



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.43, No.27

July 13th, 2007

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Political leaders who are ready to obtain their country's entry into war by facilitating an enemy attack on it cannot be depended on to wage it in the national interest... Admiral Kimmel and General Short... were retired to conceal from the public... the true source of responsibility for the disaster at Pearl Harbour... Their operations had to conform to some higher plan, the nature of which they could not plainly perceive, but which was patently not that, of military victory in the national interest, taught to them from their earliest days as the sole reason for a soldier's being..."

– Douglas Reed in *"The Controversy of Zion"*, 1978

THE HIGH COURT DOES IT AGAIN by Ian Wilson LL.B: The High Court of Australia has done precious little to preserve Federalism and our freedoms. Over a century it has delivered judgment after judgment which centralised power in Canberra, and eroded the power of the States. It has acted completely contrary to the spirit of the Founding Fathers of the Constitution. Recently it has acted to have a chilling effect on free speech in Australia, when it decided in a defamation case involving a restaurant review by a *Sydney Morning Herald* food critic, which a New South Wales jury found was not defamatory, was in fact defamatory. The case in question is John Fairfax Publications Pty. Ltd. v Gacic [2007] HCA 28 (14 June 2007).

Janet Albrechtsen (*The Australian*, 20/6/07, p.12) points out that two leading so-called conservative judges, simply found that it was pointless to send the matter back to a jury, because a jury might find that defamation did not occur, and they were certain that it had! Presumably the standards of the community were irrelevant to the matter: but from my recollections of defamation one of the essential elements is a lowering of one's image in the eyes of the community.

This disdain for juries is symptom of a deeper philosophical problem: that unelected judges make law and effectively contribute to government, without the democratic checks and balances. It is in my opinion, a fundamental contradiction in our system of government, but the problem is seldom recognised.

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL INSANITY OF REFUGEEISM by James Reed: A friend received an e-mail which had an article "African Refugees = 300 million dollars drain on the Australian taxpayer". The article went on to state: "A senior management-employee from Centreline (Centrelink?) allowed myself and two other people to view an internal document pertaining to the cost, which

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *The High Court Does It Again* • *The Economic And Social Insanity Of Refugeeism* • *Prince William As Governor-General?* • *Tonal Languages And Racial Development*

African refugees burden the Australian taxpayer with. In all, "the conservative estimate" for the privilege of being burdened with African refugees, is set around 300 million dollars a year!

"This figure is arrived at by accruing medical, housing, education costs and welfare payments, which is calculated at \$8,750, an average, per refugee, multiplied by the 34,000 African refugees unable to support themselves."

This raises the issue of the enormous cost the entire post-World War II refugee programme has had on Australia. Politically, refugees have been used as testing grounds for the next wave of a racial or ethnic type. Thus Vietnamese refugees ultimately led to large scale Asian immigration. From the post-World War II migration of the Mediterranean groups, we now have Melbourne as the largest Greek city outside of Greece and Australia as the No.2 most "multicultural" nation on earth. What is wrong with this picture? The U.N. 1951 Refugees Convention has been used by the ruling elites in a programme of racial and demographic engineering.

As documented in this journal, newspapers now joyfully write in their editorial pages about the death of Anglo-Saxon Australia. They celebrate this demographic displacement of a people and the transformation of a nation as a good thing, whilst inconsistently lamenting in the next breath about the sad displacement of the Aborigines by "the British".

Refugeeism, the cult of taking in people at the first sign of trouble, has to be abandoned in a world awash with "refugees". At best, the massive numbers of refugees which we take in is but a token gesture to make puffed-up intellectuals feel less guilty on pay-day.

If refugees are to continue to come to Australia, let them be fully paid for by the dollars of these same self-indulgent intellectuals from their own pay-cheques. How many do you think would then be admitted?

PRINCE WILLIAM AS GOVERNOR-GENERAL? *David Flint's Opinion Column: Governors-General, Royalty and Citizenship:* The story about Prince Williams wish to become Governor-General is from the pen of a fashion journalist, not first hand and therefore of doubtful authenticity. But it must have worried republicans. Having no idea how to revive their taxpayer-funded project, the republican movement is clearly demoralised. They realise that the appointment of a young handsome prince to Canberra would be resoundingly popular and strengthen support for the constitutional monarchy, which has been increasing anyway. In the same way they are frightened by the prospect of one of the Royal Princes marrying an Australian or New Zealander. Some are worried about the reaction when either marries. They know Australians aren't interested in some republican bash even if it is candelabra lit and in a five star hotel, but they are very interested in our – let me stress - our Royal Family.

Crowd control would be needed: As I told those journalists who asked me on Friday, 29 June, 2007, if the Prince were appointed, there would have to be ways found to control the crowds of admirers, and the media of the world would be fascinated in a way they have never been by the Australian Governor-General. And he would have handled the job superbly. After all, would he not have a direct line for advice to the world's most respected practitioner of the art of ruling, his grandmother, and our beloved monarch, Queen Elizabeth II.

Every young person I spoke to or heard on Friday approved the appointment, and many were excited about the prospect.

Of course it was not going to happen even if a prime minister recommended it. The palace would no doubt insist that it be bipartisan, and that there be some guarantee that the appalling behaviour of our politicians in 1975 and subsequently in blaming the Governor-General and the system for their own behaviour in bringing our country to the brink.

Unbelievably, the principal beneficiary, Malcolm Fraser, later joined in, and converted to republicanism, thus abjuring his support for the Crown and, incidentally, for Australians for Constitutional Monarchy where he is recorded as a supporter. He claimed the dismissal would not happen under the 1999 politician's republic, which was too true. Gough Whitlam would have sacked the President first. But he still would not have had supply, unless Mr. Whitlam had proceeded with the proposal to ignore the Senate, which would have been a dangerous revolutionary act.

Author of "Mate for Head of State" campaign joins in: "How very good to see the Prime Minister and Opposition Leader so quickly agree last week that, in the 21st century, the idea of Prince William as our governor-general will not fly. Still, this just wasn't good enough for Professor David Flint of Australians for Constitutional Fairytales" wrote Peter FitzSimon in his column in the *Sun Herald* on 1 July, 2007.

He will be remembered as the author of the failed Mate for Head of State campaign.

Mr. FitzSimon selected the following of my comments on the recent media story about Prince William: "The appointment of Prince William would be very popular and attract international attention. Unfortunately, the disgraceful, appalling behaviour of some of our leading politicians - all republicans has ensured it won't happen."

He commented: "Seriously, does anyone have the first CLUE as to what on earth he is talking about? He makes it sound like some of our pollies were caught weeing in the dahlias at Buckingham palace, with Sweaty Betty so annoyed she won't send us her grandson. But, as far as I know, this is not what happened. "Seriously, professor, please advise. Name names! Dish the dirt! What politicians are you talking about, and what have they done that has denied us the opportunity to grovel before a 25-year-old Englishman?"

Accordingly, on the same day, Sunday, 1 July, 2007, I sent the following e-mail to: shletters@mail.fairfax.com.au

"Dear Editor, Peter FitzSimons (1/7) demands that I name the politicians whose" appalling behaviour" I said would make it difficult to appoint Prince William as governor-general, however popular that would be. I assume he took the extract he used from the site www.norepublic.com.au, about which he has previously complained. That spells out the fact that Gough Whitlam and Malcolm Fraser, who together brought on the political crisis in 1975, blamed the umpire and the political system for the consequences of their own action. One way to avoid a repetition of 1975 would be to allow the people the democratic right to petition for a recall election, which exists in parts of the U.S., Canada and in Switzerland.

And why does Mr. FitzSimon stoop to name calling when he refers to our 81-year-old Sovereign? This in a lout would be unacceptable; in a mature columnist of a leading newspaper it is appalling. — David Flint, Australians for Constitutional Monarchy, etc."

The politicians and citizenship: Now as to the condition of having Australian citizenship, the only conclusion we can make about that is that the politicians seem intent on devaluing it. A former Labor Minister of Immigration, the Hon. Chris Hurford says that both sides have abandoned proper standards in selecting immigrants, a point we took up in our submission of November, 2006 on the proposed citizenship test.

This failing was amply demonstrated recently when the cabinet papers of the Fraser government were released. In *"Among the Barbarians: the Dividing of Australia"* (Random House, 1998), Paul Sheehan argued, convincingly, that during the Hawke and Keating governments, the Labor Party had at times used the immigration selection process to provide electoral fodder for Labor.

Mr. Howard's republican predecessor, Paul Keating, still refuses to explain his role in clearing the path for the then to be deported Sheik Taj el-Din al Hilaly to stay here and become a citizen...

Just this year Parliament has once again made it even easier to become an Australian citizen. And if citizenship is a technical barrier to vice-regal appointment, the Danes have a solution. Immediately before Princess Mary married Crown Prince Christian, she was made a Danish citizen – by Act of Parliament...

But to return to Prince William: there was no need for the Prime Minister to say he would never recommend the Prince. There was no need to announce that as a reaction to a socialite journalist's book. Why allows the world's media to conclude the Prince is unwelcome here? There is after all no rule against such an appointment. The Prince is in line to become the King of Australia and as such he will be Australian.

The media also reported the *bon mots* of Mr. Kevin Rudd, the Leader, who, let us recall, the Leader of Her Majesty's Australian Opposition. (That serves to remind him and all politicians that they are under the Crown, as trustee for the people, and that they are not our masters.) Mr. Rudd reacted to the suggestion in jest, saying: "I think it would be party, party, party out at Yarralumla, wouldn't it?" Mr. Rudd then observed, gratuitously: "There is a great place for British royals, and it's in Britain." He added a curious remark – that Australians are better at exporting royals, such as the Crown Princess of Denmark, rather than importing them. This may not have helped Mr. Rudd. One reader of this column wrote to me to say that he had had a call "from a 'swinging voter' saying that they will be 'sticking with Mr. Howard' because of Mr. Rudd's dismissive comments about Prince William becoming Governor-General and the way Rudd laughed it off in such an arrogant fashion and declared he was a republican."

In any event I think most Australians will be disappointed by the way in which both political leaders reacted to the ramblings of a socialite journalist in a book she is determined to launch into the best seller lists. The standing of the politicians was, however, saved by the much attacked Health Minister, Tony Abbott, whom News Limited reported as saying: "I think it's great that Prince William wants to be involved with Australia, I think that the monarchy has been very important to this country. I think it's very good that we've got a connection with the Crown and I'm pleased that Prince William seems to take the Australian connection seriously."

TONAL LANGUAGES AND RACIAL DEVELOPMENT by Brian Simpson: University of Edinburgh researchers Robert Ladd and Dan Dediu published a paper in the journal *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences U.S.A.* on 30 May, 2007, on the genetics of tonal languages ("Linguistic Tone is related to the Population Frequency of the Adaptive Haplogroups of Two Brain genes, ASPM and Microcephalin"). Tonal languages, like Chinese, and unlike English, convey the meaning of words by changes in pitch.

It was found that people possessing old versions of two brain genes, ASPM and Microcephalin are more likely to speak tonal languages. Most sub-Saharan African languages are also tonal.

Ladd and Didiu conclude that the first languages were also tonal. Although they deny the existence of "genes for the Chinese", a case can be made for this. Further, a case can be made for the later evolutionary emergence of Europeans, based on the relative lack of older versions of these brain development genes.

This is yet another example of the biological reality of race and racial differences.

"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.

