

The Australian League of Rights Submission: Migrant Intake into Australia

Overview

The Australian League of Rights has, for almost 70 years sought to defend traditional Australia and the core liberal democratic and Christian based values of Western civilisation. Along with tens of thousands of other groups across the world we believe that Western civilisation is under attack, not only externally as "terrorism" on one view represents, but internally as well. We see policies such as mass immigration, multiculturalism (or state imposed plurality and diversity), the culture of political correctness, the winding back of fundamental freedoms and most other social movements (regarded by the unholy alliance of the Left and globalised Big Business) as ultimately leading to the collapse of Western civilisation as it has been known.

Our views are well known and we have been vilified for them for decades. Yet on all of these core issues, our position has gained support. For example Eric Butler argued for many years that the diverse pluralistic societies created by so-called "non-discriminatory" immigration policies, were not stable and ultimately imploded. That proposition received support by R.D. Putnam, "E. Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century", Scandinavian Political Studies, vol. 30, 2007, pp. 137-174.

The Australian of October 10, 2006 summarises this Harvard University professor's research thus: "Ethnic diversity seriously undermines the trust and social bonds within a community, according to an important new research that casts a gloomy shadow over optimistic theories about the benefits of the social melting pot in immigrant societies such as Australia".

That research was done, and published before the explosion of home-grown terrorism, which has an obvious immigration link. Today even with race vilification restrictions on free speech, which ethnic elites have used against Anglo-Australians as a political weapon, one can find mainstream media expressions of concern with Muslim immigration and "integration" to various degrees. As an example consider Chris Kenny, "The Menace Many Dare Not Speak by Name", The Weekend Australian, December 5-6, 2015, p. 24.

Kenny says that the Islamic terrorist threat "is difficult to grasp and because it is related to cultural divisions in our own immigrant societies it can be deeply uncomfortable to confront". The core aim is to impose Sharia Law and the rule of a caliphate which "opposes choice, democracy, plurality and liberty". All of this is a creation of immigration and unthinkable in 1945.

This may be regarded as a mere multicultural housekeeping matter to be controlled by more conferences and more community consultation. Yet there seems to be a point reached where, in so-called multi-ethnic societies, integration and assimilation is no longer possible because the core "majority" has become a minority.

Whites in the US face minority status by 2044 or sooner and whites in Britain a little later. The Australian authorities haven't come clean about Australia's date of white demographic displacement, but with immigration levels contemplated by the Big Australia lobby, and as represented in the Productivity Commission document, *Migrant Intake into Australia* (2015), this demographic transformation may be sooner than even in the US: see Alan James, *New Britannia: The Rise and Decline of Anglo-Australia*, (Renewal Publications, Melbourne, 2013).

There has been a more than doubling of Australia's annual immigration numbers since 1999 and a net overseas migration constitutes the majority of our annual growth rate of 1.4%, one of the highest in the developed world. Permanent migrants are likely to top 190,000 in 2015 along with 5 million visas, so that around 1.9 million foreigners including foreign students, tourists and workers on short-term visas are in the country at any one time (<http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/five-million-visas-into-australia-this-year-likely-to-set-new-records-20150421-1mq6km.html>)

The ethnic composition of migrants is now predominantly Asian as a matter of government policy, which could be called the "Yellow Australia Policy" or Asianisation. Thus the number of Chinese-born Australians tripled in number in the last two decades to around 450,000 and the number of Indian-born Australians to almost 400,000. This is just the beginning.

The Productivity Commission Report is based on the fundamental premise that immigration will add another 13 million by 2060. This assumption is almost certainly wrong given the present immigration surge and the government's own Fourth Intergenerational Report (2015) sees 39.7 million Australians by 2055 or sooner which would discredit all conclusions about economics and the environment reached in the Productivity Commission Report.

Former Communist professor and historian Jörg Baberowski, Professor of Eastern European History at the Humboldt University of Berlin has expressed alarm at Germany's open immigration policy, at least with respect to asylum seekers, and has said that a Germany based on Christian values will disappear because of mass immigration. The same is true for Australia, only the process is a little slower.

It would follow that since the globalists see no limit to the number of immigrants, and take any concern to "discriminate" or choose on the basis of compatible values and ethnicities, as "racist" in the new class theology of political correctness, core liberal values will also be undermined. Further, it has been argued by Jerry Muller, "Us and Them", Foreign Affairs, March/April 2008 that ethnic nationalism in the early post-war years, where people were withdrawn into their separate ethnic enclaves was responsible for a brief period of peace.

As we see it, immigration and the mingling of peoples, to serve short-term greed of myopic capitalists has undermined this and given us not only the clash of civilisations (Huntington's thesis) but a clash of ethnicities and ideologies now within Western civilisation. Much less than this tore down the Roman Empire. And that assumes that there is no environmental crisis, no climate change disasters, peak oil or other resource limitations.

The Productivity Commission's Migrant Intake into Australia

The Productivity Commission Report is based firmly within a narrow neo-classical economic tradition that has been subjected to a withering critique for decades (e.g. Paul Ormerod, The Death of Economics, (St Martin's Press, 1994). Thus we find simplistic arguments, such that those who think that adding migrants reduce wages or displace workers are committing the alleged "lump of labour fallacy" - that an economy has a fixed number of jobs. Of course it is easy to model cases where a migrant intake can increase employment in some sectors of the economy.

However even if there is no fixed number of jobs at any time in an economy, this is still consistent with increased migrant workers taking jobs from this "vague set" of jobs and taking more than they create. The US Congressional Research Service (CRS), by contrast, has observed that as the foreign-born population in the US has surged, wages and the share of income of the bottom 90% of US wage-earners has fallen. (<http://www.scribd.com/doc/262874867/CRS-Income-and-Foreign-Born-Population#scribd>)

Another economic argument tossed off by the Productivity Commission is that an increased number of consumers in the domestic market results. This increases the demand for local goods and services. True: but it also increases the demand, even greater for imports since Australia now manufactures so little relative to the past.

Nor does the Productivity Commission investigate too deeply the economic costs of immigration. Dr Jane O'Sullivan estimates the infrastructure costs per migrant to be about \$200,000 per person and Will Bourke estimates that the figure may be double that. (<https://damnthematrix.wordpress.com/tag/cost-of-infrastructure/>)

Infrastructure costs arising from population increase are bankrupting states like Queensland and substantially degrading the quality of life of ordinary Australians. Yet the Productivity Commission Report seemingly exists in some weird neoclassical parallel universe without traffic congestion, pollution and water concerns.

There is of course a brief and totally inadequate consideration of the environmental impacts of immigration (conclusion: no worries, all can be managed) in chapter 6 of the Productivity Commission Report which will almost certainly be critiqued by environmentalists submissions. It is extremely shallow and doesn't seem to have been written by scientific experts, only narrow economists.

The Productivity Commission claims on the basis of Scanlon Foundation surveys that the majority of Australians support the present immigration level. (p.187) However immigration is necessarily linked to population growth and other polls have shown that the majority of Australians - over two thirds - believe that Australia does not need more people: "Majority Oppose Population Growth: Survey", at <http://www.smh.com.au/national/majority-oppose-population-growth-survey-20100413-s7n5.html>.

There is no balanced discussion of the changing attitudes of the Australian population to immigration in the Productivity Commission Report (see: <http://katharinebetts.net/>) and this is one indication of the pro-immigration bias of the Report.

That being said, the ruling elites have never cared about the majority position on immigration if it was in opposition, and they have actively sought to change the demographics of the population anyway to produce one more suitable for further immigration. Mal Fraser said that the government had to ignore public opinion on immigration to create the multicultural society and then our Asian society.

In Britain Labour undertook mass immigration, a former adviser to Tony Blair said in 2009 to "rub the Right's nose in diversity": see <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/6418456/Labour-wanted-mass-immigration-to-make-UK-more-multicultural-says-former-adviser.html>. The same has happened in Australia.

Conclusion

Although the ideology of the Productivity Commission Report is geared towards Big Australia it is worth noting that one of its conclusions is that: "There is no comprehensive empirical basis for setting an aggregate level of immigration over time that would improve the well-being of the Australian community". (p. 33) On the contrary we believe that immigration which is directly linked to a policy of quiet genocide of Anglo-Australia through demographic displacement should cease. Australia should become a non-immigrant nation like Japan: enough is enough.

Even on social and sustainability grounds Australia's population growth rate will destroy this land, as Dick Smith has cogently argued. But none of this will be solved by arguments: there will need to be political resistance shown by anti-immigrationists. The idea of a Dick Smith Sustainable Population Party - also tackling foreign buy-ups - is a good first step. (*The Weekend Australian*, December 5-6, 2015, p.8)

Governments have got away with the immigration scam only because this has been done in a time of postwar affluence. These "good times" are over now forever for reasons that you will find in other critical submissions.

If you want to continue to have an Australia for your masters to exploit, then it is time to pull in your horns on the immigration issue. Otherwise Australia too, will go the way of past societies as ancient Rome.

December 11, 2015