



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.35

September 20th, 1996

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "The ideal is the enemy of the real."
— Dr. Oscar Levy, anti-Zionist Jewish philosopher

MULTICULTURAL MADNESS by Eric D. Butler:

Press headlines read, ANARCHY THREATENS UNLESS TROOPS REMAIN. The story which followed deals with the recent elections in Bosnia, Yugoslavia. A European correspondent, writing from Sarajevo, says that while the election will enable President Clinton to go to the American polls in November, claiming that a great success has been achieved, and that American troops can now be brought home, the reality is rather different: "... the circumstances of the elections show that Bosnia is still bitterly divided." The modern history of Yugoslavia stems from the Versailles Peace Treaty at the conclusion of the First World War. A group of idealists from the victorious nations sat down to try to plan the future of the world. The old Ottoman Empire, administered by the Turks, was broken up, Turkey being on the losing side. One of the results of this process, with lines being drawn on maps with little reference to realities, was the tragedy of the Kurdish people. Approximately 10 million of these people constitute a nation in the sense that they have their own language, culture and religion. But they were left fragmented, some under the control of the nation known today as Iraq. Iraq emerged primarily as a result of the planners drawing lines on maps. Some of the Kurds remained under the control of the Turks, others under Iran and Syria. Others were absorbed into the Soviet Union.

The basic problems of the Middle East crisis, including the tragedy of the Palestinians, result from international planners drawing lines on maps. Many of the planners undoubtedly meant well. The tragedies of Africa, now assuming horrendous proportions, with millions dying in what are basically inter-tribal and cultural conflicts, stem primarily from the fact that when the European Colonial powers went into Africa, they drew lines on maps with no reference to tribal and other realities. The problem was compounded when the idealists decided that "the winds of Change" required the colonial powers to leave. The "liberated" African States, which existed only on paper, progressively disintegrated as reality asserted itself.

Australians would do well to ponder on these realities as the debate concerning multiculturalism and immigration grows. The maiden speech in the Federal Parliament by Pauline Hanson has triggered off an open debate which has been smouldering beneath the blanket imposed by all the

major political parties and the media, this dominated by the self-opinionated and self-styled academics. The late Professor Manning Clark was typical of these people. Pauline Hanson's overwhelming election victory, followed by her historic maiden speech, has resulted in developments which could prove a turning point in Australian history. It will be recalled that it was a Rotary Club address by historian Professor Geoffrey Blainey, who warned about the inevitable consequences of the present immigration policies, which forced some discussion on immigration and multiculturalism. The self-righteous ideologues brutally attacked Blainey and, to some extent, he was marginalised. But the Pauline Hanson affair is different. This courageous woman has singlehandedly made the whole immigration and multicultural issue one of major political significance. And she is supported by the West Australian Independent Graeme Campbell, who potentially is the catalyst which could see the emergence of a new force in Australian politics.

The widespread public support for Pauline Hanson has caused a note of hysteria in the ranks of the devotees of multiculturalism. Spokesmen for the Howard Government are attempting to adopt a low key response, generally confining themselves to saying that Pauline Hanson's remarks were "unfortunate". But in attempting to distance themselves they are faced with political realities. Some of the attacks on Pauline Hanson are basically attacks on the growing number of Australians who support her. As might be expected, one of the strongest editorial attacks on Pauline Hanson came from *The Age*, Melbourne. In its editorial of September 16th, entitled "The Battle For Tolerance", *The Age* attempts to come to grips with what it realises is the most formidable challenge yet made against multiculturalism. *The Age's* concept of tolerance is revealed in its first sentence, referring to the "latest poisonous outburst" from Pauline Hanson. There is reference to her "myopic malevolence", but with the resultant admission that Pauline Hanson does represent "a constituency that the rest of Australia is going to have to take into consideration if it is to maintain its essential qualities: democracy, fairness and a unity that can only come from mutual trust".

These mealy-mouthed words are typical of those who have consistently opposed any suggestion that the Australian people should have any real say concerning the type of people they want to join them in the nation they have built. Pauline Hanson makes the telling point that just as she has every right to say who can enter her home, she has the right to express her preferences concerning the people she wants to welcome into her country. She also has the right to say that she is concerned if the traditional nation and its culture is to be swamped by any group which does not readily assimilate.

But *The Age* is forced to agree that the Pauline Hansons and Graeme Campbells must be taken seriously. It suggests education and debate, *The Age* and those who endorse its attack on Pauline Hanson should be challenged to point to those parts of the world where multiculturalism has been an outstanding success: Yugoslavia? Sri Lanka, where the Tamils continue to insist upon being separate, with continuing terrorist activities? The growing problems of Papua New Guinea, with the continuing disaster concerning Bougainville, reflect the realities which men like Sir Raphael Cilento drew attention to in their warnings about tribal and cultural differences. They warned about premature so-called nationhood when there was no basis for such nationhood.

The Age and its supporters might care to explain why even in Belgium there is still marked differences between the two main language-cultural groups; while even at the famous University of Louvain a policy of **apartheid** is applied, to minimise friction between the students. The suggestion that Australia can succeed with a multicultural policy which has failed everywhere

else is a sign of intellectual arrogance, not tolerance. And Pauline Hanson and those who support her should expose the blatant dishonesty of those who claim that Australia's immigration programme has been successful. It has only been successful because it was based on a programme of assimilation. Yes, let the debate begin and expose the dangerous idealism which has driven Australian immigration and multicultural programmes for far too long.

THE "UNISEX" ARMY IN A MOSLEM CULTURE by David Thompson:

A number of reports indicate the difficulties with the "peacekeeping" forces in Bosnia Herzegovina, which attempt to keep the "Christians" and the "Moslems" from each others' throats for long enough to hold "democratic" elections. This attempt at democracy in itself is an attempt to impose Western standards of the small "I" liberal democrat on a people for whom "democracy" has no meaning whatever. The former Yugoslavia has been under the dictator's heel for over half a century, and few, if any, can remember pre-communist political structures. If the memory of pre-communist Yugoslavia exists at all, it would not be of a Western-style "democracy" in any case.

Yugoslavia, despite dictator Tito's partially successful industrialisation programme, is today a wreck of competing ethnic and political factions struggling for dominance in an artificial "peace" imposed by the West. The "peacekeeping" forces, mainly United States military forces, are all they have by which to judge Western democracy and how it "works". In the U.S. military barracks alcohol is officially banned, but acquired illicitly almost at will, including military patrols defying regulations and stocking up on alcohol before going off duty. Fraternisation with Bosnian women is forbidden, but again the rules are routinely circumvented with an ingenuity that is lacking in any military ventures. Although army stores do not sell condoms to troops, they are freely issued by the aid stations to anyone going on leave.

The forces' daily newspaper, *Stars and Stripes*, is creating increasing disquiet among the spouses of serving soldiers, since it began to publish letters of the discontented troops. And the army itself, of course, is now a "uni-sex" army, because it is no longer possible to discriminate against women entering the U.S. forces. As a result of boredom, low morale and the proximity of both sexes in the same military units, the army medical corps have so far sent home 70 United States women soldiers because of unexpected pregnancies. If the Bosnians are observing the results of "democracy" in the United States, the leader of the free world, perhaps they may well cast a cynical eye over attempts at free elections.

BILL HAYDEN ON PAULINE HANSON: The grinding of teeth and wringing of hands that has greeted the maiden speech of Pauline Hanson, Independent Member for Oxley, is largely based upon the media's **interpretation** of what she said. The League, having obtained a complete transcript of the address to Parliament, has no hesitation in welcoming this speech as a constructive contribution to the moribund political debate. We publish the full text of Pauline Hanson's maiden speech in the September edition of *Intelligence Survey* (\$20.00 per year subscription).

However, many of the media hacks overlook the assessment of the former Governor-General, Mr. Bill Hayden, of Pauline Hanson, who now holds his old seat – Oxley. Hayden has clearly spent some time in discussion with Hanson, as he revealed in his article on her in the last edition of the *Independent* magazine, before it ceased publication. Hayden hailed Hanson as "*the little battler who slew the ugly Labor dragon*" and commented "*God bless her soul, she stands (as I do) by the monarchy.....*"

Hayden also noted: *"Hanson is mentally tough. She is reading up on her topics well, albeit selectively, as much commentary from her showed when I spoke to her . . ."* Bill Hayden's comments on Hanson perhaps tell us as much about the former Governor-General as they do about Hanson, particularly the remark about the monarchy. Coming as it does from a man who professed distinct republican tendencies while in the Parliament, this may be a further indication that Hayden has felt the weight of the office of Governor-General, and the key role the crown plays in the stability of the nation. If not exactly a fully committed monarchist, Hayden is certainly no rabid republican.

It is clear that Hanson is, as Hayden notes, mentally tough. But she will need all the mental toughness, as well as much electoral support from around the nation as she can find, to keep some kind of sanity under the barrage of abuse directed at her by the politically correct press.

A.B.C. "NOT BIASED": CHAIRMAN McDONALD: The Free Speech in Australia Conference in Sydney last week must have been an in-house talkfest for the chattering classes, because not even a titter of mirth, let alone cries of derision were raised when the new Chairman of the A.B.C., Mr. Donald McDonald, rejected any claims of bias by the national broadcaster. He used his speech to the conference as *"an opportunity to rebut suggestions of deliberate political bias on the A.B.C's. part"*. Let the A.B.C. Chairman's comments go on the record for future reference:

"What I can say is that the A.B.C. takes its responsibility to provide independent, accurate and balanced news and information services very seriously."

"The A.B.C. recognises freedom of political debate and discussion carries with it responsibility to ensure that the discussion and debate is responsible, accurate and fair . . ." (The Australian, 11/9/96).

Former Chief Justice of the High Court, Sir Anthony Mason, who presided over the High Court ruling that freedom of speech was "implied" in the Constitution, claimed that the A.B.C. played an important role in free speech and democracy. *"I have no hesitation in saying that the A.B.C. has been instrumental in furthering the cause of deliberative democracy in Australia. Its current affairs programmes have played, and continue to play, a vital part in bringing to light and agitating important public and policy issues, and in ensuring informed discussion of them."*

Perhaps Sir Anthony's perspective is influenced by the well-remembered opportunity he was offered to further his small "I" liberal views in March 1995, on the A.B.C's. *"Four Corners"*, in which he claimed that in areas of concern where Parliament "fails to act", the Court itself is obliged to act to protect "rights". As it did in the case of Eddie Mabo, which led subsequently to the Native Title Act.

Groups like the League, of course, have a much different perspective of the A.B.C. Our experience has always been that the "Red Network" can be completely depended upon to distort, twist and misrepresent views that are regarded by its journalists and producers as "not politically correct". The keepers of political correctness can always be found in the A.B.C. If the Chief Justice of the High Court looks to the A.B.C. for "informed discussion", then this country is in more serious trouble than we thought.