



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.38, No.34

September 6th, 2002

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"Wilfred Owen, a young poet who died in the First World War, expressed, as a poet should, the thoughts and feelings which have driven to despair many of the finest not only of his own generation, but of all those that have followed: 'Was it for this the clay grew tall? – O What made fatuous sunbeams toil – To break earth's peace at all?'"*

What then is it that is driving us to despair? Not the real world: the sunlight or the starlight, the plants in our garden or the sheep on the hill. These we turn to... as a part of God's Creation, and therefore both good and real. No! the despair comes from a world of unreality imposed upon our souls by those who control the electronic impulses which have suddenly pervaded our lives in this country. And this imposed world is increasingly and mostly oriented towards evil, that is the rejection or denial of the good... we should face away from them, towards the real, glorious and overwhelming facts of the living Creation..."

"The Local World" by Geoffrey Dobbs in Home Quarterly, August 1995

MULTICULTURALISM UNRAVELS by Jeremy Lee:

The fanciful idea of viable multicultural societies is being exposed and destroyed by reality. There is no such thing as a successful society which accommodates a multitude of philosophies and religions. The break-point comes when religious belief is put into practice in the form of law. Unless made practical in a way of life, religion remains no more than an abstract idea. Sooner or later it dies – or else spills over into the way people relate and govern themselves.

A little common sense will acknowledge this. What is really happening is the eradication of traditional beliefs, and their resultant legal provisions, by a new religion, Humanism. Humanism has been described as a religion by the US Supreme Court. But it denies the Supernatural. The Humanist Manifesto II, published in 1973, made this quite clear: *"... We find insufficient evidence for belief in the existence of a supernatural; it is either meaningless or irrelevant in the question of the survival and fulfilment of the human race. As non-theists, we begin with humans not God, nature not deity ...we can discover no divine purpose for the human species"*

All policies come from philosophies, as Douglas so accurately pointed out. How does a society survive when different faiths advocate different norms? One faith, for instance, may urge polygamy, while another espouses monogamy. One may see vengeance as justice, while another believes in mercy. Even the clothes we wear are signs of cultural difference. In Britain, for instance, there have

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought for the Week* • *Multiculturalism Unravels* • *Australia's Back Door* • *Growing Backlash* • *Justice Is A Trial* • *Death By GM?* • *Peter Lewis Says Three Conventions Are Needed*

been heated arguments as to whether Islamic policemen should be allowed to keep their turbans instead of helmets. Now we have an Islamic movement within the British police which see wearing the Crown – to whom they are supposed to give their allegiance – as against their religion.

One cannot even play a game of cricket unless there is agreement on the rules and acceptance of the umpire.

Britain is now facing an invasion, not only of other races, but an explosion of cultures which endanger Common Law and the traditional way of life. A special article in *The Times* (UK), August 7th, 2002, said: *"The unprecedented wave of immigration from the poor world to Britain is leading to huge and rapidly growing communities from almost every Third World country. There are a million Indians, almost 700,000 Pakistanis, 260,000 Bangladeshis, up to a million Nigerians, over 100,000 Iraqis. And numbers are increasing rapidly – in the past five years, while the white population grew by 1 percent, the Bangladeshi community grew by 30 percent, the black African population by 37 percent and the Pakistani community by 13 percent.*

"The number of people allowed to settle permanently in the UK has more than doubled in the past few years, reaching 125,000 in 2000 – almost all from the Third World and Eastern Europe.The route of entry is irrelevant. Whether it is usually-unfounded-and-never-get-deported asylum, arranged marriages, bringing over parents, grandparents, children or fiancés, holiday visas that mean never going home, temporary work visas that inevitably lead to citizenship five years down the line, or simply a clandestine ride on the back of a lorry, the effect is the same. Almost all are certain to stay....

"....what is happening now is the result of sustained migration pressure the likes of which the world has never seen before. For the first time, the world has huge disparities of wealth, widespread knowledge in the poor world of how the rich world lives and how to get there through TV and global telecommunications, and cheap, quick worldwide transport. It is easier for them to get here, and far more difficult to make them leave: the revolution in 'human rights' means that as soon as anyone gets past passport control they are pretty much guaranteed to stay. More than 47,000 illegal immigrants were detected in 2000, but just 6,000 were sent home

"Nor are the British people giving their consent: survey after survey shows that the large majority of British people – including around half of ethnic minorities – think there is too much immigration to Britain; but fear of accusations of racism and the power of the immigration lobby means that no mainstream political party dare reflect public opinion"

AUSTRALIA'S BACK DOOR: While, through the efforts of Immigration Minister Ruddock, the flow of illegal boat people has been staunched for the moment, there seems to be a mass of unguarded entry points yet to be addressed. An article from a New Zealand paper, *The Ashburton Guardian* (2/8/02), headed CONCERNS RAISED NZ IS 'BACK DOOR ENTRY' TO AUSTRALIA FOR REFUGEES, said: *"...New Zealand has had a net loss of immigrants in the past few years with large numbers moving out of New Zealand In the past immigrants had moved to New Zealand, only to move to Australia once they had gained New Zealand residency In Christchurch refugees are reported to be leaving in droves. About half of Christchurch's Somali community, which numbered more than 500 in 2000 have crossed the Tasman, Refugee and Resettlement Support said.*

"Manager Felicite Jardine said some of the 200 or so who were left intend to follow and even recent Afghan refugees who had yet to get their New Zealand citizenship have signalled that they too will move to Australia. The trend is not new but appears to have been spurred by recent legislative change in Australia. The Australian Government last year cut permanent residency rights for New Zealanders, putting them on the same footing as other migrants. The change was made partly to address concerns that New Zealand was a 'back-door' entry to Australia after it was revealed that one in three New

Zealanders emigrating to Australia was not born here. Ms. Jardine confirmed that there was a 'significant exodus' of refugees from Christchurch and other New Zealand main centres last year, just before the rules changed. 'Hundreds of people went last year.' Refugees traditionally moved across the Tasman once they gained their New Zealand citizenship, she said.

"The Cambodian community, once about 1,200, now numbered fewer than 500 after many refugees and their families moved to Australia. 'Employment opportunities are better and it's a more multicultural country,' she said."

GROWING BACKLASH: As more and more experience first hand the pain that oozes from forced multiculturalism, the muted grumbling grows louder and finally breaks into the open. A new movement in Britain, Migration Watch UK, has caused heated debate in the UK. Its leader, Dr. Coleman, recently claimed Australia's asylum policy was the best way to handle mass people movements within the terms of the Geneva Convention. *The Australian Financial Review* (26/8/02) reported: "... Dr. Coleman, who is a reader in demography at Oxford University, said Australia's asylum-seeker stance 'seems by far the best way to do it ..' ...and described Australia's policy of mandatory detention as 'utterly unobjectionable'.

"... 'If you permit people to claim residency simply by uttering the magic word 'asylum', you will become a magnet [to illegal immigrants] and the idea that you can then sort them out is just a mirage,' he said....."

Dr. Coleman recently addressed a closed-door seminar on the subject, attended by Mr Ruddock.

JUSTICE IS A TRIAL: A little bit of our robust Foreign Affairs Minister Alexander ("Eiderdown") Downer seems to have rubbed off on President George Bush. According to *The Australian* (28/8/02): "The US is pressuring Australia to sign an agreement promising it would never hand over Americans to the new International Criminal Court.

"The proposed bilateral pact is part of an aggressive global push by the US – backed by threats of sanctions – to prevent its troops being hauled in front of the court for war crimes without Washington's approval.

"But any decision by the Howard government to sign such an agreement would be condemned by human rights groups as undermining the integrity of the ICC, of which Australia is a founding member"

It was Downer who suggested, during debate on the Treaty in Parliament, that Australia would add a rider excluding Australian troops from prosecution in the Court he was advocating. "Liability for other nations, but not for ourselves" seemed to be his illogical argument.

The US hasn't even signed the Treaty, but obviously fears that past or future actions could be interpreted as "war-crimes". So it proposes "sanctions" against those who might contemplate arraigning Americans – Bush, Cheney, Wolfowitz, Perle, Rumsvelt, or the startling Condoleeza Rice – before such a court.

What sanctions might the US take? Stopping our lamb-sales to the Americans? Banning Australian steel? Or even accusing Alexander Eiderdown with war crimes himself?

We can think of a few who might join George Bush in his quest for exemption – Robert Mugabe, Ariel Sharon, Idi Amin (who is still living in Saudi Arabia, by the way) as well as Yasser Arafat and Osama bin Laden.

If only Gilbert and Sullivan were still alive!

DEATH BY GM? There are now 14 million starving people in Africa, as a result of the combination of drought and disastrous government. The worst is in Zimbabwe, where Mugabe seems prepared to halve his population by starvation in order to eject the hated white farmers who would otherwise save many of the doomed.

Now Zimbabwe, Zambia and Mozambique are rejecting US food relief, on the grounds that the grain offered is genetically modified.

Three others, Lesotho, Malawi and Swaziland, are swallowing their pride and GM food. It seems to be a case of shot or boiled in oil. But, if your kids are starving to death, it seems a futile choice anyway.

PETER LEWIS SAYS THREE CONVENTIONS ARE NEEDED by Betty Luks:

The Constitutional and Parliamentary Reform Conference set up by the University of Adelaide (August, 17th-18th, 2002) had raised more issues than could be dealt with by a single convention – as originally mooted – says Peter Lewis, Independent Member and Speaker of the Lower House in South Australia's Parliament (Adelaide *Advertiser*, August 19th, 2002).

The Conference certainly lined up some of the legal and constitutional 'big guns', but the man-in-the-street doesn't seem to be having too much of an input.

It is good to know Peter Lewis is emphasizing the fact "The first priority of the convention should be to look at citizen-initiated referenda". He thinks the second priority is the question of the size and the role of Parliament. It would seem the Labor Government tried to take greater control over the convention but Peter stuck to his guns and refused to take a back seat.

The Labor Government has set aside \$570,000 for a single convention to be held in March or April, 2003, but Peter Lewis is calling for at least three conventions backed by a \$2 million budget.

Pleased to see Professor Geoffrey de Q. Walker (author of *"Initiative & Referendum: The People's Law"*) of the Queensland University was one of the speakers. He argued strongly for 'direct democracy' (CIR) for the people, "This system would give back to the people the real power to decide the laws under which they live, free from the interference of lobby groups and party machines." He insisted voters were better educated and informed than in the past and were "no longer willing to assume that politicians know best".

Professor Gerard Carney of Bond University said reforms to parliamentary free speech were needed to discourage politicians from using immunity from prosecution to unfairly defame individuals. "There are no effective safeguards to prevent this occurring when a member is determined, with impunity, to destroy another's reputation at all cost," said Professor Carney.

He called for a parliamentary ethics committee to be established to investigate complaints and advise appropriate sanctions for the "more serious abuses".

Hard pressed to find 'men of honour'! There was a time when a man of honour would not have abused such a privilege! These days we are hard pressed to find such 'men of honour'!

Liberal opposition justice spokesman, Robert Lawson, thought bi-partisan agreement on convention topics was critical to the success of the event.

National Party MP Karlene Maywald thought it necessary to first identify what was wrong with the Parliament before considering reforms.