



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.44, No.23

June 20th, 2008

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: Before the advent of multiculturalism in Australia, it was not felt necessary to impose draconian legislation to prevent 'racial vilification', with the threat of imprisonment. The people who pioneered the development of Australia, predominantly of Anglo-Celtic background and reflecting in one sense the Christian Law of Love - this was the basic meaning of the Australian slogan of a "Fair Go for all" - have been generally tolerant and easy going. This traditional tolerance is being strained by the programme of multiculturalism, and the manipulation of ethnic minorities against the Anglo-Celtic majority...

Those manipulating the minorities have no genuine interest in the long-term welfare of the minorities. But they make clear their dislike of any Christian based Anglo-Celtic culture.

– Eric D. Butler in *The New Times*, June 1995

THE CHICKENS HAVE ROOSTED: It seems an Anglican Bishop's scathing attack on 'liberal' values touched a nerve with Sydney's Radio-2GB personality Alan Jones. Alan's comments are worth repeating:

"There was an interesting story published at the end of last month in London's *Daily Mail* newspaper. It was called a lacerating attack on liberal values, by the Right Reverend Michael Nazir Ali, the Anglican Bishop of Rochester. Dr. Nazir Ali was born into a Roman Catholic family in Pakistan. He converted to Anglicanism at the age of 20. He suffered, as a young man, from rough treatment handed out to Christians in a country, Pakistan, where failing to follow the official religion can sometimes end in murder.

The story reported that he was educated at Cambridge University and had served as an assistant to the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Robert Runcie. And many thought he was a candidate for the post of Archbishop of Canterbury. He's 58, and he's been in Rochester for nearly 14 years.

Well, the Bishop argued that England was mired in a doctrine of endless self-indulgence that had brought on an explosion in public violence and binge drinking. And he said that the collapse of Christianity had wrecked British society. And he dated the downfall of Christianity from what he called the social and sexual revolution of the 1960s. And he said the newfangled and insecurely founded, his words, doctrine of multiculturalism had left immigrant communities "segregated, living parallel lives". And he said Christian values of human dignity, equality and freedom could be lost as the way is left open for the advance of brands of Islam that do not respect Western values.

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *The Chickens Have Roosted* • *Don't Hold Your Breath – The Leader Is Not In This Church!* • *Why Femism Is Wrong* • *Emma Tom Is Almost Right* • *What Will Happen iIn U.S. When Things Fall Apart?* • *Romantic Primitivism*

"ON TARGET"

June 20th, 2008

Page 1 (89)

As an immigrant from Pakistan the Bishop said that he might be thought to be least qualified to discuss British identity. But he quoted Kipling: "What should they know of England who only England know".

And he talked about something momentous happening in the sixties, and he called it a cultural revolution in which women ceased to uphold or pass on the Christian faith. And he said that "instead of resisting this phenomenon, liberal theologians and church leaders all but capitulated".

And he said, "It's created the moral and spiritual vacuum in which we now find ourselves". He said in the place of Christianity there was nothing "except perhaps endless self-indulgence". And then he said the consequences of all this were, his words, "The destruction of the family because of the alleged parity of different forms of life together; the loss of a father figure, especially for boys, because the role of fathers is deemed otiose; the abuse of substances including alcohol; the loss of respect for the person, leading to horrendous and mindless attacks; the increasing communication gap between generations and social classes". He said the list is very long.

But then he said another result of the collapse of Christianity was that immigrants had been welcomed, not on the basis of Britain's Christian heritage to which they would be welcome to contribute, but by "the newfangled and insecurely founded doctrine of multiculturalism".

Obviously the Bishop's outspokenness has not endeared him to the head honchos within his church. But he is not without support.

He may not be the Archbishop of Canterbury, but his comments would echo a ring of truth amongst millions of people in Britain and in Australia. The simple question is, where is the leader who is likely to do something about it?

DON'T HOLD YOUR BREATH – THE LEADER IS NOT IN THIS CHURCH! The following snippet of news about the liberals within this 'Christian' church came from *Salt Shakers*: Christian Ethics – Research, Education and Action Group: <www.saltshakers.org.au>

They write: We have spoken many times against the inter-faith/multi-faith movements being established across Australia and across the world. The local Council based groups, the Sydney based 'Common Dreams', the 'National Interfaith Festival' held in Qld and the big one, the 'Parliament of the World's Religions' meeting in Melbourne next year.

We have been challenged about our opposition – people say these groups help local evangelism. We always ask 'How' but we get no answers.

Now we have the truth – from the President of the Uniting church in Australia, (UCA) the Rev Gregor Henderson.

'Other faiths, [are] not for conversion' – you might upset the interfaith dialogue! Rev Henderson says, "But deliberate targeting of people of other faiths has a touch of disrespect about it; it will not contribute to inter-faith understanding and harmony; it will not contribute to peaceful relationships in the Australian community.

"Evangelistic targeting of other faith communities – Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, etc. – is very likely to create tensions between these groups and Christians." Go and evangelise the non religious or the "nominal" Christians, he says, but not those of other religions/faiths!!

For a copy of the letter *Salt Shakers* refers to – the one that went out to all UCA 'leaders', go to <http://crosslight.victas.uca.org.au/?p=141#more-141>

WHY FEMINISM IS WRONG by James Reed: I recently came across an interesting online-opinion piece (www.onlineopinion.com.au) by Australian philosopher Stephen Buckle: "Feminist Social

Explanations are Wrong". In a nutshell feminism uses sex and gender relations to explain the 'woman problem' and the 'woman problem' in some shape or form is due to men. There are of course sophisticated variations of this: not all men, but patriarchy, or more recently oppressive dualisms (e.g. men/women, black/white, etc.) under the influence of post modernism. However, whatever the covering rhetoric used, the same old story is rolled out by the feminist tongue or key-board: maleness is the problem.

Dr. Buckle goes on at length to give an alternative explanation of that which enlivens the feminist problematic. I won't try to summarise it and/or criticise it because I am still trying to understand it. But I would question the core assumptions giving rise to the very need for feminism that women are oppressed (we all, who are not rich and members of the ruling elite, are oppressed) and that maleness in the John Wayne sense is a bad thing.

Indeed, if we were all feminists, human civilisation would not exist. The human race would have died out. If the deracinating, emasculating effects of feminism continue, maybe our elites will get a taste of the real Hobbesian world of 'all against all'. Let us hope that 'natural selection' is on our side!

EMMA TOM IS ALMOST RIGHT by James Reed: Columnist Emma Tom (*The Australian*, 6/3/08, p.13) usually writes such weird columns that I don't see fit to put our readers through the process of reading a critical review. However, one article with an important issue for us she discusses at length is the "Butcher of Bega", an obstetrician and gynaecologist who, by Tom's description, mutilated women in a horrific way. I used Google to check this and her descriptions are correct.

But Tom, a young feminist, says that if the attacks were on men, there would have been an uproar with the very first case. She makes the whole thing a feminist issue.

The facts are that the medical profession is like the Mafia and stick together. What about the female staff who assisted the Butcher of Bega and all the female doctors who knew about him? Where were all the feminist lawyers who write articles about women's oppression from their air-conditioned offices of our universities? Where is there concern for the plight of such women? A good lawsuit earlier could have stopped this fellow in his tracks.

According to the world's leading medical journal, *Journal of the American Medical Association* vol.284, July 26, 2000, doctors are the third leading cause of death in the U.S., causing 250,000 deaths every year. Of these, men and women are equal sufferers. So the issue is not a feminist one as trendy "wry side" columnist Emma Tom paints it, but one about the soundness of orthodox medicine.

Much has been written about this, especially the way doctors mindlessly prescribe drugs solely on the basis of drug company recommendations. Doctors, I believe, have a book that is full of the side effects of most drugs. I have yet to have a doctor give me an outline of the risks associated with their witch-doctor prescriptions.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IN U.S. WHEN THINGS FALL APART? by Brian Simpson: This question was discussed in *The Social Contract* (U.S.A.) Fall 2007 "The Future of an Unsustainable Planet: Chaos, Resource Depletion, Ecological Degradation, Ethnic Unrest and National Dissolution." Here are some quotes from an overview by Dr. Richard Duncan, quoting Professor Jose Angel Gutierrez's view on the fate of 'gringos':

Gutierrez bio: "Professor Jose Angel Gutierrez is on the State of Texas payroll at the University of Texas – Arlington. He founded "La Raza" the group of Mexicans openly dedicated to taking over at least the southwest portion of the United States. He notes that by the differential birth-rate of Mexicans versus white Americans the Mexicans will inevitably take over, and it is only a 'matter of time' before the Mexicans have control. Whether by this he means just the Southwest United States or the whole country is unclear." (Youngquist, 12 July 2007)

We are nice: "If the hot weather hasn't got you steamed, this will do it. Those people will kill us if necessary to take over the U.S. But we have one on the State payroll supported by the taxpayers of Texas. And we meekly put up with these statements. If we said we were going to kill the Mexicans think of what an uproar that would be.

But we are nice and civilized and so we submit to this sort of threat without a protest. Given present trends, they will indeed take over." (Youngquist, 12 July 2007)

Gringos must go: "We have got to eliminate the gringo, and what I mean by that is if the worst comes to the worst, we have got to kill him." (Gutierrez, 1969)

Reconquista: "The border remains a military zone. We remain a hunted people. Now you think you have a destiny to fulfil in the land that historically has been ours for forty thousand years. And we're a new Mestizo nation. And they want us to discuss civil rights. Civil rights!! What law made by white men to oppress all of us of colour, female and male.

This is our homeland. We cannot-we will not- and we must not be made illegal in our own homeland. We are not immigrants that came from another country to another country. We are migrants, free to travel the length and breadth of the Americas because we belong here. We are millions. We just have to survive. We have an aging white America. They are not making babies. They are dying. It's a matter of time. The explosion is in our population." (Gutierrez, 1995)

A leading paper in the journal by Richard Peltó "What Will Probably Happen... When Things Fall Apart" sees nations going the Yugoslavia way. Nationalist and ethnic sentiment will arise when "globalisation-caused fragmentation" finishes off the American state.

People will return to their roots when the artificial environment created by globalisation is switched off by inevitable resource and ecological crises. Then what remains of America will need to face Professor Gutierrez's friends...

ROMANTIC PRIMITIVISM by Brian Simpson: Australian writer, Roger Sandall writing in the June 2006 edition of *Quadrant* (also: "The Savage Garden of Eden", *The WE Australian*, 10-11/6/06, p.19) offered some brilliant reflections upon why various peoples look with nostalgia and longing to the "primitive past". "Primitive Life" was brutal and often short. Scholars have shown (e.g. L.H. Keeley, "War Before Civilisation" (Oxford 1996) and S. Le Blanc, "Constant Battles: The Myth of the Peaceful, Noble Savage" (2003) that it is indeed a myth to suppose that any "traditional" or "native" society was peaceful. Bloodshed and killing has been the human lot since the year dot. Sandall says that romantic primitivism arises as part of a guilt-complex "involving moral rules idealising the communal way of life. This ideal is deeply inscribed in conscience; and guilt arises because of the claims of this communal social conscience on the one hand and the opposing need in civilised societies to assert oneself individualistically against the communal, against the collective, against the claustrophobia of the tribe, against the tyranny of the human herd."

Globalism imposes a prohibition against natural *xenophobia* (fear of stranger desires). Xenophobia "is obviously an expression of the same unaccommodating instincts we share with countless other animals, including chimpanzees, and goes back to the primate past."

Anti-civilisational *xenophile* (love of strangers), if I understand this argument, is an "inversion of much that is natural, normal and universal in social life" because the suppression of natural xenophobic forces is far from successful: "those bad old violent and aggressive drives just won't go away." [It therefore makes little sense, I believe, to attempt to compound problems, by building and ever striving, to increase constantly, cultural, ethnic and racial diversity. It is only a matter of time before the wheels fall off of the multicultural cart.