



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance —*

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.30, No.3

February 4th, 1994

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** "We are living under threat in this country. The threat defines itself more clearly every day; the foundations of our traditional social order are breaking up because we are losing faith in each other and in our traditional systems.

"Life in any society has to be built on that trust; trust in each other, trust in the enactments and the administration of the law, trust in the value of our money, the security of our savings and the honesty of those we pay to administer them. These are the currencies of our lives, the symbols of our mutual dependence. Without them we become like beasts in a jungle preying upon each other for simple survival."

- Morris West, well known Australian Novelist,  
The Bulletin, January 25/February 1, 1994.

**MANIPULATING THE PRINCE OF WALES** by David Thompson:

It is sheer dishonesty to suggest, as Mr. Keating did, that Prince Charles had given "a wink and a nod" to the republican debate by his remarks in his Australia Day speech. The dishonesty has been compounded by the pro-republican press (especially the ABC) in a ludicrous attempt to enlist Royalty in the republican cause. As Mr. Tony Abbott, of Australians for Constitutional Monarchy, pointed out, the republican craving for Royal approval must be the ultimate in cultural cringe.

To claim that Prince Charles approved of the republican debate is dishonest, and to further imply that he is a closet republican himself is a blatant lie. In his address, the Prince also said that he wasn't surprised that there were differing views on our constitutional arrangements, that "some people will doubtless prefer the stability of a system that has been reasonably well tried and tested over the years...". If the Prince's comments are to be "interpreted", the headlines could just as legitimately read "Prince Backs Monarchy".

The Prince of Wales' remarks were entirely proper, and were no more and no less than he may have been expected to say. If there is any

disagreement with his comments, it may be that the debate is a "sign of a mature and self-confident nation...". The Prime Minister's behaviour, and the press's handling of the issue, reflects a dishonesty and immaturity, as well as a nation uncertain of its identity. This, of course, is the product of many years of eroding nationalism in the school system.

**THE ATTACK UPON PRINCE CHARLES:** The attempt by a university student to draw attention to the "cause" of Cambodian boat people by attacking the Prince in Sydney has been excused (by those inclined to excuse it) as merely a political stunt, in which no-one was hurt. The truth is that all loyal Australians who value their roots and heritage were very deeply hurt by a reckless act of aggression towards a person who symbolises Australia's national identity. The attempt to "use" the respect with which the future King of Australia is regarded in order to highlight the problems of a minority group of foreigners is an act of sheer contempt for the well-earned tolerance of Australians for such groups. It is a cynical violation of a deep-seated emotion that symbolises what is best in the Australian tradition - loyalty.

Contemptible as this publicity stunt was, it did serve to draw some attention to basic flaws in the republican argument. Why attack the Prince of Wales? Why not aim a pistol at the Prime Minister, or a Premier? Because there is a quality about Royalty, derived from the institution of monarchy, that is central to our idea of nationhood and therefore of far greater significance than mere politicians. That a thought-process alien to most Australians should choose Royalty to highlight its cause, is a backhanded compliment to monarchy that the republicans cannot afford to acknowledge. Why choose the Prince of Wales? Because he is the Prince of Wales, and because he is not Malcolm Turnbull, Donald Horne, or some other figure of fleeting and dubious distinction.

**THE MULTICULTURAL DELUSION:** To add further injury to the insulting attack upon Prince Charles, those whose plight the attacker sought to highlight are openly attempting to circumvent Australian law, and to manipulate public opinion for their own ends. Those in detention centres are there because they sought to enter Australia illegally. Such illegal immigrants sneak into this country, then make arrogant demands for their "rights" upon long-suffering Australian taxpayers. The misplaced charity of some churches, and the avarice of self-serving lawyers ensures that the courts are clogged for years with the endless appeals from such people, while Australians who cannot themselves afford resort to the courts are paying the legal bills! If the "boat people" are desperate to be released, they need only apply to be returned to their own country, and avoid further testing of Australian tolerance.

As his attacker stumbled forward, under the unflinching gaze and kingly demeanour of the Prince, NSW Premier John Fahey tackled him personally, and afterwards deplored the attack commenting that "this is not the

Australian way of life". But what does a 23-year-old Cambodian (although born here) know of "the Australian way of life"?

David Kang knows nothing of Australia's heritage, thanks to a well-undermined school system that has deliberately filtered out any reference to our cultural roots and identity. He has not been encouraged to grow up as an "Australian". In fact, those mesmerised by the multicultural delusion have encouraged him to cleave to his Cambodian heritage instead. The rabid multiculturalists, exercising a form of cultural fascism, share the responsibility for Kang's attack upon Prince Charles. Other acts of racially generated violence must be expected in a nation of racial and cultural tribes. But here can be no doubting the affection for the Prince, nor the success of his 1994 Tour, irrespective of republican dishonesty.

**A QUEENSLAND MIRACLE:** Those listening to Queensland Labor Premier Goss deliver his Australia Day speech could have been excused for believing that Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen had been resurrected to office. Premier Goss said that Australia should give more recognition to traditional families, who are under threat because new social policies ignored them. He said that society should never be afraid to stand up for such families. Later he called for a debate on the taxation system and government policies which discriminate against women and those who chose to be full time mothers and homemakers. These and similar remarks resulted in a frenzy of protests from the radical feminists and similar people.

Premier Goss provoked more protest when he turned his attack on to the demands of minority pressure groups and said that people were being intimidated by the insistence that they must be "politically correct". He called on Australians "to return and preserve our Australian identity and not let it be masked by a mixture of political correctness and imported American social values". In his attack on the "disease" of political correctness, which at best was "trendy nonsense"! Premier Goss said it had to "be nipped in the bud". He gave a few examples of the politically correct disease such as the insistence that places or words with quote "black" in them should be changed. Unless one was "politically correct" one was liable to be called a "racist".

Premier Goss said, "What I find particularly insidious about politically correct behaviour is that it presupposes that people are victims. It is time for the victims to fight back."

Premier Goss clearly has become increasingly frustrated by what is happening in Australia. He is not impressed with the Mabo madness and bluntly says that ridiculous land claims will not even reach the courts. The leaders of the Aboriginal industry have joined in the campaign of criticism of the Queensland Premier. Irrespective of how Premier Goss's new politically incorrect attitude is interpreted, it is obvious that he understands the current mood of the Queensland people and being an astute politician he is attempting

to reflect that mood. He is increasingly disillusioned with Canberra and the Mabo issue could produce a type of alignment between a Court Liberal Government in Western Australia and a Goss Labor Government in Queensland. The Australian political scene is changing dramatically under the pressure of realities.

**BRIEF COMMENTS:** As is frequently demonstrated in the United States, the presence of Royalty has an interesting effect upon republicans. The NSW Treasurer, and declared republican, Mr. Peter Collins, somehow managed to land the coveted job of welcoming Prince Charles to the Carnivale festival, much to the disgust of some other Ministers. Collins is a prime example of the type of hypocrisy for which politicians have become noted, and it is amazing that they are indignant when Australians object to having a politician for a President!

\* \* \* \* \*

As we go to press, the ALP Leader of the Opposition in Western Australia, Carmen Lawrence, is expected to announce that she is a candidate for the former Treasurer, Mr. Dawkins' seat of Fremantle. The Prime Minister and others urging Lawrence to make the move to Canberra hope that Lawrence will do something to counter Mrs. Bronwyn Bishop's rise in the ranks of the Liberal Party. It also helps to fulfil the Prime Minister's undertaking that more women should be elected to Commonwealth Parliament. The objective is that 50% of the Parliament should be occupied by women by the year 2000. Any suggestion that this is a form of reverse discrimination (against men) is treated with scorn among the politically correct.

\* \* \* \* \*

In 1993 the High Court ruled that the election of Mr. Phil Cleary to Mr. Bob Hawke's old seat of Wills was invalid, as Cleary was technically still employed by the Education Department in Victoria; he "occupied a position in service of the Crown for gain". In NSW the electoral law also disqualifies government contractors from standing for Parliament, which throws doubt upon the legality of Liberal Candidate Miss Jillian Skinner's candidacy for Ted Mack's old seat of North Shore. The by-election for this seat will be held this weekend, resulting from the resignation of Mr. Phillip Smiles for tax offences. As the ALP is not fielding a candidate, there is considerable speculation that the independent candidate, Robyn Read, could unseat the Liberal candidate, leaving Premier Fahey with only 47 seats in the House; the same as the ALP.

\* \* \* \* \*

The new Native Title legislation has given new hope to a group of WA Aborigines, who are campaigning for 1% of the State's revenue from the last 90 years. They are contesting the repeal of Section 70 of the WA Constitution, passed in 1905. This section was a stipulation by Britain that W.A. Aborigines receive 1% of State revenue annually. If successful, this could cost the State hundreds of millions of dollars.