



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.47

December 5th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"Asians do not feel guilty about thinking in racial terms, but they do understand that Westerners, especially Americans, do. They will often use accusations of racism to disarm their Western opponents. The same Japanese politicians who loudly impute racist motives to American racism of Japan believe implicitly that the Japanese are racially superior to Caucasians, and also to their Korean and Chinese neighbours. They would never admit these beliefs to a Westerner, but among Asians, thinking in racial terms is too commonplace to even bother with denial or guilt."*

Chin-ning Chu, *"The Asian Mind Game"*, 1995.

THE MEDIA CRUCIFIXION OF PRINCE CHARLES by Eric D. Butler (*The following reflections are based upon notes compiled during my recent six week tour of Canada and the United Kingdom*):

History records that mass hysteria, manipulated by the media and demagogues, is not the most reliable basis for realistic policy making. It would be instructive to hear from any of those who broke into unprecedented applause following the incredible funeral address by Princess Diana's brother, Earl Spencer, now that the sordid aspects of his treatment of the wife who bore him four children have been publicised. The good Earl suggested in his Diana funeral address that he would be a suitable person to have some say in the bringing up of Prince William and Prince Harry. There is no record of what the Princes' father, and heir to the throne, Prince Charles, thought of this veiled insult. The truth is that Prince Charles has been on the receiving end of a mass media inspired campaign which has as its ultimate objective the destruction of the institution of Constitutional Monarchy. And, as the saga of Princess Diana becomes more objectively assessed, it becomes clear that unwittingly she became a victim of that campaign. Basically a simple country girl from Northumberland, growing up in a broken and unhappy family environment, Diana was the product of what one writer has described as a "de-Christianised" generation, cut from its traditional roots and grasping at the symbols of artificially created pop stars. The mass media turned Princess Diana into a type of pop star. This made it easier to criticise Prince Charles who, instead of being photographed rushing around hugging politically correct causes like the AIDS victims of homosexual activities, was quietly going about his many public duties, including support for dozens of little-known charities, and occasionally trying to encourage higher educational and cultural standards. Both in Canada and the USA I noted with interest the more objective comments on the Princess Diana saga, including those in the conservative Roman Catholic paper, *The Wanderer*, by well known columnist Sobran. His views were echoed by Ted Byfield, prominent Western Canadian Anglo-Catholic associated with two Western Canadian high quality journals. Byfield writes of his attempt to discover what produced the Princess Diana saga. Answering the question of did Diana deserve to be idolised, Byfield points out that the Pope had hugged AIDS victims long before Diana appeared. Byfield comments, after listing what she did, that "lending your name to various politically correct causes and being photographed in support of them does not really make you into a Joan of Arc. Dying in a booze-caused car wreck after dining at the Ritz with an international playboy lover does not quite equate with being burned at the stake . . . There must be better explanations for the idolisation of Diana".

Byfield makes a comment which echoes that of other perceptive Christian-oriented commentators: "People need heroes and the 'me' generation isn't very good at producing them. So they have to settle for celebrities instead, a very different phenomenon. Diana is not another Madam Curie or an Edith Cavell: she is another

Elvis Presley or Marilyn Monroe, revered not for what they actually did but for what they stood for, chiefly defiance of convention and moral authority." The real tragedy of Princess Diana was further highlighted with the revelation by Andrew Mortimer, author of the first book which allegedly revealed the shocking way in which Diana was being treated by her husband, that it was Diana herself who provided the material for the book through a go-between. Mortimer, typical of his kind, made a fortune out of the book which was then sensationally serialised through Rupert Murdoch's anti-Monarchy media. This was meat and drink to the Republican revolutionaries everywhere. A few of the more responsible journalists have now come forward to reveal that Princess Diana, clearly advised by those with a grudge against Prince Charles, had been secretly attempting to manipulate the media. Princess Diana foolishly allowed herself to be used to foster the view that Prince Charles was not fit to be King. Through all this an occasional ray of sanity emerged. Probably the most objective and responsible piece of journalism came from Australian Clive James, who knows Prince Charles personally. James, a most perceptive commentator, was also kind to Princess Diana, admitting, like many others, that he "loved" her – but clearly with reservations. The writer cannot claim to have met Prince Charles, but he is privileged to have met several who have worked with the Prince, one being engaged with Prince Charles in the field of architecture. "You get what you see with the Prince," he said. He shared the Prince's horror of the vulgarity of much of modern architecture. A most realistic assessment of Prince Charles is provided by one of Australia's most distinguished Ambassadors, Sir Walter Crocker, in his introduction to *The People's Prince*, a selection of some of the wide ranging number of addresses Prince Charles has given over the years. It is depressing to find well meaning people who have never actually read what Charles has said, and who repeat absurd nonsense about the man. He has managed to turn the tide against him, particularly in the more responsible British media, with his recent visit to South Africa, where he delivered a brilliant address in Swaziland on the value of heritage and tradition. This address was, naturally enough, warmly welcomed in an African nation which remains a Monarchy. Not without significance, Swaziland remains one of the most stable nations in "liberated" Africa. Prince Charles stressed that respect for heritage and tradition did not mean opposition to change. This is a balanced view.

Demonstrating that he is basically a civilised and decent man, Prince Charles while in South Africa paid a tribute to the "good works" of Princess Diana. So far from lacking in leadership qualities, Prince Charles played a major role in the crisis precipitated by Diana's death. It has been revealed that he graded the importance of bending protocol to meet what was obviously a critical and dangerous situation. He also showed great moral courage in a situation which, under the pressure of a mass hysteria generated by sections of the media, could have exploded. It was Prince Charles who insisted, in face of opposition from Buckingham Palace, that the flag at the Palace should be lowered to half mast.

There is growing evidence that in many fields, including that of alternative medicine, organic farming, and the recycling of human wastes, that it is being conceded that Prince Charles is being proved a man ahead of his time. One headline from the British press reads, CHARLES' SUPPORT PUTS HOMEOPATHY IN MAINSTREAM. He has been criticised for devoting time to trying to bring ethnic minorities into the mainstream of British life. But it was the politicians who in the past have created the problem. The heir to the throne clearly is trying to ascertain how he can preside over a multicultural society he did not create. His constructive approach to the best elements in the world of Islam is one of statesmanship in the dangerous world of today.

As the world moves further away from the Princess Diana saga, it is important that the right questions are asked about how such a disaster happened. The short answer is, of course, that Princess Diana was a victim of a world which has turned its back on a traditional value system which in the past provided some stability and hope for the future. Diana was swept away by those forces which saw her youthful beauty primarily as something to be exploited in the interests of purposes she could not be expected to understand. Perhaps it was symbolic of the reality of the situation that at her funeral the media attempted to feature the central role of the well known sodomite Elton John, who attended with his "companion", to offer a revamped version of a song he wrote for actress Marilyn Monroe, a physically beautiful but tragic figure who was also turned into a cult figure before taking her own life. Marilyn Monroe had been unscrupulously used by rich and powerful people, including President John Kennedy, before being driven to her tragic end.

If the real lessons of the Princess Diana saga are heeded, then the woman who gave birth to the next heir to the throne has not died in vain. Those who wish to support the Constitutional Monarchy should heed the real lessons of Princess Diana's life in order that they can more ably combat those evil forces which seek to bring a great heritage to an end.

WIK FUSE CONTINUES TO SMOULDER by David Thompson:

In the Aussie vernacular, Prime Minister Howard is "on a hiding to nothing" with his native title amendments, known as the Wik Bill. The confluence of trendy social figures, city-dominated press monopolies, and opportunistic "aboriginal" interests ensure that Howard will be forced to bear a heavy electoral burden whether the Bill passes the Parliament or not. Perhaps the main reason Howard just can't win on aboriginal issues has yet to be spelt out. There is no way of knowing whether Howard himself is even aware of it.

In his address to the nation last Sunday, the Prime Minister earnestly declared that he and his colleagues in government were committed to "full reconciliation" by the centenary of federation, and implied that nothing less will do. But what does "full reconciliation" actually mean?

The former federal Member for Griffith, the late Arthur Chresby, an analyst in constitutional law and Social Creditor, wrote extensively on political strategy, tactics and organisation. In an address he gave in January 1996, titled "*How to Get What You Want*", Chresby dealt with three scientific principles of making a demand. In this case, Chresby was applying the principles to making a demand on electoral representatives in Parliament, but the demands of the aboriginal industry, being served upon the Parliament, work on the same principle.

Chresby's three scientific principles that must be embodied in any successful demand upon the Parliament are:

1. Is the demand something which everybody really wants?
2. Not only is it something which everybody really wants, but is it something that everybody is quite determined to get?
3. Is it something that, when they have got it, they will be able to recognise whether or not they have got it, without having to ask anybody else to interpret the result for them?

The latter principle is the reason that "aboriginal reconciliation" is such an immense problem for Mr Howard. *Who is to say* what "reconciliation" actually is, and even more important, when it has finally been achieved? Because of the bleeding-heart morality of the aboriginal issue, it is almost certain that so long as there is a single "aboriginal" voice of significant volume continuing to make demands, then "reconciliation" has not been achieved. What an open-ended treasure chest for those with the determination (and some vague claim to aboriginality) to exploit it!

In the same way that the arbiters of what is "anti-Semitic" and what is not are exclusively Jewish, so the sole arbiters of what constitutes "reconciliation" are the aboriginal activists who have successfully positioned themselves at the centre of the debate. The fact that the "aboriginal" voices are generally strident, and the demands high, is a function of the press. On the principle that controversy sells papers or air-time, the press prefer the dramatic.

One of Howard's problems is that where reconciliation is concerned, the goal-posts keep shifting. The coterie of part-aboriginal activists who monopolise the sympathy of urban Australians will not define what "reconciliation" eventually is for two reasons.

The first is that Australians really are extraordinarily tolerant. Over time, circumstance and fortune could deliver vast advantages to "indigenous" interests, so the activists refrain from identifying modest, reasonable objectives for fear that they might limit their opportunities for future power, money and *influence* unnecessarily.

The second reason that reconciliation has never been defined is that the activists know very well that if they ask for *everything* they want in the long term (sovereign ownership status, compensation for historical affronts, a separate black state, etc) it would produce such a violent backlash that even modest gains would be much harder to achieve. Much better to continue with a new demand after the previous one has been met for as long as tolerance will permit. When the limits to tolerance have been tested, shout as loudly as possible that Australians are intolerant and "racist", until the process of gradualism can resume.

THE FREEHOLD TITLE ISSUE: Howard's Ministers have been vigorously accused of "scare-mongering" having called into question the status of freehold title in the context of the High Court's Wik decision. But given the unpredictable decisions coming from the High Court, it is quite valid to raise this issue. We should not forget that most of Keating's Ministers (if not all) fully believed that leasehold title extinguished native title, and were given a rude shock by the Court in its Wik ruling.

It should be noted that Howard's colleagues are not claiming that freehold title is vulnerable to a *successful* native title claim. But they are saying that *native title over freehold has never been tested* in the High Court.

Everyone believes freehold to be secure, but until it is tested, this is not *certain*.

One journalist who covers High Court issues competently for *The Australian*, Bernard Lane, points out that Chief Justice Brennan offers some comfort to the view that the security of freehold title is no longer clear. Brennan was a minority dissenter in the Wik case, because he believed that the Wik decision contradicted the Mabo decision. His view is that if the Wik argument that pastoral leases don't extinguish native title, then why should this not be extended to freehold? Lane writes:

"Under a tradition of land law going back to feudal England, the issue of a lease by the Crown has effects that leave no room for any native title. But the majority judges agreed it was Queensland land statute - not the old English common-law tradition - that revealed the effect of these Queensland pastoral "leases". And the issue of these "bundles of statutory rights" over vast, remote country left room for native title, they held.

"Criticising this dismissal of what he regards as true leases, Brennan says *"it would be equally correct to treat a 'grant of fee simple' not as the grant of a freehold estate held of the Crown, but merely as a larger bundle of statutory rights"*.

"Brennan's point is *not* to suggest native title can also survive freehold but to show the Wik argument against pastoral leases cannot be right." (*The Weekend Australian*, 29/11/97).

All of which illustrates the difficulties facing Howard. The complexities being so difficult to explain, it is a simple matter for the professional activists to reduce the argument to a matter of grubby "racism" on Howard's part.

Recommended reading: *"How to Get What You Want"* by Arthur A. Chresby. Elements of organisation, strategy and tactics as applied to grass-roots political action to break the strangle-hold of party politics. \$5.00, or \$6.00 posted.

WHAT TO DO WITH MAHATHIR? The dominant fear in financial markets now centres on what might happen in Japan if financial institutions begin to unravel. There appears to be every possibility of at least one more major bank collapsing, which would begin to send shock-waves around the globe. One of the few national leaders with any common-sense observations concerning the market volatility is Malaysia's Prime Minister Mahathir.

At the APEC forum Mahathir continued to state his demand for currency trading regulations, warning that the unchecked market forces would result in impoverishment and slavery of entire peoples. This could already be taking place in poorer Asian countries. Already reports are leaking out of the Philippines, not carried by the major press, that since the peso collapsed, businesses are closing, food distribution systems are breaking down, and desperate people unable to provide for themselves.

Mahathir's views run right against the policies adopted by most other regional nations, and are certainly rejected by Australia's government. Lkening the powers of the free market to the evils of communist economies, he points out that currency traders in charge of almost unlimited funds can bludgeon countries like Malaysia into submission. "Two decades of growth was wiped out in two weeks. For four of these (East Asian) countries, the loss in purchasing power totals almost \$300 billion. Vibrant economies have been reduced to begging for aid from the IMF. . .

"Power corrupts. As much as government can become corrupt when invested with absolute power, markets also can become corrupt when equally absolutely powerful. We are seeing the effect of that absolute power today, the impoverishment and misery of millions of people and their eventual slavery.

Mahathir pointed out that international trading was regulated in all sorts of ways, but for some reason "currency trading is regarded as beyond regulation", with the volume of currency traded each year being 20 times greater than trade in goods and services.

While other APEC leaders at Vancouver distanced themselves from Mahathir's comments on currency trading, it is clear that they have no answer to the problem, except more of the same medicine - even fewer trading barriers of any sort. This is the IMF policy, and it is the IMF - the treasury of the emerging world government - that is imposing such measures on problem economies. Mahathir has much sympathy among regional leaders in private, and at the grass-roots of Asian countries, but the power to act is now with the IMF.

Recommended reading: *"Economic Rationalism - a Disaster for Australia"*, by Graham Strachan. \$12.00 from all League bookservices.