

AUSTRALIA BETRAYED

How Australian democracy has
been undermined and our
naive trust betrayed.



GRAEME CAMPBELL

MEMBER FOR KALGOORLIE

AND

MARK UHLMANN

AUSTRALIA BETRAYED

**GRAEME CAMPBELL MHR
MEMBER FOR KALGOORLIE**

and

MARK UHLMANN

FOUNDATION PRESS

*“Wisdom is before him that hath understanding,
but the eyes of a fool are in the ends of the earth.*

Proverbs 17:24

CONTENTS

PART I

Introduction	vii
Multiculturalism: A Definition	1
Immigration And Consensus	3
Immigration Pre-war	6
Overseas Comparisons	7
Whitlam And Fraser	11
The Hawke Government	13
Public Discontent	16
Political Opportunism	18
Asianisation	19
Family Reunion Engine	22
The Business Migration Program	23
The Fitzgerald Report	26
The Howard Outcry	28
Chinese Students And Refugees	31
Illegals And Crime	46
What Of The ATCU?	49
Doctors, Shearers And Others	54
Grassroots Opposition	57
Social Security Costs	60
Call For National Debate	62
Appeasement Continued	66
The Immigration Club	68
Health Problems	75
Fast Bucks And Education	81
Evolving Party Positions	85
Consultations, Reviews And Race Laws	89
Immigration Intakes	100
The Need To Organise	106

Understanding Mabo	110
Some Philosophical Background	110
Invasion?	111
The Mabo Battlelines	111
Division Of Powers	112
Western Australian Response	113
The Keating Legislation	114
Background To Mabo In The High Court	115
Mabo 1	115
Mabo 2	116
On Mabo	117
The Economy: What They Don't Say	122
Reprise: Australia's Great Challenge	127
PART II						
In Equity's Name	132
Re-education Campaign	133
Disability Discrimination Bill	134
The Push For The Bill	135
Administrative Services	136
"Big Person" Database	137
Children Of The Vilification Bill	139
Codes For Commercial TV	139
Irony	141
The "Aussie" Council	143
National Museum	146
Multiculturalism And The NSW Government	146
Another Museum Captured	148
Background On The Site	148
Name Change	149
Hands Off Our Heritage!	151
How The Sex Bill Was passed	153
Half Way To Equal: A Case Of Intellectual Fraud	158
Terms Of Reference Of The Inquiry	158
The Constituency	159
Submissions	160

Domestic Violence	160
Homework	161
"Glass Ceiling"	162
Sport And Leisure	163
Multicultural Angle	163
To Conclude	165
The Racial Bill's Progress	166
The Submission Process	166
Community Consultation	167
The Law Of Moss	169
Background	170
Aboriginals	170
Extirpation Of "Anglo" Influence	171
Illegitimate Occupiers	172
Displacement	174
Methodology	175
Evidence	176
Conclusion	178
The Tasmanian Gay Case	180
Basis For The Judgement	182
Lavarch Acts	184
Western Australia Attacked	185
Western Australia Joins Tasmania	186
Interesting Times	186
Another Multiculturalist Stack	187
Kirner On The Centenary Of Federation	190
Citizens Or Occupants?	192
The Departments Of Undermining	192
Government Response	195
It's Time For Responsibility	196
Select Bibliography	203

INTRODUCTION

AUSTRALIA BETRAYED

Australian leadership elites in politics, the bureaucracy, academia, big business, the churches and the media have effectively cut themselves adrift from the interests of the majority of Australians. Many have betrayed the trust of the people they are supposed to represent.

As part of this process the elites, while they may mouth concern for the country, have given up thinking in terms of the national interest to pursue an internationalist agenda. This agenda is eroding the foundations of our nation and marginalising the majority, which has less and less say in its own destiny.

The bulk of the media, charged with a watchdog role in the public interest, have become active agents in this process. Academics, artists and others who are supposed to be independent-minded have become propagandists and intellectually corrupt hirelings.

Only a handful of such people speak out against political correctness.

Not only do the favoured lobbies and their friends not encourage open scrutiny and criticism in politically correct areas, they actively act to suppress criticism and often, as well, smear the critic. They have become so powerful that they have been able to use the power of the state to attack and silence dissidents.

Intellectual corruption and conformity has been deeply entrenched and large amounts of public funds have been siphoned into the pockets of those who posture as defenders of minorities and the disadvantaged. This is particularly so in Aboriginal Affairs, multiculturalism and feminism.

Even the Australia Council, a body which is supposed to promote Australian culture and art, acts as a central propaganda agency for the government policies of multiculturalism, hard-line feminism and Asianisation. By its funding power it promotes those artists which agree with its agenda and excludes those who disagree. Most remain silent out of fear of losing potential grants. It has, with few exceptions, promoted a servile and conformist mentality among the supposed "consciences" of our nation.

The Australia Council links into a network of other coordinating sections of the bureaucracy such as the Office of Multicultural Affairs, located in the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. The former general manager of the Australia Council, Max Burke, is the head of the Office of Multicultural

Affairs (OMA). OMA is specifically charged to permeate multiculturalism though all mainstream departments, as the Australia Council is charged to do so throughout its operations.

The Bureau of Immigration and Population Research (BIPR) has acted as a propaganda agent for both high immigration and multiculturalism. It acts quickly to counter critics.

In politically correct areas, inquiries, boards, councils and committees are stacked with members or friends of favoured lobbies. Statistics are also abused and manipulated to suit the purpose and all this is publicly funded, so that the power of the state and the money of the public is used to promote policies which the majority do not support.

The main players, while claiming to represent the disadvantaged, or even to be disadvantaged themselves, are in fact privileged in comparison to the majority of the public.

They are a new cosmopolitan Ascendancy, holding the "old" Australian majority, from which most of them come, in contempt compared to "ethnics" and Aborigines, who are viewed through rose coloured glasses. The ethnic lobby itself uses Aboriginal matters as a stalking horse for its own agenda, including in the push for Racial Vilification Legislation.

Though many Australians instinctively understand that this process is happening, they would be shocked to discover that their country is effectively being taken from them as a result. This process has either been actively promoted by both major political parties, or allowed by them to happen.

This is part of a broader process which has afflicted all Western countries. In common with these other countries, a peculiar and parallel development of extremes in society has taken hold. Social regulation has been tightened, with an accompanying restriction of free speech, at the same time as economies have been rapidly freed of regulation.

It is as if, having been driven from the economic field, the regulators have focused all their energies in the social area in a Stalinist attempt to mould society in their image, while the laissez-faire advocates have largely abandoned social issues and focused all their energies on the economy. As a result social areas have been unreasonably restricted, while the economy has been left without sensible regulation. Both sides, while they may be antagonistic in some respects, effectively complement each other in the erosion of nations and national sovereignty.

The purpose of this book is to provide a background and specify some of the problems Australia is faced with in detail, particularly in the areas of immigration and multiculturalism. We will also be giving case studies of how insidious legislation has been promoted by intellectually corrupt means.

New class bureaucrats, academics and cultural professionals have become increasingly sophisticated in their social engineering, working together in areas such as the arts, museums, public and private multicultural bureaucracies, universities and the media to coordinate public relations campaigns and in

order to impose and promote their authoritarian ideology.

If this process continues much further, it will not matter which political party is in power, the dominant ideology will be so entrenched, governments will feel obliged to continue to support it. Both immigration and the policy of multiculturalism have been central to these developments. This is outlined in the largest section of this book, *Immigration and Consensus*.

In short, people who are supposed to support the nation and its people have been busily undermining it, for whatever reason. Many, if not most, of these people are of "old" Australian stock. Some are deluded utopians who honestly believe that we would all be better off if national sovereignty was broken down. Many are also driven by guilt about the past treatment of "minorities". Others are just following fashions. The breakdown of nations would lead to tribalism and anarchy, but, perhaps, those who promote it are seduced by the theory that we could all live in perfect harmony without nations.

It is a bitter irony that Paul Keating, who is assisting this process, claims to be an Australian nationalist. He is effectively promoting the hollowing out of the substance of nationalism, while pretending that his window dressing of a Republic would deliver us independence. Although the push for a Republic has been given an enormous amount of publicity, the deep seated and serious problems facing Australia are all but ignored in public debate. Unless these problems are confronted, our national sovereignty will continue to be eroded. Whether we are called a Republic or not will make little difference.

Of course Australia is not unique. This sort of thing is happening in other Western countries, particularly English speaking countries, notably the USA and Canada. But if you want to understand at least part of the reason why Australia is in serious difficulties, you should read this book.

Graeme Campbell MHR
Member for Kalgoorlie

and

Mark Uhlmann

PART I

MULTICULTURALISM: A DEFINITION

There is considerable confusion, much of it deliberately inspired, about the meaning of the words "multicultural" and "multiculturalism" and it is necessary to define the terms.

"Multicultural" is often used as a purely descriptive term to indicate a society composed of people of a variety of races and cultural backgrounds. Hence Australia is described as a "multicultural" society, even though the great majority of the population is still of "old" Australian stock and only about 10 per cent of the population is of non-English speaking background born overseas.

The great majority of Australians do not regard themselves as "multicultural" at all. They think of themselves as Australian pure and simple, as do many migrants.

So even in the seemingly innocent descriptive use the term is misleading and statistics are manipulated to make Australia appear much more "multicultural" than it is, in order to justify and make seem inevitable, a government policy in response.

So the term "multicultural" or "our multicultural society", while seemingly benign, is loaded, because its acceptance also implies acceptance, as a matter of course, of the government policy of "multiculturalism". Indeed the two words are often used interchangeably. Proponents also speak of "multicultural policies".

So when ex-Prime Minister Bob Hawke said in 1989 that Australia had "no choice" but to be a "multicultural" nation, what he was really saying was that it had no choice but to pursue a policy of multiculturalism. He deliberately confused the softer descriptive meaning of "multicultural" with the government policy.

In these circumstances anyone objecting to the policy of multiculturalism could be portrayed as objecting to the demonstrable fact of Australia's racial diversity. That person could be portrayed as not only unreasonable, but a racist.

This sort of misleading approach is often used by proponents of multiculturalism. Phillip Adams for instance, in the Weekend Australian of 9-10 January 1993 in "Building a New Babel" states, "The opponents of

multiculturalism fear a loss of social cohesion...What they fail to recognise is that our society would be multicultural to a bewildering and extraordinary degree [even had post war immigration never taken place]".

Mr Adams starts with the word "multiculturalism", indicating the government policy, but slides effortlessly to the purely descriptive term "multicultural" and uses it in its broadest possible sense to illustrate the diversity between people even in societies which may regard themselves as "mono-cultural".

There is no denying such diversity, but Mr Adams acts as though, as a matter of course, the case for the totally distinct government policy of multiculturalism has been made as a result, even though he has not even examined the objections people have to the policy in practice.

While serious questions can be asked as to what degree a nation, regardless of policy, can be racially and culturally diverse and still maintain social cohesion, our central criticism is of "multiculturalism" as a government policy and how it operates in practice.

Any fair minded person who looks closely at this policy in practice will find it deeply corrupt. It has not only swallowed up millions of dollars in intellectually corrupt research, bureaucratic funding and attempts at ethnic bribery, but promotes a multiplicity of often mutually hostile, narrow, ethnic nationalisms. It encourages migrants to fight the battles of the old world anew on our soil. There is only place for one nationalism in Australia - Australian nationalism, which encourages all residents to integrate as Australians, regardless of their ethnic background.

IMMIGRATION AND CONSENSUS

After his election as Prime Minister in 1983 Bob Hawke stressed that his aim was to achieve a consensus in Australian society. A woolly concept at the best of times, it came to mean that reaching a uniformity of opinion in public issues, or maintaining an illusion of uniformity, was promoted as the overriding virtue.

To initiate debate which threatened consensus, or caused a section of the population pain, was to be divisive, a term of abuse which implied that the person was not only insensitive, but wilfully destructive.

The participation of the general public was not called for in the achievement of a consensus. The consensus could be reached by various groups afforded elite status and then handed down from on high. If the general public showed signs of not living up to the high standard of consensus that was set for it, then something was wrong - with the general public. It would have to be attacked for its ignorance and/or educated to think correctly.

Snugly wrapped at the very heart of consensus were two interrelated issues which came to be afforded the status of sanctity: immigration and multiculturalism. The latter policy was foreshadowed by Mr Al Grassby, Immigration Minister in the Whitlam Government, under the influence of a model first adopted in Canada.

The policy of multiculturalism was subsequently embraced by the Fraser Government. It was felt among senior Liberals that the party had failed to court the "migrant" or "ethnic" vote and that the Labor Party had been much more effective.

The Fraser Government's first immigration minister, Michael MacKellar, oversaw the re-establishment of the immigration department, which, in 1974, had been downgraded to the Department of Labor and Immigration under the Whitlam Government. A strong connection was established between immigration and ethnic affairs, which was reflected in the title of the new department - the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. As part of this overhaul and influenced by ALP courting of ethnic groups, Mr MacKellar began a strategy to woo the so-called ethnic vote.

The Fraser Government believed that by appealing to and helping to establish so-called ethnic leaders, these leaders would deliver ethnic voting blocs to its cause. But the hoped for delivery of ethnic voting blocs to the Liberals didn't happen, nor do ethnic groups vote in blocs today.

As part of the policy of multiculturalism the Fraser Government funded

various people, particularly small groups of Greeks and Italians who claimed to represent their broader community.

However, as Dr Katharine Betts, in her book *Ideology and Immigration*, has pointed out, for all its rhetoric of multiculturalism, the Fraser Government continued to give preference to British people in immigration. The Greeks and Italians who had been funded and in effect established as pressure groups by the Fraser Government exerted pressure for a widening of family reunion provisions, believing that this would allow more Greeks and Italians to be admitted.

Mr MacKellar responded. As John Gardiner-Gaden stated, in his paper *The Multiculturalism and Immigration Debate 1973-93*, on 7 June 1978, "Mr MacKellar provided for the concessional entry of certain relatives (beyond the immediate and dependent) and introduced [a system]...so that occupational skills, literacy in mother tongue, competence in English and family ties in Australia could be factored into the selection process." This allowed the entry of non-retired aged parents, so long as most, or at least an equal number, of their family were already in Australia - the so-called "balance of family" test.

Mr MacKellar left the portfolio in December 1979 and was replaced by Ian Macphée. Continued pressure from the Greek and Italian groups on the new Minister saw more fundamental changes to the family reunion program.

In 1980 brothers and sisters became eligible for sponsorship. In 1981 the procedures were further eased. Age limits on children who were part of a family unit were removed and all working age parents were allowed to enter without a points test. The balance of family test was dropped.

There were other changes, both in general administration and specifically related to the Migration Act, in the 1975-80 period which have had profound consequences for the administration of immigration. Gardiner-Gaden notes, "until the mid-1970s there was ample scope for the exercise of Ministerial and Departmental discretion in the area of Immigration and the only avenue for appeal was effectively the High Court." As a result the power over immigration administration virtually rested solely with the government and the Immigration Department.

However the second half of the 1970s was the beginning of the end for straightforward administration of immigration. Gardiner-Gaden states, "Between 1975 and 1980 ... the Administrative Appeals Tribunal, the position of Ombudsman, the Determination of Refugee Status Committee and the Human Rights Committee [were all established]". In other words there was an explosion of bureaucracies which had a role or took an interest in immigration matters. Also Mr Macphée opened the gates to the courts and lawyers, who now so infest immigration matters, by making amendments to the Migration Act in 1980, which gave the Federal Court entry into the field. As a result immigration administration has become increasingly complex and decisions of the Immigration Department, particularly relating to people who have claimed refugee status, have been overturned in the courts.

Subsequent changes to migration law have made matters even more complex and a industry of migration agents, who have a vested interest in seeing the customers keep on coming, has been spawned. Combined with this has been the growing power of the ethnic lobby and the increasing intervention in immigration matters by Ministers senior to the Immigration Minister, including the Prime Minister, or at least Ministers who combine to push their own agendas against the advice of the Immigration Department. This happened for example in the case of the Chinese students, which will be considered later.

At times Immigration Ministers have seen matters directly relating to their portfolio taken out of their hands and the Immigration Department has seen its advice and/or warnings ignored and its senior officers sacked in response to external pressures.

At any rate, the administrative and legal changes were bi-partisan and though the expansion of the family reunion program was a Liberal initiative, the Labor Opposition - and the Australian Council of Trade Unions - had endorsed the wider family reunion approach to immigration before the Government. In general though, the ALP opposed large increases to the intake.

But the ALP, from the mid-1970s in Victoria, also became involved in an inter-factional tussle to gain ethnic support, which also became part of a general effort to counter the Liberals. The Socialist Left faction was the first to establish exclusively "ethnic" ALP branches in Melbourne. It has concentrated on establishing Greek branches. Its factional opponents on the right of the ALP responded by establishing exclusively ethnic branches of their own in competition. This has, for example, involved Greeks and Turks being ranged against each other across ALP factional boundaries.

This process was not generally realised or understood, until the article "Labor's Ethnic Branches Take Root" by John Masanauskas appeared in *The Age* of 23 May 1992. It noted that there were about 20 "ethnic" ALP branches in Melbourne and 14 of these were Greek.

Ernest Healy of Monash University has since produced a comprehensive paper on this issue for the journal *People and Place* (Vol 1, No 4, 1993) entitled "Ethnic ALP Branches - The Balkanisation of Labor". Healy states, "Currently there is a predominance of Greek and Italian branches, with at least fourteen of the former and seven of the latter. There are also two Kurdish branches, three Arabic, one Macedonian, two Turkish and one Timorese."

While there is also one Spanish branch, "a concerted effort is presently under way to mobilise people of Spanish speaking backgrounds with a view to forming at least another four branches. A staffer in the office of [Deputy Prime Minister] Brian Howe is contributing to the recruitment of Spanish speaking members, particularly in the electorates of Holt and Melbourne Ports." This sort of ethnic branch stacking has also been conducted in NSW and Queensland by ALP factions.

In spite of the claims of Greek and Italian professional ethnics that there

was a strong desire for expanded family reunion among their wider communities, very few Greeks and Italians took advantage of the changes initiated by Mr MacKellar and Mr Macphree to bring out relatives. More British people used this new category than Greeks and Italians. The big users of the new category were Asian people.

The Hawke Government inherited both the policy of multiculturalism, which it immediately embraced and strengthened and the family reunion change in immigration policy.

IMMIGRATION PRE-WAR

Prior to World War II, organised labour had traditionally opposed high immigration but the business sector had supported it. This was because immigration had the effect of forcing wages and working conditions down by adding to the supply of labour relative to demand. Business also believed a larger population would increase its market.

At various times in the 19th Century, employers had proposed importing cheap indentured labour from Asia, particularly after convict transportation to the Eastern Colonies ceased. Opposition to the introduction of cheap Asian workers came to loom large in the labour movement. In 1878, when the Australasian Steam Navigation Company replaced European seamen with cheaper Chinese labour, there was a strike which was supported by unions in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, South Australia and New Zealand. The strikers eventually won.

This positive proof that employers were prepared to use cheap Asian labour to displace European workers combined with fears of being overrun by the Chinese, in the wake of Chinese immigration during the gold rush, brought the union movement closer together. An intercolonial trade union congress was held in 1879 to call for entry restrictions on Chinese to Australia.

At the same time as the labour movement pushed for exclusion, conservative politicians, though representing employer groups, saw a value in the social cohesion they believed would be fostered in importing people of basically "British" stock. In other words the evolving idea of White Australia on both sides of politics was a very influential unifying factor among the colonies. This was one thing the conservatives and the labour movement could agree on. Between 1881 and 1888 the colonies enacted legislation restricting Chinese immigration.

At Federation the White Australia policy was one of the first pieces of legislation passed by the new Australian government. It was not only a unifying factor but laid the basis for the relative stability and prosperity of future generations. No matter how much people of today may abhor the racial hostility which was deeply felt in sections of the labour movement in particular and widely expressed in such papers as *The Bulletin*, this exclusion of cheap Asian

labour laid the basis for reforms in working conditions which set world standards.

If the labour movement had not been so vigorous in pressing for exclusion, Australia may well have gone the way of Malaysia and Fiji where cheap indentured labour was imported by the British, so keeping wages and working conditions down. Also hostility to the descendants of those labourers, who came to constitute large sections of the population, has been an on-going problem in Malaysia and led to the 1987 coups in Fiji.

If our forebears are to be judged on the White Australia policy they have to be judged according to standards and imperatives of their times. It should be remembered by those strident critics from the fashionable middle class left, including those who inhabit such publicly funded organisations as the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, that the famous names of the Labor Party strongly supported the White Australia policy. These included H.V. Evatt, the first president of the United Nations General Assembly, who announced the Declaration of Human Rights, but insisted that Australia had the right to choose the composition of its own people.

With the changing times though, the White Australia policy had to change. A perception of a relative slowness to adapt to the necessary change may help explain why the self-anointed elites are such champions of a high immigration intake today. Given our past they don't think we have a "moral" right to be firm in our own interests when it comes to immigration.

OVERSEAS COMPARISONS

In fact, Australia dismantled the White Australia Policy in a series of steps following the end of World War II. John Warhurst in his chapter of *The Politics of Australian Immigration* stated, "...the White Australia Policy was slowly dismantled between 1947 and 1973. The dismantling took place in a number of steps, with major announcements and/or policy changes taking place in 1947, 1956, 1958 and 1966. The White Australia Policy was removed from the ALP and Liberal Party platforms in 1965...". The most significant change, which in practice put an end to the policy, occurred under Prime Minister Harold Holt in 1966, only one year after the United States announced a fundamental overhaul of its immigration procedures.

In spite of this the claim continues to be made that the White Australia Policy was not abolished until 1973. Some have gone so far to promote the Immigration Minister of the time, Mr Al Grassby, as the driving force behind the abolition of the policy.

In fact the Whitlam government merely put the final seal on what was already the reality.

However as part of its symbolic attempt to divorce itself from past policy, Mr Grassby introduced a so-called "easy visa" system in July 1973. As stated

in *Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest* (No 3, 1975, Part 1), under this system, "tourists and other short-term visitors from non-European countries could, like most Europeans, obtain visas without the careful checks heretofore prevailing, simply by producing a pre-paid return ticket, a valid passport, a declaration they had enough funds to support their stay and a promise not to take a job while in Australia." This scheme was introduced at Mr Grassy's insistence and against the advice of senior Immigration Department officials, who clearly saw that it would be abused. Mr Grassby wanted to send a message to Third World countries that Australia was no longer a restrictive immigration country, however he decided that the system was on trial.

Overstaying jumped considerably. In February 1974 Mr Grassby withdrew the concession from Fiji, "because visas from there had increased three-fold and over-stays greatly increased." He also had to take measures against travel agents in South America, particularly Columbia, who had been telling their customers that they could arrange permanent settlement.

However it was not Mr Grassby who abolished this scheme, it was his successor Clyde Cameron who did so in January 1975. Mr Cameron stated that while visitors from Japan and the US strictly observed their visa conditions, visitors from other countries which had been allowed concessions under the system, overstayed and took jobs. He estimated that between 30,000 and 50,000 people had entered illegally.

In spite of this, pressure groups, particularly connected with the tourist industry, continue to push for the reintroduction of what would effectively be an "easy-visa" system for Asian countries such as China, which have a bad track record for producing overstayers. In fact an inquiry into "Australia's Visa System for Visitors" conducted by the Parliamentary Joint Standing Committee on Migration is one result of the pressure to soften the visa system. It will be interesting to read the recommendations of the committee.

Australia has been presented as some sort of special and damnable case because of its racially restrictive approach to immigration in the past, but it shared this in common with the other countries which ran immigration programs.

The main immigration receiving countries of the past were overwhelmingly European in composition. It is hardly surprising then that they would have chosen immigration intakes which reflected this composition. In fact, Asian nations of the present, such as Singapore, remain racially restrictive in immigration matters. Australia, with the USA and Canada, and to a lesser extent NZ, remain the main immigration-receiving nations today, though none run racially-restrictive immigration programs.

Israel of course encourages immigration, but it is restricted to people who are Jewish, or who have married Jews. The restrictive policies of the past were not justified as a case of racial superiority, but compatibility, as well as being justified on economic grounds. Australia's greatest statesman, Alfred

Deakin, made this very clear in his parliamentary address on the policy, which was never officially known as "White Australia". White Australia was the unofficial name for the policy.

Perhaps it is partly because of the bluntness of this name, which did not have a parallel in the other immigration-receiving nations, that Australians have been smeared as being almost uniquely racist by local multiculturalists.

In spite of the name, there was very little difference between the immigration policies of northern hemisphere nations like the USA and Canada and Australia. Canada restricted Chinese immigration by legislation in 1885. Canada's 1910 Immigration Act excluded, as noted in *Critical Years in Immigration* by F. Hawkins (1987), "any race deemed unsuited to the climate or requirements of Canada". The right to vote was denied to those of Asian origin up until the 1940s and restrictions on Asian immigration continued between 1946 and 1962. In 1962 new regulations changed much of this and in 1967 Canadian policy became explicitly non-discriminatory.

The US Congress passed a Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882. In spite of this Japanese and Filipinos continued to arrive. In 1907 an agreement was reached with Japan to stop the immigration and after the Philippines gained independence from the US that flow also stopped.

Between 1917 and 1925 the US passed a series of restrictive immigration bills based on the concept of "national origins". That is, the intake was designed, in its national composition, to mirror the ethnic composition of the US. This looked and sounded much better than the term "White Australia", but in practice was more restrictive.

The US "national origins" was designed to restrict the intake to people from Britain, Ireland and other Northern European countries and exclude Southern Europeans, which it did. As relatively few people from Northern Europe wanted to come the numbers of immigrants was also not large.

Ironically a number of Southern Europeans who had wanted to migrate to the USA and found themselves blocked were able to migrate to Australia between the wars.

An even greater irony is that the former chairman of both the Caucus Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Committee and the Joint Committee on Migration Regulations, Dr Andrew Theophanous - a man who presents himself as a vigorous anti-racist - put forward his own recommendations for an immigration overhaul, incorporating a version of the US quota system. This time however the quota element was designed to favour Southern Europeans, in spite of the fact that these days they don't want to come here.

Although the US officially dropped the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1943 because China was a wartime ally, this had little effect because of other factors built into the system. It was not until 1965, as stated, only one year before Australia itself finally dismantled White Australia, that Asian exclusion was effectively changed. The 1965 changes however, though motivated by what were represented as high moral considerations, turned out to be very different

in practice to what was anticipated. The enormity of the changes this act has wrought, with minimal input from the American people of the time, is only now being widely realised.

So, far from being an international pariah when it came to immigration, Australia moved more or less with the times. It was also one of the few nations to actually have a large official immigration policy. Those who did not and do not have such policies, particularly those who still have racially restrictive provisions for entry into their own countries, are hardly in a position to criticise either Australia, the US or Canada.

As noted, before World War II in Australia the labour movement continued to oppose immigration for economic reasons, but immigration continued strongly, except for periods of recession and depression.

The threat of invasion by Japan during World War II made a deep impression on Australian politicians. They saw Australians exposed as a tiny population inadequate to hold a vast continent against invaders. The 19th Century slogan "populate or perish" was revived and heard on all sides. The Chifley Labor government of the day was convinced we needed more people.

So it was mainly fear, the fear of invasion, which motivated the mass post-war immigration program. It was launched by Immigration Minister, Arthur Calwell, with bi-partisan support. The conservatives of course traditionally favoured immigration. The Menzies Government which followed continued it. General union agreement was gained by preventing wages and working conditions from being driven downwards, as they otherwise would have been.

This was achieved through protection of local industry from foreign competitors by high tariffs, which allowed employers good profit margins and the ability to pay relatively high wages. The manufacturers employed locals and migrants and supplied the local market. The building industry also did well, with a continuing flow of people to house. Australia paid its way internationally largely through its agricultural and mining sectors. Though large sections of these industries resented being obliged to subsidise local manufacturing industries, farmers were also subsidised by the government which provided a guaranteed market for produce.

Although there have been non-British settlers from the earliest days in Australia, the country was overwhelmingly of Anglo-Celtic descent before World War II. With the mass immigration program large numbers of people from continental European countries came to Australia, particularly from southern Italy and Greece. People in this wave were referred to as "new Australians".

The Australian people at the time was repeatedly assured that this mass immigration program would not upset the local way of life, that the country would not be dramatically altered.

Subsequently the promises upon which the immigration program was launched and maintained have not only proved to be false, but the changes wrought by post-war immigration have been used to justify the policy of

multiculturalism and strident demands from government that old Australians change their ways to suit the supposed needs and desires of the newcomers. Of course the general population was never asked about the policy of multiculturalism. It was just imposed upon them. Though academics, politicians and others have consistently tried to maintain that there is no connection between immigration and the policy of multiculturalism, the general public instinctively understands the connection.

WHITLAM AND FRASER

During the Whitlam Government the Labour movement eventually reasserted its more traditional opposition to immigration. Economic recession was a large factor, but not the only factor, though Mr Whitlam himself stated in his book *The Whitlam Government 1972-75* that "the Government, due to the advent of world recession, was forced to constantly reduce its annual targets for migrant intake. The size of the new settler program was reduced from 140,000 to 110,000 in December 1972 to 80,000 in late 1974 and to 50,000 in late 1975."

The administration of the program under Mr Al Grassby, who served as Minister for Immigration from December 1972 to June 1974, was unusual to say the least. As Peter Hartcher indicated in *The Sydney Morning Herald* article of 3 May 1991, "Why What's Best for Australia is Not Best for Australia", the approach Mr Grassby took to his portfolio was to "surrender" to special interest group pressures.

Hartcher noted - "in a year in which 112,000 immigrants entered Australia, Grassby's office decided the vast bulk of the annual intake on the basis of special interest without reference to the Immigration Department." The potential for abuse of such an approach is obvious. As noted, it was also Mr Grassby who foreshadowed the policy of multiculturalism, a concept which first gained credence in Canada, with the release of his paper, *A Multicultural Society for the Future* in 1973.

It was only after Mr Grassby had lost his seat in the 1974 election and was replaced as Minister that immigration levels were cut to the bone and, in a revamp of the department, Immigration was merged with the Department of Labour and relegated to second place. The new entity was called the Department of Labor and Immigration and the former Labour Minister, Clyde Cameron, became its minister in June 1974. Mr Cameron lasted less than a year in the new portfolio and was replaced in June 1975 by James McClelland, who held the post until the Whitlam government was dismissed by the Governor General, Sir John Kerr, only five months later.

With the advent of the Department of Labor and Immigration, the view was widely expressed that Australia had an obligation to train its own people in preference to bringing in skilled workers.

There were no accusations from ethnic groups that the changes and the immigration cuts were "racist", rather they were generally seen as being sensible in the economic circumstances. The defence rationale for immigration was widely held to be discredited and in recent years expert opinion from the Defence Department has confirmed that, in this age of technological warfare, population increase has little impact on our defence capabilities.

But the Fraser Government which replaced the Whitlam Government in late 1975 not only pushed the numbers back up, but, as has been seen, established a strong link between immigration and ethnic affairs. Criticism of the increased immigration intake became linked to criticism of ethnic groups. Betts notes that in 1976 Labor's Tom Uren, though he supported family reunion, criticised the general immigration increase. His criticism was attacked in Parliament by the Liberal, Roger Shipton as, "an insult to the migrant community...an attack upon migrants...an attack upon the relatives of people in Australia, it is an attack upon our refugee policies, and it is an attack upon migrant children."

This set the standard for the sort of emotive criticism people faced if they dared to question the immigration program. In 1979 the Fraser government established in Melbourne, as a statutory and "independent" body, the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs. This was part of its response to a report by the prominent lawyer Frank Galbally entitled *Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants*. Petro Georgiou, a senior adviser to Mr Fraser, was appointed as director, with Mr Galbally as chairman. Mr Georgiou was one of the prime movers on the Liberal side in the development of the policy of multiculturalism as a means of trying to gain the support of ethnic groups. In 1981 in his inaugural address to the Institute, Mr Fraser endorsed "multiculturalism" as the official policy of the Commonwealth Government.

During the Fraser years, pressure groups claiming the non-British migrants who had come to Australia since World War II and their descendants as their constituency, had an increasing influence on immigration policy. As has been seen their influence had the unintended consequence of increasing the component of Asian immigrants.

In fact the process which brought this about has extraordinary parallels with the experience of the US in the 1960s. It was largely pressure from organised groups of Southern European origin, once again mainly as an issue of status, which caused the US quota system to be scrapped.

As was to happen in Australia, these groups claimed that Southern Europeans wanted to come to the United States in large numbers and that the quota system prevented them. In the era of Civil Rights and the "Great Society" of President Johnson, the arguments, turning as they did upon the racial bias inherent in the quota system, carried the day. The Southern Europeans pushed for a system based on family reunion and Congress, guided by a subcommittee chaired by Senator Edward Kennedy, accepted it.

But again, as was to happen in Australia, relatively few Southern Europeans

took the opportunity provided under the new system to move to the United States. In practice the immigration program went from exclusiveness to another, far more distorted, extreme. Overwhelmingly the new immigrants came from the Third World in a chain migration process, their numbers building rapidly from what had been, in many cases, relatively small US populations.

As Peter Brimelow notes in his article "Time to Rethink Immigration?" in the (US) *National Review* of June 22, 1992 "85 per cent of the 11.8 million legal immigrants arriving in the US between 1971 and 1990" were from the Third World. In the mid-60s US immigration rates were running at about 300,000 a year. They are now running at about one million a year. Every single assurance given by Edward Kennedy about the act proved false. Senator Kennedy stated of the 1965 Act:

"our cities will not be flooded with a million immigrants annually. Under the proposed bill, the present level of immigration remains substantially the same...Secondly, the ethnic mix will not be upset...Contrary to the charges in some quarters, [the bill] will not inundate America with immigrants from any one country or area, or the most populated and deprived nations of Africa and Asia..."

The consequences since 1965 were totally unintended by the legislators, but this is only legal immigration. Illegal immigration is also overwhelmingly from the Third World, particularly Mexico and South America. *The Washington Post* of 6 May 1992, reported that Attorney General William P. Barr "said that nearly one-third of the first 6,000 [Los Angeles-Rodney King] riot suspects arrested and processed through the court system were illegal aliens".

Los Angeles itself has been ironically dubbed "the capital of the Third World" and the US, much more so than Australia, threatens to divide into a nation of tribes. The social conflict in US cities is a salutary warning, but so far Australia merely seems to be following in the wake of the US.

THE HAWKE GOVERNMENT

In the Hawke Government the Immigration Minister, Stewart West, again wanted to bring down the numbers and in particular to cut back on the skills intake of migrants. Mr West did not feel he could cut back on the family reunion and refugee areas, but he had a traditional Labor commitment to the training of locals, as did, initially, the Government.

Mr West stated in Parliament on 1 November 1983, "We will not continue to use, as the previous Government has done, the migration program as a substitute for sound work force planning. There is a requirement to train and retrain Australian residents and citizens to meet emerging labour needs."

An Australian Parliamentary Library background paper, prepared by long-time immigration critic, Dr Bob Birrell, with Ernest Healy and T.F Smith,

outlines the approach of the ALP at the time. The paper, released in March 1992, is called *Migration Selection During the Recession*.

The paper notes that in its early days, the Hawke Government introduced an "Occupational Share System" which restricted the entry of skilled migrants to areas which were deemed to be in short supply over the medium term in Australia. The determination of which skills were in short supply was made by the then Department of Employment and Industrial Relations (DEIR), which had Mr Ralph Willis as its minister.

The scheme was implemented in 1984-85. The paper notes that ceilings were placed on the number of migrants who could be selected in particular occupations over the program year. The government, in the words of its DEIR news release of 22 February 1984, aimed "to increase over time, through improved education and training efforts, the share of jobs in skilled occupations taken up by Australian residents. This objective is consistent with a policy of maximum self-sufficiency in skills."

But at the same time as the Hawke Government cut back on the intake of skilled migrants, it eased the criteria for the concessional family category, which consisted of "brothers and sisters, non-dependent children, parents not eligible for 'balance of family' and nieces and nephews sponsored by relatives resident in Australia".

As has been noted, this category had been introduced under Liberal Immigration Minister Ian Macphie - with the support of the then shadow Immigration Minister, Mick Young - in response to continued ethnic group pressure. At that time Concessional applicants had to pass a selection test which was weighted towards skills and English language ability.

On taking office the Hawke Government removed the English language requirement and less weight was given to skills. Again this was in response to pressure from government-funded professional ethnics, again mainly from southern Europe. This made it easier for people to qualify under the family category. In July 1986, the Concessional category replaced the Family sub-category C comprising non-dependent children and brothers and sisters and extended eligibility to nephews and nieces.

Not surprisingly the numbers coming in under this Concessional category expanded considerably and reached a high point of 39,426 in 1987-88. (While in 1988 the "balance of family" category was reintroduced for parents, requirements for this category were further watered down in response to ethnic pressures).

However, the initial pattern of cuts to skilled immigration meant that the overall numbers of migrants fell at first under Labor - to 62,000 in 1984. But the proportion of Asian migrants rose dramatically, because most of the proportion in the favoured family reunion and refugee categories were Asian. This, as with the Liberals, was an unintended consequence of the appeasement of so-called leaders of other ethnic groups.

Mr West, a member of the left wing of the Labor Party, was concerned

about the political allegiance of many of the refugees, who, coming from Indo-China, were not only anti-Communist, but overwhelmingly anti-socialist as well. They had little sympathy for the left wing of the Labor Party.

He was predisposed to continue a policy of refugee diversification, pushed for by the ALP's Mick Young when he was shadow immigration minister and agreed to by the then Minister, Ian Macphree. Mr Young explained in Parliament on 8 May 1984, that he "directed to the attention of the then Minister [Mr Macphree] who then accepted it, that under our humanitarian program we ought to accept some of the refugees from other places in the world so that our refugee program did not look as if it was based entirely on South East Asia. Such a program is now well under way."

So it was Mr Young who - apparently for appearances' sake - initially applied the pressure to mix and match refugees, Mr Macphree, who as immigration minister accepted it and Mr West who embraced and broadened the approach. This has continued under subsequent ministers.

Mr West, detailing ALP promises made before the 1983 election on immigration, stated in Parliament on 1 November 1983, "We promised to diversify the refugee program and the special humanitarian provisions for people in human rights difficulties. This had been done. Greater numbers of refugees from Central and South America, the Middle East and East Timor, including East Timorese in Portugal, will be resettled in Australia, in addition to Indo-Chinese and Eastern Europeans. The Government is also helping people affected by civil strife in Sri Lanka and the Lebanon, and by repression in El Salvador and Chile." This has been extended to nations in Africa.

In spite of this peculiar policy approach to refugees, which followed upon an approach initiated by Mr Young, it must also be said of Mr West that he was very sceptical about another component of the intake - the now discredited Business Migration Program. At that early stage of its evolution he clearly saw the potential of such a scheme for abuse.

Mr West was also sceptical about the effectiveness of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (AIMA). One of his criticisms was that it was desirable that Aboriginal Affairs fall within the province of the Institute and the AIMA act seemed to preclude that. Of course, from the early 1980s, there has been an ongoing attempt by multiculturalist organisations to bring Aboriginal Affairs into the multiculturalist empire, which has been strongly resisted by Aboriginal groups. But, as will be seen, the multiculturalists have had some success.

At any rate, on 24 July 1983, former Whitlam minister Dr Moss Cass was appointed as chairman of a committee of review to consider and report on the Institute's effectiveness. Dr Cass had been Immigration shadow Minister in 1978 at the time the proposal for the institute had been put forward. He welcomed it at that time on the basis that it operate as not merely an academic "ivory tower", but an organisation with contact with the "everyday problems" of ethnic groups.

Before beginning his official inquiries into AIMA, Dr Cass had described it as "sadly unrepresentative of ethnic communities". Apart from Dr Cass the other committee members were Eva Cox, a former Director of the NSW Council of Social Service, Professor Laki Jayasuriya of the University of WA and a member of the Commonwealth Government Immigration Advisory Council from 1972-75 under the Whitlam Government and Mr Alan Matheson, Ethnic Liaison Officer with the ACTU - a position he still holds, although under the "upgraded" title of International Officer. In other words it was a solidly ALP group inquiring into an institution established under the Fraser Liberal Government.

Again before beginning the inquiry, both Ms Cox and Mr Matheson had been publicly critical of AIMA, Ms Cox describing it as "politically suspect". That was precisely what Mr Galbally thought of the composition of the committee and he stated on 25 July 1983 to Mr Hawke and Mr West that, given this composition, it was highly unlikely that the outcome of the report would be favourable.

The report, handed down in November that year, damned the Institute as not fulfilling its functions effectively and being, in the words of Mr West "a costly failure". The report recommended that AIMA be replaced with a new body. Following strong public criticism of the report as politically biased, including from the Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia (FECCA), the recommendation was not adopted. Consultations continued through 1984 and in February 1985, under Chris Hurford as Minister, the AIMA Act was amended. The statutory functions of AMIA were increased, but its budget was cut.

PUBLIC DISCONTENT

There had been simmerings of discontent among the general public at the rate of increase in Asian immigration from the time of the Fraser Government. It was known by the "elites" that the general public was not happy with both the composition of the immigration intake and the policy of multiculturalism, but the general public was easy to handle as long as it had no focus and was not organised. All the elites, including crucially the great bulk of the media, were in agreement that these two issues should not be publicly discussed; or, if discussed, in such a way as to discredit those who questioned them.

It is true that many of these people were driven by good intentions. It was feared that the hostility which exists in every society of racial diversity, but was particularly claimed to exist in Australia, would overflow if not contained. Also there was a large degree of middle class guilt over the White Australia policy and a belief that our future lay in Asia.

We were part of Asia, or so we were told ad nauseam. It was madness to upset Asian countries by questioning Asian immigration. It was also in

extremely bad taste given our White Australia background. Therefore the immigration question was unexamined by the media, or, if examined, only in the most superficial terms. The "racist" general public had to be attacked, and/or educated. The onus was on the host population to adapt and change to accommodate the newcomers, without question as to what affect these newcomers might be having on the existing society.

Then in 1984 a prominent figure, Professor Geoffrey Blainey, who rightly speaking should have been seen as a member of the elite, one of the "educators", was perverse enough to break the consensus. He publicly criticised the rate of Asian immigration and said that social problems would result if it continued. He also strongly criticised the policy of multiculturalism and noted that during his time on the Australia Council he was directed by the government to give preference in funding to people of ethnic background. As the economist Stephen Rimmer notes in *The Cost of Multiculturalism* this "positive" discrimination aspect of multiculturalism has virtually become institutionalised throughout the public sector.

Professor Blainey was savagely attacked by the elites. He stood his ground. The public had a focus. A man of influence was articulating what was widely felt, but which had been suppressed.

In the ensuing backlash against Blainey, which saw his own academic colleagues savagely turn on him for daring to exercise his right of free speech, Stewart West was moved from Immigration. But his successor, Chris Hurford, was a believer in high immigration. He cited material such as the 1985 Committee for Economic Development of Australia (CEDA) report as support for the economic benefits of high immigration. One of the members of the steering committee of this report, Dr John Nieuwenhuysen, is the head of the Immigration Department's own research body, formerly called the Bureau of Immigration Research (BIR), but known since 27 May 1993 as the Bureau of Immigration and Population Research (BIPR). It is supposedly independent but continues to stress the benefits of high immigration.

The levels of immigration rose dramatically. Mr Hurford concentrated on increasing the economic category of the immigration intake, but the component of family reunion also continued to rise. In mid-1986 he opened up a new Independent category, which gave priority to people with university degrees and a sound employment record.

Though he stressed the economic importance of high immigration, Mr Hurford did not have a strong commitment to multiculturalism. In a separate announcement preceding the August 1986 Budget the Government announced cuts to the English as a Second Language Program, a cap on grants under the Ethnic Schools Program, the end of the Multicultural Education Program, the merger of the Special Broadcasting Service with the ABC and the abolition of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs. As the Treasurer of the time, the present Prime Minister, Mr Keating, must have approved of these measures.

POLITICAL OPPORTUNISM

Sensing a political opportunity in the on-going battle for the so-called "ethnic vote", members of the Liberal Party Opposition strongly criticised these changes and pronounced them as a sellout of ethnic groups. The changes were also met with hostility by ethnic pressure groups themselves, who with the backing of academics, bureaucrats and much of the media launched a campaign against them. The ethnic groups claimed that the ALP had broken promises it had made and it is certainly true that the ALP promised before the 1983 election to expand "multicultural television" Australia wide. The clear implication of that promise was that the "multicultural channel" would be maintained as a separate entity.

Amongst the critics was former Liberal shadow immigration minister Michael Hodgman. In Parliament on 25 September 1986 he, along with other Liberals, savagely attacked the government for the changes. In 1983-84 when he had been shadow minister, Mr Hodgman had attacked the government for very different reasons. He claimed then that the Immigration Minister of the time, Mr West, had a "vicious" anti-British and anti-European bias and that the immigration intake was unbalanced. In this September 1986 speech he again attacked Mr West, this time for his 1983 claim that AIMA had been a costly failure.

The Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, was alarmed at the reaction to the Budget changes and feared the support of ethnic pressure groups swinging to the Liberals and so attempted to regain their approval. He dropped the SBS-ABC merger proposal.

The Prime Minister's most significant act however was to establish the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA), not within the Immigration Department, but within his own department. The establishment of an organisation like OMA had in fact been foreshadowed by Mr Hurford in the second reading speech of the AIMA Repeal Bill on 25 September 1986. This was in response to the *Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services*, by Dr James Jupp, the first stage of which had been presented to the Government in August that year. The full document was tabled later that year.

The Jupp report said nothing about whether AIMA should be retained, but recommended the establishment of a new Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs. On August 22 that year the Prime Minister indicated in Parliament in answer to a question from Dr Theophanous, that the new body, proposed by Dr James Jupp, would be established within the Immigration Department.

But by late September it was being reported that the PM was considering taking overall control of the proposed new body himself. He did so, locating the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA) - the "Ethnic" was dropped from the title - in his office. In 1987 Mr Hurford was replaced as Immigration Minister by Mick Young, a man who had had experience as an Immigration shadow minister and was thought to be popular with ethnic groups. Dr James

Jupp became a close Hawke adviser on "multicultural matters" and now heads his own Centre for Immigration and Multicultural Studies at the Australian National University. He is also a frequent grant recipient.

A notable remark of Dr James Jupp was that what non-migrant Australians thought of the policy of multiculturalism was of no account because they had not been through the migrant experience. Under the patronage of Mr Hawke, Dr Jupp also edited the book, *The Face of Australia*, which was released in 1988 as a Bicentennial project. At its launch Mr Hawke was lavish in his praise of Mr Jupp and stated that Australia had "no choice" but to be a multicultural nation. In other words it had no choice but to pursue the policy of multiculturalism.

The staff of OMA was vetted by the Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia (FECCA), which itself was funded by the Federal Government and in fact would probably not exist without such funding. A former academic adviser to FECCA, Dr Peter Shergold, became the head of OMA. He later became a deputy secretary in the PM's Department and is now chief executive officer of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission. Certain members of FECCA are fond of running a "we made him what he is today" line, when he is discussed.

FECCA incidentally, announced on 3 December 1993 that it would be moving from its headquarters in Sydney and building a new national headquarters in Canberra.

ASIANISATION

These structural changes were accompanied by an increasing belief in academic, economic and bureaucratic circles that Australia had to integrate with Asia to secure its economic future. The rapid increase in Asian immigration, originally, as has been seen, an unintended consequence of the widening of family reunion provisions, was embraced by the elites, including the Hawke Government, as essential to our economic and social well being.

As Stephen Rimmer remarks, "the policy of Asianisation, while linked and allied with the multicultural lobby" has a number of philosophical differences and rejects the idea that all cultures are of equal value to Australia. It gives primacy to Asian countries and cultures. Many of the proponents of Asianisation view "multiculturalism as useful for engineering social change and suppressing public debate" and so actively support the policy.

One of the strong influences behind Asianisation is a former ambassador to China, Professor Ross Garnaut, who used to be one of Mr Hawke's close circle of personal advisers, derisively dubbed "the Manchu Court" by Paul Keating, while he was Treasurer.

However, Mr Keating, since he has become Prime Minister, for all his talk

of nationalism, has embraced the essentials of the Hawke position. Mr Keating uses Britain and British connections as a convenient straw man. Britain offers no threat to our national sovereignty or unity, but Mr Keating's attacks give the illusion of independence. At one and the same time he advocates "integration" - in reality dependency - in Asia.

Also, in spite of past private reservations about the policy of multiculturalism, he appeases the multiculturalist lobby. He is both afraid of a backlash from ethnic groups in his own electorate and determined to keep the fashionable elites on side, including arts bureaucrats from the Australia Council and their clients who push the politically correct line.

Professor Garnaut's 1989 report, *Australia and the North-East Asian Ascendancy* which was greeted ecstatically in the press, is, in its fundamentals and in spite of quibbles over tariff levels, Mr Keating's - as it was Mr Hawke's - blueprint for the future. Mr Keating has essentially embraced the ethos of the "Manchu Court" he once derided.

The "integration" of Australia into Asia is also enthusiastically pursued as a foreign policy objective by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Senator Gareth Evans, whose department released a report in late February 1992, called *Australia and the North-East Asia in the 1990s: Accelerating Change* which strongly backs the Garnaut position. Things are clearly not proceeding fast enough for the Foreign Affairs bureaucrats. The report has been nicknamed "the son of Garnaut".

In a consideration of another publication, Senator Evans's own book on foreign policy, released in 1991, *Australia's Foreign Relations in the World of the 1990s*, the article, "Australian Identity is Becoming More International" by Mark Metherell in *The Age* of 4 November 1991, quoted Senator Evans as making the claim that "increasingly Australians were accepting that their nation was part of Asia". This in spite of polling which indicates the exact opposite. For example the Saulwick Age Poll, published in *The Age* on 21 April 1992 indicated 70 per cent of Australians did not consider Australia part of Asia. Australia was considered a separate entity and the highest per centage of people who felt this was not among the older population, but the younger. People aged between 18 and 24 registered the highest - 79 per cent of them did not think Australia was part of Asia. Subsequent polls have turned up similar results.

In a foreword to his book Senator Evans says "The late 1980s and early 1990s are watershed years for Australia. We are, whether fully recognising it or not, engaged in nothing less than the reshaping of our national identity".

That is to say a section of the elites are attempting to engineer such a change, whether the people want it or not. Senator Evans is echoed by a herd of academics, who can always be guaranteed wide and uncritical publicity for their books on the need to Asianise. Another former ambassador to China, Dr Stephen FitzGerald recently spelt out the role of the elites. Dr FitzGerald, once offside with the Hawke government, following his 1988 immigration

report, which will be considered later, has made a strong comeback as the director-general of the Sydney-based Asia-Australia Institute.

He was quoted in the article by John Shaw, "Asiacrats push Australia's line" in the (Sydney) *Sun-Herald* of 21 November 1993 as stating: "These elites - intellectuals, bureaucrats, business people - are forging the ideas for Asia, setting the agendas, making policy. These are the travelling Asiacrats - many do little else now. There are literally hundreds of groups and gatherings specifically about regional cooperation."

Dr FitzGerald said he was also prepared to advocate "some kind of ultimate political confederation", ie: a ceding of Australian sovereignty to an Asian grouping of nations. Dr FitzGerald's institute is receiving \$2.5 million in government funding over the next five years. Senator Evans, in the same article, said the institute was "in the forefront of the debate on how Australia should manage its relationship in Asia."

One book given a dream run, barely touched by the breath of academic criticism, was *The Yellow Lady: Australian Impressions of Asia* by Alison Broinowski, who was formerly the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade's regional director for Victoria and is now director of Advocacy and Planning of the Australia Council.

The book was launched by the Governor-General Bill Hayden, who once stated that it was inevitable that Australia would become a "Eurasian" country and welcomed the prospect. More recently though he seems to have developed reservations about the administration of the immigration program.

The author of *The Yellow Lady* is the same Alison Broinowski who gave a speech at an immigration conference held by the Evatt Foundation in Sydney on April 24 1992. The conference was titled: "A Fatal Shore or a Worker's Paradise?". At the conclusion of her speech she asked, in all seriousness, why Australia did not have an immigration category for domestic servants! No doubt she thought a cheap foreign domestic would come in handy.

This is precisely the sort of thing which the labour movement in the past fought bitterly to prevent - namely the provision of cheap imported labour for the well off and wealthy at the expense of the wages and working conditions of locals. Ms Broinowski though, perhaps used to such a lifestyle when she resided as a diplomat in foreign countries, could clearly not see a contradiction. In another cringe, typical of the elites, she also said that any attempt by Australia to introduce an English test for skills would be seen by Asian nations as a revival of the White Australia policy.

Senator Evans, along with such morally advanced supporters, clearly sees himself as being a major agent in the process of Asianisation. He states in the concluding chapter of his own book that Australia's foreign policy, as driven by himself, is acting as an important catalyst in building a new Australian identity, "one which is much more internationalist and regionally focused, than before". Senator Evans may one day care to stop and ask the Australian

people, whose servant he is supposed to be, what they think of his words. So might the Prime Minister, Mr Keating, who clearly endorses them.

FAMILY REUNION ENGINE

In the mid to late 1980s the family reunion component of the immigration intake was the engine which drove the numbers up toward and beyond 150,000 per annum. Most in the family reunion category were low skilled and, as the ability to speak English had been downgraded as a requirement for immigration after 1984, many could not speak English. Low skilled people such as these would supposedly help improve our trade with Asia.

This policy of Asianisation was accompanied by an embracing of the free market and a pressure to cut protection of local industries, in line with Garnaut's recommendation to cut all tariffs by the year 2000, though the Keating Government has since changed tack slightly on tariffs.

But it was precisely these protected industries, such as automotive plants and the textiles, clothing and footwear industries where low skilled, non-English speaking migrants had been largely employed in the boom years of the past. By bringing in such large numbers of immigrants at the same time as future job prospects for them was declining Government policy was clearly contradicting itself.

The closure of the Nissan automotive plant in Victoria in early 1992 starkly illustrated this contradiction. A report in *The Australian Financial Review* of 17 March 1992, "Need to Train Car Workers in Literacy Skills" by Michael Lynch, highlighted the prevalence of migrant workers in the highly protected automotive industry. It quoted a survey by the Work Placed Education Project for the Victorian Automotive Industry Training Board stating that "over 71 per cent of the State's non trades car workers were from non English speaking backgrounds [and] over 34 per cent of these employees - typically production line workers - had arrived in Australia in the past five years."

"They, and the remainder of the of the 71 per cent non-English speakers, came from 53 countries and spoke a total of 67 different languages." How can such enterprises possibly compete with the Japanese and other monolingual countries as the Government continues to bring down the tariff walls protecting them? These industries will need massive injections of funds merely to bring communication skills up to scratch.

The lack of English language in the workplace was estimated by the Office of Multicultural Affairs itself to cost \$3.2 billion dollars per year in extra time needed to communicate. Though it later played down the figure, the cost is clearly substantial. Where will these workers be employed as the factories close?

The low skilled non-English background migrants the government is continuing to import directly compete with those already in Australia for scarce

positions. To continue to import people of this profile, as is done through the family reunion component in particular, works against both migrant and non-migrant Australians, as well as the best interests of the country in general. Australia is well on the way to creating an intractable pool of long term unemployed.

Also, particularly during the 1980s, the size of the immigration intake, which acted to boost demand, direct local savings to the unproductive areas of housing and infrastructure and stimulate private borrowing abroad, was in conflict with policies to dampen local demand for imports and encourage export capacity.

To complicate matters, from 1985, precisely as immigration numbers were rising substantially, the government cut back significantly on its spending. Public services such as hospitals, education and postal services have been compromised, but bureaucracies associated with immigration and multiculturalism have had little problem in getting funds. In fact they, with other politically correct bureaucracies which interlock with them, became a growth industry, even in the midst of the recession.

In the 1980s, the ever increasing immigration intake was also accompanied by a sustained attack on the worth of "old" Australians, who resented the changes and could not see how they benefited from them. The elites preached that it was precisely because Australians were so lazy, dull and unimaginative that such an immigration program was vital, to "invigorate" the country economically and make us face up to the "reality" that Australia was part of Asia.

The elites had also consistently pushed the line that Australia had no culture and that multiculturalism would invigorate us culturally as well, to the point where these attacks have been of significant impact in undermining local morale. Any commentator of reasonable intelligence should realise that good morale is fundamentally important to the economic health of a nation.

THE BUSINESS MIGRATION PROGRAM

In 1983 a program had been introduced designed to attract business migrants. Its introduction and subsequent justification is almost a classic case of the colonial mentality in action. Given that locals were considered second rate we had to import business people. In January 1988, under Mick Young as Minister, the prevailing belief in deregulation and the deification of the market saw the administration of the program virtually handed over to private enterprise middle men whose driving motivation was the profits they could make. They, at one and the same time, were employed and paid by prospective migrants, mainly from Hong Kong and Taiwan and also entrusted by the Government to decide which migrants gained entry to Australia!

When rumours of mismanagement arose, the bulk of the media relied on

the testimony of these middle men and others in the immigration industry. They of course, including representatives from the Immigration Department, claimed the scheme was working well and did not hesitate to smear critics as racist. The Business Migration Program became a byword as a massive rort, but for years nothing was done about it. Finally, in 1991, the all party Federal Public Accounts Committee was directed to investigate the program.

Lenore Taylor in *The Australian* of 25 April 1991, "Police Fear Business Migration Crime Link", reported that the Australian Federal Police stated in a submission to the Committee that it was concerned that: "individuals are arriving in Australia under the Business Migration Program by using funds provided by organised crime. It is thought that the funds are then recycled and used to fund further immigrants under the BMP. It is also suspected that the scheme is being used to launder money by known criminal groups which lend the immigrants the money required for the scheme. No apparent checks are made to ensure that the funds for the BMP are kept and used within Australia."

The AFP believed that Triad crime gangs were using the scheme to help them relocate to Australia before Hong Kong was taken over by the People's Republic of China. About 10,000 business migrants and 30,000 dependants entered Australia under the scheme.

The Australian Tax Office noted that in 1987 the Immigration Department had given it a list of the names of 100 successful business migration applicants, but had been unable to provide any other personal information. The Tax Office could trace only seven of the migrants and only two of those had lodged tax returns. Despite evidence such as this, the Immigration Department continued to claim that the program was working well right up until the Committee delivered its report on 21 June 1991.

The report was a scathing indictment of the Business Migration Program and also stands as an indictment of the integrity and professional competence of the Immigration Department itself. The Committee said that the program was flawed from the start, had been "disastrously" mismanaged and called for its abolition.

In spite of this the Secretary of the Immigration Department Chris Conybeare, subsequently claimed in letters to newspapers that the scheme had not been so bad after all and that any new scheme would be based on what he called the "successes of the old". What does it take before the Immigration Department and other high immigration advocates will face up to their failures?

Further, given that the elites are so desperately afraid of how Australia is perceived in Asia - sections of the press harp upon this theme constantly - it is interesting to note that the scheme became a standing joke among the Hong Kong business community. Far from increasing our prestige in Asia, it, along with the Education for Export fiasco, which will be considered later, has significantly diminished it.

The Business Migration Program has since been scrapped, but private sector immigration agents lobbied hard for a new scheme to suit their purposes. The new business scheme - the Independent/Business skills category - was announced by Mr Hand on December 17, 1991 and began in February 1992. The scheme has stricter controls, which will supposedly include extensive monitoring of the successful applicants.

The stricter controls have resulted in a considerable slowdown in the rate of applicants from the late 1980s when over 10,000 migrants were arriving annually. Those were boom years before the bubble economy burst of course and the recession has no doubt played a part in slowing down the intake. But the slowdown could also indicate that many of the profile of migrants formerly accepted under the lax assessment system would not meet the more stringent conditions. The new system may be discouraging the type of people who rorted the old scheme from applying. Much of the currency these rorters bought into the country is suspected of having been recycled. In other words the currency intake was largely illusionary.

As reported by Michael Millet in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 23 September 1992, "Stiffer Test Slashes Business Migration", the Immigration Department had had only 110 applications under this business skills category since it was introduced, but is continuing to process applications outstanding under the old scheme. It expected to meet its target of 5,000 migrants and dependents in the 1992-93 financial year.

The national migration agents body, the Migration Institute however, as might be expected, attacked the new rules applied by Immigration Department as being too strict. As ever, they, and others in the immigration industry, will lobby for more immigrants in areas likely to afford them personal profit, regardless of the best interests of Australia.

As a result of fiascos like the BMP, Australia has gained a reputation for mismanagement and confusion in dealing with Asian countries. Australia's pathetic efforts to graft itself to Asia is a source of bewilderment in Asia and has made us appear as a country sadly lacking in confidence. This has been exacerbated by the deeply embarrassing cringing attitude our officials adopt towards Asian countries.

It should also be noted that a de-facto guest worker scheme has been in operation in the tourist industry in Australia for several years, with Japanese-owned companies overwhelmingly employing Japanese nationals holding working holiday or temporary resident visas as tour guides, in preference to locals. This allows Japanese companies to form a network, whereby Japanese tourists fly into Australia on Japanese planes, stay at Japanese-owned hotels and go on Japanese-owned guided tours, filled with Japanese tour guides. Where the job prospects for Australians materialise is uncertain.

Attention was brought to this practice by a proposal in 1991 by Japanese tourist companies to import up to 2,000 Japanese to work as guides in the local industry. *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 3 June 1992 stated:

"Figures...show that last year, only five of 96 tour guides working with Japanese tourists in Cairns were Japanese-speaking Australians. On the Gold Coast only 36 of 218 guides were Australians. The remainder were Japanese [on short stay visas]".

THE FITZGERALD REPORT

In spite of general attempts to stifle debate on immigration, the public discontent with immigration was noted and acknowledged by Mick Young when he was Minister. In 1987 he commissioned a report into immigration and chose Dr Stephen FitzGerald, who, as noted and like Garnaut, was once an ambassador to China, to head the inquiry. Mr Young left the Immigration portfolio before the report was released. Mr Clyde Holding was the Immigration Minister when the report was handed down in 1988. It was widely expected that the report would back up the government. Instead the report, entitled *Immigration: A Commitment to Australia*, commonly known as *The FitzGerald Report*, was, by implication and in particular, very critical of the policy of multiculturalism.

During the inquiry Dr FitzGerald spoke to hundreds of people claiming to represent ethnic groups and not one of them spoke of immigration in terms of the national interest. He was disgusted and later commented privately that the ethnic lobby didn't "give a stuff" about the national interest. He personally became strongly opposed to the policy of multiculturalism. The report also recommended that Australia should "disengage" from the Indo-Chinese refugee program and merge the Independent and Concessional Family Reunion categories into an "Open" category, which took more account of Australian labour market needs.

As the paper *Migration Selection During the Recession* stated "The Committee agreed that extended family reunion was not a right and that only those meeting Australia's economic, demographic, social and cultural priorities should be selected." *The FitzGerald Report* favoured continuing high immigration rates, but with an emphasis on skilled workers. The criticisms of multiculturalism and the family reunion and refugee policies in the report were leaked by a disgruntled committee member to OMA, which subsequently orchestrated a campaign against the report even before it was delivered.

Once it was delivered both Mr Holding and Mr Hawke at first distanced themselves from it. Dr Andrew Theophanous, then chairman of the Caucus Committee on Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and chairman of the all party Migration Regulations Committee weighed in. Since shortly after entering parliament in 1980 Dr Theophanous had made immigration matters his speciality. He took it upon himself to condemn the report out of hand on behalf of the Labor Party.

Subsequently, the role of the Caucus Committee in the government's

consideration of the FitzGerald recommendations was crucial. In an address to the 3rd Year students of Dr Bob Birrell at Monash University on 23 May 1991, Dr Theophanous claimed that an Immigration Minister couldn't make decisions that went to Cabinet before they went through the Caucus Committee. He said there were 22 meetings of the Caucus Committee to consider the FitzGerald Report and "we then determined, with the Minister [then Senator Ray], the shape of things". He said that the committee got agreement with the Minister on 80 per cent of issues, but couldn't get agreement on four key issues.

Dr Theophanous said, as chair of the Caucus Committee, he was invited into Cabinet to put the case. The committee got its way on three out of four of those issues. The basic composition of the program was maintained: 50 per cent family reunion, 40 per cent economic and 10 per cent refugee, though the economic component actually fell. There was no "disengagement" from the Indo-Chinese refugee program and the Independent and Concessional categories were maintained, along of course with the policy of multiculturalism. The Minister had wanted points to be awarded for English language across the whole program, but the committee managed to exclude it as a factor in family reunion selections. The other change went to strengthen the primacy of family reunion in the immigration program.

The only victories the Minister achieved was to have regulations introduced to reduce the amount of Ministerial discretion in immigration matters as well as a slight adjustment in family reunion provisions. Senator Ray stated that Ministerial discretion had led to a "sleaze factor" in immigration decisions in the past. Discretion had allowed intensive lobbying of the Minister by pressure groups and so increased their influence over immigration decisions.

Senator Ray indicated in Parliament on 14 December 1989 when introducing the regulations that "in one instance in our history 110,000 people were admitted to this country by application to a Minister's office. More drug pushers got in in that one year than during the rest of the years put together... We have had Ministerial intervention without any accountability."

Senator Ray continued: "A [diligent] Minister will not be going out and spending \$1.5m to deport a drug pusher and, after all that money has been spent, have his colleague come in the next day and write one word on the form - admit - with a signature. We will do away with this business of marginal seat candidates trooping into a succession of Labor and Liberal Ministers and saying 'I must get this case up because it will help me save my seat'. All that rotten borough system had to be done away with. All that political sleaze had to be sunk, and the only way to sink it was to make migration policy into law and that is what we have sought to do."

However the Caucus Committee wanted Ministerial discretion to be maintained. There is a potential problem with complex regulation in that lawyers, spying profits to be made, could complicate immigration proceedings further, as indeed they have done. In fact immigration law has become

extremely complex and has spawned a parasite growth industry of migration agents. But that was not the basis of the Caucus Committee objection. As will be seen, in the face of this and other opposition, the Senator's victory was short lived.

At any rate sources in the Immigration Department have confirmed that widespread lobbying of the Department by politicians on behalf of others is still very common. There is nothing inherently wrong with this, but, as Senator Ray has indicated, there is considerable scope for problems to arise where the cases seem to have little intrinsic merit.

THE HOWARD OUTCRY

With the release of the FitzGerald report in June 1988, the Opposition Leader Mr Howard was seen to have been vindicated in his earlier attacks made in Parliament in May, with his shadow immigration minister Alan Cadman, on the undue emphasis on family reunion in the immigration program.

However Mr Howard went further than FitzGerald in subsequent comments on immigration and found himself at the centre of a political storm. In *The Politics of Australian Immigration*, Katharine Betts has a chapter dealing with the Howard Immigration controversy. She notes that as early as January 1988, Mr Howard had begun talking of the need for "One Australia" and clearly had reservations about the policy of multiculturalism.

However on 1 August 1988, the very day on which he terminated bipartisanship on immigration and explicitly rejected the policy of multiculturalism, he stated on radio that it would help social cohesion in Australia if Asian immigration "were slowed down a little".

Of course Mr Howard was well aware of polls showing public disenchantment with the levels of Asian immigration and obviously realised the political opportunity, but there is no doubt he was genuinely concerned about social stability.

As Dr Betts states, Mr Howard did not repeat these remarks, though other general comments later made by him were taken by the media as a coded way of letting the electorate know that Asian immigration would be slowed under his leadership. Still Mr Howard was against the statement being repeated and later expressed his own dismay at the way he had phrased his remarks. Six weeks after his comments on radio, Mr Howard sacked former Treasury secretary and Finance spokesman John Stone from the Opposition front bench for repeatedly calling for a reduction in Asian immigration.

Dr Betts notes that the media was at first confused in its response to Mr Howard's slowdown statement on radio, but a piece by senior Press Gallery journalist, Paul Kelly in *The Australian* on 5 August 1988, "Howard and the political game of Asian roulette" attacking Mr Howard for the comments set the tone for the media storm which was to follow.

It should be emphasised though that Mr Howard's approach to immigration differed little from that of the leader of the Opposition in 1984, Andrew Peacock, who also expressed his concern about social stability and "the fragility of the concept of community acceptance" of dramatic immigration changes. He stated in Parliament on 8 May 1984, that "the magnitude of the disaster for our community if the Government gets too far out in front of this issue cannot be understated".

At that time, Mr Peacock, in common with others in his party, including the shadow Immigration Minister of the time, Michael Hodgman - who at times ranted on the subject - attacked the government for "lack of balance" in the immigration program. They claimed that the Government was giving preference to people of Asian background and was biased against Europeans. The Opposition was clearly disturbed at the sudden changes, but basically and not surprisingly did not understand how the changes had come about.

They accused Mr West of engineering them. He became very suspect because of his decision, within 19 days of taking office, to scrap the preferential arrangements given to the Big Brother Movement. This British movement had been selecting its own young migrants for Australia since 1928 and sending them at the rate of about 200 a year. It was the last organisation of its type to have such a privilege and was clearly seen as an anachronism by Mr West, who, never the less, was basically standardising immigration procedures on the advice of his department. Former Liberal Minister Ian Macphree had been in favour of scrapping this arrangement before Mr West.

Although Mr West made statements indicating that Australia had an Asian destiny, the charge that he deliberately manipulated the intake to favour Asians or to disadvantage Europeans, does not stand up. Mr West though, like other members of the government, was very quick to call critics of immigration racists.

When put on the spot by the media Mr Peacock himself did not call for a cut or a slowdown in Asian immigration, just for more Europeans to be accepted. Mr Peacock was also attacked by the media for opportunism, and for implying through the general tenor of his comments that a cutback in Asian immigration was called for, but to nowhere near the same extent as Mr Howard was to be in 1988. On the ABC Radio Program *PM* on 9 May 1984, it was alleged that there was a split in the Opposition ranks over Mr Peacock's handling of the immigration issue and that Mr Macphree in particular had differences with Mr Peacock.

That same night in Parliament Mr Peacock denied a split and he was supported in a separate Parliamentary statement by his friend and supporter Mr Macphree. Mr Macphree stated, "The Opposition has continually called for a return to the bipartisan policy and has asked the Minister [Mr West] over and over again to explain why under his administration the European component has dropped...at no time did I imagine the Leader of the Opposition

[Mr Peacock] was saying anything different from what I was saying. Indeed, I know he was not."

Three months later, in Parliament on the 23 August 1984, in what was regarded by ethnic leaders and members of the media as a statesman-like speech, Mr Howard reiterated his express rejection "that the Liberal Party should take a stand against Asian immigration" which he had originally made two weeks earlier at the NSW convention of the Liberal Party. He stated that he was sickened by the fact that anyone who dared to criticise immigration was immediately branded racist. He also said that "of course [in common with the ALP] there are some people in the Liberal Party who have more discriminatory views on race and immigration than others". This was considered a mild rebuke to the Hodgman approach on the matter and even as an aside to Mr Peacock himself.

With Howard under attack for his 1988 comments a number of senior Liberals, including state Liberal leaders Nick Greiner and Jeff Kennett as well as Peacock and Macphee, distanced themselves from his remarks, which as stated were not so different from those Peacock and other Liberals made in 1984. The big differences were that unlike Peacock, Howard explicitly rejected the policy of multiculturalism and explicitly, if only once, called for a "slowdown" in Asian immigration.

Also the battle to overturn the 1986 Budget cuts had resulted in the professional ethnic organisations and their sympathisers, particularly in the media, becoming more organised and sophisticated. They became very effective at networking. As some have confided, the lessons they learned in that 1986 battle were used to good effect in the media campaign against Mr Howard.

But there was far more to the eventual downfall of Mr Howard as Liberal leader than the general position he took on immigration and multiculturalism and the resulting storm. A perception had been growing among the Opposition ranks that Mr Howard could not win the next election, due in 1990, even before the immigration storm broke. The underlying tensions between the Peacock and Howard camps emerged during the immigration uproar, as those who distanced themselves from Howard were in the Peacock camp. The immigration issue therefore presented an opportunity to the Peacock forces and the media uproar disturbed the waverers on the backbench. Mr Howard's position was thus weakened, but if the majority of the party had had faith in his ability to win the election, the immigration uproar would have passed and he would have continued as leader.

It focused an underlying discontent and highlighted the division between Howard-Peacock forces which had never been far below the surface since Mr Peacock committed the tactical blunder in 1985 which allowed Mr Howard to attain the leadership.

With the Liberal coup just before the 1990 election, Mr Andrew Peacock replaced Mr Howard and Mr Ruddock replaced Mr Alan Cadman as Shadow

Immigration Minister. Multiculturalism was again embraced and it was emphasised that Asian immigration was not an issue. The Liberal policy was still, as it had been under Howard and Cadman, to push the overall immigration numbers up.

CHINESE STUDENTS AND REFUGEES

Meanwhile, in an attempt to gain foreign currency, the Department of Education, Employment and Training has also had an effect on immigration. A new full-fee paying overseas student policy was introduced in 1986 under the then Minister, Mr John Dawkins. As part of this policy and again without adequate government controls, private English language schools were encouraged to establish themselves, mainly in Sydney and Melbourne. These schools were supposed to attract foreign, particularly Asian, students who would pay for a short term course and then return to their countries of origin. That was the theory.

From the very first these schools were used as a front by supposed students to obtain back door entry to Australia. The government was warned that this would happen. Even a Kung Fu school was allowed to recruit Chinese nationals as students. Loans were raised by students in places such as Hong Kong or on arrival and the students then worked in Australia to pay them back, with the result that much of the expected foreign exchange did not eventuate. Many of these students never attended the classes they had enrolled in. The Immigration Department under Clyde Holding officially passed on its concerns about abuses of the program to the Prime Minister Mr Hawke in March 1988, but was ignored.

After the 1989 massacre in Tiananmen Square, Australia found itself with thousands of Chinese students on its hands, the majority of whom had never intended to return to their homeland.

There were about 20,000 of these students in Australia at the time of the massacre.

In a teary intervention, Mr Hawke announced that the students could stay in Australia on temporary permits and 18,000 chose to do so. He said that none of them would be forced back to China against their will.

As John Masanauskas noted in *The Age* of 26 June 1991, "Document tells of student abuses", even before the massacre the Education Department routinely allowed such students to abuse visa conditions and turned a blind eye to the use of forged medical certificates. These forged certificates were used by the students as an excuse for not attending classes, while they worked instead. The Department did not want to know about other abuses of the system.

John Masanauskas also stated that "By August 1989 the Government seemed to be saying enough is enough when it announced that there would be

strict checking of the bona fides of thousands of Chinese who prepaid their course fees but had not yet been given visas. Despite the apparent toughness, opposition in Cabinet from the Education and Foreign Affairs Departments succeeded in watering down the policy. The result: an extra 25,000 Chinese nationals were allowed into Australia" after Tiananmen Square.

In other words the government cynically allowed the public to believe it was being tough while it allowed this second group in, knowing full well the sort of problems that might arise.

So, in summary, there are two groups of Chinese students - the first is the 20,000 who were here before the Tiananmen Square massacre, of whom 18,000 took up Mr Hawke's offer of temporary permits and the second comprises those who arrived after the massacre. Of the latter group, about 17,000 applied for refugee status and swamped the refugee processing system at the cost of millions of dollars. They claimed they were afraid to return to China, when they were freely allowed to leave China after the massacre.

Some of these students were very careless with their passports. As reported by John McNamee in *The Sunday Telegraph* of 3 May 1992 hundreds of passports belonging to Chinese students had been reported stolen in the previous few months. The report stated that, "Federal authorities suspect that the majority of the Chinese citizens reporting their passports lost or stolen have applied for refugee status in Australia." An Immigration Department spokesman was quoted as stating: "We think they believe, quite wrongly, that their applications for refugee status will be enhanced by them losing their passports."

However the report stated that "unofficially" the authorities thought that the lost and stolen passports "may be part of a racket involving the entry into the country of illegal immigrants". It will be remembered that a prominent member of the Chinese community in Melbourne, Wellington Lee, accused the bulk of these students of trading "on the blood" of the victims of the Tiananmen Square massacre. After the massacre it was common practice for these "students" to publish their names in newspapers under denunciations of the Chinese government. A number later cited such self-publication of their names as a reason why they would face persecution if they returned to China.

An article by David Lague, in *The Weekend Australian* of 1-2 May 1993, "Chinese immigration fraud rife", highlighted the high levels of fraud being practiced by people claiming to be dependents of Chinese students in Australia. The article also stated, "High levels of fraud have also been detected in applications for family reunion and short-term visitor visas. Senior Australian officials told *The Weekend Australian* that more than 90 per cent of the visa applications lodged in Shanghai were supported with fraudulent documents."

It was always clear that whatever the situation in China, the Australian government would not have the political will to return the first group of students. In fact Mr Keating in April 1992 wrote to a Chinese magazine to assure those of the 20,000 students still in Australia and who arrived before

the massacre that they would not be forced back to China against their will.

In effect he converted the four year visa extension granted by Mr Hawke into defacto permanent residency. Dr Hewson wrote a letter to the same magazine insisting that these students would be considered on a case by case basis if he led the Liberals to government. As he lost the election this resolution was never put to the test.

The Migration Regulations Committee conducted an inquiry into the issue of Chinese students as part of an overall consideration of the refugee issue. It delivered its final report, entitled *Australia's Refugee and Humanitarian System: Achieving a Balance Between Refuge and Control* in September 1992. Dr Theophanous, with Senator Barney Cooney, dissented with the majority finding of the other nine members of the committee. The majority strongly criticised the emotive actions of the former Prime Minister Mr Hawke in granting indefinite stay to those Chinese students in Australia at the time of the Tianamen Square massacre. The majority called for the students to be dealt with on a case by case basis after their four-year visas expired in 1994.

Members in the majority also accused Dr Theophanous of misrepresenting the majority view of the committee in the presentation of the report and giving more weight to his own views. Mr Hand also clashed heatedly with Dr Theophanous.

However after Mr Keating was returned in March 1993 and following the retirement of Mr Hand from parliament, Senator Bolkus was made the new immigration minister. On 19 October 1993 he officially announced that the first group of "students" would be allowed to stay.

These people and the members of their families they bring out, are in addition to announced immigration intakes. The government also allowed those in the second group who failed in their applications for refugee status to apply again under a new category with softer conditions. Other people such as Sri Lankans and those from the former Yugoslavia granted temporary residence during the time of Mr Hand are included in this category. Senator Bolkus said he expected that "only" 8,000 people would be accepted under this category, though how successfully he would remove those who failed is another matter.

With the chain migration effect the actual numbers of the students and those they sponsor is likely to be considerable. In fact the former Minister for Immigration, Mr Hand stated that if all these Chinese students were granted permanent residence they could sponsor a further 300,000 relatives under the family reunion scheme within a decade. The relatives in turn would be able to sponsor others. Even if the actual result is one third this number it will still be considerable.

It should be stressed though that the Immigration Department is not responsible for this fiasco. Mr Hand privately, like the Immigration Department under Senator Ray, opposed the blanket de-facto acceptance of the Chinese students announced by Mr Hawke. The Immigration Department also

consistently warned of the likely problems with the students from before the time of the massacre.

The principal responsibility for the fiasco lies with the Department of Education, Employment and Training under Mr Dawkins which imposed itself on immigration matters and exercised a minimum of supervision over the program it initiated. It is also the result of the personal intervention of Prime Minister Hawke in particular, but also the Department of Foreign Affairs under Senator Gareth Evans, which, with the Education Department, was instrumental in allowing the extra 25,000 Chinese students into the country after the massacre. Later, as noted, Mr Keating weighed in and compounded the problem.

A scheme which was aimed at raising money has, in large part, become a financial and social liability. No doubt the advisers who dreamed it up are still drawing healthy salaries and coming up with new schemes.

In fact they were dishonest enough to try to pretend that there were no problems with the program even in the face of solid evidence. Senator Robert Ray when he was Immigration Minister was very concerned about the issue. He had to bring Dr Bob Birrell of the National Population Council, the man who had been instrumental in bringing these problems to light, to Canberra from Melbourne to argue the point against officials of the Department of Employment, Education and Training, who were still defending their scheme.

Officers of this department further displayed their ignorance by sneering at Dr Birrell for alleged racism and sniggering behind his back while he delivered his appraisal.

The Federal and State governments have since expanded their education-selling activities in China. This includes the distribution of a promotional video throughout China and arrangements between the NSW TAFE system and a Chinese agency to provide Chinese students. Mr Dawkins also reached a similar agreement with Chinese counterparts before he left the Education portfolio to become Treasurer. Australia has also opened a consulate in the southern Chinese province of Guangdong, which will, among other staff, have immigration and education officials.

The Australian Financial Review article of April 19, 1993, "Chinese tourists our next big market" by Ian Thomas, indicated that the Australian Tourist Commission (ATC) is making a "tourism drive" into China. The ATC also has an office in China and its managing director Mr Hutchison is reported as stating, "...early information suggests that China could soon be on the way to becoming one of our biggest tourism markets by the turn of the century." He is clearly keen to promote the prospect.

There is no consideration at all by this tourism worthy of the probable problems with overstayers, given China's poor track record in this respect. Potential rorters will only need to fly in on a tourist visa, overstay and claim refugee status on the basis of fear of persecution if they return to China. Mr Hutchison and others like him should be held personally responsible for the

consequences of their schemes, to make them aware of a larger national interest, but of course they won't be.

In fact publicly-funded tourist bodies are pushing for the Federal Government to drop visa requirements for tourists from Asian countries. In the article, "Visa requirements 'alienating' migrants" by Carolyn Collins in *The Weekend Australian* of 15-16 January 1994, the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation South-East Asia director, Mr Mike Dywer said the visa system was outdated and highlighted "the alienation of Australia from the rest of Asia". Of course Mr Dywer claimed that there would be no problems if visas were scrapped. He seems unaware of what happened with the easy-visa scheme under Mr Grassby. The article stated of Mr Dywer, "he said state tourist authorities and the Australian Tourist Commission's Asian representatives had raised their concerns at a joint meeting late last year and had agreed to lobby the Government formally to have the issue examined." On 17 January *The Australian* backed Mr Dywer's call in its editorial "When visas impede tourism".

If visas were scrapped or drastically downgraded the tourist operators would take any profits and the bureaucrats the prestige, while costs would be passed on to the general public. The private "profits" will be highlighted, while the public costs will be hidden. These bureaucrats are so lacking in the concept of national responsibility that the costs of overstayers should be deducted from the budgets of their own organisations. Their salaries should also be cut according to such costs. Maybe this would help to concentrate their minds.

At any rate, the upshot of the Chinese student fiasco is that Australia will be accepting thousands of people as immigrants who it had no intention of accepting. This is on top of the officially admitted level of immigration, which the Immigration Department does want to maintain and increase and which its research body, the Bureau of Immigration (and Population) Research, which was established while Senator Ray was Minister, generally supports with selective reports.

As for the refugee program apart from the Chinese students, it is clear that it also has been massively rorted. Officials from the Immigration Department itself admit that up to 50 per cent of refugee applications are bogus. Given the record of the Department it is highly likely that it has understated the problem.

As far as boat people specifically go, Australia is facing a second wave. As David Jenkins noted in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 6 June 1992, "Destination Darwin", the first occurred after the fall of Saigon in 1975. About 2,000 Vietnamese boatpeople arrived in Australia between 1975 and 1981. Far more - 43,000 - were flown to Australia by plane from refugee camps in Asia during those years. Jenkins states: "Many [of the boatpeople] were ethnic Chinese fleeing persecution and harshly restrictive economic policies". However Jenkins states that there were indications that not all of the boats which arrived in Australia in that wave had set out from Vietnam. He quotes a source from the Immigration Department as stating: "The last boat, in 1981,

came from Thailand. But there were others we have always had great doubts about."

No refugee boats arrived in Australia for the next eight years.

The second wave, which began in 1989 with a boat from Cambodia, is different in character from the first and the claims of the boatpeople far more dubious.

The Immigration Department's former deputy secretary Mr Wayne Gibbons told the Migration Regulations Committee in July 1991 that refugee rorts would worsen if boat people in this second wave were given the right to apply for residence on humanitarian grounds as well as refugee grounds, as had been suggested in some quarters. He said: "If we relax controls on our borders, we are sending a great signal to the world which might result in large numbers of people turning up and trying their luck" and also "Worldwide, border claimants are not the most deserving of the refugee claim".

In spite of this clear warning, the chairman of the committee, the ubiquitous Dr Theophanous, strongly supported giving boat people "a second chance" to apply on humanitarian grounds if they failed the refugee test.

The comments of Dr Stephen FitzGerald should also be noted on this issue. While he supports high legal immigration and Asianisation he is clear eyed about the potential boat people threat. He told David Jenkins in another *Sydney Morning Herald* article, "A tide that must be turned", of 27 November 1993, "Once the corrupt [Chinese] Public Security Bureau and Armed Forces people in China wake up to the idea there's a quid in it and allow these little boats to set out, not caring a fig whether people drown, there could be whole armadas setting out from China...it would be a case of you ain't seen nothin' yet!"

Others such as Justice Marcus Einfeld and Church bodies deny that there is even potentially a problem and accuse those of raising the issue of racism.

At any rate, by February 1992 Mr Hand had honestly admitted that in refugee matters he "had been taken for a bit of a dill" by lawyers and others claiming to represent refugees. This is a refreshing change from the bureaucrats who generally refuse to admit any errors. Mr Hand indicated that the government would crack down, because, as he stated, "I hate rorters". He outlined procedures which he hoped would allow the prompt processing of refugee claims and the deportation of those whose claims were rejected. In the past some claims have taken several years to process, with the result that residential status was virtually assured by default. With the interventionism of the courts it is becoming increasingly difficult to exercise firm control.

The cost of accommodating these refugees runs into millions of dollars each year. A first assistant secretary in the Immigration Department, Mr Mark Sullivan, stated before a Senate Estimates Committee in April 1992 that 438 boatpeople had arrived in Australia between November 1989 and January that year. He said the cost of accommodating them was about \$6 million in the 1991-92 year and would be about \$8 million in the 1992-93 year. Mr

Sullivan said 22 of these people had absconded from their low security compounds and at that time 15 were still at large.

Not long after another eight Cambodians absconded from Villawood. The costs above of course do not include such things as legal aid, which is available to boatpeople to contest court cases against the Immigration Department and has provided a lucrative practice for lawyers. The Coalition estimated the overall cost to Australia involved in the processing of refugee claims - including the Chinese students - at about \$500 million. The then shadow Immigration Minister, Mr Philip Ruddock, said in a statement on 12 April 1992 that this estimate included, "benefits, holding arrangements, additional staff for refugee processing, legal assistance and so on."

It is one thing to process the refugees and another thing entirely to send them home. Cambodian boat people claiming to be refugees and held at Port Hedland indicated in early March 1992 that they would refuse to return to their country and would rather die in Australia.

They had already been here waiting a decision on their case for two years. This was basically been due to the delaying tactics of the people representing them, particularly "human rights" lawyers, the fact that Mr Hand was played for a dill and lengthy bureaucratic procedures.

As stated in the article "Hand gets tough on refugee hopefuls" by Lenore Taylor in *The Weekend Australian* of 14-15 March 1992, "From the first boat load [of the second wave] in 1989, Australia's refugee processing system was tested. Refugee applications were lodged a month after their arrival. But then a group of supporters and lawyers lobbied Mr Hand on behalf of the boat people, who said there had been insufficient time to write an application that would give them the best chance. Mr Hand agreed to the applications being relodged, but they were not lodged again for 16 months." The article notes that a similar pattern was followed with the next boatload of 119, who arrived in March 1990 and are being held in Villawood in Sydney. They used the same delaying tactics. A third boat of 79 Cambodians "arrived in June [1990] and took more than a year to lodge refugee applications in November 1991." The lawyers and others, including people from Church groups, then had the hide to blame the government for the largely engineered delay.

As indicated, these refugee claimants are never short of outside advisers, some of whom are experts at milking the media. Apart from the excellent factual article by Lenore Taylor, *The Weekend Australian* of the same date also published a piece on the refugees by the paper's foreign editor, Greg Sheridan under the headline "Serial murderers get more reasonable treatment." The front page of the paper also featured a large close up picture of the face of one of the refugees "baby Colin" behind a wire fence. Clearly the shot was set up to gain the maximum emotional impact. This sort of shallow emotionalism is typical of sections of the media in matters involving boat people and other refugee claimants.

The Cambodians went on a short lived hunger strike, which was readily

abandoned when their adviser, a locally-based Catholic priest, Father Larry Reitmeyer, suggested they should stop, as reported in *The West Australian* of 11 March, 1992, "Boatpeople end hunger protest" by Eddie Albrecht and Stephen Bevis. The Cambodians at Villawood also went on a hunger strike at about the same time. Father Reitmeyer is now based in Canberra as the head of a national Catholic refugee office, established by the bishops. The aim of this office, according to the article, "Catholic help for asylum seekers" by Fioana Curruthers in *The Australian* of 19 January 1993, is to "offer practical assistance to asylum seekers and attempt to influence immigration policy" - ie to try to considerably increase the numbers, in line with the issues paper put out by the Catholic Social Justice Council in September 1991 entitled, *I am a stranger: Will you welcome me?*

To Mr Hand's credit when he was Minister he stood firm and displayed great resolve on the boat people issue, in spite of generally being in favour of high immigration. After initially being taken for a ride, he learnt from bitter experience. He said that if he was "forced to sabotage the system" to allow the boat people to circumvent the process he would resign. This was a message to Mr Keating and other Cabinet Ministers that he would not tolerate the sort of intervention in his portfolio which had occurred in the past, particularly under the leadership of Mr Hawke. In parliament on 5 May 1992 Mr Hand stated: "Where I have the ability and control over matters that I am concerned with, I will be scrupulously fair and firm. The problem is that I have not always had that ability or control over certain things."

On the same date, Mr Hand also pointed out a media ploy which was used to try to milk sympathy for the boat people in Pt Hedland. Mr Hand stated: "a woman was shown on television stumbling out of a car. She was encouraged to run to the fence to embrace her son through the wire. But the departmental officers had made arrangements to have the gate open 50 yards down the road so that the car could drive in and she could embrace her son in a proper way. But that was not good television; that was not good copy."

Mr Hand also pointed to the tactics of some church leaders: "a bishop goes on television and alleges that the Department and I are engaged in some sort of compulsory abortion process, and then he carefully backs away. That is another outrageous lie - bishop or no bishop. That was never going to happen."

Although the Opposition under Mr Ruddock supported Mr Hand in his stand, following the election the new Opposition spokesman for immigration, Senator Jim Short, attacked the government over the detention of the Cambodians. This followed intensified and emotive media coverage, particularly from the ABC's *7.30 Report*, comparing the detention to concentration camp conditions. In fact, Mr Short's shadow portfolio was given the grandiose name of "Multicultural Australia, Immigration and Citizenship".

Following the Liberal election loss there was a renewed attempt to butter up the ethnic lobbies. This was reflected not only in the name of Mr Short's

portfolio, but in the fact that Sue Knowles was made the Shadow Minister for Multicultural Affairs.

After Mr Hewson was deposed as leader by Alexander Downer this portfolio was abolished and the name of Mr Short's portfolio became Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, as it had been before. Mr Short was also relegated to the outer ministry. Before he became leader, Mr Downer as shadow treasurer, had called for immigration to be cut on economic grounds. He has also stated that while he is a strong supporter of multiculturalism, this must be done in such a way as to promote a unified nation.

He has however made the rounds of the ethnic lobbies, notably, when on 16 June 1994, together with John Howard, he "kowtowed" to Chinese "community leaders" in Chinatown, Sydney, at a function organised by businessman Lawrence Lu. Mr Lu told *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 17 June, "Downer puts Liberals' multicultural policy on the table", as summarised by journalist Brad Norington, that "the Coalition's view on family reunions was very important to Chinese people. As well, the Chinese community would like Coalition support for [Federal] racial anti-vilification laws similar to those in NSW."

The state Liberal government in NSW has also created a Ministry of Multicultural Affairs, filled by one Michael Photios. He joined the chorus attacking the Federal government over the Cambodian boatpeople detention.

A complaint was also lodged with the UN Human Rights Committee on 20 June 1993 by Nick Poynder, co-ordinator of the Sydney-based Refugee Advice and Casework Service, accusing Australia of being in breach of its "international obligations" over the detention. Australia allowed complaints to be taken to this body in December 1991. Complaints can be made after, supposedly, all domestic legal avenues have been exhausted. Although the decisions of this body are not legally binding, they have a strong pseudo-moral force.

On 31 March this committee decided - and publicly announced on 8 April, 1994 - that Australia was in breach of its international human rights obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, over Tasmania's law making sodomy a criminal offence. Though a lengthy term of imprisonment is technically possible under this law, the law has not been enforced for many years. The complaint then was largely symbolic. This case was interesting in that the Australian Federal government effectively supported the complaint by Mr Nick Toonen against itself. This was in order to put pressure on Tasmania to overturn the law, on the grounds that it was causing Australia to be in breach of its "international obligations" and holding Australia to ridicule and contempt internationally. Alternatively, such a judgement provides a "moral" justification for the Federal Government to use its external affairs power to overturn the law.

Though we do not agree with the Tasmanian law, Tasmania is a democratic state and has the right to make and uphold its own laws as outlined in the

Constitution. It is up to the people who want the law changed to convince their fellow Tasmanians and their elected representatives to do so.

In spite of its claim to be forging an independent destiny for Australia, the government has encouraged a non-representative, foreign body to effectively dictate to us. This is in spite of the fact that not all countries who have representatives on the committee allow the committee the same liberty. Some come from countries where "human rights" are a joke. The committee itself is not even a proper court and yet seeks to influence laws of duly elected, democratic states.

The members of this Committee are as follows: Kurt Hendl, Austria; Julio Prado Vallejo, Ecuador; Omran El Shafel, Egypt; Christine Chanet, France; Nisuke Ando, Japan; Waleed Sadi, Jordan; Birame N'Diaye, Senegal; Bertil Wennergren, Sweden; Vojin Dimitrijevic, the former Yugoslavia; Francisco Urbina, Costa Rica; Marco Bruni Celli, Venezuela; Tamas Ban, Hungary; Laurel Frances, Jamaica; Rosalyn Higgins, UK; Rajsoomer Lallah, Mauritius; Andreas Movrommatis, Cyprus; Faust Pocar, Italy and Justice Elizabeth Evatt of Australia, who was appointed on 10 September 1992. Justice Evatt is the first Australian member and chairwoman.

Given the fact that the Federal Government has already assigned this committee such moral force, a successful complaint against the government, where it has not conspired with the person lodging the complaint for its own domestic purposes, would be highly embarrassing. The complaint regarding the detention of the Cambodian boatpeople had this potential, particularly given the loudly expressed opinions of the local human rights industry and the presence of one of its members, Dr Evatt, on the committee. Dr Evatt was also reportedly very influential in the finding in the Toonen case.

Almost inevitably the government backed down with the Cambodians. On 19 October 1993, at the same time as the announcement on Chinese students, Senator Bolkus announced a "special Assistance Category for Cambodians with Australian Links". These "Australian links" extend to those who illegally landed in this country by boat and have repeatedly failed in their applications for refugee status, while being detained at Port Hedland and also in Sydney and Melbourne. It also extends to those who chose earlier to return to Cambodia. This opens the way for permanent residence. However a qualifying period of 12 months in Cambodia is necessary before residence is granted. Most of the people from the camps who have consistently claimed that they are afraid to return to Cambodia have already done so in order to qualify under the conditions.

However nine Cambodians of ethnic Vietnamese descent and their 18 dependants were not obliged to return. They were granted refugee status on 21 January 1994 on the basis that they would be persecuted as ethnic Vietnamese if they returned. This reversed an earlier finding that they were not refugees. A report in *The Canberra Times* of 22 January, "Immigration Switch on Boatpeople" by Margo Kingston, quoted Nick Poynder. He stated,

We've
and they
for a year
is well. Pot
who run re
A group
Vietnamese
China who
the knowle
up. Ten o
Roebourt
Rights Co
to the In
from Pt
detainee
had in fe
groups.
Ano
also tra
discove
22 Ma
cross
strand
It
in the
they
status
volu
was
cal
of

"We've done a lot of negotiating about the people who are ethnic Vietnamese, and they've been advised not to take up the offer of returning to Cambodia for a year because of the danger." So the government caved in on this aspect as well. Potential "refugees" in both Cambodia and Vietnam and the operators who run refugee rackets will have noted this angle.

A group of Chinese were also detained in Pt Hedland along with some Vietnamese and Poles. These included some of the 56 boat people from South China who arrived in the Kimberley in WA on December 31, 1991 without the knowledge of authorities and wandered around for days before being picked up. Ten of these people were subsequently transferred from Pt Hedland to Roebourne jail. This sparked another humanitarian outcry and the Human Rights Commission was quick to jump in to "monitor" the situation. According to the Immigration Department, seven of these ten had previously escaped from Pt Hedland and were considered a threat to the safety of the other detainees and immigration staff. According to the department other detainees had in fact asked for them to be removed, though this was contested by church groups.

Another ten Chinese who arrived by boat in Darwin on 10 May 1992 were also transferred to Pt Hedland. Most remarkable of all however was the discovery of 12 Polish "boat people" on Saibai Island in the Torres Strait on 22 May. These people were clearly in the process of making an attempt to cross to Australia from Papua New Guinea when they found themselves stranded on the island and gave themselves up to local residents.

They had previously made inquiries to Australian immigration staff earlier in the month in Port Moresby about visiting Australia. They then stated that they faced political persecution if they returned to Poland, claimed refugee status and were transferred to Pt Hedland. They have since left Australia voluntarily, but Mr Ruddock was indeed correct in saying that their arrival was a disturbing precedent.

Apart from boatpeople we can expect an increase in "aeroplane" people. Aeroplane is not an uncommon mode of entry to western countries by so-called refugees, particularly in North America and Europe.

The arrival of the Chinese boat people was also very disturbing - apart from health concerns raised by graziers about the first group and the slackness of coastal monitoring - on two counts. The first is that, like the Poles, they could have no pretence for political persecution. Their motivation was clearly economic and there are no doubt tens of thousands of others from China who will be encouraged to try their luck if reasonable numbers from such expeditions succeed in gaining refugee status.

Secondly the Chinese boat people were assisted by Indonesia to reach Australia, particularly the first group of 56. It is a farce that many in this group who originally had their applications for asylum denied, have been successful on appeal to the Refugee Status Review Committee. The grounds are that they have a justified fear of persecution if they return to China.

An article in *The Age* of January 23, 1992, "Asians got help for voyage in Indonesia" by Chips Mackinolty, pointed out how these "refugees" had been assisted on their way to Australia. The story stated: "The Indonesian media reported in July [1991] that the boat people, who had come from southern China, had wrecked or substantially damaged their Chinese boat. They were forced to buy or trade-in their boat for an Indonesian one. An [Australian] immigration official, who refused to be named, said yesterday that preliminary interviews with some of the boat people have revealed that a number of them were detained by Indonesian authorities during the five months they spent in the Indonesian archipelago."

Naturally the Indonesians, who, like the Malaysians, have become tired of the demands boatpeople have placed upon their resources, would have no desire to accept them in the first place, but re-equipping them and sending them on to Australia would be a perfect way of both embarrassing and exerting influence on the Australian government. Both Malaysia and Indonesia have been upset by Australian criticism of their internal affairs and sending on refugees is one way of getting square.

There is always the threat that in the event of a major exodus many more could be actively assisted to reach Australia if relations with the countries to our north soured. The boat people would know, in those circumstances, that they were assured of stop-over points and assistance, making the trip less hazardous and therefore more attractive. During the Afghan war the former East Germany dumped thousands of people claiming to be refugees on West Germany, which because of its constitution - amended in the wake of reunification to try to stem the flow of economic refugees from Eastern Europe - was obliged to accept them. The refugees had been transported thousands of miles by air from Afghanistan by the Russians expressly for the purpose.

As noted in the article "Toilers of the East" by Louise de Rosario and Gordon Fairclough in *Far Eastern Economic Review* of 2 April 1992, China has used similar tactics in disputes with Taiwan. Also in the late 70s, Cuban leader Fidel Castro responded, during the presidency of Jimmy Carter, to the "humanitarian" policy of the US of accepting all Cuban nationals who arrived in the US as "refugees", by releasing inmates from Cuban jails and sending them to Florida. So the potential of using or orchestrating the movement of people into other states as an instrument of strong arm diplomacy, or war, is definitely there.

That is not to say that we need to cravenly appease Malaysia and Indonesia. Standing up for ourselves and our own values, while at the same time not indulging in over-moralising over their internal affairs will gain us respect. Our system and values are right for us, but it is arrogant in the extreme to attempt to impose our ways upon others. It is interesting to note that our relations with Malaysia, in particular, were far better before the new breed which fluctuates between craven appeasement and moralising took control in Foreign Affairs.

More generally, the contention has been put forward by B.A. Santamaria, Hugh Morgan and others that because of worldwide population pressures and movements Australia is obliged to continue with a large immigration and refugee program. The argument goes that if Australia cut its immigration intake significantly then we would eventually be forced to take more people anyway - with a large immigration program we at least have an element of choice.

Western Mining chief Hugh Morgan stated at a meeting of Australian and German industrialists in Berlin, as reported by *Australian Associated Press* (AAP) on October 29, 1992, that Australia should "open up to more immigrants". He has suggested that 500,000 immigrants per annum should be taken. At the same meeting attended by Mr Morgan, a leading German industrialist, Dr Eckhard Rohkamm, had earlier stated, as reported by the *Australian Financial Review* of 28 October in the article "Import cheap Asian labour, say Germans" by Andrew McCathie, that Australia should import "cheap Asian labour" to make it a more attractive place for business investment. It sounds as if Hugh had been having a word or two in Dr Rohkamm's ear. Dr Rohkamm said, "Australia must be prepared to open its borders and not live in splendid isolation". No doubt Mr Morgan and friend are animated by an altruistic concern for the welfare of the country and are not in the least self-interested.

Mr Santamaria is genuinely concerned about Australia's national interest and has made some very cogent points, but he believes that the United Nations might impose a solution upon us, or at least sanction large scale movements of people towards Australia, if we do not allow it ourselves.

The simple answer to that is that if population pressures ever get so great that such a movement is encouraged it will occur anyway, no matter what level of immigration we have. Also Australia is not exactly defenceless and Australians, at least at the grass roots level, are not so weak that they would allow themselves to be invaded without resistance. This after all is our country and we have the sovereign right to determine our own destiny. If the great majority of Australian people decide they are prepared to take their chances in cutting immigration, then that is their prerogative. This country is supposed to be a democracy after all.

Further the attitude that a solution will be imposed upon us no matter what we do implies a negative resignation and encourages immigration abuses to continue. Why bother to strive for proper selection procedures when we are going to be engulfed anyway? In fact there is no iron law to say that we will be engulfed, but if we court such a prospect, this prophecy will have a dangerous tendency to fulfil itself.

Australia is not only entitled to cut immigration significantly, it is also entitled to have a rigorous selection procedure for refugees. Indeed such a procedure is vital if abuses of the system and the flow of boat people to Australia are to be checked.

It is interesting to note that not all of the members of the Migration

Regulations Committee were as blase as Dr Theophanous about the refugee problem. One said privately that many boat people were wealthy and had bought their way to Australia, intending to enter through the back door. A report on ABC radio news on November 11, 1991 indicated that a number of Vietnamese refugees in Hong Kong camps had criminal records and others without records had been persuaded to operate with the criminals in protection rackets in the camps. These people had been among the most vociferous in opposing forced repatriation to Vietnam. Though the Vietnamese Government has said it would not persecute the people returned from the camps, it said it would prosecute people who had committed crimes before they had left.

In answering Question No. 1461 in Parliament on 8 February 1993, Mr Hand stated that during the 1991-92 year, the Immigration Department had paid \$665,000 to the Refugee Council of Australia and Australian Lawyers for Refugees to provide assistance to people making applications for refugee status and review of decisions.

This did not include aid for judicial review of refugee status decisions. In these cases there was ready access to scarce legal aid. Mr Hand said a limited amount of these costs were reimbursed to state and territory Legal Aid commissions by the Commonwealth specifically for such cases, but the major expenses were borne by the state and territory Legal Aid Commissions, which received some general funding from the Commonwealth. Mr Hand stated that "Persons seeking entry permits into Australia as refugees will often satisfy the legal aid eligibility criteria as they are often without means and risk detention and/or deportation if they become illegal entrants".

In other words virtually anyone can just turn up on our shores and use taxpayer funded assistance to lodge an application for refugee status, no matter how dubious, and then use scarce legal aid to contest the determination of status. Moreover there is an industry of lawyers and bleeding hearts to service them. This at a time when Legal Aid budgets are very tight and many eligible locals are being denied such funding. Mr Hand stated that Legal Aid Commissions had handled about 430 refugee matters since 1 July 1991.

On December 8 1992, the High Court upheld the right of the Department to detain illegal entrants, but struck down another provision which sought to deny a court the right to rule on the legality of their detention. So the Government has the right to detain, but courts have the right to determine whether that detention is legal or not.

The refugee procedures themselves, once again with scarce legal aid, were challenged by four Chinese people who had their claims for refugee status rejected. AAP of 15 April 1993 reported that one of these was a man who stowed away in a ship two years before and the other three were among a group of 33 who arrived in Darwin on March 4, 1991. Fifteen members of this group and a child born in detention had already been granted asylum. The basis of the appeal of the four was that in the words of their humanitarian lawyer, "the refugee assessment procedure is unfair because it does not afford

refugee
maker.
As no
of 15 Af
claimin
stem fr
prohibi
the cou
applic
La
decisi
comp
lengu
scin
file
com
May
The
ch.
1

a refugee applicant the opportunity of an oral hearing before the final decision-maker."

As noted in the article "Playing by the rules" by Steve Bunk in *The Bulletin* of 15 April 1993, "more than 75 refugee applicants [mainly Cambodian] are claiming damages in the High Court for alleged illegal detention. These actions stem from a High Court decision on legislation passed last May [1992] prohibiting the release of boat people from custody. On December 8 [1992] the court upheld the 1992 law, but indicated that long term detention of refugee applicants before its enactment could have been illegal."

Lawyers filed compensation claims for 75 boatpeople on the basis of this decision and the government responded by passing legislation limiting compensation to \$1 a day. *The Bulletin* article however failed to note that the length of the detentions were largely caused by the delaying tactics of lawyers acting for the boatpeople. They hoped to break the resolve of Mr Hand. Having failed to do that they then applied to the courts to allow the release into the community of the boat people, pending the result of their applications. The May law was passed in response, and this was challenged by the lawyers. Then on the basis of the High Court decision they claimed compensation. All this manipulation of the system has cost and is costing the Australian taxpayer a fortune.

Most of the media continues to portray the refugee problem in purely bleeding heart terms, as if all the refugees were merely innocent victims, instead of looking at the problem closely. It is clear that the soft approach taken in the past has made things worse, not better, and that countries such as Australia have in many cases been played for fools. The former Prime Minister of Singapore Lee Kuan Yew said as much several years ago. It is high time that the situation was dealt with firmly.

It should also be emphasised that criminals and spivs, including from our own country and New Zealand, among others, are involved in dubious activities in some South Pacific Island countries. Some have exploited business migration schemes in the islands.

Emeritus Professor Ron Crocombe of the Fiji-based University of the South Pacific, has written a book called *Pacific Neighbours: New Zealand's relations with other Pacific islands*", which in part deals with the problem. An article in *The Canberra Times* of 7 December 1992, "Carpetbaggers, crooks a threat to security", noted that even before the release of the book there had "been growing regional unease at the activities of doubtful characters who in the past have enjoyed high level access in a variety of countries including the Cook Islands, Fiji, the Marshalls, Papua New Guinea and Tonga."

Professor Crocombe notes that many of the suspected criminal elements enjoy high-level political access and in 1991 the South Pacific Chiefs of Police Conference in New Zealand stated that "international criminals were more of a threat to the internal security of South Pacific nations than any other external factor." Professor Crocombe gave the example of a Japanese man linked with

the Yakuza (Japanese mafia), "who has also provided enormous sums of money to the ruling party in Japan and to other 'good causes' to provide a base of popularity [and] invited all heads of Pacific Islands governments except New Zealand to Tokyo for discussions on aid to their countries. Every one attended."

ILLEGALS AND CRIME

Bob Bottom, a journalist and author who has written extensively on organised crime, used to produce a publication called *Insight Bookmagazine*. In its December/January (1991-92) edition he highlighted the problem of illegal immigrants in Australia. He stated that, at that time, authorities acknowledged the existence of at least 78,000 illegals living in Australia, though others have put the figure at over 100,000. Of the 78,000, about 70 per cent were said to hold down jobs which would otherwise be available to locals and 11 per cent drew the dole under false names. "Four out of ten of the illegals are suspected of doing underhand deals to avoid paying any income tax." Employers have also complained that the Commonwealth Employment Service "has sent them people for jobs who have turned out to be illegal immigrants."

Bottom notes, "One illegal immigrant, a Fijian, James Shiram Sundar, not only managed to live and work in Australia under a false name, but used four other aliases to milk the Social Security system to obtain multiple unemployment benefits totalling \$84,000."

Most apprehended illegals did not use false names, but 21 per cent were found to have Medicare cards and five per cent managed to get government accommodation subsidies. "More than 10 per cent also have been able to use millions of dollars in taxpayers' money in free legal aid." Bottom states, "When authorities raided an Indonesian fishing boat used to land illegals from Bangladesh on the north west coast of Western Australia in a highly organised scam, papers seized listed a number of Australian addresses and information on how best to use Australia's free legal aid system." Two of the eleven illegals had been deported previously.

Bottom notes that in Australia "some members of the legal fraternity, as well as fee charging immigrant advisory groups, specialise in exploiting loopholes in legislation and regulations on behalf of illegals. Authorities complain that most illegals lie to gain visas for temporary access, then seek out legal and civil liberty groups to campaign to be allowed to stay to achieve permanent residency status."

"Sixty percent of those caught entering Australia on visitor or tourist visas, stay on and go underground. With a boom in international tourism, the issue of short-term visas has exceeded 750,000 a year." Corruption within overseas agencies has also been a problem.

Mail order bride agencies have also acted as fronts for illegal immigration. Bottom states, "Cases have been recorded of immigrants terminating marriages

of convenience by divorce, then using their new status to sponsor a wife and family from overseas. According to immigration authorities, up to 70 per cent of all visitors applying for permanent residency by marrying or claiming defacto relationships with Australians are based on deliberate fraud."

Australia is the only country in the world to "recognise a de facto as legitimate for permanent residency on the same basis as a spouse", and this has been exploited by illegal immigrants.

The soft attitude of our governments in general has of course also been exploited. Bottom points out that amnesties for illegal immigrants in the past have been failures and have encouraged more illegals to come to Australia in the hope of amnesties in the future. However after the last amnesty in 1980 "legislation was enacted disallowing further proclamations and both major political parties agreed that there should not be any more."

This did not stop the rumours however, including one which was widely current in 1988, that illegals would be granted amnesty as part of Bicentennial celebrations. It has been claimed that migration agents in other countries stoked this rumour and arranged for illegals, who believed the rumours, to land in Australia. Of course there was no amnesty.

The cost to taxpayers of all this is enormous and includes such fees as legal aid, detentions, investigations and deportations.

But the bleeding heart industry, including large sections of the media, generally portray illegals as humanitarian cases.

In fact immigration/refugee/passport rackets are a big and growing worldwide business and are increasingly connected to organised crime groups.

In *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 24 January 1992 there was an article entitled "Billion dollar backdoor migrants" by Margaret Harris, which outlined the illegal immigration racket in China, thought to be controlled by Hong Kong Triad syndicates.

The organised illegal immigrant smugglers are known as "snakeheads". Harris stated: "The most complicated and successful immigration syndicate uncovered so far was one that flew 23,000 mainland Chinese to Venezuela between March 1989 and February 1990. Most came from Guandong province [as did Australia's Chinese boat people] and paid between US \$10,000 and \$17,000 for the trip."

"Those who take this route often get the money by borrowing from the syndicate members. When they get to their destination they are put to work in restaurants or factories and their wages are used to repay the debt." This was the pattern with many of the so-called Chinese students who have come to Australia. Also some of those people who have been financed by criminal organisations are believed to act as operatives for them in the new country.

In fact established mafia groups in the US are reported to be in decline and Asian-American and Latin American gangs are increasing their power. The Asian gangs have links to sophisticated Asia-based crime syndicates smuggling heroin and illegal immigrants.

The feature story in the 1 February 1993 edition of *Time* magazine was "Triads Go Global". The article stated: "Together with criminal groups in nearby parts of Asia and a network of shady businessmen and friends in high places, Hong Kong's underworld is ... traffic[ing] in lucrative contraband - notably, Southeast Asian heroin and mainland Chinese 'refugees' ... With sophisticated computer and communications links and an underground banking system, they [Triads] seem perfectly adapted to thrive in an increasingly transnational economy."

The article continues, Says Michael Ball of Britain's National Criminal Intelligence Service: 'It used to be that the problem of Chinese gangs was only in Hong Kong, New York, Amsterdam and the UK. They are still there, but they have moved into new places like Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. They are worldwide now.' The article further states: "The smuggling of Chinese nationals to America alone grosses the Triads and syndicates an estimated \$2.4 billion a year."

As stated, Canada is another country with such problems. *Reuters* news agency reported on 27 May 1992 that the West Coast-based Chinatown Merchants Association "says Canada's liberal politicians, afraid of being labelled racist, appear unwilling to crack down on illegal Asian immigrants who are terrorising Vancouver's large Chinese community." Spokesman Victor Cheng said that Asian criminals consider Canada a soft touch. He said, "The criminal community from South-East Asia knows that if they come to Canada they will not get deported."

Another Canadian new class brainstorm was to allow a Saudi woman refugee status because she supposedly feared persecution in Saudi Arabia due to her views on the status of women. This was her appeal of last resort after she had previously been rejected for asylum and had spent 21 months hiding from authorities. She was not only allowed to flout the law, but Canadian authorities said they might institutionalise her ground of appeal - namely refugee status on the basis of sex.

At any rate, there is no doubt that similar problems with Asian criminals exist in Australia. Despite attempts to tone down or cover up Asian gang activity on the part of Australian authorities, problems in Cabramatta in particular in recent times have come to the fore.

The murdered State Member for Cabramatta, Mr John Newman, had been trying to bring attention to the problem there for some time. As *The Sydney Morning Herald* of April 10 1993, in the article, "The shopping heaven that's a quiet hell for some", stated, the problems in Cabramatta were made clear "by the midday attack on April 1 on an 18 year-old man who was shot in the face by three youths armed with a rifle as he queued to buy a ticket at Cabramatta rail station....Gangs such as 5T - with over 100 members...the Trai Lu Lac...and smaller clusters of rough and ready teenagers, some as young as 12, are making their presence felt daily."

In December 1992, 17 year-old Thi Inthasen of Villawood was bashed to

death by
restaurant
in the stre
Mr Ne
Cabramat
threaten t
of these
really for
Cabram
Triads a
carry ou
the gan?

As far
Austra
the pe
was it
Th
the A
Resea
May
and t
over
higa

the
say
er

death by members of an Asian gang while eating with friends at a Cabramatta restaurant. He was dragged down the stairs after his beating and left bleeding in the street. He died later in hospital.

Mr Newman also reported an increasing incidence of "terror crimes" in Cabramatta, in which gangs invade houses, bind the occupants, rob them and threaten them with violence if they talk to the police. Mr Newman said many of these crimes go unreported. It has taken the murder of Mr Newman to really focus attention on the problem.

Cabramatta is only the most visible example of Asian gang activity. The Triads are more sophisticated, though they have used Vietnamese gangs to carry out work for them. Once again heroin trafficking is a central activity of the gangs and Triads, whether the members are young or old.

WHAT OF THE ACTU?

As far as the high immigration intake generally goes and its specific effect on Australian workers, what of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU), the peak union body and supposed guardian of working conditions? What was it doing while immigration numbers were being forced up?

The former Prime Minister Bob Hawke, a high profile past president of the ACTU, made some interesting comments during a Bureau of Immigration Research conference, entitled *The Politics of Immigration*, in Brisbane in May 1993. Mr Hawke said that the leadership of the major political parties and the ACTU had not only agreed to keep immigration off the political agenda over a number of years, but actively worked against public opinion to maintain high immigration.

He was agreeing with a thesis put forward by academic Ian McAllister of the Australian Defence Force Academy. Mr Hawke said, "what McAllister is saying is that there has been an implicit pact between the major parties to implement broad policies on immigration that they know are not generally endorsed by the electorate, and that they have done this by keeping the subject off the political agenda. Now from the broad experience I have had and the knowledge I have acquired first hand, I must say that I find it difficult to resist the basic thrust of McAllister's hypothesis..." He then went on to say that McAllister had not given enough credit in this process to the leadership of the ACTU, particularly Albert Monk, former secretary and long standing president, who preceded Mr Hawke himself in the position.

Mr Monk was an enthusiastic supporter of high immigration and as Warhurst noted in his chapter of *The Politics of Australian Immigration*, Monk travelled overseas on government business to do with unions and immigration and participated on government advisory and planning councils. He was even co-opted by the Department of Immigration to speak at Australian Citizenship

Conventions and was more than happy to present the high immigration case on the Department's behalf.

Warhurst stated, "Monk's commitment seems to have led him dangerously close to allowing his personal opinion to distort his presentation of ACTU policy. While the ACTU generally supported the Government - Labor or Coalition - on this issue, ACTU agenda papers were peppered with calls for cuts to, or cessation of, the program. This was the case, for example, at the 1952 Congress when the Congress decided that unemployment was too high to justify continued immigration."

In 1957 at an ACTU executive meeting, "Monk as president [was obliged] to read the meeting letters critical of the immigration program from the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the Building Workers Industrial Union, the Sheet Metal Workers Union, the Melbourne Trades Hall Council and the Queensland Trades and Labor Council (TLC), 'requesting the Executive to make its migration policy consistent with that determined by Congress'...The gist of the Queensland TLC motion was that the anti-immigration 1952 ACTU Congress decision still stood, yet members of the Executive [dominated by Mr Monk] were making statements that 'did not fit in with ACTU policy'". Mr Monk certainly does seem to have played a major role in this respect, as Mr Hawke indicates.

Why was Mr Hawke happy to boast of the subversion of democratic will? Perhaps because he was in front of an audience which he knew would be sympathetic to the notion that the elites know best and are implicitly morally superior to the masses and even the members of the organisations they are supposed to represent. The masses are presumed to be prejudiced and the elites enlightened, therefore the masses must be bypassed on such sensitive matters as immigration. Subversion of democracy in such cases is seen to work to the moral credit of those responsible.

However, as we have seen, this bipartisan understanding on immigration among the elites in fact broke down for a period during the Whitlam years. Mr Hawke at the time was president of the ACTU. Public figures connected with Labor tend to ignore this period however and claim that it has only been recently, specifically at the instigation of John Howard, that this consensus between the parties has been challenged. The former Treasurer John Dawkins for example, was reported by *The Australian* of 10 December 1993, as stating, "One of the great things about our immigration program up until the last five years was that there was bipartisan support for a level of immigration which was around the 100,000 [mark] and maybe a little more".

This is strange coming from Mr Dawkins who has been erratic, to say the least, on immigration matters. While formerly in favour of high immigration intakes, he himself called for immigration to be cut dramatically at the end of 1991. As part of his comments in *The Australian* of 10 December 1993, "Treasurer pushes for more migrants" by Laura Tingle, he called for higher

migration levels. This was not long before he resigned as Treasurer. At any rate he is not the only one who has this misunderstanding of history.

It is of course a convenient lapse of memory for those members of the ALP who wish to butter up high immigration lobbies today. However the fact is that, as Charles Price states in his chapter "Immigration and ethnic affairs" in the book *From Whitlam to Fraser*, the 1971 ALP national conference made an interesting decision regarding immigration. The conference affirmed that immigration selection should be racially non-discriminatory, but, in Price's words, decided that "bearing in mind the current recession, the strains which large-scale immigration imposed on welfare, education, housing and other social services, the rapid depletion of limited natural resources and the increase in popularity of notions of zero population growth, Labor's immigration policy would no longer be directed to the goal of increasing population."

Though the intake was high under Al Grassby as Minister in the Whitlam Government, the general ALP sentiment running against high immigration asserted itself during the latter stages of the Whitlam government, both in immigration numbers and philosophically. A Green Paper was delivered to the Prime Minister entitled, *Policies for Development of Manufacturing Industry* in October 1975, just one month before his dismissal by the Governor-General. In that report, otherwise known as the *Jackson Report*, under the heading "Australian Population Trends" (Vol 1, p 127), reference is made to the *Borrie Report* (*The First Report of the National Population Inquiry*). The *Jackson Report* states, "The other factor [apart from local birth rates] determining the rate of population growth is immigration, which is largely dependent upon government policy. The *Borrie Report* concludes that a return to the high level of migration in the post-war period is unlikely and against the current weight of opinion in Australia."

This opinion was clearly accepted at the time, not only by the members of the committee delivering the report, but the Whitlam government itself. Incidentally one of the members of the committee who produced the report was none other than Bob Hawke, in his capacity of president of the ACTU.

The Liberals however remained in favour of high immigration and upon assuming government under Malcolm Fraser immediately acted to push immigration up. This initially met resistance from figures on the ALP side of politics.

Mr Hawke, as shadow minister for Employment, Industrial Relations and Youth Affairs in the early '80s, used low immigration advocate Dr Bob Birrell as an adviser on immigration matters. In an address to a Young Labor Conference on 25 January 1981, Mr Hawke said in answer to a question, "...it's absurd, where you have young people unemployed to be bringing people from overseas to fill alleged or actual shortages." It was not until Mr Hawke actually became Prime Minister and was subject to the blandishments of the ethnic and big business lobbies that he could be said to have comprehensively proved himself a "high immigration man", as he claims he has always been.

During the Whitlam government low immigration enjoyed a brief ascendancy, not only on economic, but philosophical grounds. In spite of the previous support for high immigration under Mr Monk, the main reason that the ACTU these days feels inhibited in calling for cutbacks, even during strong economic downturns, is because of the influence of the ideology of multiculturalism.

So the high post war immigration program, which the ACTU supported until that brief period in the 1970s, produced the justification for multiculturalism, which in turn largely shapes its attitude to immigration today, at the expense, particularly, of its low skilled, blue collar members. Blue collar membership has in fact dropped significantly, while public sector white collar union membership has exerted a much more powerful influence in the ACTU in recent years.

During the rise of multiculturalism and a strident brand of feminism the ACTU found itself under attack by people of this profile and middle class left leaning academics for not taking these concerns to heart. The old guard of the ACTU resisted these criticisms initially, but gradually gave way.

People of the sort who made the criticisms, rejecting the aspirations of their own class, but not the comforts of the lifestyle, have systematically taken over the Labor Party. The agenda of these people reflect their own aspirations and desire for status. They may still support blue collar workers in specific efforts to secure better working conditions, but their support for a high immigration rate while protection is being dismantled means that wages and working conditions will invariably be undermined anyway.

Also in other respects, such as lifestyle, they regard the Australian working class with derision, particularly the working class male. They realise that the working class is most resistant to their agenda, particularly the god of multiculturalism. Workers who regard themselves first and foremost as Australian have not only been denied a voice but also their lifestyle and their value as human beings are being attacked by the organisations which are supposed to represent them. Bob Hawke, when Prime Minister, and other Labor politicians, were never slow to join these Volvo socialists in their attacks. The old Australian working class will find more sympathy for them as people in the mainstream old Australian middle class than they will amongst the trendy lefties and social poseurs who have insinuated themselves into their organisations.

So multiculturalism has become high on the Labor and ACTU agenda and, with the compositional changes in union membership, distorted their more traditional working class concerns. The ACTU, in its support of multiculturalism and fear of being branded racist, did not feel as though it could publicly criticise the high immigration levels.

In fact, particularly through its ethnic liaison or "international" officer, Alan Matheson, the ACTU is extremely anxious to appease ethnic lobby groups and so very reluctant to confront family reunion. Mr Matheson has also gone

so far as to suggest that there is little that can be done to prevent the worldwide movement of labour impacting upon Australia. This echoes the opinion of someone such as Michael Stutchbury of *The Australian Financial Review* who, in the past has advocated the "free" movement of labour, along with capital, between nations, as though labour were just a commodity and local governments had no obligations to their own people.

The "free" movement of labour would mean that the labour export schemes which already widely operate in Asia would be introduced into Australia, with devastating effects on local wages and working conditions. Local workers would essentially be faced with modern day indentured labourers as competitors, particularly if China entered the market in a big way.

China has yet to embrace labour export schemes to any great extent, but has made significant moves in that direction. The "Toilers of the East" article on migrant labour schemes cited previously, noted that China officially classifies 200 million of its workers as "surplus". Were a portion of those to be released onto an open Australian labour market the effects can be imagined. The Chinese also, according to the article, offered to send two million migrant workers to Japan, to the horror of the Japanese. We have already seen, on a small scale, the fiasco of the Darwin special economic zone, where low paid Chinese workers were imported to work in factories.

Such schemes continue to be urged by new class, multiculturalist academics who no doubt regard themselves as "humanitarian", along with various politicians and business lobbies. For example at the BIPR's conference, *Asia-Pacific migration affecting Australia*, held in Darwin from 14-17 September 1993, a paper entitled *Global population movements and their implications for Australia* was delivered. This paper advocated, as reported in *The Canberra Times* article of 15 September, "Immigration policies need to be more flexible" by Keith Scott, "that Australia could also benefit by employing temporary foreign labour on key infrastructure projects in remote areas where 'the costs of using Australian labour would preclude such developments'". In other words they advocate undercutting local workers with cheap imported labour in a way which brings to mind the coolie labour schemes of the 19th Century.

That Mr Matheson appears not to care about such potential problems illustrates just how out of touch he is with the sentiments of the people he is supposed to represent - Australian workers. In fact he acts as though he is little more than a captive of the multiculturalist industry and echoes their tactics in trying to take the high moral ground. He has called for "a positive strategy to combat racism" in Australia which no doubt involves more multiculturalist bureaucrats. He and the ACTU in general, as apologists for the policy of multiculturalism, have badly failed Australian workers on immigration.

Much of big business, many real estate operators, property developers and the like, realising multiculturalism's effect on immigration had moved in behind it with the ACTU. They were free, with ethnic pressure groups, to

push for ever higher immigration intakes without the opposition of organised labour. As has been seen, big business favours immigration both because it has a downward effect on wages and working conditions, particularly where those people come from countries with no strong tradition of organised labour, and because, for developers and real estate operators, more people mean more development, regardless of the best interests of the country.

There is a division between those who argue on the basis of economics (ie their perceived economic interests) and those in the multiculturalist camp who push for family reunion and refugees, but both broad groupings favour high immigration rates and use each other's arguments to justify such intakes.

In April 1991 however, the ACTU made a submission to Cabinet for a cut in immigration, though it was very careful not to target the family reunion category. The ACTU called for a cut in skilled immigration of 20,000. This was a short term response to the recession, which had little impact upon the Hawke-led government, but was at least a start. In 1992 the ACTU recommended a target of 110,000 for 1992-93, a feeble effort, fortunately ignored by Mr Hand who set the numbers 30,000 lower. The ACTU has clearly not been serious about cutting immigration.

The long term impact skilled immigration has on local training opportunities has to be considered by the ACTU. As long as employers know they can import skilled workers readily there is little incentive for them to train locals.

DOCTORS, SHEARERS AND OTHERS

Apart from locals losing opportunities for training, our unthinking cargo cult commitment to skilled immigration has also meant an oversupply of skills in some areas. The 1990-91 Budget papers acknowledged that overservicing by GPs was caused by the oversupply of doctors. The AMA at least recognised that this oversupply was largely caused by the immigration of doctors and acted to do something about it. Like engineers - whom we continue to import - we have too many doctors, at least in city areas, where the overwhelming majority of immigrant doctors settle. This not only leads to overservicing pressures, it denies local residents places in medical schools, which because of the oversupply have cut back on student numbers. Locals are also missing out on engineering training.

Yet the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Health Mr Howe was very slow to confront this problem. On the contrary he initially threatened to flood the country with foreign doctors in his battle with the AMA over his proposed Medicare patient charge of \$3.50, which was eventually revised downwards to \$2.50 in the face of opposition from the Labor Caucus and ultimately abandoned by Prime Minister Keating. This charge was proposed to offset the costs caused by overservicing.

Mr Howe's threat to use immigration as a way of attempting to break the strength of local doctors was an echo of the tactic some employers down the years have advocated to break the strength of trade unions. The irony - and the dangerous precedent he would have set - seemed to have been completely lost on him. Mr Howe though subsequently acknowledged that some form of entry restriction was necessary.

A paper drafted by the Director of the National Health Strategy, Ms Jenny Macklin, entitled *The Future of General Practice* and released on 15 March 1992, took account of the problem of the immigration of doctors. This paper, among other things, called for the intake of overseas doctors to be restricted to 10 per cent of the output of Australian medical schools, which themselves would face a 10 per cent cut in student places. Mr Howe supported the thrust of the proposals.

The Macklin paper pointed out that over 400 foreign doctors per year were being allowed to settle permanently in Australia, which was more than five times the number of overseas doctors allowed to settle in Canada, a country with a much larger population.

On 16 May 1992 Dr Howe announced that the number of overseas trained doctors allowed to settle in Australia would be reduced to 200 a year in 1992-93. This followed an announcement by Mr Hand that the qualification of medicine would be downgraded for immigration selection purposes.

But note should be taken of the problems Australian shearers have been experiencing. *The Australian* of 9 September 1991 stated: "In Victoria, Western Australia and Queensland, Australian shearers are gradually being outnumbered by their New Zealand counterparts to a point where more than 42 per cent of the country's flock is shorn by foreign hands. Meanwhile at least 80 per cent of Australian shearers remain unemployed." The Australian Workers Union NSW secretary, Mr Ernie Ecob remarked: "Over the last three and four months there has been a completely orchestrated, organised campaign by the National Farmers Federation to have these foreign teams come in and do the work which has been traditionally done every year, for 20 years, by the locals. The large graziers are bending to the wishes of the NFF to ensure they get the work."

In the article, "Shearers fear violence as Kiwis undercut rates" by Colin Williams and Richard Sproull in *The Australian*, it was reported that the itinerant NZ gangs were working for rates of about \$90 per 100 sheep, compared with the award rate of \$137. This is an example of the traditional attempts to undermine the wages and working conditions of locals by using cheap foreign labour. Further, much of the money earned by the itinerant workers is taken out of Australia. This trend has continued.

The shearers set up a camp outside Parliament House in May/June 1992 and put their case to the ALP Caucus. Among other things the shearers called for work permits for New Zealanders.

A resolution which did not support work permits was later accepted by caucus on 2 June 1992. It called on the government to "cancel those aspects of the travel arrangements that allow New Zealanders to work without paying income tax and in breach of awards". In spite of that the problem remains. The shearers continue to fight on the issue.

One evocative part of the shearers' general protests was a meeting on Sunday 31 May 1992 of a group of about 100 shearers under the Tree of Knowledge in Barcaldine, Queensland, to support their fellow shearers in Canberra. Under this tree in 1891 a group of shearers met following their disastrous defeat in strike action that year and their resolutions were instrumental in the formation of the Australian Labor Party. It is an understatement to say that in recent years they have become disillusioned with the party their predecessors helped to establish.

The Closer Economic Relations (CER) agreement between Australia and New Zealand stipulates free movement of labour between the countries. Historically Australia and New Zealand have had a special relationship and free movement between the countries has been part of the legacy. With changing times though circumstances are different. A passport requirement was introduced for travel between the countries in 1982 and clearly the case for work permits exists.

CER is basically a trade agreement and it does not follow at all that the freeing up of trade automatically means that labour should be able to move "freely" between nations if this is clearly shown or is likely to disadvantage local workers. An important factor to consider also is that Australia has no responsibility or control over New Zealand education and training standards. They may not be to our requirements or standards, yet the surplus NZ workers can still move freely into the Australian labour market, or NZ can be used as a point of access to gain illegal entry to Australia. Free trade does not automatically mean free movement of labour.

Yet in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 30 May, "Work curbs threat to ties, warns NZ" by Tony Wright, a spokesman for the New Zealand Minister for External Affairs and Trade is reported as stating: "You can't have free trade between countries without a free labour market." This is apparently the New Zealand Government position.

This one example of the shearers being undercut by cheap New Zealand labour gives a small scale indication of what would occur were the present push for freer trade with Asia to be followed by free movement of labour. As already indicated the consequences for local workers would be disastrous. Yet this prospect is seriously proposed by members of the academic and bureaucratic elites.

Is this to be the subtext to the "free" trade push - namely the deliberate undermining of local wages and working conditions by the "free" movement of labour in order to minimise production costs? It becomes clear why the bible of high finance in the USA, *The Wall Street Journal*, preaches open

borders in its editorial pages. Mr Keating, interviewed by Brad Crouch of *The Sunday Telegraph*, stated in its 12 December 1994 edition, under the title, "APEC is no easy cure" - "I would like to see open borders one day, with no trade restrictions, but I know that is a very distant goal." Not so distant perhaps as he has subsequently strongly supported the idea of extending CER to the Asian nations to our immediate north.

Whether doctors, shearers or carpet layers, Australian governments and bureaucrats have an obligation to support locals first. If they don't then nobody else will and if they don't why should locals have any respect or regard for their government?

It is clear from the example of doctors and shearers that immigration and itinerant foreign workers have had a negative impact on local employment. In a more general sense, while it is true that there is no hard evidence that immigration increases overall unemployment in the long term, people live in the short term and it can hardly be doubted that by increasing the labour pool it has a downward effect on wages and working conditions.

Wages in Australia are already among the lowest in the OECD, but select well paid economists continually stress that lower and middle income real wages must fall, while not suggesting that their own salaries or those of the bankers or executives many of them work for should be cut. In saying Australian real wages are too high they are not comparing us with OECD countries, but Asian countries. It is part of their grand vision of Asianisation that real wages should fall to those of Asian countries, so we can properly compete and/or "integrate" with Asia.

The call for Australia to integrate itself with Asia is essentially a call to the majority to deliver itself into the hands of the economic imperialists. These economists, bankers and big businesses would benefit individually, but Australia would merely become a colonial satellite, a quarry and construction dump, with the bulk of the locals a cheap labour pool without unity or a sense of national purpose.

People who support Asianisation, high immigration and the "free" movement of labour, should be very clear that in doing so, whatever noble motives they think they have, they are riding shotgun for those who would reverse all the gains in working conditions that the labour movement has fought for and which Australians in general take for granted. They are also acting as agents for the social disintegration of our country.

GRASSROOTS OPPOSITION

In the absence of opposition to immigration by bodies such as the ACTU and with the general hysteria surrounding the subject, organised grass roots opposition to immigration, despite general public discontent, was slow in coming. It began while Senator Ray was Minister. Groups formed opposed to

Australia's high immigration rate for environmental, economic and social reasons. Individuals, such as Dr Bob Birrell, had for many years stressed the problems of high population growth. As has been noted, when Bob Hawke first entered Parliament in 1980, it was Dr Birrell he contacted and asked to advise him on immigration matters.

In 1984 Dr Birrell was one of the editors of a book *Populate and Perish*, backed by the Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF). Sections of the ACF attempted to block publication, because its release coincided with the Blainey furore, but it went ahead. Under the former ACF leadership of executive director Phillip Toyne and president Peter Garrett though, population levels and particularly immigration policy, were not openly criticised. While Mr Hawke was Prime Minister there was clearly an understanding that the ACF would not rock the boat on such issues, in return for political favours.

One member of the ACF executive seemed to have no understanding of population issues at all, or even knowledge of past submissions calling for low immigration put forward in the name of the organisation. The president Peter Garrett, for all his rock star celebrity, went so far as to say: "immigration is not an issue at all for us", in spite of the fact that high immigration levels were very much a concern in the ACF submission to the FitzGerald inquiry, though the executive later disowned this submission. Further, the ACF in the 1970s repeatedly criticised immigration intakes.

Under the Hawke government, while the dominant sections of the conservation movement avoided one of the major issues confronting the environment, namely the effects of our very high rate of urban population growth, they alienated potential allies with the hysteria and the hyperbole of their approach to other issues. The problems of the environment are of genuine concern to the majority of the general public, but there is a strong risk they will become antagonistic if this approach continues.

A power struggle arose within the ACF between those who wanted to criticise immigration levels and those, such as the leadership, who wanted the issue suppressed in line with the general consensus of the elites.

Finally, by late 1991, Phillip Toyne garnered the courage to take a firm stand on population. He thought an annual immigration figure of 60,000 was reasonable and a draft policy to that effect was circulated to members in the ACF publication *Conservation News* early in 1992. A Sydney ACF councillor, Faye Sutton, had the job of analysing feedback. The majority opinion of members was to go much lower - to a position of nil net migration (ie: to match the numbers which leave Australia - in the order of 30,000 per annum). Ms Sutton drew up another draft policy which accurately reflected the views put to her, which was presented for ratification by full council meeting on 20-21 June 1992. This draft was rejected and "nil nett" migration was replaced with "Immigration to Australia should be looked at in terms of Ecological Sustainability and our humanitarian commitment to accept refugees."

Headed by new executive director Trish Caswell, a member of the trendy

left formerly with the Victorian Trades Hall, the ACF, though it technically has a low immigration policy, is once again effectively avoiding the issue. The new president, replacing Peter Garrett, is Professor David Yenken of Melbourne University.

Since their elevation, the ACF has done a deal with the Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia (FECCA), after FECCA initiated a move for closer relations. The two organisations signed a "charter of co-operation" in Canberra on 1 December 1993. In the charter, as reported by AAP, both groups "commit themselves to support the principle of ecologically sustainable development and cultural diversity". FECCA proposed the charter, "as part of its plan to broaden and strengthen its links with other community groups...The two commonly-held principles in the charter will be pursued through joint representation to governments and other bodies, disseminating material among each others' members and more frequent discussions."

On 29 November, AAP reported Professor Yenken as stating, "These new forms of alliance reflect the way the environment is being seen throughout the whole community as vital for the survival of the planet and for future generations of Australians." Oh really? FECCA is still the self-serving organisation it always was and is still all for high immigration. An alliance with FECCA means it may back the ACF on superficial or immediate issues, but will expect concessions on immigration in return. The ACF is also obliged to support the corrupt policy of multiculturalism.

While Phillip Toyne at least was eventually prepared to endorse a reasonable immigration figure, it should be remembered that he joined in the smear tactics against those who did have the courage to confront the issue within his own organisation in the days when the mud was flying at its thickest.

Environmental groups opposed to high immigration which did have the courage to confront the issue when it was taboo, included the Canberra-based Australians for An Ecologically Sustainable Population (AESP) and the Melbourne-based Australians Against Further Immigration (AAFI), both formed in 1988. These were the major groups to take a public stance against high immigration.

The first group, which includes poets Mark O'Connor and Judith Wright, concentrates strongly on environmental arguments for a significant cut in immigration as part of an overall population policy, though they also use economic arguments. AESP has no clear policy on multiculturalism. Some members are opposed to the policy and others are not and are hopeful that immigration can be cut significantly, while keeping the policy of multiculturalism in place.

President Jenny Goldie, who formerly worked for Senator Coulter of the Australian Democrats and frequently has letters to the editor published in newspapers, stated in a letter to *The Australian* of 16 March 1992 that "It may not be necessary to dismantle multiculturalism...in order to achieve an immigration policy in the national interest." That seems a deluded belief.

AESP has also been criticised in recent times by others, including ourselves. Though we are strongly in favour of low immigration, we do not accept that local birthrates are too high. As well as cutting immigration AESP wants the government to provide incentives for Australians to have less children, something we reject as unnecessary.

Australians Against Further Immigration do not concern themselves with local birthrates; their attack is focused on immigration. They are strongly opposed to the policy of multiculturalism and see it as fundamental to confront the policy in order to bring immigration policy under control. AAFI argues on environmental, economic and social grounds for cutting immigration to replacement levels, and the development of a more independent Australian outlook. Its members include Denis McCormack and founders Dr Rod Spencer and his wife Robyn.

Others, such as Stephen Joske, formerly of the Legislative Research Service of the Federal Parliamentary Library, specifically dealt with the economic costs of immigration. His 1989 paper *The Economics of Immigration: Who Benefits?* claimed that the immigration intake was adding as much as \$8 billion a year to the current account deficit and was distorting the economy. Australian savings, instead of being invested in productive capital, were being directed into building unproductive housing and infrastructure to accommodate the population increase brought about by immigration.

Further, there were not enough savings in Australia to cover the cost, so we borrowed overseas, so adding the \$8 billion to the current account deficit. Australians were not only subsidising an immigration intake they clearly did not want but the intake was pushing the country further into debt. Former Finance Minister and Senator, Peter Walsh, is of a similar opinion. Mr Joske's paper was met with considerable hostility by the BIR and Senator Ray and he was also attacked by Dr Neville Norman, author of the CEDA report.

Dr Norman also launched an attack on a critic of the CEDA report, Mr Brian Parmenter. Mr Parmenter, in his presidential address to the Victorian branch of the Economics Society in 1989, had cast serious doubts on Dr Norman's conceptual approach in the CEDA report. Other economists, including in the Federal Treasury and Department of Finance, are in agreement with Mr Joske's general point, though the overall economic cases for and against immigration in the longer term are matters of strong dispute.

SOCIAL SECURITY COSTS

The current account problems are quite apart from the social security payments which have to be paid out to the large number of immigrants who have entered Australia in the last few years and have been unable to find jobs, particularly those from non-English speaking backgrounds.

The paper *Immigration and the Recession* by Dr Bob Birrell released on

July 1, 1991 and based on Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, stated that the average unemployment rate for migrants from non-English speaking backgrounds who had arrived since 1986 was 21.6 per cent. For those arriving since January 1990 the rate was 44 per cent. Dr Birrell calculated that if the average level of unemployed from non-English speaking backgrounds of 48,000 was sustained over 1991-92 and they all received unemployment benefits at the single rate it would cost Australia \$340 million.

Even in the skilled area, Australia was bringing in - and continues to bring in - people such as engineers when there was an oversupply of engineers. These people were reluctant to look for work outside their area of expertise and so ended up unemployed. Further, the unskilled migrants who did find jobs in manufacturing were directly competing with locals for scarce positions. Dr Birrell asked: "Why then is the government continuing with a substantial migration intake most of whom will add directly to the dole bill or indirectly by taking up jobs locals could have filled?"

The BIR subsequently attempted to debunk Dr Birrell's findings. It commissioned a paper entitled *Immigrants and the Social Security System* by Peter Whiteford of the Social Policy Research Centre of the University of NSW. This paper was one of six delivered at the BIR's *Social Impact of Immigration* Conference at Macquarie University in September 1991.

Much of the media subsequently reported this document as though it was fact. The document however was seriously flawed as pointed out in a critique by Stephen Rimmer. Mr Rimmer noted that Mr Whiteford's paper "ignored ... important characteristics of migrants... these include English language ability - or the lack of it - and educational and occupational skills." Definitions were also changed in the Whiteford paper to suit the purpose. Mr Rimmer notes: "changing the use of definitions when results are not consistent with a hypothesis represents an unscientific misuse of statistical methods, which would not be tolerated in any university in Australia".

Mr Rimmer concluded that Mr Whiteford's paper did nothing to undermine the conclusions of Dr Birrell's paper. The BIR issued yet another report which, acknowledging the high unemployment rate of NESB migrants, tried to twist the argument to claim that this was because of workplace discrimination. The Australian Chamber of Manufactures called this report, "a very illogical, soft review, which doesn't prove anything" and remarked that as the government enticed such migrants, training them was the government's responsibility. It was not the role of employers to train migrants in the basics they needed to adapt to this country. Neither BIR report stands up to scrutiny.

Dr Birrell's original findings were further supported by the facts provided by the Department of Finance in October 1991 in response to a question put by the Opposition shadow minister for Social Security, Senator Alston. Senator Alston had asked for figures on the full year cost of the social security payout to migrants of less than one year's residence in Australia. The Department of Finance calculated that the payout for these migrants was \$251 million.

The BIR report, which aimed to downplay such payments, was clearly misleading. A further Department of Finance document, of 17 September 1991, estimated the major recurrent Commonwealth costs incurred in the first twelve months after migrant arrival, as at June 1991, as \$378 million. This includes other social security benefits, health and language training costs.

This pattern of high social security payouts has continued. More recent work from Dr Birrell's on the subject is contained in *People and Place*, the journal of his Centre for Population and Urban Research at Monash University. As *The Age* of 8 March 1993 states, "using previously unpublished data from the Department of Social Security, Dr Birrell said that in May last year about 30 per cent of migrants who arrived in 1991-92 did not have work. At the same time almost 33 per cent of migrants who had arrived in 1989-90 still had no employment...The most severely affected were migrants from Vietnam, Lebanon and Turkey, with more than half the 1991-92 arrivals on unemployment benefits. Two years after their arrival almost 60 per cent of Vietnamese did not have work in mid-1992. More than 97 per cent of Turkish migrants were jobless." In contradiction to official claims, "migrants were not being steadily absorbed into the workforce." The migrant groups experiencing the most difficulties were those in the family reunion and refugee categories.

Through most of this the BIR has acted to downplay the problem. In fact the quality of some of the work the BIR has commissioned is truly appalling. The worst example so far is probably *Immigration, Ethnic Conflicts and Social Cohesion*, by Cope, Castles and Kalantzis from the Centre for Multicultural Studies, University of Wollongong, a paper which was also delivered at the September 1991 conference. This is no more than a bigoted attack on "old" Australians, the very group which most heavily subsidises the writers. Ms Kalantzis has since been appointed as a "Professor" to James Cook University in Townsville. She is on the Bureau's advisory committee and is a commentator on "cultural matters" for ABC radio. Her articles feature regularly in the press.

CALL FOR RATIONAL DEBATE

At any rate, during Senator Ray's period as Minister, AESP and AAFI, as well as other individuals, called for a rational and open debate on immigration. Through the efforts of people such as these, more people began to realise just how high Australia's immigration intake was; how deliberate lack of scrutiny and intimidation of critics has allowed the immigration intake to steadily climb since 1984.

In an article in the *Current Affairs Bulletin* in May 1989, the demographer Dr Christabel Young of the ANU pointed out that, at that time, Australia's immigration intake was two or three times per capita the immigration intake

of Canada or the US. Largely because of an immigration rate at that time of upwards of 150,000 per annum, Australia had the highest rate of population growth in the developed world. She said then that if the growth rate continued, Australia would double its population in a bit over 40 years.

Most of the immigration intake settled in the major cities, so massive problems of congestion and pollution would eventuate. The quality of life of all would suffer. The effect of the immigration policy on urban infrastructure costs was underlined in a report delivered in March 1991 by the Economic Planning Advisory Council (EPAC), entitled *Urban and Regional Trends and Issues*. The report also notes, "It would seem indisputable that high levels of immigration have contributed to the very high growth in housing prices in Sydney in recent years."

The great bulk of immigrants settle disproportionately in Sydney and Melbourne and attempts to decentralise the intake have been historic failures. Where outflow from these cities occurs it is largely by longer term residents - who can no longer afford the price of living - to other cities. In the unlikely event that immigration decentralisation programs were seriously implemented in the future there is no indication that they would be any more successful than in the past. At any rate none worth the name are in place. This means that in considering the impact of the immigration intake it is simplistic in the extreme to point to the large size of the Australian land mass to justify a large intake, as for example was done in the Catholic Social Justice paper *I am a Stranger, Will you Welcome Me?*

It has frequently been claimed by such people as Northern Territory Chief Minister Marshall Perron and business consultant Phil Ruthven that the north of Australia can support tens of millions of people. On this basis they then claim that Australia should have a very high immigration intake as if the immigrants will somehow ignore the attractions of the south and magically change past behaviour by seeking out the north.

One of the best appraisals of the nature of the north was given by geographer O.H.K Spate to a conference at the Muslim University, Aligarh, India in 1956, at a time when there was a similar sort of simple-minded attitude to populating the north. This was republished in his book *Let Me Enjoy:-*

"Tropical Australia is a very hard land indeed, hard to get at, harder to scratch a living from. It has a monsoon climate but none of the geomorphological features which have enabled great populations to develop high civilizations in Asia. There is not a single river perennial for more than about two hundred miles from its mangrove-choked mouth; no snow mountains to feed massive irrigation work; no great alluvial deltas. The few pockets of good land are liable alternately to savage drought and to disastrous flood. Were the features of monsoon Asia found in monsoon Australia - say a 12,000 foot mountain range running down diagonally from Cape York - there might be many times the present

number of Australians. Or, to be more accurate and realistic, they would probably be Malays. The Malays certainly knew northern Australia long before the first white settlers, the Chinese very probably; had it been of any use to their economy, would they not have settled it with something more than an occasional ephemeral fishing camp?

Agriculture in the tropical North, on any significant scale, would require an almost fantastic degree of capitalization; and even assuming that unlimited shipping were available, it seems to me highly unlikely that in two decades one could settle more than five or ten million people on something like average Asian peasant standards; in other words a mere increase in the area of agrarian poverty. But what are five, ten, twenty millions to Asian population increases? One cannot empty an ocean into a pint-pot..."

It is clear that even if there was an attempt to settle large numbers of people in the north that there is no way, short of an harshly authoritarian government, of ensuring they stay there. Even if landed in the north, many, if not most, would naturally be attracted to the more settled and more promising areas of the continent. There would be an internal migration from the north to the south, as there is a migration from rural to urban areas in the Third World. This would put extreme strains on existing urban areas, both in economic and social terms.

Spatie also has an answer to those who claim that we failed to utilise the continent adequately:

Given the capital and technique available, it may be doubted whether any people would have done more with our pleasant (where habitable) but intractable continent. And if there is as yet only a handful of people in the North, it is not for want of a century of pioneering effort."

Quite apart from the fact that much of the rest of our land mass is largely infertile, it is the capacity of the major cities and our coastline to cope with immigration which must be considered, as that is where immigration impacts. There is a movement of people from country to city areas. Internal migration from the big cities within Australia is largely to regional urban areas, for example in south-east Queensland, laying the basis for more big, coastal cities. The rate of population growth in these urban areas is placing severe strains on local infrastructure. Australia, despite its size, is not some vast empty land waiting to be filled with people.

Within the big cities, the so-called solution of urban consolidation not only implies a lower quality of life for existing residents in cities, it does not effectively bring down the price of housing, one of the things its proponents, particularly those on the left wing of the ALP, claim it will do.

Local councils are also strongly resisting urban consolidation. And as was indicated in an article in the November 1991 edition of *The Independent Monthly*, "City living: why few can afford it" by A.N. Maiden, in Sydney's

experience, "in inner suburban areas...urban consolidation is perversely being achieved at the expense of low and moderate-cost rental accommodation". In North Sydney the accommodation mix "increasingly excludes low-to-moderate income earners and virtually all first home buyers".

The article goes on to state: "It is difficult to escape the conclusion that urban consolidation is at best a holding operation - a program of apparent action that can be pursued with apparent vigour until environmental and economic constraints at the fringes impose a market-dominated price solution to Sydney's housing crisis. And that solution will be to exclude the population that cannot afford soaring home prices. For an urban consolidation program to achieve anything else will require draconian changes in the lifestyle that generations of Australians have come to regard as their birthright."

Yet as Dr Birrell states in his article in the book *Immigration, Population and Sustainable Environments*, "Though officialdom rarely acknowledges it, the message is that in their scale of values the well-being of the next generation of Australians living in Sydney and Melbourne is less important than the maintenance of high immigration."

There have also been contentions that immigration can overcome the problem of an aging population and that without immigration our population would decline. These contentions have been demolished by the work of Dr Christabel Young. She has found that in fact, without any immigration, our population would grow by several million by the end of the first quarter of the 21st century. Even a report by the Bureau of Immigration Research has supported this, though high immigration spokesmen had earlier contended that immigration was needed to offset a supposed population decline which would result from Australia being below replacement fertility levels.

But in spite of Dr Young's work, Dr Andrew Theophanous and others continued to claim that immigration could play a significant part in retarding the ageing process. The fact is that our rate of natural increase is enough to cope with, we do not need to import such a large number of people.

During the 1990 election campaign, despite a general avoidance of the issue, immigration again impinged briefly with the issue of the Multifunction Polis, a Japanese "future city" with implications for immigration policy, planned for Gilman in South Australia. Opposition leader Andrew Peacock was accused of racism, particularly by Paul Kelly of *The Australian* for his opposition to the MFP on the basis that it would establish a foreign "enclave". It was also Kelly who had led the attack against John Howard over his Asian immigration slowdown comments.

The criticism of the MFP went far deeper than the enclave element of course. Though most of the media were blinded by its superficial gee-whiz appeal, the cargo cult baby has proved, as its critics said it would, to be still born. Dr Joseph Wayne Smith, of the Flinders University of South Australia, was one of the most effective critics of this project. His work demolished the claims of those who promoted the MFP as some sort of gold mine. In spite of

this the Federal Government, particularly the Industry Minister John Button, strongly backed the project and provided finance.

In January 1994 the incoming Liberal government of South Australia downgraded the project. Former ALP Premier John Bannon who embraced the concept had some time earlier resigned as Premier, following a string of financial disasters. He left South Australia with the highest per capita debt of any Australian state. As in Victoria, the financial losses were largely caused by property speculation. The MFP, at bottom, was just another dubious property deal.

After the re-election of the ALP in 1990, the new opposition leader Dr John Hewson called for a rational and open debate on immigration. Then there was a real bombshell, Senator Peter Walsh, who resigned from the Finance Ministry, attacked the immigration intake on economic grounds and revealed that he had been arguing against high intakes in Cabinet for several years.

The media which, in general, had done its part to keep the lid on the subject, burst forth. The newspapers were awash with immigration stories. At last in the media, there was a general acceptance that it was alright to talk about the subject as long as race wasn't a consideration. The press in general though maintained its commitment to high immigration and the policy of multiculturalism, though dissenting voices were heard.

APPEASEMENT CONTINUED

Not long after Gerry Hand took over as Immigration Minister in 1990 there was a slight cut in the intake and a long overdue campaign against illegal immigrants was instituted. However, changes introduced by Senator Ray to reduce the opportunity for direct lobbying on the Minister by special interest groups were overturned. As will be recalled, the introduction of regulations to replace discretion was the one victory Senator Ray as Minister had had over the Theophanous-led Caucus Committee on Immigration and Ethnic Affairs in the wake of the FitzGerald Report. This change had been urged on the Minister by the secretary of his Department, Ron Brown and the Deputy Secretary, Tony Harris. There was an outcry in the ethnic lobby at the change. They felt particularly aggrieved with Mr Harris, because he consistently held the line in the Immigration Department against ethnic lobby groups.

Although the Immigration Department was in favour of continuing high immigration under Brown and Harris, it was prepared to stand up against the more importunate demands of the professional ethnic lobby. Brown and Harris for example refused to water down skills testing - such as it was - in the concessional family category so that a predetermined target in the 1989-90 intake for the category could be met. They were prepared to allow a shortfall rather than compromise the entry test as the ethnic pressure groups demanded.

The ethnic lobby had considerable influence on the department, but saw the real champion of its cause as the Office of Multicultural Affairs. And as stated in the article, "Ethnic lobby influence steers migration policy" by Joanne Gray in *The Financial Review* of May 1990, "because of the perceived [electoral] power of Lebanese community leaders in Sydney and the Jewish, Greek and Italian community leaders in Melbourne they have almost direct access to Mr Hawke". A campaign was launched to overturn the changes which was orchestrated by FECCA, with the assistance of OMA.

Though all the ethnic groups involved in FECCA had motives in overturning the regulations, the decisive intervention, according to sources in the Immigration Department and Peter Hartcher in *The Sydney Morning Herald*, came from the Melbourne-based Jewish pressure groups who wanted to clear the way for the entry of Soviet Jews and lobbied Mr Hawke directly. The Special Assistance Category was established within the refugee component to accommodate them and ministerial discretion was reintroduced for that category.

In order to disguise the real reason for this category, other ethnic groups also qualify under its provisions. On 31 January 1991, Mr Hand announced that "A tentative total of up to 4,000 places has been decided...to be distributed among ethnic minorities of the former Soviet Union, Yugoslavs, Croatians, Slovenians, East Timorese and Lebanese applicants." Those in this special category are described as people "who had a special need to resettle here, but who did not fit the United Nations definition of a refugee." Also entry requirements for the concessional family reunion category were watered down, which effectively increased the concessional family intake by 7,000.

As Mr Hartcher noted, the head of the Immigration Department, Ron Brown, who had advised Senator Ray to make the original change to introduce Ministerial regulation was sacked on the Prime Minister's initiative. The Deputy Secretary, Tony Harris, was also sacked. Mr Harris has since made a comeback, via the Industry Commission, then as an adviser to the Treasurer Mr Dawkins. He is now the Auditor-General of NSW. The replacement for Mr Brown was Mr Chris Conybeare, a Hawke man, formerly of the Prime Minister's department. This continued Mr Hawke's trend of appointing officers who had served him in the Prime Minister's department to senior positions in other departments.

During Mr Hawke's reign, examples of this, other than Mr Conybeare, who became heads of departments, included: Noel Tanzer, Administrative Services; Allan Rose, Attorney-General's; Tony Ayers, Defence; Greg Taylor, Employment, Education and Training; Mike Keating, Finance; Stuart Hamilton, Health, Housing and Community Services; Neville Stevens, Industry, Technology and Commerce; Graham Evans, Transport and Communications; Tony Cole, Treasury and Mike Codd, PM's Department. Mike Codd, under Mr Hawke, was the number one bureaucrat in Australia. He was quickly dispatched by the new Prime Minister Mr Keating.

Though individual ethnic leaders were heard claiming the credit for Mr Brown's demise, Dr James Jupp, generously funded multiculturalist and intimate of FECCA - who in fact holds the FECCA archives for 1983-89 at his ANU immigration centre - stated at a conference in Austin, Texas, in April 1991, that FECCA had been gunning for Mr Harris and that Mr Brown was just "collateral" damage. Mr Harris had been seen as the real thorn in the ethnic lobby's side.

This is a clear example of what Dr Stephen FitzGerald described in his Morrison Lecture of November 1989. He said immigration and settlement philosophy in recent years had no vision or forward thinking plan, but was "step by step backwards decision making" in response to "pressure threat and manipulation" by interest groups.

In the late 1980s our population growth of about 1.5 per cent was clearly the fastest of any western nation. It was closer to India than comparable western nations. As our population would continue to increase naturally for many years, why do we have to supplement it with the current immigration rate? Who benefits? Certainly not the majority of the host population.

Australia's immigration increase combined with the basically Third World profile of our export income, namely unprocessed raw materials, must be confronted over the long term if Australia is to maintain a First World standard of living and quality of life. The national interest must be taken as our guide, and not the appeasement of select pressure groups.

This appeasement in the past has meant that immigration and multiculturalism have spawned massive and complementary industries and are very powerful, articulate lobby groups with ready access to the media. This is quite apart from the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs which has grown into a monster department. Though it is subject to a variety of outside pressures on immigration matters it finds unwelcome, notably from the courts, "humanitarian" lobby groups and other departments, it is in the nature of the organisation that it favours high immigration. The bigger the intake, the bigger the empire of the department. As has been seen the department established the Bureau of Immigration Research as a supposedly independent body, but in practice it acts as a propaganda unit for a high immigration intake.

THE IMMIGRATION CLUB

In fact it is interesting to examine who the BIR/BIPR has commissioned to assist it in its research. In the 1989-90 year Katherine Meikle of Monash University and the National Institute of Labour Studies, Flinders University were given external grants and both were connected with the CEDA report. Academics of the pro-immigration Institute of Labour Studies continue to be well patronised. In 1990-91 M. Baker and Associate Professor M. Wooden of

the Institute received two grants, one of \$65,000 and one of \$53,900. In the same year Professor Judith Sloan and S. Kennedy also of the Institute received a grant of \$44,100. Again in 1991-92 Professor Sloan received a grant of \$22,050.

The Centre for International Economics, whose work in the past has been used to justify high immigration rates, received two separate grants totalling \$64,000 in 1989-90 and a grant of \$48,600 in 1990-91.

The Centre of Multicultural Studies, Wollongong University, has also done well out of the BIR. In 1990-91 Dr R. Iredale, A. Rutherford and B. D'Arcy of the Centre received a grant of \$45,736 and Dr G. Harrison, P. Southgate, L. Murphy, C. Johnston, and A. Drummond of the Centre received a grant of \$45,767. The Centre has also been well funded by the Office of Multicultural Affairs, including grants totalling \$165,553 for eleven "working papers" on aspects of multiculturalism in 1991-92. The head of the Centre, Stephen Castles, was also given a grant of \$30,000 in 1991-92 to "review issues affecting arts and artists of non-English speaking background in Australia." Dr Iredale and Ms Adrienne Milbank received a grant of \$11,750 in 1991-92.

A former employee of the centre, Mary Kalantzis, was in 1990 made director of the Centre for Workplace Communication and Culture at the University of Technology, Sydney and is now a "Professor" at James Cook University. She has been patronised by OMA and served on the Community Cultural Development Committee of the Australia Council. She has also served as a member of the Council's Multicultural Advisory Council. The aim of these bodies, in liaison with OMA, is to, in the words of the Australia Council's annual report for 1991-92, integrate "multiculturalism into all aspects of the Council's programs" - in other words promote intellectual conformity in the arts. The National Multicultural Arts Network has also been funded by OMA.

Dr James Jupp, who, as we have seen, has made a speciality out of multiculturalism and favours high immigration rates, received two individual grants from the BIR totalling \$50,000 and a third in conjunction with two other ANU colleagues totalling \$57,120 in 1989-90. Again in 1991-92 he and colleague A. McRobbie received a grant of \$27,847. He also received a total of \$24,150 in grants from OMA in the 1991-92 year. Though it must be stated that the BIR-funded book *The Politics of Australian Immigration*, of which he was co-editor, is, surprisingly, a very useful reference work. Others well patronised by OMA include Dr Christine Inglis from the Multicultural Centre at Sydney University and Professor Ian McAllister of the Australian Defence Force Academy.

At the BIR's National Outlook Conference of Immigration held in Melbourne in November 1990, of the 94 invited speakers only a handful favoured moderate or low immigration. The remainder favoured high immigration. This improved considerably at the second National Outlook Conference held in Sydney in November 1992. There were more invited speakers opposed to high immigration, including even Denis McCormack of

Australians Against Further Immigration. The weight however was still strongly pro-immigration.

It is interesting to note though that, during this period, even immigration critic Dr Bob Birrell accepted a position on the BIR advisory committee. His approach was to try to offset the influence of the high immigration advocates from within, as he attempted to do on the National Population Council, where he certainly had some success. However, he has not been reappointed.

The committee is chaired by Dr Stephen Castles, of the Centre for Multicultural Studies in Wollongong, a high immigration enthusiast and the other 11 members of the committee are drawn largely from ethnic groups. There are eight further advisory bodies called State Reference Groups, one for each state and territory. The membership is drawn from the State Ethnic Affairs Commissions, the State Regional Office of the Department of Immigration, the State Ethnic Communities Councils and other ethnic and academic interest groups. The main role of these groups is to advise on research projects.

Apart from the contributions of Dr Birrell, though, the NPC, which is now disbanded, has been another example of a publicly funded organisation posturing as an independent advisory body to government. The members of the council were appointed part time by the Minister for Immigration for a period of two years. The composition of the last council shows how disgracefully the government stacked the deck in favour of the multiculturalism industry and proponents of high immigration in general.

Of its 18 members before it was disbanded only Dr Bob Birrell strongly favoured low immigration. The other members were: Professor David Cox, co-chair of the Settlement and Ethnic Affairs Committee; Professor Glenn Withers, co-chair of the Migration Committee and then chair of the BIR Advisory Committee (a consistent advocate for high immigration); Mr Maan Abdallah, community development worker, Lebanese Community Council; Professor Stephen Castles, director, Centre for Multicultural Studies University of Wollongong; Ms Christine Choo, social worker; Ms Paula Cristoffanini, director, Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission; Dr Robyn Iredale, research fellow Centre for Multicultural Studies, Wollongong University; Ms Joanna Kalowski, co-ordinator Community Relations NSW Anti-discrimination board; Mr Alan Matheson, ACTU ethnic liaison/international officer; Dr Kenneth Rivett, involved in refugee work, but also favours a high immigration intake; Ms Thu Linh Sam, social worker; Mr Ross Tzannes, chairman of the ethnic communities council; Mr John Scomparin, solicitor; Ms Georgina Carnegie, managing director Market Intelligence PTE LTD; Dr Graeme Hugo, Reader in Geography and Population Studies, Flinders University and Mr Phillip Toyne, executive director of the ACF, who, as has been noted, improved, despite previously avoiding the population issue, at least in public.

This scandalous imbalance speaks for itself. Yet this group advised on

issues which affected all Australians, not just professional multiculturalists. Of this group seven were selected to advise on a population strategy for Australia. They were Professor Withers (chair), Professor Castles, Ms Cristoffanini, Dr Iredale, Dr Hugo, Mr Toyne and Dr Birrell. Dr Birrell as the only Australian nationalist in the group was the only one among them who could be relied upon to voice the concerns of the great majority of Australians. This group issued its discussion paper in April 1991 and submitted its final report, following consideration of public submissions, in February 1992.

Extraordinarily enough before the final report was issued there had been some positive signs emerging from this group of seven. Dr Birrell had been a very powerful influence and to an extent had offset the influence of traditional high immigration advocates within it, with the support of Phillip Toyne. The article, "Population plan sought for nation" by Michael Millet in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 4 November, 1991 indicated that at least the effect of immigration on Sydney and Melbourne was firmly on the NPC agenda and also the need for a wider view of the effects of immigration. There was also talk that some significant recommendations might be made.

But strong pressures were placed upon the group to tone down the final report. Also pro-immigration elements were added to the report at the last moment by Professor Withers. Incidentally, high immigration champion Professor Withers was created an officer in the general division in the Order of Australia in the 1992 Queen's Birthday Honours list for "services to applied economics, particularly in the areas of immigration and population research". It is interesting to ponder whether anyone who was in favour of low immigration could have received such an award for such a reason.

At any rate, as a result of the watering down, the NPC recommendations are of little moment, with the exception of the one calling on the government to develop a population policy. In the text of the report however, Dr Birrell had some success and the problems facing Sydney are emphasised. The recommendation for a population policy was ignored by the government. However the name of the BIR has been changed to the Bureau of Immigration and Population Research (BIPR). A major coup no doubt.

The general trend of creating more multiculturalist power bases has continued. On March 26 1992 Mr Hand announced the formation of a settlement advisory council. The stated role of this council "comprising community representatives" was to "provide the Minister with a view of government settlement services from the perspective of clients". As if enough bureaucracies in this area did not exist already! This group is just another opportunity for multiculturalists to expand their empire.

The membership speaks for itself: Mr Paris Aristotle, coordinator with the Victorian Foundation for the Survivors of Torture Inc; Ms Hurriyet Babacan of the Victorian Ethnic Affairs Commission; Mr Peter Einspinner of FECCA and the Ethnic Communities Council of NSW; Ms Marina Garcia-Ruivivar, described as "involved in settlement issues, particularly relating to the Filipino

community"; Ms Carmen Harrison, has worked in "ethnic child care" and "teaches in the area of migration and multiculturalism"; Ms Sophie Matiasz, involved in multicultural education and the Ethnic Communities Council of South Australia; Ms Leah Nichles, developing an information strategy for NESB people for the Queensland Department of Housing and Local Government; Ms Rita Prasad, involved in organisations "focusing on the needs of NESB women"; Ms Carolyn Reeve, "works in the north west of WA with NESB women who have come to Australia to marry". Mr Victor Rebikoff OAM, now head of FECCA; Mr Wasili Salewski, training programs with NESB migrants; Ms Debbie Stothard, "has worked on issues affecting women, education, youth, Aborigines and anti-racism campaigns".

Earlier, on 28 February 1992, Mr Hand had announced a \$5 million package of grants to ethnic groups "to help with migrant settlement". The month before, on 10 January, Mr Hand announced a financial grants scheme to "assist immigration advisory service organisations". A number of these organisations had been financed in the past by the Immigration Department, but this announcement upgraded the grant procedure. The role these organisations play is basically to assist applicants who apply to have their temporary status changed to resident - in other words they came to Australia as a temporary entrant and decide they want to stay. In effect the Immigration Department funds these advisory organisations to work against it. All of these are of course part of the immigration/multiculturalist network.

The Law Reform Commission, then headed by Justice Elizabeth Evatt, handed down a report in May 1992 suggesting that the law should take more account of so-called multicultural considerations. Her report recommended an increased role for all the old favourites - the Office of Multicultural Affairs, the Bureau of Immigration Research and the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.

Each group in the network supports the other getting increased powers. There are also state anti-discrimination boards and an Equal Employment Opportunity and Programs Unit in the Federal Public Service Commission which link in with the network. This is not to mention the state and local government bureaucracies.

As has been noted, in the Universities there are a number of immigration and multicultural units which churn out propaganda and act as power bases for the policy and the immigration program. Churches also fund their own, similar bodies, which link in and also obtain government funding. At the fringes are a host of other groups which get government funding and are connected with the immigration/multiculturalism industry. This is quite apart from immigration agents and lawyers who use legal aid to contest immigration cases.

From time to time sham inquiries are held into the functioning of elements of this industry. This is usually either for form's sake or because even more resources have been demanded, often in well coordinated media campaigns.

The pattern is to appoint members of the network to conduct the inquiry and concentrate on asking fellow members of the network what they want, though the impression is given that it is an open, democratic and "inclusive" process. "Inclusive" is a favourite word, it really means "exclusion" of non-members of the network.

For example, on 29 June, 1993 the Minister for Immigration, Senator Bolkus, announced that there would be a review into funding of Multicultural Consultative Mechanisms. He said that he would ask the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA), located within the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, to engage a consultant and expected that OMA would report back to him by the end of October.

He stated in a press release of that date that: "It is essential that all Australians, including those of non-English speaking background, can make their views known authoritatively and effectively to Government on multicultural affairs and all aspects of Federal policy and programs."

On the basis of this clear statement that it was essential that ALL Australians have the opportunity to comment on these policies, Graeme Campbell encouraged members of the public to send in submissions and sent one in himself.

However, as expected, the consultants engaged by OMA, Yamine and Associates of Leichhardt, Sydney, made it very clear in their issues paper, *Review of the Commonwealth's Consultation Function in Multicultural Affairs* (August 1993) that they were only interested in the comments of the ethnic lobby and associated government agencies.

The Minister's statement that it is essential that ALL Australians have an input, becomes, in the words of the issues paper, "The Commonwealth has sought to ensure that the views of all Australians from non-English speaking background (NESB) can be expressed and brought to bear on all aspects of Commonwealth policy and program activities". In other words, only the vested interests need apply.

This is in spite of the fact that Yamine and Associates "issues paper" is, according to them, "important to everyone who is affected by or has an interest in multicultural affairs/policies/programs." That of course should refer to us all, as we are all affected by the programs, particularly in the fact that we have to pay for them.

But once again, despite the initial high sounding words and democratic posture, the opinions of the majority of the general public, who effectively subsidise the policy by their taxes, was excluded.

Although we know that a number of private individuals sent in submissions to this inquiry, these submissions were not only ignored by Yamine and Associates, they were not even listed in the final report.

Graeme Campbell asked repeated Questions on Notice about the conduct of this inquiry, but could not obtain straight answers from Senator Bolkus, via his representative in the House of Representatives, Mr Brereton. For

example, on three separate occasions a direct question was asked whether Mr Rick Yamine was a member of any professional ethnic lobby and if so, which one. Three times the question was evaded (Questions: No 377, 20 October 1993; No 745, 1 February 1994; No 867, 28 February 1994.) The closest thing to a proper answer came in the answer to Question 745, in which it was stated, "Two critical factors in determining Mr Yamine's suitability to conduct the Review...were expertise and his assurance that his contacts with ethnic communities did not present any conflict of interest in relation to his involvement in the consultancy."

In fact, in answer to a question from then shadow immigration Minister, Mr Philip Ruddock, (Question No 1923, 24 November 1992), to Mr Hand, the then Immigration Minister, it was stated that Rick Yamine from the NSW Ethnic Communities' Council was received a grant from OMA for the period July 1991 to December 1991. This was for providing research material on "Access and Equity" to form part of a volume edited by Dr James Jupp. Nice and cosy, isn't it?

The Minister also brushed aside questions about the failure of Mr Yamine to list a number of submissions sent to him by members of the public. This should be a serious matter, but the Senator feels safe to treat such parliamentary questions with contempt because the sacred status of multiculturalism ensures that the Opposition will not follow these questions up and the media, with the exception of one journalist now and then, will not bother to highlight the matter.

An inquiry into the Bureau of Immigration and Population Research was also announced on 8 November 1993. The chair of the inquiry was former secretary of the Immigration Department and enthusiast for Asianisation, John Menadue. The director of the BIPR, John Nieuwenhuysen, was also chosen to inquire into his own organisation. Submissions closed in March 1994. Although this was a far more open procedure, the industry would have been mobilised to dominate the submissions process. The report, issued in October 1994, is the whitewash we expected. It says the BIPR is doing a great job and advocates even closer links with the professional ethnic lobby group and OMA.

In February 1994 a new BIPR advisory committee was announced by Senator Bolkus. The cynical stacking continues. The new chair is Professor Stephen Castles. The other eight new appointments are Mary Kalantzis; Alan Matheson; Ross Tzannes, convenor of the "environment network of FECCA"; Ms Helen Tuen, North Asia Project Officer of the S.A. government; Mr Ross Barker, Queensland Department of Housing, Local Government and Planning; Dr Sheila Rimmer (no relation to Dr Stephen Rimmer), School of Economics, La Trobe University, who has "a strong interest in social justice issues"; Dr Vivian Lin, Victorian Department of Health and Community Services and Ian Lowe, Faculty of Science, Griffith University. Dr Bob Birrell was not reappointed.

The Australian Government also sponsored a conference of immigration

and multiculturalism in Germany in February 1994. It was little more than a propaganda exercise, trumpeting the supposed great success of both and Germany was urged to follow our example. Luminaries on the Australian side included Dr John Nieuwenhuysen, the First Assistant Secretary of the Department of Immigration, Des Storer and the head of the Queensland Bureau of Ethnic Affairs, Uri Themal. The Office of Multicultural Affairs is also organising a multiculturalism extravaganza to be held in early 1995 in Sydney called *The 1995 Global Cultural Diversity Conference*. No doubt the NSW Government, through Mr Photios and company will also be involved.

It gets worse. Gerry Hand, one of the few immigration ministers to show much substance while at the helm, is now a migration agent, lobbying on behalf of the people he once resisted.

On and on it goes, with not only an almost complete lack of sharp media scrutiny, but effectively assisted and promoted by the media. In the midst of Australia's economic difficulties the immigration/multiculturalism industry continues to be lavishly funded while deserving causes are overlooked.

HEALTH PROBLEMS

Stephen Rimmer has pointed to significant failings in health monitoring of immigrants at point of entry and beyond, which have obvious implications for public health. This is particularly so in the cases of Hepatitis B and Tuberculosis.

One of the founders of Australians Against Further Immigration (AAFI), Rod Spencer, is a medical doctor who has tried to bring the problem of Hepatitis B to public attention. In the AAFI manifesto, Dr Spencer provides the following information, cleared for use by 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, ie 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 per cent 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, ie 520 deaths will result from the 20,000 cases of Hepatitis B which have occurred this year (1992)."

Australia has reached the stage where mass immunisation for Hepatitis B is recommended by the World Health Organisation.

As for Tuberculosis, it had been virtually eradicated in Australia, but it is clear that, due to inadequate screening of migrants, it is again has the potential to pose a significant hazard to public health.

It is certainly a problem in other countries, even one as wealthy as the US, which has developed a poor and malnourished underclass, which virtually acts as a breeding ground for the disease. According to the US National Centre for Disease Control, as reported by *Reuter* on 19 May 1992, the TB upsurge is linked to the HIV/AIDS pandemic, immigration and the "transmission of TB in institutional settings [such as jails and other confined spaces]".

New more virulent and drug resistant strains of TB have developed in the US because the schedule of prescribed drug doses for the disease are often not completed by sufferers. This is because TB symptoms fade quickly when the prescribed drug is taken. As the symptoms fade many sufferers stop taking their medicine before time, but they still have the disease which later reappears, this time much more resistant to the drug and so the cycle can continue.

Worldwide, according to the American Lung Association (ALA), more than one third of the world's population carries the TB bacteria and TB kills more people than any other infectious disease.

As reported in the article, "A killer of the past, back in HIV's shadow" by Cathy Johnson of *The Sydney Morning Herald* on October 30 1991, "Tuberculosis...may be making a comeback in NSW, new figures from the Health Department suggest". The article cited the Public Health Bulletin and stated, that, as in the US, "The spread of AIDS and an increase in migrants from TB endemic countries is thought to be responsible for the upsurge."

The Australian approach has been as follows: if a potential migrant is identified as TB positive, he or she is required to sign an undertaking that treatment will be sought before departure for Australia. This procedure hardly inspires confidence. Other migrants have only been detected as TB positive on arrival in Australia. Latent TB cases can easily escape what screening procedures exist in Australia and reactivate when the migrant is in the community. X-rays are not enough, blood tests should be used.

While it is true that TB is considerably more difficult to contract than Hepatitis B and that 90 per cent of people will not contract TB when coming into contact with a sufferer, if a person is weakened in some way, perhaps due to another illness, poor diet or old age they will be in danger of contracting the disease.

In spite of reports such as the one in the *SMH* and the clear inadequacy of medical monitoring of migrants, there are pressures to lessen health monitoring requirements coming from, in particular, those who wish to foster "Education for Export" services. The Industry Commission, in its August 1991 *Exports of Education Services* report, stated that "There have been claims by institutions that medical checks impose unnecessary delays on the processing

of student applications in some countries" and the Immigration Department stated that there was scope to reduce such medical checks.

In fact just the opposite is true, there is considerable scope to improve medical checks. Because students are often in confined spaces with other students, checks should be as strict as possible otherwise diseases could be spread to the host community, particularly infectious diseases like Tuberculosis and Hepatitis B.

The former deputy secretary of the immigration department, Tony Harris, was the author of the Industry Commission report and he stated "if the Australian Health Authority has assessed the risks correctly, the benefits of waiving tests would accrue principally to the industry, while the resultant costs would principally be borne by the Australian community."

There are worrying signs that agents pursuing foreign students for the money they provide are prepared to put the health of the Australian community at risk, in order to maximise profits. In the immigration program in general there can be little doubt that, for reasons other than profit, medical screening and follow up have been inadequate and the Australian government has deliberately put its population at risk.

This is to say nothing of short stay travellers and tourists. As we have seen, the "brains" at the Australian Tourist Commission (ATC) want to attract large numbers tourists from China, in spite of the probability of large numbers overstaying, as was the case with the students. There has also been calls for visa requirements for tourists from Asian nations to be dropped.

At any rate the Industry Commission Report into Education for "export", while bringing the important health aspect to light, was in general disappointing. It advocated a continuation of the free market, less regulation approach to education for export, in spite of the severe problems this approach has already caused.

Education programs not connected with the Education for Export scheme can also pose problems because of lack of medical surveillance. Dr Damien Meagher, a clinical haematologist from Townsville, warned, as reported by AAP on 17 May 1992, that there was inadequate medical surveillance of Papua New Guinea students who came to Australia to study in Townsville, Charters Towers and Ingham. He had no objection at all to them coming, but had stressed, without apparent success, to relevant authorities, that their health should be closely monitored.

This is because the students come from a malaria infection area. They rapidly lost their immunity to malaria after arriving in Australia as they were no longer being continually exposed to infection. This meant the latent disease they carried developed. Dr Meagher warned that the disease could readily be spread to the host population because Townsville had the vector for malaria - the Anopheles mosquito. Dr Meagher said that malaria had existed in North Queensland in the past and could easily be re-established. He stated that 50

cases of malaria were diagnosed in Townsville in 1991 and six cases were diagnosed in one week alone early in 1992.

It should also be noted in passing that - as reported in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 18 March 1992, "Drug-resistant malaria might spread WHO warns" by Margaret Harris - the World Health Organisation has announced that a deadly new strain of malaria which is resistant to drug treatment has developed and is now common in the Thai-Cambodia border region.

So it is clear that, far from lessening medical screening, it should be significantly tightened in all immigration and education-immigration procedures.

Apart from pressures to ease testing coming from the Education for Export area, there are also other general pressures to ease the conditions of migrant entry into Australia. The Joint Standing Committee on Migration Regulations, in its own words, was given a brief "to inquire into and report to the parliament on the feasibility of allowing migrant entry to Australia, within existing categories, on a conditional basis." Such cases, for example, relate to where people from overseas wanted to come to Australia to seek health care.

A subcommittee was delegated to examine aspects relating to migration and health care. The chairman of the sub-committee was former ALP immigration minister, Mr Clyde Holding. Others included then Opposition Shadow Immigration Minister, Philip Ruddock and Western Australian ALP Senator Jim McKiernan, who in 1991 called for Graeme Campbell's expulsion from the ALP for his statements on immigration and particularly for distributing the first - March 1991 - version of Immigration and Consensus.

Criticisms can be made of all three of these people relating to their past handling of immigration matters, but to their credit on 11 March 1992 they tackled some hard questions in immigration, which were long overdue for official consideration. Senator McKiernan has also showed an understanding of "refugee" rorts.

In the course of their inquiry on that date, they established that illegal immigrants and others with no entitlement were fraudulently gaining access to Medicare. An official of Medicare, a Mr Karling, told the sub-committee, "in the year 1990-91 Immigration handed back to us a number of cards of people it had deported." The number was 74. This supports the contention that Medicare cards are readily available to illegal immigrants, as Bob Bottom's earlier research indicated. The Medicare officials defended their administrative system and said the only way abuses could happen was by fraudulent means.

The Medicare officials said that \$43,000 had been recovered from these illegals who had used the cards, but that this was not the full cost of the services incurred using the cards. The Medicare officials had no idea of the full extent of the expenses run up on the cards, at taxpayer's expense. A very conservative estimate might be double the amount which was actually recovered. Clearly, given the numbers of illegal immigrants in Australia and the ready access they obviously had to Medicare cards, the cost to the

Australian taxpayer of this sort of fraud could extend into the millions of dollars. There are clearly problems with the Medicare accreditation process.

Although illegal immigrants and others are not legally entitled to Medicare cards they have full access to the public hospital system. Further, the chairman of the sub-committee, Mr Holding, asked one of the medical witnesses, Dr Frost, Deputy Chief Health Officer of the NSW Health Department [though this area is clearly a Commonwealth responsibility] "...it is possible to obtain a visa entry based upon the fact that you are requiring medical treatment in Australia, and that will be granted, but there is no requirement given as to the security or capacity to pay for that treatment?" Dr Frost: "It would appear so".

In other words people from overseas have used Australian hospitals for quite expensive treatments and yet not paid for the service. Many clearly have taken advantage of the opportunity to have their health services met at the cost of the Australian taxpayer. Dr Frost stated that he had figures from a major Sydney hospital showing outstanding amounts of \$249,000 incurred by non-Australian residents and people who are Medicare ineligible. He said that at least half of that amount was unlikely to be recoverable. This is just one hospital! Dr Frost said that the total amount across the health system was likely to be many millions of dollars.

Dr Frost also stated that "there are good grounds to believe that currently some 55 persons - 10 per cent - receiving treatment in TB clinics in NSW are Medicare ineligible." Again, it must be assumed that much of the expenses incurred by them will not be recoverable. It can also be assumed that while some of these people may be legitimate travellers, illegal immigrants are among such cases. Also they possibly represent a small sample of illegal immigrants in the wider community affected with TB and not seeking treatment in public hospitals.

Dr Frost stated that the initial screening program for TB and its administrative arrangements were not perfect. He said there were lengthy delays in passing on X Ray film and reports and by the time people were identified as TB carriers many of them have arrived as migrants and "disappear[ed]" into the community.

As for Hepatitis B, which we have already considered, Dr Frost stated, "screening for Hepatitis B is not commonly undertaken". People from high risk countries were "offered" screening where "appropriate" - "and certainly their children, who are likely to be at high risk and therefore carriers, are offered immunisation generally at birth." Only three groups were routinely checked - pregnant women, a child for adoption by an Australian resident and an unaccompanied minor refugee child.

There has been, in short, no safe system in place which can identify Hepatitis B carriers before they arrive. For years now, Australians without their knowledge, have been subjected to the risk of Hepatitis B infection, because the government abdicated its responsibilities. No doubt in years to

come negligence cases will be launched by Australians who have been infected by Hepatitis B because of these lax screening procedures. Again the costs will be borne by the taxpayer.

Dr Frost had earlier recommended wider screening of people from countries where Hepatitis B is prevalent. AIDS screening is already in place and Dr Frost stated that it is "extremely easy" to also test for Hepatitis B while doing an AIDS test. Why then was such testing not carried out?

The final report of the Joint Committee, entitled *Conditional Migrant Entry: The Health Rules*, was released on 14 January 1993. Unfortunately it recommended relaxing of the entry rules for people who "are currently excluded because of a disability or medical condition". Although it advocated a fee payment system in most cases, there is no guarantee at all that medical expenses will be fully covered, particularly if costs are ongoing. Once again the Australian taxpayer will foot the bill.

Apart from this there were some very positive, if long overdue recommendations. These were recommendations for "wider testing for Hepatitis B and other infectious diseases; Stricter entry controls on persons belonging to groups or from countries which are in a high risk category with regard to infectious diseases; tighter controls on the distribution and use of Medicare cards; limiting access to Medicare for temporary entrants and increased exchange of information between government agencies to assist in debt recovery from temporary and illegal entrants who use Australia's health system."

However as Dr Rod Spencer states in his article "Immigration and the control of Hepatitis B in Australia" in *People and Place* (Vol 2, No 1, 1994), advice that Hepatitis B be screened for has been ignored. "...no screening of migrants occurs, except for very small numbers in the categories of pregnant women, children for adoption and unaccompanied refugee children. This...continues despite repeated calls from medical authorities in Australia and overseas that testing for Hepatitis B be introduced [a specific reference to the above report]."

There has been an "alarming" increase in Hepatitis B infection, only 15 years ago a rare disease in Australia. Now there are about 30,000 infections a year and 1,200 people die from complications of the disease every year. "Professor John Dwyer, Head of the Division of Medicine, University of NSW, states, 'The majority of the more than 250,000 Hepatitis B carriers in Australia have joined us from South-East Asia.'" and "...The chairman of the National Health and Medical Research Council, Professor Boughton, said: 'there is no doubt we are importing a problem, if we omit screening we are discriminating against our own population. There's a whole hornet's nest of immigration health questions'."

Dr Spencer remarks that even if screening took place, no procedures have been considered for the non-immune Australian population, "The experience with migrants arriving with tuberculosis who are not followed up by medical

authorities and disappear into the community leaves one with little hope that Hepatitis B carriers, detected by screening, will take steps to minimise the risk to the non-immune population."

Clearly, rather than any relaxing of migration provisions, they need to be significantly tightened. The much-vaunted idea of gaining foreign exchange by importing foreign fee-paying patients is likely to go the same way as the education for export fiasco. Apart from the abuses of the system and the rip off of Australian taxpayers by illegal immigrants and others, rich foreigners may end up being given preference over locals. The Australian community will lose coming and going. This is precisely the pattern of the education for export program. On one hand we have the financial and social liability of the Chinese student fiasco and on the other locals are missing out on educational opportunities to rich foreigners.

FAST BUCKS AND EDUCATION

At University level in general it is clear that qualified local students are losing places to full fee paying foreign students in prime courses. This is because, while local student numbers have expanded greatly in more general courses due to government policy, per capita funding has not kept pace. Institutions have been under considerable financial pressures and have been allowed by the government to have discretion over how funds gained from foreign students are used. These foreign students pay full fees and so the institutions have far more to gain from accepting them than accepting subsidised locals.

In education policy the government claims to be creating the conditions for a "clever country" and has targeted specific courses as important in its approach. These courses include engineering, computing and business courses. But as has been noted by Dr Bob Birrell and Pro Vice Chancellor T.F. Smith in their paper *The Implications of Selling Educational Services to Overseas Students*, "we find the highest concentrations of full fee overseas students in precisely these priority courses especially at well established colleges where there is a surplus of local applicants."

So while the government has increased overall student numbers significantly, opportunities for locals in prime courses are diminishing. On the one hand the obsession with a numbers game has compromised education quality and on the other local students with good academic grades who would otherwise qualify for prime courses are missing out to overseas competitors.

In fact the government has allowed institutions to set quotas for local students in priority courses which are well below course capacity so that they can take more foreign students. From the point of view of these foreign students they often have to pay more fees than they anticipated and some have complained of being treated as milking cows by local institutions. Australian

institutions are in danger of developing a reputation for voracity and greed. As was noted in an article in *The Bulletin* of 14 April 1992, "Learning to export by degrees" by Victoria Laurie, a survey of the attitudes of senior officials in Singapore to Australia's education export scheme was conducted by two university researchers. Some of the descriptions of the scheme and its marketing were "crass"; "shabby and impoverished"; "inhuman, incompetent and financially gouging".

While the institutions found themselves under financial pressure as a result of government pressure and initially went looking for overseas students to cover costs, they have developed into full scale "entrepreneurs" and have established agents in foreign countries who tout for business.

At the same time as debasing themselves and their country in this way, institutions risk compromising their quality. With these students paying such fees, lecturers are very reluctant to fail them, in spite of the poor communication skills of many.

Added to this is the fact that, as Robyn Spencer noted in a letter to the editor of *The Australian* on 22 February 1993, "Melbourne University is now offering 10 per cent bonus on marks for language other than English (LOTE) for 1995 entry into medicine" [and all other faculties]. Given that the bonus for LOTE is the only one being offered and "entrance scores in maths and the sciences are now 96 per cent" [for medicine], the bonus for LOTE will be crucial. This requirement will clearly favour native speakers of a language other than English, in other words migrants or foreign students. It will severely disadvantage and in many cases exclude "old" Australian students who speak only English from prime courses.

In the past Australia's subsidised schemes for foreign students not only ensured quality and the overwhelming return of these students to their homelands, but were positive means of promoting good relations in the region. The present approach is cynical and short term. Australia will lose out in the end, both locally and abroad.

Clearly, qualified locals are missing out in their own universities in the very courses which are supposed to hold the key to our economic future.

As university marketing networks based overseas spread and compete there will be increasing pressures for them to take whatever full fee paying foreign students they can get, with consequent implications for university standards, opportunities for locals and immigration. There is a clear danger of the fiasco with the Chinese students being repeated. Already some TAFE Colleges are recruiting full fee paying foreign students and even some schools have made noises of interest.

It was announced in late May 1992 that educational institutions in the Australian Capital Territory had established an office in Thailand to attempt to entice students to study with them. This announcement came just after the Bangkok massacre. There are already 3000 Thai students studying in Melbourne and Sydney and the ACT institutions wanted to compete. Clearly

it does not matter to such institutions if there are problems with overstayers, so long as they make their quick money.

In fact on June 11, 1992 Mr Hand and Employment, Education and Training Minister, Mr Beazley announced an easing of visa requirements for certain foreign nationals coming to Australia to study under the "Education for Export" scheme. This is in line with the recommendation in the Industry Commission report previously mentioned and also in line with the pressure applied by the English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students (ELICOS) Association. There will be no pre-visa assessment of applicants from Thailand, Taiwan, Korea, Hong Kong or Papua New Guinea. This is supposedly because the level of overstayers has dropped in the last 12 months, but in the past there has been considerable problems with nationals from some of these countries abusing the visa process. It is highly likely to happen again. Thailand will no doubt become an attractive exit route for people from neighbouring countries ready to try their luck abusing the system. As noted by *Time* magazine in its 1 February 1993 feature article, "The Triads Go Global", Bangkok is the capital of illegal immigrant smuggling. The implications for public health already raised are obvious.

It was also announced that people on visitor's visas and entry permits will not have to pre-arrange courses in order to study. In other words they can just turn up in Australia and choose a course of their liking. Dependents of foreign postgraduate students will be able to work while in the country and the government will act to entice these students to stay in Australia by making it easier for them to change their immigration status. This is an attempt to overcome a supposed future shortfall in academic staff. If this is so it would largely be caused by the ill-conceived and executed expansion in the tertiary system under Mr Dawkins. This stop-gap approach can be expected to continue, because it is harder to make the commitment to encourage the training of locals.

But what efforts have local Universities made to employ their own graduates as academics? The Higher Education sector can recruit academics directly from abroad without any consideration being given to local employment prospects. This sector is already the largest employer of professionals from overseas. The National Institute of Labor Studies of Flinders University, itself a consistent high immigration advocate, notes that one quarter of academics are from overseas and their numbers have increased dramatically since 1982-83.

The powers that be no doubt believe they are projecting an image of responsible international citizens in all this, but their bottom line is the quest for a quick buck and the embracing of the easy option. They think they have found a perfect milking cow in education and are prepared to run down the system, compromise its standards and allow locals to miss out in prime courses and in the longer term in academic positions.

Rather than institute a long term strategy to train locals, overseas students

studying as postgraduates in Australia are to be effectively poached as academics for our universities. This is not only stealing talent from countries that can ill afford the loss, it means that the gap between the academic class - many of whom have little commitment to Australia as it is - and the bulk of the Australian population will further widen.

There is no substitute to encouraging locals, whatever the country. Locals are far more likely to have a commitment to the country and to identify with its general population. They have understanding of local conditions and most fundamentally understand the language and idiom and can generally communicate far more effectively than imports. Obviously, it is not a bad thing to have some imported academics, but the government should actively promote the careers of Australians, themselves of different racial backgrounds, who have shown in the past that they can match the best in the world. In short it is high time that the government puts the interests of the people who pay the taxes and so provide the infrastructure first.

From the point of view of the institutions, no doubt they will claim and many will believe that they are being humanitarian and helping our integration with and understanding of the region. Within the institutions they will not be short of propaganda backup on this line.

In every university there is a section which acts as a propaganda unit for both immigration and multiculturalism and is well funded by the government. Multiculturalists are clearly one of the country's privileged elites. All of these bodies can be said to duplicate the function of the BIPR and OMA. Where there is any fault to be found in immigration matters such bodies invariably find it to lie with the host population. Where education is necessary, it is of the hosts and not the newcomers. Funded at taxpayers' expense, these bodies continue to stereotype and attack Australians of Anglo-Celtic descent and other "old" Australians, who regard themselves as Australian first and foremost.

An example of this general tendency was seen in the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission document, *Racist Violence: Report of the National Inquiry into Racist Violence in Australia*. This report was clearly framed to target the "old" Australian population and no other. This inquiry merely duplicated earlier inquiries and allowed the inquirers to feel morally superior in one of the world's safest and most tolerant countries.

The media as usual displayed a lack of genuine critical appraisal and generally used the report as a basis for vacuous moralising. Commissioner Irene Moss was the principal influence behind this report, which cost the Australian public \$280,000. Of this money, \$18,300 was directed, as a "research consultancy" to the Centre for Multicultural Studies, Wollongong University.

Another of Commissioner Moss's reports, claiming discrimination against foreign doctors, has been described by Paul Gerber, Honorary Reader in

Department of Social and Preventative Medicine at the University of Queensland, as being of such poor quality that it was "fit only for the shredder".

Though "old" Australians, who make up three quarters of the population, are in the main more tolerant than the migrants we import, "old" Australians as taxpayers are unwillingly subsidising professional multiculturalists to insult them in the most bigoted of terms. The barrage of insults and threats, the stereotyping, comes in the main from the supposedly educated elites. The majority of these people are "old" Australians themselves but seem to bear a deep aversion to their own people, particularly the working class. At the very least these elites are not prepared to be fair, while indulging in fairytale delusions regarding other peoples and cultures. Others benefiting from the immigration industry are of course lawyers, such as those who widely advertise their services in the tabloid press.

There is an ever increasing number of bureaucrats, lawyers, former officers of the Immigration Department, who know the loopholes and have set themselves up as private immigration consultants in order to exploit them, and professional multiculturalists with a vested interest in maintaining both multiculturalism and the high immigration levels. Combined with big business interests, real estate agents, property developers, the bulk of the media and the trendy middle class left in general, they constitute a powerful force cutting across both left and right.

EVOLVING PARTY POSITIONS

At the ALP National Conference in late June 1991, the then Minister for Education, Employment and Training, Mr Dawkins circulated a proposal, among his Centre-Left faction, calling for the immigration intake to be halved, with cuts of 50 per cent coming from each category. Because of other diversions this proposal was not debated. It was leaked to the press however. (In March that year Graeme Campbell circulated a separate paper *Immigration Policy Proposals* which advocated that the intake be cut to 50,000, with cuts coming from the skilled and family reunion categories). Also to his credit Mr Dawkins later emphasised the problems with lack of English in the workforce and insisted upon the primacy of the English language in the face of those professional ethnics who questioned it. So, in immigration matters, Mr Dawkins has very much of a mixed record.

Mr Dawkins was highly critical of the "wimps" among the ALP leadership who were not prepared to debate the tough issues, like immigration, at the conference. There had been indications that Paul Keating would be prepared to significantly cut the immigration intake if he were leader. In fact during his first leadership challenge in early June 1991, Mr Keating agreed in a private conversation with Graeme Campbell that immigration needed to be cut and he mentioned a figure of 70,000. He gave a commitment that it would be

substantially cut. His first leadership challenge of course failed, but at that stage there was no reason to suppose that Mr Keating had changed his mind on the issue.

Later though the ground shifted. It appeared as though he had made a deal with high immigration advocate Dr Theophanous, who was certainly a strong Keating supporter in the second, successful, challenge in December. For that matter Dr Theophanous, who is now parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister and his deputy, had wanted to vote for Keating in the first challenge, but was prevented by pressure from members of his left faction, including present immigration minister, Senator Bolkus. So it appeared as though Mr Keating was backing away from his commitment to be decisive on immigration cuts.

This seemed to be confirmed, when, as Prime Minister, soon after his successful challenge, he made what Graeme Campbell described in a press release as an "appalling blunder". He attempted to smear both the Leader of the Opposition, John Hewson and Liberal Industrial Relations spokesman John Howard as racists for the Liberal Party immigration stance, which was imprecise but which spoke of the need for significant cuts.

The Minister for Immigration, Gerry Hand, distanced himself from the comments and Mr Keating's attack was widely condemned in the press, even among enthusiastic immigration proponents.

Since then of course and the release of the One Nation economic package in February 1992, Mr Keating has attempted to take on the mantle of an Australian nationalist. He has attacked past attitudes to Britain and has claimed that Britain abandoned Australia over Singapore in World War II. However his approach is essentially hollow. For all his talk of independence he redirects the colonial cringe to Asia and for all his talk of national unity, he not only does nothing to confront the policy of multiculturalism, he actively promotes it.

At about the same time as Mr Keating's attack on Britain, Mr Hand gave a ringing endorsement of the policy of multiculturalism and Mr Keating referred to Australia's "multicultural triumph". Clearly the ALP wants to keep the professional multiculturalists on side, a number of whom, including NSW state ALP politician Franca Arena and Paolo Totaro, who is something of a specialist in ethnic affairs, are leading lights in the Australian Republican Movement.

Franca Arena, while she contests Australia's right to curb immigration, strongly endorsed the right of the Italian Government to restrict immigration, during an exchange at the Evatt Foundation immigration conference on April 24, 1992, *A Fatal Shore or a Worker's Paradise: Immigration and Australia's Economic Future*. Perhaps she should stand for election in Italy. Her position on immigration would be more popular there than it is here. Paolo Totaro, on the other hand, laments the fact that Italians who have come to Australia are ceasing to form identifiable cluster groups and are integrating into the

mainstream. Some might regard this as a triumph, but Mr Totaro laments it and advocates ways of increasing immigration from Italy to top up local communities - in other words he wants to maintain separatism through immigration. The fact that very few people from Italy want to come to Australia anyway does not prevent this approach to immigration being taken seriously by the multiculturalist lobby, in particular the Catholic Social Welfare Commission.

For its part, the Opposition, under Dr John Hewson, strongly reaffirmed its support for the policy of multiculturalism and a deluded belief has emerged that its loss in the 1993 election was partly due to its failure to butter up the ethnic lobby. This line has been pushed for self-interested reasons by the lobby itself. It was also pushed by NSW State MP Paul Zammit in a *Sydney Morning Herald* article of 29 March 1993, "Libs need a healthy dose of culture". Mr Zammit, after missing out on a position in the ministry, had earlier charged that he had been discriminated against because of his ethnic background. In his article Mr Zammit claimed that the Liberal Party's failure to woo the "ethnic" vote was significant in its defeat. He claims that there must be more non-English speaking background candidates in the Liberal Party, without mentioning merit.

He did not consider the case of the by-election for Wills in 1992 when two NESB candidates were chosen by the major parties and were resoundingly rejected by an electorate with a large migrant component. The electors voted for Phil Cleary because of his local profile, on economic issues and because the two other main candidates were poor performers, ethnic background did not come into it.

Mr Zammit was honest enough to admit that Coalition policies on issues traditionally regarded as "ethnic" - immigration and "settlement policies" (ie multiculturalism) did not adversely effect the coalition, but that "industrial relations, Medicare and access to welfare" were of major concern to ethnic communities. Precisely. These are the mainstream issues on which the community in general rejected the Liberals. Nevertheless *The Sydney Morning Herald* continued to run articles of this type as part of a pro-multiculturalism propaganda campaign, without publishing critical comment. This campaign obviously had an effect upon the Liberals.

Prior to the Zammit article, they had Mary Kalantzis and Bill Cope on the theme, "Cultural victory for Labor" (18 March); following the Zammit article: "Anglo Libs lost touch with a new Australia" by Spiro Zavos (8 April); "Libs out of touch: Fraser minister", featuring the comments of Ian McPhee (26 May) and an editorial two days later, "A multicultural Liberal Party".

The Liberals have clearly bought this line, both at the NSW state and the Federal levels. Their appeasement of professional ethnics will make them even more irrelevant. The Liberals should present a broad vision which unites Australians and should have the courage to attack the ALP over political correctness. Where the electorate rejected the narrow economic ideology of

the Liberals, they will also ultimately reject the narrow social ideology of political correctness which has captured the ALP, as long as the Liberals broaden their economic appeal. The best chance for the Liberals is that they return to the economic mainstream and target political correctness. This will ensure them of a broad base of support, but it is unlikely to happen.

As has been noted, the Liberal immigration spokesman is Senator Jim Short. He replaced Philip Ruddock who has moved on to shadow minister for Social Security.

It is interesting to consider the dynamics at work while Mr Ruddock was immigration spokesman. While Mr Ruddock was essentially uncomfortable with cutting the immigration program, particularly the family reunion section, he persistently stated the need for Australia to maintain the integrity of its borders and was an effective critic of the government's administrative failings in immigration. He also pointed out that some new arrivals were receiving the pension, when they clearly had no entitlement to it. Immigration administration is clearly a big problem and it is in this area where he largely confined his attack.

However, during an attack by Mr Ruddock in Parliament on 7 November 1991 on the government's lack of control over illegal immigration, an interesting exchange occurred. Mr Ruddock stated that the government was sending mixed signals and encouraging people to rort the migration process. He gave as an example of the government's slackness that the number of residency places granted to visitors or students had risen from over 14,000 to 18,000 in a year.

Mr Ruddock: "We have seen a 28 per cent increase in the number of people successfully applying under the old system for grant of residency status or under the new system..."

Mr Hand: "Some of them are your cases. Some of them are the ones you came knocking on my door to get accepted. Some of them belong to you."

Mr Ruddock: "It happens to be the case that it has gone from 14,000 to 18,000."

Mr Hand: "You promoted them. Is that correct?"

Mr Ruddock: "If the Minister thinks I have traipsed to his door with 18,000 special cases, he has a much more active imagination than most."

Mr Hand: "They know they can come to you and you will come and see me."

On 26 May 1992, Mr Hand answered a question from Mr Ruddock in Parliament in the wake of the Marshall Islands Affair, which itself revolved around a dubious business migration proposal by a private businessman. This led to the resignation of Senator Richardson who had signed a reference on his behalf. In answering the question, Mr Hand said of Mr Ruddock, "The honourable member for Dundas would probably break every record in the book" when it came to the number of times he had made immigration representations on behalf of individuals. All members of parliament have made

such representations and as Mr Hand states it is a legitimate role for a Member of Parliament, but some clearly do it much more than others.

Mr Hand also indicated in Parliament that Mr Ruddock changed his approach to suit his audience and buttered up ethnic groups. Dr Theophanous also indicated in Parliament that he had been given assurances by Mr Ruddock on immigration over a period of time which he clearly interpreted as being in general agreement with his own position - namely in favour of high immigration and the policy of multiculturalism.

In spite of Mr Ruddock's representations on behalf of on-shore applicants for change of status and his general reservations about the position of his party at the time, he went along with it. Though, as stated, the Liberal Party refused to be definite, it indicated in broad terms that it would have if elected cut immigration significantly on economic grounds in the short term and particularly cut back on family reunion. When leader, Dr Hewson indicated that he believed in high immigration in the long term. The National Party went along with the short term strategy, but its leader Tim Fischer made it clear that he only supported cuts in the short term and strongly advocated a much larger population for Australia. Since the election however, he has been trying to carve out a separate identity for himself and his party and he has called for immigration to be significantly cut, without including such qualifications.

That is one way in which many politicians are consistent about immigration - they are consistent in their inconsistency. And, as has been seen, both sides have attacked the other for short term political gain when attempts have been made to reform immigration or multiculturalist policy.

CONSULTATIONS, REVIEWS AND RACE LAWS

While heading his immigration committees, Dr Theophanous clearly believed that he was a kingmaker, if not the pretender to the throne, when it came to Australia's immigration program. In a press release of 16 January 1992 he stated: "with respect to the program of 1992-93, we, that is the Government, the Minister of Immigration, will be holding extensive consultations with community groups, the union movement, the business sector etc with a view to making a decision in April this year."

In this manner Dr Theophanous announced the Minister's progress. A person not familiar with the circumstances might assume from such a statement that Dr Theophanous was the Minister. At any rate, community consultations did take place, but at that time it was far from certain that Mr Hand would make significant cuts to the program.

Dr Theophanous later announced that immigration procedures should be reviewed. He presented his own proposal to make immigration "fairer", based

on zones and quotas. It was clearly an attempt to facilitate the entry of people he preferred to Australia, while claiming to be non-discriminatory. As part of his system Dr Theophanous proposed to award marks to each ethnic group on the basis of "the numerical contribution to the immigration program which that group has made since the inception of the program in 1945". This he said would result in a greater weighting being given to "larger, older" groups such as Dutch and Italians [and Greeks], who he said had been severely disadvantaged in the last few years under the present system. This, in spite of the fact that Greek and Italian professional ethnics have been largely responsible for the way it has evolved.

While Dr Theophanous's system also contained a zonal element which he said was based on "the equal right of all regions of the world to contribute people to Australia", the clear intent behind his proposals was to favour select ethnic groups, something he has condemned in others. As noted earlier it is particularly ironic because it seems mainly to be a matter of status and wishful thinking. Very few Greeks and Italians in fact want to come to Australia these days. Graeme Campbell attacked the Theophanous proposal in two speeches in parliament (Hansard, 8 and 12 October 1992).

The Theophanous system is typical of the approach of ethnic lobby groups. Though they condemn past immigration and settlement policies as being racist, they, like earlier Australians, basically want to bring out people who are like themselves. While earlier Australians expressed this openly, even bluntly, and it was part of a cohesive nation-building vision, in the case of the ethnic lobbies it is more a matter of status and empire building. It is justified by sham postures of anti-discrimination and brought about, as Dr FitzGerald noted, by "pressure, threat and manipulation". A vision of the national interest does not come into it. Also when one group gains concessions in immigration matters, other groups also have to be bought off with concessions. Bidding wars develop which further distort the program.

Of its very nature this approach is alive with unintended consequences, including the simultaneous importation of people from groups who are mutually hostile. A large part of the dubious moral authority of ethnic lobbies, which helps to sustain their influence, is based on the claim that they were systematically discriminated against in the past and continue to be discriminated against - even while they are favoured. They must therefore continue to claim discrimination, hence the endless reports, from the ethnic lobby and its bureaucratic allies attacking the "old" Australian population as racist.

The strongest examples of racial hostility exist between ethnic groups themselves and this of course has to be played down.

In Dr Theophanous's own electorate of Calwell in northern Melbourne, ethnic hostilities surfaced in a battle between Greeks and Turks for control of ALP branches. *The Sunday Age* article of 10 May 1992, "Turkish moves lead to ALP branch war" by Mark Forbes, noted that there was a massive upsurge

is in
mem
a
con
rite
that
The
wh
pe
we
in
~
u

in membership of the Coolaroo branch. The branch used to contain only 29 members, but on 21 April, 204 new members with Turkish backgrounds joined.

ASIO apparently believed the branch stacking was part of a move by people connected with the Turkish government to attempt to unseat Dr Theophanous after his critical comments about the former Turkish Prime Minister, when that PM was in the country in 1991 to receive an award from the government. The stacking brought a counter from supporters of Dr Theophanous, 215 of whom were signed up in two Broadmeadows branches. Ernest Healy in his *People and Place* article noted that apart from Greeks, some of these people were Kurds, traditional enemies of the Turks and that since a party rule change in 1991 this sort of branch stacking had been encouraged. According to *The Sunday Age* report, a senior supporter of Dr Theophanous said, "If they want war, we'll give them war." It will presumably be a war to determine whether the foreign policy of the Greek or Turkish governments should be given precedence in the electorate. Branch stacking with ethnic groups has also taken place in NSW and Queensland ALP branches.

Apparently, having beaten off the challenge in his own electorate, Mr Theophanous, parliamentary secretary to Paul Keating and responsible for the government's "access and equity" program, merely sees such branch stacking as ethnic people wanting to participate in the democratic process. In an article in *The Canberra Times* of 13 July, 1994 "More ethnic participation is a healthy trend" he stated, "While some new members in particular branches may have dubious motives, the overall increased ethnic participation is healthy for our democracy and reflects the increased cultural diversity of our society."

Another politician in the mould of Dr Theophanous is NSW State ALP education and youth affairs spokesman, Mr John Aquilina. Mr Aquilina is the secretary of the NSW ALP Parliamentary Ethnic Affairs Task Force. Franca Arena is the chair. Mr Aquilina has already indicated his desire to enter Federal politics and get involved in immigration matters and is not slow to make accusations of racism, like Franca Arena. The NSW state Liberal party has of course got in on the act as well. As stated, it has a Minister for Multicultural Affairs called Michael Photios, who receives a salary of \$150,000 a year and has 11 staff. As John Laws pointed out in his *Sunday Telegraph* column of 21 November 1993 entitled "The Minister for Waste", there is no justification for the existence of his portfolio. The central "ethnic affairs" responsibilities are handled by the Premier and Attorney-General. Mr Photios administers only one piece of legislation and his position is little more than a sop to the ethnic lobby.

In the wake of the furore caused by the ABC Film *Cop It Sweet* about police and Aboriginal relations in Redfern, a film shown twice within a week, and the video of police officers pretending to be hanged Aboriginals for a party prank, also shown on the ABC, though it was several years old, *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 16 March 1992 reported Mr Aquilina as saying an attack at about the same time on shops and his own office was racially inspired.

This was contested by other shopowners, themselves migrants. As *The Sydney Morning Herald* article, "Merchants deny racism in attacks" by Shelli-Anne Couch, noted, "The Aussie World Air Travel office, which Mr Aquilina said was left unscathed because it was Australian, was run by a Malaysian." The manager of a real estate office which was also attacked, Mrs Maree Baran stated, "I believe we're being branded as a racist community and its just not correct". On the other hand violence between ethnic groups, particularly gang activity, is played down.

There is already a tendency for the media to self-censor regarding illegal activities involving ethnic groups. For example an article in *The Sunday Telegraph* of 24 January 1993, "Crackdown on Reef Poachers" by Bronwyn Gora, failed to mention the fact the that reef and marine life devastation mentioned in Sydney has largely been caused by newly arrived migrants, particularly Vietnamese. This has also been the case in Melbourne and Brisbane.

The article quoted Dr Peter Fairweather, a senior lecturer at Macquarie University who said "In places where there has been a lot of harvesting, some species aren't found any more and the reef has changed completely...the fragile web of ecology is being destroyed." This is in spite of repeated, though low media profile attempts, to dissuade people from such practices.

Were such activities being carried out by "old" Australians they would be roundly condemned, as they are condemned for past ecological damage. With ethnic groups it is not only a softly softly approach to such matters, they are often not even mentioned as being the ones responsible. A NSW government department spokesman in the article spoke of the need for a "massive community education campaign". That is to say where "ethnics" are the wrong-doers the whole community is targeted for education, but where "old" Australians are perceived to be at fault they are specifically targeted and attacked.

The approach of those such as Mr Aquilina and others who attack the broader community while being subsidised by it, is likely to incite resentment and certainly is more likely to cause problems than to solve them. When that happens no doubt he and others will call for increased legal sanctions and greater bureaucratic control.

Both he and Dr Theophanous should take note of an excellent letter published by *The Age* on 27 February 1992 about the Greek speaking branches of the ALP, which were mentioned earlier. The letter, written by a man of Greek descent, states, "For Australia to become a strong nation with a united purpose, people of all ethnic backgrounds must put the national interests of Australia above those of their nations of origin."

Aside from the difficulty mentioned earlier in getting lawyers out of immigration matters there is also the problem of the increase in laws relating to racial vilification. Allied to this "anti-vilification" codes have been introduced for both television and radio. Racial Vilification legislation is totally

unnecessary and likely to be counterproductive. It is a dangerous and insidious development pushed by select pressure groups and has ominous implications for freedom of speech. In fact it seems deliberately designed to inhibit open criticism of aspects of the policy of multiculturalism and immigration.

Already NSW and WA have such legislation on their books and Victoria has followed. However, the initial legislation in NSW didn't go far enough for the NSW Ethnic Affairs Commission. A report in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 12 June 1992, "Race law is not working, Govt told" by Luis M. Garcia, stated that in a submission to the Premier, the commission "expressed concern that no cases of serious racial vilification, including threats of physical violence, have so far been referred for possible criminal prosecution."

Surely this might indicate that the problem has been overstated, something the commission could not bear to stomach. The commission called for the legislation to be made much tougher and a network of bureaucrats set up around the state to receive initial complaints. A review of the NSW Anti-Discrimination Act, including the Racial Vilification section, was conducted largely as a result of these pressures. This publicly-funded organisation, along with its allies and counterparts in other states and federally, seems determined to create conflict. When it has it will no doubt feel that it has been vindicated. The NSW act was subsequently toughened, although this aspect was overshadowed by the elements of the legislation outlawing "vilification" of homosexuals.

The then Commonwealth Attorney-General Michael Duffy introduced a draft bill, *The Racial Discrimination Amendment Bill 1992*, to parliament on 16 December 1992. Due to the timing of the election this bill was wiped from the slate before being debated. The draft bill aimed to create two categories of offences. The first category made "racial incitement" a criminal offence. For various of the listed offences sentences of one and two years imprisonment could be imposed. Even a gesture could be construed as racial incitement under the act. The other, civil, section of the bill was to have been administered by Race Discrimination Commissioner, Irene Moss, of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, one of the people who most strongly pushed for the bill.

Television and radio codes, which have sections echoing the draft bill, have also been introduced. The television codes were introduced in September 1993 after a token submissions process. So, even before the bill was passed, television and radio peak bodies, guided by the government, were acting to fall into line.

The day after the introduction of the draft Racial Vilification Bill the Migration (Offences and Undesirable Persons) Amendment Bill 1992 was introduced to parliament and passed both houses. Among the provisions of this bill was one which echoed the racial vilification bill and allowed exclusion of a person likely to "engage in vilification of a segment of the community or [who] would foment discord in the community." This section of the bill was

introduced at the behest of the multiculturalist lobby, particularly Jewish groups who wanted to prevent the entry of controversial historian David Irving to Australia. Whatever we may think of his views, he has the right to express them.

On 30 April 1993, in the course of Mr Irving's appeal against the decision to the Federal court in Perth, it was revealed in documents tended to the court that both ASIO and the Immigration Department advised that the proposed Irving visit was not a problem. It was the Prime Minister's Department - no doubt strongly influenced by the Office of Multicultural Affairs within it and perhaps the Prime Minister himself - which recommended against the visit. So effectively it was the authority of the Prime Minister, with the agreement or otherwise of Mr Hand, which vetoed the visit of Mr Irving.

Mr Hand used the legislation to bar the entry of Mr Irving who had been due to engage in a lecture tour. Mr Irving then went to the Federal Court, which directed the Minister, in September 1993, to reconsider the visa application. The cost of a court case which should never have needed to be brought in the first place, was borne entirely by the Australian people, as the government was obliged to pay Mr Irving's costs.

On 3 May 1994 in parliament, Senator Bolkus said that he had reconsidered the application and again refused it. In answer to a question from Senator Kim Carr of his own party, Senator Bolkus said, "I have decided to reject Mr Irving's application on the basis that he does not meet the public interest criteria of good character as they were at the time of [former Immigration Minister, Mr Gerry] Hand's decision." This decision is, in fact, on different grounds to the Hand decision, though such grounds existed at the time. Mr Irving will again contest the decision in the courts.

The codes put in place are continuing to be used as an instrument of ethnic politics. A senior Bosnian Serb politician, Biljana Plavsic, was denied entry under this provision in late 1993 after the government was pressured by opposing ethnic groups. While we have every right to insist that ethnic hatreds not be brought into Australia, this provision is likely to be continue to be manipulated by those with the numbers or the ear of government. This will cause resentment among the groups whose members are banned and exacerbate existing tensions.

Though professional ethnic groups and select bureaucracies strongly support racial vilification laws, they mainly rely on the problems in white-Aboriginal relations to justify them. The Moss Report *Racist Violence* and the *Report of the Royal Commission into Black Deaths in Custody*, along with a report from the Law Reform Commission, then headed by Justice Elizabeth Evatt, *Multiculturalism and the Law*, have been repeatedly referred to as justifications for restrictive racial vilification legislation. The main difference between these reports is that the latter two are against criminal sanctions, while the Moss report supports them. Otherwise the Evatt report is a mere reflection of the recommendations of the other two. These first two

reports basically revolved around Aboriginals, but they are used to justify the expansion of bureaucracies which have nothing to do with Aboriginals.

Aboriginal Affairs Minister Robert Tickner has for some time strongly backed proposed racial vilification laws. He is reported as saying in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 16 March, 1992, "The report on racial violence took a strong stand on that issue as did the royal commission report [into black deaths in custody] and I do believe it's a key issue." He neglects to mention the shoddy quality of the Moss report and the fact that the Royal Commission, for all its value to lawyers and its moralising, found that the proportion of whites who died in custody was actually higher than Aboriginals. What was disproportionate was the Aboriginal arrest rate.

The Institute of Criminology issued another survey in 1992, changing the definition of "custody" previously used, which purported to show that marginally more blacks than whites on a proportional basis die in custody than whites. On a numerical basis the survey still showed that far more whites than blacks died in custody.

However another Institute of Criminology researcher, David McDonald, in partnership with West Australian Health Department Surveyor, Neil Thompson, found white and black deaths in custody to be proportionally about equal. ("Jail death risk equal for blacks, whites", *The Australian* 1 November 1993). This study examined all 527 deaths in custody from 1980 to 1989 and is the most comprehensive to date. Once again the researchers said they expected to find that, proportionally, many more blacks than whites died in custody. It is simply not the case, yet given all the previous publicity, any black death in custody is given wide coverage and produces a strongly emotional response, which is quickly manipulated by vested interests.

The impression is still deliberately given and widely believed that proportionally far more Aboriginals die in custody than whites.

All that has happened as a result of the government's response to the Royal Commission's findings is that even more money will be diverted to bureaucrats. It is unclear how this will help address the real and underlying problems of Aboriginal people.

In a clear indication that there was little real concern about Aboriginals in the push for racial vilification laws and that they were used merely as a stalking horse, Mr Keating announced his decision to proceed with the laws during an address to the Zionist Federation of Australia's (ZFA) 36th Biennial Conference on 28 May 1994. It was virtually a present to the ZFA. He said racial vilification legislation would be introduced before the end of that year and stated that the need for such a law had been brought home to him when he "opened the Children of the Holocaust exhibition at the Australian War Memorial in February." This exhibition, of drawings from the State Jewish Museum in Prague, was staged as a cooperative venture with the Sydney Jewish Museum.

Alan Jacobs, the director of the Sydney Jewish Museum, made one of the

primary aims of his Museum clear in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 15 November 1993, "Voices from the ashes". The museum intends to fulfil a crusading role against "racism, intolerance and religious persecution". It sounds a worthy goal, but one man's "education" is another man's "propaganda", especially if the Holocaust is used as an excuse to promote, or weaken resistance to, authoritarian and unjustified racial vilification legislation. In Australia in particular, a country which has offered such a haven to Jews, this would be an ignoble use of the tragedy. Mr Jacobs has the ability to influence not only wider community attitudes among adults, but among children as well. He said, "With anti-racism such a fundamental component of the teaching syllabus in NSW, we're working very closely with both the State and private [school] systems."

Given such an approach, and as the Jewish lobby has been in the vanguard of those pushing for racial vilification legislation, Mr Keating's remark about the Children of the Holocaust exhibition is interesting. It was originally expected that racial vilification legislation would be brought before parliament early in 1994. Had things turned out as expected, this exhibition, staged from 10 February to 30 April, would have coincided with the introduction of the legislation.

While this may have been just a coincidence, the Jewish lobby's powers of coordination are considerable, when a story from the *Australia-Israel Review* attacking and misrepresenting Australians Against Further Immigration and Graeme Campbell, can be republished in three major national newspapers on the same day. This happened on 15 April 1994 when *The Sydney Morning Herald*, *The Canberra Times* and *The Herald Sun* published, with some variations, such an article by Andrew Silberberg. *The Sydney Morning Herald* deleted references to Graeme Campbell, possibly because it had already run a hatchet job on him by Gerard Henderson in a front page feature in the *Good Weekend* magazine, "Lunar Right Rising", which used similar material. This magazine is inserted in the Saturday editions of both the *Sydney Morning Herald* and *The Age*.

The reprints in the three papers were in the wake of the success of Australians Against Further Immigration at a series of by-elections. The Jewish lobby of course is strongly in favour of both immigration and the policy of multiculturalism. It also condemns those who wish Australia to maintain a basic European heritage as racist, while spokesmen such as Isi Leibler are far more selective, being strongly against Jews marrying non-Jews. As Graeme Campbell remarked in a letter to *The Canberra Times* in response to the attack on him in the Silberberg article, it seems that Isi Leibler and co have a "special dispensation to urge discrimination", while simultaneously being among the loudest in accusing others of bigotry.

This criticism was reported in *The Australian Jewish News* of 20 May 1994, "Campbell attacks 'ideologues'". It stated, "Mr Campbell cited a report in the *Australian Jewish News* of April 29 to support his attack on Mr Leibler.

The report quoted Mr Leibler in a Yom Hashoah commemoration address in Brisbane warning against assimilation and urging Jewish communities to take steps to stem the tide of intermarriage". The article went on to quote from Mr Campbell's letter, "when one considers the enormous contribution to the arts, to intellectual thought and defence of free speech by Jews in the past, it is indeed a pity that the narrow ideologues of Judiasm seem to have such an influence in Australian public life."

The outgoing president of the ZFA, Mark Leibler, has been one of the strongest supporters of racial vilification legislation, including harsh criminal sanctions. Indeed, in his ZFA submission on the 1992 draft bill, he wanted, "artistic works, academic and scientific statements and fair reports or comments on matters of public interest to be subjected for scrutiny for racial vilification" and stated that what constituted racial vilification should be defined "through the eyes of a reasonable man of that religion, race, colour or national or ethnic origin" (*Australian Jewish News* 12 February 1993). He has previously accused Liberal backbencher Ken Aldred of being anti-Semitic for comments he made about taxation matters, though Mr Aldred did not make any general Jewish reference or inference at all.

Mr Aldred also raised concerns about sabotage of Immigration Department computer records by a foreign intelligence agency in a speech to parliament on 19 September, 1994. In spite of the Attorney General's eagerness to pass 'Racial Hatred' legislation, as desired by the Zionist lobby he showed no desire to follow up this matter. Both ASIO and the Defence Signals Directorate believed the foreign intelligence agency involved to be Mossad. Mr Aldred later lost Liberal Party pre-selection for his seat of Deakin.

In an article in *The Australian* of 27 October, 1994, 'Libs cite dumped MP's undistinguished record' unnamed sources said that some reasons Mr Aldred had been dumped included the fact that he "advocated tighter controls on immigration" and was "notorious for a stream of allegations in Parliament over espionage activities in Australia."

Mr Leibler praised Mr Keating highly at the ZFA dinner, much to the chagrin of former Prime Minister Bob Hawke, who was also at the meeting and felt his own contributions to the Jewish lobby had been overlooked. It was claimed that Mr Hawke also pointed out that Mr Keating had supported an Islamic cleric in his own electorate who had vilified Jews. If Mr Hawke did make this statement then he had a point, but it is an episode that also entangles himself as well and highlights the complications involved in the appeasement of sometimes mutually hostile ethnic groups for perceived electoral gain. The cleric in question is Sheikh Taj Eldine El-Hilaly, Imam of Sydney's Lakemba Mosque. Lakemba and the surrounding suburbs have a large Muslim population. Two Federal ALP electorates cross Lakemba. One is Watson, presently held by Leo McLeay and the other is Mr Keating's electorate of Blaxland.

In September 1988 Sheik Hilaly gave a speech to Muslim students at

Sydney University in which he described Jews as "the underlying cause of all wars threatening the peace and security of the whole world", accused them of "a malicious disposition towards all mankind" and blamed them for the use of "sex and abominable acts of buggery, espionage, treason and economic hoarding to control the world." (*The Australian Magazine* 19-20 November 1988).

This was not the first time that Hilaly had indulged in such tirades. He had used his sermons at the Mosque in the past to denounce Israel and applaud the support for terrorism offered by Ayatollah Khomeini and Muammar Ghaddafi. He was also on record as being a supporter of the Hezbollah terrorists in Lebanon. Hilaly had come to Australia on a temporary entry permit, which he breached by overstaying and was only granted an extension in 1982 on the understanding that he stop his inflammatory sermons. However his sermons continued. In 1986, after protests from the Jewish community and also other Muslims who were opposed to his installation as Imam at the Lakemba Mosque, deportation proceedings were commenced. However, after lobbying by sections of the Muslim community and the ALP, successive Immigration Ministers extended his visa.

After the September 1988 speech many expected the Federal Government to act against Hilaly. Not only did the Government not do so, only a few weeks after this speech a large group of senior ALP figures, invited by Hilaly to thank them for his latest visa extension, attended a banquet at the Lakemba Mosque. At the banquet were then Prime Minister Bob Hawke, Treasurer Paul Keating, Communications Minister Gary Punch and backbenchers Leo McLeay, John Mountford and Stephen Dubois. At that time Mr Dubois was the member for Watson, but, to his credit, perhaps after seeing the sleazy politics of multiculturalism from the inside, he later became a strong critic of multiculturalism. He lost his seat on preselection to Leo McLeay, after Mr McLeay was forced out of his previous seat of Grayndler by the Left. Also present at the dinner were Gough Whitlam, Barrie Unsworth and Frank Walker.

Not long afterwards in parliament, Opposition immigration spokesman Alan Cadman produced photographs taken at the banquet, but Prime Minister Hawke reacted angrily and succeeded in preventing them from being tabled. *The Bulletin* of 22 November 1988 published two of the photos however, one of which showed the above mentioned party standing alongside Hilaly in what looked like some sort of reverential pose. Permanent residency was granted to Hilaly in September 1990 by then Immigration Minister, Gerry Hand.

While Mr Keating may have lobbied on behalf of Hilaly because of pressures in his own electorate, he was clearly not alone and Bob Hawke was one of those who went along with the process. This is an insight into the style of politics our politicians are involved in when it comes to multiculturalism and courting the so-called "ethnic vote" - particularly it seems when ethnic groups have the potential to be volatile. While Mr Keating appeases the

Zionists by promising them a present of racial vilification legislation, so eroding the traditional freedoms of the tolerant majority, he has supported a person who clearly holds a bitter enmity towards Jews and Israel because of perceived electoral advantage. What a high minded approach!

For all the smears about mainstream Australians being racist, it is clear that ethnic and ethno-religious groups have far more to fear from each other than they do from the Australian mainstream they accuse, which is exceptionally tolerant by comparison. This tolerance is of course used against the majority.

Others present at the Zionist dinner included Malcolm Fraser and Deputy Opposition Leader, Peter Costello, who made some noises about the need to protect free speech, but said that the Opposition supported racial vilification legislation in principle. Also present at the meeting was Richard Pratt, a former senior fund raiser for the Victorian Liberal Party. *The Australian Jewish News* of 27 May 1994, in the article "Pratt second-richest" stated, "Packaging king Richard Pratt is now Australia's second richest man and the wealthiest member of Australia's Jewish community. Business Review Weekly last week estimated that Mr Pratt's fortune had more than doubled from \$550 million last year to \$1.2 billion today." The article went on to state, "There are about 50 members of Australia's Jewish community among Australia's richest 200 individuals and families."

It was reported in the *Sunday Herald Sun* of 3 July 1994, "Pier museum plan endorsed" that Mr Pratt had been appointed by Victorian Liberal Premier Jeff Kennett to a committee to look at establishing a Museum of Immigration at Melbourne's Station Pier. It was also announced at the ZFA dinner by Mr Keating that ZFA lobbyist Helene Taft Teichmann was to be the first member of a proposed 20 member body, whose task, according to the *AJN* of 10 June 1994, "New body to advise PM", would be to advise the government on "the cultural diversity dimensions of the Centenary of Federation and the 2000 Olympics": in other words how these events can be used as propaganda vehicles for multiculturalism. Helene Taft Teichmann is the ex-wife of Melbourne academic Max Teichmann, who is strongly opposed to racial vilification legislation. A 'Racial Hatred Bill' was introduced to parliament in early November 1994 and is similar to the 1992 Draft Bill. It allows for prison terms of up to two years for threats to people or groups on the basis of race or ethnic background. There are also civil penalties for acts done which are likely to "offend" people on the basis of their race or ethnic background. Graeme Campbell strongly opposed this bill, but as we go to press it is likely, in its essentials, to be passed and become law.

IMMIGRATION INTAKES

While on April 30 1991 the Cabinet cut the projected intake for 1991-1992 program to 111,000, the changes were cosmetic. At the time of the cuts the government also announced its intention to gradually increase the intake to 128,000 by 1993-94.

At any rate, as Michael Millet reported in *The Sydney Morning Herald* article of 12 March 1992, "Migration blow-out as thousands beat quota", the projected 1991-92 figure was on line to be overshoot by about 4,000 anyway. He stated that this was "despite claims by senior Government ministers that the recession would act as a natural curb on immigration by reducing Australia's attraction to overseas applicants."

This has been the oft repeated theme of the head of the BIPR, Dr Nieuwenhuysen - that the market will naturally adjust the intake. It is a totally facile and incorrect claim. No matter what our economic condition, many family reunion migrants can earn more on the dole than they can in their home countries and will continue to come to the country if they can. As Millet stated: "The blowout is due to an oversubscription of family reunion cases" mainly in the concessional part of the program.

Concessional family reunion is one section of the program which should be scrapped entirely, not just cut back.

As for the blowout in the 1991-92 figures, Mr Hand was firm that the program would come in at 111,000 and to the extent that it was achieved, it was no doubt by merely deferring the settlement of several thousand of the migrants until the next intake.

On 12 May 1992, Mr Hand announced a projected immigration intake of 80,000 for the year 1992-93. This represented a cut of over 30,000 on the intake of the 1991-92. The 111,000 figure itself represented a minor cut on the year before, but had been made with heavy qualifications.

Bob Hawke, a self-proclaimed "high immigration man" desperate to keep ethnic pressure groups on side, was Prime Minister at that time. Also, at that time, Mr Hand stated that he saw no reason to cut the intake further in the future. Clearly he changed his mind fundamentally. He said that it was his community consultation which convinced him that immigration should be cut. But there is no doubt that the continuing criticism of immigration levels from a number of sources played its part in his change of mind, as did the general economic conditions. It is also unlikely that immigration would have been cut so substantially had Bob Hawke still been Prime Minister.

The immigration cuts were made in the concessional family and independent categories. Both of these categories have in practice been skills tested, but in reality no account has been taken of demand for skills in Australia. Many of these skilled migrants have added to the oversupply of various skilled areas such as engineers.

Also, specifically in the concessional family category, among the chief users were Filipina brides sponsored by Australian men, who appeared to use this entry point as a way of progressively sponsoring other relatives. This seems to have been a predetermined manipulation of the immigration system by people who would not otherwise have been accepted. Dr Birrell issued a report at the *A Fatal Shore or a Worker's Paradise?* immigration conference conducted by the Evatt Foundation in Sydney on 24 April 1992 which highlighted this approach. As reported in *The Weekend Australian* of 25-26 April, Dr Birrell's report stated that of 10,170 brothers and sisters brought out by sponsors under the concessional category, 1,902, or nearly 20 per cent, were from the Philippines. Most of the sponsors were Filipina women who "had married Australian men, including, but not exclusively, through the 'mail-order bride' system".

Another report has since been issued which highlights the violent treatment some Filipina women have received from the men who sponsored them. Some of these men were alleged to have sponsored several women, which further calls immigration procedures into question. The report was co-released on 20 May 1992 by the NSW Ethnic Affairs Commission and the NSW state Minister assisting the Premier on the status of women, Ms Anne Cohen. It is called: *Filipino Women: Challenges and Responses* and, among other things, calls for checks on the men sponsoring the women. That is a sensible idea, if long overdue. It would be a better one to discourage the easy order bride practice altogether.

As far as the skills supposedly gained through the concessional and independent categories go, in some cases migrants have been given a misleading picture of Australian conditions and in others the "skills" of the migrants have not been up to local standards.

People have been enticed to Australia by immigration officials based overseas who have given them misleading accounts of demand for their skills in Australia. The major concern of these officials seems to be justifying their own existence and one way to do that is to direct as many skilled migrants to Australia as they can, with little regard for local conditions. An article in *The Age* of 16 April 1993, "Migrant doctor trapped on dole in the lucky country" by Martin Daly, for example, pointed out the case of Dr Rafiq Memom, who resigned a well-paid job in Pakistan to come to Australia due to the encouragement of immigration officials at the Australian Embassy in Pakistan.

There have been a number of similar complaints from skilled migrants unable to get jobs in Australia - they were actually given an untrue account of the circumstances in Australia by Australian immigration officials.

Another problem is that the skills are often not up to local expectations and the lack of local knowledge has been a handicap in seeking employment. As Michael Dack of the Institution of Engineers, Australia, wrote in a letter to the *Australian Financial Review*, on 15 May 1992, skill selection has been slack. He noted that in the past "A person qualifying as a professional engineer

20 years ago, for example, who has been driving a taxi for that period and has no English, would still be classified as an engineer for migration purposes even though he or she could not possibly function here as one." Mr Dack commended Mr Hand's introduction of compulsory English testing for skilled immigrants as a step in the right direction of ensuring workplace competency.

However, in the past, the fundamental skill of English language competency has been largely self-assessed by the migrant. As a result migrants have overstated - at times considerably - their English language ability. A number of those in the independent category who have assessed themselves as "excellent" in English in order to maximise their points, can hardly speak English at all. Many are now attending English language courses at public expense. As far as English classes go, Mr Hand brought in a provision to seek a contribution from migrants to the cost of teaching English.

Though the changes announced by Mr Hand gave greater emphasis to English assessment in the remaining concessional and independent areas, the record of the Department in the past means that adequate testing cannot be taken for granted. If the testing turns out to be only stricter in theory and not practically enforced, it will be worse than useless.

Not only should such testing be practically and competently enforced, it should be extended across the entire program, with the single exception of refugees. There were no plans for English testing of the preferential family reunion category under Mr Hand's new arrangements, or any cuts to this component. In fact Mr Hand increased immediate family reunion numbers by 2,000 to 45,000. The concessional family category - first introduced by Ian Macphie in 1979 - which provided 6,000 migrants in the 1992-93 intake, should be abolished.

It must be said though, that Mr Hand's revised program, as well as his tougher stand in some aspects of the program, were positive and welcome steps. It is unfortunate however that, after leaving Parliament at the 1993 election, he not only decided to become a migration agent, but that he pushed cases from sections of the Chinese "students", who had missed out on earlier concessions and whom, as a group, he had resisted as Minister.

AAP of 1 February 1994 reported, "According to correspondence seen by AAP, Mr Hand arranged for himself and [Chinese Students and Graduates] association members to meet [Immigration Minister] Senator Bolkus in December [1993]. Association spokeswoman Tang Hong said the Victorian branch of the group approached Mr Hand about the matter. A meeting scheduled for 14 December was postponed until 23 December, but Mr Hand advised Senator Bolkus he would not attend after an apparent falling out with association members. 'I will, however, continue to work with the individual Chinese students in Victoria and New South Wales,' [Mr Hand wrote to Senator Bolkus]. 'I may seek to discuss their plight as a group with you some time in the New Year'." He did and his representations clearly paid dividends. Concessions were extended to the students on 1 February, 1994.

The 1993-94 immigration intake was cut marginally from 80,000 to 76,000 by Senator Bolkus. 71 per cent of places were taken by family reunion. Places in the concessional or extended family component nearly doubled from 6,000 to 11,000. Senator Bolkus said that the intake had reached its lowest point and was unlikely to be reduced further in future years.

This proved to be so with the announcement of the 1994-95 intake on 9 May, 1994. The intake represented an increase of 13 per cent over 1993-94. Places were increased by 10,000 to 86,000. Before the intake was announced Mr Keating stressed that, in preference to merely bringing in skilled migrants, he would concentrate on training locals to fill skills shortages. The clear impression of his words was that there would be less emphasis on skilled immigration and so, logically, skilled immigration would fall. However places for skilled immigrants were actually increased from 17,000 to 25,000. At best his statement was a half truth.

Chinese "students" who arrived after the Tiananmen Square massacre made up 8,300 of the new places and a strong emphasis was placed on business migration. The government has eased criteria for business migrants in spite of the fiasco that business migration was in the past. In spite of the claim that there are adequate safeguards, this category was rorted before and the poor administration of the immigration department gives no confidence that it will not happen again.

There were also 2,000 extra places for family reunion, in spite of the high unemployment in this category. This does not sit well with supposed attempts to bring down the unemployment rate.

Graeme Campbell put out a press release on 9 May which stated that the intake had been based on two failures and a broken promise. The failures were the mopping up operation of the Chinese "students" farce and the reintroduction of emphasis on a failed scheme of the past - the business migration program. The broken promise was Mr Keating's pledge that he would not rely upon skilled immigration.

The Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils, though its chairman, Victor Rebikoff, announced itself pleased with the intake. Senator Bolkus stated that the increase was "very moderate", though a 13 per cent increase can hardly be described as very moderate, particularly if it is increased by that amount again next year and the year after...

Before the announcement of the 1993-94 intake, Dr Birrell circulated a paper entitled *How many immigrants in 1993-94?* He again pointed out that in spite of high unemployment in specific categories the government continued to bring out people of those categories who directly competed with locals for scarce positions. This was particularly so in teaching, metal trades and engineering. He stated, "In the case of engineers the 1991-92 settler intake was about the same size as the numbers graduating throughout Australia in 1991. In April 1992 when the annual graduate survey (of 1991 graduates) was completed barely 50 per cent of the engineers had found a full time job,

with large numbers still unemployed...It is true that there was probably an even higher rate of unemployment among migrant engineers. But what is the point of making matters worse by increasing the competition for our own graduates? For teachers the situation was worse, with just 43.5 per cent employed full time and 31 per cent unemployed. Even graduates in computer science were struggling with only 44 per cent working full time and 21 per cent unemployed. As to the metal tradespersons, the metals area is one of the most oversupplied of all the trade fields."

Dr Birrell also stated, "many sponsors cannot provide for their relatives once resident in Australia. As matters stand at present there is nothing to stop a person who is dependant on unemployment benefits or a pension from sponsoring a spouse or parent. An assurance of support is required in the case of parents, but does not have to come from the sponsor. A pensioner can sponsor a spouse with no English and no formal qualifications whose fate after six months residence is highly likely to be at the end of a dole queue." Dr Birrell's paper was ignored by the government.

Senator Bolkus is also a champion of multiculturalism and is arrogant enough to make comments so dismissive of "old" Australians that if made similar comments of ethnic groups he would be charged with "racism". He stated for example on the SBS program *Face the Press* on 13 October 1993 that if you took the "Chinese, Greeks and Italians out of Sydney, you wouldn't have much left". No, only the descendants of the people who built it in the first place.

With the change of Immigration Ministers, the Hawke-appointed head of the Department, Chris Conybeare, took the opportunity to shake up his department and exert his authority. He also authorised a Federal police raid on officers of his own department. This was in reaction to allegations by lawyers in a Federal Court case concerned with the detention of Cambodian boatpeople that documents had been tampered with. The Federal Police cleared the officers involved of any wrongdoing.

Mr Conybeare said the raid was unrelated to the personnel changes he has instigated. He first shifted the department's deputy secretary, Wayne Gibbons and the head of the Protection and International Division, Ian Simington, into new tasks. They had taken a strong line on control of our borders and Gibbons was generally considered to be the real power in the immigration department under Mr Hand.

Mr Gibbons was then moved on 5 July 1993 to a new department. In answering questions asked by Opposition immigration spokesman Senator Short at a hearing before a Senate estimates committee on 2 September, 1993, Mr Conybeare at first indicated that this had occurred at the request of Mr Gibbons.

In a report in *The Canberra Times* of 16 September 1993, "Conybeare's curly question session" by Verona Burgess, extracts of this hearing were published. Mr Conybeare stated that Mr Gibbons had "expressed an interest

some considerable number of weeks earlier in moving out of the department" and later, that "when the issue was discussed, it was one that was, I think, initiated by him".

Mr Conybeare, "He is on an attached basis to DEET [Department of Employment, Education and Training] at the present time. The understanding that I have with the secretary of that department is that he will be employed by DEET for about two years with a review at the end of that period to establish the ongoing need of the department for his services".

Senator Short said, "He moved from a secure position of deputy secretary in the department of immigration, as his instigation, to a non-permanent holding position in DEET, is that what you are saying?"

Mr Conybeare, "The initiation of the discussion about moving out of the department of immigration was some considerable number of weeks before the events that took place that resulted in him moving on 5 July. The 5 July move was the result of quite particular discussions that took place between myself and the Secretary of the Department of Employment, Education and Training. In those discussions, the department indicated that it had work for Mr Gibbons to do in DEET and that it would, through an understanding with me, be very comfortable with an arrangement which involved him being placed in DEET for a period of at least two years."

Senator Short, "And did you ring DEET or did DEET ring you?"

Mr Conybeare, "I rang DEET."

Senator Short, "In other words you were looking for somewhere to put Mr Gibbons?"

Mr Conybeare, "I was of the view that it was time to take steps of a fairly proactive nature to see the concept realised of the officer moving to other career opportunities in the Public Service."

In English that means that Mr Conybeare gave Mr Gibbons the boot. This continues the patterns of officers being removed from the Department when they actually try to take a firm line on sensitive matters in the national interest. First Ron Brown and Tony Harris - Mr Conybeare of course replaced Mr Brown - and now Wayne Gibbons.

At any rate, whatever changes are made in the Department, for whatever reasons, it will still act as an advocate for high immigration. Immigration has to be held down in the long term and the parasite industry which feeds off it, broken up, so that the many millions of dollars it absorbs can be directed into productive investments.

This will entail confronting the policy of multiculturalism, which the Labor Party under Mr Keating is unprepared to do. While the Liberal Party has said that there is scope for deeper immigration cuts and greater emphasis on skills and the English language, it has refused to articulate a policy. Certainly the Liberals seem to still hold the view that immigration should be greatly increased once the economy improves. Under Dr Hewson and despite his brief questioning of the policy, multiculturalism was accepted by the Liberals

and continues to be under Alexander Downer. Former shadow immigration minister Philip Ruddock was a strong supporter and put out press releases attacking Stephen Rimmer for his criticisms of the policy.

THE NEED TO ORGANISE

It is interesting to note that, even after the cut in the immigration program announced for 1992-93, a Morgan poll was released showing that almost three quarters of respondents thought there were too many migrants settling in Australia. Opinion polls have consistently shown large majorities of the same mind. It is high time for the government itself, not only to give the people a say, but to act upon the wishes of the great majority on this issue.

In a press release of August 26 1992 Graeme Campbell suggested going directly to the people. He suggested that they be asked in a referendum what they think about the policies of immigration, multiculturalism and integration with Asia. If there is to be a referendum on the issue of the Republic, then there should be a referendum on these issues too. After all they are vital to the future of this nation. If we really believe in democracy the people should be given the chance to express themselves on these vital issues. If Australia's elected representatives don't put the interests of their own people first then nobody else will. There should also be an independent inquiry into immigration and the policy of multiculturalism.

While Mr Hand introduced legislation in May 1992, supported by both parties, to regulate the activities of migration agents, it would be much better to get rid of them entirely and - as the independent member for North Sydney, Ted Mack, suggested in Parliament on 2 June 1992 - make immigration advice the responsibility of the Immigration Department. The whole area of migration agencies has been a problem area for some time. Although the industry will have some regulation, it will continue to be a problem area and as Mr Mack states, essentially a parasite industry. A general inquiry into immigration should look at how immigration procedures could be made simpler and how lawyers and immigration agents - a number of whom are lawyers - could be removed, as much as possible, from the system. In the meantime though the legislation introduced by Mr Hand is at least a step in the right direction.

All this of course should be done in the context of cutting immigration right back. The opponents of immigration and multiculturalism among the general public have the numbers, but not the organisation or the funding. They are the working class and middle class people of the general public, both migrant and non-migrant who want to see their country united and want prosperity and a good quality of life for their descendants. There is more common sense to be found among them, than among all the much vaunted elites combined.

The success of Australians Against Further Immigration at a series of by-elections in early 1994, has certainly made politicians sit up and take notice. At the Werriwa by-election in January, candidate Robyn Spencer gained 7.24 per cent of the vote without even stepping into the electorate. The seat of Werriwa is in Sydney's western suburbs. Denis McCormack travelled from Melbourne to stand as a candidate in the Bonython by-election in Adelaide on 19 March 1994. He won 6.78 per cent of the vote.

As there were no ALP candidates standing in the by-elections of Warringah and Mackellar, both held on 26 March 1994, Graeme Campbell was able to openly campaign on behalf of AAFI. Robyn Spencer stood again at the Warringah by-election and won 13.54 per cent of the vote in a four candidate field. John Phillips stood in Mackellar and won 8.16 per cent of the vote. Well known director, writer and actor, Bob Ellis, stood as an independent in this seat, but was in fact the de facto ALP candidate. ALP branch members were strongly represented in his campaign.

These were excellent results and provide hope that the system can be jolted through the ballot box. If such figures held up throughout NSW in a full senate election AAFI would win a seat.

Since this success there has been a series of newspaper articles trying to smear AAFI, by implying a "racist" agenda, that they are "reactionary" and the usual remarks. Attempts have also been made in these articles to link AAFI with extremist groups. Graeme Campbell has also come under attack, particularly from Gerard Henderson in the Good Weekend magazine of 9 April 1994. All this is to be expected and indicates that the pro-immigration forces are worried, not about "extremism", but that the voice of mainstream Australia might finally be heard.

Apart from the general public, nine of "Australia's most eminent population scientists" called for immigration to be cut to 50,000 per annum on environmental grounds at a symposium in Canberra hosted by the Australian Academy of Science on 29 April, 1994. This was outlined in an article by David Mussared of *The Canberra Times*, "Slash migrant numbers, say top scientists" on 30 April. However they stated that immigration should be kept separate from debate about multiculturalism.

The nine scientists were Professor Julius Stone from Sydney University, Australian National University demographer Dr Christabel Young, Drs Doug Cocks and Jetse Kalma from the CSIRO, Professor Henry Nix and Dr Lincoln Day from the ANU, Drs Tim Flannery and Alan Jones from the Australian Museum in Sydney and Professor Mark Westoby from Macquarie University.

So, at least some academics have the courage to criticise immigration, though the effectiveness of these attacks, without a willingness to seek how immigration is sustained by and linked to the policy of multiculturalism, is open to question.

However those people who regard themselves as intellectuals and continue to push intellectually corrupt arguments in favour of immigration and

multiculturalism in order to win grants, should not be surprised if they come increasingly to be held in suspicion and contempt, as their practices come to light.

It is not true that Australians do not respect people of learning. They do respect them, but the supercilious arrogance and self-righteousness of many of the educated, who are prepared to be critical of anyone else but themselves, is not deserving of respect. Not only is a little education a dangerous thing, but education without wisdom and common sense can be a potent weapon of destruction.

So many of these educated have acted as nihilists, demanding rights, but not speaking of responsibilities, attacking and stereotyping people in the most violent of terms and then accusing the attacked of violence. They are thieves of virtue, seemingly incapable of honest introspection and utterly convinced of their own moral superiority. They run inquisitions at public expense, demanding prohibitions and severe punishments. They, along with an unrestrained big business sector prepared to sell off the country for profit and the politicians who appease both, and not the people they claim to be fighting, are the biggest dangers to our freedom and our sovereignty.

It is up to concerned people to organise, not only in opposition to these nihilists and opportunists, but also with a positive vision of the Australia of the future - an independent and united Australia which relies upon its own people and resources. High on the priority for that vision is ridding ourselves of the millstones of multiculturalism and mass immigration and the delusion that we are part of Asia.

While that contention may have been useful once to force us to recognise our proximity to Asia, it has become one of the big lies of the elites. We are no more part of Asia than England is part of Africa. Our continent is unique in the world and our history and culture are unique. We have to have the courage to accept that and we have to learn our history to understand more about ourselves and in order to value the country more. If we take Australia for granted it will be taken from us. We should be proud of our heritage and be prepared to stand up against those who would efface it for illusory gains.

Unfortunately there has been an attitude that immigration matters only for "ethnics". Immigration matters for all of us as Australians, regardless of our ethnic background. We must live with the consequences, and we can no longer allow immigration policy to drift or be the captive of vested interests. It must be closely scrutinised.

We need to invest in ourselves and the downstream development of our own resources, looking outward, but with a strong sense of national purpose and unity to our region and the world. The clever country? Let's try a bit of common sense for a change.

* Stephen Rimmer's book *The Cost of Multiculturalism* can be obtained by sending \$10 to the author at PO Box 1094 Belconnen ACT 2616.

* CONTACTS FOR AUSTRALIANS AGAINST FURTHER IMMIGRATION: **Victoria:** AAFI, PO Box 24 Armadale Vic 3143; **NSW:** PO Box 500, West Ryde, NSW 2114; **SA:** PO Box 312, Kingswood, SA 5062.

NOTE: The first version of *Immigration and Consensus* was published as a pamphlet in March 1991. Since then it has been updated a number of times. The November version of the paper was published in full in Bob Bottom's *Insight Bookmagazine*, along with another paper first put out in March, *Immigration Policy Proposals*. The policy proposals paper was published in Mr Bottom's magazine under the title *Time to End Multiculturalism*.

UNDERSTANDING MABO

The ongoing Mabo affair is becoming ever more complex. There are three main elements to Mabo. The first is the High Court decision itself, which overturned the concept of "terra nullius", or "land belonging to no one", and affirmed that there was an Aboriginal title to land which preceded white settlement and has a status in law. The second has been the various responses, including that of Aboriginal groups and particularly government responses, Federal and State, to the decision of the court. The third, flowing from this - most notably the conflict between Western Australia and the Federal Government - is the extent to which central power overrides that of the states.

SOME PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND

The first point to make is that the concept of "terra nullius" has been widely misrepresented in the media as some sort of nasty legal fiction which pretended that there were **no people** in the continent at the time of white settlement. In fact the doctrine of terra nullius recognises the existence of prior occupants, but posits that there was "no use of the land" as understood in the European sense of land cultivation, town and city building. The Aboriginals were nomadic hunter-gatherers who built no permanent structures. On that basis the land was seen as being open for settlement.

The early settlers are also sometimes condemned for not making treaties with the Aboriginals. The fact is that the early Governors, from Phillip onwards, had specific instructions to try to make treaties and treaties are a feature of other British settlements in North America and New Zealand. The problem in Australia was that the Governors were unable to recognise a structure of authority among the Aboriginal groups they came into contact with. They had the intention of making treaties, but, as far as they were concerned, lacked the opportunity.

Treaties in other lands at any rate were often ignored by settlers who pushed into new country in advance and in defiance of their own authorities. The authorities were then pressured to accept the new settlements, or give de facto recognition and protection which later became official. It was not a simple case of centralised British authorities deciding to expand. Once a settlement was made in a new land it developed a dynamic of its own. So whether or not representatives of central authorities had signed treaties, the attractiveness of land or such things as a gold strike in frontier areas drew settlers irresistibly

towards them. Economic imperatives often led the way and political accommodations followed.

On the part of Aboriginal peoples there was also often no realisation that in agreeing to a treaty or making other agreements they were actually giving up land for good, though this was clearly understood to be so by Europeans. When there is no concept of land being bought and sold on the one side, such treaties are worthless. This is even a problem today in Papua New Guinea where the PNG government has not been able to enforce agreements involving mining grants with foreign investors. The local landowners, though they have been paid for the use of their land, refuse to accept that it can be alienated from them in any way. They take the money, but still think the land is open to them and get very upset when they discover otherwise. This has led to acts of sabotage of mining ventures and the withdrawal of investors from PNG, much to the dismay of the PNG Government.

INVASION?

Armed conflict with Aboriginal groups was scattered and there was no sense of European-style military engagements. For this reason there has been little sense among European Australians that they have been invaders. We instead talk of European "settlement". If the early Europeans had seen themselves as invaders they could have claimed the continent by right of conquest and the legal argument about terra nullius would be academic. Right of conquest was universally recognised as giving title to, not only captured land, but captured buildings, towns and cities as well.

It is by Right of Conquest that the Turks hold Asia Minor and the area of the city of Istanbul, formerly Constantinople, today. Magnificent buildings predating Turkish conquest still stand in the city and are understood to be owned by the state of Turkey.

It is of no use to the Greek descendants of Byzantium to claim native title to Constantinople. They can claim all they like, no one will take any notice.

In fact it is by right of conquest that most nations have come into being, or at least consolidated themselves. It has become fashionable in certain white guilt circles to speak of the white "invasion" of Australia, but those who use that language can not then claim to support the decision of the High Court which does not recognise an invasion or Right of Conquest.

THE MABO BATTLELINES

It must be remembered that the main battlegrounds, arising from both the Mabo case and the proposed Federal Government legislation enshrining native title, are Western Australia, South Australia and Queensland, but particularly

Western Australia. Western Australia has by far the largest amount of land open to native title claim and this land is in areas, though unattractive to European settlers, which are prime mining sites. This land is known as "unalienated Crown land". Although title resides with the Crown, because it has not been given over to freehold or lease, Native Title may be found to continue to it. This is because six of the seven High Court judges found that a declaration of sovereignty in itself was not enough to extinguish pre-existing native title. The land had to be alienated in some way which specifically extinguished pre-existing native title, such as the granting of freehold.

So, by this ruling, there would be no claim to urban areas, even though such claims have been made in the wake of Mabo. All sorts of claims can be expected and many will be publicly funded regardless of their chances of success, but it is the unalienated crown land of Western Australia that offers the most extensive opportunity for claims and what appears to be the best chance of success.

Mining is vital to Australia's export earnings and Western Australia is by far the biggest export earning state. In Western Australia mining is absolutely central to the economy and therefore the funding of Aboriginal Affairs. It will suffer from any uncertainty to mineral investment caused by native title claims in these areas.

That is why, while other states have been prepared to go along with much of the Federal government agenda, Western Australia has refused. Western Australia rushed through its own legislation on 2 December 1993, in response to the Mabo judgement before the Federal Government legislation had been enacted. The Western Australian legislation of Premier Richard Court extinguishes native title but allows for fair compensation to be paid. Any disputes would be heard by a state court.

Only 24 hours after this legislation was rushed through WA parliament it was challenged in the High Court by Aboriginals in the Kimberley area of Western Australia, who will no doubt be Federally funded. Western Australia has also lodged a High Court challenge to the legislation passed by the Federal Government in response to Mabo.

DIVISION OF POWERS

Under the Constitution, of which the High Court is the final interpreter, land law is a state issue. However under section 51 (xxvi) of the Constitution the Commonwealth has the power to make laws with respect to the people of any race for whom it is deemed necessary to make special laws. In a 1967 referendum the Commonwealth was given power to make laws with respect to Aboriginals who had previously been excluded from this.

These two constitutional powers, together with a third giving the Commonwealth the right to make laws pertaining to "external affairs" are

what the Federal Government takes its power from to make legislation in this area. The constitution also states that where a Commonwealth law conflicts with that of a state, the Commonwealth law prevails.

The external affairs power - with the assistance of successive High Court interpretations which have increasingly acted to assist the centralisation of power - has been used in a way which is entirely at odds with its original intention.

The Federal Government has repeatedly used this power to sign United Nations treaties and instruments and then make local laws based on those treaties, which the High Court has determined - on the basis of its very wide interpretation of the external affairs power - have the power to over-ride State laws.

Usually very few people realise these treaties have even been signed. The decision to sign is usually made by a handful of people in the executive without reference to the wider parliament. The United Nations has increasingly been used to impose diktats upon the states, but in gaining such power over the states, the Federal Government has ceded its own sovereignty to UN instruments and bodies. So not only is this process an issue of State's rights, it is an issue of national sovereignty.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN RESPONSE

At any rate, the Federal Government will not find Western Australia going quietly if the High Court strikes down its legislation. While there are some significant individuals and groupings in Western Australia who support the Federal Government and/or even want its legislation to go further, public sentiment in general is strongly behind Premier Court on this issue and will lash out at the Federal Government, if only politically.

It should be remembered that Western Australia is the only state which has voted to secede from the Federation. It voted to do so in a referendum in 1933 by a decisive ratio of 2:1. At that stage however Britain still had the power to determine such matters and refused to allow it and the Western Australians never envisaged taking up arms to press the point. (Nor would their fellow Australians have supported taking up arms to stop them for that matter.) It is sure however to take the fight right up to the Commonwealth in other ways.

The last and most reluctant colony to join the Federation, Western Australia has throughout its history felt neglected by the centres of power in the eastern states. It is well aware that it contributes much more in export earnings than any other state and yet feels it does not get a good deal in return. Also many in Western Australia (and Australia generally) regard the Federal Government's administration of Aboriginal Affairs to be controlled by self-serving bureaucrats and other hangers-on. Federal and state money together contribute

\$2 billion a year to Aboriginal Affairs, yet the chorus of demands from the professional "Aboriginal industry" is growing, not lessening. Some even openly call for Mabo to be used to establish a separate Aboriginal nation.

This is a volatile mix and while actual secession is extremely remote, the secessionist sentiment will certainly be running high in WA and is open to be used by Premier Court.

Aboriginal groups are sharply divided. The majority of those in Graeme Campbell's Federal electorate of Kalgoorlie, which covers most of WA, strongly oppose the Federal legislation. This is on the basis that, in spite of its high sounding morality, the bill delivers nothing for them, benefits only a select few and leaves the majority with a backlash. Also existing cattle stations owned by Aboriginals have been included in native title claim by other Aboriginal groups in the Kimberleys. Others in Western Australia and Australia generally, support it, others want it to go further.

THE KEATING LEGISLATION

The Keating legislation is universally recognised to be complex, others have called it poorly drafted and difficult to understand. It will allow those making Mabo claims to be funded by the public, but does not guarantee legal aid to those who find themselves faced with a claim. This has the potential to bankrupt farmers wishing to contest claims.

The bill provides for a system of courts and tribunals to deal with matters affecting native title. A disturbing aspect is the establishment of a Native Title Tribunal, which may run its own agenda in matters of native title and the determination of grants.

The bill also sets up a land acquisition fund "to address the situation of those Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders whose dispossession means that they would be unlikely to benefit from the High Court's decision on native title." The administration of the fund was contested by various Aboriginal groups and on 10 May 1994, details of the fund were announced.

Aboriginal Affairs Minister, Robert Tickner, stated in a press release that the Federal Government had committed "funding totalling \$1.46 billion over ten years for the establishment of a National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Land Acquisition Fund" and that \$1.24 billion of this represented "additional allocations". He said the fund would be allocated \$200 million in 1994-95 and \$100 million in each of the subsequent nine years. The Government would work out administrative details in consultation between the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and other "key Aboriginal organisations", including Land Councils. Representatives of these groups would form an Indigenous Land Corporation.

BACKGROUND TO MABO IN THE HIGH COURT

While the court decision has been hailed in the media on the basis of its superficial appeal, there are in fact considerable problems with it. These include some of the justifications for the change and the fact that it was presented as a "social justice" issue, in response to "community values" with all the subjectivity that involves, rather than a clear judgement according to law. It is not the role of courts to make social policy. The emotive language used by some of the judges, including the supposed "unutterable shame" of the past treatment of Aboriginals and the lack of historical understanding of the judges have also been strongly criticised. As leading historian Professor Geoffrey Blainey has pointed out, the majority of judges seemed to have relied heavily upon the "white guilt" school of history and to have been animated accordingly.

The case was commenced in the High Court in May 1982. The same year a preliminary hearing failed to reach an agreed statement of facts. The case was to do specifically and exclusively with a claim for native title on the Murray Islands off Queensland, led by the late Eddie Mabo. The lawyers for the Murray Islanders themselves pointedly stressed the differences between the Murray Islands and the mainland.

The Murray Islands, a group only nine square kilometres in total area and closer to New Guinea than the mainland of Australia, were annexed by the colony of Queensland in 1879 and form part of the state of Queensland today. In 1882 they were set aside for the exclusive use of the natives of the island in perpetuity. The people of the islands are Melanesian and have carried on a continuous and settled use of the land in the cultivation of gardens. Leases were granted by the Crown on part of the islands to the London Missionary Society and to a sardine factory, but otherwise native use of the islands has continued undisturbed.

Finding native title existed on the Murray Islands, to which the doctrine of terra nullius never applied, is one thing. There are few people these days who contest this aspect of the decision. The most controversial part of the decision in fact occurred in 1985. To understand this, it first must be understood that Mabo in fact consists of two related cases heard by the High Court.

MABO 1

The so-called Mabo 1 case - the first case determined in relation to Mabo, occurred after the Queensland Government tried to finalise the matter by itself. It passed legislation in 1985 which retrospectively declared that on the annexation of the Murray Islands in 1879 the Queensland government of the day had intended to extinguish all rights to native title.

In February 1987 the Queensland Supreme Court was given the task by the High Court of determining the issues of fact of the Mabo case. These

proceedings were adjourned when a challenge was launched against the 1985 Queensland legislation. In December 1988 the High Court ruled by a narrow majority that the Queensland legislation was invalid on the basis that it was in breach of the Commonwealth Racial Discrimination Act of 1975.

This act was based on sections of the UN's International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination and passed by the then ALP Government of Gough Whitlam. Whitlam was one of the first in Australia to realise the potential of such a power to override the states, though similar tactics had been used in the US.

While this 1985 case indicates that the Commonwealth would be favoured to be able to strike down the present WA legislation, that is not a certainty as WA government lawyers believe they have worded the legislation in such a way so as not to breach the Racial Discrimination Act. The matter will have to be tested.

MABO 2

The proceedings in the Supreme Court of Queensland recommenced in 1989 and it delivered its judgement on issues of fact in November 1990. The native title case then went to the High Court for final determination and a decision was handed down on 3 June 1992. This is the Mabo 2 judgement generally referred to as Mabo.

Six of the seven judges ruled that native title existed in the Murray Islands case and had survived the group's annexation by the Crown. The seven judges delivered four separate judgements between them. Justice Brennan wrote a judgement which was supported by Chief Justice Mason and Justice McHugh. Justices Deane and Gaudron wrote another, Justice Toohey another and Justice Dawson was the dissenter.

It was one thing to recognise native title on the Murray Islands with its distinctive differences from mainland conditions, but it was another thing altogether to extend this decision to the mainland. There were no plaintiffs and defendants covering the mainland situation, there was no opportunity to put forward arguments about the merits of the differing cases.

If the High Court wanted to deal specifically with the mainland it could have expressed a desire to pursue a test case and such a case could have been brought forward.

As S.E.K Hulme QC has pointed out, Justice Brennan extended the Mabo judgement to the mainland by the fiction of claiming the islands had been "settled" by the British. In fact it was a central fact to the case that the islands had not been settled by whites, apart from the leases mentioned. They were already settled by the Murray Islanders and this settled existence was fundamental to the success of their claim to native title.

By saying the Murray Islands had been "settled" by the British Justice

975
university
by the
in Australia
ugh state
- favour
claim
succ
late

Brennan then jumped to the claim that as native title applies to this case of "settlement" it must also apply to the settlement of the mainland. So the Justice roughly twists the circumstances to suit his purposes. He dismisses the differences between the Melanesian and Aboriginal peoples on the basis that to allow such a difference would be racially discriminatory.

Hulme states the approach was to "proceed to overrule long-decided cases, in the total absence of argument from interested persons, and a total absence of evidence as to Aborigines generally. This was for some reason seen as preferable to deciding the necessary case, as presented, and putting mainland questions aside for consideration, with full evidence and parties and argument, when they arose." pp47-48 (Samuel Griffith Society lecture, "Aspects of the High Court's Handling of Mabo" July 1993)

ON MABO

989
(This is an edited version of a speech by Graeme Campbell, delivered to the Samuel Griffith Society on 6/11/93).

The government [has set in place] a land acquisition package as part of its response to Mabo. The money is likely to be administered through the Land Councils. If these generally unrepresentative bodies, driven by their legions of white lawyers and Aboriginal activists, do get control of their money, then you will see the buy-up of stations, but on an emotive, not on an economic basis.

The uneconomic buying up of stations will undermine hope of Aboriginal self-determination. The lowest common denominator will be the measure of productivity. We will be told by the New Class manipulators that community and social values are much more important than the mere economics of the properties.

High-sounding moral arguments will be put forward. White guilt will be manipulated to extract funds for schemes which had no hope of economic viability to begin with. The schemes will only remain afloat by the injection of ever-more funds extracted from the long-suffering taxpayer. All this will be done in the name of reconciliation.

This of course will totally deny Aboriginal people any chance of self-respect, self-management or sense of achievement, which is absolutely necessary if their social and economic position is to be improved. It will keep them in the position of the eternal mendicant that I believe is exactly what the Aboriginal industry wants. They want a captive constituency which has to deal through them. People who are independently minded and who are economically viable would have no use for the industry.

This land acquisition package will also provide an excuse for a separate black state. As the non-viable ventures fail the Aboriginal industry will claim that the reason has nothing to do with management, but can be put down to

200 hundred years of subjugation. Only breaking free of this subjugation by a form of sovereignty will free the Aboriginals. So ironically - and as we have already seen if people are honest enough to look at the process - the more special treatment that is afforded, the more that will be demanded. The complaints against the white man will grow no matter what is given, until we reach this demand for what is effectively a separate black state. Let there be no doubt that under such a system, ruled over in effect by the Aboriginal industry and their white side-kicks, Aboriginal people will be far more repressed than ever.

They will cop it both ways, because the response of the white public opinion to all this can be imagined.

I hope that the voice of reason, common sense and uniting force of shared objectives will triumph within the Aboriginal community. The voice of the majority of Aboriginals is presently thwarted by government and ignored by the media but these Aboriginal people are determined and I am happy to back them.

Keating has raised the Mabo decision to a matter of fundamental importance to all the true believers. He has made it the ultimate Social Justice issue. His speech of Redfern is held by some, but by no means all, of my colleagues to be a landmark in social justice.

It is of course nothing of the sort. It was the speech of somebody ignorant of the subject who fell back on outpouring of guilt and the most degrading national self abasement. Frankly I can see no reason to make such a speech to the lost tribes of Redfern. They are in the city because they voted with their feet and long ago left their tribal areas for what they perceived to be a better life. Historically it is this perception that caused large numbers of Aboriginal people to gravitate to our society or to the fringe of it. They, particularly the young men, made a decision that our way looked better than the very hard unforgiving laws of their own cultures. This is not however accepted by the New Class as it does not sit well with the development of the guilt industry.

Notwithstanding the present euphoria, I believe Keating's Redfern speech will come to be viewed as the emotive, but empty, rhetoric that it really is. Even Don Watson, the joke writer who manufactured the speech for Keating was surprised that it was accepted in its entirety. He referred to it as an "ambit claim" - the ambit claim of a privileged individual who takes or bears no responsibility for its consequences.

The Aboriginal industry in Australia today receives something like \$2 billion a year - \$1.25 billion from the Commonwealth and about \$0.75 billion from the States. There are, in round figures, something like 240,000 people of Aboriginal descent in Australia. On this basis, each man, woman and child receives about \$7,500. If you accept five people as being an average for the Aboriginal family, then every two or three years that Aboriginal family should receive enough money to buy a completely new house. Quite clearly, the money is not getting to Aboriginal people and Aboriginal people are aware of

this. Obviously in the acquittal of these funds lies the greatest opportunity for social justice and this what Aboriginal people are calling for.

It has been put to me that this legislation will pit black against black and black against white at the same time as the Aboriginal communities believe we should all be working together. These people say to me "We are Australians. We don't want anything other Australians don't get". This is not a view one finds reflected in the mainly city-based media.

Aboriginal people and the wider community must realise that the continuation of the guilt industry is incompatible with Aboriginal advancement. The guilt industry needs victims. If Aboriginal people are advancing in mainstream Australia, where most of them want to be, there are no victims. I can assure you the Aboriginal industry will fight tenaciously to maintain the quota of victims.

Some months ago I was talking in my office to an Aboriginal elder who has in fact been inducted into three Aboriginal lay systems - a man who has battled and overcome chronic alcoholism, a man who has travelled so widely there is scarcely a nook or cranny of Central Australia that he is not familiar with. While I was talking with him, I heard raised voices in my outer office. I went out to investigate to find two young Aboriginals harassing my secretary for money for a variety of reasons. I might add this is not an unusual occurrence. On this occasion, I said there was no money for them but they had in fact not repaid previous loans and that it was my view that they would spend the money on grog.

One of the young men then said to me "You owe us, you have taken our land". Now since he came from the Central Reserve area, where their land has never been taken - it was totally untrue. I set about to simply throw them out of the office when the elder emerged from my inner office and said "What is this?, What is this I hear" and lined up the young blokes and said "Now listen, you fellas, listen to me. Two hundred years ago" he said, "this was a big empty country, just a few black fellas like you and me running around the place. Sooner or later someone was going to come 'ere - you can thank your lucky stars it was this mob and not..." and he reeled off a whole list of other possible colonists. The fact that Australia was bound to be colonised by one group or another was obvious to this man. The fact that the British as colonisers have a better record than most was also clear, no matter what the New Class may insinuate.

Europeans themselves have been subject to colonisation and invasion. Consider the devastation of the Mongol invasions of Europe, the advance of the Turks through the old Empire of Byzantium and into Europe and the advance of the Moors into Spain. This sort of thing is a constant in human history and our own European forebears have been at the end of it. The Mongol atrocities for example put anything that happened in Australia well and truly in the shade.

But 200 years ago, due to the development of superior technology,

Europeans were the leading colonisers, so it was always most likely to be either the British, French or Dutch for this continent. If the first two had both gained footholds we might have found ourselves today in the situation of Canada, in danger of breaking up as a nation. If the Dutch had colonised part of Australia they may well have shipped indentured labourers from the East Indies here. In time the descendants of these labourers may even have been as numerous as, or even outnumbered, those of Dutch descent. Whatever the case, when the East Indies gained independence, Indonesia would have made a strong claim for the Dutch controlled section of Australia (as it did successfully with Dutch New Guinea).

We were fortunate to have only one coloniser providing a solid base and a common culture and language from which the country could be unified. I strongly maintain that at the time only the British had the power to claim this entire continent, other colonisations would have been piecemeal and would have led to inevitable conflict and division.

I can assure you that there are many Aborigines who accept that there is no conceivable way that they could have continued on as they did 200 years ago. Given the forces at work it is nonsense to even suggest it as a possibility and yet the utopian new class act as though if it had not been for the nasty British, the Aborigines would still be living their traditional lifestyles all across the country.

As it stands the descendants of the colonisers of this country are far and away the best bet of the Aboriginal people. I have heard the professional Aboriginal Eric Willmot virtually wishing for the day that Europeans are displaced and Australia becomes Asian. Would that help the Aboriginal people? Dr Willmot and others should take note of the comments of thoughtful Asians. The vice chancellor of Hong Kong university, Professor Wang Gungwu, has stated for example, as reported in *The Canberra Times* of 8 July 1992, "where most Asians are concerned, the survival of Aboriginal peoples and cultures has never had any priority." For those who open their eyes this is obvious, but our elites always have us look at Asian countries through rose coloured glasses. Our extinction is something to be welcomed almost as some sort of divine release and Aborigines are used for their guilt value to hasten the process. The logic involved is truly that of which, to paraphrase Orwell, only an intellectual would be capable: in order to survive in the region we have to conspire in our own demise.

Becoming an Asian nation, in the fashionable jargon of the elites, would mean that Aboriginal people would slide further and further back, rather than advance. I make it quite clear that I do care strongly about Aboriginal people and I do want to help them to advance. It is because I am so sure that Mabo is not the answer that I oppose it.

Contrary to the myths of the guilt industry, there is little evidence in our history of massed or planned genocide of Aboriginal people if it exists at all. Of course there were individual instances of killings, often in revenge for the

killing of stock. But even in Tasmania, the passing of the Aboriginals was not a planned policy. Quite apart from the individual brutalities of convicts, who were themselves often brutalised, it was largely a case of misguided paternalism. Misguided paternalism in the shape of welfare is also the problem today. It is welfare that is killing Aboriginal people and there are indeed people who recognise this, but believe that the solution is to increase the welfare even more. There is that twisted logic again. It a logic I am not prepared to accept and I do everything that I can to support the real and legitimate concerns of my large Aboriginal constituency.

Mabo will lead to a mis-allocation of resources with no benefit except to lawyers and the Aboriginal industry. Great hopes can be raised among some, only to be dashed and the end results will be bitter.

The situation of Aboriginal people will not improve until they take responsibility for themselves. I am interested in hard headed measures which will assist them at the grass roots. I am not interested in enriching lawyers and promoting the status of members of self appointed Aboriginal industry.

At this point I should consider what the government's Aboriginal affairs policy has been about. If it was to improve the lot of Aboriginal people, then it has been very expensive and only very marginally effective. If it was to placate urban white middle class guilt, it has been very successful, so successful that we are now at the backlash stage. The tragedy is that the Aboriginal people, the vast majority of whom do not deserve it, will be the recipients of the backlash. Those in the Aboriginal industry will simply move on, protected as many of them are by jobs funded by the Australian taxpayer.

We should scrap the rubbish about guilt and address the basic issues: housing, health, education, training and employment. I think in that order but all are interlinked and if one element is missing, it cannot work.

We should listen much more to what Aboriginal people are saying. They are much more realistic, sensible and honest than the industry.

We must demand the same level of competence and accountability from Aboriginal bureaucrats as we demand from others.

We must stop treating Aboriginal people like children. They are able to and they want to enter into their own negotiations.

Somehow we must make the press more responsible, especially ABC TV. I have many experiences where with ABC programs which have been little better than politically correct propaganda pieces.

In Western Australia the ABC has point blank refused to give air time to Aboriginal people who want to complain about statements made in their name but about which they have absolutely no input and with which they do not agree. I can give many instances of this.

People like Peter Yu of the Kimberley Land Council, Robert Riley of the Aboriginal Legal Service speak ad nauseam on television but the counter Aboriginal view never gets reported. This leads the wider society to think that all Aboriginal people are the same and I know it is not the case.

THE ECONOMY: WHAT THEY DON'T SAY

Australia's poor economic condition is front page news just about every day of the week, but our economic commentators rarely put this condition in its historical and social context.

The historical context is almost completely ignored and most of those who attempt to consider the social context come out with the same facile attacks on Australian cultural attitudes and work practices. These commentators seem to imply that were these attitudes and work practices changed our economic problems would be substantially solved.

Certainly there are elements of our work practices which can be improved and we have been extremely complacent, but Australia's economic problems go far deeper than work practices and the cultural attitudes of middle and lower income earners. The blame for our economic condition lies mainly with our governments and private investment practices.

Our most consistent and debilitating economic problem has been the deficit on the current account. The current account blow out of the 1980s and the circumstances which led to it are not new. We have had similar current account problems on four previous occasions in our history and in three of those cases severe depressions followed. Australia experienced depressions in the 1840s, 1890s and 1930s. The fourth current account blowout in the 1950s was followed by a credit squeeze and recession in 1961 which almost cost the Menzies government office.

On every occasion a surge in population, largely fuelled by immigration, has preceded the economic downturn.

The circumstances which led to the first two depressions are the closest parallels to what occurred in the 1980s. In all three of these cases an element of government deregulation of the financial system led to a massive inflow of foreign capital, which was then overwhelmingly invested in the unproductive areas of property and property speculation.

In 1834 the Forbes Act led to the removal of British money lending laws in NSW, which included what is now Queensland and Victoria. British investors found as a result that they could get very attractive rates of return on their loans in the colony. Money became available in abundance to borrowers and was recklessly invested in country and city properties. The colony was building up debt without developing the capacity to be able to repay it. Then a further, crippling bill of one million pounds to pay for

subsidised immigrants fell due. When British investors demanded their interest repayments, the colony's economy collapsed and depression took hold for most of the 1840s.

The depression of the 1890s was largely concentrated in Victoria and was preceded by two parliamentary acts which deregulated financial controls. In 1864, with the surge in colonial prosperity following the gold rushes, the Victorian Parliament passed the Companies Act. This relaxed controls on lending and the establishment of new companies. Again foreign capital flowed in and was readily available to borrowers. There was some fluctuation in investment and population increase through the 1860s and 1870s, but between 1881 and 1891 Melbourne's population increased by a staggering 70 per cent - from 282,000 to 491,000.

As Don Garden notes in his book *Victoria: A History*, in 1887 a Royal Commission into banking recommended that banks be able to issue advances on the security of land and the legislation to further deregulate the financial system as suggested was passed. Over 150 banks and land finance companies were established during 1888, a year in which Melbourne's population increased by 46,000. British investment poured into the colony and with the money from local investors large and small, was overwhelmingly directed into property, including Government spending on infrastructure and property speculation. The combination of the financial deregulation and the huge population increase made this speculation possible. Victoria was left severely exposed to the whims of its British creditors. When they panicked and pulled the plug Victoria's economy collapsed.

One hundred years later precisely the same, pre-depression, pattern was repeated. Deregulation of the banks by the Hawke government in 1985, which followed its 1983 decision to remove currency controls and float the dollar, led to an influx of foreign banks and the ready availability of credit. There was no reason whatsoever to trust the banks to have any concern for the national interest once controls were removed from them.

As a direct result of the 1985 decision, banks, in the battle for market share, aggressively pursued customers, lending money for schemes they once would not have considered for an instant. The once trusted bank manager became a financial tout encouraging farmers to sink themselves into debt with expensive purchases and uneconomic property buy-ups. People in general were encouraged to go into debt. "Entrepreneur" spivs making flashy property deals sprouted out of the ground and were lionised in the financial press.

This was accompanied by a boom in immigration when Chris Hurford, like Mr Hawke a "high immigration man" replaced Stewart West as immigration minister, also in 1985.

There was however a significant difference from the 1890s. Apart from the traditional pressures from property interests for higher immigration, the government-funded and created multicultural lobby groups pushed for higher and higher family reunion intakes. In spite of the fact that Mr Hurford wanted

to concentrate on skilled migrants, family reunion became the engine driving the immigration program ever upwards. Property and other big business interests became enthusiastic multiculturalists. Most of the media urged them on. The net immigration intake peaked between 1987 and 1989, reaching a high of an extraordinary 163,600 in 1988-89.

Again, as in the 1880s, this massive population increase provided the base for the surge in property development and speculation. Again the money for this was being overwhelmingly borrowed abroad. The hysteria surrounding the subject of immigration meant that the issue was not able to be examined rationally.

Then in 1989 the Canberra-based economist Mr Stephen Joske released the paper "The Economics of Immigration: Who Benefits?" in which he stated that immigration may have accounted for about half of our current account deficit, or \$6 billion to \$8 billion, in the 1987-88 financial year. He was roundly attacked by the immigration minister of the time, Senator Ray and others of the immigration and multiculturalist industry, including the Immigration Department's Bureau of Immigration Research.

Mr Joske was later backed up by Senator Peter Walsh and the then head of Economic Planning Advisory Committee (EPAC), Mr Fred Argy. In more recent times it has been revealed that both the Finance and Treasury Departments had warned the government in the 1980s of the current account problems with immigration.

A similar investment pattern was followed in the 1920s. In that decade Australia's population, considerably fuelled by immigration, increased by 20 per cent and 80 per cent of government borrowings went into city building to accommodate the increase. Again Australia experienced severe problems on the current account.

As a result Australia was left dangerously exposed to an international downturn in its terms of trade, just as it is today. When the crash came of course it was worldwide and catastrophic, but in fact wool and wheat prices were falling and unemployment was rising significantly before the Wall Street crash of 1929.

The international crash meant that creditors were more concerned than ever for their loans and the debt problem we had accumulated through the 20s led to Australia having terms dictated to it by its creditors under the aegis of the Bank of England. In 1930 Sir Otto Niemeyer of the Bank of England came to Australia by arrangement between the Bank of England and the Commonwealth Bank to evaluate Australia's economic circumstances. Prime Minister Scullin claimed to have invited Niemeyer but in fact he was effectively bypassed.

After surveying the scene Niemeyer said Australia was living beyond its means in an over-protected economy and that the Commonwealth and state governments had to balance their budgets. He advocated deflation and retrenchment. His formula was largely followed in the Premier's Plan of 1931,

which, among other things, led to a significant cut in wages, salaries and government outlays.

There is no reason at all why, on the heels of another international economic downturn, that our creditors could not combine to impose conditions upon us again. Under such circumstances they will not be fussy about which resource projects to proceed with. If they can sell it, they will rip it up and ship it out. Our government will be obliged to cut outlays as it did in the 1930s.

It will be useless to argue that an expansionary policy should be adopted on the ground of social justice. The economic purists of the World Bank and the IMF will have little patience with such talk. It will be useless to protest to our government about environmental damage in those circumstances, because, at least in the short term, it will not effectively be our government making the decisions. This is the pattern in African and other Third World countries, they ravage their environment in an ongoing and desperate attempt to keep up with debt repayments.

Not only is Australia dangerously exposed to an international downturn, our agricultural products are being pushed out of traditional markets. Under such circumstances our mineral resources sector becomes vital. Time and time again, Australia has been rescued from its economic lulls by fortuitous mineral finds. The recovery from the 1890s depression was greatly assisted by the rich gold finds at Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie, combined with NSW wheat harvests. Australians in the cities do not realise to what extent their standard of living is subsidised by both the mineral and agricultural sectors. We cannot afford to sabotage them.

Australia's position is not hopeless, but we must learn from past experience. While in the past it might have been reasonable to build up our population, it no longer makes economic or environmental sense to do so. Our only long term prospect as a nation is to develop as an outward looking export economy. We also need to foster a strong sense of national solidarity to meet the challenges ahead.

Australia already has the people and resources necessary to succeed. We do not need a large population. We certainly cannot afford to repeat the insidious pattern of borrowing abroad and splurging on immigration-driven property development and speculation. We also cannot afford to be lax on financial supervision. There will come a time when we dig ourselves a hole so deep we will be unable to climb out of it. We are almost at that point now.

What is needed as a starting point and as a matter of urgency is to sensibly develop our mineral resources and increasingly process them ourselves to add value. Immigration should be immediately cut to a ceiling of about 50,000 and should be held down at about this level for the long term. Of course there will be squeals from the property sector - including other big businesses with property portfolios - and no doubt their bedfellows in the multicultural and immigration industries will squeal the loudest.

The latter lobbies, subsidised at enormous expense to the taxpayer, are a

creation of governments and the media. They are not representative of our migrant population, which overwhelmingly wants what is best for Australia. Any government with the guts to ride out the media storm which would occur if they took the lobbies on would find the great bulk of Australians, migrant and non-migrant thanking them.

No doubt these lobbies will plead all sorts of humanitarian reasons for keeping immigration high and some of them will be genuine in doing so, but the moralising in most cases will be cant. The great majority are primarily concerned with their own interests and empire building. They have this in common with the most notorious land boomers of the 1890s who were amongst the biggest moralisers in the colony. As Garden states in *Victoria: A History*, "an exceptionally high proportion of the boomers were ... exponents of public morality and wowserism", just like the multiculturalists and their interminable bureaucracies are today.

REPRISE

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT CHALLENGE

Australia is faced with its fourth great challenge since Federation. The first was the First World War when Australia had to cope with enormous military losses, bitter divisions on the home front over the issue of conscription and social dislocation. The second was the Depression when up to one third of the workforce was unemployed. The third was the Second World War and in particular the threat of invasion from Japan, when a limited form of conscription was introduced, but not without rancour.

These three great periods of stress and the responses to them have had an considerable influence on today's Australia. All three were clear cut and part of an international experience. Australia on the world stage was one of the smaller players, but it was not helpless in the face of international forces and pressure. It could and did make decisions to influence its own destiny and can do so in the challenge it faces today.

The fourth challenge is also part of an international experience, which is far more difficult to recognise, let alone define, but its outcome has the potential to shape the country far more completely than any of the preceding three. Australia is faced with an inexorable economic and social decline to the status of a Third World colony unless we rise to this challenge.

In spite of the fact that this entails coming to terms with powerful international forces, the country's biggest battle will be won and lost at home. It is being fought between groups with two broadly conflicting views of how Australia should respond to these forces to secure its future. One view can be described as basically nationalist and the other broadly internationalist.

Naturally both sides will attract extremists at the fringes, but it is the moderates with coherent visions and a commitment to democracy who will determine the outcome. There will be no shortage of attempts however, given the examples of the recent past, to attempt to link the moderates, particularly the moderate nationalists, with the extremists.

There are differences in emphasis between groups and individuals on one side or the other of course, some of them considerable. Some on the nationalist side would be embarrassed by the label and have only gradually aligned themselves to others who are more overtly nationalist. Some on the internationalist side consider themselves as strongly Australian, but also as pragmatists facing up to international realities.

Those sympathetic to the nationalist approach have the numbers, because they include the great bulk of the general public, but lack organisation. The internationalists though have gained the ascendant in the power elites which control and influence both Government and Opposition and so are both organised and well funded - to a large degree by public money. Crucially, the internationalist viewpoint is promoted and espoused by the bulk of the media, but there have been recent signs of a more sceptical approach on the part of some journalists.

During the last decade the internationalists have been in the ascendant to such an extent that the nationalists have had extreme difficulty in having their view accepted as a legitimate alternative. The nationalists have found themselves attacked and shouted down, no doubt by some who were driven by good intentions and feared the resurgence of an insular, counter-productive brand of nationalism. With the postmortems over the financial excesses of the 1980s, the failure of a number of internationalist schemes such as the Darwin Free Trade Zone and the growing maturity of the immigration debate though, the nationalist viewpoint is gradually gaining legitimacy.

The nationalist viewpoint can be broadly described as putting the interests of Australia's own residents first and developing a more united independent outlook. Its proponents emphasise the capabilities and achievements of Australians and the necessity to invest in our own residents and resources. They say one of Australia's basic problems is that it allows its ideas to be developed overseas, rather than ensuring that we develop them. They oppose high immigration on economic, environmental and social grounds and criticise Australia's colonial cringe and cargo cult approaches. They say that our immigration program does nothing for the underlying problems of emigrant countries and that our skilled immigrant program is not only a form of intellectual piracy, it denies our own residents training opportunities. Australia could far more effectively assist foreign countries by using much of the money squandered on immigration to increase foreign aid programs.

The internationalists tend not to rate local abilities or adaptability to changing international circumstances highly and stress the need for high levels of immigration to invigorate the country, both economically and socially. They believe generally in multiculturalism, but specifically in integration with Asia. They look at the economic groupings of nations such as the European Community and the North American Free Trade agreement and fear that Australia will be left behind if it does not make a similar arrangement. Prime Minister Keating in fact wishes to extend the Closer Economic Relations (CER) agreement, which allows for both free trade and the free movement of labour between Australia and New Zealand to Asian nations to our north. How he would prevent local labour being undercut by these cheap wage nations has not been explained.

As a nation in an "Asian" region which promises, particularly in the North East, to be the world's economic powerhouse, the internationalists see it as

being in Australia's interest to integrate with the region. Many of them even say, flying in the face of common sense and local feeling, that we are an "Asian nation". There are differences in emphasis of course, but a blueprint which has been very enthusiastically greeted by academics, bureaucrats and in the media is Professor Ross Garnaut's *Australia and the North - East Asian Ascendancy*.

This approach stresses, among other things, the need to take more immigrants from North - East Asian countries, so as to link up with the region and the need for an educational emphasis on the region, particularly the study of its languages. Others on the internationalist side would stress the significance of other countries, particularly in immigration, while not publicly opposing the Garnaut view. Garnaut also proposes abolishing all tariffs by the year 2000 as part of a commitment to a "level playing field" and the government has already significantly reduced tariffs.

On the other hand, most of the nationalists call for government intervention to assist local industry and deny that there is any such thing as a level playing field. They say the economies which have prospered are interventionist, particularly Japan and Germany and for Australia to advocate a level playing field, when no other successful economy really believes in it, is folly. They believe that sensible intervention can be accomplished without fostering a mentality of "rent seeking", or companies bleeding money from the public purse over long periods in order to keep basically inefficient industries afloat. What our industries need is a positive business climate and incentives, so they will invest in Australia and employ Australians.

Intelligent nationalism stresses the importance of maintaining good relations with Asian countries, particularly with Japan, our major trading partner and does not oppose the desirability of becoming better informed about our neighbours. It stresses though that all these things can be done without sacrificing our own traditions or - in the glibly fashionable language which is current - becoming an "Asian nation". Indeed the Asian nations will respect us for approaching them as equal, but different, and secretly - and not so secretly - hold us in contempt if we attempt to submerge our traditions in an attempt to "fit in".

The nationalists say that if Australia "integrates" with Asia, we will lose everything we value, including our democratic traditions, and, ultimately, the respect of the Asian nations themselves. Australia must have the courage to accept its uniqueness rather than attempting to extinguish it. It must also look to trade with the world and not become locked into putting all of its trading effort into Asia. Given the rapidly changing political and economic circumstances in the world, Australia not only has to have the ability to adapt quickly, but it cannot afford to put all its eggs in the one basket - in trade or any other area.

However if those in the nationalist camp who advocate widespread protection and the use of simplistic tariff walls gain the ascendancy then the

nationalists will fail. Government assistance to industry will have to be very selective and the nationalists will have to stress the development of our own abundant natural resources. On a social level they will have to stress the things which unite, not those which divide the nation.

The tendency among some who align themselves with this movement to hanker for past solutions and the re - creation of a Australia which no longer exists except in their memories, will have to be resisted. An intelligent outward looking nationalism, which values and builds on the strengths of the past, while looking to the future and developing the flexibility to respond to rapidly changing international circumstances is the only type which has a prospect of success. Isolationist nationalism will fail completely.

It is our contention that this intelligent outward looking nationalism, which builds upon our traditions and strengths, is the correct choice for Australia. It is also a vision which the general Australian population will readily embrace and work towards. On the other hand there is likely to be widespread grassroots resistance to the internationalist approach, which denigrates Australian traditions and which is basically being imposed by the power elites from above.

A country can only continue to prosper if it builds upon the best of what already exists and has the support of the bulk of its population. The people without leadership is aimless, but leadership without the active support of the people will ultimately fail.

The present leadership in Australia, on the one hand, works against the grain of its country's most valued traditions, while on the other promotes its worst - namely the cargo cult and the colonial cringe, (with a strong dose of middle class guilt to boot). All it has done is to direct these two old vices towards Asia and Mr Keating, in particular, has done this while claiming to be a nationalist. His "nationalism" in an empty shell.

In maintaining the illusion that there is no alternative to the internationalist approach and denigrating the moderate voice of nationalism our leaders not only ask for ultimate failure, but they undermine the faith of the public in the political process. If moderates are to be denied political legitimacy because of internationalist repression, then nationalist extremism will gain ground and basically good people will embrace it out of sheer desperation. This would be particularly so if the loud and threatening tactics of some migrant groups are seen to be effective. As stated, extremism is not likely to succeed in Australia, but it could deeply divide and damage the nation and those who denigrated the moderates will bear a large part of the responsibility.

It must be remembered that unlike some expressions of European nationalism, Australian nationalism is not expansionist or imperial. Australian nationalists don't want to invade or bully other countries, just secure the future of their own, so they can pass it on to their descendants. Australian nationalism is strongly democratic.

The alternative is to remain a stunted country and - out of fear of being left

alone in the big wide world - attempt to engineer an artificial conformity with one part of it. That is the cowardly way to eternal colonisation. Our future must be based on the courage to build on our strengths, and not be dominated by our fears.

PART II

IN EQUITY'S NAME

Largely in the name of equity an insidious system of government coercion is being institutionalised in Australia. This coercion is justified in the name of groups generically designated as "disadvantaged", such as people from non-English speaking backgrounds and women.

This coercion takes the form of both general administrative measures and specific legislation.

The common body at the centre of two pieces of insidious legislation - and the push for a third - is the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.

The bills already passed are the Disability Discrimination Bill 1992 and the Sex Discrimination Amendment Bill 1992. Right at the end of the parliamentary sitting year, on 16 December 1992, a draft Racial Vilification Bill was introduced to parliament, but was wiped from the slate due to the timing of the March 1993 Federal election. Mr Keating at the 36th biennial conference of the Zionist Federation on 28 May 1994, in the presence of outgoing president Mark Leibler, who had pushed strongly for such a bill including criminal sanctions, promised that a similar bill would be reintroduced before the end of the year.

The progress of all three bills was similar. In each case reports from either statutory bodies, parliamentary or inter-departmental committees were used as justification for the legislation. These reports were either partisan or overwhelmingly based on submissions from the vested interests who most favoured such legislation.

The Sex Discrimination Amendment bill 1992 effectively gives the agents of an unelected bureaucrat and partisan, the Sex Discrimination Commissioner of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, the power of a judge to make binding legal determinations on allegations of sexual harassment.

The legislation is complaints-based and offers a monetary reward if the complaint is successful. So a complaint can be lodged against a man, the commission can make a determination and lodge that determination with the Federal Court. If after 28 days a man found against has not lodged an appeal, the determination is legally binding.

Given the bias of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, a man complained against will be entering an essentially hostile atmosphere.

If found against he is unlikely to get Legal Aid if he wants to appeal against the decision in the Federal Court.

In other words the tendency at the hearing will be to presume the man guilty until he proves his innocence. If found against he most certainly will be designated legally guilty unless he takes the time and personal expense of an appeal in the Federal Court. If he wins his case he will have to pay the court costs and even if the judge finds that the complaint was malicious, he will have no action against the complainant for perjury.

This effectively reverses the onus of proof which is fundamental to our system of justice, namely that a person is innocent until proven guilty. It also, in the name of "equity", discriminates most heavily against men on lower incomes. They are unlikely to be able to afford to spend several thousand dollars on a legal appeal.

This will not be much of a change historically. While women have been effectively excluded from public positions in the past they have always exerted a powerful influence in social matters, particularly matters of morality. Where an upper class woman in the 19th Century was matched against a man from the "lower orders" in a legal case involving sexual matters, she could confidently expect the sympathy of the court. The low income man in a Human Rights Commission case may not be complained against by a woman of higher earnings and privilege, but his fate will most definitely be determined by one.

Two accompanying articles in this volume critically examine both the justification for this bill and public campaign to have it passed.

RE-EDUCATION CAMPAIGN

Apart from the Act, Mr Keating on 10 February 1993 announced a "re-education campaign" for magistrates and judges to help them identify their prejudices against women. The coordinator is to be Justice Deirdre O'Connor, former president of the Administrative Appeals Tribunal and current president of the Industrial Relations commission. What is to be the punishment for these males if their thoughts are impure?

How oppressed all the women who will gain most from this are - presidents of legal tribunals and commissions, senior political advisers, quasi-legal commissioners and professional feminist bureaucrats and lobbyists.

No doubt those unemployed men over 40 who formerly held blue collar jobs and are unlikely to be ever fully employed again in their lifetimes would like to be as underprivileged as this company.

And it is unclear how corruption of the legal system will help women in general. Such a process can lead to governments and legal systems being held in contempt. If this happens to a serious degree, then both women and men will suffer because the law will be regarded as politicised and will have little moral authority.

DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION BILL

The Disability Discrimination Bill is basically the baby of the trendy left led by the Deputy Prime Minister and former Minister for Health, Brian Howe, but also including people in the Attorney General's office and department, among others.

The most obvious problem with this act is its extremely wide definition of disabled. It includes a disability which "previously existed, but no longer exists; or may exist in the future, or is imputed to a person". As the Australian Medical Association has pointed out, this definition is so wide as to be meaningless. Under this provision almost anyone could qualify as disabled.

During a hearing of the Senate Standing Committee on Community Affairs into the bill on 9 October 1992, an officer of the Department of Attorney-General's, Kim Duggan, who was involved in the processes leading to the bill, was interviewed. At one point he was asked about this very wide definition. His response was "what you could say to that, is that, if you have been discriminated against unreasonably, then why should you not have an action."

This is an extraordinary statement and illustrates the sloppy and ill conceived manner in which this bill was drafted. In other words the officer was conceding the definition was essentially meaningless, but what was important was that a person who had been discriminated against unreasonably had a right to an action. In that case why not just call it the Anybody Discrimination Bill? If words are to have any value they must have a clear meaning. If the legislators have included a nonsensical definition of disabled, then this law is clearly open, not only to abuse, but to being held in contempt by the public.

The next problem with the bill is the definition of discrimination, which includes "indirect" discrimination, which means the person who discriminates is unaware they are doing so. Heavy overtones of the thought police. All in a good cause of course. It starts to look as though an employer would be both afraid to and afraid not to employ a disabled person. These sort of absurd provisions are likely to create resentment against disabled people rather than assist them.

The act is extremely subjective. Employment agencies will be deemed to have discriminated against the disabled if, "in the MANNER in which the agency provides the person with any of its services" it discriminates. Employment agencies will be in fear of prosecution and also open to malicious complaints. A (widely defined) disabled person may just take a dislike to an officer and complain on that basis. In a politically correct atmosphere, such a complaint may, even if eventually disproved, bring great distress upon the officer.

It should be a basic right of any landlord or occupant advertising for another occupant to share a house to determine who their tenants (or housemates) will be. The bill seems to deny that right. Discrimination is deemed to have

occurred if a disabled person, because of the disability, is given a "lower order of precedence in any list of applicants for that accommodation". How is it to be proved? All that needs to happen is for a complaint to be lodged and a hearing is conducted. People cannot go about their everyday business with disabled people involved without the threat of being hauled before the thought police of the HREOC to justify their actions.

Other features of the bill - and remember this is law - include:

- * An act of victimisation under the Act, including threats against people who plan to make a complaint under the Act carries a penalty of six months jail.
- * Anyone who places an advertisement - which "includes every form of advertisement or notice", which contravenes the act, is liable to a \$1,000 fine.
- * "Positive" discrimination in favour of the disabled under "grants, benefits or programs" is allowed, but not the reverse.
- * The act will be administered by the Disability Discrimination Commissioner of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.
- * The Commissioner will have the power to summons witnesses to give evidence or produce documents and to call compulsory conferences.
- * HREOC decisions, findings and reasons are supposed to be published in the Government Gazette not later than one month after being made, but any failure to comply, "does not affect the validity of the decision". In other words they can please themselves.
- * Also, the "Commission may prohibit publication of evidence" or "on its own initiative" hold an inquiry in private.
- * HREOC will also undertake research and "educational" ie propaganda programs.

Given the politically correct bias evident among the present commissioners, it is yet another opportunity for a Star Chamber.

THE PUSH FOR THE BILL

Mr Duggan gave an outline of those involved in the process of pushing for this bill in his evidence to the Standing Committee. He said: "the Bill has been developed by the mechanism of a disability discrimination legislation committee which was made up of representatives of the Department of the Attorney-General; the Department of Health, Housing and Community Services; the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission [the very organisation which is to administer the bill] and representatives of the Disability Advisory Council of Australia [a body established and funded by the government]. That [committee] has essentially continued on being the body that has driven the legislation up until this point."

Officers from both Minister Howe's office and former Attorney-General Michael Duffy's office were also involved. This is very select company and the submissions it received overwhelmingly came from bodies with a professional interest in the area. In other words there appears to have been very little balancing with a wider national interest in the process.

In his second reading speech on the bill, Minister Howe stated, "today, not 12 months after the establishment of this committee we are in the fortunate position of bringing this significant indicator of the Government's continuing commitment to social justice before Parliament". In other words the committee was established, it asked itself and the government-funded lobby whether this legislation was necessary and it said yes. No wonder it was quick.

Mr Howe also stated, "I do not believe there is any better example of social justice than this legislation". He spoke of Australia fulfilling its international obligations under "a number of United Nations instruments" and said it was timely "at the end of the United Nations decade of disabled persons" that such legislation be introduced. Indeed a representative of Minister Howe's went to the UN not long after, figuratively carrying this act aloft. Is it too cynical to suggest that Mr Howe sees this legislation as his landmark? Something to pose with in a world forum to show how socially advanced he is? Too bad his glory as a social justice warrior is at the expense of the Australian people.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Apart from these bills and their influence, the Department of Administrative Services has instituted procedures whereby companies deemed not to be effectively following equal opportunity principles can be denied government contracts. While this is done in the name of "equity" the pressure is to effectively introduce a quota system whereby membership of a designated "disadvantaged group" is in fact an advantage.

Valerie Pratt, former head of the Affirmative Action Agency, which has responsibility for instituting Equal Employment Opportunity policy in tertiary education bodies and companies of over 100 people, went so far as to recommend that government funding to tertiary bodies be conditional upon their adherence to EEO principles. Again this is an attempt to introduce a defacto quota system by coercive means.

The SA government has already declared that 50 per cent of SA Government board and committee positions will be occupied by women by the year 2000. What of merit? A database will be compiled to help this process.

Similar professional feminist campaigns are underway in the political parties, particularly the ALP.

"BIG PERSON" DATABASE

Another data base is the Continuous Record of Personnel (CRP) held by the Public Service Commission. The Commission's EEO Policy and Programs unit is responsible for this database. The unit's director is Ms Michalina Stawyskyi, formerly head of the education section of the Australian War Memorial. (Yes, political correctness has gone that far!)

The Annual Report of the Australian Public Service Commission of 1991-92 states "the data collected for the purpose of monitoring the progress of agencies in relation to the appointment and advancement of women and designated EEO groups...is held on the Continuous Record of Personnel". While the identification of women by this system is easy as personnel forms traditionally have listed sex, the identification of people from Non-English Speaking Background (NESB) is more difficult. There is a considerable reliance on "self-identification". The Annual Report on p 65 states that there is "an apparent reluctance to self-identify as NESB". This may be because people just want to be regarded as Australian.

Certainly a recent attempt to get people in the Army to identify themselves along ethnic lines was met with considerable hostility. The great majority of soldiers regarded themselves as Australian pure and simple and resented the question.

But the Public Service Commission will get the information on public service officers whether people want to give it to them or not. The Annual Report states on p 66, "Concern about the gradual reduction in the number of staff volunteering EEO data and having it recorded in the CRP has resulted in actions to improve EEO data held on the CRP. An interdepartmental committee was convened by the Department of Finance to develop strategies to improve data held on the CRP. This reported to relevant agencies in March 1992."

"In addition, the Secretary of the Department of Finance and the Public Service Commissioner wrote jointly in May (1992) to all Secretaries and Heads of Agencies with staff under the Public Service Act, all Heads of Management and to Senior Executives responsible for EEO, seeking cooperation in taking action to assist in improving the Equal Employment Opportunity data held on the CRP". A simple way to force people to provide the information is to make job applications etc conditional upon filling in relevant forms completely.

Apart from this every government department has to report annually to the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA) on its implementation of "Access and Equity" programs. The OMA networks with the Public Service Commission and other bodies, in its efforts to implement multicultural objectives. As the Public Service Commission Annual Report states, "The Commission has also consulted with the Office of Multicultural Affairs on the development of a cross-portfolio framework for cross-cultural awareness training in the APS (Australian Public Service)."

OMA also holds a joint database with the Bureau of Immigration Research.

So the multiculturalist regulators in the public sector has become increasingly sophisticated and coordinated in its mechanism of coercion and quota enforcement.

Officers within the system, whatever they truly feel, are afraid to criticise this coercion for fear of having their own advancement blocked.

In the names of the wrongs of the past, wrongs of another sort are perpetuated into the future, which will in turn produce another reaction. All of this is justified by reports and surveys permeated with intellectual corruption.

Apart from the mainstream bureaucrats, others in publicly funded organisations such as the Australia Council act to enforce this system of state coercion. The National Museum of Australia is also shaping up to be another politically correct organisation.

Also politically correct influences are not only at work in universities, but even upon primary and secondary schooling.

Late in 1992 the then Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training, Mr Kim Beazley, announced the introduction of a new "National Equity Program for Schools". The strategy for this program was developed over 1993 and something similar will no doubt be continued in the years to come regardless of who is in government, such has this "equity" ideology taken hold.

Combined with other efforts at indoctrination in the various aspects of the religion of political correctness, our educational authorities are doing their bit for social engineering and the suppression of open inquiry.

Also Dr Andrew Theophanous, a champion of multiculturalism, has co-ordinated, through the Office of Multicultural Affairs, a series of so-called community consultations throughout May, June and July 1994, on the implementation of the government's "Access and Equity strategy". This will no doubt continue the pattern of going to the self-interested lobbies, asking what they want and then delivering it in the recommendations of the report. The majority, who by definition are excluded, will foot the bill as usual.

A press release about the process was put out by Dr Theophanous on 19 April 1994, in which he stated, "The Office of Multicultural Affairs is currently developing an information base on the implementation of [earlier OMA] recommendations [to "strengthen the Access and Equity strategy"] for a report to the Prime Minister which will be published and tabled in Parliament before the end of this year [1994]."

These earlier OMA recommendations were contained in a 1992 Evaluation Report and were accepted in their entirety by the government. The largely unseen and insidious process continues.

CHILDREN OF THE VILIFICATION BILL

Although the Draft Racial vilification bill 1992 was not passed in the time frame anticipated, it provided the model for other regulations.

The first of its bastard children was an immigration amendment passed in 1992 which was used to prevent the entry of controversial historian David Irving to Australia.

Whatever we may think of his opinions, he has the right to express them.

This immigration amendment is called the Migration (Offences and Undesirable Persons) Amendment Bill 1992.

It was introduced into the Parliament and passed on the last sitting day of 1992, one day after the Draft Racial Vilification Bill was introduced. The amendment had its genesis in a Federal Court judge overturning a decision by then immigration minister Mr Hand to bar members of the US Hells Angels motorcycle club from entering Australia.

From that perspective there was justification for an amendment to bar people involved or strongly suspected of involvement in criminal activity. However, in line with pressure from various vested interests, particularly the Jewish lobby, the amendment was extended to echo the Draft Racial Vilification Bill. Apart from people likely to engage in criminal conduct, it included people who were likely to "engage in vilification of a segment of the community or would foment discord in the community". It is under this segment of the legislation that Mr Hand banned Mr Irving, who later appealed.

CODES FOR COMMERCIAL TV

The second child was the code of practice adopted for commercial television.

After a token submissions process, the Federation of Australian Commercial Television Stations (FACTS), introduced its final code of practice for the commercial television industry in September 1993.

In the draft document FACTS stated that the suggested codes contained "new anti-discrimination provisions based on the wording of the Federal Government's draft amendments to the Racial Discrimination Act", ie: the Racial Vilification Bill.

The codes include a section under "Proscribed Material" (section 1.6) which begins "A licensee may not broadcast a program which is likely, in all the circumstances to:.... (1.6.5) seriously offend the cultural sensitivities of

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people or of ethnic groups or racial groups in the Australian community." and "(1.6.6) stir up hatred, serious contempt or severe ridicule against a person or group of persons on the grounds of age, colour, gender, national or ethnic origin, physical or mental disability, race, religion or sexual preference."

Also, under Section 4, dealing specifically with News and Current Affairs programs, is the following - "In broadcasting news and current affairs programs, licensees: (4.3.7) must not portray any person or group of persons in a negative light by placing gratuitous emphasis on age, colour, gender, national or ethnic origin, physical or mental disability, race, religion or sexual preference. Nevertheless, where it is in the public interest [how defined? who determines?], licensees may report events and broadcast comments in which such matters are raised".

Exceptions to the "proscribed material" in section 1.6 are provided for in section 1.7 which follows. However, the exemptions do not give rise to any confidence that the codes will not be used to suppress open public discussion of issues such as immigration and multiculturalism.

Assurances that such things in the codes would not inhibit "genuine" discussion on public issues have been given by people such as former Federal Race Discrimination Commissioner Irene Moss in relation to the Racial Vilification Bill, yet she and others like her have been very quick to make charges of racism and call for people to be silenced in past public controversies.

The push for these codes came from the multiculturalist industry to begin with and every other politically correct cause was tacked onto it, including "anti-homosexual vilification", "anti-disability vilification" and "ageist discrimination". The individual most responsible for instituting the codes was Brian Johns, the head of the Australian Broadcasting Authority (ABA) and former head of SBS, the official publicly-funded "multicultural" channel.

The first draft of these codes was released in August 1992 before the appointment of Mr Johns. At that stage they contained no echo of the Racial Vilification Bill at all. The Proscribed Material section (5.1) contained only four items, with no mention of race. Then Mr Johns arrived on the scene at the newly constituted ABA. As the FACTS document states, "the commercial television industry...developed these codes of practice in consultation with the ABA."

Under the influence of Mr Johns, the codes were 'extensively rewritten', in the light supposedly of 'several hundred written comments from individuals, community groups and government agencies.' (The same old stacked submissions process).

That was how the draft codes were brought about. Now the codes are official. The ABC of course also has a "multicultural" unit and actively censors views critical of the policy. It has a de-facto quota system in employment to favour "minorities" and its director David Hill has gone so far as to threaten

the commercial stations with [more?] regulation if they don't do the right thing, according to his lights, in their portrayal of Aboriginals.

He stated, at the Media and Indigenous Australians Conference in Brisbane on 16 February 1993, as reported in *The Australian* on 17 February, that "the commercial industry should be placed on notice that it will be regulated if it doesn't show responsibility and take the initiative" in its depiction of Aboriginals.

He also said, "large sections of commercial television in Australia and commercial radio do not have the proper policies or strategies in place to deal with these issues and their coverage reflects this." This was denied by FACTS, but their own codes indicate they have been intimidated. Mr Hill is just one of the networkers putting the pressure on. His aim seems to be that of ensuring all stations become as politically correct as the ABC.

Though where he gets the authority to make such threats is another matter.

So now no one who speaks on any television station can be confident of a right to speak freely in criticism of the policy of multiculturalism or aspects of immigration policy, or other matters touching upon race, without having complaints made under the codes. It may not be that the individual is even personally made aware of the complaints in some cases, but pressure placed on station managements may be enough to ensure that the individual's views are not heard in future. It is potentially a very insidious process and is all part of the politically correct agenda to stifle opposition.

IRONY

It is ironic that one of the people who has most strongly pushed for racial vilification legislation and the like, the President of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, Mr Isi Leibler - who has a 6 per cent stake in the 10 television network - has himself been the subject of a complaint by the Islamic Council of NSW for remarks he made about Islamic fundamentalism on the SBS 6.30pm news of Australia Day 1993. He stated, "Israel is on the front line [of Islamic fundamentalism today], it could be Europe and even North America and even ourselves [Australia, tomorrow]".

In a letter sent to Federal politicians, dated 1 February 1993, the Islamic Council stated that "Mr Leibler's tone and intent to incite fear, suspicion and alarm against those belonging and committed to the Islamic faith [is viewed with deep concern and is condemned]".

He has, according to this council complaint, just broken the codes he himself favours. The irony is compounded in the light of fact that his brother, Mr Mark Leibler, the immediate past president of the Zionist Federation of Australia (ZFA), has stated, as reported by the Australian Jewish News of February 12, 1993 that racial or religious vilification should be defined "through the eyes of a reasonable man of that religion, race, colour or national

or ethnic origin". No doubt the men [and women if any] of the Islamic Council regard themselves as reasonable. In that case Mr Isi Leibler would be guilty. Here is a clear example of how the legislation and codes he himself and his brother have pushed for could be used to suppress his own views.

In fact the ZFA's submission to the Attorney-General on the Draft Racial Vilification Bill which the ZFA wanted made stronger, is a classic of authoritarianism. The ZFA, in the words of the Australian Jewish News, wants "artistic works, academic and scientific statements and fair reports or comments on matters of public interest to be subjected to scrutiny for racial vilification." - in other words subject to a politically correct censorship board.

According to Australian Associated Press of 25 February 1993, Mr Isi Leibler again urged the Federal Government to push forward with its racial vilification legislation after a survey by the Australian Institute of Jewish Affairs and the Australian Union of Jewish Students claimed that 60 per cent of Australian students held "racist" views.

This random survey only covered 400 students across ten campuses and agreeing with the statement that Asian students were "too cliquey", as 60 per cent did, was regarded as racist. That was the sort of "evidence" the survey provided. Yet Mr Leiber said, "If these are the attitudes of Australia's educated population, then there is an urgent need for education and legislation to tackle the problem of racism in this country."

THE "AUSSIE" COUNCIL

The Australia Council, a body charged with promoting the arts in this country has become, once again in the name of equity, part of the system of coercion of the New Class Ascendancy.

It is relentlessly politically correct. Its own Annual Report for 1991-92 makes this clear.

The Council has adopted an "Asia-Pacific policy initiative" to complement the government's "we are part of Asia" propaganda line. As stated on page 18 of the report, "In 1990-91 about 12.5 per cent of the international programs budget was allocated to Asian or Pacific region projects. The 1991-92 target was 25 per cent and this will rise next year to 50 per cent."

Also, "The Community Cultural Development Board expanded its multicultural arts officers program...It supported the development of the National Multicultural Arts Network - an organisation of artists of NESB and multicultural arts organisations - whose main objective is to provide a voice and to advocate on behalf of Arts for a Multicultural Australia."

The report spoke of the work of the Strategic Development Unit's assistance in the "further development of Access and Equity policy as required by the Office of Multicultural Affairs..." There's that word "equity" again.

The report goes on, "The Arts for a Multicultural Australia (AMA) policy neared the end of its third year of operation. Major outcomes have been:

- * consistently recommending to Ministers the appointment of non-English speaking background (NESB) artists to Council, its boards and committees.
- * integrating multiculturalism into all aspects of the Council's programs.
- * establishing strategies and targets at Board level to redress unequal access to information and resources for NESB artists and multicultural arts organisations.
- * encouraging the arts world to interact with NESB artists and communities to help Australian culture evolve and grow.

Whatever happened to just choosing artists on the basis of merit? The Australia Council, funded by the public to the tune of \$60 million a year, has, to a large extent become a pensioner system for politically correct and "target group" mediocrities. This is particularly true of the Literature Board.

Perhaps this is put best by the man regarded by many as Australia's finest poet, Les Murray. In a letter to the then Minister for the Arts, David Simmons, in February 1991, Mr Murray stated that the Literature Board of the Australia Council was a scandal. He continued, "It has taken the best part of two decades for the one genuine faction in Australian letters, the left-wing or "progressive"

one, to make its hegemony over the Board total. It now routinely excludes from awards and fellowships all writers of quality who do not support its agenda in detail; mere agreement on a few points is not enough. And wrong friendships are fatal."

The Australia Council however has attempted to make itself more attractive as a potential money spinner. One idea, as announced by its chairman Rodney Hall, is to develop an "Office of Cultural Tourism" to, in his words, as reported in *The Canberra Times* of February 21, "maximise the involvement of overseas tourism in Australia's cultural life". Political correctness meets the Gold Coast!

Apart from this and other public relations stunts, like giving grants to venerable names as a smokescreen, the council is an active participant in the coercive mechanism of the state. It promotes intellectual uniformity and stifles dissent through its financial power. Though this hasn't proved all that difficult - there are few writers and intellectuals with the courage to speak out, for fear of risking their own chances for grants.

How easy it has been after all to buy off the supposed conscience of our nation.

So the Council is promoting a quota system, not based on sheer merit, but on whether you belong to a "disadvantaged" group or not. Nice statistics are preferred over quality. The great joke is that the pampered and politically conformist bureaucrats of the Australia Council regard themselves as avant garde!

The role of the Australia Council as a politically correct enforcer is underlined from some quotes from its 1993 document, "Policy on Arts for a Multicultural Australia":

"A policy for multiculturalism and the arts rejects narrow definitions of excellence, culture and artistic practice. Instead it highlights the importance of viewing these terms in their appropriate cultural context" (p 4).

To that end and "in view of the Council's commitment to the principle of peer review, applications by artists of non-English speaking background are judged by appropriate artform and cultural peers.

This means that external referees who are specialists within their own culture or language group are appointed to assist in assessing particular projects. They may be drawn from within Australia or, where that is not possible, from overseas." (p 8)

The council has a "Multicultural Advisory Committee" to "advise it on all matters relating to development, coordination and implementation of the policy" (p 8).

And, "In its promotion of artistic activity in Australia, the Council cooperates with a wide range of organisations including the Office of Multicultural Affairs, state arts funding authorities and Ethnic Affairs Commissions, the Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia and its state-based counterparts, the National Arts for a Multicultural Australia Network and the education system."

As well "multicultural arts officers" are funded, "within appropriate organisations".

No wonder the former general manager of the Australia Council, Max Bourke, moved so smoothly to his new job as head of the Office of Multicultural Affairs.

Multiculturalism, combined with such things as institutionalised feminism and "integration with Asia" are the guiding lights of the Australia Council. No matter that there are confusions and contradictions embodied in the combination of such ideologies.

An example of the Asianisation push is found in the September 1992 issue of *Artforce*, the newsletter of the Council, which announces the appointment of Alison Broinowski as director of something called "Advocacy and Planning" for the Council. She is an enthusiast for Asianisation from the Department of Foreign Affairs.

The newsletter notes, "A member of the Australian diplomatic service since 1974, Ms Broinowski is also an author, editor and consultant on Asian affairs. She has spent over 15 years on overseas assignments, mostly in Asian countries. Her last diplomatic post was as Counsellor in the Australian Mission to the United Nations in New York." She is the author of *The Yellow Lady*, another of the endless new class texts urging Asianisation upon Australia. Her fame rests upon this one fashionable book.

While in missions abroad Ms Broinowski obviously became used to the comforts of cheap labour around the house. She asked, during an immigration conference held by the Evatt Foundation in Sydney on 24 April 1992, why there was no immigration category for domestic servants.

Overwhelmingly our so-called independent artists go along with this sort of thing. Most either keep silent on the insidious effects of these ideologies, the stifling of artistic expression and merit, or actively promote them. In their fear of being denied grants, or in active attempts to gain them, they have become conformists and cowards. They are effectively advocates for this stifling of merit, elevation of fashionable mediocrity and submerging of our national character. There is no place in the true arts for this approach.

The appointment of a single minister to oversee both communications and the arts, Michael Lee - a protege of the authoritarian Paul Keating - should start alarm bells ringing even further. This offers further opportunities to coordinate every area of public communication in the country to suit a politically correct agenda. Of course our courageous "arts" community fell over itself before the last election to lick Mr Keating's boots, so they are unlikely to complain.

Hilary McPhee, the wife of the Prime Minister's speech writer, Don Watson, was also appointed chair of the Australia Council. While she obviously has the ability, this offers further opportunities for control and coordination. Of course she has said she will be independent, but we've heard that one before. Even the BIPR calls itself that!

NATIONAL MUSEUM

Another home of the politically correct is the so-called National Museum of Australia. While it will not be given a new building for a consolidated collection as it hoped, it will still hold displays in Old Parliament House and will administer a new Gallery of Aboriginal Australia to be built in Canberra. It is little more than another power base for the already privileged New Class Ascendancy which has largely captured our cultural institutions. Again in the name of "access and equity" its collections will concentrate on those target groups designated as "disadvantaged". For example its Access and Equity Plan 1991-92 to 1993-94 states that its "publication, production and distribution will target access and equity groups" and "the possibility of a joint publication with the Office of Multicultural Affairs is being explored." Its staffing already reflects the influence of "Affirmative Action" ie: legalised discrimination. The Museum is likely to act as yet another agency for intellectual conformity.

One recent display put on by the Museum in Old Parliament House featured a "shrine" to Al Grassby for his great contributions to immigration policy and multiculturalism!

Yet the National Museum was promoted by actor Jack Thompson as something all Australians could be proud of. Not only did Thompson have a high profile, he made his name in films with strongly Australian themes. This sort of appeal to the Australian mainstream, it is now apparent, has been exploited to harness support. Thompson himself, though he certainly didn't start out that way seems to have been comprehensively won over by the politically correct. Thompson stated, as reported in *The Canberra Times* of 3 July 1993, that the museum would change the nature of the "education" of Australians and help "clarify the lies" told in our history. Already mainstream Australians have left after visits to Museum displays feeling not only alienated and insulted, but as if the positive contributions of their forebears had been erased.

MULTICULTURALISM AND THE NSW GOVERNMENT

The Sydney Morning Herald of 23 August 1993 reported that the Liberal/National State government would appoint "up to 50 'ethnic representatives' on boards and committees throughout the Government within the next two weeks".

In March the NSW government - in a cynical attempt to curry favour with the "ethnic lobby" which the Liberal Party has been told it needs to cultivate more, particularly by *The Sydney Morning Herald* - launched a so-called "Charter of Principles for a Culturally Diverse Society".

As part of this charter, "Each department would be required to produce a

binding statement of intent, explaining how it would implement the charter. It would then have to supply a public report on its achievements...An Ethnic Affairs Commission (EAC) task force would act like an ethnic ombudsman to monitor the departments' progress and provide assistance, while several target departments covering health, education, employment, community services and justice would be monitored regularly.."

As part of NSW grants, the government would spend \$260,000 on 'multicultural arts', so complementing the Federal government's corruption of artistic policy. All this was announced by an "ethnic" politician called Mr Photios. Another "ethnic" politician, but from the ALP Opposition, Mr John Aquilina, said that the moves did not go far enough.

In the 1993 NSW state government budget it was announced that funding on the ethnic affairs portfolio would be increased by 57 per cent. Most of this funding consists of a \$4 million increase to the Ethnic Affairs Commission, which takes its annual budget to \$10.5 million.

Mr Photios also announced the allocation of \$300,000 towards a feasibility study for the establishment of a museum of immigration, but the Victorians may well beat him to the punch, as the Victorian Government has announced the formation of a committee to look into turning Melbourne's Station Pier into an immigration museum. While Sir Arvi Parbo, who has been critical of multiculturalism, is to chair the board, the overall composition of the board suggests the museum will become yet another power base for multiculturalism once in operation. Others on the board include Phil Honeywood, the parliamentary secretary for Ethnic Affairs, Carlo Furletti of the Ethnic Affairs Commission, Professor Pookong Kee, director of the Centre for Asia-Pacific Studies and Richard Pratt.

If the Victorian museum goes ahead, does this mean the Sydney one will not be built? Or are we to have two such museums, one in Sydney and one in Melbourne for double the propaganda value?

So there we are, both the ALP and the Liberals are busy institutionalising the policy of multiculturalism in their ongoing quest for the so-called ethnic vote. The fact that this mainly benefits professional ethnics and not the people they claim to represent is a secondary matter. The fact that the majority of the general public is excluded in all this is, it seems, just a matter of course.

ANOTHER MUSEUM CAPTURED

Apart from the National Museum of Australia, yet another institution which is supposed to be for all Australians seems to have been captured, or at the least heavily influenced by, the politically correct.

A site in Sydney was specifically set aside in 1988 for a museum to commemorate the First Government House. The museum was to focus specifically on the First Government House and its significance to all Australians. Since then the concept behind the museum has been fundamentally altered and the name of the museum changed. It will now be called "The Museum of Sydney on the Site of the First Government House".

In other words the original concept has been relegated to an afterthought and will certainly, in day to day usage, be dropped from the title. Already the acronym "MOS" is being featured on the glossy brochures issued by the Historic Houses Trust of NSW, which has responsibility for the site. In time the afterthought part of the title will no doubt be officially dropped.

Given the record of the NSW Government, which has copied Federal examples, the Museum can be relied upon to adopt a "multicultural" theme. Instead of celebrating and honouring the significance of Government House, the basic reason for the museum in the first place, it will simply be used as a departure point, in a general celebration of Sydney's "multiculturalism".

This will fit in nicely with the NSW and Federal Governments' multiculturalism propaganda in the lead up to and during the 2000 Olympic Games. Of course if the ALP Opposition gained government it would continue on the same track.

BACKGROUND OF THE SITE

The site is located on the corner of Bridge and Phillip Streets. The foundation stone of Government House was laid by Governor Phillip on 15 May 1788. He moved in during April the next year. Government House was the first permanent European building in Australia. It was built in a plain Georgian style of two storeys and six rooms.

The first nine Governors of the Colony of NSW lived and worked there and considerably extended the original building. It was the centre of the Colony's administration, political and social life, but was demolished after the present Government House was built in 1845. The site had temporary use from that time on.

The site was being leased from the NSW Government and a high rise building was to be constructed on it, when archaeological excavations in 1983 found footings of the original house and other artefacts from the colony's earliest days. It was a dramatic and exciting find.

As was stated in the brochure, "First Government House Site", put out by the NSW Planning Department: "no one could have imagined how much of the original buildings remained buried in the heart of Sydney. The archaeologists found a wealth of remains dating back to 1788. The base of the back wall, part of the western wall of Phillip's house and the foundations of the original outbuildings containing the kitchen and bakehouse were all uncovered. They also discovered other stone foundations, garden paths, drains and evidence of the first printing office which Governor Hunter had established. Further digging uncovered a corner of the long dining room that Governor Macquarie had added to the House."

A group called Friends of the First Government House Site was formed in August 1983 to lobby to save the site and build a museum to commemorate it. Largely due to its efforts the site was saved and plans were made for a museum on the life and times of the first Government House.

The project was to be financed from payment the NSW Government received for selling "air space" above the site. It became generally accepted that there would be a Government House Museum on the site. In 1988 the Historic Houses Trust (HHT) of NSW took over responsibility for the museum.

NAME CHANGE

In October this year, the Friends learnt indirectly for the first time of a possible name change. Letters of protest from historical groups, politicians and heritage-conscience citizens were sent to the NSW Minister for the Arts, Mr Peter Collins, who, one of the Friends stated, seemed surprised that they had not been informed of the change. It took a direct Ministerial order to the HHT before they agreed to meet with representatives of the Friends on 8 November.

Although the HHT engaged in a submissions process and hired a market research firm to gauge "public opinion" with a questionnaire, the HHT refused to give the Friends a list of submissions or supply them with the questions asked in the market research. However it is known that the number of people surveyed was only 286 in total: 30 from Sydney, six from Melbourne and 250 tourists at Circular Quay and Manly.

The Friends raised a number of points at the 8 November meeting, including the fact that the museum was originally intended to represent the birthplace of a nation and its formative years, therefore "Museum of Sydney" was both inappropriate and misleading.

The HHT Trust members stated that a number of historians and academics, who they refused to name, backed the name change, but they said that would

"note" the objections of the Friends. A compromise name was even floated. The Friends were told that although the Minister would be launching the concept on 19 November, it would not include launching a new name, but was to attract potential sponsors. This meeting was shown to be a sham when the new name, "Museum of Sydney on the Site of The First Government House" was in fact launched on 19 November at the Intercontinental Hotel by the Minister.

It is hard to resist the conclusion that the meeting was not only a token gesture on behalf of the Trust members, who had already made up their minds, but that preparation of the glossy brochures announcing the name were already well advanced when the meeting took place. The Minister clearly also did not really concern himself with the objections of the Friends.

The Friends are concerned, and with very good reason, that the Museum is likely to be used to suit current political fashions and present a distorted view of our history.

This concern is very well grounded when we consider the words of the director of the Historic Houses Trust of NSW, Peter Watts, the organisation which engineered the change. He appeared on Radio 2BL on 20 December 1993 and was interviewed about the museum by Andrew Olle.

Peter Watts: "...I suppose the most important thing [about the museum] is an attitude firstly, being prepared to *embrace different views* and that is something that comes as a bit of a shock to some people is preparedness on our part to say well, let's *listen to different voices*, let's listen to what different people have to say about this site. So there's many ways in which one can express that in a museum, through *public programs*, through the sorts of exhibitions we have, through allowing different people, *both contemporary people but people from the past to have their own voice in a museum.*"

This museum was supposed to be about the First Government House, its life and times. It can be seen just from this statement how far the Trust has moved away from the original intention. The words we have placed in italics are pure multiculturalist-speak. This is the sort of language used to give the impression that many people have been listened to, whereas in fact the input comes from multiculturalist elites and the majority is not only ignored, its interests are overridden by the minority, or its supposed representatives. It all sounds very inclusive, but in fact is highly exclusive. Under the Trust the museum has clearly been turned into an opportunity for political theatre.

Watts continued: "...it is a museum about *ideas*, it is a museum about *issues*. Therefore we are allowing the expression of these ideas and issues *in a very contemporary way*. So there will be the traditionally museum exhibits of course, painters that were on the First Fleet, objects that were in the house, but there will also be an opportunity [for] very theatrical displays, for instance one of the, the initial displays will be, trying in a very theatrical, very creative and very potent way to give a sense of first contact. What was it like, what did it actually feel like, not was it hist...*not the historical facts, but what did it*

feel like in the heart at first contact, from an European perspective of those people who arrived on the First Fleet but equally from Aboriginal perspective and also from a perspective of *other colonial cultures*."

On the face of it an attempt to provide a dramatic recreation of first contact has merit, but only in so far as it is strongly grounded in historical fact. This talk about expression in a "very contemporary way", the talk of ideas and issues has the strong smell of an opportunity to push fashionable agendas, such as multiculturalism. What does the supposed perspective of "other colonial cultures" have to do with the First Government House? Which other colonial cultures and at which time? There is a strong suspicion that this will include a perspective of today's multiculturalists from "colonial backgrounds".

Andrew Olle to Peter Watts: "And are you trying to some extent to tie it into the, the big issues of today? To bring it right through to that, the Mabos, the Republics, that sort of stuff?"

PW: Absolutely, I think that is one, yes, one of the wonderful things of this museum, that it is *fairly much a museum of the moment*, because it provides an opportunity to deal with those issues like *Mabo, Aboriginal reconciliation, environmental issues, all of which of course derive their history from this place*."

So, it will be a museum of the political moment, pushing the fashionable agendas of the day, as though this was something marvellously innovative, instead of the intellectual conformity that it is. The NSW government has already announced a feasibility study for a museum of immigration, which will be another propaganda unit, promoting the marvels of multiculturalism. The National Museum of Australia is also out of the same politically correct mould, as any Museum of Immigration can be guaranteed to be. It is as if these museums are becoming monuments to the increasing dispossession of the majority.

The Friends of the First Government House Site are continuing to protest about the coup conducted by the Trust. They have produced a pamphlet, part of which is reproduced below:

HANDS OFF OUR HERITAGE!

YOU need to JOIN with the Friends of the First Government House Site, the Fellowship of First Fleeters, the 1788-1820 Pioneer Association, the Womens' Pioneer Association, the Bloodworth Association, the Woollahra History and Heritage Society, and many individual Australians, politicians and academics, as well as other historical groups who support the FIRST GOVERNMENT HOUSE MUSEUM. Say NO to the M.O.S. and the philosophy this name embraces. Say NO to "political correctness" and SAY YES to "historical correctness"! PROTEST NOW! Write to the Premier Mr John Fahey,

Parliament House, Macquarie St Sydney NSW 2000. Send a copy to: Friends of the First Government House Site, PO Box E350, St James, Sydney NSW 2000. Ask the Friends of the First Government House Site for more information and membership.

* The museum is due to open in early 1995.

HOW THE SEX BILL WAS PASSED

With the recent furore over supposed widespread harassment of women in the armed services, the navy in particular, a footnote to an earlier and similar professional feminist campaign has gone largely unremarked and unreported.

In 1989 an International Crime Survey (ICS) found that Australia had the highest level of sexual violence among a group of 14 nations. This formed part of a wider series of questions asked of 2,012 Australians, 1,100 of whom were women. Because it suited a politically correct purpose, this survey finding received considerable publicity and was the spur to the making of the film about sexual assault, *Without Consent*, shown in two parts on ABC television over consecutive weeks in September 1992.

This film itself was relentlessly promoted in the media and generated a number of spin-off stories about sexual assault. Newspaper articles and lobbyists claimed that Australia had "the highest rate of sexual assault in the world". The coverage during the period was so intense that it was dubbed "sexual assault fortnight".

However the NSW Parliamentary Standing Committee on Social Issues chaired by Legislative Council member Marlene Goldsmith, a feminist herself, has examined this survey and found it to be seriously flawed. The report of the committee, *Sexual Violence: The Hidden Crime*, December 1993, stated, (p 77), "It is therefore the committee's conclusion that the media attention placed on the finding that Australia had the highest incidences of sexual offences in the world was unfounded. The Committee does not consider it appropriate for the [NSW] Government to take account of ICS results in considering policy options in relation to sexual violence."

The committee effectively declared the survey worse than useless in the following terms, "It is the Committee's opinion that the ICS shortcomings discussed above impact not only upon the general international comparability of the survey results, but upon attempts to ascertain the incidence of sexual violence."

It also stated that "The difficulties in interpreting and presenting data of this nature...suggest that statistical information *must be used with some caution.*" (our italics). Certainly it should be, especially on such emotive subjects, but of course the exact opposite occurs and not just once or twice, but consistently.

It seems we can thank the Dutch Justice Ministry for the ICS survey. The NSW committee report notes, (p27), "The impetus for conducting this survey came from Dr Jan van Kijk, of the Netherlands' Ministry of Justice. Joining him on a working group formed to coordinate the project were Ms Pat Mayhew

of the Research and Planning Unit, Home Office, England and, as a result of his expertise and experience in telephone surveys, Professor Martin Killias, University of Lausanne, Switzerland."

This NSW Committee finding was reported, from Australian Associated Press copy, in *The Canberra Times* of 12 February, "NSW inquiry rejects international survey finding on sexual violence", but was not generally highlighted by the media.

Information calling the ICS survey into serious question was in fact available to the media in 1992 from Professor John Walker of the Institute of Criminology. In an article in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 24 September 1992 he reportedly contested the survey and was quoted as stating that, by international standards, "the incidence of sexual crime against adult women in Australia is low." The voice of Walker was not only a voice in the wilderness, but was drowned out even within his own institution by another senior criminologist Dr Patricia Easteal, who was given very generous media coverage as she joined in the "shock-horror" chorus.

Dr Easteal seems to specialise in a remarkably narrow field. Her papers in 1991/92 included, *Premenstrual Issues and the Law* and *Battered Woman Syndrome in the Court*. In conjunction with a fellow American, Professor Edna Erez of Kent State University, she edited a book called *Victimisation of Women Around the World*. Another report of hers for the Bureau of Immigration Research (BIR) on women of ethnic backgrounds in Australian prisons entitled *The Forgotten Few: Overseas born Women in Australian Prisons* was launched by Justice Elizabeth Evatt in 1992.

Justice Evatt's report *Multiculturalism and the Law*, released later the same year, in turn recommended a greater role for the BIR and the Office of Multicultural Affairs. It also, like the report of the *Royal Commission into Black Deaths in Custody*, recommended the introduction of racial vilification legislation, but without criminal sanctions. This is all part of the network, linking and supporting not only professional feminists, but multiculturalists and others in the politically correct pantheon. Membership of the network provides a career path through local and overseas bureaucracies. Dr Evatt now chairs the UN Human Rights Committee.

But the example of Dr Walker shows that even in the midst of hysterical media campaigns stories striking a discordant note can appear, though they are rarely highlighted and they become engulfed by the general stream.

The general method of attack in these media campaigns is simple and ancient. On the basis of an element of truth and parading the supposed high morality of the cause, a problem is highlighted. Highly emotional and exaggerated claims are made about the extent of the problem, often based on dodgy statistics and surveys. Calls are made for resources to be increased to favoured groups to combat the problem, so increasing their influence and power.

If it is found, or admitted, much later that the campaign was based on misleading material, even deliberately misleading, the money will not be taken back, the laws will still stand and the corpses will remain burnt. We certainly cannot rely upon fair minded reports from parliamentary committees. Quite often such committee reports are effectively part of the lobbying.

So *Without Consent* was based on a highly suspect survey. It was shown on the ABC over consecutive weeks in September. At that time Dr Anne Summers was adviser to the Prime Minister on women's matters and was pushing for an amendment to the sexual discrimination act. This amendment was basically to give the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission the powers of a court to make binding legal determinations when dealing with matters of sexual harassment.

The "need" for such a power had been recommended by a Federal parliamentary committee in its report *Half Way to Equal*. The chairman of this committee, Michael Lavarch, made his name with this report and was later appointed Attorney-General. The committee basically sought the ideas of the interested lobbies and delivered them what they had asked for in the report. (An article scrutinising this report follows).

Dr Summers wrote a speech indicating the government's intention to introduce the amendment to the bill and Mr Keating delivered it word for word before a forum of women's groups in Canberra. The forum was organised by Dr Summers and the speech was delivered on Saturday 19 September, falling right in the middle of the covering propaganda barrage of "sexual assault fortnight".

Who would have dared question such a bill in such an atmosphere?

Later Dr Summers personally selected the Human Resources Manager of the ABC, Sue Walpole, to be Sex Discrimination Commissioner in charge of administering the legislation.

The ABC of course routinely discriminates on the basis of sex, not to mention race. In the January issue of the *Engineering Times*, an engineering student, Doug McFarlane, outlined his experience with the ABC. He stated, "All the ABC's trainee positions I have seen advertised in *The Australian* and *The Age* have required applicants to be female, Aboriginal or from a non-English speaking background." Nevertheless, "in the spirit of equal opportunity" he applied for a position marked "female only" and was rejected on the basis of his sex and background. The ABC had received endorsement for its policy of anti-white (English Speaking Background) male discrimination "from the Human Rights Commissioner as a special measure under Section 33 of the Sex Discrimination Act 1984." Well it would, wouldn't it?

At any rate, the ICS survey was dodgy, *Without Consent*, as a result, was dodgy, *Half Way to Equal* was dodgy, but legislation flowed from this combination of factors, skilfully manipulated by the relevant lobbies and relentlessly promoted by sections of the media, led by the ABC.

Contrary information was certainly available, but it was not what the bulk of the media wanted to hear. For those who care to look closely these campaigns are often based on very slim "evidence" - accusations, a couple of surveys or reports, even a single report by a sympathetic committee. One or two factual events can also be highlighted and their frequency exaggerated.

However, even with the latest campaign on sexual harassment in the armed forces, particularly the navy, a careful reader will find the occasional discordant note. On 11 February four women sailors appeared before the Senate inquiry into the matter and stated that they were angry with the media coverage. AAP reported, "the women told the hearing they had not been sexually harassed in the course of their work but had heard of other women who had. However they said they would have no difficulty in telling someone if their behaviour was unacceptable." One of the women, Able Seaman Cheryl Rutland stated, "...being on ship with a mixed crew is just like being part of a big family, brothers and sisters will always be fighting about something."

Another female navy officer, who had had no problems herself, said that there was also a problem with the behaviour of some women sailors, who sent out conflicting signals to the men. Obviously in such circumstances there is a considerable potential for misunderstandings and friction. It is of course totally unfashionable to say so. Only men are ever at fault in these matters and the problem in the services is "widespread". We know that because Sex Discrimination Commissioner Sue Walpole says so.

Incidentally, Dr Patricia Easteal produced a book based on a "national survey" she conducted about rape and sexual abuse held as a result of *Without Consent*. The book, *Voices of the Survivors* was launched at Parliament House on 8 June 1994 by the Minister for Health and the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women, Carmen Lawrence. Just prior to the launch a documentary, *Deadly Hurt* by Melbourne film-maker Don Parham, had been shown on SBS television. This documentary slammed the *National Strategy on Violence Against Women* for its hardline feminist bias. It was remarkable enough that SBS had shown the film, but Dr Lawrence was determined such an act of open mindedness would not be repeated. She indicated her feminist authoritarianism by stating, according to *The Canberra Times* of 9 July, "Lawrence slams documentary" that the film should never have been screened.

Writing in the *Sunday Herald Sun* of 12 June 1994, "Behind the Violence" the maker of the film, Don Parham, attacked a well publicised poster put out by the Office of the Status of Women, which claimed that "one in three" of Statistics 1994 publication *Crime and Safety in Australia*. Based on its figures, which factored in the issue of women not reporting domestic violence, allowing that for every woman who reported violence, two did not, this publication reached the conclusion that only 0.7 per cent of adult women

were
still a
for t
misi
and

were victims of assault in the home and 0.4 per cent of men. Of course this is still a problem, but nothing like the problem the hardline feminists claim it is for their own purposes. None of this will stop the hardline feminist misinformation and disinformation from continuing to spew forth in the media and being used to frame policy of course.

HALF WAY TO EQUAL: A CASE OF INTELLECTUAL FRAUD

In April 1992 the report entitled *Half Way to Equal: Report of the Inquiry into Equal Opportunity and Equal Status for Women in Australia* was released by the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs.

The committee had commenced its inquiry on 25 May 1989 at the request of the then Attorney-General Lionel Bowen. When the House of Representatives was dissolved for a general election in February 1990, the committee ceased to exist. However it was re-established by the new parliament on 15 May 1990, with the same terms of reference, by the new Attorney-General Michael Duffy.

The chairman of the committee, Michael Lavarch, has since been appointed Attorney-General, in large part because of his contribution to the report. Legislation based on the recommendations of the report subsequently passed both houses before the end of that year.

The extraordinary speed of the passage of legislation, based on one single report was due to Mr Keating's electoral timetable. Keating adviser on women's issues at the time, Dr Anne Summers, was a powerful influence in both the passage of the legislation and other measures announced by Mr Keating.

Half Way to Equal then has had a very powerful influence on the law and been largely responsible for the elevation of an Attorney-General. Yet it has not been touched by adverse criticism in the mainstream media.

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE INQUIRY

The terms of reference of the inquiry were as follows:

"To inquire into and report on the progress made towards the achievement of equal opportunity and equal status for Australian women, as detailed in the *National Agenda for Women* and the extent to which the objects of the Sex Discrimination Act 1984 have been achieved or are capable of being achieved by legislative or other means, with particular reference to:

- 1) effective participation by women including young women, in decision-making processes;
- 2) the extent to which women receive appropriate recognition for their contribution to society;

- 3) participation by women in the labour force including the efficacy of equal employment opportunity schemes;
- 4) participation by women in leisure and sport; and
- 5) the extent to which young women are encouraged to participate equally in society.

No evidence can be found in the report of any detailed examination of the meaning of this frame of reference. What constitutes "effective participation"? What exactly are the decision making processes? How are such things objectively identified? Likewise what is "appropriate recognition" and what exactly does it mean to say that the **extent** to which young women are encouraged to **participate equally** in society is to be examined?

We are not told. We are told though that a wide ranging and all-encompassing examination of the position of women in society faces the difficulty that women are not an homogenous group "and it would be quite impossible to gain a consensus on either what the problems were, let alone the solutions" (p 2).

Logic might have suggested at this point that impossible terms of reference had been adopted, however there are those who are never slow in coming forward claiming to speak for all women. These people of course compose the largely government funded professional feminist lobby, the very people who agitated for the inquiry in the first place.

THE CONSTITUENCY

The committee sent approximately 1,500 letters between September 1989 and July 1990 to universities, Colleges, TAFE's, sporting organisations, political parties, women's organisations, businesses, Ministers, charitable organisations, EEO officers, ethnic organisations, rural organisations and organisations for the elderly and for the disabled. As well the inquiry's terms of reference were advertised in all national and capital city press in both 1989 and 1990.

A high return rate might be expected if women were as badly off in contemporary Australian as the more vocal feminists claim.

Whilst the committee states that a "vast number of submissions" were received, the 634 submissions cannot be objectively regarded as statistically significant for a "wide ranging and all-encompassing examination of the position of Australian women".

A random sample of a target population was not generated, questioned and the results analysed. Rather organisations were selected which were certain to deliver the results which professional feminists would want. This has been the pattern with other "politically correct" reports, including the inquiry of Race Discrimination Commissioner Irene Moss into racist violence in Australia.

SUBMISSIONS

By consulting the list of names of individuals and organisations in the submissions section in appendix A of the report this deliberate bias is made clear.

Here is one section of the organisations and individuals: Key Centre for Women's Health in Society, The University of Melbourne; Women's Sub-Committee Migrant Resource Centre of Canberra and Queanbeyan Inc; The Women Lawyers' Association of Queensland; Women in Sport Committee; Labor Women's Organisation Queensland Branch; Women's Health Information Resource Collective Inc; Women's Interest Unit, Office of TAFE, W.A.; Women's Legal Service Inc, Queensland; Hon Justice Elizabeth Evatt, the Law Reform Commission; Equal Opportunity Committee, Macquarie University; Social Questions Committee, Catholic Women's League; The National Council of Jewish Women of Australia; National Pay Equity Coalition; Women in Tertiary Institutions (WITI) National; Women's Electoral Lobby, Cairns; Private Sector Equal Opportunity Association, Victoria; Council for Equal Opportunity in Employment, Victoria; Women's Action Alliance, Victoria; EEO Practitioners in Education Committee (South Australia); Equal Opportunity Practitioners' Association Queensland Inc; Toora Single Wimmin's Shelter; Equal Opportunity Practitioners in Higher Education, Monash University. And so on, for another 28 pages of text. While there are exceptions, femocrats dominate.

We should not be surprised to find that the conclusions of the report are essentially that women are a poorly treated group. In Chapter 2 of the report, titled "The Context for Women in the 1990s" the claim is made that women are invisible in society - at least in a relative sense. They supposedly have a low self-esteem and a low capacity to participate in society. They are subjected to the tortures of child raising and house management -according to the performer Robyn Archer. In an anecdote mentioned in Archer's submission, she asks, what is the reward of motherhood? What is its point, "...believe me, just the existence of the children is not enough".

While there are no doubt a number of women who feel about motherhood as Archer does, it is highly doubtful that they are the majority. Fortunately most women treasure their children and need no academic theory to justify their existence. Yet Archer's view seems to be that shared by the femocrats who dominate the report. While it may be valid, it is certainly not typical.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Also the spectre of domestic violence allegedly limits the public participation of many women; thus the committee supported the Office of the Status of

Women and the National Committee on Violence Against Women in the area of domestic violence.

This area has been very productive for the femocrats. While there is no denying that domestic violence is a problem, its prevalence has been deliberately exaggerated for guilt purposes and to build empires. You will recall the advertising campaigns a few years back in which a badly battered woman was displayed with the voice over that one in three women were subjected to domestic violence. The clear intent was to leave the impression that one in three women were battered to that extent.

This was a blatant lie, but was not only not challenged it was promoted by the media. The campaign gave impetus to the femocrat agenda. Some time after that the figure was revised and "one in ten" became popular, but you will still hear one in three from time to time.

At any rate, the committee recommended as a partial solution to the problem of women's "invisibility" that government departments review their current operations to identify the extent to which they focus on women as a client group, and in particular that all "statistical and qualitative data collected by government departments should be gender disaggregated to ensure that neither gender is invisible".

HOMework

In chapter 3 of the report, "All Women Work, But Only Some Get Paid", crocodile tears are shared for women who stay at home, a group once openly despised by femocrats as "hausfraus". Women in the 19 per cent of families where the husband goes out to work and the wife does the work around the house, are generically designated as exploited. This is because the work of the housewife is undervalued and underpaid.

That is a valid point. The government should pay those women who would prefer to stay at home and look after the children and the house an allowance. This of course has been suggested by others over a period of years, but they have been ignored. If such an allowance, at a reasonable level, were available, then many women who currently go to work because it is an economic necessity, would choose to stay at home.

This of course has not suited the femocrats in the past, though they would no doubt incorporate it into their agenda if they could not defeat it, in order to maintain control. There has certainly been little interest in making things easier for women who would prefer to stay at home in the past. There is also no conception of the family working together as an efficient unit and the extra work in overtime men do in order to better support their families. There is no understanding of the fact that many women, particularly femocrats are economically better off than many men, who because they are men are lumped together in a single group. The blinkered femocrat view of the world is a

relentless case of men versus women. As far as the femocrats are concerned women who stay at home are exploited and that is an end to it. How this "exploitation" can be manipulated to suit their own ends may be open to some flexibility.

"GLASS CEILING"

The Committee also recommended that initiatives be undertaken to recruit girls and women into non-traditional areas of work. It recommended that volunteer participation be included in the National Accounts as a supplementary report. The Committee, reflecting on the fact that women predominate in lower level positions, rejected the view that this had anything to do with women's own choices in balancing employment and motherhood and advanced the all-encompassing view that this was because of a glass ceiling, "whereby women can see a career path, but they are unable to progress beyond a certain level for a variety of reasons". (p 52).

In general, it is stated, the glass ceiling is a function of the systematic discrimination practised by male professionals due to their belief that women will leave to have children and hence the investment in training will be wasted. While some male professionals may think that way, no hard evidence is offered at all to support the contention that it is "systematic". This systematic discrimination allegedly occurs in the legal professions and medicine.

In academia there are supposedly further oppressive forces at work: that more men than women go on to post-graduate studies, so that ultimately there is a smaller pool of women eligible for senior academic jobs - this is also a product of male sexism and oppression. The committee made recommendations to address all of this.

The Office of the Status of Women is to work with employers and professional bodies "to develop policy and proactive affirmative action strategies to redress gender imbalance in senior positions." (p 83). Three measures to achieve this include:

- (1) an examination of policy and procedures to ascertain instances of procedural and structural discrimination;
- (2) examination of selective criteria to ascertain possibility of gender inclusiveness; and
- (3) training of selection panels.

Along with this are a number of other recommendations, including that Commonwealth agencies examine initiatives to improve the provision of child care. Child care is supposedly the big answer that will enable the liberation of women from the oppression of the home to the joys of the workplace. As mentioned it is arrogantly presumed that every woman at home would prefer not to be there, or presumably that they are too ignorant to realise that they

are being oppressed if they actually prefer to stay at home. This is in spite of the fact that many women who work would prefer to tend for their children themselves and place them in care unwillingly.

SPORT AND LEISURE

According to the report, women have little time for leisure because of their dual commitments as workers and homemakers: "The most frequent and fundamental reason that women have less leisure time than men is that women, not men, have generally assumed responsibility for domestic duties". (p112) There are also sexist barriers to women's enjoyment of leisure, especially sport, which all begin at school: "The educators have allowed a masculine culture to pervade school sport" (p 115).

Of course in the past women have not been encouraged in sporting matters, but this position has greatly improved. It is not that some of the report's claims don't have an element of truth. The problem is the deliberate exaggeration and misrepresentation of the problems to serve ideological purposes.

This professional pursuit of grievance can lead to some ridiculous outcomes. The committee questions section 42 of the Sex Discrimination Act which allows the exclusion of persons of a particular sex in sporting events where the strength, stamina or physique of competitors is relevant.

The Western Australian Women's Advisory Council believes that women should have the right to participate in any sporting activity that they wish to. The Equal Opportunity Commissioner for South Australia also argued against section 42 because it has the effect of making men the sporting standard with which women are compared. Is the next step a push for female participation in first grade football teams?

Quite apart from sport, it is already the case that lifting requirements in certain jobs have been ignored and then waived so that women can obtain them. The requirement to lift remains - it is just that a woman in such a job is not required to do the lifting. In other words one of her male colleagues is obliged to take on an integral part of her job in addition to his own duties. This revolt against common sense is all in the name of anti-discrimination.

MULTICULTURALIST ANGLE

A report such as this would not be complete without the contribution of the multiculturalist industry. Migrant women are a particularly loved group of the professional grievance industry, because they link into so many politically correct areas and therefore are great fodder for the cause.

In the following paragraph from the report, most of the new class concerns, can be found:

"Evidence to the Inquiry suggests that racial and religious discrimination is a problem particularly for Moslems and some Asian ethnic groupings. Settlement difficulties remain an issue, particularly for refugees and those migrants who are transferring not just from different cultures but from rural to urban communities as well. Low self-esteem and self-confidence, resulting from the status shock associated with migration and related cross-cultural experiences, can be a debilitating problem - particularly for older migrant women. Repercussions of domestic violence and family breakdown are also exacerbated from women from NESB [Non-English Speaking Background]. The major area where migrant women experience restricted opportunity is paid employment."

From this you'd wonder why migrant women want to come to Australia at all. Dr Patricia Easteal from the Institute of Criminology went so far as to claim that the Australian culture is as nasty to women and as misogynist as any culture in the world. In explaining why more migrants kill their spouses than Australians do, she claimed it might have something to do with the migrants being influenced by our terrible society. Why not have it both ways? As hardly anyone has the courage to contradict femocrats like her she can spout any sort of nonsense. Perhaps she would prefer to try to earn her living in Saudi Arabia or Pakistan, instead of extracting a high salary from the Australian public.

Reports such as *Half Way to Equal* and the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission's *Racist Violence* are not inquiries about real events, but are activities of "creative" social science which twist things to suit a pre-determined agenda.

The new class has no doubt about its own righteousness and the correctness of the cause. They impose from above upon the masses because they are superior to us all and they will legislate to make us good.

In the report Justice Elizabeth Evatt states:

"...laws enacted by Parliament in relation to matters of current social interest play an important part in changing attitudes. There is a very interesting process involved in public opinion, legislation and judicial decision-making; they each feed into the other. But where the leaders, the elected members, see that there is an issue which is fully justified in terms of human rights and internationally accepted standards, and they legislate for it, that legislation will work towards change, if it is carefully planned and implemented appropriately. That is my belief. I am a law reformer and I say that law reform is not there to follow; it is there to push the barriers forward...not to wait until attitudes change" (p 216).

In other words damn public opinion, yet at other times, when it has suited her, Justice Evatt has claimed that the law is out of touch with community attitudes. But community attitudes as determined by whom and who decides what reform is, when it is all about being ahead of public opinion? Not only is her position confused, it is all about having the power to impose what is

represented as reform. Is repressive legislation in a high sounding cause reform? It seems that it is when you have the power and influence to call it such.

TO CONCLUDE

The committee makes a number of concluding recommendations, involving a tightening of the Sex Discrimination Act, which has subsequently occurred.

The most disturbing of the recommendations which was accepted and is now law is that Human Rights and Equal Opportunity determinations be registrable in the Federal Court and that in the absence of an appeal they automatically become an enforceable order of the court. The establishment of this star chamber was based on this one report, though other propaganda methods, as outlined in the preceding article, were employed to ensure that the legislation got through. For form's sake however there needs to be at least one official "report" to justify legislation.

The Act has since been amended again to mark the 10th anniversary of the original bill, passed in 1984. The most significant modification is to change the onus of proof in cases of sexual discrimination. It will now be effectively up to an accused man to prove himself innocent. As stated by the *Australian Financial Review* of 26 July, 1994, "(Previously) under the Sex Discrimination Act, it (was) the responsibility of the complainant to prove the respondent - in the majority of cases an employer - was discriminatory." The article quotes the chief executive of the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Mr Ian Spicer as stating, 'now there will be no obligation on the part of the complainant to prove anything, just to make the claim'.

THE RACIAL BILL'S PROGRESS

At 8.01pm on 16 December, on the second-last day of the Parliamentary sitting year, the secretary to the Attorney-General introduced the draft Racial Discrimination Legislation Amendment Bill 1992 to parliament. It aimed to create two categories of offences. The first category made "racial incitement" a criminal offence. For various of the listed offences sentences of one and two years imprisonment could be imposed. Even a "gesture" could be construed as racial incitement under the act. The other, non-criminal, section was to be administered by Race Discrimination Commissioner Irene Moss of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, one of the people who most strongly pushed for the bill.

While the bill was effectively wiped from the slate because of the Federal election, a similar bill will be reintroduced before the end of 1994. Submissions on the 1992 draft bill continued to be taken until February 28 1993, but though a report on the submissions and public consultations was written, the Attorney-General, Mr Lavarch, has made it clear it will not be released publicly. Officers of Mr Lavarch's department are also understood to have recommended against criminal sanctions, but their advice will also not be made public.

To begin with, very few in the public knew of the bill's existence, let alone the fact that they had the opportunity to make submissions.

THE SUBMISSION PROCESS

It is quite clear that the Attorney-General's Department did not particularly want the general public to participate in the submissions process anyway. The Department only placed advertisements in newspapers about the opportunity to make submissions and obtain copies of the bill on January 2 1993 and at later dates.

These advertisements followed letters to the editor of *The Age*, published on 24 December and *The Australian Financial Review*, published 31 December, from Mark Uhlmann which strongly criticised the Department for not making the bill and information about it readily available to the public.

People who had previously asked the Attorney-General's Office for a copy of the bill were told to buy one from government bookshops. Two people in two different states found that government bookshops had no knowledge of the bill.

So advertisements first appeared in papers on January 2, possibly only under pressure, and it was originally intended to close written submissions

on the bill by February 5. No doubt the Attorney-General's Department hoped that the general public would be distracted by the holiday period and that few submissions critical of the bill would be received. In the meantime the organisations which had pushed for the bill, being in the know, could write submissions in favour of the bill, if not recommending that it be made even worse.

However, at this point the Department was upset by a piece of incompetence. In placing the newspaper ads, perhaps indicating the haste in which they were put together, the cut off date for written submissions was given as "by February". People complained that this terminology was ambiguous and so the intended date was extended to the end of the month - February 28.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Apart from written submissions, the Department engaged in a so-called "community consultation" process at major cities around Australia. Two principal counsels from the Human Rights Branch of the Attorney-General's Department, Mr Thami Nqayi and Mr Kim Duggan were on a panel sent around the country to answer questions and supposedly get the "community's" views on the bill.

The fact that the Department attempted to fix this process is made clear by the program of consultations. Without exception the consultations were held in venues of those who lobbied strongly for this bill, such as Bureaus of Ethnic Affairs, Ethnic Communities Councils and offices of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.

Both the Ethnic Communities Council of NSW and the Bureau of Ethnic Affairs in Brisbane sent letters to their constituency with the statement, "The Department of the Federal Attorney-General has asked us to assist them with community consultations". Presumably this pattern was repeated around Australia. In other words a clear and coordinated attempt to stack the meetings with those in favour of the bill was promoted by the Attorney-General's Department.

The Canberra meeting of about 30 people, held on 27 January, was the first. Surprisingly enough the majority who spoke were strongly against the bill. They were concerned individuals, rather than members of groups.

In Sydney the meeting had been successfully stacked with "ethnic" community representatives, many of whom wanted to make the bill worse. There was even a Scot in tartan pants complaining about anti-Scot bias in Australia! There were only a handful of people who spoke in favour of free speech. This pattern was repeated in Brisbane.

In Adelaide things were different. On the whole people concerned with free speech outnumbered those in favour of the bill. There were one or two

loudmouth extremists who abused the panel, but they were not representative of those who opposed the bill.

In Melbourne the meeting was evenly divided between those in favour and those against. One representative of an ethnic organisation in favour of the bill said he would be quite happy if it caught up the "anti-immigration" people in its provisions.

It is clear that, in spite of the best efforts of the Attorney-General's Department to both stack the public consultations and limit the submissions process, it did not get the desired result.

If it had got strong endorsement for the bill the findings would have been widely publicised as proof that the public did want such a law. Instead, the Attorney-General has decided not to release the results of the public consultations to the public.

This was confirmed in response to a question on notice from Graeme Campbell (No 1215 of 31 May, 1994), answered on 31 August: "I have also received reports from my Departmental advisers on the result of public consultations held early in 1993 which have been put to Cabinet and will not be released publicly."

This action makes it clear that what the public thought about the law was never really the issue. The consultations process was a setup and a public relations stunt that failed and, such is the lack of scrutiny afforded to these matters by both media and opposition, the government can simply keep its failure to itself. So the one process which could most reasonably be claimed to represent the views of the general public is treated with contempt, while sympathetic reports conducted by vested interests, are relied upon for justification.

Mr Lavarch states in the same answer, when asked what level of support there was for the bill, "...this issue has been considered and reported on in three reports to Government and extensive consultations were undertaken with the community [ie: selected community lobby groups] by the bodies responsible for those reports, namely, the Australian Law Reform Commission [chaired by Elizabeth Evatt], the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody and the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission [chaired by Irene Moss]. Whilst I am not able to say what the views of all Australians are on the issue, the Government must give weight to the recommendations of these reports."

THE LAW OF MOSS

Russell Lewis in his book, *Anti-Racism: A Mania Exposed* (Quartet Books, London, 1988) quotes Tom Hastie's formula of Newsam's Law: "The incidence of alleged racism in a given society will vary in a direct proportion to the number of people handsomely paid to find it". The society in question is Britain and Newsam's Law is named after Peter Newsam, who at the time was chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality.

In Australia, Newsam's Law could be rechristened "Moss's Law" after Irene Moss, who for seven years was the handsomely paid Federal Race Discrimination Commissioner of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. Prior to that she worked for ten years at the NSW Anti-discrimination board. On 1 June she took up an appointment as a NSW magistrate.

In an interview with Justine Ferrari of *The Australian*, published on 22 April 1994, under the headline, "Magistrate blazes a trail for Asians", Moss "admitted to wanting to have had national racial vilification laws in place before she left as commissioner" and stated, that whether or not it happened in that time frame, "that will happen [such a law] and I know I had something to do with it". Indeed. She, along with various ethnic lobbies, has been the driving force in the push for such laws at the Federal level and would seem to regard such a law as a personal monument.

The draft Racial Discrimination Amendment Bill, otherwise known as the Racial Vilification Bill, was introduced into Federal Parliament at the end of 1992, but was not proceeded with due to the timing of the last Federal election. One of the principal justifications of the bill, was *Racist Violence: Report of the National Inquiry into Racist Violence in Australia* (AGPS, 1991). The chairperson of this inquiry was Irene Moss.

A new bill, The Racial Hatred Bill 1994, which includes criminal sanctions, as desired by Moss, has been introduced and is likely to be passed, so it is instructive to examine her report, which remains the main one justifying such legislation.

Moss's Report is not only seriously flawed in method as a piece of research, but displays a blatant bias against "old" Australians, the "Anglo-Celtic" majority or "Anglos", as the report refers to them when listing alleged aggressors in a highly selective Appendix 14 (p 478 - 535).

"Anglo" in fact, as used in Moss's report, is just a blanket designation for all whites of English-speaking background. It seems to escape Moss's attention that there were a number of Germans and Italians who settled in Australia

from the 1840s onwards. Though their descendants are part of the Australian mainstream and are English speakers, many would not accept the “Anglo” term as a designation of themselves. Indeed many of them, like their “Anglo-Celtic” compatriots, will accept no other designation than Australian. This is of course also the case for the children of many migrants of non-British background who have arrived here since World War II.

BACKGROUND

The Moss Report consists of four parts. Part one is the background to the National Inquiry into Racist Violence, including the terms of reference, definitions of key terms, the basis in Australian law and a potted history of so-called ‘racist’ violence in Australia from the frontier years until today. One of the historical gems of the Report is the claim that Lambing Flat (Young in NSW) is located in Victoria.

Part Two gives an outline of the evidence. Part Three details the overseas experience and part four describes what Moss believes are the necessary directions for change needed to achieve a supposedly harmonious and just multi-racial and multicultural society.

Moss’s report is founded on the assumption that “multiculturalism” is self-evidently a success in Australia. The term presumably incorporates the government policy on the one hand and racial and cultural diversity on the other. She wants increasing degrees of ethnic “pluralism” to continue.

In her preface (p.xvii) Moss states, “Multiculturalism is working well in Australia” and indeed that “racist violence, intimidation and harassment is nowhere near the level experienced in many other countries” (p xiii). The latter statement is a truly gracious admission.

Having made such an admission you might think that this would undermine the need for the inquiry, but of course The Law of Moss must be enacted.

ABORIGINALS

She must justify her position and so Moss uses the alleged level of racist violence against Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders as the central justification for her report. This is in spite of the fact that it was the supposed violence against migrants, particularly Asians, which was most frequently cited by those in favour of such an inquiry.

Aboriginals therefore become the convenient stalking horse for belting the “Anglos”, without any contemplation of the fact that migrants of other ethnic backgrounds, in sharing the country’s prosperity, laid by the “Anglos”, consequently share the responsibility for the position of Aboriginals. This is quite apart from the fact that negative attitudes to Aboriginals certainly also exist among such migrants.

When it comes to Aboriginals, the multiculturalists, particularly those who are handsomely paid from the public purse like Moss, cannot simply absolve themselves of responsibility and point the finger at "Anglos". While wringing their hands about Aboriginal dispossession, people like Moss neglect to consider that they have profited by it. And in using Aboriginals as stalking horses for their own purposes they themselves exploit Aboriginals.

Apart from allegations about the treatment of Aboriginals, Moss's report is very thin. Nevertheless, Moss believes that racial violence and harassment will increase against Aboriginals and other ethnic groups in future (in spite of the fact that "multiculturalism is working well in Australia"!) and that it will be perpetrated by those evil villains - the "Anglo" majority.

There is no consideration of course that the biased attacks on the majority by people such as Moss themselves raise the racial temperature and add to the likelihood of conflict. Such people seem to regard themselves as totally pure and should increased conflict occur they may only take it as confirmation of the evil of the Anglos and the vital role they fulfil as protectors of the right.

Chapters 3 and 4 of the Moss's report leave us in no doubt that she regards the old Australian population as tainted with the original sin of racism, passed on since the frontier days.

There is no consideration at all of racial conflict in other countries or among other races.

The fact that the taxes of the majority are appropriated to pay the salaries of Irene Moss and others like her and that in such a publicly-funded position she has a duty to be fair-minded does not seem to occur to her. The unique villain status of the "Anglos", even as she puts her hands in their pockets, must be confirmed.

EXTIRPATION OF "ANGLO" INFLUENCE

For Moss, multiculturalism is much more than the welcoming of diversity, it seems to be the path to extinguishing not only the original sin of Anglo-Celtic occupation of Australia, but to extinguishing the Anglo-Celtic cultural base of the country itself. Were her position taken to its logical conclusion then English would lose its primacy as the national language.

Apart from the national division and expense which would ensue if this occurred, it would, ironically, be severely embarrassing for those professional ethnics who in fact do not speak the language of their forebears well or at all - yes such people exist! It would also be a problem for those "Anglo-Celtic" multiculturalists who, for all their disdain of their own people, have only English with which to communicate.

Moss claims that multiculturalism is the "acceptance that the nature and unity of Australian society will emerge from the integration of old and new

settlers rather than from the assimilation of newcomers into some fixed concept of Anglo-Celtic 'Australianness' that existed in the past." (p 63).

Yet Australia went from a policy of assimilation to integration before the policy of multiculturalism was embraced. Integration in practice meant that migrants were encouraged into the Australian mainstream while being entirely at liberty to keep an attachment to ethnic clubs, to continue speaking the old language and so on. Integration offered access on very benign grounds - all that was required was that the new migrants and their children accept English as the national language and give their loyalty to Australia above other nations.

Multiculturalists however lamented and lament the fact that once distinct ethnic groups have integrated into the mainstream. They want these groups to maintain themselves separately ad infinitum. The very success of integration is a threat to them.

The "Anglo-Celtic" base of the society of course is what provides it with unity and stability. To believe that unity would ensue by eroding it is not idealism, but utopianism, or something worse.

However the end of the "Anglo-Celtic" base is welcomed by multiculturalists because according to the new history taught in high schools and at university, Australia's history is one of shame, genocide and racism and many of the heroes of the past are murderers or fools.

Don Watson, an academic and speech writer for the Prime Minister Mr Keating, sums up this New Class white-guilt view of history in these words:

"My generation was taught from the model of the Victorians, like Carlyle. They were always looking for heroes, so we learnt the history of great men. But you can't do that today...You can't teach about explorers, for example, because they killed Aborigines." (*The Australian*, 19 August 1993, p 7.)

Moss repeats the white-guilt view of history in Chapter 3 of her report, drawing on the work of Dr Andrew Markus. Markus's main work in the field is entitled *Fear and Hatred: Purifying Australia and California 1850 - 1901* (Hale and Ironmonger, Sydney 1979.) In that book Markus argues that Australia was founded upon the twin pillars of racial hatred of Aborigines, culminating in horrific genocide and the irrational fear of kindly Asian people to the north of Australia.

ILLEGITIMATE OCCUPIERS

The over-riding emotion often produced in "Anglo" students and other people, when confronted with the white-guilt view of history, is one of shame and possibly an unconscious desire for punishment. They are made to feel illegitimate occupiers of their own country, in spite of the fact that their

forebears built its prosperity and that this prosperity supports the very people who attack the forebears.

In white-guilt history Aboriginals are legitimate because they were here first and suffered at the hands of the whites. Post World War II non-"Anglo" migrants, particularly Asian, migrants are legitimate because they did not kill Aboriginals and they have been discriminated against in the past, so by implication recompense has to be made to them, or racially equivalent descendants. This being so there is, for example, no moral right for the illegitimate "Anglos" to restrict immigration.

It is only in recent times that Australian history has been widely studied in schools and universities. In the past a colonial cringe led to Australian history being regarded as unworthy of study, so the majority of people, largely being unaware of their own history, do not have the means to defend themselves when faced with the seemingly learned works and pronouncements of the dominant white-guilt view of history.

Though many instinctively know that this white-guilt view is biased and unfair, they are unable to match the sophisticated assaults of people who have the resources of universities and other publicly-funded bodies, including arms of government, at their disposal. So at the very time that Australian history comes to be widely studied, it is studied as a history of shame.

The "Anglo-Celtic" intelligentsias, for the most part enthusiastic multiculturalists themselves, are the main culprits in perpetrating the white-guilt view of history, but this self-revulsion for their own kind rarely expresses itself as sacrifice at the individual level. (How many multiculturalist academics, bureaucrats and judges have given up their jobs, properties, Volvos and sailing boats to Aboriginals for example?) Rather this guilt is manifested in campaigns at the wider social level in which others will have to bear the sacrifices dictated by their elevated consciences.

Moss's version of Australia perfectly fits this agenda of political correctness. This is so even as she draws a salary, now as a NSW magistrate, which would be the envy of the majority of "Anglos" - a salary which they are forced, through government appropriation of taxes, to be the major contributors towards.

For Irene Moss racist violence characterised the "Anglo" development of Australia. Of course, taking her perspective this could be extended to any country, but in the way of these things Australia is considered in isolation. If comparisons are ever made by white guilt historians they are made with other "white nations", particularly "Anglo" countries, which are comparatively among the most tolerant of nations. Rarely if ever do such historians consider the history of "racist violence" of the Asian invaders of Europe, such as the Mongols, whose savagery puts the excesses of the white settlers of Australia well and truly in the shade.

Moss highlights the frontier violence against Aboriginals, but does not consider the impact of introduced diseases which were far greater killers.

Moreover these diseases were not only introduced by Europeans. Chinese indentured labourers introduced diseases like leprosy to Aborigines in the Northern Territory.

Aborigines in North Queensland, particularly on the Palmer River goldfields, also indulged in cannibalism of Chinese. There were in fact clashes between all major groupings - Aborigines, Europeans and Chinese in the Palmer River area during the goldrush. Aboriginal society is of course regarded as utopian and peaceful, in perfect harmony with the environment. None of the harsh elements of Aboriginal societies, or their own impact upon the environment is considered and there certainly was an impact. For example, as reported in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 8 January 1993, "One scientist who has done intensive research on the subject, Dr Tim Flannery, head of the mammals section at the Australian Museum [in Sydney] concludes that Aborigines were responsible for the disappearance of most of the 60 or so species of giant marsupials which inhabited Australia until 30,000 to 40,000 years ago." Aborigines also dramatically changed the vegetation pattern of Australia by their use of fire.

DISPLACEMENT

The coming of a modern society was bound to have a traumatic effect, but it is not only "Anglo" nations which have colonised and displaced original inhabitants. It has been a constant throughout history. Europeans themselves have been displaced. Much of modern day Turkey was originally inhabited by the Greeks and Greeks still regard Istanbul, formerly Constantinople - captured by the Turks in 1453 - as a Greek city. How would the Turks react to a Greek native claim on Istanbul? Alexandria in Egypt was a Greek city before the invasion of the Arabs. In fact, large areas of the Middle East were ruled by the Byzantine Empire before the Muslim Arab invasions of the 7th Century. Western crusader kingdoms rose and fell in the Middle East.

In Britain Celts were conquered by Romans and displaced by Angles, Saxons, Jutes and Frisians in parts of Britain, who were themselves subject to Viking and Norman invasions.

So what has happened in Australia with the Aborigines is nothing new, but at least since the 1960s, genuine - if at times misguided - efforts have been made to improve the lot of the indigenous people. The same cannot be said of those Asian nations who we are enjoined to emulate, being in the eyes of some both our economic and moral superiors. As the Vice Chancellor of Hong Kong University, Professor Wang Gungup stated, as reported in *The Canberra Times* of 8 July 1992, "where most Asians are concerned the survival of Aboriginal people and cultures never had any priority."

By today's standards the establishments of Aboriginal reserves, legislation

such as the Aboriginal Protection Act and the Child Welfare Act and policies such as the prohibition of hotels selling Aboriginals alcohol seem harsh and/or paternalistic, but they involved some genuine attempts to improve conditions for Aboriginals. Moss however portrays such things as a great and deliberate evil, a further extension of "Anglo" racist violence. Whites are judged in the harshest possible light, while Aboriginal societies are presented as having been utopian before the whites.

While in the past judgements on Aboriginal societies have of course been overly harsh and dismissive, they have gone to an opposite extreme in recent years. It is important to put things in perspective. Things were far more complex than people like Irene Moss are prepared to allow. She takes all the benefits of a modern society, while attacking that society with the wisdom of hindsight and idealising a way of life she shows no inclination to try herself.

Moss then jumps from Aboriginals to post war migrants. Moss states, p 54, "migrants were a disadvantaged group within Australian society who deserved social justice". All of them? Surely they are not just one big group of disadvantaged? How did their conditions actually compare with their conditions before arrival? If their conditions in the vast majority of cases improved considerably, as they did, then how were they all disadvantaged? Some had problems adapting no doubt, some were discriminated against, but overwhelmingly Australia was a great land of opportunity for them. If not why didn't they return to their country of origin and why do they continue to come?

What of the "Anglo" and other migrants who came out in sailing ships on sometimes dangerous voyages in the 19th Century and had little, if any, society and government support? Life was far harsher in those days surely than it was for the great majority of post war migrants, who arrived when material living standards and work opportunities were rising and one of the world's most generous social security systems - fought for and won by previous Australian generations - was being put in place.

METHODOLOGY

Moss admits that there has been lengthy philosophical debate about the definition of 'race' and 'racism'. Likewise the definition of 'violence' is contentious. However it was not considered appropriate to discuss these 'important issues in the report' (p 13). Instead the frame of reference is adopted from the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which in Article 4:

"...condemns all propaganda and all organisations which are based on ideas or theories of superiority of one race or group of persons of one colour or ethnic origin, or which attempt to justify or promote racial hatred and discrimination in any form, and undertake to adopt immediate

and positive measures designed to eradicate all incitement to, or acts of, such discrimination...."

Yet Affirmative Action and quota policies are discrimination based upon race. The policy of multiculturalism is racially-based and effectively promotes favouritism on the basis of race.

Moss defines 'racist violence' as a 'specific act of violence, intimidation or harassment carried out against an individual, group or organisation (or their property) on the basis of:

- race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origins; and/or support for non-racist policies (p 14).

The definition is so broad as to include almost any disturbance, dispute or disagreement as 'racial' in nature if it occurs between people of different races, descents, nationalities or ethnic groups. First, most disagreements, disputes or disturbances are to some degree 'violent' or have some element of intimidation or harassment. Second, we have already seen in our examination of the race-relation industry's view of Australian history that racism is already presumed to be endemic among the 'Anglos'. They are the target population.

It does not come as a surprise that Moss includes in her definition of 'racist harassment', all behaviours that may intimidate subjects, such as verbal abuse. But what constitutes verbal abuse? What constitutes intimidation? It is often, and is allowed to be by Moss, a purely subjective definition. The mere fact that someone feels - or claims to feel - verbally abused or intimidated and is of a different race would be enough to constitute racist violence under the definition of Moss.

EVIDENCE

The evidence presented in Part 2 of Moss's report consists of four chapters: Racist violence against Aborigines, racist violence on the basis of ethnic identity, racist violence against people opposed to racism and a chapter drawing conclusions from the evidence.

Virtually all of her 'evidence' is based on uncorroborated testimony. The incidents which are reported may or may not be factual, but the majority of the evidence given is simply unproven.

In cases where violence may have occurred Moss and the alleged victims simply assume that the violence was racially motivated.

Logic and the rules of evidence did not prevent Irene Moss from concluding that racist attitudes, practices and violence 'pervade our institutions', including the police and the media. She was prepared to identify the perpetrators of 'racist violence' against people of a non-English speaking background as young male Anglo-Australians (p 219). No examination was conducted of

racial violence between ethnic groups; inter-ethnic violence was simply dismissed as not being a problem. There was no consideration of the activities of ethnic gangs. For Moss it is only the Anglos who have the problem.

On this basis she recommends the creation of new criminal offences of racist violence and intimidation and incitement to racist violence. In spite of the fact that "Racist violence on the basis of ethnic identity in Australia is nowhere near the level that it is in many other countries (p 219)", it is necessary Moss believes to put race-hate laws in place now, in anticipation of racial tensions increasing in Australia.

This is inconsistent with Moss's claim that the policy of multiculturalism is working well in Australia. It seems on the contrary that in order to maintain the policy, free speech has to be constrained. Is this to be one way in which we emulate Asian nations such as Malaysia and Singapore? In order to manage ethnic divisions, speech is curtailed by the state. Is this one of the prices we have to pay, along with democracy, for the policy of multiculturalism?

The most revealing parts of the report are those passages where Moss speculates on the ultimate causes of racial tension in Australia: the immigration debate and indeed any questioning of multiculturalism and foreign investment. Two passages are worth quoting:

"Most of the incidents of racist violence on the basis of ethnic origin which were reported to the Inquiry occurred in a period of increasing non-European immigration, rapid economic change and recession and highly publicised expression of opinion on the desirability of a multicultural Australia (p 172)".

"Evidence to the Inquiry indicates that the incidence of racist violence is particularly influenced by debates about the ethnic composition of Australia, immigration policy and the economy. Ethnic community organisations maintain that, when issues such as foreign investment, immigration and multiculturalism receive extensive media coverage and public discussion, they can expect an upsurge in racist violence and abuse. A large number of witnesses felt that there had been a perceptible increase in spontaneous racist violence, abuse and harassment following public debate about Asian immigration during 1987-88" (p 217).

The implication here is that opposition to immigration is the cause of the 'problem' (p 172) and that such opposition is a non-specific form of race-hate, or at least that it inspires it. In the Melbourne Community Consultation meetings on the draft racial vilification bill, proponents of the bill stated that they would be happy to see "anti-immigration people" caught up in the bill.

Moss leaves no doubt that she herself believes that Professor Blainey opened the door to the expression of 'racist feeling' with his statements questioning the rate of Asian immigration in 1984. Moss regards critics of multiculturalism as having 'misconceived views' (p174) - although she never details why. Further, she is critical of those who oppose immigration on

economic and environmental grounds (p 175), seeing unconscious or subtle racism lying behind these concerns (p 176).

CONCLUSION

Irene Moss's *Racist Violence* is not based on either science or sound logical reasoning. Its style may be best described as McCarthyist: under every bed is a racist, and probably in every bed as well. Worst of all *Racist Violence* has its own 'racist' bias. It is firmly within the multicultural tradition which sees "Anglos" in particular and Europeans in general as uniquely stained with the original sin of racism.

Professional ethnics use the very freedom provided by "Anglo" countries, not only to attack the general populations of these countries, but to try to impose alien restrictions upon freedom of expression. In particular it is hard not to hold in contempt people who have fled tyrannies or left far less tolerant countries, only to try to impose a form of tyranny upon those who have given them shelter. It is doubly a farce when this is justified in the name of maintaining the culture of the countries they have left.

The multiculturalist view that Europeans are unique sinners derives from the general economic and political dominance of Europeans for the last 500 years, but even during that time and certainly further back Europeans themselves were subject to other races. In each period of ascendancy the conquering races regarded themselves as superior to those they had conquered. This was also true among the tribes of the New World and Africa before the coming of the white man. "Anglos" then are not the only "baddies", they have simply been the most efficient colonisers, in fact "Anglo" based countries are far more tolerant than most.

How many non-Anglo and non-European countries actually have people like Irene Moss and co funded at public expense to attack the public as she does? Certainly none of our Asian neighbours. It is interesting that in making comparisons with the "Overseas Experience" (p 229) of dealing with "Racist Violence" the examples are the USA, Britain and Canada, the first two "Anglo" countries and the third largely "Anglo" with a strong French element. Is racist violence only a problem in these countries?

Of course not. Paradoxically it is the very fact that these countries are among the world's most tolerant that has allowed people like Irene Moss to thrive. She has exploited our tolerance. In nations where racist violence really is a big problem, there is no desire to subsidise someone like Irene Moss.

Irene Moss's report is best described as a work of theology or dogmatic religion. It has no philosophical rigour or social-scientific basis and reveals a thinly-disguised dislike of "Anglo" Australians, the very people who make her privileged position possible.

NOTE: Another report used to justify racial vilification legislation, though

without criminal sanctions, is the Report of the Royal Commission into Black Deaths in Custody. For all its moralising, research commissioned by this inquiry found, very early on in its investigations, that although it was assumed that many more blacks than whites died in custody, in fact the proportional death rate was roughly the same. Numbers wise, many more whites than blacks died. Although its rationale broke down early on, this did not stop the commission from continuing of course. Research since then has confirmed that the proportion of deaths is roughly equal. What is disproportionate is the arrest rate. When an Aboriginal dies it is front page news, when a white dies it is ignored and so the impression is still given that deaths in custody is solely a black problem caused by nasty whites.

THE TASMANIAN GAY CASE

Tasmania has come under international scrutiny and condemnation, particularly in the British press, following a decision of the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations. The Committee effectively ruled that Tasmanian state laws making homosexual acts and sexual intercourse "against the order of nature" a crime is a breach of human rights, specifically the right to privacy.

This was not a case of the committee finding directly against Tasmania however. While under the Australian constitution, states such as Tasmania have the right to make their own criminal laws, Tasmanian government representatives were not allowed to appear before the committee or make their own submissions, as only sovereign nations are recognised under international law.

The committee then, found against Australia as a whole. The Australian government not only made no attempt to defend the right of its constituent states to make their own criminal laws, but virtually invited the committee to find against Australia. It did this so it could use the decision as a way of putting pressure on Tasmania to change its laws.

So the Federal government effectively conspired with a UN committee against the laws of one of its own states, with which it disagreed, supporting the complaint of Mr Nick Toonen, a Tasmanian resident.

The deliberations of the UN committee were secret and the rules of law and evidence were not followed. But the committee's ruling was seen to have morality on its side and so that excused, not only the approach of the Federal Government, but the rotten foundations upon which the decision was built. The basis of the decision will be considered later.

Individuals from Australia have only been able to take complaints to the committee since the government ratified the First Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights [ICCPR] in 1991. This allows the committee to consider alleged breaches of the ICCPR in Australia after, supposedly, all local legal avenues have been exhausted.

This ratification was made by a handful of people in the Federal executive without the consideration of the parliament. Many members of parliament were not even aware it had been done and certainly the great bulk of the general public had no idea. This has been the case with most of the "international instruments" which have been signed and upon which the Federal government is increasingly coming to use as justifications for domestic legislation.

The Human Rights Committee made its ruling on 31 March and publicly announced on 8 April, 1994, that Australia was in breach of its international human rights obligations under the ICCPR, over Tasmania's laws. Though a lengthy term of imprisonment is technically possible under the laws, they have not been enforced for a number of years. The complaint by Mr Toonen then was largely symbolic.

Though we do not agree with the Tasmanian laws, Tasmania is a democratic state and has the right to make and uphold its own laws as outlined in the Constitution. It is up to the people who want the laws changed to convince their fellow Tasmanians and their elected representatives to do so.

It is clear that, although the UN committee's decisions are not legally binding, the Federal Government intends to use the decision as a moral justification for acting to over-ride the Tasmanian laws. The Tasmanian Government has made it clear that it will not bow to the committee's decision and will challenge the Federal Government.

Although those who drafted our constitution never envisaged that the Federal government would have the power to override state criminal laws, it is able to do so by a manipulation of the external affairs power of the constitution, with the assistance of a succession of activist High Court judgements.

This external affairs power gives the Federal Government the right to make laws pertaining to external affairs issues. The High Court has interpreted this power so widely that in practice the Federal Government can use its supposed obligations under an external treaty as an excuse to impose its will upon the states.

If Tasmania wanted to contest the Federal Government intervention it would have to appeal to this same High Court, which is the final interpreter of the constitution.

In spite of its claim to be forging an independent destiny for Australia, the government has encouraged a non-representative, foreign body to meddle in our affairs. This is in spite of the fact that not all countries which have representatives on the committee have signed the optional protocol themselves and so are not subject to the same scrutiny. Some come from countries where "human rights" are a joke and democracy is unknown. The committee itself is not even a proper court and yet seeks to influence laws of duly elected, democratic states.

The members of this Committee are as follows: Kurt Hendl, Austria; Julio Prado Vallejo, Ecuador; Omran El Shafel, Egypt; Christine Chanet, France; Nisuke Ando, Japan; Waleed Sadi, Jordan; Birame N'Diaye, Senegal; Bertil Wennergren, Sweden; Vojin Dimitrijevic, the former Yugoslavia; Francisco Urbina, Costa Rica; Marco Bruni Celli, Venezuela; Tamas Ban, Hungary; Laurel Frances, Jamaica; Rosalyn Higgins, UK; Rajsoomer Lallah, Mauritius; Andreas Movrommatis, Cyprus; Faust Pocar, Italy and Justice Elizabeth Evatt of Australia, who was appointed on 10 September 1992. Justice

Evatt, a new class crusader, is the first Australian member and chairwoman. She has been close to the Federal Government and is said to have been very influential in the final decision of the committee.

BASIS FOR THE JUDGEMENT

A paper from the independent Parliamentary Research Service from Anne Twomey, called *Strange Bedfellows: The UN Human Rights Committee and the Tasmanian Parliament*, gives a very good outline of the major legal problems with the decision. As far as the complaint went Mr Toonen had to show that he was a 'victim'. As he had never been prosecuted under the law, he had to show that he was a victim in other ways. "The Human Rights Committee concluded that Mr Toonen had established that 'the threat of enforcement [and] the pervasive impact of the continued existence of these provisions on administrative practice and public opinion had affected him and continued to affect him personally'."

Yet "The Committee also placed importance on the fact that the sections had not been enforced since 1984, and drew from this the implication that they are 'not deemed essential for the protection of the morals in Tasmania'. This assumption would appear to contradict the earlier conclusion that the existence of the sections does have a great effect upon Tasmanian society [and hence the capacity to injure Mr Toonen]...The Committee did not recognise this contradiction." This gives some sort of idea of the lack of rigour involved in the decision.

Definitions were simply twisted to suit the predetermined decision. Article 2 (1) of the ICCPR states: "Each state party to the present covenant undertakes to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognised in the present covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status."

Mr Toonen argued that sexual orientation came under the category of 'other status', the Commonwealth was uncertain and asked the guidance of the committee, but the Tasmanian government accepted Mr Toonen's argument on that point. As the author notes, "the submissions put to the Committee by both sides discussed the issue solely in terms of 'other status' rather than 'sex'.

Yet the Evatt-led committee saw fit to make the following statement: "The state party [the Commonwealth] has sought the committee's guidance as to whether sexual orientation may be considered an 'other status' for the purpose of article 26.

The same issue could arise under article 2, paragraph 1, of the covenant. The committee confines itself to noting, however, that in its view the reference

to 'sex' in articles 2, paragraph 1, and 26 is to be taken as including sexual orientation."

Ms Anne Twomey notes, "Prior to this statement, it had generally been accepted in both the domestic and international sphere that 'sex' meant gender, and did not include sexual orientation."

Yet the committee made an arbitrary definition without giving any reasons for its decision, which has implications for every country which is party to the ICCPR. Such is the luxury of star chambers. The closest thing to an explanation came from the Swedish member of the committee, Mr Bertil Wennergren, who stated, "In paragraph 8.7 the committee found that in its view, the reference to the term 'sex' in article 2, paragraph 1, and in article 26 is to be taken as including sexual orientation. I concur with this view, as the common denominator for the grounds 'race, colour and sex' are biological or genetic factors."

As Ms Twomey states, "This would seem to indicate that the committee includes sexual orientation within the term sex, because it considers sexual orientation to be invariably determined by 'biological or genetic' factors. This is a controversial assumption which is not yet adequately supported by scientific evidence, and would be rejected by many homosexual people....The ramifications of this interpretation of 'sex' are far more significant...It means that there can be no discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in relation to *any* of the rights under the ICCPR." And this at the whim of a handful of unrepresentative UN bureaucrats, more influenced by international elite fashions than the rule of law.

This decision has implications for all those countries which have ratified the ICCPR and which have local lobby groups powerful enough to make it an issue. Obviously this does not apply to authoritarian states, but has implications for countries such as the USA. There are over 20 US states, mostly in the South, which have laws against homosexual acts and sodomy. However the US has not signed the first optional protocol, so "there is no opportunity for a similar complaint to be brought to the Human Rights Committee from one of these states." However, activists in the US can certainly argue that as the ICCPR is binding upon the US it should take action to overturn local laws at odds with the committee decision. It will be very interesting to see if this avenue is pursued by gay rights groups in the USA. Given their history, the southern states are likely to fiercely resist any US Federal attempts at interference with their laws.

Given the fact that the Australian Federal Government has already assigned the UN human rights committee such moral force, it has also limited the extent of its own power to act. A successful complaint to this committee against an action of the Federal government, where it has not conspired with the person lodging the complaint for its own domestic purposes, would be highly embarrassing.

The complaint before the committee regarding the detention of the Cambodian boatpeople has this potential. On 20 June 1993 Nick Poynder, co-ordinator of the Sydney-based Refugee Advice and Casework Service, lodged a complaint with the committee accusing Australia of being in breach of its "international obligations" over the detention. The finding in this case, particularly given the loudly expressed opinions of the local human rights industry and the presence of one of its most prominent members, Dr Evatt, on the committee, is likely to be against Australia.

Dr Evatt has a clear agenda to force a Bill of Rights upon Australia, by placing "international" pressure upon it. She said after the Tasmanian decision that a Bill of Rights would have made such an appeal to the Human Rights Committee unnecessary. A Bill of Rights, with the politically correct bias that can be expected to permeate it, would allow the judicial activists who would interpret it, such as Dr Evatt, to seize even more political power. This is what has happened in Canada. A Bill of Rights was a pet project of both Lionel Murphy and his protege Senator Gareth Evans, when they were Attorneys-General.

It is clear that the Federal System is under systematic attack by those who wish, not only to erode the powers of the states, but to increase the power and influence of lawyers and select bureaucrats over the political process. In the process the ability of the Australian people to influence the destiny of their country is undermined. Particularly when this is considered in conjunction with our increasing loss of economic sovereignty, Mr Keating's talk of a republic making us more independent is seen to be laughable. It is a confidence trick. Without the substance of democratic sovereignty, the Republic would just be a gaudy wrapping on an empty shell.

LAVARCH ACTS

The Attorney-General, Michael Lavarch, introduced a Human Rights (Sexual Conduct) Bill to Federal Parliament to invalidate the operation of the Tasmanian laws against sodomy in September 1994. Mr Lavarch has acted cleverly in that he did not move to directly and specifically override the Tasmanian laws as demanded by the gay lobby groups. This approach led to a split in opinion in Coalition ranks. In the end the Coalition effectively supported the bill. However four members voted against the bill and eight abstained.

Mr Lavarch's advisers told him that legislation targeting Tasmania specifically was likely to have been struck down by the High Court, even given the Court's present makeup, on the basis that it discriminated unduly against one state. Instead Mr Lavarch produced a catch-all bill which will have a general effect for the whole of Australia and so, as a consequence, invalidate the operation of the Tasmanian laws.

However the legislation is only activated if there is a prosecution under the Tasmanian Act. In that case any conviction would be overturned. Firstly, the Tasmanian laws have not been enforced for many years and secondly, in spite of the efforts of gay activists to get themselves arrested, the Tasmanian government has been deliberately avoiding prosecutions. The police have not acted on information volunteered to them by homosexuals about their sexual conduct. Even blatant staged homosexual sex in a public park could not provoke the Tasmanian Government to prosecute under the Act. The two men were charged by police under public indecency laws.

The Tasmanians, if they are smart, will continue to adopt this approach, so defiantly keeping the laws on their books, while being free to challenge the Federal law in the High Court.

However, with the High Court generally sympathetic to using the external affairs power for such purposes - so long as it does not specifically and overtly target one state - the chances of success are doubtful.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA ATTACKED

Western Australia has also been attacked by the gay lobby, because, while it does not have laws like those of Tasmania, the age of consent for male homosexual sex (21) is higher than that of other mainland states. It is also of course considerably higher than the age for heterosexual sex (16). The Lavarch bill sets a nationwide age of consent for sex between same-sex partners of 18 years, which could override the WA law.

Even this would not be enough for the gay lobby, which wants the age of consent to be lowered to 16. In Perth recently an American tourist was charged with having sex with a male under the age of 21 - a 17 year old Indonesian boy - in a hotel. This brought outraged cries of discrimination, because had it been a female there would have been no charge. As the age in this case was 17, such cries would continue even with a new standard of 18 years.

In his column in the *Australian Financial Review* of 24 August, 1994, ex-Senator Peter Walsh pointed out that many of the same sort of people who have joined in the cries of outrage over the WA incident have also strongly backed recent extra-territorial legislation that makes it a criminal offence for an Australian tourist to have sex with a girl under 16 in Thailand. In the Perth case the charged man will have all the rights of a trial within the state where the offence was alleged to have occurred, including the right to cross examine his accusers.

In the Thai case, the law, made under the authority of another UN treaty, will allow an accusation to be made in Thailand by deposition by the accuser, who will be subject neither to cross examination or a charge of perjury if the charge is shown to be false. While there are no doubt cases of young Thai girls being sexually exploited by Australian tourists, this should be a matter

for local authorities. This "feel good" legislation is unlikely to be effective, but it may provide a great opportunity to blackmail Australian tourists.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA JOINS TASMANIA

Western Australia has announced that it will join Tasmania in any High Court challenge against the Human Rights (Sexual Conduct) Bill. The states could of course argue that even though the Federal law will be general, the obvious intention behind it, made clear by the public comments of the Attorney-General, if not in the legislation itself, it is to target Tasmania. They can also argue on the general ground of criminal laws being a responsibility of the states.

Victoria may join them. The Premier of Victoria, Jeff Kennett, said on 24 August, as reported by AAP, that the matter was not a gay rights issue, but was a states' rights issue and the states had an "open and shut case". He said, "I think this is going to give us a very clear case to fight [for] the roles of the states and redefine the roles of the states and that of the Commonwealth."

The support of Victoria in any challenge would be highly significant, as it can not be painted as having any "anti-gay" laws on its books. It would argue the case clearly as a states' rights issue.

INTERESTING TIMES

The actions of Western Australia and Victoria in backing Tasmania mean that Tasmania will be fortified in its stand and the limits of our Federal system could be tested in the High Court. After the uproar that followed the High Court decision on Mabo the court will be put under intense scrutiny.

A blatant decision in favour of the Federal Government could further erode its public standing. If it finds in favour of the states it will be a severe setback for the treaty manipulators. At any rate, there are interesting times ahead.

ANOTHER MULTICULTURALIST STACK

The membership of the Federal Government's Multicultural Advisory Council (MAC) was announced on 26 July. This body will, among other things, advise the government "on the cultural diversity dimension of the Centenary of Federation in 2001 and the Sydney 2000 Olympics". In other words it will advise on how these two events can be used to promote multiculturalist propaganda. The establishment of this body was first announced by the Prime Minister, Mr Keating, in May 1994, at the Zionist Federation Biennial Conference in Melbourne.

This is the same forum the Prime Minister used to announce that racial vilification legislation would be proceeded with. At that stage only one member of the MAC was announced - ZFA lobbyist Helene Teichmann.

Ms Teichmann, nee Taft, is the ex-wife of Max Teichmann, who clearly has considerable differences with her and the ZFA. He is a strong critic of the proposed racial vilification law. At the time the MAC was announced, the office of Senator Bolkus seemed uncertain of details.

The Australian Jewish News of 10 June 1994, stated that when it "asked simple questions such as who would head the council and who its other members would be, a spokesperson for Senator Bolkus could only say: 'The Prime Minister has a habit of announcing what his ministers are doing ahead of time. We will be making an announcement when arrangements have been completed.'" Federation of Australian Communities Councils (FECCA) chairman, Vic Rebikoff, "appeared surprised by the news which he had heard as a 'rumour'. Assured that Mr Keating had revealed Ms Teichmann's appointment when he addressed the Zionist Federation of Australia conference in Melbourne...Mr Rebikoff sought a copy of the statement to see for himself." The Office of Multicultural Affairs also seemed at a loss.

In other words, the formation of this body seems to have been driven by lobbying from the executive of the Zionist Federation of Australia. In fact the Prime Minister announced that the MAC would be established and the Racial Vilification Bill would be proceeded with as if they were presents to the retiring president of the ZFA, Mark Leibler.

Other members of the MAC, apart from Ms Teichmann, read like a who's who of the multiculturalist industry, with a few public relations appointments thrown in. The chair is former Immigration Minister, Mick Young, who was first appointed as Immigration Minister under the Hawke government because

he was considered to be popular with ethnic groups - ie: he gave them what they wanted.

Other members are: **Josef Assaf**, manager director of Ethnic Communications Pty Ltd and publisher of Multicultural Marketing News, which links into the various ethnic chambers of commerce in Australia.

Professor Cora Baldock of Murdoch University; **Professor Stephen Castles**, director for the Centre for Multicultural Studies at the University of Wollongong and chair of the Advisory Committee of the Bureau of Immigration and Population Research. He participated in Irene Moss's National Inquiry into Racist Violence in 1990-91 and is well known for his consistent smears against the old Australian population.

Ms Helen Cattalini, social worker. In 1985 she was appointed as Commissioner for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs in Western Australia. She has served on the state women's advisory council to the WA Premier and has served on national bodies including the Institute of Multicultural Affairs, the National Museum and the Advisory Council on Multicultural Affairs. She is a member of the WA Equal Opportunity Tribunal;

Martin Ferguson, President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions; **Ms Carmel Guerra**, co-ordinator with the Ethnic Youth Issues Network, attached to the Youth Affairs Council of Victoria; **Mr Pac Tam Lam**, arrived as a refugee by boat in 1976, restaurant owner and organises tours of Vietnam for Australian business people; **Ian Macphee**, former Immigration Minister in the Fraser Government and a well known bleeding heart;

Lex Marinos, actor and television personality, a good public relations choice; **Mr Gian Carlo Martini**, involved in various Italian immigration associations and a member of the Immigration Review Panel; **Mr Prakash Mirchandani**; arrived in Australia in 1980 from India, ABC news journalist, established news and current affairs service to Asia and has just been appointed head of news services, Northern Territory;

Noel Pearson, executive director of the Cape York Land Council, hand picked by Keating as an Aboriginal representative in the Native Title negotiations; **Mr Saleh Parkar**, Tasmanian Government official and legal adviser to the Australian Federation of Islamic Councils; **Janet Powell**, ex-politician and former leader of the Australian Democrats, strongly politically correct;

Victor Rebikoff, chair of the Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia (FECCA); **Mrs Heather Riddout**, director of the Metal Trades Industry Association; **Kevin Sheedy**, coach of Essendon Football Club, can be relied upon to know nothing about the way multiculturalism works in practice, while proving another useful public relations appointment; **Ms Helene Teichmann**, ZFA;

Dr My-Van Tran, Associate Professor in International Studies and Multicultural Australia and Director of Research, Centre of International and Regional Studies at the University of South Australia. Appointed in 1992 as

South Australian community representative of the Commonwealth-State Council on Non-English Speaking Background Women's Issues. In the same year appointed as Director to the Board of Directors of SBS. She has been awarded the SA Government's "Certificate of Appreciation for Valuable Contribution Towards the Promotion of a Multicultural South Australia" and the Order of Australia for Service to Australia-Asian relations;

Ms Agnes Whiten, Woman's adviser to the Archbishop of Brisbane. Educated in part in the Philippines, she is the founding president of the Filipino Community Co-ordination Council of Queensland; member of the University of Queensland Senate; chairperson of the Queensland Ethnic Health Advisory Committee, chairperson of the Logan Migrant Neighbourhood Centre and member of the Queensland Women's Consultative Council representing FECCA;

Mr Harry Zacharoyannis, lawyer, president of the West Adelaide Soccer Club and a member of the Multiculturalism and the Law Advisory Committee in 1991/92.

***All members have been appointed for three years and the Council will liaise with the Centenary of Federation Advisory Committee. These groups will link in with other propaganda bases in the public sector and the media.

What a marvellously representative group! Yet, Bolkus and co continue to claim, with scant criticism from the media, that multiculturalism is for all Australians.

KIRNER ON THE CENTENARY OF FEDERATION

After smearing the founders of our Federation for being terrible white males, the former ALP Premier of Victoria, Joan Kirner, chairperson of the Centenary of Federation Advisory Committee, toned herself down remarkably in delivering the committee's report, "2001: A report from Australia" on 10 August. Her original comments belittling the achievement of Federation met some scathing criticism from historians who were provoked enough by her ignorance and lack of historical sense to speak out.

Also the committee had to contain state representatives and could not be entirely stacked by the Prime Minister. To show his politically correct credentials however, seven of the nine Commonwealth representatives, apart from Ms Kirner, were women and one of the men was the ubiquitous Phillip Adams.

Ms Kirner affirmed the central Keating themes, claiming that people around Australia were talking of the need for Aboriginal reconciliation; recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders as "original owners of the land" [no doubt written into the constitution]; "a statement of citizens rights and responsibilities in, or accompanying the constitution" [ie a Bill of Rights to suit the social engineers]; also "a preamble to the Constitution that says who we are and what we stand for as Australians [ie enshrining multiculturalism] and whether we should become a Republic.

This, supposedly, was what people all round Australia were talking about as central issues to the centenary of Federation. Or is it just that these are the central issues that Keating, Kirner and co have decided upon? In spite of the presence of state representatives on the committee, the priorities outlined by Kirner constitute the Keating agenda writ small.

Ms Kirner's committee made a number of recommendations, some of which were quite reasonable. It did affirm that the achievement of the Federation was a great democratic feat and even suggested that the people should be allowed to vote for delegates to People's Conventions to consider the big Federal issues. Ms Kirner stated, "conventions could be made up of equal numbers of sitting politicians appointed by parliaments in each state according to party numbers in the Senate **and other members directly elected by and from the community with no party endorsement allowed** (our emphasis).

This is a surprisingly democratic suggestion and would present a window of opportunity to the general public if accepted.

Other suggestions were merely the projections of opportunistic local

politicians, including from the Northern Territory and the ACT. The ACT politicians wanted a strong financial commitment to the National Museum of Australia, the politically correct bias of which we have mentioned before. The Northern Territory wanted statehood status and if granted it would no doubt expect ten Federal senators. This would significantly increase its political power while, no doubt, it continued to rely heavily upon Federal subsidies. If there is any government which pushes the "we are part of Asia" line more than the Federals it is the Northern Territory government.

The Kirner Committee also made the suggestion that there should be a "Great Australian Family Reunion" to "match the emotional symbolism of the arrival of the tall ships in 1988".

This great family reunion would be one that "symbolises the Many cultures - One Australia theme [suggested by the committee]" as a celebration of the "success" of multiculturalism. "In 2001 it would bring to Australia representatives of families from all the nations whose people are now part of Australia. They would come on ships and planes to celebrate with their Australian relatives."

Far from this being a small scale symbolic gesture, it seems that the committee envisages this occurring on a large scale. In other words if this suggestion was accepted, hundreds of thousands of people would be encouraged to descend on Australia in 2001, many of whom would take the opportunity to stay on without an invitation.

Once they are here campaigns would begin to allow them to stay, rumours of amnesties would circulate and be exploited, as they were in 1988, and we would end up with a large boost to illegal immigration. These obvious problems seem not to even have been considered by the committee.

CITIZENS OR OCCUPANTS?

A parliamentary inquiry is looking at the vexed question of Australian citizenship, which at present can be achieved after two years residence and without a requirement to speak English. Graeme Campbell put in a submission to this inquiry arguing that citizenship should be truly enhanced, in line with the title of the inquiry: "Inquiry into Enhancing the Meaning of Australian Citizenship". He said competence in the reading and writing of English should be essential and a test should be conducted to determine competence. Also residence requirements should be tightened for citizens and only citizens should be allowed to sponsor relatives to Australia.

However both the Departments of Foreign Affairs and Attorney-General's put in submissions which if accepted would lead to a further erosion of citizenship status. These submissions are indicative of a strong push by key bureaucracies, academics, big business interests and the professional ethnic lobby. They want to further water down Australian citizenship. In spite of the title of the inquiry, this push may well decisively influence the recommendations of the committee.

THE DEPARTMENTS OF UNDERMINING

The Department of Foreign Affairs and the Attorney-General's Department also put in submissions to this inquiry. Key elements of both illustrate the woolly-minded internationalism and the downgrading of national sovereignty which has taken hold and is being promoted in these departments.

The Department of Foreign Affairs for example seriously proposed that dual citizenship should be allowed in order to obtain "commercial advantages". Under the heading "Loss of Citizenship" (p 2), it stated: "There is an apparent trend emerging for Australians to take the citizenship of another country so as to improve their prospects in commercial ventures or expand their employment opportunities."

If this is the case it indicates that these people can't take their Australian citizenship too seriously, as, at present, they are obliged to surrender it if they take the citizenship of another country in this way. It is also open to grave doubt that the activities of these people will actually benefit Australians. They seem entirely driven by self-interest. Yet the Department wants to foster this "trend", by allowing people to take another citizenship and retain Australian citizenship.

The mixture of commercial greed leading to bad economic judgements,

combined with posturing humanitarianism, continues in Foreign Affairs. Their grubby and counter-productive grab for cash, which leads the Department to promote economic imperialism, is underlined in their claim that the "more liberalised trading environment" should lead to a more liberalised attitude to citizenship. In other words Australian citizenship should be a matter of the cash register. It should be eroded in order to promote supposed business opportunities to people who clearly have little commitment to Australia anyway.

The Department's confused submission however claims that by allowing such divided allegiances, the allegiance of these people will in fact be retained by Australia. It states: "If they have to acquire other citizenships for this purpose [business] it would seem desirable, if we wish to retain their allegiance to Australia's interests, to let them do so without loss of their Australian citizenship."

People who take up such an option will do so purely for their own private convenience. Allegiance to Australia will not come into it. This justification of dual citizenship may even become a fashion. As a result those who retain undivided allegiance will be further marginalised, while those who effectively forsake Australia will not only be rewarded - as the multiculturalists have been rewarded - they will also look to promote foreign interests at Australia's expense if it suits their business interests.

The Office of International Law in the Attorney-General's Department also suggests that citizens should not have more rights than non-citizens, except in key areas relating to public service and the right to vote. So, according to them, it would be against the principles of international law to allow citizens to have access to family reunion and not allow non-citizens the same. This claim involves an extremely dubious interpretation of the International Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (ICCPR).

The submission states, p 10, "The general provision in Article 2 (1) concerning non-discrimination 'on the ground of race, colour, sex language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status' does not explicitly single out nationality as a status on which one cannot discriminate in relation to the rights recognised in the Covenant." It is clear that nationality is not meant to be included by an examination of the balance of this paper, yet the submission states, "...there is no reason to suppose that nationality could not embraced as an 'other status' by this general non-discrimination provision." Only if you draw a very long bow, but of course international committees are certainly capable of that.

The submission admits that Article 1 (2) of the ICCPR specifically states: "This convention shall not apply to distinctions, exclusions, restrictions or preferences made by a State party to this convention between citizens and non-citizens."

Yet the submission continues to effectively argue against that right, on the basis that discrimination between citizens and non-citizens on the basis of

"nationality" is prohibited. Yet the distinction is not on the basis of nationality, or national origins, but citizenship.

The submission then goes on to argue the case on the basis on economic grounds. (p 11) "There are a number of agreements dealing with economic, trading or commercial relations between Australia and other countries which limit the extent to which distinctions can be made between citizens and aliens...Examples include the Closer Economic Relations (CER) Agreement with New Zealand, 1988 Protocol on Trade in Services, (Art 5), and certain of the GATT trade related instruments, eg GATT, Art III and certain agreements arising out of the Uruguay round (eg TRIPS, Art 3; Trade in Services, Art XVII)...Hence, in this area [specifically services] countries are increasingly constrained in the extent to which citizens can receive favoured treatment."

Of course, Mr Keating wants to extend the CER concept to cover South-East Asian nations. CER is not only a free trade agreement, it provides for free movement of labour. We have considered the implications of its extension to such low wage countries before.

The logic then is that open borders are on the way, citizenship is being downgraded by international organisations and the trend should be encouraged.

The submission continues, "This move away from citizenship as a relevant criterion for most purposes has been reflected in for instance, removal of citizenship requirements for admission to certain professions...It reflects a general trend whereby citizenship becomes primarily a status with significance for political and external purposes (such as diplomatic protection) but not a relevant status for other entitlements." (p 12).

Yet its significance for political purposes (membership of parliament, voting etc) will be minor if decisions about our future are increasingly made from abroad. In effect the real value of citizenship will be minimal. Why bother to obtain it?

Yet, in the very next, and concluding, paragraph it is stated, "Citizenship is a significant legal and symbolic relationship between a State and its nationals...Citizenship is particularly important in a State such as Australia, where many residents have migrated from other States. In this context it is important that it be promoted as a symbol of the reciprocal commitment between an immigrant and Australia which may otherwise not exist."

How can that occur if citizenship is undermined and given such a lowly status, as suggested by this submission? This last paragraph is nothing but empty rhetoric, pretending to revive a corpse after having ripped the heart out of it and on very dubious grounds, even by the standards of international law.

The true agenda of the Office of International Law is to undermine nations and national status, no doubt out of some deluded belief that we would all be better off without them.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

The Government has claimed, according to AAP of 10 May, that it will seek to enhance the profile and significance of citizenship and has "allocated \$4.6 million [from the budget] over the next four years for a major promotional campaign to encourage migrants to take up Australian citizenship."

What will be the point of that if citizenship is little more than an empty symbol? It will allow the Government to play a numbers game, a con trick, but will amount to little in substance if advice such as that above is accepted.

Senator Bolkus's rhetoric affirming the value of citizenship sounds nice, but, given the similar rhetoric of the concluding paragraph in the Attorney-General's submission, cannot be trusted. He states, "Australian citizenship is a central symbol of Australian identity and the government believes that increased importance should be attached to it."

In the end the report of the Joint Standing Committee on Migration, 'Australians All', released in September 1994, recommended that dual citizenship be open to all Australians and that people who have lost Australian citizenship in the past by taking up the citizenship of another country - as Rupert Murdoch did for business reasons - be allowed to reapply for Australian citizenship. Some recommendations however were quite encouraging. A stress was placed on the desirability of learning English and basic outlines of Australian history and institutions. We will see what happens in practice.

IT'S TIME FOR RESPONSIBILITY

An open letter to concerned Australians
Graeme Campbell MHR, Member for Kalgoorlie

I have outlined elsewhere my concerns about the Keating Republic. I see it as basically being a politically correct Republic, an opportunity for the new class to foist all its baggage upon us. A further step upon the road to a state ruled over by authoritarian elites. Those who claim that Australia is an Asian country push for the Republic to supposedly make us more relevant in the region. The ex-head of Austrade, Bill Ferris, has made the ludicrous suggestion that becoming a republic will be a great boon to our trading performance.

It is a matter of deep concern that someone who has held such a senior position obviously believes in magic puddings. That utopian mentality has in fact been driving too much of our policy. Mr Ferris is hardly alone. People like him, flying in face of common sense and the wishes of the great bulk of Australian people, try to force us to become something we are not. To them the Republic is the seal on becoming part of Asia.

Then there are the multiculturalists in general, many of them old Australians, who revile our past and run down our institutions, so that they can start with a new slate. The first year of the Republic to them would be Year Zero. As part of this they will push to impose a so-called Bill of Rights, which will in fact erode and undermine the free speech we have come to regard as a fundamental right. This crew, for all their talk of democracy and access and equity, reveal their authoritarian natures by their push for racial vilification legislation. It seems that multiculturalism goes hand in hand with intellectual conformity.

Mr Keating's recent rhetoric affirming the role of the states is too much and too sudden a contradiction of his past attitudes to be taken seriously. Part of the baggage of the Republic remains a push for continuing centralisation of powers and the marginalisation of the states. Federalism may be imperfect, but increasing centralisation of power will further alienate the bulk of the population from the political process.

These are all issues which may be glossed over, but which relate fundamentally to the Republic versus Monarchy options as presently framed. But there are even deeper issues which are being avoided by those in positions of power and influence. These issues go to the heart of our continuing viability as a nation. If we do not come to terms with them our decline as a democracy and as a nation is inevitable. The failure to adequately deal with these issues

can be summarised as basically a refusal to take responsibility, both at the public and personal level.

There is a growing gap, for example, between city and country. Those in power in the cities have lost their sense of responsibility to the country regions. I have made this point over and over again, as has Professor Blainey. In the broad we are becoming two nations - city and country. Within that division, under the influence of multiculturalism and the Aboriginal industry, we are diving along ethnic lines. There is yet another division emerging along economic lines.

A nation is not a mere economic clearing house, not just a trading concern or a funding base for fashionable causes. It cannot survive with so many of its educated elites effectively working to undermine it.

The people instinctively understand what is happening. They understand that their country is at risk and under attack from the very people who are supposed to lead them. There is a crisis of faith in our parliamentary system of government, not only in the country, but among people in the cities as well. Our leaders have insulated themselves and have engaged in a flight from their responsibilities in the national social contract.

People in both city and country have a responsibility to try to understand the conditions of the other. Both must prosper together for the contract which holds our country together to function.

My starting point is always what is best for the Australian people. I adopt what I call intelligent, outward-looking nationalism. There is only place for one nationalism in Australia - Australian nationalism, or patriotism if you prefer that word. There is no place for fostering a multiplicity of nationalisms in Australia under the banner of so-called "multiculturalism".

These nationalisms are often mutually hostile and import ancient hatreds which have no place here. They have often been developed in deeply autocratic soil, while the Australian nationalism that I foster, is, by contrast, deeply democratic and offers a place to all residents as Australians. If migrants are not prepared to embrace Australia and our democratic ways, then we are entitled to ask them: what are you doing here? Better still we should not bring those sort of people here in the first place.

I am concerned with maintaining the integrity of our nation, so that our best traditions of tolerance, free speech and free assembly can flourish. They cannot flourish among people who have no regard for them. And for these things to flourish we must have a strong economy, we must have a system in which the democratic will of the people is taken seriously. We must have a system in which officials are responsible to the people and are accountable to the people in the spending of public funds.

I put Australians first, but I also advocate cultivating good relations with our neighbours. I advocate trading with the world. I reject the economic level playing field and propose a sensible industry policy, which I have outlined in a separate paper. I advocate the training and retraining of our own people,

rather than the importation of skilled labour. I advocate the maintenance of country services in the face of those narrow econocrats who would erode them.

Those in the cities should realise that they are subsidised by the export-earning capacity of the country, both in agriculture and mining. In that case it is only fair that country services, such as post offices and health care, should be subsidised in return.

When city-based econocrats take the benefit of this subsidy from the country, but recommend cutting country services because they regard them as being oversubsidised they fail to uphold their responsibility under the national social contract. They adopt a very narrow perspective, not a truly national vision.

I advocate full employment, low immigration and integration into the Australian mainstream, not only for economic reasons, but as essential to the maintenance of a united and stable nation. I strongly oppose the policy of multiculturalism, which is a corrupt game of patronage in practice, which threatens to turn us into a nation of tribes.

To believe in democracy and take the will of the people seriously is these days almost to be a radical, but in fact I believe I represent mainstream Australia.

The self-serving elites dictating policy from above against the wishes of the great bulk of the people have become so powerful that they have been able to define what is acceptable political discourse. These unrepresentative pressure groups taken together are even arrogant enough to call themselves "the community". If such a process continues good people will increasingly turn to extremism out of desperation.

It is a supreme irony that the Prime Minister, Mr Keating, claims that becoming a republic is the key to increasing our national independence and self-respect. Our national sovereignty has been declining, not increasing in recent years.

Our national sovereignty, that is to say our ability as a people to influence the destiny of our country, is being compromised with each passing year. Whether or not we become a republic will make very little difference to this process.

The most obvious way in which our sovereignty has been eroded has been through Australia's massive and increasing foreign debt. It is easy to understand the effect of this debt if we consider debt at a personal level.

If an individual is running a business for example and borrows from a bank to keep it afloat, the more that business goes in debt to the bank, the greater the control the bank has over the business. This is precisely what is happening to Australia, overseas economic interests have an increasing say in how our economy operates.

With a business if the debt gets bad enough the bank can directly intervene

and dictate how the business itself should be run in order to recover the debt. This can happen to Australia. It has happened in the past.

In 1930 during the Scullin Government the Bank of England effectively intervened on behalf of our major, then British creditors, with recommendations which were subsequently taken up by the Commonwealth and Premiers in the so-called Premier's Plan in 1931. This plan involved a savage cut in outlays. So if Australia does not gain control of its debt intervention could occur again, but this time, instead of the Bank of England, it will be the International Monetary Fund which dictates terms.

Another way in which our sovereignty has been eroded is the increasing tendency of courts to impose sudden changes in the law, on the basis of so-called social justice principles, rather than interpret the law in an evolutionary and orderly way.

Traditionally in the Westminster system, which we have inherited and adapted from Britain, the parliament is the supreme law making body. Apart from the common law, which is supposed to evolve, not jump suddenly away from past precedent, the courts are supposed to interpret the law which parliament has made.

The parliament is supposed to be directly representative to the people. This principle of course has itself been compromised, but at least with an elected parliament, there is a stronger chance for the public, if organised, to exert pressure on politicians.

When courts take it upon themselves to make law in an arbitrary manner, the public can exert no such pressure. The judges are not elected officials, they have no fear of the ballot box. When they impose new class law on their own account they are, in effect, dictating law to general public. And the public is unable to express its disapproval by voting them out of office.

By this I do not intend to suggest that the independence of the judiciary should be compromised. It is in fact disturbing to see well advanced plans to supposedly re-educate judges in so-called gender awareness. Justice Diedre O'Connor is organising a re-education campaign for judges who don't measure up.

It has even been suggested, by the visiting vice-chairwoman of the American Bar Association, that a so-called "merit panel" should be established to screen judges before they are selected to test their views on gender awareness and other politically correct matters. If they fail to meet the politically correct standard, the vice-chairwoman recommends they not be selected. This road leads to fascism.

I am not advocating anything like that. I simply state that if judges take it upon themselves to dictate laws, they will find themselves becoming increasingly part of the political battle and in danger of being held in contempt by the public. If the public loses faith in our judicial system then it will be in danger of being defied and our stability as a nation will be threatened.

In the end it is in the best interests of judges themselves to take their responsibility to the majority of Australians seriously. This is what I am asking them to do - consider their responsibilities to the wider community.

If we take the example of the High Court decision in Mabo, we see that this is a case where a majority of the judges have put themselves above the general community, instead of being responsible to it.

Whatever might be said about the judgement, some of the language, particularly from Judges Gaudron and Deane, was highly emotive and included the phrase "unutterable shame" in respect of past treatment of Aboriginals. By doing this they symbolically separate themselves from that history and absolve themselves of blame. They can see the shame so they are pure, people who contest their version are by implication part of the society and the process they condemn.

The challenge for Australia is build a positive vision which can unite. For that to happen, people in authority must feel a responsibility to the entire society and not just those who claim to represent sections of it.

We must build on the best of our traditions, rather than - out of fear of being left alone in the big wide world - try to artificially integrate with one section of it. Rather than redirecting towards Asia the colonial cringe and the cargo cult that have been features of our past we must have the faith to invest in our own people and resources.

"Integration" with Asia will ensure that we are eternally a colony, far more than maintaining the Royal vestiges of a British attachment. An independent approach which meets our neighbours as independent equals is the way not only to international respect, but self-respect and self-confidence. These are issues of substance which have to be confronted if Australia is ever to fulfil its great potential.

Another of the new class favourites is the policy of multiculturalism. The policy of multiculturalism was cynically introduced in Australia in an attempt to capture the votes of ethnic groups, by buying off and promoting pressure groups which supposedly represented them. It has since become bi-partisan, in spite of the fact that there appears to be little support for it among migrants.

Supporting this policy came to be seen amongst the fashionable elites as an indicator of a socially advanced cosmopolitan attitude. Other indicators were unquestioned support for high immigration and integration with Asia. This was because of middle class guilt over the White Australia Policy and past attitudes to Asia. These policies were imposed on the public from above. Anyone who dared question them was branded a racist.

Proponents, particularly in the media, constantly claimed that our reputation in Asia was being damaged by daring to talk about these issues. Our leaders continue to alternate between being servile and cringing towards Asian nations and morally superior - a contemptible combination.

At any rate the push for a Republic involves all this baggage - notably the policy of multiculturalism and Asianisation. This links in with the grievance

industry and the flight from responsibility to the public. Not only that, but the public is actually being systematically excluded from having a say in the policies it is forced to fund.

Another way in which our sovereignty has been undermined is the ceding of sovereignty by the Federal Government in international treaties as a way of overriding the authority of the states. This has been mainly done, with the assistance of the High Court, through the use of the external affairs power of the constitution. This power has been used in a way which was never intended.

Usually the general public has no idea that these treaties are being signed, many politicians also do not know at the time. But after signing such treaties the government then claims that we have a so-called international obligation. In other words an elite signs something on our behalf, without our approval and then claims that this binds the entire nation. It then justifies the introduction of local legislation based on that treaty.

The government claims it has no choice but to introduce such legislation. It is merely following its "international obligations", so it evades responsibility for the very process it has initiated. "It is not us" they will say, "we are merely following our international obligations".

What an irony that someone who claims he wants to make Australia more independent, is happy to cede sovereignty in this way.

A major problem is of course that many in the new class, who have so strongly influenced our leaders, have given up thinking in terms of the national interest altogether. They take money from the public purse, but they do not believe in the nation. They constantly denigrate Australia and its history. They have adopted a woolly-minded internationalism which shifts with each passing fashion.

They have no sense of responsibility to unfashionable fellow Australians because they see their duty as being to the world, they have some woolly ill-defined concept of the "international community". They link this with various sections of our own society which are fashionable, or are deemed to have been disadvantaged in the past. As noted they insulate themselves from the consequences of the sacrifices they demand on behalf of others by extracting the taxes of the general public they despise. The general public is just a funding base to them.

The irony of course is that by not looking after Australia's best interests or taking the concerns of the Australian majority to heart, they undermine the on-going effectiveness of that funding base.

Our major concern should be providing jobs for our own people. Unemployment must be tackled by providing, not just any jobs, but meaningful jobs. It would, I suppose, be possible to have full employment with our people working in menial, low paying jobs. I am not prepared to see my children become drink waiters and street sweepers in their own country, as I am sure you are not.

We must provide a future for our children with good jobs and have the

courage to put our faith in our own capacity to succeed. Continuing to import skilled labour denies training opportunities to our children so they can get good jobs.

Getting good jobs means good education opportunities in universities. Yet opportunities are denied locals by the practice of universities taking large numbers of overseas students. While universities deny that this displaces locals, in fact universities have effectively and deliberately taken large numbers of overseas students in preference to locals in prime courses, such as medicine, engineering and computing.

These are the very courses that are supposed to make us the clever country. This is done because overseas students pay full fees and universities have discretion over the use of those fees. It is simply more financially attractive to take such students. Why is that not being addressed?

We have to put our own population first. If we don't nobody else will. That also means that locals must make the effort to be involved in the political process. If they just sit back and hope others will do the job then their country will be taken from them. She won't be right mate, unless Australians at the grass roots join with us in helping to make it right. Rather than people telling me what else I should do to improve the situation and saying 'good on you, wish there were more like you' and leaving it at that, I'd appreciate offers of assistance. What are you prepared to do in the fight for our country?

You can start by writing letters to newspapers, joining radio talkback sessions, writing to your local member, joining the local branch of the party of your choice and organising your friends and acquaintances to do the same. Write to me and let me know what you are doing. The time to act is now. If we leave it much longer the fight will be lost and we will become tenants in our own country.

I strongly believe that the basis for providing jobs has to be a strong manufacturing sector. We have to provide the conditions in which our industries can not only survive, but grow and prosper. Australian ingenuity must be fostered. The government should provide funding to develop the clever ideas of Australians in our own country, instead of seeing them, as we have time and again, being lost overseas.

We must add value to our own products, such as wool and minerals. There is a great opportunity to develop machinery for the mining industry instead of importing it from abroad. This obsession with the mythical level playing field has to be ended. We need to use a bit of imagination and start from the basis of putting our own people first. We need to instil self-respect in our nation again. That is the way to create jobs - not just any old jobs, but the sort of jobs we would like to see for our children.

Australia can be revived and go on to prosper as a proud nation. Are you willing to play a part?

.....

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Betts, K; *Ideology and Immigration, Australia 1976 to 1987*, Melbourne University Press, 1988.
- Betts, K; *Racism, Immigration and the Australian Nation, A reply to Cope, Castles and Kalantzis, Immigration, Ethnic Conflicts and Social Cohesion*; BIR, September 1991.
- Birrell, R; Hill, D; and Nevill, J. (editors); *The Stresses of Population Growth in Australia*, Fontana and ACF, 1984.
- Birrell, R; *Immigration and the Recession*, Sociology Department, Monash University, June 1991.
- Birrell, R; Healy, E; and Smith, T.F; *Migration Selection During the Recession*, Commonwealth Parliamentary Library paper, 1992.
- Blainey, G; *All for Australia*, Methuen Haynes, 1984.
- Cope, B; Castles, S; and Kalantzis, M; *Immigration, Ethnic Conflicts and Social Cohesion*, AGPS, 1991.
- Creative Nation*, Commonwealth Cultural Policy, October 1994.
- Evatt, E; *Multiculturalism and the Law*, Australian Law Reform Commission, 1992.
- FitzGerald, S. (chairman); Committee to Advise on Australia's Immigration Policies (CAAIP), *Immigration: A Commitment to Australia*; AGPS, 1988.
- Galbally, F. (chairman); *Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants: Migrant Services and Programs*. AGPS, 1978.
- Gardiner-Garden, J; *The Multiculturalism and Immigration Debate 1973-93*, Commonwealth Parliamentary Library, 1993.
- Garnaut, R; *Australia and the North-East Asian Ascendancy: report to the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade*, AGPS, 1989.
- I am a stranger, will you welcome me? The Immigration Debate. An Issues Paper from the Australian Catholic Social Justice Council*; Collins Dove, 1991.
- Industry Commission; *Exports of Education Services*, 1991, AGPS.
- Joint Committee on Migration Regulations; *Australia's Refugee and Humanitarian System: Achieving a Balance Between Refugee and Control*, AGPS, Canberra, 1992.
- Joske, S; *The Economics of Immigration: Who Benefits?*, Legislative Research Service, Commonwealth Parliamentary Library, Canberra 1989.

- Jupp, J; and Kabala, M; *The Politics of Australian Immigration*, Bureau of Immigration Research, AGPS, 1993.
- Lavarch, M. - M.P. (chair); *Half Way to Equal, Report of the Inquiry into Equal Opportunity and Equal Status for Women in Australia*, House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, AGPS, April 1992.
- McKiernan, J. - Senator, (chairman); Joint Standing Committee on Migration, *Asylum, Border Control and Detention*, AGPS, 1992.
- McKiernan, J. - Senator, (chairman); Joint Standing Committee on Migration, *Australians All, Enhancing Australian Citizenship*, AGPS, 1994.
- Menadue, J. (chair); *Evaluation of the Bureau of Immigration and Population Research*, AGPS, October 1994.
- Policies for Development of Manufacturing Industry, (The Jackson Report)* October 1975.
- Moss, I. (chairperson); *Racist Violence, Report of the National Inquiry into Racist Violence in Australia*; Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, AGPS, 1991.
- National Report, Royal Commission Into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, Volume 5 (recommendations)*; AGPS, 1991.
- National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia, Sharing Our Future*, AGPS, 1989.
- National Population Council; *Population Issues and Australia's Future*, AGPS 1991.
- Price, C. and Martin, J. (editors); *Australian immigration: a bibliographical digest, No 3, 1975, Part I*.
- Rimmer, S; *The Cost of Multiculturalism*, Flinders Press, 1991.
- Rimmer, S; *Multiculturalism and Australia's Future*, Kalgoorlie Press, WA, 1992.
- Smith, J.W; *Immigration, Population and Sustainable Environment: The Limits to Australia's Growth*, Flinders Press, Bedford Park, S.A.
- Whitlam, E.G; *The Whitlam Government, 1972 - 75*, Viking, 1985.