



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.45, No.37

September 25th, 2009

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:

"By Him All Things Consist: The bond of the universe... is the devotion of the Son to the Father. It is the life of the universe. It is not the fact that God created all things, that makes the universe a whole; but that He through Whom He created them loves Him perfectly, is eternally content in His Father, is satisfied to be because His Father is with Him. It is not the fact that God is all in all that unites the universe: it is the love of the Son to the Father. For of no one-hood comes unity; there can be no oneness where there is only one. For the very beginnings of unity there must be two. Without Christ therefore there could be no universe."

– "George MacDonald An Anthology" edited by C.S. Lewis, 1973

"As applied to mankind the word Love is full of emotional as well as tremendous spiritual content, and has been much trivialised, but in its highest meaning as a spiritual thing, how can we recognise its operation in the non-human world, uncomplicated by our emotions? We cannot perceive it directly with our senses, but only by its effect. And what is that?

What else can it be but that infinite variety of mutuality that we find when we look for it in what we call Nature, a name we give to that small part of creation within reach of our limited ken? Long time have we marvelled at the beauty and intricacy and balanced existence of individual creature, and have worshipped the glory of landscapes and sunsets which strike into our hearts, and been awed and humbled at the more-than-majesty of the heavens. But how could all this even begin to exist or survive without the mighty power which enables it to fit together in mutual benefit?

Why not call it Love? Is it not clear also that this power of love, even when operating as an infinitely intricate mutuality, is as essential for the creation and survival of human societies as for non-human, but the personal, mental and spiritual potentialities of us human creatures make it manifest that an impersonal concept of love is wholly inadequate? A higher form cannot automatically or by happenstance emerge from a lower, nor the greater from the less.

Moreover, the lower cannot even begin to grasp the nature of the higher unless the latter chooses to reveal itself at the level of comprehension of the former; as Christians believe that God reveals Himself to us through the manhood of Jesus Christ..." – "The Local World: Part XII" by Geoffrey Dobbs

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *Chinese Students: Pregnant, Aborted, Living In Fear* • *If Not All Cultures Good, Why Don't We Have Right Of Critique?* • *Go For Promotion Girls, Let Kids Look After Selves!* • *Taking The Gas Out Of Oz And Pouring In Nuke Toxins* • *Putting Phillip Adams To The Test Of Logic* • *Critique Of Lawyers, Lewis And Wertheim On Toben*

"ON TARGET"

September 25th, 2009

Page 1 (145)

CHINESE STUDENTS: PREGNANT, ABORTED, LIVING IN FEAR by James Reed: Visited Adelaide recently and caught up with Len the Cleaner. On that day *The Australian* had the headline: "Lecturer 'solicited' sex, cash for marks" (p.3), a sorry tale of a Melbourne lecturer who exploited female Asian international students. I was walking down a street and came upon a young Asian man with a protest sign. I asked him about his protest. It seems that some other individual is likewise exploiting young Asian students.

I advised him to give his thick surveillance file to the police. He said that he had heard that about 30% of the abortions performed in Adelaide were on Chinese international students. In 2008 there were 435,263 – yes, astonishing isn't it? – international students in Australia and 22.2% of them were Chinese. If the same statistic holds in other states, that is a lot of abortions and a lot of exploitation of young Chinese girls.

China is already issuing warnings to its students to be security cautious (*The Australian*, 8-9/08/09, p.3). Perhaps China also needs to issue cautions to its female students to beware of sexual predators down under. All the more reason not to come here in the first place.

IF NOT ALL CULTURES GOOD, WHY DON'T WE HAVE RIGHT OF CRITIQUE? Barry Cohen ("Not All Cultures Are Good", *The Australian*, 21/8/09) is happy with a multiracial Australia, but not a multicultural one. He is also "aghast at the way multicultural advocates have taken control of the race debate by denouncing as racist anyone who disagrees with their view of the future of Australian society". For Cohen, it is not the government's duty to keep ethno-racial groups divided. New migrants should assimilate, learn English and about Australia's history, including its Anglo-Celtic origin.

I am sure if Arthur Calwell could read this article he would smile. It is all nonsense that ignores racial and demographic realities. If ethnic populations get too large, fuelled by immigration, multicultural policies are inevitable. An Asianised Australia with say 150 million Chinese migrants, could not assimilate to any Anglo-Celtic ideal. It would become a Chinese society – and that is the real meaning of Asianisation. And if we don't resist, that is our future.

GO FOR PROMOTION GIRLS, LET KIDS LOOK AFTER SELVES! by James Reed: The shock-horror headline read – "Women shun promotion for sake of children", *The Australian*, 24/8/09. That for me is a good thing; it is a good thing for women and men to put the sake of their children over their careers. But the *Australia Institute* has "warned" that childcare concerns are leading to women rejecting pay-rises and promotions. And worse yet are 2.4 million "hidden unemployed" women who in the recession have dropped out of the labour market but who would be willing and able to start work within a month.

This analysis is said to show that the official statistics which show that men do worse than women in a recession is flawed and that the jobless rate is really three times higher than what is stated.

Where do I start? The women have the ability to disappear out of the labour market because they have a working male partner. What about families where there is no working partner, single parent families with usually a mother on welfare, with kids set to also live a life on welfare? What about the homeless, what about rural Aboriginal communities...need I go on? Viewed in the light of the suffering of the poorest people in our society, bleating about "hidden unemployed" women has no sympathy with me.

I am glad that women are shunning promotion for the sake of their children and I hope that more men will do so in the future, if there can be a wider social consciousness about the bankruptcy of decadent consumerist materialism. That too is one of the tasks of social credit with its philosophical foundation in Christianity.

TAKING THE GAS OUT OF OZ AND POURING IN NUKE TOXINS by James Reed: The elites were over themselves regarding China's promise to buy \$50 billion worth of natural gas from the proposed North West Shelf Gorgon development. Viewed in conventional, rather than social credit/nationalist terms, this makes superficial sense. Flog off anything for money. But in racial nationalist terms, do we really want to feed a dragon that one day may breathe fire upon us? NO – it is a policy of racial suicide to economically feed China, just as it was in the past for "Pig Iron" Bob Menzies to feed Japan iron.

Beyond that, why shouldn't gas resources – and all other resources – be used for our use, now and forever? Only the insane illogic of liberal capitalism, which puts money, money, money above life and blood and soil would dictate such a conclusion.

Thinking along such lines, why not turn Australia into the nuclear waste dump of the world? Former Prime Minister Bob Hawke thinks so (*The Australian*, 19/8/09, p.3). And here comes that familiar globalist argument for this: it is our moral duty as a good environmental citizen to do so. It is the same tired old argument used for refugees and mass immigration.

Well if we must do this, then let us first, following in the footsteps perhaps of ancient Egypt, invite all of our living ex-Prime Ministers to move down into the pit with the nuclear waste, just to keep it safe! Perhaps the first cry of waste could be deposited under Parliament House Canberra!

PUTTING PHILLIP ADAMS TO THE TEST OF LOGIC by Betty Luks: In his satirical piece (*The Weekend Australian*, 22-23/09), Phillip Adams has a go at those who believe in a Barack Obama birth conspiracy. As he puts it, "birthers" believe that Obama's Hawaiian birth certificate is forged. Really? All the sites on the internet that I could find from a few hours research reveal that these critics are saying that the Hawaiian birth certificate is consistent with a Kenyan birth. So Adams hasn't represented his opponents correctly – but what does this matter when later in his article he compares Kevin Rudd to Superman. If this is true, then Rudd is surrounded by Kryptonite and our own Deputy Prime Minister may be, for Kev 09, a walking, talking Kryptonite being.

The celebration of Rudd and Obama was also made by Adams in the previous week (15-16/09) when he rattled on about Rudd and Obama being "soul mates". Then he goes further and matches others: Hawke and Clinton, Turnbull and Schwarzenegger, Gough and JFK, Howard and Nixon and so on. Well, even if there was a case for similarities, what does this prove and what does it matter?

One would have thought for a true believer like Adams in the coming environmental catastrophe, there would be more important things to write about.

CRITIQUE OF LAWYERS, LEWIS AND WERTHEIM ON TOBEN by Betty Luks: As I type these words Dr Frederick Toben is in prison. He was sentenced to three months gaol on a contempt of court charge originally arising from a breach of Australia's race/hate legislation. Steven Lewis and Peter Wertheim, lawyers with Slater and Gordon, ran the racial vilification and contempt cases against Dr Toben and they published their view of the matter in "Voice to be held in contempt" (*The Australian*, 18/9/09, p.12). The sub-heading summarises their position: "Freedom of speech should not be freedom to vilify". Let us see how they try to justify their position.

First they point out that in 2002 the Federal Court found that material on Toben's Adelaide Institute site breached the Racial Discrimination Act. Various claims of Holocaust revision were made, including that there were no homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz. Lewis and Wertheim point out that Toben did not get his prison sentence from this as there "are no criminal sanctions under the act". The contempt of court charge arose from Toben being "ordered to remove the offending material and he didn't". Does that mean that Toben did not take off the old offending material or is the claim wider,

that Toben went on to continue to deny the Holocaust in new words. Did the 2002 "gap orders" stop Toben from denying the Holocaust per se? The article as I read it doesn't clarify this.

Reading on in the Lewis/Wertheim article we do not find a discussion of the case at hand and an answer to these questions. Rather, they address the issue of freedom of speech and say:

"But does this sort of commentary, publicly attacking people because of their race, ethnicity or religion, really constitute community debate?"

But how did Toben do this? The claim that "the Holocaust did not occur", "there were no (homicidal) gas chambers at Auschwitz" are denials of purported facts. They are not racial, ethnic, or religious attacks unless one identifies Jewishness with the Holocaust, which is arguably false. The closest claims to vilification attributed to Toben are, quoting Lewis and Wertheim, that "Jewish people who believed in the Holocaust were of limited intelligence" and "they have exaggerated the number of Jews killed during World War II to profit from what he described as "a Holocaust myth" (end quote).

The former claim is wrong-headed rhetoric but an opinion nevertheless that freedom of speech should permit – are we only permitted to think only good about people? The second statement may be controversial but is arguable if Toben established his initial Holocaust denial premises. So what, so far, justifies the claim that there is a public attack on people based on race, ethnicity or religion? Nothing, in my opinion.

Lewis and Wertheim go on to say that "the proper limits of free speech are exceeded", when "it is about causing harm". Public vilification of "entire groups of people", "can only undermine, and ultimately destroy, their sense of security". This puts one "on the defensive with workmates, friends, neighbours" and is "the invariable precursor to violence against members of the targeted group".

If this line of argument is correct, then it would be logical to censor, using the Racial Discrimination Act, articles which may stir up anti-Israel sentiment. For example: "International fury as Israel evicts Palestinians", *The Australian* (4/8/09, p.8) describes how Israel is defying the U.S. and evicting Palestinians in East Jerusalem and moving Jewish settlers into their houses. Some of these people had lived in these houses since the 1950's. *The Weekend Australian Magazine* (22-23/8/09) features the story of a Palestinian Nasser Jeber who lost his house to armed Jewish settlers.

Such stories have, arguably, more contemporary relevance in compromising "social relationships" than a discussion of the Holocaust, which is some time in the past. Closely related to this question is that of whether it should be a criminal offence to compare Israel's activities to the Nazis. The European Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism thinks that it should, because such comparisons cause "pain to Jews" (B. O'Neill, "Playing the Nazi card is vile and pathetic but hardly illegal", *The Australian*, 9/8/09, p.12). Nevertheless, arguing along the lines discussed above, there seems to be an arguable case for prosecuting all of those anti-Israel protestors who play the Nazi card. The gaols in the future may be full of liberal-left critics!

It may be argued that Toben is not involved in a "genuine" debate about history because established historians see Holocaust revision as crank material and false. But should a "genuine" debate be decided by a show of hands of establishment figures? As John S. Mill in "On Liberty" argued, we can't argue thus without begging the question as issue of the truth of *status quo* views. Only by allowing the irritating heretic can truth be reached. If Toben is so wrong, then debate him, not gaol him!