



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.15

April 25th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"National strength can only come from true freedom, and true freedom requires a true sense of the order which the life of freedom itself requires. A freedom related to order becomes in time licence."* — John Farthing in *Freedom Wears A Crown*

THE REALITY BEHIND THE ANZAC LEGEND by Eric D. Butler:

Self sustaining legends like Anzac reflect a reality which is akin to the very soul of the nation. The constant re-assessment of the meaning and significance of Anzac Day has served to increase interest in the legend. The controversy concerning whether children should be permitted to march has not been negative, but has helped to focus attention on the question of the future of Anzac Day. As RSL leader Bruce Ruxton observes, if the Anzac Day march is to continue to be a major feature of the celebration of Anzac Day, then eventually the children of today will be required to march. But for both practical and emotional reasons, the majority of ex-servicemen do not at present wish children to participate. Men who have faced death together develop a special sense of comradeship which they find it difficult to share even with their wives or children.

In contemplating how Anzac Day may develop into the future, it is appropriate to recall that the new Federation of Australian States had not long been born when the First World War provided the first opportunity for troops from the separate States to come together in military conflict. One of the driving forces which helped to create the Federation was the fear of military invasion. In one sense, Gallipoli was the bloody baptism of a new nation. The majority of Australians saw themselves as part of the British Empire. The Republican movements of late last century, mainly based in Sydney, started to fade away under the impact of Federation. Further events associated with Gallipoli, as they became known, had played a major part in shaping a new Australian nationalism. Support for the Monarchy was strong and there was wild excitement when King George V sent a cable congratulating the first Anzacs for their "magnificent achievement". No great battles were won at Gallipoli. But the event had all the elements which grew into a legend.

Here were free men demonstrating both courage and resourcefulness as they attempted to storm cliffs that appeared insurmountable. Epic events associated with military achievements are remembered in different ways, even among those with a common background. British troops were also involved in a campaign which British strategists hoped with help to shorten the First World War by defeating one of Germany's major allies, Turkey. The bravery of the British troops was typical of British people everywhere. But the efforts of the British troops never had the same impact upon the British public as did that of the Australians at Gallipoli. There was a widespread

perception in Britain that Gallipoli was a disastrous military failure, one which had a damaging effect on the reputation of Winston Churchill. No great military victories were achieved at Gallipoli, such as that in which the famous Australian Light Horse so effectively participated as Turkey was brought to its knees.

It is encouraging that a growing number of young Australians are now attending the annual Dawn Services, at Gallipoli and throughout Australia. They are seeking to discover their roots, and the significance of an event which more than any other in the nation's short history, has taken firm root in the Australian psyche. The future of Australia requires that Anzac Day is seen, not merely as another public holiday, but a day consecrated to maintain and strengthen those values which Gallipoli helped to symbolise. But what are those values? The ability to perform courageous acts; to demonstrate comradeship in time of major disasters? These and other values were all demonstrated at Gallipoli. But is there something else?

Perhaps it was the achievements of the stretcherbearer known as Private John Simpson with Donkey which provides a reflection of the deeper spiritual reality, and unlimited source of inspiration for carrying the Anzac legend into the future. John Simpson Kilpatrick was a product of Northern England – a "Geordie" – who came to Australia as a ship's stoker in 1907, when he deserted his ship and dropped his name Kilpatrick as form of disguise. He worked all around Australia, participating in a variety of activities – from cane cutting to gold fossicking. He was an early volunteer for the A.I.F. Because of his great strength he was assigned to ambulance work and immediately was carrying wounded men from the front lines to the relative safety of the beaches. Faced with the difficulty of carrying wounded men on his back over the treacherous terrain, he hit on the concept of using a little donkey which he had commandeered. Over the next few weeks Simpson and his donkey made up to 20 trips a day, up and down the treacherous gullies, risking his life on practically every trip. On his return trips he took water back to the men in the front lines.

Both Australian and Turkish troops were amazed as Simpson and his Donkey survived until he was cut down in a Turkish counter offensive on 19th May. Legend has it that a deep hush fell over both Australian and Turkish troops. Simpson's rare type of courage was not that of a V.C. winner who generally displays his courage in one short flash of bravery, but one of calmly walking through the shadow of death day after day for several weeks. But what really motivated Simpson? Correspondence provided by his sister revealed him as a political radical, a non-Christian believer. He was no "God, King and Country" young man, a revelation which so upset well known Melbourne churchman the Rev. Irving Benson that for a period he refused to hand back the Simpson correspondence to Simpson's sister. Perhaps Benson was making the same mistake as those who criticised Christ for associating with prostitutes and similar people?

An American woman visitor to the Melbourne Shrine of Remembrance penetrated closer to the truth about Simpson when, after contemplating the statuette of Simpson and his Donkey at the Melbourne Shrine of Remembrance, wrote a poem in which she referred to the "Christlike chivalry" of Simpson. While Simpson would probably have rejected this description, in a realistic sense he was practising the famous Christian law of love: greater love hath no man than this that he would lay down his life for his own friends. During his few short weeks at Gallipoli, the 23-year-old Englishman born as John Simpson Kilpatrick, created a legend which might well be the central theme of all Anzac ceremonies, these concerned primarily with discovering the very soul of the nation. As symbolism can be used as a powerful servant of Truth and Reality, it might be pointed out that the unborn Christ child was carried into history on the back of a donkey. It has been said

that God sometimes speaks to Man in strange and mysterious ways. Does the story of Simpson and his Donkey have a special spiritual message for today's Australians as they face the most critical period in their history?

HANSON PARTY WARNS OF "EXTREMIST" INFILTRATION by David Thompson:

The explosion of interest in Pauline Hanson's new political party has seriously shaken administrators of older existing political parties, particularly those in Queensland. It is clear that the Hanson initiative is a direct threat to the National Party in Queensland, and explains why Senator Bill O'Chee is taking such an uncompromising stand on issues like the Wik decision, and extinguishing native title. O'Chee has yet to address himself to the firearms issue with the same vigour, but it is also clear that the new firearms legislation has badly eroded the Coalition's political base. As well as diverting votes away from the Coalition Parties, Hanson is also certain to appeal to the disaffected blue-collar rump of the A.L.P.

The Federal Director of Pauline Hanson's fledgling *One Nation* political party, Mr. David Ettridge, appears to be nervous of groups such as the League of Rights attempting to control his party. He is quoted in a weekend newspaper (*Sunday Telegraph*, 20/4/97) as threatening to expel League infiltrators, and also members of the former Confederate Action Party.

We remain uncertain of Mr. Ettridge's background, except that as a professional fundraiser he worked for World Vision until he became associated with *One Nation*, upon which World Vision reconsidered his position in the light of Pauline Hanson's comments on overseas aid in her maiden speech. We are unaware of any experience Mr. Ettridge may have in running political parties, let alone establishing one from scratch. Nevertheless, in our view, Mr. Ettridge will need all the assistance available to him in the task before him, and he need not fear interference from the League of Rights.

While we have made every endeavour to distribute Pauline Hanson's addresses as widely as possible, and offered every encouragement to others to support her in the raising of the issues with which she has become associated, **the League has had no contact with Pauline Hanson whatever.** And Mr. Ettridge appears to be jumping at shadows to suggest that the League is attempting to control *One Nation*. In fact, although we support much of what Ms. Hanson has said since elected to Parliament, and have observed her fortunes with interest, we believe Pauline Hanson is making a mistake with the formation of *One Nation*. In our edition of April 4th last, we wrote:

*"But an analysis of Hanson's success reveals that she has provided the best service to Australians when she has acted as a type of catalyst, and united Australians **against** that which threatens their best interests. It is possible to reach across all party divisions, social, economic, religious and even racial divisions to unite Australians **against** something which threatens them. A political party is not necessary to achieve this, and, in fact, a political party begins to divide loyalties, and destroy that unity."*

Nothing we have seen since this was written has caused us to change our views. The many thousands of normal, decent Australians who have come forward to support Hanson have been accompanied by some strange and unsettling characters, hungry for political power. Indeed, with some of the strange people coming forward, eager to associate with *One Nation*, our reservations have only deepened. Mr. Ettridge may find that in the struggle ahead, those attaching themselves to the Hanson bandwagon will be quite enough to keep him occupied, let alone Hanson's political enemies.

At this stage, we can only wish Hanson well, but observe that it may be much easier to force the Coalition Government into making concessions on **one issue at a time**, rather than form a party and seek power. Immediately the latter step is taken, **objectives have changed**. Instead of forcing the other parties to **achieve the results required**, Ms. Hanson and her associates are seeking power for themselves, on the assumption that if this is achieved, results will naturally follow, as night follows day. In our view, this is a serious misreading of power politics.

ABORIGINES SEEKING U.N. SANCTIONS:

When we warned, early in Mach, that Australia faced the prospect of international economic sanctions, such a suggestion was almost universally regarded as "extreme". But even a rudimentary understanding of the **pursuit of policy** would indicate that Australia has been moving in this direction for many years. The issue that has confirmed our warnings, and brought the whole question right into focus, is the question of how Prime Minister Howard will resolve the problem of native title and pastoral leases.

Aboriginal interests threaten that if Mr. Howard does effectively extinguish native title with legislation in the Parliament, they will appeal to a higher court. What higher court? Australia abandoned appeals to the Privy Council in Britain in 1974. It was regarded as a sign of national immaturity to have another outside court placed above our own national courts. But as a result of commitments to international treaties, Australia is subject to the rulings of a United Nations body, **The International Court of Justice**.

In 1983, an Aboriginal delegation, led by Mr. Paul Coe, appealed to the United Nations Human Rights Committee to intervene to guarantee "land rights" to Aborigines, but were told that while ever the Australian High Court held to the *Terra Nullius* doctrine, the U.N. could not intervene. It was the Mabo case in 1992 in which the High Court rejected the *Terra Nullius* doctrine, opening the way for another Aboriginal group to return to the U.N. Human Rights Commission early this month to re-open the argument.

As Councillor Bevan O'Regan reports in his *From The Parish Pump* (April), a former official at the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Mr. Bill Barker, has denounced Australia to the U.N. for abusing the human rights of Aborigines. The suggestion that Australia may extinguish native title is put forward as a serious case of racial abuse, and in the words of one Aboriginal representative who met with Mr. Howard last week, was the Government's "final solution" for Aborigines. It was argued that extinguishing native title was not only about land, but about extinguishing the entire Aboriginal people.

With the U.N. Draft Declaration on Discrimination Against Indigenous Peoples now being considered, it is clear that Australia is on a collision course with international forces that intend to ensure that Australian sovereignty is shattered. The instrument that is to be used is the question of Aboriginal self-determination, and international sanctions could be employed if Australia resists the establishment of separate black states. Whatever the result, genuine reconciliation, if it was required, is further remote than ever. The greatest tragedy is that the Aboriginal people, mainly loyal Australians themselves, are being manipulated in the struggle, and will suffer most in the inevitable backlash.