



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.42, No.9

March 10th, 2006

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Man, seeing himself as part of a "cosmic spiritual drama," and feeling his power to make history, developed an historical and scientific habit of mind; and the fact of a common culture without political or economic uniformity, produced the unique diversity in unity which has been Europe. The trend now is to political and economic uniformity without cultural and spiritual unity... The differences between Christians and Pagans or Moslems had not been one of race or language, but a gulf between two spiritual worlds. The transition had been a change not only of religious beliefs but of laws, customs, art, even a new script...

The secularist tendency of the last three centuries had detached some Christian principles from their context - the rights of man, liberty, equality (before God), social justice; when the lack of an independent basis for these ideas was realised, men turned to nationalism, class, or race, starting a new world of exclusive antagonistic ideologies which undermine the very existence of Western civilisation."

— Sir David Kelly in "The Hungry Sheep", 1955

THE SONG REMAINS THE SAME by Brian Simpson: Clash of Civilisations? What clash of civilisations? Not here in Australia, my multicultural mate! That is the thesis of multiculturalist George Megalogenis. ("Comedy of Terrors", *The Weekend Australian*, 11-12/2/06, p.20). Sure there may be conflict overseas, but Australia has been the real multicultural success story. Wave after wave of migrants has been injected into the Australian population with no problems at all – meaning – that the dominant Anglo-Saxon population has not resorted to violence against them! With such a low standard of success how can one lose? After all, the Anglo Saxons in Australia have accepted the lies about the changing of the White Australia policy. Malcolm Fraser has said that if politicians were open about the abandonment of this policy then we would never have had the Greeks and the Italians here – and where would that have left George?

Megalogenis is not a megagenius to observe that Australia did not experience the riots and murders seen elsewhere in the world. Australia does not have the high concentration of Muslims as France and lacks the hard core extremists that Europe has, or at least in great numbers. Megalogenis claims that the cartoons were published in Australia in Queensland and on Tim Blair's website. However, no Australian newspaper published all the cartoons and Brisbane's *Courier-Mail* printed only one.

The authorities also kept a tight lid on the situation after the Cronulla race riots. (But as a test case, how about *The Australian* newspaper publishing all twelve cartoons on its front page? Let's see what happens then. George could even write the cover story.)

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *The Song Remains The Same* • *Multiculturalism Continues To Crack* • *Terra Nullius, The High Court And Historians*

Megalogenis does not show that Australia's multiculturalism will continue to be a "success" even by his low re-definition of the term. To date Australian elites have got away with their programme of ethnic warfare and racial dilution of the Anglo population by the Fabian socialist strategy of bringing in relatively small numbers per annum of a diverse number of racial and ethnic groups. A divide and conquer strategy. But this situation has changed.

Howard's 'asianisation' of Australia: Under Paul Keating in 1996 Arabs accounted for 7.7 per cent of the annual immigration intake. Under John Howard in 2004-2005 the figure rose to 10.5 per cent. The Howard government has run in its term of office a "Yellow-brown Australia policy" with the Asian component (not counting Middle Easterners) exceeding 70 per cent for most years.**

According to Megalogenis the most efficient weapon available to counter the clash of civilisations is "immigration because there will always be more Muslims queuing for a visa than for a vest of dynamite." That sentiment misses the point: when numbers of an ethnic minority reach a certain poorly defined threshold a quantum change occurs in their group behaviour. This has been seen in Europe where in places like Holland with large Muslim populations there is an emergent demand for Sharia law. As Wassim Doureihi, the Australian spokesman for the radical Islamist group Hizb ut-Tahrir, has said: "There is no possibility of harmonious co-existence between Islam and the West because there is a fundamental conflict. Ultimately one has to prevail."

Megalogenis' multiculturalism is incapable of dealing with groups who reject multiculturalism, the rule of law and Enlightenment values. His only "solution" is to replicate the conflict witnessed elsewhere by advocating even more immigration. This is a form of multiculturalism which is truly "fundamentalist" and irrational: cure the disease by administering more poison!

**** SPECIAL THREE-IN-ONE *New Times Survey* PACK – \$3.00 POSTED:** Australians need to understand the elitists' goal of diluting the racial mix of the Australian people in order to fit us into their New World Order. Three issues of the *New Times Survey* are being offered for the price of one:

- "Racial Treason: From White Australia Policy to Yellow Australia Policy"
- "China-Threat: Yellow Peril Revisited"
- "It's Time: For a New Anti-Immigration Movement in Australia".

N.T.S. Special Pack available only from Box 1052, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001. Price: \$3.00 posted.

MULTICULTURALISM CONTINUES TO CRACK by James Reed: The Cronulla race riots and now the "cartoon crisis" – multiculturalism has taken a beating and this is early days yet! What will the world be like when (not if) an Islamist terrorist atomic bomb vaporises New York (said by terrorist experts to be their most likely target)? Will a nuclear armed Iran level Israel and make Europe glow with the fall out? Such questions are no longer the domain of paranoid cranks, but are real and troublesome issues worrying security experts.

Destruction by terrorist weapons of mass destruction is balanced on the scale of terror by weapons of multicultural destruction, which can equally as effectively level a society and civilisation. The elites and new class are starting to get worried about multiculturalism. For example, *The Australian*, 10/12/06, p.6, features two articles from surprising sources which indicate some shift of ground.

Tim Costello, a well known supporter of most things I hate, although arguing that the "cartoonist crisis" is not an argument to show that Muslims aren't ready for democracy, says something very important about freedom of speech:

"Free speech and free press are only free if that freedom includes the freedom to be offensive and irresponsible. Sure they can and should be criticised if they are either or both, but that does not mean they cannot publish what they want."

"That there are limits to this is obvious, but they are extremely narrow. Vilification, even hateful,

racist, sexist or religious vilification, should not be an offence in my view. Nor should Holocaust denial."

A brave defence of free speech indeed but not one likely to make the Zionist lobby happy.

Queensland State Labor M.P.s., Rachel Nolan, Andrew McNamara and Craig Wallace put it bluntly in their article "Foster National Values, Ditch Multiculturalism". They say that the "abuse of bikini-clad women by Muslim men on Sydney beaches has brought the clash of cultures much closer to our suburban homes". Multiculturalism is a policy "that pushes acceptance of difference as an end in itself" and this is "a hopelessly inadequate moral and cultural guide". Further, it "is completely unable to deal with ethnic cultures that won't implicitly accept Australia's core values." This was essentially the critique of multiculturalism which Professor Blainey and other conservatives made in the 1980s.

Superficially though, these Labor M.P.s. go on to say that the ethnically diverse U.S. "has no real fear of a home-grown terrorist blowing up a train" because of an integration of migrants into core cultural/national values. Now, although this is better than multiculturalism, it is still, in my opinion, no cast iron protection from terrorism. Have they forgotten that a White man Tim McVeigh (allegedly – there are a lot of conspiracy theories on this) blew up a federal building in Oklahoma City and McVeigh was a brave soldier and patriot?

All that said and done, it is an eye-opener to see the conservative critique of multiculturalism now being made by members of the Australian left.

TERRA NULLIUS, THE HIGH COURT AND HISTORIANS – taken from an article by David Flint, Australians for Constitutional Monarchy: "Mabo was an extraordinary case both as to its conclusion, and the process the judges adopted in coming to their decision in a case apparently limited to the rights of certain Torres Straits Islanders, who were not nomads. The judges, or at least a majority of them, did their own research, apparently relying on historical texts which O'Connor says are wrong.

Alone, Sir Daryl Dawson said that Aboriginal land rights were a matter for legislation, not for judicial interpretation.

(Mabo decided that native title survived the British acquisition in relation to land the Crown had not alienated by way of grants. It therefore seemed to affect Crown land only. This was dramatically extended in the Wik Case, where the Court was almost evenly balanced, 4:3. There the Court held that native title existed not only on Crown land, but also co-existed with leasehold title held principally by farmers. This led to hotly debated changes to the native titles' legislation which had been introduced by the Keating Government as a result of Mabo).

Since the case, it has been widely accepted that *terra nullius* was the defining doctrine used by the British both to justify their acquisition of Australia and the system of land law they introduced. This assumed all land was vested in the Crown, which could then make grants to the settlers.

The orthodox view today in the schools and universities is that the High Court has conclusively demonstrated that the British were in error in determining that Australia was *terra nullius*, and that accordingly the birth of our nation, almost alone in the world, is legally tainted.

The High Court did not rule that the acquisition was illegal – it could not. Its own authority ultimately derived from the settlement. But its conclusion that the British were wrong to assume that Australia was *terra nullius* and that no land rights survived has led establishment historians to come to this conclusion.

Terra Nullius invention: Michael Connor argues that all this is based on a judicial fallacy. In his new

book, *"The Invention of Terra Nullius"* (Macleay Books, 2005), Connor claims that *terra nullius* was surreptitiously introduced into political and legal debate as recently as the 1970s.

Most of the original owners or occupiers of land across the world have been dispossessed by their successors. This is true on all continents. As international law developed, the right of a state to annex territory came to be limited, particularly in the twentieth century.

Mabo 'hangs on' international law at time of settlement: But the Mabo case hangs on the state of international law, not today, but at the time of the settlement. At that time, a state could, under international law, annex territory, occupied or not. **The concept of *terra nullius*, the right of a state to occupy land without a sovereign, peopled or not, arose well after the settlement.**

Hence the British made no judgement as to whether or not Australia constituted *terra nullius*; they had not heard of such a concept because it did not exist. *The Australian* asked me to write on this, my piece appearing on 10 February, 2006: http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/common/story_page/0,5744,18096939%255E7583,00.html (Note that the internet version contains a minor misprint in transposing the French term *territoire sans maître*)

Not everyone will agree with Michael Connor, or indeed with my conclusions, which of course are not A.C.M's. The historical question is whether the British, as the basis of their acquisition, and for the purposes of land law, determined Australia to be *terra nullius*? After all, that is the 'received truth' which is being taught today.

There is no evidence that they did.

This has nothing to do with the compelling argument that Aboriginal Australians are entitled to the same rights and opportunities as all other Australians. Nor is it a critique of the early administrators, who were, by the standards of the time enlightened – and instructed to be enlightened by the Colonial Office – in the treatment of the indigenous people.

This is not just an academic argument.

Since Mabo, the suggestion is that the birth of our nation, unlike the acquisition of just about every other square inch of the earth, was somehow tainted under the law of nations, international law then prevailing. This is not so.

Almost alone among the nations, a considerable proportion of the people and especially our youth, have been taught and are being taught to labour under a burden of guilt about the birth of Australia. If this is based on a fallacy, as I think Connor clearly demonstrates, this burden should be lifted. (There may be a legal consequence for those deleteriously affected by Mabo, which I mention in my piece). At the very least, the schools and universities, and the media are under an ethical obligation to ensure Australians and foreign scholars are at least aware of Connor's thesis.

May we expect scholars such as Michael Connor and Keith Windschuttle to be, say, ABC Boyer lecturers, in the coming years? Will they be offered platforms in our universities and on our public broadcasters. Most importantly, will their works be prescribed as a text or reference by academia? Rather, I suspect these works will be proscribed both by the media and the academy, with certain honourable exceptions. And I repeat, less there be any misunderstanding, acceptance of Connor's argument does not mean, and should not be taken to mean, that the nation should not continue to address the discrepancy in the living standards of the indigenous people." (emphasis added...ed)

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.
Subscription \$40.00 p.a.