



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.40

October 25th, 1996

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Prejudice is often but the wisdom of the unlettered man."

— Edmund Burke

HYPOCRISY AND MADNESS CONCERNING RACE by Eric D. Butler:

Former Prime Minister Bob Hawke made the boast that he was primarily responsible for the establishment of a bi-partisan Australian immigration policy, thus ensuring that the Australian people had little opportunity to debate or discuss the question. Anyone who did so was smeared as a "racist". If Bob Hawke's boast is true, it confirms the famous observation by Shakespeare that the evil that men do lives after them. Followed by Paul Keating, Bob Hawke was prominent in the campaign to persuade Australians that their "destiny" was in Asia. All the major political parties have followed baaing like a flock of sheep. It is hard to find suitable language to adequately describe the hypocrisy and sheer madness of party politicians attempting to further a programme of national suicide. While the party politicians of Australia are competing one with another to assure the Asians that Australians will not tolerate any type of immigration policy which discriminates in terms of race, this is exactly what every Asian nation does. The Asians are pleased to draw upon Western technology, but they have made it clear that they intend to preserve their own homogeneous societies and their culture. They have every right to do so.

The island State of Singapore is held up as one of the success stories of the Asia which Australians are urged to emulate. But the truth about Singapore should be used to force Australian party politicians to reveal their hypocrisy. At the end of the Second World War, as part of their general policy of decolonisation, the British granted independence to the Federation of Malaysia. Singapore was part of that Federation, but led by Lee Quang Yew the predominantly Chinese population of Singapore campaigned to separate themselves from a political structure in which they feared that the Chinese would be dominated by the Malays. The Chinese leader of Singapore rejected the concept of a multi-cultural nation. Those Malays living in Singapore were encouraged to migrate to Malaya, while the Chinese living in Malaya were encouraged to move to Singapore. Whatever virtues he had, Lee Quang Yew demonstrated that he was a master of double-talk and hypocrisy; at Commonwealth Conferences he was one of those who strongly condemned South Africa for practising the very apartheid (separate development) he had implemented.

If Australia is to survive as a harmonious nation rooted in its Western European heritage, the Australian people must unite to insist that they have the same natural right as the Thais, the Singaporeans, the Chinese, the Koreans and the Japanese, to preserve their own homogeneous society and traditional

value system. A nation which does not have the right to openly discuss and decide who can join the nation, and under what conditions, is doomed.

Before the science of anthropology was penetrated by the Marxist and collectivist virus, eminent anthropologists like the famous Scot Sir Arthur Keith, stressed that discrimination was a natural factor in the development of civilisation. Every form of life, no matter how primitive, discriminates in favour of itself. If it doesn't, it dies. Sir Arthur Keith, in one of his famous lectures, stressed that prejudice was a major factor in the development of civilisation. Those joining in the chorus of abuse of Pauline Hanson, who is charged with being a bigot and prejudiced, are merely demonstrating their own colossal ignorance of natural laws. The same politicians who parrot the theme that all individuals and races are "equal", will be amongst those attending the current Spring horse racing season in Melbourne. No sane punter believes that all horses are equal, and that a draughthorse is likely to produce a Melbourne cup winner. Those engaged in the horse racing business are keen students of the hereditary factor.

Prejudice is certainly playing a major part in the fashioning of the immigration policy of New Zealand First leader Winston Peters. Peters is a classic example of how large numbers of the Maori people have mixed with the European and absorbed European culture. But New Zealanders of part European and part Maori backgrounds are united in their fear that they will be swamped by large-scale Indian immigration. It is very difficult to try to smear Peters by calling him a "racist". What he and those who think like him are demonstrating that they are determined to preserve what they have evolved and find it suits them.

History is full of examples of the truths enunciated by Sir Arthur Keith and others. Greece at the height of its great civilisation was a relatively small community of homogeneous people with the same basic culture. Elizabethan England was a relatively small nation of several million. And what a galaxy of "stars" it produced, perhaps the brightest being William Shakespeare, described by Ben Johnson as being "not of an age but for all time". There was Bacon, described as the father of modern science, with its stress on the inductive method. It was the English who were the flower of constitutionalism which reflected the Christian value system. Different explanations have been for the unique contribution of the English to Western civilisation, but whatever the truth, Elizabethan England was certainly not the product of multi-culturalism. It was a mono-culture. The decision to expel the Jews was still to be reversed, awaiting the arrival of Cromwell.

It is not without significance that Jewish leaders, prominent in the campaign to foster multi-culturalism, are strong advocates of mono-culturalism as essential for maintaining cohesion and a sense of nationality among the Jewish people. Their main current concern is what they see as the threat of assimilation. Australians who wish to maintain their own identity and their traditional culture might well consider following the Jewish lead and that of Asian leaders like Lee Quang Yew.

GAGGING PAULINE HANSON by David Thompson:

The Australian press make much of their commitment to "free speech", and although routinely vilifying people like David Irving and Pauline Hanson, nevertheless **pontificate on the "right" of such people to be heard**. That this is a complete travesty is then illustrated by the failure to publish **what Irving or Hanson are actually saying**. It is much easier to run a sloppy, vague or even blatantly dishonest assessment of what Irving or Hanson are saying, and then thrash it to death, in a sort of ritual crucifixion of deplorable views. Sometimes the hubris is so thick, that the ritual crucifixion purports to be "more in sorrow than in anger".

A classic example of such press irresponsibility is the way Pauline Hanson's interview with *The Sun-Herald* on October 13th was reported. In the interview with Fla Cumming, Pauline Hanson had actually called for policies to promote unity in Australia, rather than increasing division. Cumming later confirmed that the headlines published by the Sunday tabloid, "*An Aussie Bloodbath*" and in a later edition "*Aussie Civil War*" in a manner that implied that they were quoting Hanson's views, were **never uttered by Hanson**.

Later in the week Pauline Hanson made a personal explanation to the Parliament to place her position, in which she said: "*Mr. Speaker, those dramatic, sensational and totally invented headlines were based on an interview I did with a journalist Fla Cumming. These headlines were blatant misrepresentations, and I will be taking this matter further with the journalist involved and her employers.*"

It appears, however, that journalist Fla Cumming was not responsible for the offending headlines, but a biased (or bored) sub-editor who had no idea what Hanson actually said, and probably didn't care. Anything to sell some papers.

WHAT PAULINE HANSON DISCOVERED: Pauline Hanson did not make her maiden speech in Parliament until September 10th, six months after being elected. On June 14th she issued a press statement releasing her research into the benefits available to Aborigines compared with those for others who may be disadvantaged. The differences are staggering, and there is little wonder that the Independent Member for Oxley drew the conclusions that she did. She has been thoroughly abused for saying that she thought Aborigines enjoyed many privileges not available to others, **but the press has never published Ms. Hanson's research**.

The Australian electorate has been systematically denied the **evidence** upon which Hanson's views are based. Why is this? The only possible answer is that every effort is being made to isolate Hanson as a person driven by prejudice, bigotry and hatred. The message is that we should be ashamed of such views if we agree with her, and that she is not worthy of support. But the basis for her views is never published. What does that research say?

Accompanying Pauline Hanson's June 14th media release was a 24-page booklet, which laid out the statistics on what is available to Aborigines. Alongside this information, was statistical information on what was available to non-Aborigines in the same circumstances. The sources of the information are meticulously quoted, and for the most part are official reports, Government Departments, and official publications. In only three cases was a press report quoted.

In her introductory press release, Hanson asked a number of questions: "*Why should Aboriginal students get more than non-Aboriginal students? Why should Aborigines in gaol be allowed to continue receiving Abstudy when non-Aboriginals are automatically disqualified from Austudy? Why should non-Aboriginals be means-tested for legal aid when Aborigines are not? Why can't ordinary Australians get 3% and 5% housing loans?*" There may be logical answers for such questions. **If so, let us hear them, and debate them!**

The research published by Hanson covers only Federally funded benefits. Those available from the States are a matter for further research. The question asked by Hanson, which no-one is prepared to attempt to answer, is ***do we allocate benefits on the basis of skin colour, or not?*** If the answer to this is "Yes", then what is the purpose of Lionel Murphy's Racial Discrimination Act 1975? Is it acceptable to discriminate in favour of one group and not others? On what basis is such a judgement made?

These are the questions which should be debated, but are being carefully covered up by a refusal to publish Hanson's research, and **address the issue.**

THE LEGACY OF LIONEL MURPHY: The late Lionel Murphy, Labor Senator and High Court judge, died 10 years ago last week. The experts say it is still "too early" to judge the influence Murphy had, for better or for worse, on Australian politics and law. We dispute this assessment. It is quite early enough to make such a judgement, and the judgement must be that Murphy was an unmitigated disaster for the free society. As time passes, Murphy's activities are gradually forgotten, even though the **effects** of Murphy's legislation (and High Court decisions) continue to linger. While Murphy's **actions** fade from memory, however, the **results** of those actions loom ever larger as a poison gradually killing the free society.

The left-wing historian Manning-Clark, who knew Murphy well, provided perhaps the most accurate and striking eulogy of Lionel Murphy. It is in the light of Clark's revealing eulogy that Murphy's career must be judged. Clark said of Murphy that he had *"believed passionately that the morality of Judeo-Christianity had ceased to be relevant . . . I see Lionel Murphy as a man who in that context strove to end the domination by God over human beings . . ."*

Murphy's **policies** were a classical out-working of his anti-Christian philosophy. As Whitlam's Attorney-General, it was Murphy who introduced the Family Law Act (1975), which established the principle of the no-fault divorce. The effects of such a philosophy have devastated the Christian institution of marriage. It is now widely recognised that marriages fail largely because it is not necessary to make permanent commitments; the law does not reward **responsible** marriage partners, and repeatedly rewards irresponsible marriage partners. In many cases, women who move to dissolve marriages do so in the knowledge that the Family Court is very likely to award them not only custody of children and a regular child support payment, but also half the couple's property **quite irrespective of the circumstances**. One immediate statistical result of the Murphy Family Law Act was a record divorce level in 1976 – 63,200. Malcolm Fraser's Attorney-General, Bob Ellicott, Q.C., says Murphy's belief in no-fault divorce has proven to be "quite wrong", but it should be noted that Fraser's administration did nothing to reverse such policy disasters.

Murphy was also directly responsible for the Racial Discrimination Act (1975), which laid the basis for much of the "rights"-based legislation that was to follow. It is likely that Murphy was also instrumental in the later Mabo case, since he was questioning the doctrine of "terra nullius" many years previously.

Perhaps one of the most damaging cases in which Murphy was involved on the High Court was the Tasmanian Dams case of 1984. It was this case that established the principle that the "external affairs" power of the constitution meant that, provided the Commonwealth could produce a treaty with a "foreign power", it had the power to impose the terms of that treaty on the States, irrespective of whether this breached other Constitutional powers belonging to the States. The result was massive centralisation of power, which continues to this day. Murphy was a disaster for the free society, but given his objectives of undermining Christianity and pursuing Fabian policy, he was an outstanding success. The fact that he was successful is a serious judgement on Coalition politicians who claimed to stand for something quite different.