



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –*

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.9

March 17th, 1995

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** "Since a politician never believes what he says, he is surprised when others believe him."  
French President Charles de Gaulle

## **ERODING SUPPORT FOR THE CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY** by Eric D. Butler:

Attempting to manipulate Australian public opinion from Germany, Prime Minister Paul Keating says that Germany provides the type of Republic he prefers for Australia. He dislikes the proposal that, in an Australian Republic, the electors should elect the President. Paul Keating does not mention that the Germany he so much admires has imposed such draconian legislation that freedom of speech and research concerning major historical issues that anyone expressing doubt concerning the official version of history is liable to be imprisoned and/or heavily fined. Ever since he started to express his doubts about the extent of the killing of Jews, and then concluded that there were no mass gassings, British historian David Irving has been banned from entering Germany. The role of the German President is primarily ceremonial. Perhaps Paul Keating visualises himself as the first Australian President, elected by his fellow party politicians and strutting the stage giving Australians lectures on his version of culture.

It is becoming increasingly clear that Keating and his Republican strategists, aided by much of the mass media, are skilfully attempting to shift discussion on the Republican issue on to the basis that as a Republic is "inevitable", debate should be concentrated upon what type of Republic. Even National Party leader Tim Fischer was manoeuvred into a position where headlines had him saying that "I personally favour an elected-by-the people ceremonial president..." with newspaper comment that like other Opposition Members, he was softening his stance on the Monarchy issue. This has forced him to issue a statement saying that he had not changed his position: "I remain absolutely in favour of the constitution of Australia." But the reality is that there is open division inside the Opposition ranks, with prominent Liberals open supporters of Republicanism. Every time an Opposition Member, including John Howard, agrees that he is in favour of dialogue on the Republican issue, he is ceding ground to the Republicans. This is especially so when the

Opposition with few exceptions has not equipped itself adequately to put the case for the continuation of the institution of the Constitutional Monarchy. In most cases they are afraid that with full blooded support of the Constitutional Monarchy they might be charged with losing the much publicised ethnic vote.

A classic example of the tactics of erosion is the writing of Robert Manne, editor of *Quadrant*, and a columnist for the Conrad Black media. Manne is a man who has demonstrated that he is capable of changing his stance on fundamental issues. Originally he felt that British historian David Irving should be allowed into Australia, but later he was able to argue that because of allegedly changed circumstances it was desirable to keep Irving out. He wrote a blatantly false description of Irving's video film, *The Search for Truth in History*, as pointed out by Nigel Jackson in his work, *The Case for David Irving*.

Originally a supporter of retaining the Constitutional Monarchy, in two articles in *The Age*, Manne said he was shifting his position. In *The Age* of March 5th he cites the argument of some Monarchists that if our present Constitution works, why tamper with it? Manne writes, "On the surface this is an attractive argument. No doubt our constitutional arrangements do work well enough. Yet, on closer inspection this argument seems to me to miss the point. Those who support the movement from Monarchy to republic are not arguing about the efficacy of our present Constitution but about its symbolic content, and in particular about the mismatch between contemporary Australian identity and the British monarchical inheritance."

Manne argues that unless what he terms "the conservative coalition" belongs outside the Republican debate it will be vulnerable to "the expert taunting of the Prime Minister and to the charge of being out of joint with the times". Manne does not explain why Opposition politicians should be concerned about the taunts of Keating. As for being "out of joint with the times" supporters of the continuation of a Constitutional Monarchy are in fact supporting the maintenance of roots without which there will be no worthwhile future. The suggestion that an indirectly elected President, which Manne favours, and the retention of the reserve powers which now rest with the Crown and its representative, the Governor-General, are arrangements that would take "hold of the public imagination" is a manifestation of a type of dialectical doubttalk. The reality that Manne is proposing is that Australia should tear itself from its spiritual roots. Such a procedure would ensure the death of Australia, and its eventual absorption into Keating's proposed Asian-Pacific Common Market.

### BLAINEY PRODS THE SACRED COWS by David Thompson:

In his quiet gentlemanly manner, Professor Geoffrey Blainey has once again hit the nail right on the head concerning Australian citizenship. In an address to the Institute of Public Affairs Seminar in Sydney, Blainey again flayed the multiculturalists, and charged that Australia's concept of citizenship was "a disgrace", with any migrant speaking perhaps a few words of English being eligible for citizenship after a few years. Blainey said:

*"Australia's notion of citizenship is a disgrace. We, more than any other country in the world, throw away our citizenship. Anybody can become a citizen with ridiculous ease. Applicants for citizenship have to live here, or claim to live here for only two years, and one of those years can be spent overseas. They need to know no more than a few words of English. If they are over the age of 50, they need to know no English. They can also maintain their allegiance to a foreign power while becoming an Australian citizen ....."*

Blainey makes the telling point that unfortunately the responsibility for citizenship is largely in the hands of the Department of Immigration, *"and that department is largely the lobby for recent migrants and their relatives who hope to arrive soon ..."*. The policy agenda concerning immigration, citizenship and multiculturalism is being set mainly by people from minority groups with a personal vested interest in manipulating the majority.

In his Sydney address, Blainey said: *"Not only do we demean citizenship by thrusting it on newcomers, we demean democracy by compelling newcomers to vote. They might know little about Australia, and have no previous experience of democracy, but they can display that ignorance by voting ....."*

**THE DECLINE OF ENGLISH:** In the fortnight preceding Blainey's address, Professor Helen Hughes had touched a raw nerve by warning that the presumption that English was no longer the essential common language was *"undermining essential democratic values of Australian society"*. Hughes had pointed out that migrants were not making the traditional move from their own communities into general society, and the development of ghettos *"complete with criminal gangs"* was the result.

Without commenting on Hughes' assertion, Blainey said: *"... one Senator insisted that making English a pre-requisite in a migrant would be inbuilt discrimination. She did not seem to realise that Parliament holds all its sessions in English. Without that inbuilt discrimination, without a common language or, say, two common languages, we are reduced to the level of monkeys. Even monkeys probably have a common language ... A nation has every right to deny a citizenship to those who know nothing about the nation they have just entered ..."*

Although Blainey's views are the political equivalent of incendiaries, he makes his point in a mild, well-mannered fashion, which appears to infuriate the multiculturalists the more. In press interviews and staged "debates" following his Sydney address, he was vocally abused by a woman, obviously an immigrant, who sought to establish what views concerning immigration and citizenship were acceptable and what were not, which simply emphasised Blainey's point.

**EVILS OF "DISCRIMINATION":** In one radio interview, Blainey was charged with *discrimination*. With devastating common sense, he pointed out that "discrimination" simply involved making choices. He pointed out that in an Australian election, we discriminated against people from other nations by not permitting them to vote here. In essence, he is saying that we have the natural right to discriminate in our own favour simply in order to survive as a nation.

It is now being suggested by the multicultural lobby that "discrimination" is not only UN-Australian, but should be illegal. But the High Court's ruling that the various human rights tribunals cannot enforce their rulings, indicates something quite different. It indicates that the new breed are having great difficulty finding comfort in the Constitution in the attempt to outlaw 'discrimination'. Jeffrey Goldsworthy, who teaches law at Monash University, notes that the founders of the Australian Constitution, although borrowing heavily from the American Constitution, did not include an Australian bill of rights, regarding it as unnecessary. Goldsworthy notes that they also thought it unwise, because *they wanted to be free to discriminate against people of other races*. This is an interesting view, with profound consequences for Australia. It implies that 'discrimination' (in our own favour) was one of the foundation-stones upon which the nation was based. Why abandon it now?

The reality is that all attempts to prevent the individual 'discriminating' in his own favour are doomed to failure, as they defy reality. A devastating account of such failures is contained in the new book ***Discriminate or be Damned***, by John Fairbanks Kerr, O.B.E. This book is a classic answer to those who insist that discrimination *ought* not to be allowed. As a campaign tool, it is peerless, as the politically correct have no answer to reality.

#### **BRIEF COMMENT:**

Federal Health Minister Dr. Carmen Lawrence has endorsed a booklet, costing the Australian taxpayers \$250,000, which purports to advise young Australians on "safe sex". The magazine ***Cleo*** has run articles based on the booklet. As the average reader of ***Cleo*** is the 12 to 16 year old girl, it is not surprising that Mr. Bill Muehlenberg of the Australian Family Association, has described the material in the booklet as "sexual dynamite". But Dr. Lawrence defends the booklet, claiming that teenagers were sexually active and needed the information. Some of the "information" can only be described as revolting. Whipping is permissible, but make sure that all the equipment is kept clean. This taxpayer-funded booklet says that urinating on your partner, described as "golden showering", is fine so long as no urine gets into broken skin. Dr. Lawrence says that the kids "are doing it" anyhow. If there are any teenage Australians engaged in the type of filth described in the Government's booklet, surely those responsible are those promoting "safe sex". While some responsible adults are attempting to warn the young against the dangers of smoking, drink driving and drugs, there are the criminally irresponsible attempting to encourage young people to blight their lives through promiscuous sex. Sex is one of the most potent forces in human affairs, and the development of the traditional family has been the most constructive way of ensuring that that force is using for creative purposes.