

## Archives are for the Record and Judgement

Michael C H Jones  
2nd July 2013

One of the most annoying aspects of modern journalism is that almost all sectors of the community, not just politicians, are held to account except journalists. They report the most outrageous twaddle and pontificate nauseously on rumour and character assassination without conscience as to its impact particularly the debasing of the entire democratic process of parliamentary government. Thank heavens I realised at a very tender age that reporting from the Thai 'girly' bars on the upper levels of the Bangkok Hilton on hand-to-hand fighting in the Mekong Delta was not overly accurate and most likely detrimental to US war strategy in Vietnam.

Apart from the exceptions, there are always exceptions upon which to hang your hat, most journalists remain part of the flock of pigeons homing back to the thinking of those who sign their pay cheques. The 2013 problem is that there is a lot of money floating around the world and many aspiring ambitious multicultural paymasters. On that basis never allow Freedom of Information in your bailiwick as your captive readership might read the other mob's twaddle and then start throwing stones in the streets. In Sydney we did not riot but certainly occupied a lot of buildings and streets during the 1960s. Under any assessment, even the most reactionary, we won - we changed forever the social and economic mores of our generation and the generations to come. Even the conservatives of today would have been considered 'extremists' 50 years ago.

Which brings me to the ACCCI Archives, messy as they are, and placing matters especially opinions and actions on the Record for future Judgement. A Think/Do Tank encourages and embraces that sort of evaluation. Did the German people acquiesce in the Holocaust? Was there a Turkish mindframe to eliminate the Armenians? Were Stalin and Mao's agricultural economic policies directed at destroying specific social categories or classes of the Russian and Chinese peoples? Has American world hegemony been based on doctrines of free enterprise and global Free Trade? Are Australians a 'little people' with no aspiration for genuine independence?

Important philosophical questions are at least indirectly raised by some of our academic scribes, one of which is Tim Soutphommasane, political philosopher at Sydney University and columnist for the Age and Sydney Morning Herald. Fortuitously on the first day of the new financial year he wrote a comment with a lousy heading and a great deal of worthwhile questioning in my view.

<http://www.smh.com.au/comment/fear-and-loathing-a-journey-to-the-alps-heart-20130630-2p58k.html#ixzz2XkRJs1ax>

Specifically he raises many questions about Governance, and the role of the media in fashioning aspirations, and highlights issues in Turkey and Brazil as well as the inner-workings of political parties in the US, UK and Australia. He concludes by asserting:

"But you can't help sense there's something also rotten in the state of Australian democracy. For some years now, political theorist John Keane (my director at Sydney University) has argued that democracies are sleepwalking their way into deep trouble. Representative democracy, in his view, has reached its historical exhaustion. Political parties and politicians are no longer responsive to citizens' aspirations".

The Revolutions of the 21st century are multiple - economic, social, political and cultural - and at different stages and levels not only between the nations of the globe but across and within the subsets of peoples' aspirations. What the Parliament of Australia thinks and does is often, and more frequently, irrelevant. In this sense the philosophical differences between Rudd and Gillard and subsequently Rudd and Abbott are profound, but will international trends and events allow them to be played out via policy formulation on Australian soil or will this country be swept along in the regional and sub-regional strategic confrontations?

The Return of China has to be viewed in this Governance context, the struggle of ideas about Human Rights, Democratic Forms, Property Relations and Multiculturalism, and how in practice Political Parties, Transnational Corporations, International Aid Organisations and Global Cultural Institutions actually function under the varying pressures of the multiple Revolutions that are taking place.

\* A History of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce in Sydney since Federation

Rather than continue with a "bits and pieces" record of Chamber activities since re-founding in the mid 1970s, we have launched cooperatively another Special Project namely 'A History of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce in Sydney since Federation'. Many of the business leaders who established the Australia China Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCCI) in September 1976, following the formal recognition by the Whitlam Federal Australian Labor Government of the Peoples Republic of China as the legitimate government of that country, were also members of the original Chinese Chamber of Commerce established from 1913 which collapsed in 1937 with the Japanese invasion of Shanghai - I say Shanghai because in fact the Japanese invaded China in 1895 when Taiwan was conquered, again with the taking over of German enclaves in Shandong Province from 1919 and then subsequently annexing Manchuria or the northern provinces of China in 1931. You have to know the history - an accurate record - to understand the people and to make judgements on their governments from time to time.

Similarly with Chamber. Our History is about to be written in three parts:

- 1) 1913-37 with an Introduction on the formative years of Australia China trade relations from before the Gold Rush days but specifically that period around Federation when the White Australia Policy was gazetted.
- 2) 1937-72 with evaluations of (a) Australian Diplomacy during and after the Second World War, (b) the role of Peoples Diplomacy in the 1950s and 60s and (c) the Economic Reform Programmes of the PRC from 1949 to the death of Mao in 1976.
- 3) 1976 - 2002 concentrating on (a) China's Opening Up from 1979 and (b) the post 1989 Tiananmen Square economic internationalisation to membership of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) at the end of 2001 and (c) the ACCCI response as part of Australia's

trade engagement with the PRC including the province of Taiwan and subsequently the Hong Kong SAR.

However the Chamber History did not stop a decade ago, it merely altered course as shown by the material on the ACCCI Website which was launched in September 2001, our 25th anniversary. Gradually, step by step across the river of stones, ACCCI has morphed into a Think Tank but never forgetting its 'Do' or activist pioneering traditions. Much of that history will be revealed in due course depending on the quality of future academic historians and what records exist. The major challenge, maybe, will be an avalanche of conflicting perspectives and experience.

Nevertheless I think it important to note by way of a benchmark or sign of possible future Chamber history the initial focus by ACCCI on (a) political parties and their promotion of policies and programmes that represent specific sectors of the Australian Economy, indeed sub groups, and (b) their interaction with the Communist Party of China (CPC) as it evolves under the already mentioned multiple pressures of economic, social, political and cultural revolutions in a globalised world. Just think of the ramifications of Chinese Urbanisation, approximately 500 million peasants migrating to the cities in about 35 years with at least another 300 million to come over a similar period, and the basis of the ACCCI Key Cities Strategy since the mid 1980s and more recently the thinking behind our Indauspac maritime regional approach to the challenge of 'China into the World'.

For the last 40 years ACCCI has been attempted to influence all political parties and especially during this protracted run-up to the 2013 Australian Federal Election.

#### \* Liberals

In the Speeches and Media Releases section on the Homepage of the ACCCI Website there are a number of comments and advice to the Progressive wing of the Liberal Party, the Libertarians perhaps? Malcolm Turnbull, Barry O'Farrell and Joe Hockey specifically. However the businessmen of ACCCI have always been globalists, advocating and supporting Free Trade since Federation and 'bitterly' accepting defeat by the Victorian Protectionists until Whitlam slashed the tariffs by 25% when he won the federal election in 1972. ACCCI has played a significant role in opening up trade with China as launched during the Hawke/Keating Labor years. We have had serious doubts about the nature and structures of the modern Liberal/National Party with respect to business - too few of them actually have big corporate experience. Essentially they are mostly 'shop-keepers'.

Hence the value of Clive Palmer acting as a ginger group. It will be interesting in early July to watch the Rudd factor on everything.

#### \* United Party

A number of contacts have been made with Palmer people. The general philosophical and

policy approach is highlighted by several emails, the last dated 20th June 2013

Jim,

Thank you for your reply email and I did email ..... - I hope you got it and I await Clive's response if any.

In the meantime events move quickly re the organisation of the United Party and the political attack on Clive personally

- last weekend's Australian article on Clive's business interests/situation, repeated on Monday, is just an example -

Murdoch may or may not have a vested interest in the failure of the United Party which in many respects is "radical"

Right re trying to get the LNP to live up to its 'free enterprise' rhetoric.

In my view it is important for the United Party to not only go on the offensive, to be heard, but on a very 'selected'

range of key issues with philosophical/ideological underpinnings, to get credibility. Bottom line is that the United

Party has to have a dual track re House of Representatives and Senate. For the House the gathering of preferences is the

key re if the United Party can get between the Liberals and Labor one side's preferences may get your candidate elected

re as an example Liberals 37%, Labor 28%, UP 29%, Greens and rest 6% - final vote after preferences UP 51% and Liberals

49% - or the reverse. Not impossible with swings of up to 20% in some electorates. For the Senate, I suggest a better

chance for the UP, your quota could be gained from a very low initial first preference vote re 2/3% and then a gradual

build up via preferences distributions. The Senate could become a disaster re an assortment of 'minor' parties such as

the Greens, WikiLeaks and UP gaining more than just the last position in each State, and thus holding the balance of

power with no common philosophy/ideology for decision making/agreement on policies.

From the Chamber perspective we are interested in Clive Palmer and the UP from a number of perspectives, all business and Australian Economy related.

1) His business experience re the role of business/companies is to make a profit and not to be social welfare

organisations - the aim is to grow the cake/run the tuck shop, questions of 'egalitarianism' and social justice are issues for Government at all levels. Hence the central issue is 'productivity' re a company's ability to provide employment/jobs. The Liberal Party, with very few members having legitimate big business experience, has lost touch with its historical roots.

2) His connections and experience with China business re too many academics, journalists and others pontificating about China - as Clive has found with CITIC Pacific there is no substitute for the 'coal face' so to speak and an understanding of their perspectives and cultural mindframe. Although since the PRC joined the WTO in 2002 I have gradually withdrawn from day to day dealings with China companies, and hence I understand that the attitudes of the younger PRC businessmen may have changed, in the 'old' days a contract was not a contract in the western sense, it was only an agreement to have business relations and subject to change according to evolving circumstances - plus terms could not be enforced in China as the local CPC Secretary at whatever levels simply told the magistrate/judge what his decision was. Unfortunately you have to play the Chinese at their own game, even if your circumstances have not changed claim that they have just to keep the "bastards" honest by varying the contract. It is very time consuming, but the expertise gained is vital for future Australia-China Economic Relations.

3) His role in attempting to shake up the Australian Political System - a sort of Australian Ross Perot re in the US 1992 Presidential race - [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ross\\_Perot\\_presidential\\_campaign,\\_1992](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ross_Perot_presidential_campaign,_1992) - the principal and perhaps only reason for Clinton's victory - although "It's the Economy stupid" was a great battle cry. Clive and the UP should zero in on a similar slogan re "Its Productivity stupid" and relate all policies to it re just three reports in the Australian in recent days: a) 17th - Rick Morton - "Northern food bowl critical for security" - producing for the region/world b) 18th - Patricia Karvelas - "Call to fix welfare for the poorest" re "Mission Australia also wants the Productivity Commission to investigate the most effective and affordable model of childcare, including reviewing the

current funding models" and c) 15-16th - Noel Pearson - "Recent indigenous policy failures can't be pinned on Aborigines" re you cannot feed the sparrows by feeding the horses.

Unless people like Clive succeed the Chinese, Indians and Asean will simply "eat" Australians in future decades - building mines etc is a long term proposition, like turning around a national economy, and it takes experience beyond what we currently have on either side of Parliament. In a strange way the UP and WikiLeaks have a similar objective - shaking up both sides of the political system in Australia.

Regards

Michael

On the previous day 19th June ACCCI had emailed Julian Assange. Again the Rudd factor might change some key strategies.

\* Wikileaks

Julian,

Until such time that I have a contact name, I will address my thoughts to you personally.

You, through the Wikileaks Party in 2013, have a unique opportunity which we did not have in the late 1960s, specifically in the 1969 Federal election. The political parties were too strong with their trade union and business connections and the social 'liberation' movements across the spectrum too young and fragile and lacking both experience and funding. Businessman Gordon Barton was an exception but even he could not make much of a dent.

Nearly 50 years later times have really changed for all sorts of reasons but specifically in the social sphere, pretty well everything we fought for has come to pass to a greater or lesser degree. However politically, and with many exceptions economically, not much has changed in Australia. That is why WikiLeaks has been so important - it has highlighted the sordidness of our political leaders by burning down the curtain of secrecy to

reveal the true dimensions  
of velvet glove authoritarianism on so many issues - the current travails of the ALP was  
predicted and hence the  
response to your situation by Gillard and Carr is not surprising.

The 'transparency' platform is ideal for this Federal Election and if your strategies/tactics  
are well thought out and  
implemented you should be elected in Victoria and possibly an associate in NSW. Then the  
real work begins. Enlist your  
allies wherever, and I suggest keeping Senator John Faulkner on side re his Freedom of  
Information work. If the ALP is  
reduced to a rump of some 30+ members he will be a very important policy formulator in all  
sorts of ways.

In this context I draw your attention, if you have not already read it, to the article in last  
weekend's Australian re  
by Greg Pemberton - "For the record, much of the past is classified" and the disgraceful  
situation Australians face  
concerning information/record of our parliaments. Your campaign should highlight this issue  
- indeed you could make the  
ramifications front and central for the sort of middle-class, tertiary educated, well travelled  
internationally,  
socially libertarian people who support WikiLeaks - you get your support from both the Left  
wings of the Labor and  
Liberal parties as well as the Greens.

Policies on nearly all issues can be tied into the question of access to information, and its  
current and past  
manipulation for vested interests both organisational and personal. Just keep hammering  
away - re Human Rights,  
Democratic Forms, Property Relations and Multiculturalism as examples. In Australia  
particularly broaden the ambit from  
the USA as the major culprit (as the major global power that should both live up to its  
rhetoric and set an example), to  
the EU, China, and Russia. Keep the global bastards honest. Even the most politically  
disinterested know that Australia's  
economic welfare depends on global events, so accurate and timely information is  
crucial/key. Promoted the right way you  
will get a Nobel Peace Prize, irrespective of whether you want it or not.

Michael

Of course all of this is pertinent to the questions of Philosophy, Issues and Policy. Chamber has entered into a dialogue with the Sydney Peace Prize Foundation which organisation we have supported in the Peoples Diplomacy section of the ACCCI Website.

\* Sydney Peace Prize

On the 19th June my last email in the dialogue was sent to a number of Board members including Professor Stuart Rees.

Hello Stuart,

I follow up my email below in the context of the report, at least in the Australian yesterday re "Israelis may sue boycott activists" that a foreign organisation namely the Israeli Civil Rights Law Centre (Sturat HaDin-Israel Law Centre) is considering/threatening suing an Australian domestic organisation and/or its members (Sydney University's Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies) for allegedly breaching Australian legislation (Human Rights Act). Is it true/factual that you in your capacity as Director - Sydney Peace Foundation, as well as Jake Lynch, "and other figures" have received communication/letters "warning" that you "may be subject to civil, administrative and criminal legal action"?

This has got to be if not a first pretty close to it re foreign bodies taking legal action against Australian domestic entities for political actions deemed/interpreted as "criminal". Probably dual Australian/Israeli citizen Andrew Hamilton, allegedly cites the Australian Racial Discrimination Act of 1975, the Australian Competition and Consumer Act of 2010 as well as the Australian Human Rights Commission Act of 1986.

Apart from the intimidatory nature/intention of the alleged correspondence, it appears to me to set all sorts of precedents in our increasingly globalised world. Obviously your legal advisers will have more to say on this. However my experience of these matters urges a dual front re let the lawyers take care of the law and you take care of the politics. The story/publicity, though meant to denigrate and frighten the Centre's supporters, actually opens up so many



opportunities to take the issue more concretely to the "councils" of the world, and you would be remiss in not pursuing a multi pronged offensive to highlight the reasons for BDS, irrespective of whether or not such BDS strategy is "good" policy or indeed "University of Sydney policy".

As a person who flouted the Conscription Act, Defence Forces Protection Act and the Crimes Act for seven years during the mid/late 1960s, and even at my age, I would simply "love" to be the recipient of legal action for "civil conspiracy" based on the assertion that "the participants of the BDS movement clearly seek to violate freedoms guaranteed by federal law". I know it would take hundreds of thousands to go all the way to the Australian High Court, but the exercise would be worthwhile similar to decisions of the US Supreme Court. I believe the Centre would win a victory that would have profound international ramifications and benefits for the Palestinian people.

In these "interesting times" I would like to be on your mailing list.

Finally as an aside in my view the question of Israel is fundamentally the issue of Jewish fundamentalism, and the Christian fundamentalism of many of their supporters in the US/UK/Australia. It is almost impossible to have a rational discussion about West Asia and extremes/terrorism of Muslim fundamentalism without addressing the question of the Jewish State of Israel and the racist/apartheid structures that it maintains. Troubles/civil wars in Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan as well as Saudi Arabia, Egypt and the rest cannot be delinked from US blinkered policy on Israel. The Centre performs an absolutely vital role in advocating a contrary opinion to the Rudd/Gillard and Abbott/Bishop bipartisan view/policy in lock-step with the US. It is essential that your voice not be silenced, irrespective of whether or not your strategies from time to time are foolish or brilliant.

Please keep up the good work and never be intimidated by the bully boy minions of "Great Powers" - thankfully so far Julian Assange has not.

Michael

Wednesday, 12 June 2013 7:01 PM

Stuart,

Thank you for your email and a very worthwhile, indeed stimulating exchange of ideas over dinner. The question of Peace with Justice is complicated involving many relevant side issues such as FOI and 'Just Wars', hence non-violence is not so clear cut as it may appear - with Mandela as an example when does his later aspirations for peaceful change supercede his early commitments to guerilla warfare and violence against the Apartheid State?

After a quick perusal of your literature there does not appear to be a business leader/global economic relations corporation person recipient of the Sydney Peace Prize - after about 15 years there needs to be rigorous consideration as the winners might appear to be "one-dimensional" on the Left. I would like to participate in the search for such a person, otherwise just give it to Bill Gates !

Below is my congratulations to the ACCCI Webmaster re recent material on the Website - I think the links have relevance not only to your Gold Medal for Julian Assange, not yet the OBE of Sydney Peace Prize, but to future impacts of information/communications technologies on Peace and Justice - hopefully Julian is wrong in his thinking on Google but I personally do not think so.

Michael

PS Marilyn and others think I am a little paranoid for believing meetings like our recent dinner are bugged. However from recent news stories, re the young man in Hong Kong looking for a Julian Assange Embassy and thus limited safety for a time, I think it is safe to say everything that disagrees with US Pentagon opinion is bugged, and certainly people who question current Israeli/US policies in West Asia.

12th June

John,

Great stuff re the book reviews on 'The New Digital Age.

I especially agree with John Naughton's (Observer) final paragraph comment, if correct:

"Despite its thoroughness and appetite for detail, there is one glaring omission from Schmidt's and Cohen's vision of the future: the phenomenon of corporate power. They are – rightly – interested in the ways in which networking technology will affect the power of states both vis-a-vis one another and vis-a-vis the people who live under their jurisdictions. But there's very little in the book about the power and reach of the global corporations – like Google – which will dominate this emerging world. And, in so far as corporations are mentioned at all, they are generally seen as benign forces. As the Duke of Wellington famously said to the man who approached him in the street saying, "Mr Smith, I believe", if you believe that, then you will believe anything".

I also liked Julian Assange's review, though not in agreement with all his views/terminologies, in "The Banality of 'Don't Be Evil", The New York Times, 1 June 2013.

Michael

This raises the question of how future history is recorded? Will it be the New York Times or Google? However the question of Judgement based on the Zhao Ziyang 'Right to Know' is another matter? In this respect what about 'Forgotten History'? Chamber has been in contact with Professor Gary Sturges who is considering the same.

\* Forgotten History

19th June

Gary,

Thanks for your reply - ACCCI is also having fun with its Three-Part Histories re pre 1937, up to 1972 and post 1976 to 2002 - the last decade and the evolution of the Think/Do Tank will have to wait.

In order to facilitate our work we have set up additional ACCCI email sites re:

- 1) History@accici.com.au - for the Chinese Chamber of Commerce in Sydney since Federation and
- 2) Policy@accici.com.au for on-going discussion/recommendations for links/materials in the

various sections of the website

I have no doubt some of your writings will soon appear there, and the discussion may subsequently be of help to you.

Speaking from a family perspective re always involved in British government, church, military and colonial trading, with the wayward sons banished as "remittance" men to distant parts, much of the trading/business history at least orally has been well known, so it will be fascinating to read what you come up with.

It is in a way similar to trading with the PRC throughout the 1950s and 60s - "political BS" makes Australia go round on both sides - Julia Abbott and Tony Gillard as Clive Palmer likes saying !!

Lets keep up the dialogue

Best of writing

Michael

> Michael,

>

> The historians can be partly forgiven for having got lost in a government-to-government narrative of Australia's origins. Virtually none of the merchants' records have survived, and until recently (and even then only with a great deal of effort) it was virtually impossible to reconstruct their role in the Botany Bay enterprise. Digitisation of archives and indexes has certainly helped, but there has been a radical change in naval history over recent decades, with historians realising that Britain could never have sustained the wars of the late 18th and the early 19th century when much of Europe was ranged against it, if it had not been for its superb logistical systems and the skill with which it engaged the private sector. We have permission from the professional historians to approach this subject differently now.

>

> This is just as much a problem in China, where the Hong merchants of the late 18th and early 19th centuries had low status. None of their records have survived either. Paul van Dyke, the academic who is

organising the conference I am speaking at in November is reconstructing their history by going to the archives of the various East India Companies scattered across Europe. Someone is financing a major exercise in collection and translation, which is rather exciting.

>

> I also had the good fortune to start my project while living in London, and the Botany Bay story looks very different from there. The financial and managerial aspects are much more evident, and you are interested in seeing the ships home again. For the most part, Australian historians have only been interested in getting the convicts to NSW, and have lost interest thereafter. And of course, I was running a think tank for a global public service contractor, so I was looking for the contractual dimensions to the story.

>

> In Australia, the situation is not helped by a great deal of early propaganda against the merchant class. Much of the nonsense that is (still) written about the Rum Corps arises out of the hostility of the early Governors to the trading class. (The Rum Corps dominated for only 2 or 3 years between Phillip's departure and Hunter's arrival, but the traditional histories have massively underestimated the importance of the convicts/emancipists in the trading economy from very early on, and they have neglected the entrepreneurship of the merchant captains who were involved in importing consumer goods for the new economy.) Hunter and King expected all of those convicts from London's inner city underclass to become good yeoman farmers, and they were appalled to discover that they were much more interested in solid urban pursuits, such as running pubs, manufacturing illicit spirits and trading in imported commodities.

>

> So this is very much about how we as a nation have perceived ourselves and our forebears - farmers/miners vs traders; penal settlement vs economy; apron strings to Britain vs linked into the Asia-Pacific economy.

>

> It is fun writing such a book at this moment in time.

>

> Gary

>

19th June

>

> Gary,

>

> Glad that you made contact, and thanks to Steve for the suggestion.

>

> I remembered you as ex Premier Greiner's DG Cabinet Office from 1988, so I checked re [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gary\\_Sturgess](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gary_Sturgess). This is about the time I joined the ACCCI Executive.

>

> It was interesting to read your history since retirement after Greiner went. From time to time I have read your

> newspaper articles on Governance - I think we have at least one on the NSW Bureaucracy on the ACCCI Website - any

> comments would be welcome, good or bad.

>

> Yes History is a funny thing, as I have made Comment in one of my "inflammatory" remarks on Julian Assange. When I read

> about the history I participated directly in during the mid/late 1960s it is as if I was never there - factually

> inaccurate and totally wrong analysis. Similarly with the travails of the present Federal Labor Party Government - when

> you know most of them personally and have watched their self serving antics since the mid 1970s - Liberals included -

> possibly the writing of history is a absolute waste of time.

>

> So to your history. Congratulations for the intellectual brilliance of perspectives that are not tunnel vision/bilateral

> and more global/multilateral re the circular route of UK/South Africa/Australia/China/India/South Africa/UK or variants

> thereof. Chamber for at least the last decade re post PRC joining the WTO in 2002 has been advocating, with little

> success, analysing Australia China Economic Relations from 1) a global context re China in the world and its impact on

> Australia 2) China's influence on Australia's maritime region re Indauspac Strategy (geo-political) and Watch

> (socio-cultural) 3) non-government institutional connections re Peoples Diplomacy via key cities in China and 4) the

> potential role of Greater Sydney for Australia-China Relations. In this respect Chamber has

become what is known in the

> current jargon as a Think/Do Tank re still an activist organisation - the 60s never died, just fading away as an old US

> General once said.

>

> The Australia China connection actually begins prior to the First Fleet in 1788 if you read the records of discussions

> in the UK Foreign Office and were fanned by the reports/observations from Lord George Macartney's China/Beijing

> visit/delegation in 1793/4

>

> <http://www.upf.edu/materials/huma/central/fonts/materials/macart.htm>

>

> You have to ask the question why Australian "historians" have been so deficient? We cannot blame Gillard or Rudd or even

> Abbott for that. Navel gazing is part of the Australian tradition, we are notoriously insular in our thinking - hence

> one of the reasons for all the international links on the ACCCI website.

>

> I wish you well and hope you can bring greater clarity, factually and by analysis, to the beginnings of the Australia

> China Economic Relationship. It will be a tough job.

>

> Regards

>

> Michael

>

> PS Barry Pearton at Asia Today is another person you should contact, perhaps we could all do dinner and have a good

> discussion/laugh?

>

> > Dear Michael,

> >

> > I caught up with Steve Barclay last week, whom I have known for some years since he was at the Efficiency Unit in Hong

> Kong, and he suggested that I should make contact with yourself about a book I am writing.

> >

> > I'm around a third of the way through an account of early convict transportation, with a particular focus on the

> private contractors who owned the ships, provided the victuals and managed the

prisoners throughout the voyage.

>>

>> The reason Steve thought you might be interested in this is what happened to the ships after they landed the convicts

> and sailed out through Sydney Heads. Around one third of the ships in this period (1787-1800), including three of the

> First Fleet transports, returned home via Canton, collecting a cargo of tea on behalf of the East India Company.

>>

>> Thus, the history of Australia was intimately linked with the China trade from the very beginning. Historians have not

> particularly noticed these linkages because they have focused on the convicts and thus the voyage out, and on the public

> officials, who were almost exclusively interested in relations with their superiors in London. It is only when we look

> at Australia's early history through the eyes of the private entrepreneurs that we see how important these early

> linkages to Asia were.

>>

>> While I am writing to book up to 1795, I have studied up to 1800, and in that period, I have turned up the first

> Australian exports to China, and the first attempted exportation of Chinese goods to Australia (which ended in shipwreck).

>>

>> I'm off to Guangzhou in November to deliver a paper at Sun Yat Sen University on the convict trade and the tea trade,

> and I will probably get a little publicity around it then. I don't want to pre-empt the book entirely, but do want to

> build public interest in advance of publication.

>>

>> I don't know that this fits with the history book that you have commissioned, but thought I should make contact in any

> case.

>>

>> Regards,

>>

>> Gary

>>

The above dialogue underpins the value of the ACCCI Archives as a Record of what is likely to be the Forgotten History of the Australia China Economic Relationship over the last three



or four decades.

Finally I want to include the latest email to Kevin Rudd, the setting of the scene for future Thinking and Doing. ACCCI has made much comment on the issue of the Palestinians and the Jewish State of Israel, a global challenge about which Rudd and Gillard have similar views. Rudd's knowledge of China will increasingly be relevant as that country becomes more involved given its stance on Syria. Similarly we have made mention of North Korea and its inevitable collapse into unification of the Korean peninsula - again China is essential for any peaceful solution. But a question even Chamber will not 'face' given its potential for destabilisation of our neighbourhood region is West Papua and Melanesian unity. As I have said before Australia's political relations with Indonesia is even more important than with China. So far West Papua is another Forgotten History.

\* Labor

On 1st July Kevin Rudd announced his new Federal Labor Government Cabinet

<http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/political-news/rudd-names-his-team-20130701-2p61b.html>

My following email was sent about 5 minutes prior to the breaking story on ABC News TV that PM Julia Gillard had declared a spill of the Labor Caucus. It is a record of thinking at the moment and a prediction for the future, and should be considered as such before the self-serving tendency for rewording! It anticipates that Kevin Rudd would be elected leader of the Federal ALP and hence PM, but strongly advocates a ruthlessness which Rudd in reality does not have. Like Hawke he needs to be loved. Keating, a man who could negotiate eye to eye with former Indonesian President Suharto, would I suspect have gone in hard - correctly in my view. When you purge, purge well and once only. If I were the Tony Abbott Conservative 'blue cavaliers' I would be publicising all Garry Gray's comments on Rudd's personality quirks - as well as those of others from his new Ministry. Other heads may well have to be lopped second 'purge' around - very messy indeed. Better to have gone to the Federal Election with a completely new team - the only baggage being Rudd himself and like Hawke he can overcome that given his 'love affair' with the Australian younger people.

26th June

Kevin,

For three years I have been consistent in my support for your return as PM.

This has been based on my belief that only you could have led Labor to a victory over John

Howard in November 2007, and that John Howard was correct in asserting that you would have clearly won the June 2010 Federal election for the ALP.

Secondly that you won office on a platform that included the ending of factional union control of the Party. I am now nearly a 50 year member, joining the ALP in early 1966 and hence currently a Life Member. I have written on a number of occasions that "treachery" should never be rewarded, the latest on Monday 24th June the 3rd anniversary of your "dumping". The structure of the Party and the functioning of Caucus needs a thorough review to meet the challenges of the present times/century.

<http://www.accci.com.au/media.htm> -  
Michael C H Jones to Kevin Rudd, MP, 24 February 2012.

<http://www.accci.com.au/CommentariesbyJones.htm> -  
Commentary by Michael C H Jones at:  
<http://www.accci.com.au/JonesCommentonGillard.pdf>.

In this context your China knowledge and religious convictions need to be front and central of your decisions/actions should you regain the position of Prime Minister, most likely by a small majority unless PM Gillard resigns which appears unlikely. For the good of the nation and the party you need to act decisively by accepting the resignations of 7/10 current ministers. You could never depend on their actions given their past character assassination of yourself. Moreover the Australian people would not believe you if you allowed their continuance in the Cabinet. Additionally you desperately need new blood for a future Labor Government and though risky you should appoint up to 10 new front line Ministers.

The question of your possible Deputy is vital. For the future Chris Bowen, for the present Bob Carr - each has individual advantages/disadvantages depending on your objectives re the future Labor Government should you beat Tony Abbott and the tactics of the forthcoming federal campaign in September or whenever you call it. In my view the election

should be as late as possible so you can prove to the Australian people that it is really a new Government under your leadership.

As I have said before - best of luck for yourself, the party and the country.

Michael C H Jones  
President - ACCCI