

The Eight Core Policies Of Australia First

The eight core policies of Australia First are the basis of association for the party. They are (with explanations and the implied ninth point) as follows:

1 Ensure Australia Retains Full Independence

Protect our sovereignty (national, constitutional and personal) and maintain an adequate defence, whilst being reasonable and fair in our nation's international dealings.

2 Rebuild Australian Manufacturing Industries

This is the only way we can be self sufficient. It will provide jobs for our children, and help buy back the farm and allow Australia to be free of foreign debts. Our infrastructure has been run down over many years - it must be rebuilt. We must improve the practicality and relevance of our educational systems, and target government support for industry to diversify, innovate, perform and expand. We recognise that small business is fundamental to this policy. A satisfactory financial environment is also urgent and essential.

3 Control Foreign Ownership

Bring foreign ownership and investment back under control.

4 Reduce and Limit Immigration

Immigration mistakes can be big long term mistakes. Immigration policy must take into account social cohesion, employment opportunities, urbanisation and environmental issues

5 Abolish Multiculturalism

End the divisive, government funded and institutionalised policy of multiculturalism.

6 Introduce Citizen's Initiated Referenda

Amend the Australian Constitution such that the people can initiate a constitutional referendum which, if approved by the Australian people, will amend the Australian Constitution. This simple step will confirm the political authority of voters and make legislators aware that they are the servants of the Australian People, not their masters. The people directly should also possess the sovereign right and the power to initiate other legislation

7. Strengthen the family

Promote policies that strengthen and protect the traditional family.

8 Strive to Rebuild A United Australia

Promote policies that recognise the interdependence of city and country.

9 Democratise Other Policy Issues

The party's core policies also *imply* a point nine.

All other policies (non-core policies) are matters of free conscience and are not binding upon Australia First's future parliamentarians or councillors who are to represent their electorates.

Issues of public interest on which Australia First needs to formulate policy will be canvassed with the party membership and plebiscites conducted where deemed appropriate by the party's National Council. The party also permits branches to formulate specific electoral policies or community policies not inconsistent with the Eight Core Policies.

From time to time, the party will issue material that provides interpretation of the core policies. This interpretative material would reflect the spirit of the party.

The organizational purpose for this statement of policy and system for policy creation is simple: Australia First does not require weighty tomes, which change from month to month, as do the programmes of the Establishment parties and those who ape them. It requires a focus for action and for unity within the party.

Australia First is to build a new national movement. Practicality is method.

Ten Reasons To Oppose The Fake Republic

Dr. Jim Saleam

The push is on again to bring about a referendum on the matter of a republic. If we are to believe the supporters of the proposal, there will be a plebiscite to determine if Australians support a change, then another plebiscite to establish the agreeable 'model', and finally a referendum to decide whether a republic is accepted at all.

It is the view of Australia's nationalists, those who value most the Australian identity and who struggle for our country's true independence and for freedom, *that we must band together to urge our fellow Australians to vote 'no' at each step of the pseudo-process. Why?*

In 1999, Australians rejected the 'republic'. Yet, as we must concede if the opinion polls steered us true, the republic referendum would have been passed had the 'model' on offer been different. Essentially, the Australian Republican Movement of Turnbull and Co. rammed through to a vote a 'model' which had the support of wide sections of the political class, the traitor class, for a republic with a president chosen by parliament, a president with little more than ceremonial powers who could be dismissed at will by the party-room Prime Minister. Quite rightly, and we say this whether or not the system should be changed at all, a large section of the people who *might have accepted* a republican constitution, saw through the arrogance of the official-republicans and their idea of a 'chosen' president. They demanded democratic participation, a directly-elected president. Since they couldn't get this model, the working people of the suburbs of the large cities, traditional sceptics about the future of the monarchy in any case, turned out to bloc with the monarchist-minded people - *to sink the republic*. Their resistance drove the official-republicans to despair. How dare the "ignorant" masses refuse what is good for them?!

This time around, the fake-republicans are going to be a little smarter. This time, they will 'support' a presidency elected directly by the people.

Of course, this 'model' is all but certain to contain certain restrictions to limit the effect of mass campaigning and the powers of a president. After all, flukes happen, and the traitor class could not live with the thought a maverick figure might just win the nation's highest office. The door must be locked and if by a miracle a maverick wins, his office would be one of no real power – a position which would be easily dominated and controlled by the party politicians in parliament. Perhaps the people will see this too, but we can never be sure of anything.

Our present and urgent task is not to persuade those who want to retain the constitutional monarchy (albeit in whatever way they like it or theorise about it) to vote No (as they are bound to vote No anyway). That would be just useless propagandising. Rather we must persuade those who wanted a directly-elected president in 1999 (who were obliged then to vote No), who may now intend to vote 'Yes', *to maintain their common sense and continue to vote no!*

Any other course of action may see the referendum pass. The ordinary Australians who thought a republic might bring them a greater say over their lives and freedoms if they elected their president aren't fools, or any less true patriots than those who said the old system could be made to function better because it derived from a theory of constitutional right and responsibility. These ordinary Australians are the key to winning genuine Australian

independence and how we now approach them as nationalists will be decisive not only in this new republic process, but also in building a new movement of Australian nationalism.

We offer ten reasons why the republican-minded ordinary people should reject the fake-republic. Each of these reasons might become printed material and spoken words for pubs, clubs and workplaces.

Reason One: Political self-defence

There is 'something', an unnamed intangible in the present constitution, which the fake-republicans wish to dispose of. We may argue about what it might be. Yet, the sheer persistence of the majority of the traitor class to abolish the monarch from the constitution shows *it must be there*. It can be best defined as a residual impediment or block to the *formal removal of all Australian sovereignty and the creation of arbitrary government*. None of these means, as some older-style patriots have hitherto written and shouted, that our constitution is a wonder-document to be revered beyond criticism, but it is still to state a fact – and move from there. Why allow a weapon of self-defence to pass from our hands?

Reason Two: Protect our Common Law freedoms

The fake-republic will not deliver anything in terms of democratic rights and freedoms. The sad fact is that the impositions upon our rights and freedoms, those legislated and judicial-activist subtractions from the broad general heritage of Australia derived from the Common Law tradition, have all occurred under our constitutional monarchy. However, we have no reason to believe the republicans will give them back. Quite the contrary, as they were most likely the very ones involved in robbing us of our freedoms in the first place. Whatever rights and protections we do have, we would prefer to retain, if only because this position allows us an opportunity to fight back and reorganise people around the cause of freedom.

Reason Three: No to a money-focused republic

The fake-republic would offer no moral improvement over the personal failures of the present members of the monarch's family. It may nonetheless be argued the constitutional position of Australia does not depend upon the personal qualities of the members of the House of Windsor, although it can be difficult in practise to separate the two. Certainly, there has been a serious decline in the general character of this Family, yet there is no specific virtue, obvious or latent, in the gang of official republicans in Australia which could convince a reasonable person a constitutional change was appropriate on that basis. Given the coteries of rapacious capitalists who lurk behind the façade of the official republican movement, we would be certain to experience a decline in the quality of Australian political culture into a corrupt order as yet unimagined. It might not be a banana republic, but it would be a merchants' and bankers' republic.

Reason Four: Radical legal changes would undermine our freedoms

The change from a constitutional monarchy to a republic must change the legal status of every institution and person in the land. For this reason, the fake-republicans argued previously, in public at least, for a 'minimalist' presidency, supposedly only the governor-general renamed with the institutions of the so-called Westminster democracy and the old law both intact. It seemed 'easier' and less dangerous on every level. The republicans would control 'their' president and push change as they saw fit. But, as the old saying goes, 'he who rides the tiger cannot dismount' and change would come rapidly if only because the legal framework of Australia would creak. *Is this what they wanted anyway?* The only 'alternative' for the fake republicans to their own engendered disorder would be radical legal change which would reduce Australians to mere legal pawns of a new order with a puppet president signing away the freedoms of us all.

Reason Five: Oppose the "Open Borders" activists

The fake-republicans are, almost totally, ardent cosmopolitan-internationalists. Whether they say so or not, their cause is that of open-borders, the free market, and the commercialisation of the social order. These policy visions are to be imposed, not negotiated, and are regarded as 'moral' (sic) necessities regardless of the counter-political-morality of the ordinary Australian. The republic is not a consensus thing, but a creature of this capitalist revolution. It therefore disenfranchises the people in the first instance.

Reason Six: Protect our independence

The New World Order system has no time for independent sovereign nations and this fake-republic would hardly be outside of this system. Quite the contrary. Those who assert the necessity of a republic to demonstrate 'independence', are almost to a man those who have enmeshed Australia in an array of bewildering alliances, treaties and institutions, each of which has usurped national independence. The fake-republic does not deliver independence for Australia, but would instead undermine it.

Reason Seven: Defend the well-being of the average Australian

The fake republic would organise a class attack upon all Australian working, productive, people. The republic will be a class republic. As a creature of the capitalist revolution, it is an instrument of this inverted class war. The republic is conceived largely in terms of Australia's trading future and this future entails 'international competitiveness'. The republic is likely to enshrine as its constitutional and legal principles the idea of the free labour market, freedom to contract, freedom to buy and sell, freedom to engage in globalised business. The ordinary person in Australia works for wages or for himself, employing few workers in a small business. The republic would be obliged to enforce these 'norms'. We may expect therefore a withering fire of legislation to imprison the ordinary person in a system he cannot influence and which would punish those who dissent from and oppose the anti-national plans of Liberal and Labor. The anti-worker state would be born, where the industrial worker, other wage earners, the farmer and the self-employed and 'small' operator, would be obliged to serve the regime of the rich.

Reason Eight: The President would be a puppet of Liberal and Labor

The method by which a president would be chosen is certain to be a denial of democracy. Whether 'directly' elected or not, the election model is bound to have rules that exclude potential non-mainstream candidates and an operation which focuses on 'the big two'. The choice of the people would become purely formal and cannot really deliver the truly independent people's leader that the direct-election-republicans desire.

Reason Nine: A fake republic would be a national deception

The republic would be meaningless in terms of the quality of existence of the broad mass of Australians. It is not a matter of 'lowering' the tone and crying that it is a costly exercise and public money should be better spent elsewhere. To a small extent this may be true. However, it is more a matter of determining how it would change a world of family breakdown, youth hopelessness, social strife and generalised 'uncertainty'. These fundamental issues cannot be addressed by official republicanism, if only because these fake-republicans are often the creators of the problems. A cosmetic makeover is in fact a deception of the people, a lure to accept a pseudo-political 'change' as a change in the quality of Australian life. Is that why this fraud is being organised?

Reason Ten: Fake republicans oppose Australia's ethno-cultural heritage

If there was a *true republicanism* in Australian history, it was the creation of men and women who *never sought* the destruction of the ethno-cultural heritage of Australia derived from Britain in particular and Europe in general. Rather, they were usually *nativists* in their cultural and political perspectives (ie. concerned with how this heritage was lived and applied here) and were equipped with a particular idea of where the political destiny of the oldest continent would travel. Needless to say, the modern 'republican movement' has no genesis in the former historical movement. In so far as the former movement lives in those who were the disappointed direct-election-republicans who voted No in 1999, there is a moral obligation on them to actually defend their singular political tradition. This tradition has always claimed to stand for a genuine Australian identity and independence. That being so, its' spiritual fathers could not consent to the republic of the merchants and bankers inside the New World Order system. The issue indeed remains this matter of Australia's heritage and national future, things best safeguarded by voting "No".

The media-masters will present the Vote No campaign as a negative one. After all, most referenda have failed in the past because of public suspicions and mass inertia. The traitor class will say that the Vote No campaign is backward, reactionary, bigoted, out-of-touch and just plain contrariness. We must argue that in fact the Vote No campaign is positive because it delivers a body blow to those who are the enemies of our national identity, sovereignty, political rights and freedoms. By voting no, we can turn the wheel of history against those who have sabotaged the true national future.

What is the best result? The best result would be a resounding "No" in the first plebiscite. A 'No' to whether a republic should be formed would end the matter. But if that passes, we would expect a close fight on the matter of a 'model'. If the direct-election model passes as the favoured one, as it 'must' if there is any chance at all, there is still the referendum to fight, still time to mobilise against the fake-republic.

All Australian nationalists and true patriots have an urgent mission. It is to build a No campaign that reaches out to potential 'Yes' voters. This positive campaign is one for our true identity, sovereignty, independence, dignity, freedom. It is not impossible to win this fight. By fighting and winning, we will have forged a mighty extra-parliamentary political and cultural movement, the necessary nutrient for a new struggle for political power.