



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.21

June 6th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "..... *democracy is threatened not by the masses . . . but by 'best and brightest', who have become 'arrogant internationalists' forming a community of elite professional and managerial contemporaries stretching across the globe, with little sense of civic and moral virtues.*"

– Christopher Lasch in *The Revolt of the Elites and The Betrayal of Democracy*
quoted by the author of the book on Pauline Hanson

THE THREAT OF VIOLENCE MUST BE REJECTED by Eric D. Butler:

Pauline Hanson was ridiculed earlier for warning that in the absence of far reaching political, economic and social changes, Australia was threatened with the possibility of internal violence. A number of distinguished Australians have made the same type of warning, but none of these has been subjected to the unprecedented campaign of vilification directed against Pauline Hanson. As Pauline Hanson obviously is no demagogue with a threatening personality, the only logical reason for the anti-Hanson campaign is that she is seen as a potential threat to those elitists who have smugly believed that they know what is best for everyone else. They reminded one of the Shakespearean character who exclaimed, "*When I opts my lips let no other dog bark*".

The student of psychopolitical warfare is familiar with the technique of claiming that those marked down for destruction should be charged with the very evils which the aggressor was either practising himself, or proposed to practise. Pauline Hanson has been charged with preaching hate. No evidence whatever has been produced to show that Pauline Hanson has been encouraging hate or violence. But both hate and threats of violence have been a feature of a recent number of Pauline Hanson's meetings. In the latest issue of his annual publication, *Your Rights, 1997*, widely respected civil libertarian John Bennett points out that the citizen has every right to attend an advertised political meeting, and to make appropriate interjections, but he does not have the right to disrupt the meeting, thus interfering with the rights of those who have come to hear the speaker. Anyone who examined closely the faces of those shouting abuse at Pauline Hanson's meetings cannot help noticing the striking evidence of hate. The Hobart meeting had to be closed because it was obvious that the police could not guarantee the safety of Pauline Hanson.

A revolutionary atmosphere is being deliberately fostered right across Australia. While John Howard has only himself to blame for the mounting ferment of concern throughout Australia, as the far-reaching implications of the High Court Mabo and WIK decisions start to penetrate public consciousness, he did not deserve the insulting treatment he received at an event allegedly dedicated to something called "reconciliation". The first thing that struck any objective observer was that the overwhelming

majority of those present claiming to represent Aborigines were, in fact, Australians of part Aboriginal background. Most looked well dressed and reflected the good life they enjoy as members of the Aboriginal Industry. Shirley Lomas, described as an "Aboriginal activist" by the media, interrupted the opening ceremony to deliver a "savage attack" on Pauline Hanson which, if made by a white person would have resulted in media outrage and a demand for appropriate action. Those who heard the outburst distinctly heard the "activist" say that, if she had access to one of the farmers' illegal guns, she would be prepared to use it against Pauline Hanson. While this inflammatory statement was carefully edited out of the print media, the *Herald-Sun* of May 27th, on page 5, reported Lomas as saying that Pauline Hanson could "consider herself dead". The photo on the same page, showing those who deliberately turned their back on the Prime Minister when he was speaking, is most revealing.

Prominent in the general campaign of misrepresenting Pauline Hanson, is the Melbourne *Age*, which indicated the possible shape of things to come with a comment by Tony Barta in its issue of May 17th. Reference is made to Hitler's "One Nation" party, followed by the comment that "killing Hitler is a project that has to be kept up by each generation". Apparently *The Age* did not feel it necessary to, in the interest of truth, to point out that Hitler's party was known as a National Socialist party, not "One Nation", and that in fairness to Pauline Hanson she has in the few policies she has enunciated, never suggested anything resembling Hitler's policies.

The Zionist-Jewish press goes much further than *The Age*, and has publicised comments comparing Pauline Hanson with Hitler. Not without significance, there are references to the alleged plight of the Aborigines and how they are threatened with extinction in the same way that Hitler threatened the Jews. The impression is created that Pauline Hanson poses such a threat to the Jewish community that its members must involve themselves in action programmes. An "Open Letter" to Prime Minister John Howard by Australian and New Zealand Jewish leaders in which reference is made to Pauline Hanson's "Fulminations and poisonous rhetoric" which are "infecting peaceful Australia, unleashing forces of enmity and division which have the real potential to bring tragedy to us all". And there is more in similar vein.

The main threat to stability in Australian society is not Pauline Hanson, but the destructive finance-economic policies being continued by the Howard Government. Campaigns to maintain present immigration, multicultural and Aboriginal land rights programmes are like throwing petrol on a smouldering fire. Even Phillip Adams, quoted in *The Australian Jewish News* of May 2nd, warns that Australia is faced with the threat of major social and political upheavals. The worst that can be said about Pauline Hanson is that she is reflecting a deep malaise eating away at the foundations of Australian society. But she is certainly not responsible for the malaise.

The revolutionary forces operating in Australia fear that the oppressed majority may organise itself sufficiently to challenge a revolutionary programme in which elitist groups have played a major role. Whoever wrote the Pauline Hanson book put his finger on the role of the university produced elitists. It was the same type who played a decisive role in the first modern revolution to threaten Western Christian Civilisation, that in France. And as the great Lord Acton said in commenting on that revolution, behind all the smoke and smother was the evidence of clear design. There is design behind what is happening in Australia today. The situation is producing desperate people who might easily be goaded into violent action, playing into the hands of the revolutionaries. Strong political leadership is urgently required to ensure that violence of any kind will not be tolerated in achieving a solution to Australia's problems. This requires exposure of and opposition to those promoting the anti-Pauline Hanson campaign.

MAXIM TAYLORIAN
AL
30
JUL 5 -

RECONCILIATION OR REPARATIONS? by David Thompson:

In retrospect, the Aboriginal Reconciliation Conference was conducted in an environment of shrill demand, confrontational debate, and assumed guilt, hardly conducive to any genuine reconciliation. The series of events that appear to have coalesced at present – either by coincidence or design – has produced a high-pressure, emotionally charged environment in which non-Aboriginal Australians appear to be expected to concede guilt for past sins, and offer a "blank cheque" which is to be construed as "reconciliation".

Events such as the 30th anniversary of the historic Constitutional referendum recognising Aboriginal people, the report on the "stolen generation", the efforts of Prime Minister to solve thenative title issue flowing from the Wik and Mabo High Court decisions, and the push to include recognition of Aborigines as the prior "owners" of australia in a new preamble to the Constitution all point towards a concerted attempt to force concessions to the "Aboriginal Industry". This is not true reconciliation. This is a demand for **reparations**, not reconciliation.

The occasion of the 1967 Constitutional referendum has been clouded by mythology, but there is no doubt that the Australian people took the opportunity in 1967 to demonstrate massive goodwill towards our Aboriginal population. The overwhelming "yes" result in that referendum was a heart-felt demand that Australians should be **one people**, with the same "rights", not special status for different groups. The truth is that **it was the 1967 referendum** where true reconciliation between Aborigines and other Australians was effected. The out-pouring of goodwill to Aboriginal people, with a determination to relegate the injustices and the tragedies of the past to history, was a practical demonstration of true reconciliation in which **all Australians** took part.

The 1967 reconciliation, however, has been squandered. If blame needs to be apportioned for the squandering of this opportunity, it must be laid at the door of the "Aboriginal Industry", not ordinary Aboriginal people who are just as misrepresented by their leadership as are Australians by their politicians. But instead of Aboriginal people willingly joining the mainstream of Australian political and social life, the professional Aboriginal leadership has refused to permit their people to become "mainstreamed". They have insisted that ATSIC was essential to deal with distinctly separate Aboriginal issues. Any benefits flowing from ATSIC were to be specifically race-based, and exclusive.

The "Aboriginal Industry" has demanded the policy of **self determination**, a policy of social exclusion of Aborigines, rather than inclusion. This also is specifically race-based, and exclusive. Demands for "land rights", native title, apologies and compensation are also race-based, and exclusive to Aborigines.

The 1967 fund of goodwill has been squandered by demands that European Australians (and presumably all those who have migrated to Australia this century – European, Asian, etc.) bear the guilt for the sins of the past, such as that of **hostile invasion** of Australia, rather than peaceful colonists, and the "stolen generation".

Even the closing ceremonies of the Reconciliation Conference were riddled with hypocrisy and double standards. For example, Chairman Patrick Dodson wept over the man called "our brother Rob" – W.A. activist Robert Riley, who committed suicide last year at the age of 41. Dodson lamented that Riley was one of those "stolen generation", implying that he suicided because the burden of such

- 2 JUL 1997

injustices could no longer be borne. The truth is rather different. Rob Riley was not, in fact, "stolen" from his mother, but was voluntarily given up to the W.A. children's institution Sister Kate's. Former Senator Peter Walsh claims that his mother feared for the child's safety because her partner was a violent drunk. The irony of Riley's situation is that when he was given up to Sister Kate's, Ronald Wilson, the author of the stolen generation report "Bringing them Home", was at that time **on the board of Sister Kate's**.

No-one seems to have asked the obvious question of why the conference's keynote speaker was Dr. Alex Boraine, vice-chairman of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission. What did Boraine have to offer? Was his lecture to Australians, and scathing criticism of Howard, constructive and conciliatory?

It is not possible to repair the damage done to the relationship between Aborigines and other Australians without voluntary goodwill, forgiveness of past injustices, and a determination to ensure that **all Australians** enjoy the same rights and privileges. If reconciliation is to be achieved, rather than "reparations" imposed upon non-Aborigines, and compensation extracted, perhaps voluntary concessions should be encouraged. For example, those who insist that Aborigines should be given "land rights" Or special title, could offer a portion of their own property to an Aboriginal family. Such offers (which have been effected in the past) might be made tax deductible. If compensation is to be paid, why not open a special fund, and those who wish to compensate our Aboriginal brothers might feel free to contribute as heavily as they choose. This also might be a tax deductible contribution.

HAYDEN WARNS REPUBLICANS:

Former ALP leader and Governor-General Bill Hayden appears to be concerned that he is a little too closely identified with the occupant of his former seat of Oxley, Pauline Hanson. Hayden had praised Hanson as a person of conviction and courage when she won Oxley, and noted that she seemed to support the constitutional monarchy "God bless her". This appears to stick in the craw of Hayden's old political friends, who have insisted that he distance himself from Hanson.

Hayden has proposed the establishment of a panel of "eminent persons" who might ritually condemn Hanson's views and pave the way for her defeat in Oxley.

However, Bill Hayden himself appears to be irritated that his credentials should be challenged by the politically correct, and responded with a letter to the editor of *The Australian* (28/5/97) in which he again assaults the republicans. His views should be placed on the record:

"One of my major violations against reigning correct political standards . . . is, apparently, to have offended the Australian Republican Movement with some pro-monarchist comment. Well, in that case they will be ropeable should there be a referendum on a republic. Then I will be out on the hustings energetically opposing their case. I have never been a supporter of their views. It is not, not yet anyway, against the law to disagree with them, although some of their members have a tendency to act as if disagreement should be a punishable offence . . ."

Hayden's quirky but rather authoritative views may make him something of a "loose cannon" when the republicans – some of them former colleagues – set about pushing for the abolition of the Crown.