

Mass Immigration Undermining Australia's Way of Life

Ryan T. Jones
11 November 1996

Introduction

An increasing problem for Australia is its excessive population growth, predominantly resulting from mass immigration. Australia's immigration policy is disastrous, proceeding as if there is no social ill-effects, no concern for destroying our national identity and culture, no balance of payments problem, no national debt, and no geographical or environmental constraints to population growth. Continued mass immigration will finally and irreversibly destroy the identity and culture of our nation, alter the natural and urban environment, and undermine Australia's economic viability.

This document sets out and explains our beliefs with respect to past and present immigration policies and their effects on:

1. Culture
2. The environment - natural, rural, and urban
3. The economy
4. Defence
5. Humanitarianism
6. Health
7. Education

We believe that for Australia large-scale immigration played a role in its early days, but it is now a concept whose time has totally passed. Public opinion polls consistently show that the majority want immigration drastically reduced. Many people want a complete cessation. But Government and Opposition politicians maintain high immigration policies.

Our aim is to dismantle the entire immigration programme, allowing entry of assimilable European persons for settlement into Australia only under individual circumstances.

In the past, our immigration policies have been promoted on the basis of fear and self-interest, as witnessed in the concepts of:

- Populate or perish
- Economic failure of small nations
- Ageing of the Australian population
- International ramifications

The first three arguments have been shown to be unsound and have, in the main, been dropped by the pro-immigration lobby. We now have a policy heavily promoted by the ethnic lobbies and supported by big business, both of whom see Australia as an empty land of plenty, waiting for population growth and exploitation. To these groups the

nation's historical culture and identity means nothing, and they have no understanding of, or interest in, Australia's fragile environment.

Immigration is of perceived benefit to the following groups in our community:

1. Big business, including the media, finance companies, retailers, and land speculators.
2. The housing industry.
3. Protected industries in domestic markets.
4. Ethnic lobby groups.
5. New migrants.

Immigration is to the disadvantage of:

1. Australian wage earners competing for jobs, as wages decrease with an increased labour pool and rise in unemployment.
2. School/University leavers, where investment funds are being directed away from new technologies/sunrise industrial development, and resultant employment, into non-productive infrastructure to cater for migrants.
3. Senior citizens, who experience reducing value in their social security, due to diminished public funds.
4. The average citizen, by lowering the quality of life: socially, economically, and environmentally.
5. The entire population, as our foreign debt inevitably continues to increase.
6. All future generations of Australians, as our resource base declines due to increased local consumption and accelerated environmental degradation.
7. All true-blue Australians (past, present, and future), because of the destruction of the Australian identity and culture by the twin policies of mass immigration and multiculturalism.

Two hundred years ago the British Government saw Australia as the dumping ground for Britain's convicts and it was our forebears who opposed this transportation. Indeed, on 8th August, 1849, the Anti-Transportation League, despite opposition from the Government, squatters, and industrialists, but with the mass support of the people, physically prevented the convict ship, the "Randolph", from docking in Melbourne. The future Governor, LaTrobe, was forced to have the ship proceed to Sydney to discharge its convicts.

The Government's disregard for public opinion forced our forebears of the 1840s to fight for their vision of Australia. It was their first stand - and their actions united the people with a sense of community, independence and nationhood.

As our forebears fought; so must we, one hundred and fifty years later, fight a battle for our right to determine our future.

POPULATION SIZE

Our population was 16.85 million in 1991 and by 2021, **without any immigration**, will grow to approximately 19 million through natural increase alone.

By 2030, with continuation of the recent high levels of immigration, the population will

rise by 12 million; that is, the equivalent of the present combined populations of Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide, and Perth, giving Australia a total population of 29 million.

It is not unknown for the Government and the immigration bureaucracy to attempt to disguise or hide the truth about immigration and population matters. For example; in 1987 the Government stated that its immigration intake was 120 000 when, in reality, figures supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics showed that 170 600 (net) were added to the population by immigration. This discrepancy arises from illegal and change-of-status migrants (e.g. visitors, students, tourists) and settlers from New Zealand. Apparently, the Government prefers to hide the real state of affairs regarding immigrant numbers. Also, the Government has refused to state what the optimum population for Australia is - despite the ecological urgency of the question, and despite repeated calls for it to give an actual answer to this important question.

Population projections: Australia 1988 - 2030 (Figures are in millions)			
Year	No net immigration	Net Immigration: 125,000 per annum	Net Immigration: 170,000 per annum
1988	16.0	16.0	16.0
2000	17.5	19.5	20.2
2020	18.7	24.0	25.9
2030	18.9	26.1	29.0
(Sources: FitzGerald Report and Australian Bureau of Statistics)			

With current policies, this will mean a doubling of our population in our lifetime.

THE AGEING POPULATION ARGUMENT

Australians are now living longer and are having fewer children, and therefore older people will become an increasing proportion of the population. Pro-immigrationists say this maturing or "ageing" of our society is a bad thing - something to be feared - and which needs to be reversed by immigration.

This argument is used by some advocates of increasing immigration to frighten Australians into believing that the work force will not be large enough to support them in their old age. This is not so. The following points need to be considered:

1) Immigration will not significantly affect the age structure of our society. ANU demographic studies, the FitzGerald Report, and the Liberal Party Immigration Policy all agree on this.

2) The support of Senior Citizens is accomplished from their own savings over a

productive life, and by increasing the productivity of the work force. The matter is one of successful economics and low taxation, not of population age.

3) Our society has been pushing productive older people from the work force by forced or early retirement. A great economic benefit will be gained by slowing this trend, allowing individuals to remain in the work force if they so desire.

4) Our young unemployed need to be placed into jobs or given work training.
5) Sophisticated, high-technology industries, which will be a major factor for industries of the 21st century, do not need a large or young work force.

6) Countries with rapidly increasing populations have a "young" population structure. These are poor, "Third World" countries headed for the problems of over-population.

7) We should welcome the transition to a mature, stable population as this signifies the end of our rapid growth phase and enables Australia to resolve its economic and environmental problems without being constantly faced by the increasing problems of rapid growth.

8) The most successful countries economically, Germany and Japan, have the "aged", mature, stable population that we are supposed to fear. In fact, we envy them their economic prosperity. They have no problems caring for their aged population - and neither shall we.

INTERNATIONAL RAMIFICATIONS

The new justification for immigration being promoted by such diverse organisations as the ACTU, Refugee Council of Australia, National Population Council, the United Nations, and our own media, is that with the inevitability of increasing mass movements of people in an unstable world, Australia is unable to resist or oppose entry of such people. This argument states that Australia is wiser to accept controlled high immigration rather than risk facing even greater unwanted uncontrolled immigration.

Such appeasement is a cowardly but "easy" solution for our weak politicians, but not a course likely to be followed in Europe where protective walls against immigration are already rising. As is the usual case with "easy" short-term solutions, this appeasement will bring us long-term problems.

The mass movement of people from Third World to First World countries will not solve Third World problems, but will create Third World standards of living in those countries unwilling to resist such immigration.

Culture

The Australian culture is unique and must continue, and be given the opportunity to gradually evolve at a natural pace. To continually introduce outsiders into our society, people who have played no part in building our community, or who have no relationship

with our heritage and values (and often never will) diminishes not only the cultural heritage of Australia, but breaks down the bonding of our community.

The Australian character has been formed by a unique set of circumstances. This ancient land has been inhabited by an ancient people, a convict heritage, and our pioneer's battles with the land, coping with drought and climatic uncertainty. The early explorers were heroes in their own time and their names live on - Stuart, Burke and Wills, Sturt, Eyre, Wylie and Baxter, Giles, Blaxland, Wentworth, and Lawson, and later Kingsford Smith and Mawson. The stark evidence of their exploration lives on in place names like Despair, Desolation, and Hopeless scattered grimly across our landscape.

The early British and varied European settlers did not simply transfer a British culture to this land, but were determined to shed the shackles of a British class system, and thus developed a unique Australian society.

The Australian nation has produced a wide range of unique poets, authors, literary legends, artists, scientists and inventors, cultural icons, rebels, heroes and heroines, recreational activities, sports, music, entertainers and characters, colloquialisms, and an identifiable style of language; we have developed a distinct national character and ethos.

Our national identity and culture arose from among those Australians (especially the native-born) who saw this country as their home, loved it as their own, and drew their inspiration from it.

Our unique character further evolved through the people who developed our agriculturally based economy - the drover, the shearer, the itinerant worker, and our pioneer women. Australians fought in two World Wars, struggled through the Depression, and created an open democratic society; a society which, although imperfect, was free from the tyranny of government, censorship of the media, and which gave great freedom - and consequent responsibility - to the individual.

The success of our forebears in laying down the institutional foundation of Australian life is something we can be proud of, and draw guidance from. The centrepiece of their ideals was that this should be a nation free of "old world" social divisions between citizens. Also, no Australian was to be forced to work under pay and conditions enforcing servility or poverty.

AUSTRALIA FIRST

Our culture is rooted in our history. Australia led the way with the secret ballot; the 8 hour day; votes for women; invalid, widow, and old age pensions; strong trade unions; the arbitration system and the basic wage. Our culture embodies the values of egalitarianism and mateship. It rejects excessive authority and believes in a "fair go", admiration for the battler, and a belief in the individual. Nowhere do humans stand smaller than in this wide red land, nowhere is human insignificance so apparent: it was certainly the land and isolation that fashioned mateship through shared adversity in the face of its hardships.

Today, with our population huddled together on our coastal strips, our leaders try to

ignore the nature of our land, but we must not. The agricultural disaster area which is the Ord River scheme, the burgeoning tragedy of riverland salinity, algae infestation along the Murray/Darling system, the ecological chaos in the Gippsland Lakes, deforestation, and a hundred other problems, shout aloud our ecological mistakes.

The Aboriginal people treated this land as a being with a spirit. This current generation of Australians must strengthen our understanding of the land, and preserve its soul and spirit for all future generations.

Our culture today emphasises a "balanced" life, free of excessive striving and materialism, and has created an attractive society. As in the USA, Canada, and New Zealand; Australia has incorporated the best features of British Culture - the balance of law, freedom, and order; separation of public service and politics; conflict solving by debate, not by force and insurrection; tolerance; economic opportunity; fortitude in war without militarism; and provision of social services. We have our distinctive art, music, theatre, literature, sport, and film; with achievements in science, medicine, and social welfare; and a unique quality of life.

SHE'LL BE RIGHT, MATE

Some of our cultural values, such as the apathy of "she'll be right, mate", are now working to our destruction, as the Government, media, ethnic lobbies, and business lobbies, motivated by self-interest and misguided humanitarianism, work unopposed against the best interests of the Australian nation. The "Australian Cringe" should be a concept of the past. We do not need to look beyond our shores to solve our problems, be it educational or economic: let us look to ourselves and our own resources.

Our culture and its values need support. Destroy a culture and you destroy a people. This is well known to Australians who have seen the near destruction of Aboriginal culture. We cannot undo history, but we can learn from it.

ONE CULTURE OR MULTICULTURALISM?

Today "our" Government is telling us that this nation is to have a new culture: institutionalised multiculturalism. Immigrants are no longer encouraged to join the mainstream of Australian culture. Our culture, like all others, has weaknesses and failings, but this only means we should work towards resolving these deficiencies - not destroying or replacing this tried and tested set of beliefs with a system of multiculturalism which has so clearly and violently failed wherever in the world it has been tried, such as in the U.S.S.R., Ireland, Lebanon, Fiji, Uganda, Singapore, Israel, the U.K, India, Spain, Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia, and the U.S.A.

Multiculturalism always produces a situation where group "rights" will conflict with individual rights. Multiculturalism is making us into a colony of all nations, rather than providing us with a sense of community. Why should people co-operate and accept sacrifices for the larger community good if they do not feel a part of such a community? Very few Australians support the idea of deliberate multiculturalism. The survey done by the Office of Multicultural Affairs in 1988 showed that neither the Australian mainstream,

nor migrants, want this policy, but their wishes have been ignored. In practice, multiculturalism exacts the greatest adjustments from the least privileged. The middle-class can choose their neighbourhoods. The poor, who have the least choice in housing, jobs, schools, and social welfare, must live with the changes wished upon them. The tensions thus created, and the loss of cultural identity, are problems which are remote from the experience of the pro-immigration lobbyists and the Canberra-based politicians.

One hundred years ago our forebears resisted the concept that Australia was only a new (inferior) version of England. Now the "cultural cringe" has surfaced again - with the cry "Australia is a part of Asia"; yet Australia is no more a part of Asia than Africa is a part of Europe - historically, geographically, and culturally we are unique. Let us not lose our European identity in the rush for trade and tourism - and let us teach these facts to all Australians.

The Australian people have slowly grown to understand and love this country - our home - and we all have a responsibility to preserve it. We also have the right to maintain our way of life - our culture - without its government-induced destruction via mass immigration and institutionalised multiculturalism.

The Environment

Attention must be paid to the ability of the environment to sustain the population for ever. "Even the present population is rapidly degrading the environment and is therefore not sustainable in the long run" - Australian Conservation Foundation submission to the FitzGerald Immigration Enquiry, December 1987. This is to say that our material/economic demands made on the environment need to be curbed if Australia is to have a sustainable economic system even for its current population, without even taking into account the rapid increases which flow from mass immigration.

AGRICULTURE

Australia is a large country, but with limited renewable resources. Of a total land area of 768 million hectares, 500 mha are arid or semi-arid, and only 77 mha are suitable for agriculture. That is, only 10% of our total land area is arable. Those who like to compare Australia's population (about 18 million) with that of the United States should be made aware of the fact that the area sown in crop in Australia (21 mha) is the equivalent of the crop area in just two states of the USA (Iowa and Illinois - which have a combined population of only about 14½ million).

In agricultural terms, Australia is only about the size of France, but with soils that are much less fertile. The first national study on the extent of the degradation of Australian land and soil resources (published in 1978), estimated that 66% of cropland has already been degraded by erosion, compaction, acidification, and rising salt levels. France produces over 44 million tonnes of cereals a year, compared with Australia's 15 to 20 million tonnes. If we had the population of France (50 million) we would have to import food. Because of the 1991 drought in the Darling Downs, Australia imported bread-making hard wheat in 1992.

In Australia, for each tonne of wheat grown, tonnes of top soil are lost. Grains are packed with nutrients from the soil, which must be replaced in poor Australian soils if fertility is to be maintained. The 1988 wheat crop of 12.5 million tonnes removed 250 000 tonnes of nitrogen, 23 000 tonnes of phosphorous, and 48 000 tonnes of potassium. These nutrients must be replaced by imported superphosphate, which in turn leads to acidification of our soils, which in turn decreases plant growth. We must minimise further impact now that we are aware of the environmental problems.

Maintaining healthy agriculture is not merely a matter of providing irrigation and fertiliser as the Murrumbidgee, Murray, and Ord River schemes have shown. Soil degradation is a continuing process due to our overuse of the land.

Thus - with soil erosion; salinity problems from irrigation and tree removal; acidification; and encroaching urbanisation - the agriculturally suitable land area and its fertility can be expected to decline.

The expansion in fisheries, agriculture, and forestry is ending both here and world wide.

In the two centuries of the European settlement of Australia:

1. 19 vertebrate species have become extinct.
2. 17 vertebrate species are endangered.
3. 2000 native plant species are at risk.
4. One-half of the nation's top soil has been lost by erosion and continuing unsustainable agriculture.
5. Two-thirds of the temperate forests have been destroyed.
6. Wet-lands, rivers, and seas are being polluted and destroyed.
7. Our greatest river system, the Murray/Darling, is being turned into a polluted drain with salts from adjacent irrigation areas. It is likely to be a dead eco-system within 40 years.

HOMO SAPIENS: AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

To understand how people affect the environment it is only necessary to look at one's daily activities:

On getting out of bed one steps on the wooden floor (made from trees), turns on the light (which requires coal to be dug up and burnt to generate electricity), goes for a shower and uses the toilet (necessitating that rivers be dammed, and diverted from some other use, and that the waste water and sewage be disposed of in an environmentally sensitive way). All food comes from the land, so a breakfast of milk and cereal is not simply obtained from the supermarket and refrigerator, but is produced and grown at environmental cost. We then get into our car which uses fossil fuel and results in pollution. One may swap and substitute fuels and materials, but all our needs are met by Mother Nature, one way or another.

Our imports - cars, TVs, computers - are bought with the income earned from our exports. That is, using our land's renewable and non-renewable resources, once again, at environmental cost.

In short, even city dwellers are totally dependent on, and interrelated with, our natural environment. Even if we could create an environmentally aware community, we must face the fact that our increasing population will have an increasing environmental impact. Technological tinkering and marginal efficiencies in consumption are no match for the relentless compound increase in population. The population curve is rapidly increasing, and getting steeper and steeper. More and more Australians tread heavier and heavier upon the earth.

This largely infertile land cannot be flogged to produce more crops, logging, woodchips, agricultural products, and mining, without severe environmental cost.

It is essential that we realise that the rapid environmental destruction of our urban and rural environments is a consequence of the pressure of our rapidly increasing population.

URBAN ENVIRONMENT

Most migrants will come to the major cities. Given current immigration policy, by the year 2020 Melbourne and Sydney are likely to have grown by approximately 2 million each - Melbourne increasing from 3 to 5 million and Sydney increasing from 3.4 to 5.4 million. This population explosion is already seriously lowering the quality of life in these cities as their pollution and congestion increases with the cities' sprawling size and high density living. Bumper-to-bumper traffic jams are a very visible sign of our already failing urban infrastructure.

The pressures on water supply and the increasing demands for transport, roads, sewage disposal, and energy supply will be extreme and expensive as our cities grow up and out. This is inconsistent with the Australian dream of owning one's own house and having space in which to live.

Real Estate prices are held high, pricing young people out of the home market. Our politicians are already telling us we must accept urban consolidation (crowding) and a lower standard of housing. Also, Australian mothers now have to face the problems of raising children in a high density pressure-cooker environment.

The use of our recreational environment will become increasingly difficult with increasing travel time needed to reach the country or beach, and with shortages of space at these venues. For example, to stay at Wilson's Promontory National Park, in Victoria, one already has to book many months in advance.

The wealthy insulate themselves with their private facilities, pools, clubs, country and beach properties. Once again, the average Australian is hardest hit by the results of the immigration policy, and has to live day to day with the consequences. We cannot be expected to believe the promises of politicians and bureaucrats that their so-called "better planning" will ease the strains which an increasing population will inevitably place on our natural environment and urban infrastructure.

We believe that the environment and native animals have a right to exist and not be exploited and destroyed whenever economic gain, greed, or enterprise so dictates. We feel this generation has no right to exploit and over-populate this land and leave a legacy of polluted air, water, and land for future generations.

In contrast, those who want increasing immigration seem to think we have no moral right to this nation and its resources unless we immediately over-exploit it, as is happening in the rest of the world.

The consequences of our actions, and of changes in climate, as expected from the greenhouse effect, are often uncertain, and we should proceed slowly whilst caring for this arid, vulnerable land. We cannot solve the world's population problem (there are an extra 95 million people born into the world every year!) but we can escalate the environmental damage being done to Australia with no global benefit.

The Economy

Our per capita wealth in the international system depends on Australia's ability to earn export income in excess of expenditure on imports, while maintaining a healthy manufacturing base.

Australia's exports are:

- 44% agriculture and forestry
- 44% mining
- 12% other

Our resources are only plentiful in relation to the present population. Like all industrial countries we are wasteful users of non-renewable resources such as oil, coal, and minerals. This use will increase with an increasing population, leaving us with less oil, coal, and minerals to export. Unless a large oil find occurs soon, we will be dependent upon importing oil, at great expense, for our expanding population.

There are limits to the volume that we can profitably sell in current world markets, and also to the length of time that these resources themselves will last. With soil degradation and erosion, our agricultural resources may diminish and, in fact, the additional millions of migrants will consume much of what otherwise would have been exported. This ultimately results in less export income.

Our increasing population has little effect on manufactured exports but does increase imports, consequently making us poorer as a nation.

Our per capita G.D.P. was the highest in the world in 1870 and even in 1950, when the mass immigration programme was getting into gear, our standard of living was very high. However, since that time, with our rapid population increase, our position has fallen dramatically and we, as a nation, have become poorer with an ever-escalating national debt. There is no foreseeable improvement likely in manufacturing to redress our national debt, and this situation leaves us economically vulnerable to foreign investors, who are

currently buying our land, businesses, farms, and houses, and even building their own tourist developments on our land.

TECHNOLOGICAL GOODS

In 1986 Australia exported only \$US65 per person of goods classified technological. This figure was lower than any of the O.E.C.D. countries, except Iceland. Surely the Government does not believe that our current migrant intake will improve our production of technological goods for export? In the past, migrants helped develop protected manufacturing industries selling to the domestic market. But it is now the Government's policy to reduce industry protection. The numbers employed in manufacturing are not increasing, nor are they likely to do so. What employment opportunities will there be for these extra migrants? With 10% of Australia's work force unemployed, to augment our labour pool through immigration is plain lunacy. Unemployment payments to recently arrived immigrants is already costing us billions of dollars.

Australian industries face real difficulties in competing overseas against low-wage, technically sophisticated, populous Asian countries, some of which are very protectionist in regards to their own industries. To expect Australia to compete successfully is being unrealistic. How can an Australian worker, earning a decent wage, economically compete with a worker in Asia who earns only a few dollars a day? Should we be paying our own workers similar slave labour style wages? No way!

INFRASTRUCTURE

Most immigrants to Australia will live in the major cities. They will generate extra economic activity there, especially in the construction of housing, roads, etc., but the capital channelled into these activities could be more productively employed in **increasing investment in equipment, machinery, training, and jobs for the present Australian work force.**

Australia's population has grown rapidly since World War Two and therefore the nation has had to invest in providing **basic** services for more and more people, rather than **better** services, education, and technical equipment for a stable population. Currently, we are not even adequately maintaining existing services. It is because of the lack of capital investment in technological equipment that labour productivity in Australia has grown at a lower rate than in Sweden, Germany, and Japan - not because of what the pro-immigration advocates say: that the Australian workers are lazy.

Pro-immigration politicians, businessmen, and bureaucrats are confidently telling us that immigration will economically benefit Australia; but this is untrue - and indeed the opposite applies: The larger the population, the lower shall be our standard of living.

What of the Government's Business Migration Programme? Until just before its demise, the Government and the Bureau of Immigration Research refused to admit to its deficiencies. How much money was channelled into real estate speculation, unwanted importing activities, unhealthy business practices and laundering of money, and activities

of no benefit to Australia? The desire of Government, migrants, and the general community for easy money motivated the entire programme.

We should be self-reliant. Immigration reduces our capacity to be self-reliant, by adding pressure on natural resources and scarce investment capital which must increasingly come from international sources, hence escalating the already dangerously high levels of foreign ownership; which enables foreign influence, control, and manipulation of Australia - its people, economy, and government. **We need to consolidate our skills and our investment capacity and not disperse our limited resources in trying to service needless growth.**

After more than 40 years of mass migration, we are currently in a bigger mess than ever. If mass migration can work miracles - where are they?

THE ECONOMIC COST OF IMMIGRATION

Immigration costs us money. The ongoing costs of supporting our immigration programme in terms of housing, health services, waste disposal, education, welfare payments, unemployment benefits, and the necessity to continually expand the infrastructure to support growing cities, is an enormous financial burden on the existing community. Research puts the cost of the immigration programme at \$15 billion annually.

Business Review Weekly, in October 1989, reported the Westpac bank as finding that **our immigration programme actually adds approximately \$9 billion per year to our foreign debt.** Government estimates come to a similar conclusion (see *Economics of Immigration: Who Benefits?* by Stephen Joske of the Legislative Research Service's Economics and Commerce Group, September 1989).

Israel has experienced similar economic woes associated with her immigration programme and has had to try to raise \$52 billion to cover the cost of one million Soviet Jewish immigrants.

In Australia the equivalent of a city the size of Geelong or Hobart, or one and a half Townsvilles, or **two-thirds of a Canberra, must be built every year, with all the infrastructure to accommodate just one year's migrant intake.** Governments are cutting their budgets already for these infrastructure services, finding the burden of ever-escalating costs too high.

To maintain our standard of living with the projected doubling of our population, we will need to have double the number of houses, schools, universities, hospitals, shops, factories, power plants, waste disposal systems, dams, sewage disposal mechanisms, and transport systems. In other words, re-build Australia within 40 years! Add to this the cost of social services: pensions, unemployment benefits, medical services, legal aid, child endowment, education expenses, and transport concessions.

To finance such a project will require immense capital borrowings, which we shall bequeath to our children in the form of a national debt that they shall never be able to overcome.

Defence

Since being frightened by the belief of having to "populate or perish" in the 1940s, it has been part of the Australian psyche that this country needs to be filled if it is not to be lost. The belief that a large population was necessary for defence drove Australia's immigration programme after World War Two, and the image of a large number of conscripts ready for combat with .303 rifles defending our Northern shores is perpetuated as a reason for immigration.

Times have changed. Today's defence needs require a sophisticated military infrastructure and a strong economy. We need a professional, well-trained, mobile, technologically advanced force with access to sophisticated weapon systems.

Beyond this, we need a united purpose and sense of community to oppose an enemy. The Russian defeat in Afghanistan, and the American debacle in Vietnam, illustrate this point. A rapid migrant intake will diminish these qualities, introducing divided loyalties and undermining a central commitment to Australia. The Government's unstated policy of encouraging Asian immigration in the hope that this will discourage more hostile Asian designs on Australia is foolishness in the extreme.

The 1987 Government Policy information paper *The Defence of Australia* states: "No population increase is necessary for defence and the dangers of a nuclear war or terrorism are not averted by an increased population."

Clearly our defence needs are unrelated to population increase through immigration.

REFUGEES

Large scale immigration into Australia of refugees has almost no effect on the refugee's country of origin, which would - no doubt - instead welcome significant and practical aid from Australia. We seem to have confused overseas aid with immigration, and in doing so are offering opportunities to a few at the expense of the many.

There are approximately seventeen million refugees in the world today and any refugee intake programme could never be more than a token gesture. At the moment we take one-tenth of 1% of these refugees. Huge amounts of money is currently being spent on them, for 1) their importation (most refugees we receive come from foreign refugee camps, and are flown into Australia by the Government; only a numerically insignificant minority actually arrive here in boats), 2) initial accommodation and general well-being, 3) subsequent housing assistance, 4) education (teaching them English in particular), 5) health, 6) welfare payments (most cannot find employment for several years), etc., etc., etc. - as well as the large public service structures set up and expanded just to meet their

needs and subsequent problems. It is idiotic, if the Australian Government is actually "fair dinkum" about helping refugees, to go to such great effort and to spend such huge amounts of money on this 0.1% of refugees, when that same amount of money (or even a half of it) could help a thousand times more those 99.9% of refugees left behind (we should bear in mind that the Australian dollar squandered here can actually buy a lot more in poor Third World countries).

Instead of importing refugees, efforts could be made on their behalf to solve the political problems which caused their plight, by providing support and taking diplomatic action towards the re-establishment of refugees back in their own land.

Also, Australia's current refugee immigration policies are encouraging the creation of a new class of illegal migrants: the "economic refugee". So many so-called "refugees" now fall into this category, where they have left their squalid, poor homes in search of a better existence in a richer Western country, in contrast to the genuine refugees who have fled their country due to a real fear of persecution from their government.

The importation of refugees not only doesn't make economic sense (as, for the same money, we could help thousands more refugees who are still in the Third World), but it particularly doesn't make social sense. The arrival of tens of thousands of Third World refugees, especially on top of the hundreds of thousands of other Third World immigrants that we already have had foisted upon us, is creating social disunity and upheaval - and is an integral part of the destruction of Australia's national and cultural identity. This is why most true-blue Australians don't want our nation to be turned into a "refugee dumping ground". We don't want to take in any more refugees - as this only adds to our national destruction!!!

FOREIGN AID

However, it should also be recognised that foreign aid for countries with refugees is a luxury that we should not throw money at, until we have sorted out our own national problems. While it is "nice" to help other peoples and/or nations, our first responsibility is to ourselves. Before we throw our money down into the bottomless pit of foreign aid, we have to ask ourselves why are we doing this at a time when our own people are crying out for better hospitals (witness the long waiting lists, and some of the associated horrific stories of Australians becoming crippled, or dying, awaiting treatment), education, etc. We give away to foreign countries about \$1,386,000,000 (1992-93 figures) each year - and all this at a time when we are borrowing money to finance government expenditure (that is, in effect we are borrowing - with interest - some \$1.4 BILLION just to throw it away overseas). Are we really that stupid?

Also to be considered is the huge amounts that these Third World countries often spend on their military (especially on modern weaponry). Why, for instance, do we give Indonesia around \$128 million (that's 9.2% of our total foreign aid: 1992-93 figures) each year, when they are spending so much on their military capacity (for instance, in 1993 their defence expenditure was US\$2.03 billion; and that's excluding their defence industrial spending) - they obviously have the money to spend, but would rather spend it

in other fields whilst the stupid Australians "pick up the tab" - which means we are actually subsidising their armed forces (this is really hilarious, considering the view of Indonesia as our most likely defence threat).

Australia already has a host of "international aid" organisations; such as World Vision, Community Aid Abroad, and Save the Children Fund. They collect money everywhere for the "starving", for the "hungry children". They "Walk Against Want", "Run For Africa", starve themselves for a "Forty Hour Famine", etc. But they cannot see the real problem, only alleviate their guilt-feelings over having a full stomach while some Third Worlder starves to death. They have missed the point: that until Third World countries limit their population growth, there is nothing that can really be done to make their lot any better. Keeping a child alive sounds lovely until it grows up and has 10 children of its own (note: usually, with these foreign aid agencies we are talking about a "child", as - for propaganda purposes - foreign aid agencies rarely focus on Third World adults). For every 20 million Third Worliders alive today, we could be looking at a growth attaining some 600 million (!!!!) in only a hundred years from now (if their birth rates remain the same). By then, no "Walk Against Want" could avert the ensuing disaster - which would have happened a long time before that anyway. These facts must be faced. Overpopulation is one of the greatest threats to the future happiness of the world. Do we really want to see another 100 tragedies as has already happened in Kampuchea, Ethiopia, and Somalia???? The European race, of which we are a part, has no reason to feel "guilty" about the starvation of the Third World. Let the Third World solve its own problems (it is nothing to do with us, we have our own problems to sort out) - and let our bleeding-heart liberal-internationalists stay out of it, lest they make a catastrophe out of a crisis!

ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS

We are constantly confronted in the media with the individual illegal immigrant pleading to remain in Australia. The problems and costs of just one individual case can easily be spread over the community, but when these cases are multiplied by our current net intake of illegal immigrants, and considering that this number is being repeated every year (note: there are presently three million people wishing to migrate to Australia), the impossibility of the current emotional "open door" policy is obvious. Illegal immigrants are quite simply just "queue jumpers" who have decided to get into Australia ahead of everyone else, so that they can enjoy the benefits of a better existence. While they are here illegally, they often collar a job, thus depriving Australians of employment. They break the law by being here, they snub their nose at those who are patiently waiting to migrate, they take jobs away from Australians, and often rip us all off by avoiding taxes - and then they expect to be allowed to stay!!! Illegal immigrants are a blight on the Australian community, and deserve nothing more than immediate deportation and confiscation of any money earned whilst illegally in Australia.

FAMILY REUNIONS

In those cases where it is deemed advantageous for Australia to accept a new settler, it would be expected that he/she would bring spouse and children (if the spouse and children did not settle at the same time, then their settlement in Australia may be

arranged later on). All that aside, the government-promoted version of "family reunion" programmes, past and present, (involving adult relatives, such as parents, brothers, sisters, nieces, nephews, etc.) is, and always has been, a farce. Migration inherently involves the separation of an immigrant from his/her wider family - if it is so important for someone not to separate from his/her family, then they should not emigrate in the first place. **There is no logical or moral case for preferentially allowing independent adult relations of migrants to immigrate here on the grounds that they already have a relative here.** The institutionalised nepotism of the "family reunion" programme is unwarranted and has resulted in a pattern of never-ending chain migration.

THE BRAIN DRAIN

Considering the fact that past and present Liberal and Labor governments have imported educated, skilled, and monied migrants from poor Third World countries (known as "The Brain Drain", as it drains those countries - who can least afford it - of their educated and monied elite, especially doctors, engineers, etc.), it would be hypocritical of them to attack Nationalists on humanitarian grounds.

It is time that we overcame the "White guilt-complex", and start to focus our attention (and our money) on **Australians**, instead of wasting our resources on the bottomless pits of foreign aid and Third World refugees, whilst our own problems deepen.

Health

There are many diseases being introduced into Australia: T.B., leprosy, and parasitic diseases; but these are controllable, treatable, and not of long term significance.

Hepatitis B, however, is a severe new disease being brought into Australia from Asia and, unlike the common Hepatitis A, results in chronic illness, chronic carrier status, and large numbers of deaths. The following information has been cleared for use by the Fairfield Infectious Diseases Hospital in Melbourne:

Hepatitis B is endemic in Africa and Asia. Over one billion people have been infected. This results in two million deaths per year and a carrier population of 200 million people (that is, one person in six). Carriers, though being healthy themselves, are always infectious.

The mode of transmission of Hepatitis B is similar to that of AIDS, but is one hundred times more infectious, and spreads in a non-sexual fashion within families, between children in situations where oral spread is likely, and to non-immune individuals in close contact with large carrier populations.

Ten years ago, Hepatitis B was a very rare disease in Australia, but it is now estimated that 20 000 cases occur in Australia every year.

Acute deaths per year are less than 1% of the total number of cases, probably 20 to 100 deaths per year, but later deaths occurring over the next 40 years are in the order of 500

(that is, 520 deaths will result from the 20 000 cases of Hepatitis B which have occurred this year).

The Australian Government knowingly, willingly, and without concern for the non-immune Australian population, has brought massive numbers of Asian immigrants into Australia, of whom approximately 1 in 6 is a carrier of a very severe and frequently fatal disease. The Government is now morally obliged to begin a mass immunisation programme of those at special risk in the Australian community, especially children of school and pre-school age, and to call a halt to immigration from the Third World (Africa and Asia in particular).

The costs, beyond those of vaccination, of this growing epidemic are estimated in the order of hundreds of millions of dollars per year.

These are the facts of the risks to the nation's health from Hepatitis B, and demonstrate that the immigration programme is of more importance to the Government than the lives and actual deaths of its citizens.

Education

In primary and secondary schools, education is difficult for teachers and pupils when students do not have command of the English language and this places stresses, within a classroom situation, on all students.

In Australia each year, up to 50,000 qualified students are denied tertiary education because of insufficient places being available. This is because there are limited numbers of places for students in our publicly funded universities and colleges. Current immigration policies have rapidly increased the numbers of overseas-born students while the number of places available in training institutions have not been increased at the same rate. So, our youth, whose dreams and ambitions rely on such opportunities, are denied places. There are also 28,000 full fee paying students in Australia; these fees are supposed to be used to create better and more facilities in the training institutions, but in practice this appears not to be so. The money is being used in part to fund the daily running of the institution and once again our youth are denied places.

If the training of foreign students were a humanitarian gesture, with the students returning to their own lands and using their knowledge to the advantage of their own people, we might have no objections. But, these students are now encouraged to stay, or to return to Australia, after the completion of their courses. In effect, this is giving away places to overseas students at the expense of our own youth, and also means that those foreign students will be taking jobs in Australia that otherwise would have been available to local students.

By importing highly skilled migrants, the need to train our own people is reduced - which allows the Government and employers to evade their responsibility to train the next generation. It also means that the capabilities and experience of our training institutions is diminished; and, in some cases, maybe damaged irreparably. The recent glut of overseas

doctors underlies the Government's plan close to close medical schools in Australia and reduce medical school intakes by 15%. We must become, and remain, self-sufficient - and stop looking beyond our own shores and our own people. Just as we no longer import our Governors-General, neither should we import other personnel.

In essence, these immigration-related education problems are:

1. Non-English speaking students necessarily slow down teaching, leading to educational problems.
2. Overseas students are now, in effect, migrants in-transit and should not have preference over local students.
3. Importing highly skilled migrants avoids the need to train our own students, thus damaging our long-term national education and training abilities.

We do not have the right to give away and sell our own students' places and opportunities to others.

Summary

We have a clear choice:

We can accept increasing immigration with the consequent exploitation of this land, and a falling standard of living and quality of life; living in crowded, polluted, high density cities, with over-taxed recreational areas and inter-communal tensions. The economic consequences of increasing foreign debt, foreign ownership, and undesirable, unsustainable economic expansion will destroy any chance of maintaining the best features of Australian life as we know it. And, as migrant numbers increase, there will be an escalating push for an ever higher migrant intake which eventually will be unstoppable. The end result for the Australian people will be a very low standard of living (the "poor White trash of Asia"?), and the complete destruction of our unique national identity and culture.

OR

We can stop mass immigration and attempt to live in harmony with our fragile environment, creating an economically and environmentally sound, self-reliant and self-sustaining community, maintaining our quality of life, and handing on to future generations a country which will be cherished, enjoyed, and free from the problems of over-population.

References

References and books used in the preparation of this document include:

Australian Conservation Foundation. Report to the Fitzgerald Immigration Inquiry. Mr H. Teltscher and Senator John Coulter (SA Democrats).

The Australian Population. Migration Committee, National Population Council, Nov. 1986.

Economic Effects of Immigration on Australia. Neville R. Norman and Kathryn F. Meikie; Committee for the Economic Development of Australia (CEDA), Melbourne, 1985.

The Economics of Immigration: Who Benefits? Stephen Joske; Legislative Research Service Economics and Commerce Group.

An Historic Geography of Modern Australia. J.M. Powell; Cambridge Studies in Historic Geography.

How Many More Australians?: The Resource and Environmental Conflicts Lincoln H. Day and D.T. Rowland (eds); Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1988.

Ideology and Immigration. Dr. Katharine Betts; Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1988.

Immigration: A Commitment to Australia (also known as *The Fitzgerald Report*). The Committee to Advise on Australia's Immigration Policies.

Australian Bureau of Statistics figures.

The Military Balance 1995/96. International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1996.

Editorials, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, April 23-30, 1982, Vol. 247, No. 16.

Hep. B. in Australia, *ANZ J. M.*, 1987; 17 p.220.

Role of Saliva, etc. in Hep. B., *New England J. M.*, December 26, 1974.

Milne, *N.Z. Med. J.*, 1985, 98 pp. 529-532.