




ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.44, No.14

April 18th, 2008

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: Fire chiefs in Britain have barred white males from recruitment sessions in a desperate bid to make 15 per cent of staff women and 3 per cent ethnic minority. The Avon Fire Service held five open-days with four of those days strictly limited for ethnic minorities and women.

500,000 foreigners settled in Britain last year. 200,000 Britons left the country. Guess the ethnic-racial makeup of the respective groups. Okay, don't guess: over 200,000 were from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka.

You do the maths. At this rate the future of Britain is easy to see. The population, because of immigration, grows by the size of a city of Bristol's population every year.

– Source: *International Express*, 29-1/4/08, p.1

THE 2020 SUMMIT: AN OMINOUS NOTE from David Flint's *Opinion Column*: The introduction to the 2020 summit note on governance strikes an ominous note. It says: "19th Century Constitutional frameworks can constrain the Government's responses to 21st Century demands." That is well and truly letting the cat out of the bag. This confirms the "No" case in 1999: that the politicians' republic would give more power to the politicians.

This reminded me of a conversation I had while campaigning at Corowa in 1999. It was with Ted Mack, formerly an independent MP. He was so opposed to the parliamentary superannuation schemes he resigned from both the New South Wales and the Federal Parliaments just before he became eligible.

Ted Mack is a man of principle, as honest as the day. He is committed to a very different sort of republic to most republicans. I asked him whether the proponents of the 1999 model realised it would vastly increase the politicians' powers. His reply was that they did; in fact this was their intention in trying to impose this republic.

Note that: In Ted Mack's view, the real agenda in 1999 was to increase the politicians' powers. The 2020 summit note on governance does not say much about whatever republic is to be discussed there, other than the following questions: "And given no referendum has been passed for 40 years, what are the chances that Australia can modernise its creaky constitutional framework? Or was our rejection of the Republic at the end of the last century just healthy cynicism about the model we were asked to buy?"

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *The 2020 Summit: An Ominous Note* • *The Real Stolen Generation* • *Without Genuine Christianity, All Is Lost* • *Dear Jonathan Kay* • *There Will Be Fitna*

...the polls.... The background paper on governance for the 2020 Summit has a graph showing responses to Newspoll's question from 1987 to 2006 over about a vague undefined republic, "Thinking about whether Australia should become a republic, are you personally in favour or against Australia becoming a republic?" The trend for support of a vague undefined republic is clearly down, and the graph shows that.

The 2007 Newspoll shows a fall in support to 45%, with those strongly in favour at only 27%. Bearing in mind that many of those strongly in favour of the concept will still vote No to a specific model, the polling is hardly encouraging for republican stalwarts.

In addition, no poll was commissioned for Australia Day 2008. This suggests that those at The Australian who commission these polls suspect the answer will only confirm that the trend is clearly down. The paper changes the description of the uncommitted to "indifferent". This is wrong.

If they were indifferent they would either not vote or vote informally. Many people do not wish to answer a question put by the polling arm of an organisation which after all was probably the most significant and powerful campaigner for republican change. Why should they?

And the plain fact is most of them voted 'No' in 1999. A glance at the polling confirms that.

The issue of Australia becoming some sort of vague undefined republic takes up half a page in the fourteen-page background paper on governance for the 2020 Summit.

We suspect from the document that the desired outcome is not so much yet another call for some vague undefined republic, which will be delivered anyway. What the government really wants is a recommendation for four year fixed parliamentary terms. They will of course get such a recommendation. All of the *bien pensants* think that way. It is unlikely that such a proposal would be successful at a referendum, even if the Liberals support it. It is just as well there are issues other than a republic for the panel to think about.

Two prominent republican summitters, Sir Anthony Mason and Professor Robert Manne are on the record as identifying a "robust convention" or rule as the justification for republican change. But this is a convention or rule which clearly does not exist.

Rather than talking about a subject on which they are so ill-informed, it would be better to have their advice on other issues.

THE REAL STOLEN GENERATION from Len the Cleaner: It is good to see that the retired Supreme Court judge Mulligan QC has handed in a 600-page report to the South Australian Parliament on the plight – over decades – of the sexual abuse of children in State care. This is the real stolen generation; there is no debate here about intention. Children were exploited by what Mulligan described as the "foul undercurrent of society".

Information about 434 alleged paedophiles has been referred to police and two suspects have already been arrested. Mulligan recommended, among 54 recommendations, "conducting special police operations at known homosexual beats to arrest paedophiles and gather criminal intelligence" (The Advertiser, 2/4/08, p.8). S.A. State Premier Mike Rann will say "sorry".

But this abuse has been well known by people in Adelaide since the 1940s. Why wasn't an inquiry conducted by the governments of Don Dunstan or Tom Playford? The Goodwood Orphanage was notorious for abuse and features in the Inquiry. Male staff and nuns would rape children. Children were taken from the Orphanage and sold for sex. (The Advertiser, 2/4/08, p.11) Priests often raped children.

My mother and aunt were orphans in Adelaide in the 1920s. My mother told me stories of abuse and

brutal beatings. For 'giving cheek' to a nun she was tied up and had near-boiling water tipped over her. She never got over this, but told me only one year before she died.

I am sure that all of this horror is just the tip of an ugly iceberg. Adelaide, the 'City of Churches' has a dark murky background, like something out of an occult movie. It would not surprise me if there were not a connection between the "Family" style slayings and the paedophile rings and networks. Will we ever know?

WITHOUT GENUINE CHRISTIANITY, ALL IS LOST by James Reed: The 'foul undercurrent' of Adelaide was brought to the surface by former Supreme Court judge Mulligan QC as the above correspondence from Len the Cleaner highlights. In this case, it is the wicked abuse of children by persons in authority, from both Church and State. The two institutions set up to safeguard children not exploit and abuse them!

The Dianne Brimble case (the cruise ship death/public sex on the decks/pornography and date drug rape) and the Channel 10 Big Brother sexual assault controversy also have a common core: the permissive sexual era of the 1960s. I had written one of my familiar pieces on this issue and then I came across Paul Gray's "Era of Permissiveness Now Coming Back to Haunt Us", which appeared in *The Australian*, 3/7/06, p.8.

Gray concluded: "It would be refreshing to hear some acknowledgement from the ideologues of the 60s generation that they were wrong about sex and drugs. For they were wrong. The victims of their error are piling up." Indeed; but these generations were most fundamentally wrong in moving away from the light of traditional Christian morality – which had given hope and meaning to man for two thousand years – and moving instead into the murky shades of liberationism. The great social experiment has failed – as those at its head knew it would and intended for it to do so.

DEAR JONATHAN KAY by Wallace Klinck (Canada): I wish to commend you for your harsh criticism of the Canadian "Human Rights" Commission and for identifying this institution and the personnel operating them as what they are: "Canada's human-rights censors." Anyone educated in the strategy of Bolshevik revolution would know immediately the purpose, intent and expected conduct of such extra-legal and unconstitutional bodies. Indeed, years ago when they were being proposed I composed a letter which was published in Alberta Report warning that if such obvious political kangaroo "courts" were ever instituted we would need the help of God to extract ourselves from their totalitarian clutches.

It is sad commentary on the corrupt nature of the political process and the integrity of the legal profession and media that such criminal activities have been ignored for so long.

And I am afraid that claims by certain advocates and promoters of these Tribunals that they have evolved into unexpected activities does not wash with me. I give these people credit for enough intelligence that they could not help but be aware of the potential for repression which such extra-legal, illegal and unconstitutional bodies posed. They are almost identical in form and procedure with the Bolshevik "Peoples" Courts where the poor victims' fate was pre-decided and determined for purely political reasons.

In short, I believe that these bodies are seditious in nature and should be investigated from that standpoint. Our historic free society cannot function or exist in any meaningful way without the open and unrestricted flow of ideas, opinions and information, not for some but for all. If any legal action is warranted with regard to speech surely it should be directed against those who would conspire to deprive their fellow citizens of it.

As a free citizen I do not need, and will not tolerate, any arrogant body puffed up with an exaggerated

sense of self-importance and claiming omniscience and moral infallibility, dictating my thought processes. Governments are to listen to electors – not dictate to them. History shows that government monopoly of information is the most dangerous of all forms of opinion-making. I do not think you enhance your case, though, by the element of gratuitous and unsubstantiated labelling of people as "hate mongers", "phobic", "neo-Nazi", etc. "Hate" is an emotional word employed for obvious political strategy and is a very subjective term.

I can run into a room full of people and shout "purple" and be faced with everything from strong approval to outright condemnation, from puzzlement to hilarity.

People who have an opinion should be accorded the courtesy of being heard and their audience should be accorded the right to hear and analyze their statements. Those who are obviously unreasoning or even rabid are not likely to retain much of an audience. If individuals cannot to be allowed freedom to communicate openly and unrestricted then the whole concept of a free and "democratic" society and the worth of the individual is just a myth and the notion justifying autocratic rule by an authoritarian elite is obviously admitted.

Personally, I do not need anyone telling me what to think, and subscribe to the idea that experts are to be on tap – not on top. In any case, I do appreciate your coming forward to condemn the activities and mind-set of these monstrosities which we in Canada have wrought in the form of pseudo Human "Rights" Commissions and I hope that you and others of like mind will not rest until they are eliminated and we can return to a civilized society based on our historic values of Christian love, realistic British common law and Constitutional principles.

The present atmosphere of totalitarian legalism is intolerable and unacceptable. I wonder where the Governor-General is under these circumstances. I thought she or he was obligated to protect the Monarch and the rights of the people enshrined in the common law Constitution from abuses by the politicians or Government of the day.

I cannot fathom how any Member of Parliament can look his or her electors in the eye knowing that these outrageous abuses have, with their leave, for so long been visited upon the People of Canada. Enough is already too much.

Obviously the price of freedom is, indeed, eternal vigilance. If Canadians willingly tolerate these blatant HRC abuses of their fundamental freedoms then surely they forfeit their rights to them and deserve their inevitable fate.

THERE WILL BE FITNA by Brian Simpson: Dutch MP Geert Wilder has released a 15 minute film called Fitna – an Arab word meaning 'trouble'. Wilder may get trouble for this. The film juxtaposes the Koran and Muslim violence. It was posted at www.liveleak.com but when I looked it was removed for "copyright" reasons.

A thought-provoking comment was made by the conservative Jewish commentator Lawrence Auster at his View from the Right blog: "there are two ways people can respond to Fitna. They can say that it is not true or fair because it doesn't talk about all the Muslims who are not active jihadists. Or they can say that, despite the movie's lack of nuance resulting from its short length, it is telling the essential truth about Islam. But if they take the latter view, as I do, how can they conclude other than that Islam is a deadly threat to our civilisation, our liberties, and our very lives, and that its growth among us must be instantly stopped and reversed?"

This is a very good question, but one will not find serious discussion of this question in Australia. Our oppressive race-hate laws would not permit a Fitna style movie to circulate here and would chill all critical discussion.