness. Decisions were made without awaiting the approval of the Communist Party Central Committee. Since the 1960s, there has been an enormous increase in finance from overseas and considerably stepped up KGB activity in Australia. It is outside our present scope to present a full picture of this vast network of revolutionary conglomerates, which have made the Communist Movement a much greater force to be reckoned with. Despite the differences that exist between the various revolutionary groups they are capable of united action and are constantly negotiating for unification and joint action. Their unity is greater than the differences that are voiced in the numerous Communist newspapers and publications produced in Australia.

A study of the Marxist influence in our educational system, the fostering of "alternative lifestyle" movements, the encouragement of drugs, would take us away from the central theme of this book. But it is significant that many of those associated with movements to subvert and debauch our youth are also prominent in the "land rights" campaign. We have, for example, Labor's spokesman on immigration, Dr. Moss Cass, advocating that he would make marijuana readily available, with "a pot plant in every home." In a long article in *The Australian* of December 6, 1979, Dr. Cass attacked the "racism" of Anglo-Australians, describing them as "arrogant." Dr. Cass, who worked with Dr. Cairns, currently a guru of one of the extreme "alternative lifestyle movements," inside

the Fabian Society to further its Socialist objectives, is a strong supporter of multi-racialism.

But before we return to our main theme, it will be of interest to consider one of the expensively produced Marxist theoretical journals for the guidance of school teachers and others who might be used to corrupt young people. *Social Alternative* is sold at newsagents as well as being distributed to school teachers and other instructors from the academy. "Progressive" writers are advised as follows: "articles should avoid academic terminology and should be comprehensive to the non-specialist reader."

Among the contributing editors are Dennis Altman of the University of Sydney, strongly anti-British and supporter of multi-racialism; Mr. Gary Foley, originally from Swinburne College, Melbourne, now on government payroll where he used his time without obstruction to work towards the establishment of black republics. Mr. Bill Hartley of Socialist Left fame, and a representative of the Libyan Government in Australia; Naomi Myers, paid by the taxpayers through the Aboriginal Legal Service in Sydney, and a member of the Black Power movement; Bob McKillop, a consultant to the Communist controlled Overseas Aid apparatus; Jean McLean of the Socialist Left, prominent opponent of the Vietnam war; Kath Walker, one of the most highly trained of the Communist Aboriginal operatives; Sam Watson Jnr., who is financially supported by the Aboriginal and Islanders Health Service in Queensland; Mr. Ted Wheelwright, Marxist economist, from the University of Sydney, together with Mr. Jack Munday of the Communist Party of Australia. Other radicals are listed from the Universities of India, New Zealand, Sri Lanka and the U.S., assisting as contributing editors to this theoretical journal of Marxist destruction.

---

## CHAPTER SIX

# THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT VERSUS QUEENSLAND

Federal Government-financed films promoting misrepresentation about alleged white persecution of blacks have included particularly vile slanders against our own doctors and nurses now doing an exemplorary job among the Aborigines. One example was by Melbourne film-maker Doug Stanley who deals with the problem of Trachoma; an eye disease frequent among Aborigines due to life in a semi-tribal environment so much beloved by the Leftists trying to turn back the clock on Aboriginal progress.

As the Commonwealth Health Department medical officers publicly protested, the film, which was shown on ABC television and used overseas, smeared Australian whites as callous racists who neglect the Aborigines as part of deliberate genocide. This is how we are pictured by the World Council of Churches in their missiles against Australia concerning the exaggerated amount of Trachoma that existed. Considerable taxpayers funds are used to counter this disease, which has been effectively treated but its eradication is now becoming almost impossible with the Federal Government's apartheid policy and the return to the "old way of life" sitting around camp fires with the smoke and flies. It is a disease which has always afflicted Aborigines and will increase with a return to the "spiritual" life promoted by leaders of the Australian Council of Churches, particularly among those who have captured positions in the Uniting Church of Australia, in their efforts to persuade Aborigines to reject white civilisation and to keep them isolated in "apartheid" areas. These apostates tell the Aborigines that their tribal laws, superstitions and customs are superior to Christianity!

The Department of Health medical men said that apart from

exaggerating the Trachoma problem, the film has been used to make irrelevant references to leprosy and venereal disease. The Health Officers also highlighted how overseas use of the film "could give potential visitors a harmful image of Australian Aboriginal health standards." (Melbourne Age, August 12, 1973).

The problem of Trachoma is indeed serious, but it is not because of our doctors and nurses that it is becoming more difficult to eradicate. It is part of the return to more primitive living being encouraged by the Federal Government's backing of the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs. The picture has been presented of Australian doctors and nurses as monsters deliberately prescribing unnecessary caesarean births on Aboriginal women because of their white racist hatred of blacks. The truth is that the reason there is a higher incidence of caesarean births among Aboriginal women than whites, is because many of them are too young, and sometimes being only 13 and 14 years of age. Without a caesarean the mother would die, as they used to, in the old days of tribal living.

Overseas finance and aid from the United Nations is used to back causes actually opposed by tribal Aborigines. Let me refer to another such example.

"Aboriginal leader Mr. Ken Colbung plans to approach the United Nations unless the West Australian Government responds to Aboriginal claims for compensation." (Melbourne Age, January 2, 1979).

Numerous observers have increasingly noted how the claim for Aboriginal mineral and land rights is not being made to provide wealth for the Aborigines, but to stop any mineral development at all. Whenever minerals, oil, uranium or any wealth producing innovation is made, white and part-Aboriginal agents in the land rights areas make fictitious claims that the areas are sacred sites and cannot be touched. When any new undertaking eventually does proceed and where negotiations with Aborigines take place, exorbitant demands are made and Aborigines, who reach any agreement are declared to be "Uncle Toms" by the imposters.

As part of the revolutionary strategy towards creating independent black republics, or a black nation, to be recognised by the United Nations as separate from Australia, Mr. Colbung had served "a notice to quit" Western Australia on the State Governor Sir Wallace Kyle. Mr. Colbung, who, like the rest of those collecting funds from overseas, is unrepresentative of the Aborigines. He said he would begin raising money to visit London in an

attempt to put the Aborigines case directly to the Queen, through the international media . . . "and we'll also take our case to the United Nations."

Exploiting the Western Australian 150th Birthday celebrations in Perth, Mr. Colbung played the didgeredo with well-known entertainer Rolf Harris.

No logical person requires an economics or engineering degree to realise that by isolating Aborigines after evicting the whites would leave them in a state of poverty and without the technical assistance and resources to advance. But this is the type of childish immature demands being put forward by the left enterprise, with the help of quite a few media operatives in TV., radio, and the theatre, who believe this is the new fashion for the avante garde. If we were dealing with unimportant matters we could just tell them to behave like grown ups, but it goes much further than that.

*The Age* report on the Perth celebrations read:

"While there, Mr. Colbung gave the Governor, who was wearing an early 19th century costume, a kangaroo skin-wrapped parcel.

"When Sir Wallace opened the parcel later, he found a document saying:

'Take notice that the Aboriginal people of Western Australia hereby require you to quit and deliver up possession of all that land area being the territory called Western Australia and its dependencies.

'On this eve of the anniversary of your arrival 150 years ago, I am given to inform you that, after consultation with the people whose forbears have been here for more than 40,000 years, it is our wish to sit down and negotiate with you about the land which was taken from our ancestors'."

Gradually and more blatantly the demands over "land rights" are increased in perspective. No matter what concessions are made, the demands are then increased. One of the lessons learnt whilst working with the nurses on the reserves, was that progress was being made throughout the whole of Australia in health care and treatment of the Aborigines. Queensland is not behind any other State. It was in that State that the activities of Communist-penetrated Church groups was being stepped up because, while plenty of that State's land is made available to Aborigines, together with freedom to elect their own shire councils, Aborigines were being treated as a part of the democratic community along with

white Australians, with the prospect of future development and prosperity through co-operation. The leftist drive against Queensland is to swindle control of the Aboriginal settlements into the hands of Communist operatives from the Federal Department of Aboriginal Affairs.

'The Federal Government should assume responsibility for Queensland Aboriginal affairs,' the Church-backed Action group said yesterday.

Spokesman Dr. Noel Preston said "a report recently tabled in State Parliament dismissed the concept of Aboriginal land rights which had been accepted throughout Australia."

So reported the *Melbourne Age* for January 1, 1979. Dr. Preston continued:

"The answer is for the Federal Government to exercise its constitutional jurisdiction in this area."

"A handover of power offered the only way."

Dr. Preston, convenor of the Uniting Church Commission on Aboriginal Affairs, was stung by the truth of a Queensland Aboriginal and Islander report, which had described the revolutionary programme supported by the now completely left-controlled Church he represents in the area, as the work of "radicals" and what is referred to as "do-gooders," who, to put it more correctly, are not do-gooders at all but left-liberal wreckers.

Dr. Preston said: "We need a sharp break from that . . . which the Federal land rights and self-determination policies would represent."

The Federal Government may believe that by supporting its version of Aboriginal "land rights" it will prevent Australia from being labelled internationally as "racist." It is tragically wrong. By attempting to pressure the Queensland Government to make concessions to the radical activists, it is aiding a strategy which must eventually lead to an open revolutionary situation. Unlike well-heeled professional politicians who are not ideologists, Marxists are revolutionaries with a singleness of purpose, fighting for a definite objective about which there can be no compromise. This objective is the separate black nation. All concessions are only bites at the apple to them. They are not reformists. The only solution is to stand up and fight and defeat them. This is only being achieved in Queensland under the leadership of Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen. This is why the Premier is the target for the most venomous attacks by the revolutionaries and their "useful idiots."

I can speak with some authority concerning the position of the



Aborigines in Queensland, having had the unique experience of having worked as Industrial Officer for the Royal Australian Nursing Federation. The nurses have had more to do with Aborigines than anyone else. The crude opportunism of the Fraser Government as pretenders to the Aboriginal cause against Queensland is all the more deplorable because the Queensland Government is assisting the Aborigines in the only sensible manner possible. This is certainly not the case with Federal policies of "apartheid" which are ridiculous for so small a minority in the overall Australian population.

This does not mean that those Aborigines who wish to live separately may not do so. They are entitled to have a choice of lifestyle instead of "apartheid."

The Queensland State's policy, which has been making steady progress for years, was outlined by a former Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs, Mr. Charles Porter. The Melbourne Age of January 13, 1979, in which he was quoted as saying, "The Federal Government's policy of self-sufficiency for Aborigines would split society and deprive blacks of opportunities."

The report, by David Broadbent, said:

"Mr. Porter had a formal meeting here yesterday with the Federal Aboriginal Affairs Minister, Senator Chaney. Both men said there were fundamental differences between the Federal and State Governments on Aborigines.

"Mr. Porter said self-management programmes for Aborigines would create two classes of citizens and deprive Aboriginal children of educational opportunities.

"We want integration of Aborigines into the rest of the community — not separation and separate development at a different pace."

A similar situation applies to the misrepresentation of the problems of the Western Australian Government, but I will refer particularly to Queensland because the crude propaganda against that State in the Southern press, particularly with the use of cartoons to show the Bjelke-Petersen Government as "racist," has dragged the idea of a free press in the mud and played into the hands of Australia's enemies abroad; even to the extent of helping anti-Australian elements in the American State Department to come out in support of U.N. action against Australia.

This book has nothing to do with support or otherwise of any political party because it is primarily concerned with defence, dealing with the problem facing Australia as a nation. One of the

political tactical problems associated with the Fraser Government taking the lead in smashing the democratically elected multi-racial Government in Rhodesia is that it is dangerously counter-productive to Australia. I will leave out of consideration the complete lack of morals in Fraser's intrigue against Britain and the eventual establishing of the one party rule of the Marxist Mugabe Government; however shameful this has been, but to emphasise that one of the most elementary rules of politics as in the other fields of life is that the bully moves in on the weakest element.

The Federal Government has lavished money to finance overseas trips by alleged representatives of Australian Aborigines to meet with black leaders in other countries who are co-operating in the campaign against this country. The same applies with the Government financial support to recruit people from overseas to negotiate against the Government. Truly, it is said of those whom the Gods wish to destroy, they first make mad! The madness — or Fraser within Canberra's departments takes almost the shape of a Mad Hatter's party.

The Australian people had the humiliation of watching on television and reading in the press of the activities of Dr. Stephen Zorn, again highly paid with taxpayers money, to bargain on behalf of the Northern Land Council for royalties to Aborigines for uranium mining. In mentioning more than once, how taxpayers money is being used to finance the attack against Australia, and to pay the salaries of revolutionaries is not to invoke the emotion of envy as a means of persuasion, but to illustrate how successful this sly type of operation has become and how ridiculous is the behaviour of our politicians. With regard to Dr. Zorn, the *Melbourne Age* of July 3, 1978, shows the contempt of one who made thousands of dollars by a twisted method of representing Aborigines in a posture acted out to the world against the white Australian community. He said:

"Royalty payments would give far more self-reliance and independence from 'the great white father' in Canberra."

Zorn is a high-charging New York lawyer, full of anti-white leftist verbiage. In answer to those who had raised obvious problems about royalties, he was able to silence weak politicians by talking about views contrary to his as being "dangerously racist." Of more importance than royalties was "minimising the destructive influence of large numbers of outsiders coming on to Aboriginal land to build and operate mines." The sheer impertinence of this American left-wing operative is breathtaking with his comment

---

about "the frankly racist attitude" of those who held critical views about the Federal Government's "apartheid" policies. Under the present system of separatism, the struggle has been waging to have the Aborigines kept away from assimilation and to be isolated in a manipulative situation where left-wing operators call the tune as part of the overall Communist objectives.

---

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### LEARNING FIRST HAND BY VISITING ABORIGINAL AREAS

Australians generally have always had an interest in the Aboriginal people. But despite some background in reading and added association with a number of Aboriginal organisations, I was still totally unprepared for what I was to find in carrying out my responsibilities to the Royal Australian Nursing Federation. My knowledge was limited but as a newcomer to the Communist Party in 1948, the Party thought my knowledge to be considerable. They directed me to write an article on Aboriginal culture for one of the Eureka Youth League publications.

It was not until after the Communist Party split in 1956 over Khrushchev's anti-Stalin speech, that Communists started talking. What was surprising were the reports on how Aborigines had been singled out for specialised training in Communist countries. So secretive and important had this been that only a few of the top Communists were told or knew Aborigines participated in this type of training.

I was talking recently to another former Communist who was a colleague of mine and while we discussed how overpowering the propaganda had become, he mentioned that even he, who had much more to do with that field of Party activity than myself (because he worked in Queensland) did not know for what purpose he had been engaged until Party documents fell into his hands from the Church groups in his State, working as virtual branches of the Communist Party. How the laws of conspiracy are adhered to within the Communist movement to limit access to knowledge unless it was necessary for Party plans, is illustrated by the careful and well executed plans that have in only recent years come to full public view.

One of the problems that ex-Communists have in warning the public about the nature of the Communist Conspiracy is that they find even a quarter of the truth virtually unbelievable by other people. An illustration might be Communist activity in the world of music. I would not blame anyone for disbelieving the extent of their success in this area and will not enter upon the subject except to perhaps recommend a well informed book which draws up on information from the American FBI, one of the best informed security organisations in the world. The book is: *The Marxist Minstrels — A Handbook on Communist Subversion of Music* by David Noebel, American Christian College Press, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1974. One can add that none of these secrets is unknown to the world's security organisations. But in dealing with the advanced stage of the attack against Australia through use of the Aboriginal "land rights" issue there is no secret at all. This is shown by the common source of media information. In order to reveal much of what remains unventilated in the press, I have drawn upon my own direct experience on Aboriginal reservations.

One of the more interesting sidelights in working for different professional and trade union organisations is that in preparing their wage cases, particularly "work value" cases, the advocate has to study the ingredients of their work; their folklore and traditions such as was the case with the nurses with whom I enlisted full time for six years, and for whom I developed a great deal of admiration and respect. The public image of the dedicated nurse is as true today as it ever was, but what is often not known is how widespread and diversified are the specialised areas of their work. One such department is in the area of Aboriginal health, where additional knowledge and skills are required.

One of my tasks was to prepare a brief for the Commonwealth Public Service Board to increase the salaries paid to nurses in the various areas where they are engaged which is often referred to as "bush nursing." It entails the Bush Nursing Service, which sends nurses out to wherever they are required throughout the Territory to provide service to Aborigines. Some nurses have the sole responsibility to visit areas where cases of leprosy may be detected. Others are engaged by the Air Medical Service; still others are employed full time on the reservations where they work from a small hospital or medical centre.

My first visit to the Territory, prior to 1972, concerned a crisis over a shortage of hospital beds for Aborigines, and an equal lack of accommodation for nurses. The advice first given to me through

the press was alarming and brings us to one of the central problems of the way the competition between the two major political parties exacerbates the problems in a most irresponsible fashion. The Liberal Government was still in office when the crisis came to a head. Doctors and nurses had carried out a demonstration through a silent march through the main street of Alice Springs to draw the nation's attention to the need for emergency hospital accommodation. It did indeed appear that there was serious neglect on the part of the Government and our belief was that action should have been more speedy. Our representations to the Government had a measure of success. Time was the whole problem and the job of erecting new buildings, etc., just could not be completed on time.

While stationed in Melbourne I had little detailed information to act on and motivated by reports from politicians about Government neglect, my own criticisms of the Government had been negative to an extent that I did not understand until making first hand investigations on visiting Alice Springs. The basis of the whole problem was, in fact a prolonged drought in the desert areas which had led to a lack of natural food for nomadic and semi-nomadic Aborigines who had flooded into Alice Springs. The Alice Springs Hospital was overcrowded with patients suffering from malnutrition, filling even the corridors, and even though nurses had rushed from all over Australia there was simply not enough accommodation despite the Government booking out motels for them. The whole turmoil was caused by the drought, the blame for which could not be placed on man, but on nature. Least of all could the white people be blamed, but the ugly charge of "racism" had been levelled at them.

I found out from the more experienced nurses and doctors, who had been in the Territory over a long period, that the same problem was a regular phenomenon although on a minor scale. They had never been confronted with the effects of a drought on this scale before. With the exception of very good seasons, food became scarce in large areas of the Northern Territory, and the children particularly suffered. After Aborigines went walkabout for any length of time they would come back in the same emaciated condition. Historical records show that this had always been a feature of the nomadic tribal life and is a reason for weaker babies being put to death by the mothers throwing sand in the mouths of those newborn considered weaklings. This is a practice still carried out in the Territory, but has been virtually stopped by educational programmes and assistance provided by our nurses. It is, of course,

wrong to condemn the Aborigines for a custom of their race which had its basis in the primitive life where man was left to the fortunes of nature. Nor can the white man be blamed for areas the Aborigines live in because the desert and bush areas have been their tribal lands since time immemorial. These desert areas are not places where they were forced to live by the white man. It is the reason that Aborigines have more and more drifted into missions and onto the reservations where medical services are available and there is no shortage of food. It is also necessary to contradict those who criticise the cattle station owners, who have actually improved the diet and living conditions of Aborigines over what it had been due to the difficulties of nomadic tribal life, which was a major cause of keeping down the Aboriginal population throughout the continent prior to the coming of the white man.

The people who have more to do with the Aborigines than anyone else and who actually live with them wherever they are gathered in any numbers are the nurses and the bush nursing sisters visit them wherever they can be located outside of permanently established centres. Like all those who have studied Aboriginal affairs from a distance, I learned I had known very little about what their problems really were. The only Aboriginal I had really known personally was one from South Australia, who had been sent to a Communist training school with me during my early days in the Eureka Youth League, the name given to the young Communist League in Australia.

I made a number of visits to the Northern Territory while I was with the nurses organisation and had regular discussions with Melbourne nurses when they returned from the Territory, or from Queensland and Western Australia, when they would come back after a year or two, or a stint at work among Aborigines on the missions, and discussed developments with members of the Profession from the other States when they attended Federal conferences of the RANF. Australian nurses are highly regarded for their skills in this type of work overseas where they are eagerly sought for employment among Red Indians in the United States and among the Indians and Eskimos in Canada. Their natural empathy, together with experience among Aborigines seems to give them a ready and quick insight into the cultural outlook of those with whom they work. It would surprise readers of the daily press, which so regularly publicises attacks on the Queensland Government for its alleged racism among Aborigines, to find with what praise nurses who have had experience in that State, have for the

work of the Queensland Government in their programme for health care among the Aborigines. Nurses from Western Australia speak with equal confidence of the work of the State Government there.

It is easy to understand how visitors from Melbourne or tourists from overseas can gain misunderstanding of the living conditions of Australian Aborigines who have not been assimilated into the white man's ways. The first time I flew from Darwin to Katherine and saw the gunyas made of old sheets of galvanised iron and tin I was filled with a sense of shock and almost horror in what, by anyone's standards, is a picture of poverty and degradation. But as I found out from the nurses, Aborigines with even a lingering attachment to their old way of life do not readily take to living in houses or even tents. For one reason, an Aborigine cannot stay in the same place where someone has died because the spirits of the dead live there, and they are constantly on the move. Aborigines find that pieces of galvanised iron and such materials are superior to bark or scrub materials for the making of their gunyas, which has been their traditional type of home for the centuries he has inhabited these parts. It is nonsensical to consider the Aborigine "backward" because he lives in these circumstances, because it is, after all, not much different to the way we like to live while on a camping holiday. It is equally absurd and worse that propaganda films are made for showing overseas to brand Australia as a "racist" country which has its Aboriginal people living in squalor through deliberate neglect. In particular, the World Council of Churches are active in pedalling this type of picture of Aboriginal life through films being shown to the world at large.

The type of accommodation Aborigines choose is their right, but it happens to be one of the most glaring instruments for tactical exploitation by those whose task is to smear Australia as a "racist" country, distinguished by discrimination towards Aborigines. No attempt to correct a false picture is made by the Australian Council of Churches, who condemn the teaching of Christianity among Aborigines in favour of preserving "spiritual" and traditional ways of life, which make the modernisation of housing among Aborigines an impossibility.

One of the arguments, if not the main proposition, put by those who are trying to force the Aborigines back to the culture predominant before the coming of the white man, is that it will give them more dignity, and what Senator Neville Bonner likes to call "racial pride." The real picture, which is glaringly clear, as I found



myself, was how the Aboriginal men and women who really stood out in their display of dignity and pride, were those who had embraced Christianity on the missions and elsewhere. Similarly with the circumstances where Aborigines had independence for themselves and their families through having jobs as stockmen or who were working with mining companies and similar organisations. When the left wants to romanticise the Aboriginal gunya type accommodation they will do so, and reality will not stand in their way.

Aboriginal poet Kath Walker, who was in the Communist Party while I was a member, and who had been completely educated to the ways of white society, with all its benefits and comforts, is pictured by an article in the *Melbourne Age* of July 7, 1978:

"Quietly, through the warm, straightforward, school-teacherly personality of poet Kath Walker . . . as an introduction to poetry readings and talks by Ms. Walker at the Longford cinema . . .

"In the lucid images of one of our finest photographers, Geoff Burton, the TV-style documentary follows this attractive woman about her Stradbroke Island home at Moon-galba, listening to her poetry and snippets of reminiscence.

"She types in her gunyah-type shack, communes with birds and trees in her sanctuary, communicates something of Aboriginal culture to a class of schoolchildren . . .

In the same month of 1978, Al Grassby said:

"Aboriginals suffered more from discrimination than the 100 other groups in Australia." (*Melbourne Sun*, July 20, 1978).

Grassby did not identify the other 100 groups who are allegedly discriminated against because they simply do not exist. He was addressing an Adelaide social issues forum sponsored by the Uniting Church Commission on Social Justice. Grassby declared that:

"Churches throughout the world regarded the survival of Australian Aboriginals as the litmus test of humanity in this century."

We can note that Grassby wants the right to make prosecutions against those he alleges are "racist" and has received editorial support from the *Melbourne Age* (May 28, 1981). Grassby could have told his gaping Church followers that there has indeed been no problem about the survival of the Aboriginal because their

---

population has been on the increase for over 40 years. Any danger to them can only come from going back to "the old ways." Grassby also said that some Aborigines "live in some of the worst housing conditions of any people on earth."

These same Church people are the ones who want to preserve Aboriginal culture for which the gunyah-type dwelling is an integral part, but this is nothing of the type of information they convey to the peoples of the world, or the agencies of the United Nations who are using this propaganda to build up their case for eventual sanctions against Australia. The dual campaign to re-educate Aborigines into acceptance of the old culture and to at the same time stamp out alleged "racism" has reached ridiculous heights. In New South Wales, we are told "racism" is to be banned from school texts.

"References to witchetty grubs, boomerangs, flashing white teeth, deep brown eyes, corroborees, walkabouts, nakedness . . . will be excised or at least watered down in New South Wales schools," says *The Australian* (May 14, 1981).

"The Minister for Education, Mr. Landa, said yesterday that moves had been made to eradicate all samples of racism relating to Aborigines . . .

"He hoped writers would learn to convey the Aboriginal situation without using objectionable or racist words."

An example given by Mr. Landa was:

"Before European influence reached them, they wore no clothes, built no permanent dwellings, cultivated no crops and lived as nomadic hunters."

This happens to be true, it is certainly not a criticism of the Aborigines and it is not racist for school books to portray Aboriginal life as it was.

When the World Council of Churches made their sightseeing tour of Australia during June and July of 1981 they used the visit as a platform to attack our country. They were not interested in any of the readily available information in the steady improvement of conditions for the Aboriginal population. Senator Baume made the mistake of giving an audience to the delegation which was a form of recognition to these radicals in clerics clothing. The Melbourne Age of July 2, 1981 reported Senator Baume, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, had:

"handed them a document aimed at refuting press reports of criticisms they had made during their visit, and another titled

### **Advances in Aboriginal Affairs Over the Last Decade''**

The documents were well prepared and full of the necessary details of the Governments case, but they were rejected by the WCC inquisitors, who made it clear that they were not interested in facts.

It was left to the President of the Victorian RSL, Mr. Bruce Ruxton to put them in their place:

"Mr. Bruce Ruxton, said that the Marxist World Council of Churches was trying to stir up "racism" in Australia by sending the team here. He told the organisation's annual State conference the team members' skills would be better used in their own countries where 'murder, anarchy and genocide' were problems."

The disruptive nature of the propaganda against Anglo-Saxondom, designed to break the societal bonds of our society by causing dissension and envy between new and old Australians, is made all the worse by the fact that politicians, unfortunately some of the most prominent in disseminating discord in the community. One of the least responsible is the Socialist Left opposition spokesman on Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Dr. Moss Cass. Writing in *The Australian* of December 6, 1979, he launched into an incredibly misleading and biased denunciation of the majority of Australians, whom with mock indignation, he refers to as "Anglo Australians," whose "traditional attitudes to race" leads to bigotry towards migrants from other countries, which is simply untrue. We have a right and a duty on behalf of the majority of Australians who happen to be Anglo-Saxons to answer the misrepresentations of the likes of Cass and his ilk in order to preserve and cement the good relations which in the real world do actually exist between all Australians, no matter what their country of origin. As already pointed out, a nation that is not homogeneous cannot long continue a united and tranquil existence. A nation needs an identity which it will not have by going multi-cultural, or having its majority the centre of attack as being "racists" and "Ockers." People like Dr. Cass are dangerous men who cannot be described as so foolish that they do not know the consequences of their statements and writings. All history shows that a society will not long survive with conflicting lifestyles and values as envisaged by the so-called "sensual" revolutionists and multi-culturalists with such of their schemes of multi-cultural education. To be constantly smearing the majority of Australians and repeating the lie to migrants that the people of the host country are a lot of bigoted

"racists" can only lead to its eventual wider acceptance, and a situation where assimilation will be impossible. Enough adverse publicity overseas has already been caused by sly politicians pretenders of do-goodery, with a dream of Australia as some kind of future United Nations which would never hold together. Old Australians are becoming increasingly angry for obvious personal and political reasons. What seems even more extraordinary is the way so many politicians, particularly Liberals, have lost the ability to read the political weather and do not even hear the groundswell of virtual revulsion among migrants as to the misuse of their name by known Marxists and aspiring migrant politicians acting as spokesmen for migrant groups when they actually represent no ethnic community except small political groups, quite unrepresentative of the migrant communities from whence they come.

Melbourne's western suburbs have a heavy migrant population who work and live together with Australians of older stock without the slightest trouble. The process of assimilation has been going apace with children of the second generation walking down the streets together with other Australian children as though it was a scene from the same area prior to the Second World War. Despite everything Grassby and his cohorts, like Dr. Cass, cooing-left-Liberals and Churchmen would like to conjure up, there are no social encounters such as would bring joy to the Department of Community Relations, to issue press statements about "racism" or the bigotry of the hateful Anglo-Saxon. Stories of dissention within our community have to be invented to keep the Grassby machine flush with public tax money. If there is any complaint made, it has to be wildly exaggerated and twisted out of all proportion. Australians are among the most tolerant and generous people in the world; this is why migration programmes have been such a resounding success. The fact that the overwhelming majority of native born Australians together with European migrants have shown such open support for the criticisms of the Federal Government and its multi-culturalism and changed immigration policies as voiced by the Victorian Branch of the Returned Serviceman's League has got absolutely nothing to do with "racism." As elsewhere, except among paper shufflers and politicians in Canberra, multi-culturalism is found insulting to the migrants and old Australians. Everyone knows about Al Grassby's imaginary Ku Klux Klan which he says, among other works of ingenuity, has infiltrated the Returned Serviceman's League, but little publicity has been given to a group who have been traced and identified as

part of a left-wing operation, some of whom were not born in Australia but who have been involved in a poison-pen scheme of telephoning migrants in the western suburbs area with such obscenities as "How are you dago-wog?" "The Australians screw your wife," and so on. Another method they use is to spray paint slogans on fences outside Churches frequented by migrants. The crudity of the slogans along with the telephone calls helped lead to the group being uncovered. They were not "right-wing racists"; they were left-wing activists trying to cause dissension.

Dr. Cass attacks what he calls "the preservation of the 'rightness' of the Anglo-Australian strain." He refers to "racial arrogance." He infers that the Anglo-Australians suggest that if someone who has arrived from another country is guilty of a criminal act that the Anglo-Australians purport that this is due to their racial origin. It is this sort of statement that is sick, not the Australian people, whom Dr. Cass diagnoses as "sick." But I don't think Cass is ill, I believe he knows exactly what he is doing. It should be noted that Dr. Cass is the member for the Federal electorate of Lalor, which, as he admits, "has the highest immigrant population of all electorates." Dr. Cass uses his position as a politician in such an electorate to tell the migrant population that they are in a land of Anglo-Australian "racists." The embarrassment he causes to the ALP is on a par with the embarrassment Mr. Ian McPhee causes large numbers of Liberal and National Party supporters.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### THE FAILURE OF OUR INTELLIGENCE ORGANISATIONS

One of the most disturbing features of the situation is the decline in the standards of our security organisations. A new recruitment campaign is urgently required.

Among the best of possible recruits are Vietnam veterans and retired ex-servicemen, who are still young enough to embark on a fresh career, and who have a deep sense of patriotism together with the IQ necessary to do a good job in the nation's service, but are frowned upon in preference to people from the universities whose background cannot even be reasonably checked. ASIO has made an almost complete about-turn and does not carry out any current investigation of the Communist drive towards the separatist movement which is gathering speed and is backed financially from the Soviets. The same situation applies to the environmentalist anti-nuclear, anti-uranium and conservation movements in the grip of the Marxist octopus, because the new line is not to investigate organisations unless it is reasonably expected that there is the possibility of violence being committed. One of the few minor sections of these movements now being given coverage is a small fringe group on the outskirts who are likely to commit violence at demonstrations. This is the case with the anti-uranium movement and conservation organisations in receipt of Government funds, but which are under complete revolutionary control. Because ASIO follows a small group of fringe revolutionaries suspected of violent tendencies, and who attend anti-uranium demonstrations they will make it appear in reports to the Federal Government that are leaked to the press that ASIO carries out surveillance of the anti-uranium movement, which is untrue.

The common knowledge that the new Government of Father

Uni in Vanuatu is Communist is treated as a non-event by the leaders of ASIO and the Federal Government, while the Australian people are kept in the dark as to its geo-political and military significance. While the Australian Foreign Affairs Department briefs our politicians on how to pressure the French into ceding their possessions in the Pacific, before the time is ripe and there are inadequate preparations for defence and suitable circumstances to prevent Communist takeovers, Communist operatives from these islands are working to assist in independence movements in islands belonging to the Australian Commonwealth to the north of Australia.

Once again I will refer to the Australian press rather than documents which, no matter how verifiable they may be will show that I, and others, dealing with this situation are not voices in the wilderness, but that we are concerned with a subject, the details of which are readily available and have already been aired in the press. The *National Times* of December 29, 1979, carried a full page article headed "Torres Strait Islanders Move for Independence." In it we read:

"The action forms part of a move for independence initiated by the Torres United Party (Tupia), also known as the Torres Strait Independence Movement, formed in Townsville in November, 1978, with Wacando as its chairman . . .

"We began this independence movement because we were fed up with Governments, both State and Commonwealth. We see the only way we islanders can better ourselves in the society today is by going for independence . . .

"Within the new context of an independent Papua New Guinea, the emergence of new States in other parts of the Pacific, the campaigns for Aboriginal Land Rights on the mainland, islanders' wish for self-management has found a new expression: the call for a sovereign (sic) State . . .

"In the nationalist language of the new States, the issue is one of self-determination and political independence. The islanders' claim is no different essentially to that of any colonial dependency.

"To the leaders of Torres' United Party 12,000 islanders could, given the untapped resources of Torres Strait, constitute a viable State.

"For James Akee and Carlemon Wacando, plans to tap resources in the Strait are top priority and their Party has a detailed economic programme.

"In a submission to the U.N. Special Committee on De-colonisation in August and in statements to the *National Times*, the Torres Party spokesmen explained proposals for an Island economy run by islanders.

"These include oil and gas, fishing (including beche-de-mer), tourism and the tidal generation by marine hydro-power of 'enough electricity to power the entire east coast needs of Australia, plus the needs of New Guinea and West Irian', as well as the islands. The waters of Torres Strait, it is claimed, represent 'the leading, viable, energy-from-the-sea-potential in the world'.

"Among the Australian population there is as yet little awareness of islander moves for independence . . .

"Internationally, the reaction of the U.N. Special Committee of 24 on De-colonisation, overwhelmingly composed of Third World countries, had been 'very favourable'.

"The committee has agreed to send representatives to Australia next year . . .

"Things have at last begun to happen in the Torres Strait Islands . . .

"Among Thursday Island people there is a saying: 'If you wait at Thursday Island the world will come to you'. The Third World hasn't yet arrived in Torres Strait: the 1980 visit of members of the U.N. De-colonisation Committee may mark that occasion.'

By the use of the charge of racism against Australia and the de-colonisation slogans of the "Third World," backed by the Soviet bloc countries, a political armada is being built up against us. But like that other Armada, beaten by the British, it can be defeated. The forces of the U.N. are set to spring on us and we have to be prepared for the onslaught. In fact, the Government and politicians should be fighting now. There is no way that we can crawl away from conflict. As Machiavelli says: "You cannot avoid a battle when the enemy has resolved upon it at all hazards." and as he further says: "Whoever has to contend against many enemies may nevertheless overcome them, though he be inferior in power, provided he is able to resist their first efforts.'

Whilst a lot of water has gone under the bridge, with many advances made in the build up to disintegrating the Commonwealth, we can, and must turn the tide and we will, if enough people will take action at this time, the next round will be ours. To fulfil Machiavelli's promise, we must treat the proposed treaty as



the first; whilst at the same time carrying out a foreign policy to defend Australia abroad.

To prepare for future attacks by our enemies, it is necessary to know their plans. No secret is made of the tactics to be used by the enemy, not the least of which is legal. The details are set out in a book by Stewart Harris for the Aboriginal Treaty Committee titled *It's Coming Yet . . . An Aboriginal Treaty Within Australia Between Australians*, published in 1980.

Under international law the doctrine exists that if the land is peacefully settled on relatively unoccupied land, then it means there is no pre-existing title to the land. Conquest by invasion of a heavily populated land implies a pre-existing title to those who were conquered. This is why the debate among Marxists as to the tactical worth of propagandising for an agreement or a Treaty between Aborigines and whites looms so large in their thinking. The book is part of a campaign to win public support for a referendum to amend the constitution so as to grant power to the Federal Government to negotiate such a treaty under law. The publication follows a "Guest of Honour" talk given by Dr. C.H. Coombs on the ABC on June 2nd, 1980.

The treaty is "to establish a kind of constitutional basis for the relationships of Aboriginal Australians to Australian society generally." Were it not for the objectives of establishing a separate nation with all its results such as different international alliances, and the defence catastrophe following, all the talk would be so much university student experimenting, with leaflets and newspapers to help make them mature. But by building up the charge of "racism" against Australians and establishing in the minds of overseas observers and interested parties that Aborigines and whites cannot accommodate together, then the works of these university radicals have a seriousness and deadliness that must be recognised.

The political misuse of the solidarity shown to Aborigines by white Australians has been going on for a long time. In his book *The Struggle for Power* (E.J. Dwyer, 1980) Mr. J. Grover provides an entire chapter of detailed and valuable information as to the blatant dishonesty of the anti-uranium movement's use of Aboriginal "land rights" claims. Mr. Grover goes as far back as 1947:

"The emotional issues have been heavily dramatised by white activists, not only in Australia but also overseas. Their objectives were camouflaged by lofty and quite unrealistic moral stances aimed to draw an emotional response from the Australian people.

"This is not the first time that the Australian Aboriginal people have been used for political purposes. A quarter of a century ago an effort was made to interfere with the weapons testing programme at Woomera. It was Australia's Labor Deputy Prime Minister Dr. H.V. Evatt who wrote in a Labor Party publication 'Hands Off the Nation's Defences':

"An endeavour has been made to provide a smokescreen by asserting that the boycott move was not based on opposition to Australian defence measures but solely on the desire to protect Aborigines.

"It is true that many patriotic citizens had legitimately pressed upon the Government that the construction of the range ought not to be permitted because of possible danger to the Aborigines. But the documentary evidence shows that this was not the primary objection raised by the Communist propaganda." (Page 401-402).

By rejecting any "agreement" with the Government, which cannot, in itself, be responsibly considered, they further hope to make the Parliament, with the combined use of the Government and the Opposition, go to the people with a recommendation that the constitution be amended to allow that the treaty can then be easily interpreted to give equal nation status to Aboriginal land right areas as a fact of life. We have already seen how politicians will do almost anything, or allow almost anything to happen, even to supporting various kinds of Communist controlled conservation issues if it will get their pictures in the newspapers or provide some other paltry form of publicity to promote the image of the career politician to the public, but who know nothing of what his real responsibilities are as a servant of the nation's defence. The average citizen will take the lead if it is given, and when sufficient people in Australia are made aware of the problem, there will be enough rise up as leaders to rally the rest of the nation to its defence. And we should be able to say with confidence that some politicians will be in there supporting them. Clearly the interest already being shown in pre-selection ballots in all political parties, even to the extent of now having left-wing infiltration of the Young Liberals, shows how important the organised political area has become.

The attempt of the left to extend their power in New South Wales by dumping moderate ALP politicians must be seen as part of the overall defence situation. It is to be hoped that the developing split in the ALP, which it seems will eventuate

inevitably in the defeat of the Socialist Left in each State, and will lead to the election of candidates with a pro-defence policy. Likewise we should look to a better standard of candidate being stood in the future for the Liberal Party, such as will stand up for the country's defence. The whole operation seeking a treaty with the Aborigines has been a white activist scheme as admitted in Stewart Harris' book. Up to that time, despite all the politicising, there has been no treaty committee of the Aborigines themselves, nor had the demand come from them. The author even admits that the treaty committee was organised for whites by whites. But, as has been seen from press coverage since 1980, the radical white machine has gone into operation and the treaty perspective is now being put forward in such a way that Aborigines should be asked to support the splitting of Australia in the future. The proposed treaty is to be a law recognising that the Aborigines were a conquered nation and that Australia was not a settler state. One other attempt to be made is to try and convince Parliament that there may be no need for a referendum, and that the treaty can be made law under Section 51 (26) of the Constitution, which allows Parliament to make laws concerning "people of any race for whom it is deemed necessary to make special laws."

I have made mention of my direct involvement with the Aborigines in the Northern Territory during the period 1970 to 1976, when engaged by the RANF. I return to that experience by quoting from an article by Dr. Doug Everingham, Shadow Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in Northern Australia. Under the title, "Land Treaty Vital," he wrote in *The Australian* December 20, 1979, as follows:

"We are committed to examining the possibility of developing a treaty between the Australian Government and representatives of Aboriginal Australia, to compensate for dispossession and dispersal; restoring their land rights, self-management and self-determination."

During the time of the Whitlam Government, Dr. Everingham was the Minister of Health. I had direct dealings with him and his subordinates in the Commonwealth Department of Health, concerning Aborigines and the problems associated with self-determination on the Aboriginal reserves. So disastrous was the self-determination policies in breaking down organised life on the settlements that Dr. Everingham called myself and another Federal officer of the RANF to meet with him and two medical officers of the Commonwealth Department of Health. They wanted us to call

a strike of nurses in the Northern Territory to draw the attention of the nation and the Aborigines themselves to the frightful conditions that had developed because of the police being taken off reservations, due to the activities of such people as Charles Perkins. Even though Dr. Everingham was the Minister for Health and the doctors with him were the most powerful men in the Commonwealth Health Department, they were unable to influence the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs. A great struggle was going on in the Aboriginal Affairs Department, but left-wing penetration had already become so effective that responsible public servants in the Department were at their wits end to try and remedy the situation. We discussed the whole problem of left-wing activists in the Northern Territory and the need to take action. But Dr. Everingham and his medical colleagues explained that they considered themselves to be powerless in the situation. We pointed out that as a nurses' organisation we had a no strike policy. In any case we knew that the nurses would not walk off and leave the Aborigines without medical care. We finally reached a compromise that we would agree to the nurses being taken off the Yuendumu settlement as a means of political demonstration, provided that Dr. Everingham would arrange for nurses from the Northern Territory Air Medical Service to be flown in every day to the settlement as a substitute for the permanent nurses being taken off. It was the strangest strike I have ever been involved with, but we had to guarantee that what the RANF and nurses everywhere regarded as a sacred duty was carried out. That is, never to leave the patient. At the same time we have been heavily involved in the chaotic situation caused by the "apartheid" policy being introduced.

## CHAPTER NINE

### WHAT HAS BEEN HAPPENING ON ABORIGINAL LAND AREAS

Apart from industrial and professional matters, which were interconnected in my work and studies in the Territory, it was, as I have been showing, also a time during which the Federal Labor Government was proceeding ahead with policies of self-determination, which meant that greater control was supposed to be given to the Aborigines in running their affairs. One of the most difficult factors was the tragedy of drink, for which Aboriginal law has no means of dealing. On the Yuendumu settlement, which was some 120 miles from Alice Springs, we had the usual team of nurses working who were under great strain in coping with fights, in which spears, boomerangs, and other weapons were used. Under the influence of drink some Aborigines would throw spears at anyone, including the nurses. These confrontations broke out each night there had been a drinking party, but were related to the effect of tribal law. Often drinking was not the problem. Violence was dictated by tribal law and custom of "the old days." Under the new self-determination dictates from the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs, police had been told to leave the Aboriginal settlements. Leftists in the Aboriginal Department were determined to have no police in the areas where Aborigines were settled. Apart from the nurses based at the Yuendumu settlement. I had been contacted by the deputy head of the Department of Health in Darwin and the nurses at the Alice Springs hospital to intervene on behalf of the nurses at Yuendumu, because they were in danger due to having to rescue wounded men during fights. Police stationed on the reservations were highly trained at stopping violence, and often despite danger to themselves, would lock up someone for the night who was going for his weapons, and would let him out in the

morning with no harm done to anyone. But an Aborigine, no matter how powerful in the tribe did not have similar influence to prevent such disasters excepting if he felt obliged to join in the battle himself.

After conferences with Commonwealth Department of Health officials, medical men and a meeting of nurses at the Alice Springs Hospital, I flew to Yuendumu, and met with the nurses there. While in company with the deputy head of the Commonwealth Department of Health from Darwin, and the white superintendent of the reservation, we were confronted with a deputation of Aboriginal men and women, who explained why they needed the assistance of white police on the reservation. Some of them protested vigorously at the interference of the Aboriginal Affairs Department in Canberra, and urban Aborigines from Melbourne and Sydney, who were visiting Alice Springs and other parts of the Territory, using the authority of the Aboriginal Affairs Department to interfere in their affairs, and to unjustly lay claim to be speaking on their behalf. This, they told us, was leading to a breakdown of order and progress on this and other reservations in the Territory. The Department of Health and the Aborigines themselves had been powerless to influence the bureaucracy in Canberra, which was centred around the influence of the leftist Charles Perkins and his radical compatriots. In all my investigations, I found Perkins to be the last person who could claim to be a representative of the Aborigines. He was the exact opposite. The full-blood Aborigines in the Northern Territory constantly complained of the whites and part-Aborigines who were continually meddling in their lives and acting as imposters because of a wrong authority given them by the Federal Government. Aborigines who came in groups and as individuals told us why they needed police. Another of their concerns was that Aborigines were being physically assaulted for going to a Christian Church. The new policy was to go back to the old tribal ways completely. After a meeting with the nurses in Alice Springs, we resolved on a publicity campaign through the press and radio to draw the public's attention to what was happening in the Territory, and that I would go back to the reserve to negotiate an agreement with the tribal council to reinstate the police to provide protection for the nurses and to assist in bringing some general sense of order. It was difficult to make some pressmen believe what was really going on. But we were fortunate in that one of the Melbourne *Herald's* top writers happened to be in Alice Springs to cover a story on the commemoration of the one hundredth anniver-

sary of the first white man to put his hand on Ayers Rock. The Melbourne editor telephoned the journalist, John Larkins, who had a wide readership because of his authorship of the *Herald's* "In Black and White" column. Larkins in turn rang me at the Alice Springs Hospital. We arranged to go to Yuendumu together if that could be arranged. Highly professional in his ways as a journalist, he managed to do what a number of other reporters had been unable to contrive; that was, to obtain an authorisation from the Department of Aboriginal Affairs to visit the reserve. The story Larkins wrote was splashed over the front page of the Melbourne *Herald* and republished in a number of newspapers.

Yuendumu had a population of some 1,000 Aborigines of the Wailbri tribe together with some of the Pintubi tribe. The area provided a cattle station for the benefit of the Aborigines, a modern school and a supermarket. When Larkins and I asked where we could buy a packet of cigarettes, we at first thought they were joking when they pointed to a store. But sure enough, there it was, in the middle of the desert, complete with freezers, a wide range of goods, including cheese, T-bone steaks and the lot serving as though it were a small G.J. Coles store in a suburb of Melbourne. Both John and myself had the opportunity to learn a lot more of the settlement than I had on my first visit because of thunderstorms. We were there for a total of 28 hours.

Yuendumu was interesting because many of the Aborigines had been nomads in the desert until 25 years previously, before they came to live in the settlement. Whilst anthropologists have shown full tribal life has largely died out among the Australian Aborigines, in places like Yuendumu much of the old culture can still be observed. It was clear on this reserve, as on others I later visited, that successive Governments for more than a quarter of a century had been doing much more for the Aborigines than people down south had ever realised. All children had the opportunity of an education, and with the hospital and nurses, together with visiting doctors and a plane service to the Alice Springs Hospital, health care was equal if not better than that available to white people throughout the Commonwealth. There was a permanent staff of four nurses to a population of 1,000 people. However, no-one should complain about such a service because the nurses' activities included midwifery and the teaching of Aboriginal women about health care for babies and children. We watched as the women lined up with their babies to receive instruction from the nurses.

John Larkins wrote in the *Melbourne Herald* for July 23rd, 1973 as follows:

"Where the Federal Government pays witchdoctors \$57.50 a fortnight to take evil spirits from sick tribesmen.

"Where the men today have painted their bodies and the women shaved their heads in mourning for a leader who is dead after a tribal clash.

"And where five white nursing sisters say they live in fear of being assaulted, or speared, after drunken brawls . . .

"With me were Harry Nelson Jabarula, 29, a tribal council member who had been visiting Alice, and from Melbourne, Geoff McDonald, industrial relations officer for the Royal Australian Nursing Federation.

"Harry became a good friend.

"He took me before 15 members of the tribal council . . .

"His father, Hitler Jabarula, 61, a medicine man, was beaten to death on Saturday, July 14, at the settlement . . .

"My reason for coming to Yuendumu was to investigate claims by Mr. McDonald that two policemen should be stationed there — at present there is none — to protect the nurses.

"The senior sister, Betty Sawyer, 34, of Brisbane, showed me a hole on a flywire screen on the hospital verandah where a spear was thrown at her three weeks ago.

"The screen prevented it penetrating into the verandah. The spear stopped four inches from her chest . . .

"About two-thirds of the people at Yuendumu live in one-room huts with curved roofs — much like those on gipsy caravans.

"The rest live in gunyahs made of scrub, spinifex and canvas surrounding the settlement.

"Their spears, boomerangs and shields stand against the gunyahs.

"At night, they snuggle in with their dogs to keep warm against the cold desert air."

The huts described above were superior to the gunyahs and had been built by agreement with the Aborigines as a gradualised method of encouraging them to live in permanent housing but the majority still preferred the gunyahs, which to me looked terrible, as they do to almost all visitors to the Northern Territory, and other parts of Australia. Larkins was busy the whole time he was there looking around and questioning everyone he could. As he said, be



became a good friend of the tribe's leader, Harry Nelson Jabarula.

Look,' he said to me, after coming back to our room which we shared in the schoolteachers area of accommodation. "Those gunyahs are quite warm. Harry let me go inside one. The heat from the little fires they have in front of them circulates very well. They know exactly how to situate them.' He said he found it quite understandable how many of them were not in a hurry to change to a different type of accommodation. As an investigative journalist John had listened to all opinions as to whether riots ever took place. He would not accept any information without proof, so he went through the hospital log book. He reported in his article:

"But a page selected at random from the hospital log, showing patients treated tells a story:

"June 21:

"Freddie Dixon, spear wound to leg, scalp lacerations.

"Paddy Jabanunga, spear wound to left shoulder and lower arm (evacuated by Flying Doctor).

"Frank Jakemarra Nelson, deep scalp lacerations, ragged spear wound to leg.

"Larry Jambidjimba, deep scalp laceration, needed suturing.

"Johnny Wayne, welts on back, hit with nulla nulla.

"Henry Kennedy, small scalp laceration.

"Joe Jambidjimba, spear wound to leg . . .

"The trouble is liquor. Everyone at the settlement agrees on this point.

"The sisters say: 'We are frightened. We want police protection'.

"The sisters are: Betty Sawyers; Sue Blacker, 21, of Adelaide; Margaret Frattin, 26, of Little River, Victoria; Sandra Bodley, 23, of Brisbane, and Lynette Black, 23, of Brisbane.

"There is one male nursing aid, Alan Murray, 24, of Richmond, Victoria. He was sent there a fortnight ago after the sisters complained they were too frightened to go among the gunyahs at night to treat people hurt in battles.

"Yuendumu superintendent, Barry Lamshed, employed by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, told me:

"The trouble usually starts on alternate Fridays . . . pay days.

"They play a game called "five card" or "adding up" and one man might win as much as \$600. He'll get a ride to Alice Springs and bring back a car load of wine

flagons, say 16 of them.

'The tribal council might hear and stop the car on the reserve boundary, 10 miles out. But often they'll smuggle it through.

'Only three of them have permits to bring liquor on to the reserve.

'It's not where they are drinking that the trouble goes on. It's when they come back and give the missus a thumping. Her father hops in and it's on. Quite often, the women will come to my house for refuge, but more often they'll go to the sisters.

"Just as there is no dispute about the drinking, there is also no dispute that the men are armed."

Larkins report continues:

"The tribal council met soon after our arrival in a room in the administration building.

"The council president, Jimidja, a kindly old man, stood aside to allow Harry to chair the meeting. Geoff McDonald sat with him.

"Harry explained in Wailbri that the sisters were frightened — and the council agreed to ask immediately for a police station.

"Then Harry reverted to English —

"No longer do we live on tea and damper . . . we live on flagons.

"When the police come, some of us will get a shock.

"There were wry nods in agreement.

"He is a respected leader . . . a man who lives a double life.

"At Yuendumu, he sleeps in a gunyah. When he goes to Alice he occupies a \$12-a-night suite at the Territory Motel.

"I was allowed to walk through the gunyah camp.

"They had just moved the campsite to a new place 50 yards from the old.

"They were getting away from the spirit of Hitler Jabarula.

"The women were sweeping everywhere he had been. Sweeping away the spirits.

"Mothers sat and suckled their infants.

"At regular intervals, a sister drives through the camp ringing a brass bell, and it tells the mothers it is time to feed the babies.

"There appeared to be a good relationship between the whites and blacks. Many of the Aboriginal men were idle, but others were driving tractors, mustering cattle.

"Barry Lamshed told me of a battle he witnessed:

'A young bloke, who was married, took another girl. But her father objected . . . the trouble went on for months.

'One night, their two families met at the football ground. They sat opposite each other . . . then the young man and the girl's father began circling each other.

'The young bloke had an axe and the father had a spear and boomerang. The fight started when the father threw a spear.

'Then the men from both families joined in.

'Then the women. They used their nulla nullas to protect their own men.

'Finally, the young bloke got a spear right through his thigh. I thought 'Enough's enough' and drove in. I yelled to the young bloke 'C'mon, hop in the car' but he just kept running.

'A boomerang was thrown at me and the tribal council surrounded the car and told me to get out. They protected me'."

After the agreement was negotiated at Yuendumu, I flew to Hooker Creek, where I had also been requested to intervene by the nurses stationed there; only here there was no need for a conference with the Aboriginal leaders to reach agreement about having the police return. The two leaders were in the hospital being treated for exhaustion. While laying in bed, they pleaded with me to use the influence of the RANF to have the police brought back. Would we speak out about the "mad people" in Canberra who were destroying all the good work they had achieved in recent years? Their exhaustion had been due to running around day and night trying to stop the violence and bloodshed.

The Department of Aboriginal Affairs in Canberra refused to allow the police to be stationed at either Yuendumu or Hooker Creek. I went to see Mr. Gordon Bryant, who was the then Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, with whom I had always got on well. Present with Bryant was his secretary, who had been a personal friend for a long time, but I could not obtain any satisfaction.

One of the Aboriginal leaders at Hooker Creek, which was also a settlement of Wailbri, got out of bed to show me around the area. He spoke excellent English. Pointing to a string of modern houses being built, he said:

"They talk about the Aboriginal people and the dreamtime! I tell you, the people in the dreamtime are there in Canberra. They have issued an order that these houses have to be built for us and those carpenters have been rushed up here to build them; but my people prefer to live in gunyahs. In any case it is the custom that no-one can live in a place where someone has died; as you will have seen with my brothers at Yuendumu where the whole settlement shifts to get away from the spirit of the person who has died. These houses are useless."

Whilst our press releases were being given wide coverage, Mr. Charles Perkins went on television to tell us to keep our "dirty little noses out of it." One of the difficulties of the tribal Aborigines, was that they had very little opportunity to reach the press. However, the two leaders I mentioned did manage to get to the newspapers after hearing the impertinent utterances of Perkins over the radio. Whilst their call for the return of the police was printed in the newspapers, they were as equally unsuccessful as ours. The stranglehold of the left-wing over the Department of Aboriginal Affairs was complete. Responsible elements in the Department were as ineffective in their efforts as ourselves.

It was six months after these events that the conference with Dr. Doug Everingham took place. But no results were achieved. The behaviour of most of our politicians at present reminds me of a character described by Mark Twain "he never acquired a conviction that could survive a disapproving remark from a cat."

Whilst on the subject of Hooker Creek, which is several hundred miles from Alice Springs, I recall a long discussion I had with the superintendent, a white public servant with a great deal of experience among Aborigines, with an obvious understanding and affection towards them. "In many ways the older people think and talk differently to us," he said. "For instance, their language does not really have a word for 'no'. If you ask them 'Is that a sacred stone?' they will most likely answer, 'yes'." He then called over a grey bearded magnificent looking old man. At the same time he produced from his desk drawer a large and glossy book which had then been only recently published. "You see this book," he said to me. "It is supposed to be a study of Aboriginal culture and beliefs."

We had an anthropologist over here from Sydney and he spent more than a year talking to the people, and it's just incredible what they told him. What's more he's written it all in this book.' By this time the old Aborigine was sitting next to us and I had been introduced to him. The superintendent turned to a page and read out a question the same Aborigine had been asked, which was — What did the Wailbri believe was the cause of conception when a woman was going to have a baby? The answer had been that when an Aboriginal woman is standing by the river and a Barramundi fish swims past the woman then conceives.

'Now why did you tell the poor bugger that? You people know how women conceive just as well as everyone else?'

The old Aborigine just laughed, giving himself great amusement. It turned out that this was just the same as white people telling their children that the stork brought them. I later spent several enjoyable hours with the same Aborigine when he later came over where I was studying the nurses' work at the hospital. If ever I want to write a book of light fiction, I might go back to see him, and ask will he be the joint author.

John Larkins mentions the employment of Aboriginal medicine men to work with the RANF members on the reserves. This had been a cause of professional concern among the nurses. Some of the older, more experienced nurses had written to the RANF strongly objecting to the new system, after it had been instituted as a directive from Canberra in the package of "returning to the old ways to give the Aborigines more dignity."

On my first visit to the Territory it had been too early to study what the results would be. It sounded very plausible that the medicine men, or "bush doctors" as they were sometimes called, would have a good psychological effect on the patient. I had not read the submissions of the older nurses, which were being studied by the nurses' officials at the Federal office of the RANF in Melbourne. Doctors had also voiced alarm at the initiatives, but they had all been instructed to submit. White medicine had long since taken over from the tribal medicine and was the cause of a rapid increase in population among the tribal Aboriginal families who had come to live in the settlements. However, not many months had passed when Melbourne nurses returning from their stints in the Territory reported to us that considerable trouble was beginning to occur, several times with quite serious repercussions. The main treatment for curing any sickness by the Aboriginal custom was the "sucking method." The medicine men, who had

been taken out of their retirement, practised by putting a small piece of wood in the patients mouth and after opening up the mouth of the patient and pretending to suck the piece of wood out. The piece of wood was then shown to the patient, who was pronounced cured. It may very well be called a sugar pill and may in some cases have a good effect on the sick person. Two troubles had developed. Some of the older Aborigines had begun to think there was no need for modern medicine or treatment and failed to go to the hospital when they should. The other turned out to be the revival of an old custom of the "bush doctors" who, after their treatment was given, told the patient who the other Aborigine was who was guilty of putting the piece of wood there in the first place and causing illness. The patient then proceeded to go armed and inflict the appropriate punishment on the wicked one. Another lesson I learned in the Territory, and from talking to nurses from the other States, is that successive Governments for more than 25 years had been putting enormous effort into helping the Aborigines with modern education and health care. The same can be said of the Christian missions. It is to be hoped that Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser's announcement of an enquiry into the misuse of funds for Aboriginal health care will bring out some of the truth.

One pleasant conclusion I gained from moving among the Aborigines, wherever I went in the Northern Territory, was the complete and genuine acceptance of our nurses and doctors for the service they provided. As John Larkins pointed out in his article nine years ago, relations between the whites and blacks was excellent, but the effect of Grassby and the new army of propagandists has made things go badly. Now under a reverse kind of "racism," to use the definition of our enemies, where the Federal and some State Governments have been sending in untrained or almost completely untrained part-Aborigines as health workers and controllers of health services and financed with lots of money the service has been declining rapidly, as has been relations between the races. The Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, ordered an investigation into "what he believes are the poor results of expensive health programmes for Aborigines," (Melbourne Age November 27, 1979). Among matters sought to be investigated was "the movement back to Aboriginal lifestyles." One of the disgraceful results of the urging of blacks to move away from modern living and to adopt a different lifestyle, has been an obvious increase of disease and illness, which is not discussed by those who know what is happening because of the fear of being labelled "racist." Instead of

presenting the realities, leftists are using complaints about Aboriginal health as an excuse to put more left-wing Aborigines in charge of health services so as to give them paid Government time to work up the land rights revolution, and to build up hatred of blacks towards whites.

In the same Age article the call is made "to put more blacks in charge of their own health services." How left-wing Aborigines untrained in health matters are going to provide better health services than those organised by trained doctors and nurses should need no comment, except to emphasise how the present revolutionary organisation is being promoted. The employment of untrained Aborigines to control health services is a most serious matter. Activists are enlisted who would not know how to put on a bandage. The Marxist cadre force engaged in this manner to cause dissention within the community, and to misrepresent the name of Australian Aborigines, is a frightening manifestation of utter irresponsibility by Governments. If the recording angel of politics ever balances the account, the politicians responsible should fear a heavy debt against them.

Health care continues to decline with untrained part-Aborigines appointed to run health services. To make matters worse, Marxist medical people and even a few Communist trained qualified nurses, have become part of the bizarre scheme. Whilst I was with the RANF, I, with two nurses gate-crashed a small meeting of left-wing nurses to check out what was going on. The meeting was being addressed by John Halfpenny, Victorian secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union and John Arrowsmith, a highly trained Communist, and former full-time functionary of the Communist Party, who had been transferred onto the staff of Halfpenny's union. I had worked closely with both these men while I was a member of the Communist Party. Communists had even persuaded Marxist students to break their studies and become student nurses as part of a cadre to eventually take over leadership of the RANF, as they are trying to do with the whole union movement.

The freakish manoeuvre is getting more serious as the confidence of Aborigines in white man's medicine is undermined. In a front page story of the Melbourne Age of January 29, 1982 some of the latest developments are described. According to the report by Lindsay Murdock, "European medicine" was "thrust" upon the Aborigines. Apparently the improved health and increased population and decrease in infant mortality was forced on Australia's



indigenous people!

Murdock quotes from an up to date report issued by the Northern Territory Health Department:

"rubbing the foul-smelling, karrinyarra grass with rabbit's brains and cooking it can make a good chest rub for babies with colds . . .

"Northern Territory health workers are encouraging Aborigines in outback areas to use treatments . . . which their ancestors developed by trial and error over centuries."

First of all, rabbits were introduced to Australia by the white "invaders." They might have produced a welcome supply of food to the Aborigines, but rabbits brains could not have been part of ancestral medicine "developed over the centuries," because there were no rabbits here. Furthermore, our nurses and doctors had been making splendid progress in teaching Aboriginal mothers and fathers that the best way to treat colds is by wrapping the baby up, together with such other assistance as they could give. Nurses and doctors in the Northern Territory are being driven to distraction by this ratbaggery. Unfortunately they are not used to political fighting, so that we do not hear their voices over the radio, on the TV or in the press. Does anyone blame me for demanding that the politicians do their jobs, and put an end to what has been taking place.

In Western Australia and Queensland, where the Governments will not allow this nonsense to be perpetrated, Aboriginal health is continuing to increase. *The Age* report says:

"The cures include eating small pieces of the raw liver of a wild or feral cat. Some techniques developed with the wild cat were later adapted for use with rabbits."

The cat referred to was also brought into Australia by the white man and could not be part of traditional medicine. A nurse from the Territory, who knew I was writing this book told me how the new Aboriginal controllers of the health services appointed by the Federal Government always come to them if they need medical attention and never to the tribal medicine men. "So might I say, do the tribes Nunkri." Nunkri, is the new name given to the Aboriginal medicine men. The report takes us back to Yuendumu, the basis of John Larkins' story.

"In two isolated areas of the Northern Territory, Yuendumu and Umbakumba, books have been printed which explain how Aboriginal medicines are made. Children are taught about them in school. The Yuendumu book is printed



in English and the local Warlpiri language.'

There are other preposterous tales told in *The Age* story, which quoted from the Department of Health report:

'entitled 'Traditional Aboriginal Medicines', says the raw liver of a feral fox is mashed and rubbed on a sick person's body and fresh rabbit's urine is put on cuts, sores and ringworm.'

Now, there were no foxes in Australia before the white settlers arrived any more than there were rabbits. We need not bother finding out how they manage to get fresh urine from the wild rabbits. It is also claimed that these cures were discovered over centuries by trial and error. The whole report is without any correspondence to reality. Another traditional cure quoted from Mr. Andy Barr, a regional pharmacist for the Department of Health, stationed in Alice Springs is:

"for other illnesses, like common gut aches, it is more common for them to use their traditional treatment. Often in the case of a gut ache, it would be cutting the top off a termite hill, mixing it with water, boiling it and drinking it.'

Australian Aborigines never knew how to boil water. They had no utensils until the white man introduced the billy-can and cooking pots. Other cures mentioned are "putting witchetty grubs in spear wounds." To treat burns or large sores is to "cover them over with the bag of a caterpillar." Another Brumagen cure for scabies is "crushing and soaking twigs in blood from a goanna's nose." No doubt it would be easy enough to find the twigs, but to catch enough goannas and cut off their noses to get sufficient blood to soak the twigs, must keep the Aboriginal doctors busy, and apparently goannas are not sacred in this part of Aboriginal land. If the ecology and environment leaders were at all serious, which of course they are not, they should be up there in Northern Australia with placards about the dangers to the environment of cutting off the tops of ant hills, and they should be protesting about the poor goannas having their noses cut off! What about the rights of ants having the tops of their homes cut off and boiled? It is certainly a case for the United Nations. Perhaps some left-wing union could take direct action to put a stop to all this interference of the natural ecology. They might even be able to link it up with the campaign against uranium mining. Surely some scientist can be found to show that there is radioactivity in ant hills! They can always get left wing scientists to produce any other evidence they want, irrespective of their qualifications. The report states that over thirty

people from the Department of Health are studying these remarkable cures. In quoting Mr. Barr, *The Age* report informs us:

"He said that previously the reliance which communities put on European medicine had created the possibility of some traditional treatments being forgotten."

At least this statement endorses the evidence of our nurses and doctors who have testified to how the Aborigines had accepted modern medicine until the directives came from white non-medical personnel in Canberra.

Mr. Barr tells us that a research programme is under way involving scientific personnel, "Which would probably take another five years to complete" and "the Department of Primary Industry" is active. "Staff involved in the research programme are aware of the possibility that a 'wonder drug' may be found." This is what the founder of sociology Max Weber would call "knowledge and observation of great refinement." How disturbing it will be if the "wonder drug" turns out to be from the tops of boiled ant hills and the goannas noses. What will the environment of Australia be like with all the tops off our ant hills and all the goannas running around without any noses? However, in a recent article by Leo Navrozov, commenting on the Salt II debate, it was observed that:

"Every argument must have a certain logical sequence.

For example, the argument whether pigs fly better than cliff swallows must begin by establishing whether pigs have wings. If they have none, no further argument is necessary."

Having again reflected on Mr. Navrozov's words I think we can stop worrying. But pity those nurses, and pity the Aboriginal children who are being taught this gospel by white school teachers in the Territory. It reminds me a little of my old Aboriginal friend at Hooker Creek. He would be able to keep the newspapers going for ages. No wonder the nurses are being driven crazy in the Territory. It is easy to understand why they describe the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs as a "Mad House." Again from *The Age* report:

"The Department of Health is using almost 90 Aboriginal health workers recruited from various communities to tell nursing sisters, doctors and botanists about traditional healing practices.

"Hundreds of medicines have been catalogued and will eventually be processed by a computer."

How a Melbourne nurse back from the Territory last year, in her upset state described the Federal Government to me over lunch,

would make Florence Nightingale blush.

Since Utopia was introduced into the language by Thomas More and Gullivers' Travels among the Yahoos there has been nothing like the experiences of nurses and their medical colleagues with the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs. And now with some of the new staff being employed by the Commonwealth Department of Health, they could be excused for believing they are being pursued by hallucinations. As professionals they deserve our sympathy. As a group they are like people having to sit and laugh at the jokes of a dictator. It is also insulting to the Aboriginal people and to their past generations who did well with such medicines they could develop, without any benefit of the rest of the world's experience. Geoffrey Blainey in *Triumph of the Nomads* has a most praiseworthy chapter on the subject. The indigenous people had discovered many effective remedies which have been sensibly examined. Aboriginal medicine has been well catalogued from these same areas by anthropologists in the past but none of those included in *The Age* report are mentioned.

Our Australian Aboriginal people deserve something better than this. They can also do without witchdoctors from the World Council of Churches and the Australian Council of Churches. Nor do they need Al Grassby, whose Psychoquackery about our social affairs has been about as useful to the Aborigines as it has been to the migrant community. They can also do without the grand Vizier himself, Dr. H.C. Coombs, whose snake oil treatment for the economy was as embarrassing to the Whitlam Government as his pretensions to being leader of the movement for a treaty with the Aborigines will be to those fools from Camelot who support him.

## CHAPTER TEN

### LISTEN TO THE EXPERTS

As we have shown, the call for a treaty was an invention of white radicals. It has been equally so with regard to predictions of violence and international support with military aid, or what they sometimes call "physical" support from other countries. The translation of "physical" is military aid from outside the country. The procedure of promoting violence is to forecast that it is going to take place. The Melbourne *Sun* of January 18, 1980, reported:

"The treatment of Aborigines by white Australians would lead to violence unless attitudes changed, former South Australian Premier Don Dunstan warned yesterday.

"Mr. Dunstan said the Aboriginal people were prepared to make a last desperate stand to protect their land and culture . . .

"The former Premier was launching the book, *It's Coming Yet . . .* by Stewart Harris, a foreign affairs research specialist in the Parliamentary Library, Canberra.

"The book is part of a campaign for a treaty between Aboriginal Australians and the Federal Government, recognising Aborigines' status and rights."

Such statements as Dunstan's are not just pure fantasy. They should be read for real. It is the doctrine of encouraging foreign military intervention into Australian affairs. It is a question of practicalities. What the left hopes to achieve cannot be accomplished without outside military intervention, using the element of surprise. Not only should the politicians reflect on this situation; proper plans and a full preparation should be made before any possibilities eventuate. The other side certainly have their military plans — together with the people to carry them out.

A psychology of violence is being deliberately fostered as part

of the developing strategy against Australia.

Generally recognised as Australia's leading authority on Aboriginal culture, law and languages is the late Professor T.G.H. Strehlow. He grew up among Aboriginal children and spent his entire life in association with them. Apart from a distinguished academic career, Professor Strehlow wrote widely and was a life-long champion of the cause of the Aboriginal people. Mr. John Grover, whose book *The Struggle for Power* is warmly recommended, quoted from an article by the Professor which has relevance to our present consideration:

"harshness of 'tribal law' was only too well perceived by the younger generation of black men and women. Moreover, the savage punishments (mainly death) for all breaches, even unwitting ones, against religious observances ('sacrilege') led from time to time to the commission of what were felt to be deeds of horrible savagery against whole groups of innocent people."

Professor Strehlow was not an apologist for mistakes made by early white settlers in Australia. Indeed, he made it his business to document and write about them. As a friend of the Aborigines from when he grew up among the Aranda tribe, where he was born in 1908, on the Hermansburg Lutheran mission in the Northern Territory, he spoke the Aranda language. After a university training in Adelaide he wrote books in the Aranda tongue. He even translated the New Testament into Aranda. He has preserved their language for all time. Professor Strehlow, as a scholar, discusses Aboriginal law in an objectively academic style, including what can be its frightful consequences. He says:

"In my book *Journey to Horseshoe Bend* there occurs also a detailed description — based on well-checked black oral sources — of the grim massacre of Irbmangkara, in which over a hundred men, women and children died for alleged complicity in a doubtfully-substantiated charge of sacrilege, somewhere about 1875.

"This horror was matched some years later by the wiping out of the Plenty River local group of Udebatara, from which there was only one survivor — a small weeping boy who was taken away by one of the fierce 'avengers' and raised as his own son.

"Another widely-reported incident of the same period was the killing of a large camp of black men, women and children in the vicinity of Mt. Eba, again on a charge of

'sacrilege' — an atrocity which sent shock waves of horror as far as the Aranda-speaking area, some five hundred miles distant to the north.

"Hence I have found, during my own seventy years of life, plenty of black folk in Central Australia who, despite their own critical opinions of white settlers generally (whom some of them hated with a truly racist hatred), insisted on telling me that the coming of the whites had not been wholly a disaster for the indigenous people. These people pointed to the following three main benefits of white settlement:

1. The white people had not only augmented, but actually replaced, most of the indigenous foods.
2. The coming of the white settlers had done away with the period of starvation in a land prone to droughts.
3. The white authorities had broken down the geographic barriers between the lands of local groups: for the very first time in Aboriginal history, black people could wander about freely in Australia, without any danger of being killed when they crossed any sacrosanct group borders.

"As far as many young black people were concerned, the prospect of escaping from the harsher provisions of tribal law proved virtually irresistible. In Central Australia, at any rate, Aboriginal society was destroyed largely because the young people deliberately deserted their own people . . .

"It has been stressed here that Australia is the driest continent on this globe, and that there is no part in it that is secure from droughts. Indeed, over most of Australia, drought periods are probably more 'normal' than good or even fair seasons. Long before the coming of the whites, the black population over most of Australia lived in constant fear of droughts."

The Professor goes on further:

"Nor will the exploits of the many new hypocritical (and false) culture experts, professional admirers of Aboriginal art and civilisation, money-hungry lawyers, red-hot activists, and so on, help Australians to arrive at any just solutions of the near-insoluble 'Aboriginal problems' of the present. If the future is to be redressed at all, the present hate campaigns must be ended; and then thoughtful black and white leaders must look at the real problems of the present and the future in a spirit of helpful co-operation. Most white Australians are today at least conscious of the injustices of the past and are

willing to provide at least some of the finance to make amends for these injustices, provided that the money goes to the real victims and to the real sufferers of surviving disabilities, and not to the stirrers, the activists, and the self-appointed (or Government appointed) 'experts', 'advisers' and 'spokesmen' for the Aborigines.

"And there are plenty of Aborigines in this country who are sane thinkers and realise that all Australians, black and white, have a common destiny. The trouble is that they are rarely listened to by our Governments."

The Professor's words about the new writers on Aboriginal history recall a book *A History of Civilisation* by Gerrit P. Judd. When describing the barbarism of the west in its intellectual decline Judd wrote:

"A Bishop of Ravenna in the Ninth Century naively admitted that in writing the lives of his predecessors he prayed for God's help whenever he had no historical facts at his disposal."

There is and must be one law for both Aborigines and whites, as John Grover commented:

"He had little respect for some self-styled experts of insolent conceit,"

whom the Professor said:

"have a vested interest in promoting Aboriginal culture as invented by themselves . . .

"The Aboriginal culture and way of life has been torn apart in the years of white settlement. People have been scattered and much law and tradition lost forever.

". . . we are creating in our community scope for a small sector to get away with murder or to avoid punishment normally required under European law . . . These ill-considered theories could therefore lead to a legal no-man's land between white and black society.

"People are trying to establish important principles on very shaky foundations. There is very little real understanding by either black or white people of traditional Aboriginal law. In some instances I suspect the Courts and the community have had the wool pulled over their eyes . . .

"There can be only one law. In practice today this means white man's law . . . Aboriginal law was devised for the traditional situation."

Professor Blainey's book *Triumph of the Nomads*, can be

recommended for the same reasons as the writings of Professor Strehlow, not only to give some understanding of tribal law, but also for its great praise of the skills of the Aboriginal people. Those who turn its pages will be inspired by the remarkable skills developed by the Aborigines to cope with a hostile environment, their hunting skills and so on. *The Economist* presented the book as "a learned and ingenious plea for greater respect and knowledge of the Aboriginal people." Geoffrey Blainey, who is professor of Economic History at Melbourne University, has produced an academically honest account which is to be expected from an authority on this subject:

"the conclusion seems inescapable: over a long span of time millions of newborn Aborigines must have been deliberately killed by their mother or father. Infanticide was almost certainly the strongest check on the increase of the population of Aborigines" (page 97)

"A London scholar, James Woodburn, warned recently of the danger of explaining the abandonment of the old and the lame in hunting societies as solely the result of 'ecological pressures'. Heartless pressures were also at work. Thus in some favoured regions of Australia the old were usually given the poorer scraps as food and — for blankets — the tattered animal skins.

"If abortion, infanticide and the difficulties of caring for the very old and the very young had been the only curbs on a rising population, they would have gone a long way towards explaining the success of Aborigines in continuing to live in a land of relative plenty. These, however, were not the only customs which helped to ensure that people were usually less plentiful than food. Epidemics and warfare also pinned down the population. At present most of those who study nomadic societies are inclined to view wars and plagues as less deadly amongst nomads than in societies of farmers and herdsmen. Indeed the freedom of nomadic societies from serious plagues and wars is seen as one of their triumphs or good fortune. In nomadic Australia, however, there was no such good fortune" (page 102)

"The effect of epidemics on Aboriginal population is not easy to assess. The effect of some epidemics, moreover, was probably compounded by the reprisals which they incited. Aborigines believed that a fatal disease was the result of a plot of an enemy, and that the enemy therefore must be pun-



ished. The plague that followed the river settlements about the 1820s, for instance, was seen not as the result of a virus but rather as a malicious spell cast by hostile tribes from the upper rivers. Belief in the power of sorcery meant that some men and women, even though lightly infected, gave up hope, ceased to eat, and quietly prepared to die. Sorcery was a self-fulfilling prophecy because the victim almost willed himself to die and indeed would die unless a local medicine man was persuasive enough to convince him that the spell could be dispersed. The devastation of a plague was increased not only by the widespread belief in sorcery but also by the avenging expeditions which were set in motion after the plague had passed; ultimately the groups which had suffered from the plague felt strong enough to retaliate against the originators of the plague.

"While epidemics came irregularly, armed fights were more an annual event in many parts of the continent and Tasmania. Violent death — by spearing or clubbing — was a restraint on the growth of population. Occasionally there were pitched battles or raids in which many men took part. The casualties might not, at first sight, seem large; but the death of two men in a battle involving forty meant that casualties were approaching the scale of the Battle of the Somme. An Aboriginal fight could absorb a large proportion of the adults within a radius of fifty miles — indeed could involve a far higher proportion of able-bodied adults than any war of the twentieth century could possibly involve . . ."

In referring to William Buckley who escaped from the penal settlement at Sorrento, Victoria, in 1805, and who had fought in the French revolutionary wars, Professor Blainey wrote:

"Buckley was a giant, standing 6ft. 6ins. in his large bare feet. Physically strong, a veteran of military engagements, he should not have been frightened by the warfare which he saw as he moved from place to place with Aboriginal bands. And yet one of the strongest impressions of his memoirs is the fighting and bloodshed. He had not long been adopted by one group when a fight began with a neighbouring group. In the fight a man was speared in the thigh and a woman was fatally speared under the arm. A little later the seduction or abduction of women led to another fight in which two boys were killed. In a three-hour battle between neighbouring bands three women were killed. Buckley witnessed all these

killings. In another fierce battle, men and women were so streaked with blood and they fought one another so indiscriminately that the scene, to his mind, was 'much more frightful' than anything he had seen in battles fought with powder and shot in the Netherlands in 1799.' (pages 105-107)

Professor Blainey gives a fuller account of Buckley's experience but it would no more lessen your respect for the Aboriginal people than it would to study the evidence discovered of how our own ancestors conducted themselves by the same savagery. It is all a part of mankind's long history. But it would not bring you to support the dangerous cranks and political operators who want the Aborigines to return to the days of their past.

Professor Blainey also carefully investigates problems associated with health, infection and disease:

"As the banks of the Darling, Murrumbidgee and Murray were relatively thick with people the riverside societies must have been a smooth ribbon for the spread of the infection. Later a pioneer sheep owner of the river region noticed that the skin of very old Aborigines was pocked, and they told him that a disease had spread downstream at the time of the spring floods. So many Aborigines had died of the disease that their society ceased to operate, and for a time the bodies lay unburied, the sick were unattended, and the survivors fled. On present knowledge it is therefore not safe to assume that hunters and gatherers were much less likely than the later farming societies to be decimated by epidemics.' (pages 101-102)

Epidemics were another cause of keeping down the Aboriginal population of Australia. Professor Blainey quotes an example from the evidence of Buckley of an epidemic which caused, in Buckley's words, "a dreadful swelling of the feet" together with ulcerous sores, which took many lives.

It is only fair to say that Aboriginal medicine was never able to cope with the tragedy of epidemics any more than native medicine was able to cope with them in Africa before the coming of the white man. That the population of the whole world and all its races have benefited by "white man's medicine" need not, certainly not, lead to any sense of shame or "guilt" on our part. Might I add how stupid it would be to preach the guilt syndrome to Aborigines because their culture and tribal ways led to such massacres as described by Professor Strehlow, or the problems associated with Professor Blainey's account of tribal life. It would be just as silly as

preaching guilt to the American Indians because they gave the world the curse of tobacco.

To suggest that white children should be constantly drilled on why they are to accept guilt for anything that happened generations ago, and involving people who have since joined the great majority, is the work of purebred crackpots and dangerous political manipulators. Attempting to create guilt is a major feature of psychological war and shall be exposed as such. Propagandists who dare to try and bully Australian children with unhealthy notions of guilt should be put right in their place, even if it means dismissing school teachers and academics from our educational institutions who persist in castrating the minds of school children and higher level students. If not contradicted, the effect of this type of propaganda is the same as turning the migrant community against the Anglo-Saxon majority and would turn Australia into a spiritless community. No children, or race of people or nation should allow itself to be branded guilty of anything. The very notion of collective guilt is as ridiculous as insisting that the Jews of today have to accept the guilt of killing Jesus; a proposition seriously put forward until comparatively recent times. Many examples could be used by way of illustration. Should the Russian people and their children be declared guilty for the crimes of Stalin, or the children of China lose their pride in themselves and the history of their nation because under the leadership of Mao Tse Tung 20,000,000 Chinese were killed? Nor should the African Negro be considered guilty because slavery was practised in Africa long before the white man ever set foot on their coastline. Slavery continued to exist in Africa long after it had been wiped out in any country under the rule of white man. Even though slavery is actually making a comeback in Africa only twisted minds could try and impose the guilt of this on the Negro people as a whole, or their children. It had long been the practice among African tribes to hold in slavery the captives of other tribes. What is more, slaves were kept for cannibalism and ritual sacrifice. The anti-slavery society has continued its very effective existence in London since 1823. The organisation recently reported to the United Nations how slavery still exists today in at least 10 African countries. Mauritania has an estimated 100,000 slaves, most of whom have been taken from the impoverished black state of Senegal. The cost of a strong young woman is \$3,600. Young women generally cost twice as much as men. The children of slaves are owned by the master to be used as concubines or unpaid laborers or sold as the owner so wishes. The

Foreign Affairs Minister for Mauritania acknowledged recently to the *New York Times*:

"Yes, slavery still exists in our country. It will take a long process before we are finally rid of this hateful practice. One must remember that this is not only a matter of law but one of tradition and social custom that can't be done away with overnight."

That may be fair enough for the Mauritanian, but it would not be tolerated in Australia. We should not suggest that black people as a whole should be found guilty over this or future black children have the finger of guilt pointed at them. When a minority of white men practiced slavery it was the custom all over the world but for more than a century it was abolished in the last areas where any white man was engaged. The Nigerian black writer Dillibi Onyeama in his recently published book *The Return* caused great consternation by his reports that slavery was rampant in Nigeria, where the slaves are subjected to incredibly brutal treatment. Some slaves are as young as 10 years old.

Australian Aborigines are entitled to feel proud that they practiced very little cannibalism compared to many other native people. But the slaughter of Aborigines by each other for senseless purposes of superstition and inter-tribal wars, as has been shown by Geoffrey Blainey in his *Triumph of the Nomads — A History of Ancient Australia* (Sun Books, Melbourne, 1978), was something people did not want to see again because of rejuvenation of Aboriginal tribal law and custom. Should Aborigines feel guilt over past inter-tribal wars or preach guilt to their children, let alone seek to return to the old culture such as is put to them by white Marxist professors, or dilettantes in the robes of priests and ministers claiming to be the representatives of the Christian religion, living in a windowless room and unable to see the world outside? Certainly not! We are dealing with something other than an academic puzzle; we are relating to what is happening in the real world of politics and a subject being discussed in the school rooms and elsewhere in this Commonwealth. It is a not unimportant social question, where the potential for error is not minor, because all nations and peoples have a needed sense of pride in the past. A guilt hangover is destructive.

## CHAPTER ELEVEN

### THE PREPARATIONS FOR VIOLENCE

As part of the public relations exercise to push Australians into the Treaty objective, the bullying that goes in harness with spreading a guilt syndrome, is being worked with a form of arrogance. Bullying is an old tool of politics like slander. They are only growing in influence because the politicians are not hitting back. None of the propaganda being thrown at Australians can stand up to examination. When under political attack the only means of defence is to counter attack many times harder.

Machiavelli said that the only means of defence is to attack. In politics it is the same as with the military; there is no such thing as passive defence. Trying to instil a guilt complex is a classic form of weakening a peoples morale. To call Australians "racist" was a tactic of the Japanese in preparing their invasion plans before the outbreak of the Second World War. The Mikado kept up this slander from their psychological war department right up until the end of the War. It is the same tactic being used by the self-appointed representatives of the Aborigines.

"Australians should feel a sense of guilt and shame at the treatment of Aborigines" said Dr. Coombs when addressing a meeting of the Victorian Trades Hall Council (Melbourne *Sun*, November 23, 1979).

Dr. Coombs said he was part of a campaign to convince Federal Government to negotiate a treaty with the Aborigines. He said the treaty would allow the Aborigines to maintain their own "laws." The facts are that the overwhelming majority of Aborigines do not want to keep their "laws" at all, because they are horrible and are the cause of murder and death by bone pointing and create a constant obligation for spearing each other, if not for the purpose of causing death, then injury to various parts of the body for the

---

most unimportant breaches of custom. Rather than inspiring a guilt complex and trying to bring about a return to the stone age, it should be appreciated that Australia's Aborigines are learning to appreciate the benefits of modern civilisation. It so happens that our law is the product of centuries of development. It is more humane and effective as a means of maintaining and protecting a society than is traditional Aboriginal law, which is cruel in the extreme, and based on sorcery. Because of superstition, Aboriginal law convicts more of the innocent than the guilty. The white advocates of a return to the punishments of Aboriginal law remind me of the leaders of the alternate lifestyle movement, who leave the yearly festival's smoking pot, eating yams and using herbal soaps, to open the doors to their limousines and cruise into the city restaurants at night to enjoy the benefits of a civilisation they tell their followers to reject. Apart from the white neophytes, it is mainly the part-Aborigines who have been brought up in the cities, and who live on considerable public service salaries who are telling the full-blood natives to go back to a system of carnage, which helped keep this continent virtually unpopulated until the settlement of the white man.

There is no more commonsense in telling Aborigines to revert to a more primitive law than it is to tell the Papuans to go back to head hunting. The so-called "beautiful spiritualism" lauded by the Australian Council of Churches has been terrible in its consequences. The investigator should talk to the young full-blood Aboriginal men and women in the Northern Territory about what they think about being dragged back to the old ways. It is pure political exploitation of the Aborigines in the crudest possible form, which has been used to hold back the development of this continent for both the Aborigines and the whites, and has hit areas in every State of the Commonwealth. As the *Melbourne Sun* reported on May 12, 1980:

"Alcoa yesterday expressed surprise that 'all of a sudden' it was claimed there could be sacred Aboriginal ground on its industrial site at Portland (Victoria).

"A company spokesman said an environmental study launched in January had received 97 submissions, but none relating to Aboriginal sites."

Time was then wasted with left organised protests and expensive court cases until the argument was settled in favour of the company and the thousands of workers who will obtain jobs both directly and indirectly as a result of the project going ahead.

---

The public had known of the project for over a year with widespread publicity, but when all other environmentalist argument was unsuccessful, the sacred site gimmick was used and great publicity given through the press about a tribe of Aborigines at Portland, which does not even exist. There was much ballyhoo about "racism" and the sacrilege of building an aluminium smelter.

"Racism" can be used as an argument for almost anything against Australia. Senator Sim, Chairman of the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence told a Melbourne audience that Australia was regarded as a "racist" country because of its restrictive trade practises. (*The Australian*, October 12, 1979). What next! If we allow the "racist" slur to go unanswered, it will be used against us by additional countries whose leaders want to have a go at Australia.

While on their visit to Australia the WCC delegation spokesman Anwar Barkat said:

"Racism is a fact in Australia," *Melbourne Herald* June 18, 1981.

"The team will make recommendations to the WCC headquarters in Geneva and the United Nations on what can be done for the Aboriginal.

"Professor Barkat said this could take the form of international pressure on the Australian Government."

The *Melbourne Sun* of July 1, 1981, reported,

"Professor Barkat said 'White racism in Australia seemed to be growing.'"

Police in the Northern Territory have had to investigate the teaching of violence in a series of lectures given by Mr. John Tomlinson at the Darwin Community College which included use of "the radical activist publication, *Red Book for Social Change*, which contains a section on explosives." (*National Times* June 16, 1979).

"Chief Minister of the Country-Liberal Party Government, Paul Everingham, said officers of his department had drawn material to his attention. He said he had therefore requested the Police Commissioner to carry out an investigation into the nature of training being undertaken in a certain course at the Darwin Community College.

"Comparisons with Queensland followed in the local news media . . .

"Tomlinson told *The National Times* that the purpose of covering this area was to discuss the failure of community

work when the stage of violence was reached.

"Students and other lecturers at the Darwin Community College have been interviewed by police in their inquiries." *The National Times* report continued:

"On Wednesday May 16, Education Minister Mr. Robertson told the House he found the contents of the lecture series 'frightening' . . .

"The Minister said the materials included in the Red Book which set out methods of use of explosives and identifying targets . . .

"The Independent member for Nightcliff, Mrs. Dawn Lawrie, said that she was a member of a Darwin Community College advisory committee which discussed the contents of lectures and which had known for some time about Tomlinson's course . . .

"The Darwin Community College acting vice-principal, Don Dickson, made a public statement on May 17. He said the course had been examined by a group of assessors from relevant disciplines at the Australian National University, the University of Sydney, the South Australian Institute of Technology and by a social worker at the Uniting Church, Darwin.

"The report of the assessors was approved by the Australian Territories Accreditation Committee and subsequently registered as a course approved by the Australian Council on Awards in Advance Education, the superior body registering tertiary courses presented by institutions other than universities."

The preparation for the use of terrorism is well documented in the Australian press, which is another method of attack against Australia. As with the specific subject of this treatise, there can be no excuse for Governments being taken by surprise. I will leave the above quote as an example with the notation that Australian Communists utilise the press as a means of organisation, to rally their followers and to win over public opinion. They use the media to communicate their debates to every corner of the Commonwealth.

The idea that violence between white Australians and Aborigines is being carefully fostered, is one which the great majority find hard to accept. But the evidence for this is overwhelming. Whites have been advocating that blacks use violence against their fellow white Australians.

*The Sunday Sun* of June 15, 1980 carried the following report



In an extraordinary declaration, best-selling author Xavier Herbert has said he will pay for the legal defence of the first Aborigine to spear a white man.

He told a meeting in Cairns, 'I would bankrupt myself to defend the first one to do so'.

Dr. Herbert said he believed a full-blood Aborigine could legally spear a white man because the two races were technically at war . . .

Dr. Herbert spoke at a conference organised by the militant Aborigines who claim the World Wilderness Congress currently taking place in Cairns is ignoring the needs of their people.

He told a packed hall, 'Violence is the only solution to the Aboriginal problems. I cannot understand why an Aborigine has not speared a white man before this'.

Dr. Herbert spoke on the progress of a projected peace treaty between Aborigines and white Australians.

'Because such a treaty did not exist Aborigines and whites were still at war and an Aborigine would be acting within his rights if he speared a white man, Dr. Herbert said . . .

Mr. Mick Miller, chairman of the North Queensland Land Council, said he supported the concept of violence.'

As we contemplate this incredible advice, the question arises: If an Aborigine were to act as Dr. Herbert suggests, who is to be prosecuted for murder, Dr. Herbert or the Aborigine, or both? And further, concerning Mr. Miller's call for violence, are whites to be allowed to defend themselves, if so, would this make them "racists"? What would happen to Aborigines who accepted this open advice to engage in terrorism and then became the victims because white people defended themselves?

There are laws against advocating violence in Australia. Why aren't Dr. Herbert and Mr. Miller prosecuted?

As with leftist propaganda generally, every attempt is made to downgrade any notion of patriotism and in particular to denigrate the military tradition and the memory of our soldiers of the past. In a lengthy article (*Nation Review* December 11, 1981). John Hepworth, who makes a profession in his writing of belittling anything patriotic by way of satire and sarcasm, somewhat along the lines of Philip Adams of the *Melbourne Age*, went on to invoke the "guilt and shame" syndrome against Australians about Aborigines. In the same manner, uniformed soldiers were shown to

be savagely attacking the Aboriginal hero in the film *The Chant of Jimmie Blacksmith*, which never happened in the real capture of the outlaw on whom the film was based. No soldiers were used in the event discussed in Hepworth's article. However, the monument to Australia's fallen during the First and Second World Wars are desecrated in the form of such propaganda.

In another report calling for the treaty, Dr. Coombs extended the plan of their argument by saying the present population of Australia does not "legally" own the land (*Melbourne Age* July 20, 1979). When stating "White Australian occupancy of Australian soil had never been ratified morally or legally," he further showed how the plan for the treaty leaves the way open for no end to the list of demands. If we do not legally own the country, then it belongs to the Aborigines.

"We have made no attempt to draw up the treaty. That will be entirely up to Aboriginal organisations . . .

"Dr. Coombs said there was a deep concern among Australians of European descent that their ownership of Australian land, as defined by imported European laws, was still based solely upon force, without any documentary recognition of the quality and courage of those who were conquered."

The central thrust of the Coombs argument is that we do not own Australia and are a conquering people, who can be removed. The verbal rubbish that is to be put to us becomes louder and louder. Nor do Dr. Coombs and his Marxist allies even intend that such a "treaty" is one that would leave us with any rights. As is well known, the Premier of Queensland, Joh Bjelke-Petersen has been to the forefront in warning Australians of the danger that has lain ahead and has been a centre of attack and ridicule by the entire left operation. Among those who have been taken along on a string by the left-wing cause is the Queensland Senator, Neville Bonner. The *Melbourne Age* of July 24, 1978 reports:

"Queensland Aboriginal Senator Neville Bonner has described as fantasy comments made by his State's Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, about the development of a black power state in the Northern Territory."

The Premier had said:

"white Australians could become second class citizens unless mineral rights provisions were removed from Aboriginal land legislation.

"The Premier also said Aboriginal control, of a resource

as vital as uranium, could lead to an independent black State in the Northern Territory which Russia or China would be eager to help."

Premier Bjelke-Petersen is not a politician who uses Communism as a smear tactic; indeed there is no need to do this. As a former Communist, I can verify that the remarks he makes from time to time about Communist operations in Australia are an understatement of the position.

Far from dismantling the arguments of the Premier of his State, Senator Bonner actually testified to the correctness of Premier Bjelke-Petersen's observations concerning radical involvement in the land rights issue. *The Age* report continued:

"Speaking in the address in reply debate yesterday, Senator Bonner said Aborigines in the Northern Territory were seeking the right to say who should or should not enter their lands. Senator Bonner said: 'I do not think that is wrong. I think it is a fundamental right'."

In his same speech, Bonner admitted Sydney and Melbourne radical Aborigines were capitalising on the movement. He said:

"I think it is appropriate that the Northern Land Council is under the chairmanship of a tribal Aborigine, not a Sydney radical or Melbourne radical."

Tribal Aborigines have been brought into the Communist nursery along the same lines as urban Aborigines from Melbourne, Sydney and elsewhere. Month in and year out, tribal Aborigines who have radios as their main means of hearing the news, have been listening to reports about white "racism" against them. Naturally it has had an effect of building up a real hatred of whites by many full-blood Aborigines. All this is made worse by the smears of the white people going unanswered and with radical agents being given a free run on the Aboriginal settlements to organise virtually as they please.

One of the ways that weak people defeat themselves in politics is to try and walk the tightrope, or even worse, to join in with the enemy when their own friends are under attack, thinking that this will make them safe. Everyone has seen how some children behave to gain favour with the school bully; they cheer the bully on, and give him favours, but when their turn comes they get the biggest belting of the lot, because they cannot satisfy the bully's demands. The world of both international and national politics operates the same way. The Federal Government is like those ALP members who think they can do a deal with the Socialist Left, but every

concession made only brings closer the day of their own downfall, or makes it all the more difficult when the time comes for the unavoidable final showdown.

## CHAPTER TWELVE

### AN END TO APPEASEMENT POLICIES IS ESSENTIAL

"Australia sponsors attack on Racism," headlines an article by Michelle Gratten in the Melbourne Age of July 3, 1979:

"Australia is urging the Commonwealth Conference to back a general declaration condemning racism . . . Mr. Fraser is strongly and genuinely opposed to apartheid."

All this would make humorous reading in the light of the Prime Minister's support for the "apartheid" system in Australia. We could smile about it all except that politics is a serious matter and what we are dealing with is the defence of the country. All that the Federal Government does by prattling along about the evils of "racism," is to strengthen the case being built up against Australia.

Malcolm Fraser's refusal to back the Queensland Government, and his eulogies of leaders of Marxist-led black nations, mouthing statements as to how his Government has not supported Queensland, attempting to show that he is the "teacher's pet," does nothing for this country, or the honour of Australians, let alone its security. Such appeasement tactics, in the natural cause of events backfire, as is already happening.

The Communist strategy towards the treaty is to put it forward as a white man's proposal first, without any details, and once the Federal Government accepts the idea, and then submits it as a plan for consideration by the Aborigines, there is to be a committee elected by the Aborigines themselves who are to put forward demands which will have the support of the leaders of the black nations. Mr. Fraser apparently thinks these black leaders like Mr. Mugabe of Zimbabwe, who is gearing up to help the forces arranged against Australia. It should be unnecessary to point out that Mugabe's stationing of North Korean Communist troops in

Zimbabwe has a number of political consequences, the most important being to provide an example to the world as to the quite natural consequences of allowing these jackboots to set foot on the world revolutionary scene.

Mr. Fraser has been the subject of a great deal of flattery by some of his advisers, journalists, members of the Foreign Affairs Department and black leaders from overseas and in Australia, who know exactly what they are about, and what is the plan of attack against Australia. Mr. Fraser is reported to actually believe that they like him and that he is somehow getting somewhere. It would do the Prime Minister good to read Machiavelli, and the advice he gives with regard to flatterers when he speaks of the need to avoid these courtiers on the political scene.

"I must not omit an important subject, and mention of a mistake which princes can with difficulty avoid, if they are not prudent . . . And this is with regard to flatterers, of which courts are full, because men take such pleasure in their own things and deceive themselves about them that they can with difficulty guard against this plague."

But Machiavelli advises further:

"It is an infallible rule that a prince who is not wise himself cannot be advised."

The reason Aborigines have not yet been asked to form their committee is because the demands for complete independent nation status are too outrageous for contemplation, other than in a preparatory manner. Not one element in the plan of an independent nation is to the advantage of the Australian Aborigines whose future lies with the benefits of a prosperous Australia. This country has every opportunity to continue its economic development towards an ever increasing abundance for all its citizens.

As the very future of Australia is at stake, the issue of defence should become the determining factor in leadership in all political parties within the foreseeable future. With all its showing of opposition to "racism," and the co-operation of the Australian Government with the World Council of Churches and the rest of the Soviet backed forces against the multi-racial Government of Rhodesia elected prior to Mugabe, including the charade of the CHOGM Conference held in Melbourne in 1981, the WCC has charged Australia as a country with "hostile Governments." The WCC has come out against the policies of the Federal and State Governments concerning Aborigines. The World Council of Churches, which recently held its Central Committee meeting in

Communist East Germany, has awarded another grant to Aboriginal organisations in Australia. This time the amount being \$56,500 which, according to a Melbourne Age news item on September 26, 1981:

"puts Australia third behind South Africa and Namibia in the WCC's annual allocations to fight injustice. It follows the . . . investigation of land rights by a World Council of Churches team and the publishing of an internationally circulated report which criticised 'hostile Governments' . . . for their treatment of Aborigines . . .

"The general secretary of the Australian Council of Churches, Ms. Jean Skuse, said last night that the \$56,500 allocation was a further recognition, at international level, of the injustice to Aborigines."

Once again the Queensland Premier had no need to exaggerate the situation. On the same day we read in the Melbourne Sun:

"The World Council of Churches was continuing its financial support of international terrorist movements, the Queensland Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen said yesterday.

"The WCC's latest donation of \$125,000 to the Communist SWAPO movement in Namibia, south-west Africa, will horrify most Christians', Mr. Bjelke-Petersen said.

"He said SWAPO was helped by Soviet, East German and Cuban advisers, protected by the Angolan Communist Government and armed with the latest military weapons from Russia.

"It's utterly incredible that Church money should be used to fund a movement which is hostile to the Church and which has been the Church's greatest oppressor over the years', Mr. Bjelke-Petersen said.

"This foreign body is also funding local radical bodies which are without popular support and totally unrepresentative of anybody but a few radical insiders', he said.

"He called on Christian Churches to face up to 'ill-conceived subversive actions of the World Council of Churches in its so-called programme to combat racism'.

"Queensland's Aboriginal and Island Affairs Minister, Mr. Tomkins, said the WCC was also using Aboriginal and Islander people as pawns in a political exercise."

During the CHOGM Conference in Melbourne, Marxist part-Aboriginal activists Gary Foley and Mick Miller lobbied African journalists with the argument that Queensland was an "apartheid"

State (Melbourne *Sun*, October 2, 1981).

The same article reported Mr. Gary Foley, who is secretary of the National Aboriginal and Islander Health Organisation:

"made the call at a National Aboriginal Council press conference to focus attention on the recent World Council of Churches' report — 'Justice for Aboriginal Australians' . . .

"A delegation of five Aborigines will go to Africa and the Caribbean in November to lobby . . .

"In a statement on Queensland yesterday, the NAC said the Federal Government endorsed racism . . . the NAC also asked the black African and South Pacific Island nations for financial support.

"They were urged to remember what it costs 'to gain self-determination and independence and asked to give a percentage of the foreign aid they received so the NAC could help Aborigines in their struggle for freedom, equality and self-determination'.

The NAC met for the last time yesterday, before the election of a new executive on October 17.

"Retiring chairman Mr. Bill Bird said that in four years the conference had proven itself a force to be reckoned with."

What a classic example of Marxist dialectics, pro-Communist activists charging the Queensland Government with implementing the very "apartheid" they themselves are advocating!

To repeat an elementary lesson in politics, no matter how much the Federal Government bends over backwards in making concession after concession, including opposition to Queensland, in betraying Rhodesia, in becoming a leader in the fight against South Africa, in attacking the New Zealand Government, employing Marxists to head Government departments dealing with Aboriginal affairs, kow-towing to the Third World, condemning so-called racism, declaring Australia to be a multi-cultural nation, changing our traditional immigration policies away from Britain and Europe, makes no difference to Australia's enemies. They still declare the Federal Government to be "racist" and they will continue to do so. No battle can be won by continual retreat.

We are not dealing with a reformist movement seeking gains for the Aborigines or anyone else. It is a struggle for power which in the Communist directives means a complete separate nation flying the yellow, black and red flag already on display everywhere since the first tent "embassy" was established 10 years ago.

In all my years in the Communist Party I and my colleagues



had drilled into us that Marxism is not a reformist movement. It is a revolutionary movement. Reforms are only temporary demands to be used as part of the strategy for the overthrowing of the existing form of society. The idea of both the Whitlam and Fraser Governments of giving highly paid public service jobs to Marxist trained Aborigines does not satisfy them or the forces who control them. It is not the same as giving jobs to their mates or promoting people out of the way onto the potato board or anything like that. We are dealing with a highly organised force with international connections. The only way is to fight back and defeat them.

In commenting on the WCC report, Stephen Mills of the Melbourne Age said:

"The report has since been used to persuade the Vanuatuan Prime Minister, Father Walter Lini, and perhaps others to raise the matter with the Australian Government at CHOGM."

For tactical reasons "Father" Walter Lini and the other Marxist leaders attending CHOGM decided to go slow in the demand for separate nationhood for Aborigines in Australia, because time will allow them to do what they want and with Australia as a pawn they obtained everything else they wanted out of the Conference, even if they had to pretend that Mr. Malcolm Fraser was a statesman of international stature.

In the meantime, the campaign against Australia builds up while politicians from both major parties compete about which party is the best at appeasement. Both parties are being used by the same pressure group without either of them tackling the crisis in a way that will help Australia's interests; much in the same way as their bipartisan non-defence policy leads to debates like Aesop's battle between frogs and mice. Both the Government and the Opposition compete in trying to isolate Queensland and other States, including Western Australia and the Northern Territory, as though the attacks against these States were not an attack on the whole of Australia. Likewise the link up of the Aboriginal land rights issue with Communist fronts responsible for spearheading other pronged attacks just pass them by.

Even the claim of the WCC that "Racism was entrenched in every aspect of Australian Society" (Melbourne Sun August 11, 1981) does not spark off a real voice of protest from Federal politicians on behalf of the Australian people who elect them.

## CHAPTER THIRTEEN

### THE UNITED NATIONS AS AN INSTRUMENT AGAINST AUSTRALIA

On September 8, 1981, the Melbourne Age carried a column headed "Aborigines to appear before U.N. committee;" which helps publicise the link up with the Communist controlled "peace" movement, which is also scandalously using the land rights issue for their anti-defence cause and the joint campaign against industrial development in the name of anti-anti-anti-multi-nationals because they do not want foreign capital in this country as they know such investment will create more jobs and a stronger industrial economy backing the nation's defence.

"An Aboriginal delegation will visit Geneva this week to place before a special United Nations sub-committee what is claimed to be fresh evidence of the oppression of Aborigines.

"The visit will be the third undertaken by the National Aboriginal Conference in the past year.

"The deputy chairman of the conference, the Reverend Cedric Jacobs, will present papers on the effect of trans-national corporations and the impact of nuclear arms buildup on indigenous peoples.

"Mr. Jacobs will be accompanied by the conference's senior research officer, Michael Anderson, and support staff. He said the papers would also detail policy on land rights, land tenure and treaties. Aboriginal ideology and philosophy.

"The conference is among representatives of more than 30 countries invited to take part.

"Recommendations will be made to the full body of the United Nations.

"Mr. Jacobs said the conference was fully aware that international pressure was essential if Aborigines were to be

afforded justice in their own land.

"He said the controversial nature of information contained in the conference's papers was sure to arouse international indignation and increase pressure on the Federal Government."

§ § Details of the Federal land rights act first put forward by the Whitlam Government and then passed by the Fraser Government, means that Aboriginal people can claim unalienated crown land, or land held under special purpose or pastoral lease, on the basis of stating they have strong traditional ties. The land can then be converted into freehold. Leaving aside the longer range objective of turning the land into parts of an independent nation, let us look for a moment at some of the more immediate and associated problems.

In the Northern Territory, Aborigines are now moving into the areas granted as a result of their claims. This had led to the Northern Territory land council making claim to stock routes that long set aside for the movement of cattle. By such means even normal pastoral activity is being seriously interfered with. Voices from the people occasionally warn of the seriousness of the danger to the nation, but rarely from journalists and almost never from Federal politicians. Voices are sometimes heard in the letter columns of newspapers. Mr. Nigel Jackson, from Victoria, writes to *The Australian*. Mr. Jackson was referring to an earlier letter by Dr. R.I. Plachy (October 5, 1981), with which he found agreement:

"It will be attacked by all kinds of destructive activists, who will know by instinct that their deceptions and half-truths can never survive in the sort of atmosphere it bids to create.

"It is one of the most important letters to appear in an Australian newspaper for a quarter of a century.

"Dr. Plachy has sounded a clarion call to our nation at a moment when it is singularly lacking in sound leadership at the federal level, in all parties, in all factions of those parties.

"The Aboriginal issue is being used at the present to diminish the morale of the essentially European nation of Australia, even to work towards a division of Australia into Aboriginal State and European State which can only play into the hands of foreign powers inimical to our traditional way of life.

"Another truth which can be added to those expressed so forthrightly by Dr. Plachy is that Aborigines forever forfeited a major control of this continent when they failed to defend it against Europeans in the past. It is the duty of Australia to

offer Aborigines justice, equity, the chance to live with dignity, whether assimilated or not; but we have no obligation to emasculate Australia nor to bow down to antiquated, if not fraudulent claims, about 'sacred sites' and so on."

Mr. Jackson's words about Aborigines failing to defend the continent are not an attack or slur on Aborigines, but represent an important legal point already mentioned. That is why the books and theses are being written to try and justify the claim before the United Nations, that Australia should actually be handed over to the Aborigines. Even if there had been wars between the blacks and whites in Australia, as there was between the Red Indians and whites in the United States, there would be no more justification in abdicating our ownership of Australia and giving it back to the Aborigines than that the United States should be handed back to the Red Indians.

Aboriginals and whites can live quite well together, in this country as equal citizens. Such letters as Mr. Jackson's and Dr. Plachy's are appeals for action; and if this country is to be defended we need such voices to be joined to make them sound like thunder. When men like Dr. Plachy and Mr. Jackson take up their pens they are like soldiers taking up arms to defend their country. Letters such as these set an example of something that any literate person can do, by writing to the daily newspapers down to every journal and suburban newspaper in the country.

The finest words heard for a long time recently came from Mr. Bruce Ruxton, a Second World War private in the infantry. Mr. Ruxton is President of the Victorian Branch of the Returned Servicemen's League. He was asked:

"Does it disturb you that people might refer to you as Australia's answer to Enoch Powell?"

Mr. Ruxton answered as a man of high purpose:

"Maybe. I don't want to go into that. I'd like to leave this as it is. Pragmatism is the key-note to the old Diggers. They have the spirit of mind to get straight to the point . . . that's how we are. We speak our mind . . . what we believe in."  
(*Melbourne Herald*, July 8, 1981)

Most people involved in politics think it strange when they hear someone say what they fully believe and yet that is exactly what a sense of honour should dictate. It is men and women with a sense of honour who must rally to the country's defence. One of the methods State politicians use to escape from saying or doing

anything about defence is to declare it is a "federal matter." This ludicrous situation can be quickly ended by defence minded citizens, not leaving out the State politicians when they engage in the essential task of letting their Federal politicians know where they stand. Deputations should be made to all Federal and State politicians, with the expectation that they will speak out and act on defence.

While on the subject of defence let us turn to the related defence subjects Mr. Ruxton and the Victorian RSL were bringing to the attention of the public. Machiavelli, the founder of both modern political and military science had this to say:

"There are two different kinds of war. The one springs from the ambitions of princes or republics that seek to extend their empire . . . The other kind of war is when an entire people leave their country . . . for the purpose of seeking a new home."

This is a military matter commonly understood by soldiers. It is a military strategy often used in the past for those who wished to extend their power to send, or force some of their inhabitants into another country, as a prelude to a more military type of invasion. To Communist Vietnam, the boat people are part of a military exercise as has been explained repeatedly by Asian leaders from Singapore and elsewhere in South East Asia. The other end of the military strategy is where some of their own race already live in another country, it becomes an excuse for invasion on the basis that their kith and kin are allegedly not being treated properly by the majority of the inhabitants of the country in which they reside. This is what happened when Hitler used the Sudetenland Germans as an excuse to invade Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia was a prosperous country and democratic. The nation had arisen from the ruins of the Hapsburg Empire, but it was not homogeneous in its population and culture. Out of a population of 15,000,000 there were 6,000,000 Czechs; 3,000,000 Slovaks; 750,000 Hungarians; 100,000 Poles, and 3,400,000 Germans. In giving an account of these events, the historian Carol Quigley noted:

"the minorities of Czechoslovakia were the best treated minorities in Europe and their agitations were noticeable precisely because they were living in a democratic liberal state which gave them freedom to agitate. Among the Germans . . . only part were Nazis, but these were noisy, well organised and financed from Berlin." (*Tragedy & Hope, A History of the World in Our Time*, p. 626 the Macmillan Company,

New York, 1966).

However, any history of the time will provide an outline of what happened and will be useful to the student to gain some insight into the art of politics, as it is practiced in the real world. Hitler ran a long campaign about alleged discrimination against the Germans by the Czechs, building up to his claim of the right to intervene. As his propaganda increased, he demanded self-determination for the Slovaks, Hungarians and Poles. How Britain's Chamberlain and others were used by Hitler, with all the arguments ranging from neutrality and the normal instruments of politics for those wishing to dismember and invade a country are set out in the events leading up to Munich; all of which have relevance to Australia in its present position, and are there for the study of any person who wishes to pick up a history book. Before the Munich Agreement was signed, Hitler, Mussolini, Daladier of France and Chamberlain had decided on "self determination" as a means to dismembering such a "multi-racial" or "multi-cultural" country, as it is called in the tricks of world politics. The reader of books or those whose memories go back that far, will be able to compare all the elements of our present situation, including the role of the League of Nations with that of the United Nations today, and the way it is being attempted for use against Australia. By a little study the student of politics will find what the art of politics actually is, or what is going on in the world today than by listening to the speeches of Australian politicians. As everyone knows, Germany took over the whole of Czechoslovakia. Hitler refined all the same techniques that are being used against Australia; that is to use international pressure to set up an independent state for the Germans in Czechoslovakia.

Naturally enough, Hitler had said he only wanted part of Czechoslovakia, known as Sudetenland, to be given to the German minority. From the point of studying how the land rights issue has already led to the demand of separate nation status, where Aborigines live in Australia it should make more clear how the art of politics is used in this type of operation.

"To make their aims more appealing they emphasised the virtues of 'autonomy' and 'self determination' and the contribution to European peace which would arise if Germany were satisfied and if Czechoslovakia were 'neutralised'" (page 627 *Tragedy & Hope*)

In describing events that led to the Munich Settlement "Hitler interrupted to say that he must have self-determination"

After the Czech Germans were given self-determination,  
German troops moved in.

To go back to page 630 of Quigley's book

The new directive, as drafted by General Keitel on May 20, 1938, and submitted for Hitler's signature, began, 'it is not my intention to smash Czechoslovakia by military action in the immediate future without provocation, unless an unavoidable development of the political conditions within Czechoslovakia forces the issue, or political events in Europe create a particularly favourable opportunity which may perhaps never recur'' (This was a document for internal consumption).

It is as true as the green frog croaks, that anyone seeking an understanding of the nature of the attack on Australia today can learn from the past. The basic military political tactics are still the same as they have been for thousands of years. Unfortunately, outside of the military and the readers of Machiavelli, they are little understood in the Western countries. But all the old designs are studied well in the Communist countries and are applied with consummate skill. Unlike Western politicians, the disciples of Lenin and Trotsky, the Communist politicians, have a complete understanding of all aspects of war.

In the same way that the cry "McCarthyism" is applied to frighten people away from exposing or even criticising Communist infiltration and subversion, the words "racism" is used to stop limp-wristed politicians and the delicate small-l-liberals from discussing even the social cataclysm of multi-culturalism or wrong immigration policies, or the peril of a country that is not homogeneous, with people possessed of an historical sense of antecedents. It will be recalled how Hitler used appeasement by others and appeals to other countries to overcome the difficulties besetting what he wanted to achieve in Czechoslovakia. In other ways he tricked countries into becoming neutral or 'nonaligned' before he attacked them. Nor do we have to be stretching our memory over a long time to remember how the same political stratagems were used by Communist North Vietnam who tricked Laos and Cambodia into becoming neutralist before they marched their troops in. The manuals of political and military history are full of such examples.

"Read it up — you should. There is nothing new under the sun. It has all been done before" said Sherlock Holmes. There is also the old saying; "Those who do not learn the mistakes of history are destined to imitate them."

The manner in which the Commonwealth and State public services have been infiltrated by left-wing activists, who become paid by Governments to undermine the country is well illustrated by the case of Victoria where leftists have been appointed in considerable numbers to wield power in important public service positions relating to conservation and such departments as that controlled by the Minister of Ethnic Affairs. As a result of leftists being appointed to positions in this department, they are well placed to take part in the lie campaign to slander Australians as "racists."

During 1978 these leftists from the State Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Department carried out an exercise to ape the activities of their Federal counterparts in Al Grassby's Department, by producing a graffiti report showing Victoria as a bigoted racist State. The report, which was a falsehood from start to finish, presented the Victorian people to the world in the worst possible light, singling out Melbournians and the people of Geelong, which is the largest provincial city in Victoria.

The two main dangers of this type of propaganda, with its lack of accuracy, is in the effect on the children who are growing up, who know very little of Australia's past history, and who are easily misled into believing lies about a past that they did not themselves witness. People in other countries, outside who know very little about this country, or egalitarianism in its Australian manifestations are influenced by the lies told.



## CHAPTER FOURTEEN

### COMMUNISTS ARE THE PEOPLE WHO STIRRED OPPOSITION TO MIGRANTS

At the end of the Second World War, a Labor Government under the direction of the then Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell, and with the support of the Liberal and Country Parties, carried out a massive effort of bringing migrants from Britain and Europe, many of whom had fled from the countries of Eastern Europe taken over by the Communists under the bayonets of the Red Army.

The Communist press in Australia is today full of false indignation about Australians being "racists" in their attitudes to the migrant population, but just let anyone look at the Communist press such as the Communist Party of Australia's newspapers, the *Guardian* published in Melbourne, and the *Tribune* printed in Sydney, for the years 1948 and afterwards while their programme was in full swing against the "Balts" as they called the people from Eastern Europe. They were branded as "fascists" and every kind of name the Red correspondents could find to smear them, while the daily press was full of praise and generosity in welcoming them. Union officials are in a good position to know what is going on in the Community because they are moving among large numbers of people all the time, particularly in industry. Like all Australians living in 1948, I was interested in the immigration programme from the moment it was first heralded by the Chifley Government. I had a particular interest because as a lad of 18 I had joined the Communist Party in August of that year, and not long afterwards I took a job as a carpenter with McDougal and Ireland building contractors, on the old race course situated in the Melbourne suburb of Williamstown, where a large area of temporary accommodation was being built for the first arrivals of migrants from Europe. I

heard lectures in the Eureka Youth League (Communist Party Youth Organisation) and from the Communist Party about all these alleged Fascists, capitalist lackeys and undesirables, who should never be allowed into the country. (A reading of the Communist press for 1956 and 1957 will show the same type of smears about the Hungarians who had fled after the uprising in 1956, and when the Red hosts marched in from the Soviet Union). A similar campaign is under way at present by the left apparatus, telling us we should not allow in too many Polish refugees, because it would be discrimination against potential Asian immigrants, which would be more in keeping with a "multi-cultural" policy.

While engaged on the abovementioned building project, Communist Union officials tried to lead the workers to put on overtime bans and strikes to hold up the project, to make it more difficult for the migrants to settle in Australia. But the building workers would not support them and the project was completed on time. When, along with other carpenters, I was still on the job completing the kitchens and dining rooms, the first bus loads arrived. The Communist Party wanted us to engineer some kind of protest on their arrival, which in any case would have been impossible, but at least I, and a small group of left-wing carpenters on the job had been influenced by the Communist party line. It was a very moving scene for all of us, which I find difficult to describe, but none of us ever forgot and occasionally I still meet one of my workmates from that job and we recall the events as vividly implanted in our memory. We knew the day the first groups were to arrive, and as we saw a long bus coming through the gate towards the centre of the complex, the word went around: "Here they come." We put down our tools and stood wondering what these people would be like. I saw genuine emotion in the eyes of tough old carpenters as these people stepped out of the bus. They were clearly workers like ourselves. They were not smiling, and had a strange look about them. It was not loneliness, but something like that. Their clothes were old and the women had scarves around their heads, in a way we had not seen on Australian women. We could all see they had been through great misfortune, and were accompanied by sorrow. Apart from what we knew about the Second World War and its aftermath, there seemed to be something of sadness in their eyes that told us of fuller stories of the great break that had taken place in their lives. There was a spontaneous solidarity among those building unionists towards the newcomers. Among those present were some close friends of mine. One was Roley Farrell, who had

once been the Victorian Secretary of the Industrial Workers of the World, and a fine tradesman, together with Roy Tibbet, a "Thirty Niner" from the Sixth Battalion, and Norm Mahl, another rehabilitation trainee carpenter from the Second World War. That night I visited the Communist Party headquarters and told them what I had seen. "They are workers just like us," I said. "Do you think so," replied the official and left it at that. In the meantime the Communist campaign to build up hostility among the population towards the newcomers continued unabated; an effort they combined with bitter denunciations of the Labor Government. The anti-migrant campaign of the Australian Communist Party was one of their most unsuccessful. I refuse to use the word "racist" in regard to their propaganda against migrants at that time because the word is so stupidly used, but it is these same people who are today part of the campaign trying to smear the "Anglo-Saxon" with virtually the same argument. This brings me back to the 1979 report of alleged racism and in particular with reference to Geelong because from 1950 until 1967 onwards, I had weekly contact with the life of the city as an organiser of the Building Workers Industrial Union and off and on as a representative of other unions since that time. The Building Workers Industrial Union represented carpenters and joiners. Apart from the booming construction and housing industry, we had maintenance carpenters employed in most of the factories. Together with other union officials, with whom I worked in Geelong during those years, I can endorse the observation of how welcome the migrants of all nationalities were made and how they were so completely absorbed into the workforce and the life of the city. Geelong is indeed a happy homogeneous community no matter what the Government appointees try to say.

I have made special mention of Geelong because, despite its considerable growth since 1950, it has been an interesting study. The Geelong Trades Hall Council played its part in the affairs of the city along with its industrial activity. Union officials such as myself, had the opportunity of watching an already proud city grow. As an official of the BWIU, I had dealings with virtually every industry and was involved with the local labour movement over the whole time. I still visit Geelong for the union I represent. To suggest that Geelong has had conflict between migrants and Australians of older descent is utter nonsense. The people of Geelong are quite the opposite of "racist" or bigoted. The smear is so glaringly contrary to my own observations and experience that I single the city out for mention.

---

So outrageous a slander was the report that the Victorian Government with the support of the Labor opposition decided against it being released. The Communists and the Socialist Left apparatus reacted angrily, with the demand that the report be made public. Whilst it is to the credit of all the political parties that the report was not given to the newspapers, enough of its contents had been published in the daily press and broadcast around the globe, to be added to the file of the United Nations organisations to be used against Australia. Two Socialist Left ALP parliamentarians, Giovanni Sgro and Theo Sidiropoulos, along with Communist organisations, demanded that the report be given wide circulation. Neither the Government nor the Opposition carried out their advice.

Both the ALP and the Government took the politicians' "two-bob-each-way" out by declaring the report: "Would fuel the fires it was intended to put out" (*Melbourne Age*, June 14, 1979). What the politicians should have done was to come out in defence of the people of Victoria, and sacked those responsible for it. But the politicians tend to deal with matters in what they see as the least controversial way and to dodge a fight with anyone. The more sides they can appear to be on at the same time, then the better it is. Unfortunately politics is not the simple game they think it is. We are dealing with Australia's National security, and it is the politicians' duty to defend that interest. I am not suggesting politicians do not have to be unconcerned about their popularity or survival. This is an example where they could have defended the people of Victoria, and would have actually strengthened their own positions. What was just as bad was a Government announcement, that a million dollars was to be spent on a Government campaign to combat "racism." The report had been prepared as part of that campaign. As far as I know this wastage of the taxpayers' money, which would mean a virtual endorsement and continuance of the allegation that Victorian electors are a lot of bigoted racists, has not continued, although the leftists responsible for it are still employed by the Government.

As I write, it is pleasing to note an illustration of how the politicians can react to similar situations. On January 14, 1982 a demonstration by representatives of the non-existent tribe of Aborigines protesting about the despoiling of non-existent sacred sites by the Alcoa Aluminium Company, took place at the Olympic Park, Melbourne. Top American sprinters were injured as the protesters ran onto the park and caused an accident. The

*Melbourne Herald* tells the story:

"The Premier, Mr. Thompson, who saw the demonstration said: 'I cannot understand how anyone could harm innocent athletes as part of a political protest'.

"The Opposition spokesman on sport, Mr. Tresize, who also was at the Alcoa Challenge meeting called the protestors 'cringing cowards'.

"And the Leader of the National Party, Mr. Ross Edwards, another guest at the athletics said: 'It's sad from a community point of view that visitors to Australia who have nothing to do with controversy, have been hurt in this way'.

"A group of six, claiming to represent an Aboriginal tribe from the Portland district, ran onto Olympic Park just after the start of the 200 metre race and crashed into competitors.

"The protestors held a black, red and gold land rights banner bearing the words 'Alcoa — unemployment'."

It was encouraging that representatives of the three major Victorian parties spoke out on an issue that should long ago have been exposed; this being the totally dishonest, highly co-ordinated, left-wing campaign, to use the name of "Aboriginals" to stop industrial development, thus avoiding the creation of new jobs for working men.

*The Herald* continued:

"Mr. Thompson said today: 'The actions of those demonstrators cannot be condoned in any way, shape or form, they deserve to be prosecuted . . .

"He said the protest over Alcoa's development at Portland was senseless.

"Mr. Thompson said it was the biggest private enterprise development in Victoria, and had the strong support of the local community and the overwhelming majority of thinking Victorians.

"To link Alcoa with unemployment is totally without foundation.

"Mr. Tresize said: 'Everyone has the right to demonstrate in a peaceful fashion, but no-one, whether they supported their (the Aboriginals') cause, would have anything but contempt for what they did.'"

A lot more could have been said about the incident, including the fact that from the overall campaign by Australia's left-wing to stop any decrease in unemployment by halting new industrial development, special attention has been given to Alcoa because

aluminium is an essential defence material.

*The Herald* then proceeded to report the usual nonsense from alleged spokesmen for the Aborigines:

"An Aboriginal leader said the demonstration was caused because of 'the genocide of the Aboriginal people at Portland by Alcoa'.

"An executive member of the South-Eastern Lands Council, Mr. Les Russell, said it was to protest the action of Alcoa in removing Aborigines from their sacred grounds at Portland to build an aluminium smelter'."

But there are very few Aborigines at Portland, let alone any "tribe" for Alcoa to commit "genocide" against. Nor were there any Aborigines on the area where the smelter is being built for them to be "removed" from, any more than there was any sacred site there. The point is, the international community does not know this, but the press of the world will hear of an "Aboriginal" protest and the lie campaign continues.

It is all part of the psychological war against Australia. As a defence measure we need a foreign policy that answers these lies. This has to be part of our defence strategy. For a start the politicians have to speak out in the press. Not with the half way talk quoted above, however faintly it may be praised. I would hold the three politicians mentioned above to be in themselves very good people. But they are capable of doing much better. In defence, not even the slightest detail can be ignored, let alone the major considerations. In a democracy it is the politicians' job to conduct the defence in psychological war and electors need make no apology for demanding it of them.

The Federal Government has already been filtering black people in from South Africa, without making any great fanfare to the public about it. Meanwhile the left-wing politicians along with their Churchmen pulpитеers, have been actively organising for a massive intake of blacks to Australia, even programming the intake of black "refugees" from Haiti.

To be concerned about a mass influx of black people from 'other countries is not being "racist." The Negro people are part of the great family of races who inhabit this planet; but the constant use of the term "racist" is to try and stop people from daring to speak about such subjects in a sensible manner. Universal migration would destroy any nation. Australia does not have to go through the same troubles as Britain, but this is what will happen if the Australian people are cowered into silence by being frightened

of being called "racist." Anglo-Saxons probably think about these matters less than anyone else, whereas in the community of nations every country has some control over who immigrates to their country. Not the least are the post-colonial black countries, who have expelled Asians, whites and where one Tribe seizes power to dominate others.

A recent public opinion poll conducted in Japan and reported in the Australian press showed that the Japanese did not like people from other races and nations. To open Australia to migration from Japan would not make them come to love the white Australians. It would be childish to refer to the Japanese as "racist" because they have a preference for their own race. This preference may be found in every corner of the globe. Almost all religions teach their followers that they are the chosen people. The religions and traditions of China have insisted for thousands of years that when God made man he baked him in an oven. He did not bake the white man long enough, so he turned out with great deficiencies, and He baked the black man too long, which is the cause of his troubles, but He baked the Chinaman just right, and that is why all Chinese are perfect. The Christian missionaries found it more difficult to win converts in China than in any other part of the globe because when the Chinese were told that Christ could forgive their sins, they replied that they were Chinese and did not have any sins to be forgiven, and that if there had been any fall of man then the Chinese were not part of it. It is also the reason that, with few exceptions, they do not assimilate in any of the countries to where they have migrated. But to refer to the Chinese as "racists," even though it may fall into the definitions used today by Marxists and small-l-liberals, is as ridiculous as when the term is used today against the Negroes who have migrated to Britain, but who don't like whites. There is nothing to be argued about these matters; that is how man is and always has been. Interestingly enough the English speaking peoples are probably the most tolerant in racial matters of all peoples of this earth. It is because the term is being used as a conscious political weapon that we have to concern ourselves. Malcolm Fraser says Australia is now "colour blind"; he is talking about national suicide.



## CHAPTER FIFTEEN

### AUSTRALIA DOES NOT HAVE TO IMITATE THE MISTAKES OF OTHERS

Dennis Altman, that leading theoretician of the Australian left, opined in *The National Times* of May 18, 1980, on

"The need for diverse culture.

"It is gratifying to learn that Australia is to take 200 of the Cubans now flocking into Florida . . . It would be more gratifying were the Government to accept some of the Haitians."

As well as expressing his favour for the Negro people of Haiti, Altman calls for a great number of immigrants from "Black Africa"

". . . In recent years there has been a growing awareness that Australia is no longer a homogeneous Anglo-Celtic society and some real attempts have been made by both Labor and Liberal Governments to recognise this, although as Mr. Grassby has often pointed out, Anglo-Celtic arrogance remains."

Australians of Anglo-Saxon or Celtic origin are not arrogant at all. We should stop at this point before proceeding with Mr. Altman's perspective, to make mention that Mr. Altman was roundly condemned by his Marxist colleagues for talking about "Anglo-Celts," he had jumped the gun by "moving too far ahead," which is a favourite piece of Communist terminology to define a breach of Marxist tactical correctness. The most immediate strategy is to concentrate on the Anglo-Saxons being the majority and if possible to cause a split between the Anglo-Saxons and Celts, or to put it another way, to create divisions between Protestants and Catholics. The idea is to deal with the "Celts," or Catholics, later on. It seems almost juvenile to point out that in politics the art of 'divide and conquer' is learned at first grade level. Altman is in



some ways the more outspoken of Marxist ideologists active in Australia. His textbook *Rehearsals for Change* published by Fontana books in 1980, is one of the more widely read dissertations on revolutionary tactics being used by Communists and those who refer to themselves as the "New Left" in Australia. To return to Altman's article in *The National Times*:

"But whilst it is now fashionable to speak of Australia as a multi-cultural society, we rarely distinguish between a cultural pluralism that means encouraging migrant groups to retain their identity (through special language courses, folk festivals and ethnic language broadcasts) and one that means creating a new Australian culture out of the increasing diversity of people living here . . .

"For millions of Australians, Britain is not the mother country. As one small example, I do not understand why so many buildings persist in flying the Union Jack, and I wish they would stop it."

Although deliberately leaving aside references from Marxist textbooks, and the Communist press, and concentrating on the daily press to show, in part, how the attack is being made against Australia, it is necessary to repeat that there is no secret about what is happening. There is no reason for our politicians to remain inactive, or our security services to have their heads in the sand. Perhaps to gain some appreciation as to what has happened to a number of western security systems including that of Australia's, a most valuable and weighty contribution to the subject can be recommended. It is *Self Destruct — Dismantling America's Security System*, by Robert Morris, Arlington House Publishers, 165 Huguenot St., New Rochelle, New York, 10801.

What we are witnessing in Australia is a classical case of psychological war being waged against the nation. Let us return to Altman's book, which is being used particularly in the universities, because of the emphasis the left have on tearing down our flag and bringing Australia into further isolation by breaking our ties with Britain. Whilst these people constantly mouth off about multi-culturalism, the major part of their efforts is engaged towards depreciating and bringing into disrepute the culture of the majority. In the name of multi-culturalism we are supposed to preserve everything that belongs to other countries while at the same time we are urged to destroy that which is British. Multi-culturalism to the left is the smokescreen for destruction. The politicians who use the term demonstrate, at best, their foolishness. That in itself

makes a complete mockery of the whole concept of multi-culturalism.

It is not the purpose of this book to become too deeply concerned with the Commonwealth system of government, but as anyone would have seen from the Royal wedding of the Prince and Princess of Wales, the ties are still very great between Australia and Britain, with the Royal family playing some part in that tradition. To the majority of Australians the symbol of the Crown is a part of their tradition, and they are entitled to it. Machiavelli believed, on the basis of his studies of centuries of experience, that a mixed republican and monarchist form of government was among the best. Even the Socialist philosopher, Bertrand Russell, thought the same. We can add that this type of government has suited the commonsense moderation of the British character, which has left its mark on Australian thinking. Take the matter a little further, however, concerning the Union Jack as part of the Australian flag. It therefore represents the heritage of the majority of its people. It is the Australian flag, above all else, the revolutionaries want to fold up and throw away. To break apart our society they must destroy whatever they can of past traditions. From page 59-60 of Mr. Altman's book, we are told:

"The continued existence of the monarchy is the most concrete example of how the British connection is maintained and used to serve the interests of the status quo. Indeed as long as the Queen remains the head of state — and the Union Jack an integral part of our flag — the dominance of British culture is largely unassailable . . . annoying is the extraordinary practice of flying Union Jacks, 'as is done on so many buildings in Australia.'"

Despite the enormous and growing left-wing influence in the universities, Mr. Altman says: "In the same way our universities are still extraordinarily Anglo-centric." Mr. Altman decries all this as "a major reason why the hegemonic culture is so little challenged," which he says contributed to the low status of Karl Marx in Australia.

In the same way that the Marxists see the object of a republican Australia as a consequent break with Britain, and a weakening of our defences, they likewise put enormous effort into breaking our alliance with the United States for the military reason that it is much easier to bring in outside intervention to assist the revolutionary cause in Australia. The neutralisation of Australia is the objective of the present unilateral disarmament campaign being

run by the same people in Australia. With regard to the United Kingdom, it should be recognised, as reflected in a Gallup poll in Britain, that the overwhelming opinion was expressed that the people of the British Isles would be willing to come to the aid of Australia if it was ever under military attack. This is a very revealing indication of the character of the British people and the strong ties that exist between what is still the "Mother country" and Australia. Britain is still militarily strong with well trained soldiers, a navy and air force, and possesses sophisticated weaponry, is a fact understood by our enemies.

It is not only Communists who call for a republican Australia, severed of all ties with the Commonwealth, but others who are misled, the clergy provide a good example. While it is true that there has been an enormous Communist penetration of Church organisations, the majority who follow the line worked out by Communists are not Communists at all. They are the people being led. The same leadership by Communists determined the effectiveness of the anti-Vietnam war protests. To say that everyone involved in the anti-Vietnam moratorium movement was Communist is not only a politically incorrect estimate, but leads to a failure to understand how the political system works, the role of leadership, and equally to an actual underestimation of the true strength of Communist organisation in Australia and their capacity for conspiracy. An example of this is how a small group of revolutionaries can wreck or damage an entire industry by taking it on as a conservation issue.

A most glaring and fantastic illustration of the question of Communist leadership is the attempt to stultify the industrial development of Tasmania by preventing the flooding of the Gordon or the Franklin Rivers to provide an urgently needed dam for the building of a power station, as proposed by the Tasmanian Hydro Electricity Commission and the State Labor Government. Without more electric power Tasmania's economic development will die and unemployment will become even greater, with no prospects for the youth growing up in that State. Communists with whom I grew up with and shared training in the Party, are leading the campaign to stop the construction of new power stations in Tasmania. Their organising abilities should not be underestimated.

Like others, I learnt about conservation when I was in the boy scouts, but we also learned that human beings were part of the environment. The truth is that when dams and power stations are built in such areas as proposed in Tasmania, they bring with them

roads and means of transport and recreational facilities that allow thousands of ordinary people to come with their families to enjoy the scenic beauty of these wonderful places. As with mining and oil exploration, the amount of space required in any such area for the economic benefit of man is infinitesimal compared with the areas where they are located. Actually they are areas where new cities could even be built, where families can grow up in beautiful surroundings like Hobart and Launceston or other fine towns, where people live in a splendid environment on the Island of Tasmania. Actually the subtle charm of the wild and lonely beauty of the Australian bush is an even richer place when human beings are around and there is some sign of civilisation about. It elevates the quality of human life, and nature as well, because human beings are part of the natural environment.

Now we find that after the Tasmanian Labor Government has won a referendum to go ahead with a new power station, Prime Minister Fraser led the Federal Government into pinpointing the areas concerned to be included on the World Heritage list, only a week before the Tasmanian Cabinet was to decide in which areas to build the dam.

In the same way that the Western Australian and Queensland Governments should be defended from the onslaughts against them by the Federal Government, on the "land rights" issue, it is our obligation to come to the aid of the Tasmanian Government in its fight on behalf of the future welfare of the people in their State.

"PM Acts on South West" ran the headline on page 3 of the *Melbourne Age* of January 25, 1982.

"The Federal Government has nominated much of south-west Tasmania for inclusion in the World Heritage List, an international register of irreplaceable areas.

"This announcement, made yesterday by the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment, Mr. Wilson, brings closer the prospect of confrontation between the Fraser Government and the Tasmanian Labor Government over plans by the latter to dam some of the Gordon-Franklin River system.

"Mr. Wilson said that the western Tasmanian wilderness national parks, covering 769,355 hectares, were one of the last remaining temperate wilderness areas in the world.

"He said the parks and the Lord Howe Island group, which was also nominated for inclusion in the list yesterday, were areas 'of outstanding and universal natural significance'.

"The region of Tasmania submitted by the Government

contains the South-West National Park, the Franklin-Lower Gordon Wild Rivers National Park and the Cradle Mountain-Lake St. Clair National Park.

Mr. Wilson said the area had a wide and outstanding range of geological, landform and vegetation characteristics . . ."

The Fraser Government's attempt to sabotage the Tasmanian Government is being assisted by the ALP's left-wing. The same Age report tells us:

"Yesterday's nomination coincided with an attack on Mr. Holgate by his Federal Labor colleague, Mr. West, who is the Opposition spokesman on environment."

So far reaching is the Communist network through the United Nations and its various organisations, that as a backroom operation the Soviet Union created the concept of a World Heritage List to be used to stop development of parts of the Western World, such as Alaska, to stop the United States obtaining its much needed oil and minerals, the exploitation of Alaska would hardly effect even a minor part of the Alaskan wilderness, but under President Carter, the Communist-led conservationists were successful.

How the World Heritage Organisation operates to the detriment of Western countries without interfering with development in any of the Communist countries, has been well documented in various publications in the United States. Equally serious is the state of mind of a Prime Minister who will acquiesce in surrendering national sovereignty over parts of the Commonwealth, as is also the case with the coral reef off the coast of Queensland. The Foreign Affairs Department, with the support of Mr. Andrew Peacock, often advocated that Australia abide by decisions of the United Nations, even though it was not in the national interest to do so.

"I believe it will not be amiss to consider whether in a state that has become corrupt, a free government that has existed there can be maintained."

So began the Florentine instructor Nicollo Machiavelli when opening the eighteenth chapter of *The Discourses*.

The former Diplomatist and Secretary for Defence to the City of Florence, would not agree with those mordant critics such as Dr. Cairns, who, in their vocabulary of slander see Australia as "sick," although Machiavelli would perhaps, because of some tendencies in our time, suggest that our society is in need of some rejuvenation. His writing indicates that he would see the Australian people

as being possessed of great "Virtu," a word the Machiavellian scholars say cannot be properly translated into the English language. The closest is "Virtue," meaning a people with community spirit, pride in their country, industrious and above all displaying a willingness to defend their nation. For instance, he would rank highly on the scale of values of the Australian people, who have voted consistently since the Second World War to be in favour of universal military training. Other opinion polls have shown the Australian people to be overwhelmingly in support of a stronger defence. In answer to questions about the menace of the U.S.S.R. and its surrogates whether they be Vietnam or elsewhere, they have shown by the surveys to possess a real understanding that Australia is part of a troubled world and that only fools regard us as being without any possibility of threat. Machiavelli would hold the ordinary Australian to accept more the habit of responsibility and political vitality than the majority of its politicians. He says in *The Discourses*

"As regards prudence and stability, I say that the people are more prudent and stable, and have better judgement than a prince; and it is not without good reason that it is said, 'the voice of people is the voice of God'."

In the preface to his *The Art of War* he says:

"Good institutions without military backing undergo the same sort of disorder as the rooms of a splendid and regal palace which adorned with gems of gold but without a roof have nothing to protect them from the rain."

When dilating on the stability of republics he says,

"it is well to reason on all subjects."

He would study our history and agree Australia is a nation where its citizens can be proud of themselves. Australia has the distinctness of having the most egalitarian culture in the world, and yet the general attitude is one which does not want to pull a man down to the lowest denominator. Australians admire success and display a remarkable lack of envy towards those who "get on in the world."

Machiavelli would find studying history of the nation fascinating; with the memories and values of the Australian people which have such an imprint on the character and makeup of its inhabitants, in all fields of the national life. The humour, sense of independence, and self reliance, such as has attracted the notice and commendations of foreign armies, where they have come into contact with the Australian soldiery, even when they were on

opposite sides, has registered astonishment to scholars and historians alike. Very little of this is taught in schools today. In most schools the children are told about the convicts and bushrangers, which is fair enough, except that it is seldom explained objectively. Bushrangers, who were murderers, and the cruelest of criminals, are treated as heroes and in the imagination of teachers made into "rebels." The clarity of anything else that may be taught is clouded with alleged "racism."

If Machiavelli were a diplomat to Australia, he would write home to report on what a laudable nation it is. The republics of his day were not as extended — as the democracies of the west are today. He would write of Australia in his despatches with his readers perhaps, recollecting that he was the first of those thinkers of the past to be placed on the level of Plato and Aristotle to whom we are taught as having embodied the experience and erudition collected over centuries and worthy of study when we have basic and serious political matters coming to our attention. The intellection of Machiavelli particularly applies when dealing with the preservation of a society threatened either from within or by intervention from without; and a call for action is required. Of all those who are today held up as authors of political advice — books of the past from whom we can learn, Machiavelli was the first to dispute that all faction in a society was bad. He codified the belief that conflict between the classes was a cause of progress. He held to the opinion, as in the heading of chapter four of *The Discourses*:

"The disunion of the senate and the people rendered the Republic of Rome powerful and free."

## CHAPTER SIXTEEN

### THE AUSTRALIAN TRADITION

The strong Australian break from the class system in Britain was reflected in the attitudes of the whole people whether they be employers, farmers, workers, artisans and free settlers. They had found a new freedom and sense of independence in the Australian colonies. A good history would show among their achievements the greatest victory of the organised workers of the world during the nineteenth century, in the establishment of the eight hour day as a system and to build the strongest trade union movement in the world. Lenin and the Social Democrats of Europe looked in wonderment at this far off continent "à l'Anglaise," to see them establish the first Labor Governments in the world. How could it be that in this new nation a Federal Government was elected in 1910 controlled by trade unionists? What is more, they did all this without any "theories" such as the scientific superstitions of Marxist-Leninism! Why was it that the Australians were the first to achieve universal suffrage, the vote for women, workers' compensation, and so on? The spirit that brought all this about is not only to the honour of the Labor movement but was a reflection of the whole people. The eight hour day was eventually freely negotiated between hard headed building contractors and strong willed union men much steeped in the British Chartist tradition. They joined together in the famous celebration and march through the city of Melbourne in 1854.

Australian history is filled with many strikes and tumultuous events and wild political campaigns, but the cohesion of the nation was never threatened; not even the most biased unionist or Labor man would say they were always right but he would be pleased to hear from Machiavelli's embassy that the politician from fourteen generations ago thought how the Australians had proved



his theory to be correct and what is more, that it would not be immodest of them to claim that they had achieved the best results.

And why was it that during the First World War, one of the greatest volunteer army of battle troops came onto the scene, to whom the military historians now acclaim as among the most renowned the world has ever known. They had rallied to the call of the 'Mother country,' and more than fifty-two percent were trade unionists; when bosses, farmers and workers soldiered together in the field as equals, with an extraordinary self discipline and comradeship, and matched by a bravery second to none! And why was it that their sons carried on the same tradition in the Second World War, and thereafter through Korea to Vietnam? "Those Damned Australians!" said Field Marshall Erwin Rommel in 1941. Arthur Canon Doyle, author of the Sherlock Holmes stories had a lot to do with the Australians during the First World War. He wrote:

"They are great soldiers, these Australians . . . There is a reckless dare-devilry combined with a spice of cunning, which gives them a place of their own in the imperial ranks.' General Eichelberger of the United States Army said in 1945:

"The Aussies are unique soldiers, amazingly casual but willing to tackle anything. They liked to work in small parties and were always successful. If they had any fear they never showed it."

Back to the year 1918, we hear Marshal Foch of the French Army:

"From start to finish the Australians distinguished themselves by their endurance and boldness. By their initiative, their fighting spirit, their magnificent ardour, they proved themselves to be shock troops of the first order."

It is the duty of teachers and historians to bring all this out to the children in the schools instead of the rubbish which leaves children without a proper sense of that national identity to which they are entitled. For Australians, there is no need for foolish fancies and make-believe social phenomena. There is an extraordinary truth to be told about a democracy and freedom that was built, a truth that people from distant nations are also entitled to know about, instead of allowing Australians to be branded as a nation of "racists," holding the Aborigines in oppression and with stupid lies about ninety-nine other alleged minorities being oppressed by Anglo-Saxon foremen blowing whistles and calling people by numbers.

Apart from the contribution of political parties other than

Labor, there are bypaths of Australian history I have not here discussed, such as the builders of industry, the miners, the explorers, adventurers, in the establishment of modern farming, the sheepmen, the cattlemen, all of which is a part of Australia's heritage. I have mentioned organised labours role in Australia, especially because to the prejudiced eyes of Marxist historians whose books have such a growing distribution in schools, even Henry Lawson, who would regard them all as "nutty Russian Nihilists," is branded as a "racist," and attacked because he was a supporter of the organised workers, but also a strong advocate for the Australian military and his warnings that Australia should always be prepared to defend this Continent. He was not afraid to say that Australia could one day be threatened by Asian armies from the north. Henry Lawson really upsets the Australian Marxists and their left Liberal understrappers. Lawson's life and work is distorted to fit into a picture of false and abstract theories of class war and socialism. There is also another reason; with the empiricism and pragmatism of the Australian Labor movement, there has been no serious challenge to the free enterprise system. Nonetheless, the Australian worker has established more rights to argue with his employer than in any place in the world. Nationalisation of industry has done nothing to improve industrial relations in Britain. All employers behave the same, whether they are the managers of Socialist industries or private industry. The greatest achievement for the worker is the maximum freedom. The workers have done better than in any country where they had been under the leadership of Marxists or schizoid Socialists. The Australian worker is not ideologised. That is why he, like other Australians, has a free mind and why he has rejected and will continue to reject the hysterics of Marxian Socialism or any other empty illusions about "changing the system." It is precisely because of Australia's democracy that unionism has grown and will be still around when Marxist organisations have ceased to exist. One of the great strengths of the Australian people is that they are free from the grip of all ideologies. Because of their fortunate experience in starting off as such a free country and the individualism of its pioneers, they have never worshipped authority. The lack of conformity among Australians is part of their cast of mind. Australians would concur with the saying that "A nod from a Lord is a fool's breakfast." And yet, with all this, Australia fulfills Aristotle's two ideas of the good society; that as a community all they have to do is live in harmony "but when enlisted as any army they act in unison." A society that

fulfills these two needs will survive.

Australians have never been a people of common political and would never except the Hegelian concept of a single collective will, such as has animated various political movements in Europe, including those of Marxism. In the Communist countries trade unions are banned. It is only in Poland that unionism has had even a brief existence. What are called unions in the Communist countries are not unions at all. They are state employer organizations run by the Governments with no right to strike. Nor are they possessed of any other rights properly associated with trade unionism. The members do not select their officials. Instead they are appointed by the Communist Party. When officials of organizations claiming to be trade unions come to Australia, they are not representatives of the workers but agents of Communist intelligence services. This all has a relevance to this volume because we are talking about defence of democracy, which is worth defending. We live in a world where that international philanthropist Fidel Castro, with the Soviet provenders for his Cuban forces, jackboots around the world, with pretensions of representing the underdog. He and his cohorts in the East German and other Communist expeditionary forces are pictured as fighters for freedom to the youth of Australia, particularly in the universities, as glorious fighters for freedom, when they serve no such cause. They are imposing regimes ruled by corporate aristocrats, who are Communists. No struggle is allowed between the workers and the barons of Socialist industry. Socialism has proven that it cannot deliver the goods. In any case, there is a logical inconsistency in a Government planned economy, with trade unions having an independent say in what their wages and conditions are going to be. Trade unions happen to be a product of the free market economy, which is the basis of all our freedoms. Those who do not agree with the expression of opinion about the benefits of a free market economy must, however, agree that our society is superior to anything the Communists have to offer.

In countering the psychological war against Australia, there is another Machiavellian instruction we need to appreciate in considering our responsibilities, the need of societies to go back to their "originals" or what he called "first principles." This subject is dealt with at length in the third book of *The Discourses*. The heading of chapter 1 reads:

"To ensure a long existence of religions or republics, it is necessarily frequently to bring them back to their original

principles.'

Religion, which was held in high importance by Machiavelli, as an essential binding force in society provides a good example. If we go back to chapter 12 of the first book of *The Discourses*, Machiavelli says:

"Princes and republics who wish to maintain themselves free from corruption, must above all things preserve the purity of all religious observances, and treat them with proper reverence; for there is no greater indication of the ruin of a country than to see religion condemned. And this is easily understood, when we know upon what the religions of a country is founded; for the essence of every religion is based upon some one main principle . . . It is therefore the duty of Princes and heads of republics to uphold the foundations of the religion of their countries . . . And certainly, if the Christian religion had from the beginning been maintained according to the principles of its founder, the Christian states and republics would have been much more united and happy than what they are.'

Since Machiavelli wrote his conclusions there have been several centuries of experience in religious revivalism by the Catholic and various Protestant sections of the Christian religion. It can now be said with confidence that those who have been successful have been the sure-minded who have gone to the people with the basic original teachings of the Christian faith, who have achieved results in maintaining and extending belief in Christianity or bringing it back to life when the custom of religion had declined or was falling into disfavour. We have the writings of Dr. Samuel Johnson and T.S. Eliot's *Letters to Sir Lancelot* to testify to this understanding. For the reasons of this chapter, we speak mainly of the responsibility of priests, ministers of religion, Sunday school teachers, and others who are attracted to this calling to carry out this task; and we can see everywhere that whilst there is surprisingly little evidence of any decline in a belief in God there is a growth of sects away from the established Churches, which is a bad sign for any religion or society.

Religious spokesmen often do the opposite to what Machiavelli advised. They have attempted to adapt to what they imagine as trendy beliefs and customs and to engage themselves to all kinds of political campaigns, not the least of which concerns a great deal of the subject of this book. Apart from the fact that we live in a secular society, people do not go to Church to hear about politics,

the peace movement, environmentalism, "land rights" for Aborigines or anything else other than religion and spiritual comfort. Churchgoers or prospective attenders rightly have the view that they have sufficient intelligence to work out political questions without guidance from Churches; at least that is not why they go to Church or hold a belief in religion. There is also a general view in the lands of Christendom, that the "other worldliness" associated with the leaders of religion does not blend with the predisposition of political life. Parents send their children to Sunday school to learn about religion and nothing else. Machiavelli would advise preachers to get back to teaching the basics of Christianity, if they are to carry out their responsibilities and rebuild the following of their Churches. If fishermen belonging to a local anglers' club suddenly find their meetings to be transformed into platforms for politics, they would soon depart. For the Anglers' Club to be revived the leaders would have to get back to "their originals," and discuss fishing.

In an Australia under attack by means of psychological war, where all our traditions and pride in our past are being smeared, it is necessary to get back to first principles and to consider why Australians are like they are. We are considering the science of practical politics, and this is one of its principles. Politicians should be competent to speak on Australia's history, its traditions, and the superiority of our democracy over anything Communists or the so-called Third World have to offer.

We have already mentioned the Australian Flag, which is part of our tradition that needs defending. *The National Times* produced a silly article criticising the flag and offering ludicrous suggestions for an alternative. As specimen of "getting back to originals," an example of leadership is given by a letter from a citizen who hit back at *The National Times* article in defence of the flag:

**"PROUD OF THE FLAG**

"Sir, I read with interest the article regarding replacing the Australian flag (NT Jan 31-Feb 6) in an attempt to understand people's reasons for wanting to do so.

"Apparently they have given as much thought to new designs as to why they want to change the flag. Very little. The designs were absolutely ludicrous: Red kangaroo on blue background, yellow kangaroo on green background, white kangaroo on green and yellow background. It sounds like an advert for Qantas.

"As I understand it, the reasons for wanting a change are:

"(1) The Union Jack implies that we are still a colony of England. What rubbish. Hawaii still has a Union Jack on its State flag to mark the fact that it was discovered by Britain, and that she later relinquished her sovereignty.

"(2) Only four of the Commonwealth countries still have the Union Jack on their flag. In that case perhaps we should have sheep instead of kangaroos, because that's all we'll be if we follow the flock.

"(3) Canada did it and it worked for them. On the contrary, Canada changed its flag to calm a large minority of its population, those of French descent, and it failed.

"(4) We want a distinctive flag. Mr. Heinrichs answered this one himself. Australians will be looking at the flag most of the time, so why not please ourselves, and the designs shown in your article were sickening.

"Thousands of people have fought and died with pride for our flag and country, with never a thought of changing it. Now a group of people, who for want of a better pastime, are devoting time to changing it.

"It could be interesting to note that the Eureka flag, the only alternative considered when the mob decided they wanted a new flag, was available only from Communist bookshops, etc. an organisation dedicated to disrupting the Australian lifestyle and dividing the community on any issue it can . . .

Mr. Ainsworth explains that he is "not an anglophile . . . but I am damn proud of Australia and its flag.

"If at some point in the future the Government decides to change the flag, I and a lot of other people will refuse to recognise it."

This letter was from Keith Ainsworth, Queanbeyan, N.S.W.

We can add to Mr. Ainsworth's letter by providing some further background to the Union Jack, and what it stands for. Following upon inauguration of the Commonwealth of Australia on 1st January, 1901, the new flag was decided on after much thought and competition in design. The selection was modified by a combination of entries. It consists of the Union Jack in the upper canton, as a reminder of Australia's link with the United Kingdom. The Union Jack itself depicts a representation of the majority of Australia's pioneers and early settlers, and the majority of present

**Australians by descent. It is a combination of three flags:—**

**The English flag of St. George**

**The Scottish flag of St. Andrew**

**The Irish flag of St. Patrick**

The Constellation of the Southern Cross in the fly-symbolic of the great Southern Land. A six pointed star in the third quarter representing the six States of Federation. There could be no better flag to reflect Australia and its background. Migrants coming to a new country do not expect the nation to change its flag or institutions. Immigrants come to Australia by choice. It is the land of their adoption. Ninety-nine out of every hundred Greek and Italian migrants are loyal to Australia and are embarrassed by self appointed "leaders." They are aware that they have been singled out for special attention by Communist factions who are unrepresentative of the Italian or Greek migrants. The majority of migrants from all countries are rapidly assimilating into Australian society. There are a few political organisations of different national origin, but none of them is elected by the people who share their country of origin. They represent nobody, although the Federal Government loves giving financial handouts to these people.

The Southern Cross, put up as the alternative flag, was erected by the Eureka miners in the rebellion at Ballarat in 1856. What its present users do not like to say is that the Ballarat miners had nothing to do with Socialism or the collectivist State. They were free enterprise men working on their own to make a profit out of finding gold. They were fiercely independent and against Government interference and what they considered an unjust tax. What is more, the proclamation issued by the miners at the time of the rebellion called for universal military training to defend the country. They were among those who helped establish the Australian military tradition. We may add that the Southern Cross is already adequately represented in the present flag.

While it's not the habit of the Trades Hall to have pictures of the Queen or the Duke of Edinburgh in our offices, and union officials do not become excited when there is a Royal visit to Australia, this does not mean it is a policy of the union movement to demand a break with the ties between Britain and Australia, or to throw away other important links with the past. Union officials, who have the opportunity of mixing with ordinary people, and keeping in touch with the way their members think, are aware of how rank and file unionists think about the Monarchy; which is not so far different to those who belong to the unions in Britain.

They never criticise the Monarchy in their union journals, any more than they would allow themselves to become involved in arguments about religion. Nor does the fact that union history, such as is reflected in the annual commemorations of the Eight Hour Movement, mean less to those who do not belong to organised labor and mean that they are any less democrats. The most remarkable characteristic of Australians is how little there is that divides one from another, in any really deep sense; whether it be class or politics or religion. There is healthy debate when it is believed to be necessary, but the most common word of advice among ordinary Australians is "never argue about politics or religion." One of the few times Australians will become involved in political argument is to voice their antipathy towards anyone who wants to change anything. Consider their consistent rejection of proposals to change the Federal Constitution.

Doing away with the Crown or the idea of a Governor-General is not going to alter human nature. Whatever system was used to replace a Governor or the Queen would most likely lead to an increase in power by a president or some other pontifical head of state. And we need only remember that invitations to the American White House are the cause of no less excitement and feelings of self esteem than similar invitations to Buckingham Palace or to Government House in Canberra. More to the point, however, is that to change the system would be undemocratic because the overwhelming majority of people support the old system. I must confess that the subject of the Monarchy had hardly attracted my attention until I had been forced to consider the matter as a defence question.

An example of "getting back to originals" and putting the record straight, was a lengthy article in *The Australian* (January 30, 1982) by Sir Howard Beale where, in part, he says:

"This argument can easily be dismissed: our Governor-General is entirely the choice of the Australian Government, and his powers and actions are, and were, entirely regulated by the Commonwealth Constitution written by Australians. The Queen had nothing whatever to do with Mr. Whitlam's dismissal . . ."

Sir Howard could have added that Sir John Kerr, the Governor-General, who sacked the Whitlam Government was appointed by Mr. Whitlam, and his selection was endorsed by his own Labor Government. Sir Howard continued:

"We have no such problem, and will not have unless our Governments, in the sacred name of multi-racialism, are



unwise enough to promote migration policies which result in so great an influx of people of quite different culture and background that it gives rise to the sort of turmoil and dissension apparent in many other countries. Our culture is British and European in character, rooted in moral values and traditions which have grown out of more than 2,000 years of shared history and human experience . . ."

Sir Howard Beale, a former Liberal member of the Federal Parliament, and Cabinet Minister, rejected the suggestion that migrants of non-British stock might object to our flag, and continued connection with Great Britain, and the Monarchy. He said:

"I greatly doubt this. So far as European migrants are concerned, I suspect that most of those who think about the matter at all are content to have the British Queen as queen of their adopted country; echoes of Britain's struggles over the last century or so in defence of the freedom of European countries are still present in the folk memory of many who came here from Europe.

"If the position is really different with Asiatic migrants — and I wonder about this too — it may be due to ignorance or to republican propaganda to which they have been exposed since they came. In any case, are migrants, wherever they come from, entitled to dictate what form of Government we should have?

"Presumably, in most cases they knew when they made their choice what sort of institutions they were to live under. And they can always go away. If we are to defer to the various views of newcomers about how we should alter our established institutions we may end up like the man, the boy and the ass in Aesop's fable — off the bridge into the river.

"The United States has received millions of migrants from a multitude of foreign countries but there has never been any question of Americans changing their constitution to accommodate the alleged wishes or prejudices of those who come from countries with quite different forms of Government. On the contrary, what America has done has been to mount a powerful educational campaign to teach newcomers about America's history and the virtues of the system established by its founding fathers. We in Australia should do the same."

I am sure Australians generally, including new Australians, from lands other than Britain would wholeheartedly agree with Sir

Howard, that those migrants who do not like Australia can go back to whence they came. They would obviously be much happier away from this country. Sir Howard's commonsense observation that Australia's culture is British and European, as are its moral values, and that we should not make the mistake "in the sacred name of multi-culturalism" of destroying the homogeneity of the country which would cause the disruption and dissolution of our society, is endorsed by the overwhelming majority of Australians, whatever their backgrounds.

## CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

### MAINTAINING A HOMOGENEOUS AUSTRALIA

The Melbourne journalist, Douglas Wilkie, who sets an example of taking people back to "their originals," has asked if a multi-cultural society has never worked anywhere else before, how do the politicians imagine it is going to work in Australia? The revolutionaries know it will not, but the Canberra dreamers believe it will. The care required in selecting migrants was brought out in an editorial from the Melbourne *Herald* of January 12, 1982:

"We should expect that the biggest advantage to be gained by migrants from some Old World countries is freedom from the political turmoil and violence they have left behind. Usually this is true. But some migrants have been unable to shed the animosities, hatreds and 'campaigns' that have bedevilled their homelands — sometimes for centuries. The result is hostility among some ethnic communities which, at times, has brought unacceptable violence here.

"We now have reported the activities of the international Turkish terrorist group known as the Grey Wolves, which according to a report by today's *Sun* welfare workers believe in infiltrating local organisations . . ."

Some people were startled that the *Herald* expressed its views at all, because the constant battering about "racism" has made people reluctant to even object to migrants with traditions of violence coming to Australia.

To preserve Australian society, we need not apologise for reiterating too often that Australians should shed any fear of speaking out in defence of their society. *The Herald* concluded:

"We do not want domestic Turkish troubles here — any more than we want the violence of extremist political groups and standover tactics of long-established and organised

---

criminal movements. We do not want their bombings, arson, threats and counter-threats. We have enough local thugs of our own.

"The Grey Wolves are a particularly sinister, insidious bunch who concentrate on conditioning young people, firing them to acts of hatred. If, as reports indicate, they are becoming active in Australia, responsible Turkish migrants must give local authorities every help in maintaining the peace — an onus which rests on responsible members of all ethnic communities."

In considering what migrants, to whom, a nation will concede the right of entry, the matter of religion cannot be ignored. It is not racist, or bigoted, to recognise that different religions and the division they cause brings not only civil strife, but can lead to civil war and wars between nations.

The Turks are a useful example for our considerations, because ever since the First World War, when the Diggers brought back a very considerable admiration of "Johnny Turk," the enemy they fought at Gallipoli and in Egypt, and to whom they conceded such respect and honour for their bravery and stubbornness, the Turks have had a special place in the Australian estimate. Following the invitation of Australian soldiers, Turkish veterans have marched alongside Australians on Anzac Day, which says a great deal for them and the Australians. But one of the chief threats to stability in the world today is Islamic fundamentalism. Too many Moslem migrants to Australia cannot but make for great trouble in the future. Immigration Department officials have expressed a preference for Turkish migrants over those from Britain. It is quite reasonable to suggest that this new discrimination against the British and other Europeans should be ended. According to the *Melbourne Age*:

"Turkish community leaders believe bigotry in the Broadmeadows area influenced the local council's decision to reject plans for a new Mosque.

"A spokesman for the Turkish community, Mr. Eddie Djoumayia said Turks believe they were being discriminated against by the Broadmeadows community . . .

"Mr. Djoumayia said the Broadmeadows Mosque was needed to relieve overcrowding of the Coburg Mosque."

It is ridiculous and quite intolerable that the citizens of Broadmeadows, who already have enough problems, should have to defend themselves against the charge of "racism" and bigotry.

There was no decision by the Broadmeadows Council refusing to allow a Mosque to be built. It was a question of its placement. Local residents claimed "the main objection to the Mosque was the traffic. We have tried very, very hard not to be racist. That does not come into it. We just don't believe our street is big enough for the traffic that the Mosque will create," said a spokeswoman for local residents.

Enough is enough. If the Government cannot learn anything from past history, or from the difficulties other countries are experiencing, then the politicians will have to be made to act on what is already happening in Australia. The Turkish migrants already here can be absorbed if their aspiring leaders are made aware that charging Australians with being "racist" is not going to get them anywhere. And we can put a stop to the disruptors in our midst like Al Grassby and company.

It is quite fair to say that Turkey has for the present time had its reasonable quotient of migrants to Australia as it is equally true of Asia. In order to return to a more balanced population level we can alter present policies by granting a preference to migrants from Britain.

"Already up to 600 people a day are blocking the stair wells at the immigration section . . ." said a report from London by John Hamilton in the *Melbourne Herald* of February 9, 1982.

These are English people wanting to come to Australia. The majority are rejected by Canberra. The Federal Government prefers its fairyland cries of a multi-cultural Australia. Meanwhile, Ian McPhee assures us "the Government will continue to accept Kampuchean refugees from Thailand so that they may join the growing Kampuchean community who have settled so well in Australia."

It is hardly "racist" to remind the Government that Kampuchians and Vietnamese do not assimilate together any more than do Chinese and Vietnamese, or Indonesians with the Chinese. Even the North Vietnamese and South Vietnamese do not get on well together. Since the end of the war in Vietnam, North Vietnam Communist leaders have been replacing South Vietnamese Communist leaders in the governance of the South. The split between the Soviet Union and China has much more to do with racist differences than of Marxist dogma. South East Asian leaders have been warning Australia that a race war is emerging in the area and that Vietnam's exercise with the boat people is both a military exercise

as well as a manifestation of hatred of the Vietnamese towards Chinese ethnics. Vietnam is determined on a programme of racist purity without making any secret of it. To return to Machiavelli's definition of the two ways of waging war; Vietnam has declared those who have migrated or come to Australia as refugees are still Vietnamese Nationals. The Australian Government responds by offering the Vietnamese the opportunity of negotiating an agreement with their Communist Government for more migrants to come here. At the same time our Government refuses to accept many white English migrants from Zimbabwe (Rhodesia).

Australians concerned about defence should ponder on the Communist Vietnamese declaration that those who have left their homeland are still nationals of Vietnam, which follows a similar proclamation from the Soviet Union, thus giving both Communist States the opportunity, as they see it, to interfere in Australia's affairs. In the scheme of things, they claim the right to protect the minorities who are "oppressed" by the Anglophilism of the Australian Community. Both the Kremlin and Hanoi have the manufactured "evidence" for all this from the Federal Government's Department of Community Affairs, headed by Al Grassby, together with the rest of Australia's Anglo-Saxon hating movement.

In answer to an article by an Australian journalist, an announcement came from Thailand saying Australia could take another million newcomers from Vietnam. An Indonesian Government spokesman made a sinister statement this year that Australians are "racists," using the evidence of Grassby and those on the Aboriginal circuit because of our alleged ill treatment of the Australian blacks. More significantly, the Indonesian leader spoke of "those vast empty spaces in Australia." When the Australian Prime Minister says his Government is colour blind in its immigration policies and that Australia is a multi-cultural society, it simply means that Australia belongs to the world. Charles Perkins says in his book *A Bastard Like Me*, (1975) "I would like to see indigenous people like Maoris, Fijians, Malaysians and Indonesians coming in."

The Federal Government's stated policies are interpreted in Asia to mean that the Anglo-Saxon majority, together with those of Celtic or European origin, who make Australia a part of Western Civilisation, can no longer claim this country to be theirs. From the old military tactic used against Czechoslovakia, it is a short step to prepare an invasion to fill up those "vast empty spaces" by a

million or several million more "refugees" from Asia. That, in a nutshell, is the political and military situation before us.

There are Asian leaders who regard Australians as slightly mad with their Government's paraphernalia of multi-culturalism and refusal to arm itself adequately. In this way we lose their respect. However, sometimes they still try to warn us of the dangers ahead, and would like us to be their allies. Speaking from Singapore, on December 11, 1981, Singapore's Prime Minister Mr. Lee spoke of the military threat from Communism in the area. Michael Richardson in the Melbourne Age of February 19, 1981, reports:

"Mr. Lee . . . called for closer co-operation between the non-Communist countries of South-East Asia to safeguard regional security . . ."

Dr. Kohathir of Malaysia speaking at the same meeting said "that recent events in Indo-China including Vietnam's armed intervention in Kampuchea had "brought Communism closer to our doorstep."

Michael Richardson's report continued:

"in an obvious reference to China's policy of continuing support for Communist revolutionary movements in the ASEAN region while trying to develop friendly relations with ASEAN Governments, he said Malaysia did not believe in double standards in the conduct of international relations.

"There cannot be any compromise on this, he said, implying that Peking and Kuala Lumpur would never have friendly and durable relations while China pursued a dual policy.

"At a joint Press conference today, the two leaders announced various measures to strengthen co-operation between the two countries . . .

"Mr. Lee confirmed that Singapore's armed forces would 'augment' Malaysia's 'to meet any threat of external aggression'."

In discussing the future, Mr. Lee is further reported as saying ASEAN countries had "achieved average annual rates of economic growth of between 6 and 10 percent . . .

"The way of life and the standards of living our peoples enjoy are not to be found in large sections of Asia, especially in the Communist countries of Indo-China, China and North Korea.

"In order that our children can continue to enjoy these

freedoms, we must institutionalise our co-operation and be better prepared to meet sudden emergencies that may arise in the intermediate future.'

Australia is in the same position and should adopt the same attitude.



## CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

### DEFEND AUSTRALIA BY VOICE AND PEN

The idea that violence between white Australians and Aborigines is being carefully fostered, is one which the great majority find hard to accept. But the evidence for this is overwhelming. Whites have been advocating that blacks use violence against their fellow white Australians.

Unfortunately there is a reluctance amongst many Australians to react strongly against suggestions of violence because a type of guilt complex has been created as a result of constant propaganda which alleges that the whites have done such dreadful things to Aborigines that they must repent. It is essential that Australians come forward and wherever possible use both word and pen to expose those who vilify the Australian people.

The campaign smearing Australians as "racists" is being intensified. The Melbourne *Sun* reports under the heading, "Australians are racist; author":

"Most white Australians are prejudiced against Aborigines, according to a new book. Mr. Derek Carne says in his book *Land Rights: A Christian Perspective* that many Australians have basic racist attitudes toward Aborigines, even though they have never had contact with them."

Before proceeding to consider Mr. Carne and his fables, let us turn to a similar book, by Mr. Charles Perkins, *A Bastard Like Me*. Mr. Perkins inadvertantly gives a clue to the real barometer of feeling of the Australian people towards Aborigines. He is describing the scene of his university graduation day:

"In Sydney University's Great Hall on graduation day, I got the biggest applause in the whole hall. The poor bloke before me and the couple of people after me hardly even heard their names." (p. 75).

Here was an audience of white Australians, the students and their families, showing their great pleasure about Aboriginals going through a university. This was a true indication of Australian attitudes towards Aboriginals. Do they sound like "racists"?

Back now to our "Christian" author: *The Sun* report continued:

"Mr. Carne says there is a popular myth among white Australians that the country was settled peacefully . . .

"This myth has blinded white Australians to the history of violence on which their society was built.

"A racist ideology pervades every major aspect of white Australian culture. The book says an undeclared war existed over much of Australia during its first 150 years . . .

"Mr. Carne wrote the book for the Aboriginal land rights taskforce — a group set up by the Australian Council of Churches and the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace.

"He says Churches are well-placed to co-ordinate political action on land rights.

"'Churches have the resources to form a nation-wide network of support for Aboriginal people', Mr. Carne said."

Apart from all citizens, who have the right to defend the good name of Australians, it is the special responsibility of Christians to expose and oppose the left-wing propaganda apparatus working through the World Council of Churches and the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace.

It is not suggested there are no people in the Churches working to counter left-wing infiltration. There have been some excellent exposures of such organisations, including the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace. But unfortunately members of this "Commission" are still writing statements to be signed by Bishops, who do not appear even to bother to read them, despite their attacks against Australia.

Charles Perkins' book is one which an objective historian, or a writer with investigative skills, might profitably examine as an example of the many distortions of Australian history. Leaving aside the early history of Australia, for which there is abundant archival material for putting the record straight, Mr. Perkins provides an example of incredibly untrue statements about events within the memory of people still living. This period can be easily checked.

Mr. Charles Perkins writes:

"The white station owners would go out on regular hunts for Aborigines. 'Instead of having a kangaroo hunt today, we'll have an Aboriginal hunt'. They would go out and shoot them, men, women and children . . ."

Mr. Perkins claims that there are "many hundreds" of examples "to illustrate the atrocities that were carried out by white society through the police . . ."

"The general relationship between Aborigines and whites was that Aborigines were often shot down like dogs, whenever the white pastoralists thought 'their property' was in jeopardy . . . Many of the administrators and so-called 'protectors of Aborigines' did little to stop the shooting and killing of Aborigines at this time."

Mr. Perkins is here referring to alleged events within the last 50 to 60 years. He then goes back to the early 1900's.

"The policemen in the early nineteen hundreds in the Territory took young Aboriginal girls for their use. There was no one to stop them. They would come into the tribe and demand four or five of our girls to use as their own women. Having made their selection, they would shave the girls' hair down short, sometimes shaving it right off. The police would chain them up and walk them off. The girls would be chained to a tree for as long as the police wanted them: a week, a month, or sometimes a year. Then they would let them go again. If the girls objected, they were shot . . . This is the glorious history of central Australia . . ."

Some people will actually believe this sort of thing if it is not answered. Most important, it is used as "evidence" to support charges of "racism" against Australia overseas. Apart from considerations of Australian defence and historical accuracy, there is the insult to the Aborigines themselves. If anyone thinks that Aborigines in Central Australia, still tribalised and heavily armed with spears and other weapons during the early 1900's, would let police go in and take their women like that, then they have a very poor opinion and understanding of the Australian Aborigine.



RSL did not endorse the Victorian resolution on immigration, it did pass a resolution calling for the dismissal of Mr. Grassby by the Federal Government. Attempting to act like a schoolmaster scolding two of his pupils, Minister for Immigration McPhee, said that both Mr. Grassby and Mr. Ruxton "should keep quiet about their opinions . . ." Both Mr. McPhee and the Attorney-General, Senator Durack, defended Mr. Grassby against the RSL's call for his dismissal. *The Sun* reported Senator Durack as saying:

"the commissioner's task was often a difficult one, and subject to the law, he was entitled to carry out his duties as he saw fit. Senator Durack said Mr. Grassby had to enquire into alleged infringements of the Racial Discrimination Act. 'It is appropriate for him to refer allegations on criticism to persons or organisations to which the allegations or criticisms refer' he said."

Senator Durack is a legal man. He has had experience in the courts, yet he protects a person who publicises unsubstantiated reports in the press about people, organisations, including whole Governments and the people of Australia as being "racists" in an endless tirade to the media. No lawyer worth his salt would countenance this sort of behaviour, and yet when the RSL takes on the task of actually defending the Australian people, a Liberal Senator who, along with his fellows in the House of Representatives and the Senate should have been answering Mr. Grassby themselves, and certainly have dismissed him long ago, comes out and defends him.

The Senator Durack approach reflects the middle of the road mentality, one resulting in people making irresponsible statements if they think it is popular or trendy at the time. Another example was that of the retiring Governor-General, Sir Zelman Cowan, who told the RSL Federal Conference "not to rock the boat" and to go easy on the issues raised by the Victorian Branch.

The Melbourne *Sun* of November 19, 1981 reported:

"Student apathy was 'very evident' in universities, the Governor-General, Sir Zelman Cowan, said yesterday.

"This is a matter of concern because there are many issues about which young people should be articulate and concerned . . . he had begun to see a change on university campuses in the early 1970's.

"The 'frenetic and agitated' university campus of the 1960's had given way to a campus that was 'often torpid', he said.

---

"The organisation of the university year, with the constant pressure of assignments due to be finished on time and continuous assessment, leaves many students with little or no time for involvement in many aspects of university life . . ."

The 1960's were the greatest period of disruption and revolutionary activity ever experienced by universities in the Western world. Tradition and discipline in the universities declined to an all-time low with students rampaging around on anti-Vietnam war demonstrations, very often under the leadership of their juvenile professors and lecturers with a consequent lowering of academic standards from which the universities have not yet recovered. There is nothing wrong with university students becoming involved in politics to some extent, but they are there primarily to learn their subjects and to come out professionally competent, which is not what happens when "they become articulate and concerned." Apparently it is not good for the RSL to "rock the boat" but "concerned" university students should!

In calling on people to act in defence of the country there have been repeated cases of Mr. Grassby attacking whole sections of the Australian population at a time. It is the medical profession one day and someone else the next.

A Socialist Left Member of Parliament in Victoria, Mr. Jim Simmonds, who is almost given to irresponsible statements as his friend in the ALP Mr. Grassby, lodged a complaint with Grassby that the Victorian Police force was racist because they would not employ Chinese and Aborigines as policemen. The *Melbourne Sun* of January 21, 1981 reported:

"Mr. Simmonds said 'blatant racial discrimination was contained in section 13 (1) of the Police Regulations Act'."

It turned out to be that the regulation referred to had no effect in that as the Chief Commissioner of Police, Mr. Miller pointed out, 'The police department was not a racist organisation'. . . Mr. Miller said any potential police recruit was judged on his merits and not on his racial background.

"He said the regulation came into force when authorities thought that non-Christians could not take the oath which was administered on the Bible.

"But he said changes in the Evidence Act meant the oath could be administered through 'solemn affirmation'.

"Police sources said yesterday, Aborigines had been accepted into the force without breaching the Act . . .

"He said he could not remember a person of 'Chinese

extraction' applying to join the force.

"But Asian law enforcement officers have been used by Victorian police in undercover roles."

At least in the above case the charges of "racism" were answered, however mild was the rebuke.

On February 13, 1982, the Melbourne *Sun* carried an article headed "A Portrait of a Racist."

"Australia's racists do not conform to the popular image of a beer-swilling loud-mouthed Ocker. Community Relations Commissioner Mr. Al Grassby has found.

"He said a feature of Australian racists was that they hated nearly everybody.

"I suspect when they look in the mirror they end up hating themselves", he said.

"Mr. Grassby said a survey of middle managers, whose average age was 35, revealed a high level of 'primitive intolerance', he said.

"Mr. Grassby also said they hated 'Asians', 'Japanese', 'Trade Unionists of all kinds' and as he was addressing a meeting of the Australian Union of Jewish students he said they also hated 'Jews'."

If it had been a meeting of Eskimos, Mr. Grassby would, no doubt, have explained how they were the people hated. *The Sun* report continued:

"And they were also prejudiced against poor people. It is a pattern of bigotry that needs to be met head on . . .

"He may look and sound respectable, be well educated and hold a middle management position, but underneath he is seething with hate for Aborigines, Jews and Asians."

I think anyone would agree that sounds very much like a "hard core racist," the species of which Mr. Grassby has said there were no more than 200 in Australia.

Mr. Grassby often has these "surveys" and "numerous complaints" but the details are never made public. If there was such a survey of middle management, how was it conducted? And by whom? How did they get these people to make such extraordinary admissions?

There is another contradiction: *The Sun's* report concluded:

"No company can expect to do well with a manager who has a whole list of hates on a racial and social basis", Mr. Grassby said.

"He or she will be divisive and will, in fact, sabotage the

---

best interests of any company or corporation to feed his own bigotries and biases'''

As a union official. I would agree that no management personnel would survive if they were like this. Any other union official or employer's representative would agree with Mr. Grassby's description as to how they would sabotage the interests of the company. So where are all these people employed to even be interviewed in the first place? A number of newspapers printed Mr. Grassby's ravings. Why was he not questioned about such obvious nonsense? Why is he not questioned by the press about his other equally absurd statements? Employer and management organisations could have used the opportunity to have Mr. Grassby removed from his place, but instead, his statement was passed by.

Children believe this nonsense when they read it; as do many school teachers, who are often ignorant of what it is like in the outside world. His statements are taken up seriously in newspapers throughout the world. This is part of the propaganda war against Australia. People overseas have no reason to disbelieve a man who is paid by the Federal Government and backed by its leading politicians.

A word about the Trade Unions. We in the Trade Unions also have a heavy responsibility to take a hand in Australia's defence. The Communist and Socialist Left elements involved in the unions are doing their best to sabotage the nation's defence. That hero of the Aboriginal cause, Mr. Charles Perkins, says union officials "should be strung up by their thumbs." Well, fortunately Mr. Perkins does not run the country, but some of his statements would make useful study for a psychologist.



## CHAPTER TWENTY

### AUSTRALIA DOES ITS BEST FOR THE ABORIGINES

Generally overlooked by the media, and deliberately ignored by all those claiming to speak on behalf of the Australian Aborigines, are the wide range of welfare services for Aborigines financed by the Australian taxpayers.

Before returning to Papua New Guinea after the CHOGM Conference in Melbourne in October, 1981, Prime Minister, Sir Julian Chan, expressed his astonishment about the wide range of social services received by the Aborigines of Australia. Prime Minister Chan said his people would appreciate them. The fear of losing Australian welfare payments was a major factor in the campaign by Torres Strait Islanders to remain part of Australia.

Occasionally someone has the courage to speak about the social benefits being paid to Aborigines, but this is quickly smothered by a stream of vilification of whites as "racists" and how the Aboriginal people are being "brutally oppressed."

Former Federal Liberal Member of Parliament, Mr. Bert Kelly, writing in the *Financial Review* of June 23, 1978, drew attention to Aboriginal welfare payments, commenting that:

"Besides the cost of social services that everyone receives, such as an aged, invalid, unemployment and similar benefits, the 136,226 people who claim to be Aborigines received, in addition, \$161,537,000 in the last financial year, or \$1,185 per person. So clearly we are not being mean . . ."

Since 1978 much more money has been spent on the Aboriginal people, but still Australia is branded by the World Council of Churches as "the most racist country in the world."

It is so easy for people calling themselves Aborigines to obtain benefits unobtainable by white Australians, that many who once claimed to be white are now registering themselves as Aborigines

---

on the basis that they can trace some Aboriginal ancestry.

Senator Neville Bonner gives his definition of an Aborigine as follows: "Being an Aborigine is a state of mind. It has nothing to do with skin or colour." This is a most convenient definition for the radical activists.

The Brisbane *Sunday Mail* of June 18, 1978, quotes former Queensland Liberal Senator Ian Wood as follows:

"White Aborigines, with as little as one-eighth Aboriginal blood are obtaining large amounts of money in concessions which should go only to full-blood Aborigines. Some of them are as white as I am, and I think it is terribly unfair that they claim to be Aboriginal . . .

"The definition is that an Aborigine is a person of Aboriginal descent, who identifies himself as an Aborigine and is accepted as one by the community with which he is associated. I don't see how a departmental officer could possibly know how a person is considered in the community. At present, if a person says he is an Aborigine, then he is one. We must have some sort of classification of who is an Aborigine and who is not, some point at which to stop . . . 50 percent Aboriginal blood would probably be an acceptable cut-off point.

"There are supposed to be 130,000 hybrid people now, he said. Why should the young people of this country have to pay housing loan interest of up to 14 percent or more and, through taxation, subsidise . . . loans from as low as 2 percent?"

Mr. Charles Porter, at that time Queensland Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, added "Aborigines receive a range of benefits not available to the average Queenslanders. These range from heavily subsidised housing to freedom from the normal burden of Local Authority rates and service charges . . ." (*South Burnett Times*, June 21, 1978)

In addition to these benefits, Mr. Charles Perkins and his fellow radicals have the big budget allocated to the Commonwealth Aboriginal Affairs Department.

Questions have been asked, but not answered, concerning properties being allegedly bought in Queensland and elsewhere by the Commonwealth Aboriginal Affairs Department. The fear has been expressed that in this way it would be possible to build up radical bases outside the effective control of the Queensland Government.

# Conclusion

In my book, *Australia At Stake* (1977) I outlined my experiences inside the Communist Party and concluded by stressing my growing concern about the defence of Australia against internal revolution supported by external forces. Defence is much more than the possession of military equipment, although this is, of course, essential; it requires a national will to use that equipment, and a genuine national will requires a basically homogeneous people held together with loyalty to commonly held values. One primary language is essential.

But the Grassby multi-culturalists, backed by a Federal Government using taxpayers' money, have produced a situation where we now have nation-wide publicity concerning the alleged lack of an Australian "identity." Up until recent times the overwhelming majority of Australians, irrespective of their original ethnic backgrounds, had no difficulty in knowing what it meant to be an Australian.

Dishonestly arguing that Australia was multi-cultural and multi-racial from the beginning, Mr. Al Grassby refers to the number of different ethnic groups which came to Botany Bay with the First Fleet. It is true that there were Irish, Scots, Welsh, Cornish as well as English. But these groups all of whom spoke English, had no problem in growing together and feeling that they were all Australians. Wearing the King's uniform, saluting an Australian flag in which the Union Jack was in the left-hand corner, troops in two World Wars, or in Korea and later in Vietnam, did not suffer from any "identity crisis."

The founding groups, together with those who later joined them, had no problem in integrating and feeling that they were all Australians. Sir Henry Bolte of German background, or Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen of Danish background have found no difficulty in making distinctive contributions to the broad stream of the Australian way of life. That delightful sportswoman, Mrs. Evyonne Cawley (Goolagong) the darling of the Wimbledon tennis crowds, has also entered that stream and has refused to allow her Aboriginal ancestry to be exploited by revolutionary activists.

In the phoney debate about Aboriginal "land rights," it is generally overlooked that irrespective of what happened in the past, there would be no debate at all if young white Australians had not died on the Kakoda trail and other parts of South-East Asia in

---

stemming the Japanese assault during the Pacific War. A Japanese victory would have eliminated any Aboriginal problem — by the simple process of liquidating the Aborigines! By their sacrifices white Australians have as much right to be in Australia as the Aborigines. Their presence offers the Aboriginal people, a minute fraction of the total Australian population, the opportunity of joining the broad stream of Australian development, at their own chosen rate, retaining that part of their lifestyle they feel best suits them.

A policy of evolutionary assimilation, with every ethnic group making its own distinctive contribution, is the only way to ensure the continued development of a genuine Australian way of life. It is that way of life which the "land rights" advocates and multiculturalists would destroy.

The question of defence is much greater and much more important than the divisions of party politics. Individual politicians have a duty to come together with union officials and other community leaders to speak out. Those of us in the Trade Unions have a heavy responsibility to take a hand in Australia's defence. The Communist and Socialist Left in the Unions are doing their best to sabotage Australia's defence, even though they do not genuinely represent the views of the great majority of Australian unionists, who are patriots.

There are plenty of individuals in the community who are powerful enough in their own right to make statements to the press, and there is no one who cannot write a letter. Branches of political parties are all an effective force and more genuinely represent grass roots opinion than do some party political leaders.

The Victorian Branch of the RSL has already set an example for everyone. Hopefully a regenerated RSL can provide the type of national leadership required at the present time.

In a recent historical work by Mr. Robert Murray on Australia during the 1920s, the author mentions the enormous influence of the returned soldiers from the First World War on the political life of Australia, which he said had petered out by about 1970. We miss them greatly today. If they were around today Mr. Al Grassby would have been sacked long ago and there would be no nonsense about multi-culturalism and the wrecking of Australia by the setting up of a separate nation, allegedly for the benefit of the Aborigines. The old Diggers would have strongly repudiated the charge of "racism." But the Victorian Branch of the RSL has taken up the banner and it is to be hoped that other State branches will

---

follow the lead.

There are those who find it easy to disagree with some of the policies of the Queensland State Government of Joh Bjelke-Petersen. But this must not be allowed to obscure the vital truth that with its courageous and constructive stand on the question of Aboriginal "land rights," the Government of Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen is holding a front line of defence for the whole of Australia. That is why he is the major target of the most venomous Marxist-inspired campaign ever directed against an Australian political leader. We desperately need more political fighters like Joh Bjelke-Petersen. A defeat of the Bjelke-Petersen Government would be a defeat for the whole of Australia.

Today is a troubled world, and likely to become even more troubled. Australia must, in the words of Henry Lawson, "look to herself for strength in the storm that is yet to break."

Strength will not be found by fragmenting the nation through divisive "land rights" campaigns and the fostering of multiculturalism.

## WHAT THEY ARE SAYING ABOUT THIS BOOK

"Having read the book it is with enthusiasm that I am participating in its launching, together with my colleague Premier the Honourable Joh Bjelke-Petersen. Geoff McDonald obviously knows what he is talking about, it is to the honour of Mr. McDonald that as a union man he's taking a lead in Australia's defence. Having had experience in the area, I warmly recommend that citizens of all political beliefs read his book. It is in the national interest to do so."

— Mr. Charles Porter,  
Former Liberal Cabinet Minister in the Queensland Government  
with the portfolio of Minister for Aboriginal Affairs,  
when speaking at the launching of *Red Over Black*.

"Mr. McDonald's description of Communist strategy towards the land rights movement is a masterpiece of political intelligence and a warning which can only be ignored at peril to the Australian nation."

— Mr. Patrick Walsh,  
former undercover intelligence agent for the  
Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

"*Red Over Black* is a book which every responsible Australian should read and digest. It is a chilling confirmation of what my husband, Sir Raphael, said when he returned from serving with the United Nations in 1950. Sir Raphael said he had learned from his undercover associates of a Communist long-range plan to alienate Aboriginal lands from the Australian nation, so that a fragmented north could be used for subversive activities by other countries as well as for guerrilla training centres plus coloureds from other countries. I can only hope that Mr. Geoff McDonald's warning will be heeded in time."

— Lady Phyllis Cilento.

"We urge the public to read this book by Mr. McDonald as a necessary step in advancing knowledge of the land rights issue and those subversive elements promoting it."

Wing Commander Gordon Olive,  
Queensland spokesman for  
The Australian Defence Association.

"Mr. McDonald's documentation is impressive . . . I call on the Federal Government and all Australians to look more deeply beneath the land rights movement and examine the motives of its radical advocates. Mr. McDonald's book will promote debate on what was emerging as the most serious threat to face Australia."

— Queensland Premier, the Hon. Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

"Something is wrong in Australia. This book pinpoints what that is, and presents all the evidence. Compelling reading."

— A.C. Cameron, MBE, DFM, JP.  
Former President Queensland Branch of the RSL.

"As a former Communist entrusted to lead an Australian Communist delegation to Moscow in 1938, I can endorse Mr. Geoff McDonald's exposure of the Soviet's long-term strategy concerning Aboriginal 'land rights'. Top Communists discussed this question with me in Moscow. I was pleased to support the official launch of *Red Over Black*."

— Mr. T.C. McGillick,  
Administrator of Crusade for Freedom.

# RED OVER BLACK

*Red Over Black* is the chilling and almost unbelievable story of the Marxist manipulation of the Aboriginal "land rights" movement, told by a man who learned of Communist strategy while in the Communist Party.

Ever since leaving school at 14 years of age, Geoff McDonald has been involved in industrial and political affairs. While painting Aboriginal murals on the secret Communist training school at Minto, New South Wales, he first heard of the long-range Communist strategy for the establishment of an Aboriginal republic under Communist control.



While representing the Royal Australian Nursing Federation as an Industrial Officer in the early seventies, Geoff McDonald made a number of visits to Aboriginal reserves in Central and Northern Australia and saw Marxist operators and their dupes hard at work advancing Communist strategy.

Geoff McDonald has a deep respect for the genuine Aboriginal people, whom he sees as being treated as black cannon fodder by the Marxist revolutionaries. He writes with great feeling about Australian nurses and is loud in his praise of their dedicated services to the Aborigines.

A man of independent character, Geoff McDonald was expelled from the Communist Party for daring to criticise. In an often stormy and tumultuous career he has successfully represented Deep Sea Divers, Mannequins and Models together with various unions representing tradesmen and unskilled workers.

Over the past fifteen years, Geoff McDonald has been a free-lance industrial advocate who combines a public and industrial relations service to trade unions and professional organisations.

*Red Over Black* makes a unique contribution to the national controversy concerning Aboriginal "land rights."