

# ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300  
Adelaide 5067  
Australia  
Mob: 61+401692057  
Email: [info@adelaideinstitute.org](mailto:info@adelaideinstitute.org)  
Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online  
ISSN 1440-9828



January 2013 No 669

**The speciality of slander/defamation/character assassination used when arguments fail in the universal battle-of-the-wills...telling the truth has been stigmatized as anti-Semitism.**

\*

***'Don't only blame the Jews; also blame those that bend to Jewish pressure!' – F Töben***

\*

## **The Nonexistent "Jewish Lobby" declares war on Chuck Hagel - candidate for US Defence Secretary**

**No plane hit 47-story steel-framed skyscraper WTC Building 7 on 9/11, but suddenly it fell at 5:20 that day.**

- Rudy Giuliani, in 7 at the time, escaped, said he was warned, won't say by who,
- Eyewitnesses report hearing bombs, experts say, "classic controlled demolition".
- Owner Larry Silverstein admitted it was imploded to TV show saying, "we pulled it".
- Bizarre! BBC reported LIVE that 7 fell 25 minutes BEFORE it actually fell. (below)
- The 9/11 Commission refused to investigate and did not include 7 in their report.
- Only 5% of Americans even know 7 fell, Zionist controlled media refused to report it.

**7**

**TERRORISM ATTACKS IN US**  
**LIVE** The 47 storey Salomon Brothers building close to the World Trade Centre has also collapsed.

Deesillustration.com

## Jewish Lobby pressuring Obama not to name Chuck Hagel secretary of defense Comments on Israel by Top Contender for Defense Secretary Are Scrutinized

By MARK LANDLER, December 18, 2012, *New York Times*

WASHINGTON — With Chuck Hagel, a former senator from Nebraska, emerging as a front-runner to be President Obama's next secretary of defense, critics are taking aim at his record on Israel as well as remarks he made about pro-Israel lobbying groups in Washington.

Mr. Hagel, a Republican, has been skeptical about the efficacy of American sanctions against Iran, has opposed efforts to isolate militant groups like Hamas and Hezbollah, and has spoken candidly about the influence of what he once referred to as the "Jewish lobby" on Capitol Hill.

Those comments, in particular, have drawn the ire of Jewish leaders, who say they raise questions about Mr. Hagel's commitment to Israel and have propagated unsavory stereotypes about Israel's influence over American foreign policy.

"He has a checkered past on Israel," said Abraham H. Foxman, the national director of the Anti-Defamation League, a Jewish advocacy organization. "At the least, it's disturbing; at worst, it's troubling."

Several of the groups are reaching out to members of Congress, circulating a list of Mr. Hagel's positions on issues related to Israel, Iran and the Palestinians. The goal, officials on Capitol Hill said, appears to be to pressure the White House to think twice about naming him.

The White House declined to comment on the criticism or on whether Mr. Obama has settled on him for the job. Administration officials said Mr.

Obama would like to announce at least part of his second-term national security team this week.

Senator John Kerry, Democrat of Massachusetts, is viewed as a lock for secretary of state, while the choice for director of the Central Intelligence Agency has narrowed to two candidates — Michael J. Morell, the agency's acting director, and John O. Brennan, Mr. Obama's counterterrorism adviser.

Administration officials noted that there were other candidates for the Pentagon, including Michèle A. Flournoy, a former undersecretary of defense, and Ashton B. Carter, the current deputy secretary at the

Pentagon. Mr. Hagel, a Vietnam veteran who left the Senate in 2009 and now teaches at Georgetown University, declined to comment.

For the White House, it is the second time a candidate's record has come under fire even before a nomination was announced.

Last week, Susan E. Rice, the ambassador to the United Nations, withdrew her name from consideration for secretary of state after coming under weeks of withering assault by Republicans for statements she made after the deadly assault on the American diplomatic mission in Benghazi, Libya.

In the wake of Ms. Rice's withdrawal, there have also been questions about whether Mr. Obama's proposed national security team would lack diversity.

None of Mr. Hagel's former Senate colleagues has come out against his candidacy. But on Tuesday, several Republicans predicted that he would face some blunt questions if nominated.

"I am concerned about some of his statements on Iran and Hamas and Israel," Senator Susan Collins, Republican of Maine, said in an interview with Roll Call, the Capitol Hill newspaper. "I'm sure that those issues will be explored in the nomination hearing, should he be nominated."

Mr. Hagel is a friend and "was a fine senator," added Ms. Collins, who sits on the Armed Services Committee, which will consider the nomination of a defense secretary to succeed Leon E. Panetta.

Some officials on Capitol Hill predicted that if nominated, Mr. Hagel, 66, would not face anywhere near the opposition that scuttled Ms. Rice's candidacy. He remains popular among his former colleagues.

But the steady drumbeat of criticism from Jewish and other pro-Israel groups is a problem for the White House and Mr. Hagel, who as defense secretary would have to engage regularly with Israeli leaders on American military aid and the Iranian nuclear threat.

"There is a very systematic effort going on, and these things can have an impact," said Jeremy Ben-Ami, the executive director of J Street, a

liberal pro-Israel group, which defends Mr. Hagel.

"It is simply beyond disturbing to think that somebody of Chuck Hagel's stature and significant record of national service is being slandered in this way," Mr. Ben-Ami said.

The criticism of Mr. Hagel is on two levels. The first is his voting record, which some analysts say has been soft on groups like Hezbollah and Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. He voted against designating the Guard Corps as a terrorist organization, they said, and refused to demand that the European Union designate Hezbollah a terrorist group.

"It is a matter of fact that a record like that is well outside the mainstream of both Democratic and Republican positions on such issues," said Josh Block, the chief executive of the Israel Project, a pro-Israel educational group.

The second set of criticism centers on an interview Mr. Hagel gave in 2006 to Aaron David Miller, a long-time American diplomat, for a book he wrote on the Middle East peace process, "The Much Too Promised Land."

Speaking of groups like the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, which advocates for Israel, **Mr. Hagel said, "The Jewish lobby intimidates a lot of people up here." Critics faulted both his implication that lawmakers are bullied and his use of the phrase "Jewish" rather than "Israel," suggesting that all advocates for Israel are Jewish. Senators from both parties have expressed discomfort with his choice of words.** – emphasis added-AI.

In the interview, Mr. Hagel noted, "I'm a United States senator, not an Israeli senator." While he said he supported Israel, "my first interest is I take an oath of office to the Constitution of the United States. Not to a president. Not a party. Not to Israel."

Mr. Miller, now a scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, said that while Mr. Hagel's past positions on Iran sanctions, Hamas and Hezbollah differed from the administration's policies, it did not matter much

since, as defense secretary, he would not be formulating policy in the Middle East.

"His brief will concentrate on when to project American military might," Mr. Miller said, "and here his caution and experience in the Vietnam years coincide with where the president is."

Based on talks with Mr. Hagel, Mr. Miller said he concluded that the former senator "believes in a special relationship with Israel, but not an exclusive one."

"There should not be a litmus test of whether he is pro-Israel enough," Mr. Miller said. "He is just independent enough to recognize

that there are moments when U.S.-Israel interests don't always align."

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/19/us/politics/chuckhagelcandidate-for-defensepostcriticized-by-jewishleaders.html>

## **Israel's nightmare: Possible appointment of Hagel as defense secretary result of Bibi's support for Obama's rivals**

**By Sever Plocker, December 18, 2012 / Israel Opinion**

The Israeli prime minister's support for the Republican presidential candidate during the US elections and his blatant support for all of Obama's enemies and haters may soon exact a heavy price. According to some reports, Obama has already decided to appoint former Republican senator Chuck Hagel as the next secretary of defense.

For Israel, the appointment would be the realization of a nightmare. As a senator (1997-2008) Hagel was against imposing harsher sanctions on Iran, he opposed adding the Revolutionary Guards to the list of global terror organizations and signed a letter calling on the American government to recognize Hamas and negotiate with the Islamist group.

In 2007, when Hagel considered seeking the GOP presidential nomination, the Democratic Party distributed a document detailing his anti-Israel votes, positions and statements.

Political pundits in the US claim that Hagel is currently affiliated with a

small but influential group of rightist, conservative and anti-Israel statesmen. The members of this group view America's Jews as - almost- a fifth column that favors Israel's interests over America's interests, and attribute the pro-Israel lobby AIPAC with the power to tilt US foreign policy in Israel's favour.

The group's positions were expressed in a book written by political science professors Walt and Mearsheimer, who sought to "expose" AIPAC's "destructive influence" on America's standing in the Middle East. The book described AIPAC as a "loose coalition of individuals and organizations who actively work to steer US foreign policy in a pro-Israel direction." Since publishing their first article on the subject in 2006, Walt and Mearsheimer have become the avourites of Americans who believe the US is controlled by a Jewish-Israeli conspiracy.

In a 2006 interview for a book written by Aaron David Miller, a

former Mideast peace negotiator during the Clinton years, Hagel said "The political reality is ... that the Jewish lobby intimidates a lot of people up here." Miller, a traditional Jew, defended Hagel's comment.

America's foreign policy and defense experts believe Hagel's possible appointment as defense secretary would bring an end to the special and close relations that have existed over the past few years between the Israeli Defense Ministry and the Department of Defense in Washington.

The matter was discussed during a meeting between Obama and a group of Jewish figures who were invited to a Hanukkah party at the White House.

"It's a terrible idea," one of those who attended the event was quoted as saying. But now, after Netanyahu burned all of his personal bridges with Obama, there is nothing the Prime Minister's Office can do about it.

<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0.7340.L-4321497.00.html>

## **The Nonexistent "Jewish Lobby" Sets out to destroy Chuck Hagel**

**M. J. Rosenberg**

The American Jewish Committee was the latest Jewish organization to enlist in the battle to prevent President Barack Obama from naming former Nebraska senator Chuck Hagel to be Secretary of Defense. The onslaught is unprecedented. Never before has virtually the entire organized Jewish community combined to stop a presidential cabinet appointment because it deems the potential nominee insufficiently devoted to Israel. Of course, below the cabinet level, the lobby has been manning the barricades against critics of any Israeli government policies for decades.

The onslaught against Hagel is unique however because the reason for it is not merely that he opposes the rush to war with Iran and favors negotiating an end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The reason is because he dared to refer to the existence of the Israel lobby. He said this in 2008 in an interview with former State Department official, Aaron Miller.

This [Congress] is an institution that does not inherently bring out a great deal of courage," Hagel continued. "Most of the time members play it safe and adopt an 'I'll support Israel' attitude. AIPAC comes knocking with a pro-Israel

letter, and 'then you'll get 80 to 90 senators on it. I don't think I've ever signed one of the letters.'

When someone would accuse him of not being pro-Israel because he didn't sign the letter, Hagel told me he responds: "I didn't sign the letter because it was a stupid letter." Few legislators talk this way on the Hill. Hagel is a strong supporter of Israel and a believer in shared values. "The Jewish lobby intimidates a lot of people up here," but as he put it, "I'm a United States senator. I'm not an Israeli senator."

That quote will likely doom Hagel's candidacy because, if there is one

institution that is considered untouchable, it is the Israel lobby and its power.

Here is Wall Street Journal columnist Brett Stephens, a major neocon and Netanyahu supporter, on the implications of Hagel's remarks.

'Prejudice – like cooking, wine-tasting and other consummations – has an olfactory element. When Chuck Hagel, the former GOP senator from Nebraska who is now a front-runner to be the next secretary of Defense, carries on about how "the Jewish lobby intimidates a lot of people up here," the odor is especially ripe.

Ripe because a "Jewish lobby," as far as I'm aware, doesn't exist. No lesser authorities on the subject than John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, authors of "The Israel Lobby," have insisted the term Jewish lobby is "inaccurate and misleading, both because the [Israel] lobby includes non-Jews like Christian Zionists and because many Jewish Americans do not support the hard-line policies favored by its most powerful elements."....

**Ripe because the word "intimidates" ascribes to the so-called Jewish lobby powers that are at once vast, invisible and malevolent; and because it suggests that legislators who adopt positions friendly to that lobby are doing so not from political conviction but out of personal fear. Just what does that Jewish Lobby have on them?**

**In short, Hagel is an anti-Semite because he stated that the "Jewish lobby" both exists and "intimidates..."** – emphasis added –AI.

It is true that it is impolitic to use the term "Jewish lobby" rather than "Israel lobby" although the very same people criticizing Hagel for using the former term objected just as vehemently when Stephen Walt and John Mearsheimer used the latter in their book on the subject.

In any case, the term Jewish lobby is accurate when one refers to organizations like the American Jewish Committee or the Anti-Defamation League, etc.

They are Jewish organizations and not AIPAC, the registered Israel lobby.

As for the non-Jews and Christian Zionists that are supposedly part of the lobby, that is just silly. Having worked on Capitol Hill for 20 years, I can attest to the fact that the only voices that matter in Washington on this issue comes from Jews. The lobby contributes millions of dollars to candidates based on its determination of his or her devotion to Israel. No non-Jewish organization does that. The whole "Christian Zionist" thing is a joke and will be until John Hagee's Christians United For Israel starts pouring money into our campaigns. And to BOTH parties.

Of course, the irony about the war on Hagel is that it has been launched against him because he says that the lobby acts as one to intimidate policymakers and legislators and the lobby screams that there is no such thing as an organized lobby that does these things.

Here is a list (not comprehensive) of those who have enlisted in the campaign against Chuck Hagel:

**American Jewish Committee  
The Anti-Defamation League  
AIPAC**

**Commentary**

**Republican Jewish Coalition  
National Jewish Democratic  
Council**

**The Israel Project**

**The Zionist Organization of  
America**

**Plus, Bill Kristol, Jennifer Rubin,  
Fred Hiatt of the Washington  
Post, Ed Koch**

This list is only partial. Virtually all Jewish organizations, politicians and media figures are under pressure to condemn Hagel and many of them will. To its credit **J Street** is supporting Hagel and **Israel Policy Forum** has long been in the Hagel camp – it honored him for his support for Israel's security in 2008.

But the others are all marching in lockstep to destroy a senator, a war hero – highly decorated Marine – and one of the most thoughtful public officials on foreign policy matters. **I say "destroy" because the charge of anti-Semitism can and does destroy.** – emph. Added – AI.

If Obama decides not to pick Hagel – and he probably will so decide, this great American will be tarred forever by the charge.

The good news is that the lobby will be shown to be precisely what its critics say it is. It is an organized machine, dedicated to the interests of the Israeli right that uses its power to ensure that no one in our government ever challenges Israel's government on anything. Of course, it is unlikely that the media will even report the story.

In the wake of last week's horrors in Connecticut, the media is talking almost endlessly about the sickening power of the gun lobby. But the gun lobby doesn't come close to AIPAC's power to intimidate. After all, as I said, everyone discusses the NRA and what should be done about it.

Virtually no one in the media discusses the Israel lobby. If Hagel is rejected by Obama, don't expect David Gregory, Rachel Maddow, or any of the rest of them to explain why. **They can't. They are afraid. But they are not afraid of the NRA. Doesn't that tell you something?** – emph. Added – AI.

Fortunately, there is the blogosphere (again, most of the major bloggers are intimidated into silence on the lobby but not all) where the most prominent voice of all, former New Republic editor Andrew Sullivan does have the guts to speak out. He says:

Like a kabuki dance, here it comes: the usual vile insinuations; the usual call for the Greater Israel Lobby to kill a nomination because a US Senator actually believe his job is to care first about the security and interests of the US, not Greater Israel; the reflexive equation of opposition to the Netanyahu administration or the settlements or the Gaza wars with pure bigotry. The phrases – "the odor is especially ripe" – are as preeningly self-righteous as they are toxic. You are not allowed, for example, to note that well-financed organized Washington lobbies "intimidate" lawmakers: the word "intimidates" ascribes to the so-called Jewish lobby powers that are at once vast, invisible and malevolent; and because it suggests that legislators who adopt positions friendly to that lobby are doing so not from political conviction but out of personal fear.

It's interesting to read this familiar, exhausted, ridiculous whine in the context of our current discussion about the NRA. The NRA is routinely



called the gun lobby and it is described in exactly the same terms as AIPAC: "vast, invisible and malevolent" - because it is precisely as effective and relentless and as fanatical as AIPAC in wielding money, networking and political pressure in attaining its legislative goals. But we are forbidden from calling AIPAC what it is the way we call the NRA what it is - **because telling the truth about it has been stigmatized as anti-Semitism.** - emph. added - AI.

It's a useful ruse for bullies like the Greater Israel Lobby. It's also an insult to those who have suffered and been murdered by actual anti-Semites. But for utopian fanatics, if

casually calling honorable public servants anti-Semites helps them retain their dream of a Greater Israel, so be it. Which is why the president, if indeed he is contemplating an appointment for the Nebraska Republican, should not listen to the AIPAC thugs. He should what is right for this country, and not any other's.

Sullivan leaves out one thing. The Israel Lobby is bad for the Jews. It suggests that Jewish Americans put the interests of a foreign country first which is a damnable lie. As every poll shows, Jewish Americans not only don't vote based on Israel, they are not overly Israel centered at all. Moreover, those of us who do deeply care about Israel - although

not more than we care about our own country - believe that the best way to support Israel is to work for peace with the Palestinians and to oppose war with Iran just as Hagel does. The lobby knows that but it has higher goals: making our government tremble, supporting Binyamin Netanyahu, and scaring Jews into donating more money to their respective organizations.

In short, the lobby is bad for America. But it's worse for Jews.

How dare these hacks and lobbyists jeopardize our future in the best home Jews have ever had?

<http://mjayrosenberg.com/2012/12/20/the-nonexistent-jewish-lobby-sets-out-to-destroy-chuck-hagel/>

## Hagel smeared for standing up to AIPAC bullying

Andrew Sullivan, *Daily Beast*, 18 December 2012 01:34 PM

Like a kabuki dance, here it comes: the usual vile insinuations; the usual call for the Greater Israel Lobby to kill a nomination because a US Senator actually believes his job is to care first about the security and interests of the US, not Greater Israel; the reflexive equation of opposition to the Netanyahu administration or the settlements or the Gaza wars with pure bigotry. The phrases - "the odor is especially ripe"

- are as preeningly self-righteous as they are toxic. You are not allowed, for example, to note that well-financed organized Washington lobbies "intimidate" lawmakers: the word "intimidates" ascribes to the so-called Jewish lobby powers that are at once vast, invisible and malevolent; and

because it suggests that legislators who adopt positions friendly to that lobby are doing so not from political conviction but out of personal fear.

It's interesting to read this familiar, exhausted, ridiculous whine in the context of our current discussion about the NRA. The NRA is routinely called the gun lobby and it is described in exactly the same terms as AIPAC: "vast, invisible and malevolent" - because it is precisely as effective and relentless and as fanatical as AIPAC in wielding money, networking and political pressure in attaining its legislative goals. But we are forbidden from calling AIPAC what it is the way we call the NRA what it is - because telling the truth

about it has been stigmatized as anti-Semitism.

It's a useful ruse for bullies like the Greater Israel Lobby. It's also an insult to those who have suffered and been murdered by actual anti-Semites. But for utopian fanatics, if casually calling honorable public servants anti-Semites helps them retain their dream of a Greater Israel, so be it. Which is why the president, if indeed he is contemplating an appointment for the Nebraska Republican, should not listen to the AIPAC thugs. He should what is right for this country, and not any other's.

<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4321497,00.html>  
<http://andrewsullivan.thedailybeast.com/2012/12/smearing-hagel.html>

## 70% of Jews voted for Obama, but the Lobby backed Romney Yes, It's The Jewish Lobby, And It Consists Of One Percent Of Us

MJ Rosenberg [mjayrosenbergblog@gmail.com](mailto:mjayrosenbergblog@gmail.com) 28 December 2012 02:20

The neoconservatives' battle to sink the potential nomination of former Senator Chuck Hagel has again raised the issue of the power of the Israel lobby. And it should. Hagel, as a respected former senator would be sailing to an easy confirmation, if not for the power of the Israel lobby which considers him insufficiently loyal to the policies of the Israeli government. The assault on Hagel is truly ugly and opposing a highly respected ex-

senator and decorated war hero out of fear he won't defer to Netanyahu is also stupid. Unlike John McCain whose war record is ambiguous, Hagel's record was indisputably heroic. He and his brother Tom served side by side in Vietnam as infantry squad leaders and earned military decorations and honors, including two Purple Hearts. To put it bluntly, how does it look to be opposing this American war hero for

being insufficiently devoted to a foreign country?

The most maddening thing is that the lobby does not speak for most Jews, not even close. The best proof of that was this year's election results in which 70% of Jews voted for President Obama although Netanyahu and his cutouts here made clear that they preferred Romney. And, as the definitive American Jewish Committee survey demonstrated, not even the Jewish

Republican vote had much, if anything, to do with Israel. Only 5% of Jews consider Israel their most important issue. Republican Jews are Republican for the same reasons other Republicans are – the economy, and other domestic issues. Overwhelmingly, Jews choose domestic issues as most important to them. Additionally the Jews who do care about Israel – a strong majority at least – support neither Netanyahu nor the occupation. The last Israeli prime minister they admired was Yitzhak Rabin.

So who and what is the lobby?

The first thing to know about it is that it is about delivering money not votes. It is irrelevant that most Jews are liberals and not Netanyahu devotees. The people with the money, i.e., the lobby, are right-wing on Israel. And it is those people – think Democrat Haim Saban and Republican Sheldon Adelson and the like – who have the clout. Not the dentist or lawyer down the street or the local Hadassah chapter.

I worked on Capitol Hill for 20 years, for five Members of Congress, and had hundreds of dealings with the lobby. **Despite claims that the lobby includes Christians, that is simply not**

**true – at least not in terms of influencing U.S. policies. – emph. added-AI.**

First, so-called “Christian Zionists” do not give heavily to campaigns so their support for Likud policies is both amorphous and insignificant. Second, “Christian Zionists” are Republicans who will never support the party of GLBT rights, choice, regulations and higher taxes. Unlike the AIPAC-directed donors, they are not in play. They are just Republicans.

Even when “Christian Zionists” do contribute to campaigns, their issues are the social issues like blocking marriage equality, not supporting Israel.

Bottom line: the Israel Lobby is the Jewish Lobby. One would be hard-pressed to find a single legislator who kisses up to Netanyahu and AIPAC to please Christians. Not a single constituent organization that composes the lobby is anything but Jewish, starting with AIPAC. The others all have the word “Jewish” in their names. Who are they kidding? That makes it critical that the overwhelming majority of Jews get the message across that the lobby does not speak for us. And that the lobby isn’t us. AIPAC, the American Jewish Committee, the Jewish Council on Public Affairs and the

multi-millionaires associated with all of them constitute a lobby of a few thousand people. They are the Jewish – less than – One Percent. And that is all they speak for.

But, like the other, more famous one-percent, their voices drown the rest of us out. That is because our political system is not about votes, it is about money. Until we have public financing of campaigns – which is probably never, politicians will do what the lobby tells them to do.

But, remember, it’s not the Jews, it is a few unrepresentative millionaires and billionaires who enjoy making the United States government quake both for Netanyahu’s sake and to feel all-powerful.

Don’t blame the Jews.

And, Mr. President, do us all a favor and choose Chuck Hagel. The complaints of those whose first, and usually only, concern is ensuring that the U.S. never says no to Netanyahu should be ignored. As someone once said, or should have: the power of campaign contributions must stop at the water’s edge.

<http://mjayrosenberg.com/2012/12/26/yes-its-the-jewish-lobby/>



**Zionist bankers or Jewish bankers?**

# Arabian Sights....



**"Centuries of darkness and misery are now called the history of 'civilization'."**

Gabriel Zampirini

\*

**"Wherever Western man [culture] went and goes, slavery, robbery, lawlessness, culture-wrecking, and the outright extermination of both wild beasts and tame men accompany him." – Lewis Mumford - Myth of the Machine: The Pentagon of Power, 1970.**

\*



**Fidel Castro**

"According to Roman Catholic practice, when someone is deathly ill, they make their confession and then receive extreme unction. This is what has happened with United States credibility in the almost simultaneous meetings of the G-20 and APEC. On the basis of this, we don't know what's coming next. Perhaps they shall give a Christian burial or cremation to the remains of the absurd illusion that it is possible to keep alive a social system that is incompatible with the life of humanity.

<http://www.countercurrents.org/castro161110.htm>

\*\*\*\*\*

## **A brief and crucial history of the "United States"**

...For two hundred years Americans have been indoctrinated with a mythology created, imposed and sustained by a manipulating cabal: the financial elite that built its absolute control on the muscle and blood, good will, ignorance and credulity, of its citizenry.

America began with the invasion of a populated continent and the genocide of its native people. Once solidly established, it grafted enslavement of another race onto that base.

With those two pillars of state firmly in place it declared itself an independent nation in a document that nobly proclaimed the equality of all mankind. In that act of monumental hypocrisy America's myth had its beginning...

Once the existing oligarchy was secure in law and native people largely exterminated, the ruling class increased its wealth and power fantastically in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, using the government as its enabler, exploiting to the limit the device of chartered corporations.

With its phenomenal money power, the financial elite began to use the military to expand its sway beyond the continent. Regions, territories, islands, and whole countries were annexed, invaded, and possessed outright, their peoples crushed, suppressed, and ruled.

Because ordinary Americans, like any people, need to believe that whatever the ruling elite undertakes in their nation's name must be essentially benevolent, noble in purpose and justified in fact, the myth had to be radically modified for imperial expansion.

The foundational story was that Americans had come to a howling wilderness teeming with godless savages and, through invincible strength of character and purity of purpose, had tamed the land and honorably earned the right to possess their bountiful home.

In the era of extra-territorial expansion that version was polished to justify and ennoble imperialism. The new corollary was that America could not ignore colonialist brutality but was obliged, by the Manifest Destiny that led us to civilize our own continent, to carry our mission into barbaric darkness wherever tyranny created abuse and suffering.

A national myth that absolutely binds the loyalty of a people to its government must be a subtle and powerful elixir that elevates and aggrandizes that people's self-



regard. National policy will then appear to be an extension of its superior citizenry's inchoate will, and the basis for a justified arrogance toward the lesser world.

The simple, powerful myth of America's altruistic and heroic benevolence, shaped and maintained by the financial/political power elite, infused Americans with a deep and outrageously hubristic sense of racial superiority that, mobilized behind various imperial enterprises, has given all such adventures the character of a quasi-religious crusade. In this way insatiable imperialism acquires the apparent moral perfection of a syllogism...

So the American Myth is dead, and yet it lives on in its deadness, horribly masking our crapshot economy, our bankrupt debtors prison of a society, our Ghost Dance charade of kabuki democracy, while typhoons of impending social, economic and ecological disaster build their enormous, lightning-charged thunderheads above the dark future before us.

And what is it that the dead Myth still imperfectly obscures for Americans? What is outside and beyond the opaque wall of faltering, failing dishonesty and deception? What is the horror that the shoddy, tattered Myth has so long and so effectively concealed?

It is the world that has suffered unrelieved exploitation by the violence of our imperialist mania. It is the many wrecked and pillaged economies financially looted by our imposed predatory capitalist austerity regimes. It is the teeming hundreds of millions of starved, deprived and dying children sacrificed to Wall Street commodities gaming. It is the multitudes of humble, innocent, ignorant people, barely surviving in absolutist and dictatorial regimes propped up in their barbaric cruelty by our military while our banks siphon off the profits left after arming their brutal police and armies and bribing their ruling Kings, Sheikhs or Generals. It is the millions of dead and maimed in the raped populations of simple tribal people whom our indiscriminately murderous juggernaut has left in its bloody wake in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. It is the appalling legacy of hate and repulsion, disdain and fear, that America has earned with its appalling hegemonist villainy in every corner of the world.

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article30620.htm>

\*\*\*\*\*

### ***A brief history of Superpowers***

**William Blum**

... I think the dissolution of the European Union would benefit world peace by depriving the US/NATO mob of a guaranteed partner in crime by returning to the Union's members their individual discretion in foreign policy. And then we can turn to getting rid of NATO, an organization that not only has a questionable raison d'être in the present, but never had any good reason-to-be in the past other than serving as Washington's hit man...<sup>5</sup>

<http://www.killinghope.org/bblum6/aer111.html>

\*\*\*\*\*



**The Syria Chemical Weapons Saga: The Staging of a US-NATO Sponsored "Humanitarian" Disaster? – Prof Michel Chossudovsky**

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-syria-chemical-weapons-saga-the-staging-of-a-us-nato-sponsored-humanitarian-disaster/5315273>



***Fabricating WMD "Evidence": Israeli Covert Operation inside Syria to "Track Chemical Arsenal"***

**Julie Lévesque**

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/fabricating-wmd-evidence-israeli-covert-operation-inside-syria-to-track-chemical-arsenal/5315012>

To subscribe/unsubscribe send a blank message with the appropriate request in the subject window. Feel free to forward for information and educational purposes with Signature intact, please! - [gzahran@wanadoo.fr](mailto:gzahran@wanadoo.fr)



## Fredrick Töben

### Multicultural Fraud - August 1990

The ethnic community's lobby doesn't like the emphasis that the Fabian Socialists are putting on the teaching of English, and of course, Asian languages.

We have always felt that the European ethnics don't like the Fabians' Asianisation of Australia any more than do the Anglo Celts. Yes, the 75 per cent of us! How dare we be the 75 per cent of the Australian population? The Federation of Ethnic Community Councils wants all foreign languages to be equally officially encouraged. They grudgingly accept that English is Australia's central language which everyone has the right to learn. Jolly decent of them.

Well indeed, that comment I consider rather funny that a group of people are attempting to dictate a language policy for the majority of Australians. It would really be funny if it were not such a serious matter. And what could be a more serious matter than the future of a language that we speak, the language in which we dress up our thoughts?

Consider the question: What do you call a bear without an ear? English is not an easy language to learn but sometimes an apparently difficult language problem has a very simple solution. A bear without an ear is simply called a 'b'.

Ladies and Gentlemen, if after listening to my contribution you consider it a mere collection of personal viewpoints, on many different subjects, then that is exactly what it is. I make no apology if some of my comments appear to be sweeping generalisations. All thinking, all thoughts express generalities.

For many years I have thought and worried about so many matters. The topic of multiculturalism seems to be consolidating these worries for me, and above all, the topic helps to focus many of my worries of a very important element, i.e.

the question: What is the nature of Australia's unity?

This question together with the problem of divided loyalties is implicitly answered in the following - and let me express a preliminary word of concern. I have found that those people who attempt to pluralise anything, very often have for themselves already gained some kind of advantage by having had a unity for themselves. By pluralising matters for other people, they are putting themselves into a dominant, advantageous position which comes from their personal non-pluralised position. More of this a little later.

#### **Asking the Prime Minister a Question**

On 22 November 1984 the Prime Minister, Bob Hawke, appeared on National ABC Radio talkback. I managed to get a call through to him, and I asked Mr Hawke the following:

'My question focuses on your foreign policy and relates to the internal system in our country. I'd like you to clarify your position on what I consider a hypocritical stance being adopted by your Government on the Australia/South Africa policy. We oppose apartheid in South Africa, yet we are introducing it into Australia in a very subtle way through the Land Rights legislation, and I believe that this hypocrisy is an example of Australia being at an advanced stage of corruption'.

After a brief pause Mr Hawke responded:

*'Well, that line of reasoning, which even with my intellectual agility, I find impossible to follow, but I'll give you what I think are the appropriate comments. There is no hypocrisy and no vestige of hypocrisy in this matter. I don't know whether your question assumes that there is some justice in what's happening in South Africa. I hope you are not assuming that, but let me make it clear what the position of my government is in*

*regard to apartheid and its practice in South Africa.*

*I find it and my government finds it abhorrent without qualification that you have a systemised basis of denying to the overwhelming majority of the population in South Africa, simply because they are black, a denial of the rights available to the minority in that country. They are persecuted in a way which is absolutely abhorrent, its systematised and they are denied the opportunities as human beings in a way which is just totally abhorrent.'*

I wished to remind Mr Hawke of a situation prevailing in other all black African nations, but I couldn't get a word in.

*'There is no similarity - he continued - you'd require the most distorted sort of logic to relate that systematised abuse of rights to what's occurring in this country in regard to the question of land rights. Let me make these points. In 1967 the people of Australia, I guess you were here at the time, the people of Australia, by an overwhelming majority in a referendum in 1967 said this: that they didn't want to leave a question of Aboriginal Affairs and Aboriginal Rights any longer as the exclusive preserve of the States, and by one of the largest majorities ever in a referendum put to the people of Australia, they said the national Government, the Federal Government should have a constitutional responsibility in this area.'*

Again I tried to interject, so as to ask him about his refusal to put immigration matters to a referendum - without success - and he continued:

*'Now that was a clear decision of the people of Australia, and in response to that decision of the people of Australia in a referendum, let me remind you which was put to the people of Australia not by a Labor Government but by a non-*

*Labor Government. The no-Labor Government said to the people of Australia the Federal Parliament must have rights to legislate in this area. The non-Labor Government and then, when that was passed by the people of Australia in response to a non-Labor Government referendum, the Government of my predecessor passed legislation, land rights legislation in regard to the Northern Territory, which gave effect to the will of the people in 1967 that the Commonwealth should legislate.'*

Again I tried to ask Mr Hawke another related question, without success. The mechanism apparently doesn't let you get through – and he continued:

*'Now what we are doing is to say that in consultation with the States, with the miners, with the farmers and with the Aborigines we will move to give effect to the desire of the people of Australia, expressed in a referendum. Now, that is a position where the whole of the people of Australia were consulted as to whether in fact there should be a legislative power in the Federal Parliament. It was done by a non-Labor Government, a non-Labour Government has acted on it, and a Labor Government is going to act on it. Now, there are the full democratic constitutional processes. And as I say it requires the greatest distortion of logic imaginable to try and equate that in any way with the situation in South Africa.'*

At this point the radio presenter cut in and thanked me for my call.

So a month before Christmas the Prime Minister of Australia told me that it requires the greatest distortion of logic imaginable, and despite his own intellectual agility, he could not follow my argument that the land rights issue is carving up Australia to a number of tribalistic homelands, i.e., it would create ethnic apartheid on the Australian continent.

Perhaps I should have there and then hung my head in shame and pleaded with Mr Hawke to forgive

me for my foolish thinking. Somehow though his own response to my voiced concerns didn't ring true. His criticism of my point of view seemed rather empty and trivial, and it had nothing to do with the land rights issue. The 1967 referendum merely repealed the sections of the constitution which excluded Aborigines from the census and did what Mr Hawke alluded to – give the Commonwealth government power to legislate on Aborigines, something done previously by the various States.

#### **Democracy clarified**

Some people seem to see the 1967 referendum as a kind of watershed for Aboriginal democracy, Koorie Democracy. This is of course quite misleading because all male Aborigines were able to vote in New South Wales and Victoria as early as the 1850s. Queensland and Western Australia were late comers to the party, and I think these two States granted its Aborigines the right to vote sometime during the 1960s, certainly before the 1967 referendum.

Let me briefly digress. Considering that the American Declaration of Independence of 1776 is just on 200 years old, Australia still has nothing to be ashamed of as regards its record of democracy. The contents of this declaration makes interesting reading. Just a snippet here:

*'We hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their creative and certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness'*.

This equality was of course not extended to Negro slaves, local Indians and Immigrants.

It was not until the 1965 Voting Rights Act was passed by Congress that black Americans received the vote. And of course throughout the next 15 years the cry 'one man one vote' was adopted on the African continent without any regard to the

slow, agonizing process that witnessed its birth in the far more developed United States of America.

Anyone who denigrates Australia's treatment of its Aborigines should set their criticism into an historical world context. It will then become obvious that we can stand proud of our heritage, and to me it is high time that we stop this sentimental sloppiness and begin to focus upon the positive virtues of this country's political and social endeavours.

The people who smear our historical tradition are often themselves motivated by malice, hatred and jealousy. After all, no one denies that many injustices have been suffered by the Aborigines, but surely we cannot freeze our focus upon such injustices – that would give us a very distorted picture of government in action.

Interestingly enough such critics rarely point on the futility of pumping massive unemployment money into Aboriginal communities, without ensuring that these communities do not squander such financial injections. Even all-white communities would disintegrate in such depressing circumstances as exist in numerous Aboriginal settlements.

#### **National Unity**

Let me briefly return to Mr Hawke's statement. Six years on and I still maintain that our national unity, our national wellbeing is being threatened by the land rights issue. Its proponents refuse to discuss the concept of national unity, though recently something seems to be afoot. It's been decreed that anyone who wishes to vote for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Council must be an Australian citizen or be on the electoral role. This very recent development in fact negates in part my fears if parts of Australia are exclusively reserved for Aborigines because then the next logical step in this process would be for such communities to declare themselves independent of the rest of Australia

– in the manner in which Prince Leonard of Hutt River Principality near Geraldton did two decades ago. Interestingly enough it was only recently that a member of Mr Michael Mansell's group re-entered Australia on an Aborigines Nation passport. The explanation offered by Customs, permitting this obvious political stunt, was that any Australian citizen can enter the country without a passport, providing that some means of identification is produced to prove the person's Australian citizenship status.

For me the land rights issue or multi-racialism is the other side of the multi-cultural coin. Both issues are fracturing the unity and strength of our country. I wonder in whose interest it is to see Australia thus divided. I personally do not think it's desirable to have an autonomous Aboriginal nation on this continent. In Canada the Mohawk Indians in Quebec or the Sioux Indians in the States are also attempting to achieve Nation status. Recently a Mr Jimmy Everett visited the Mohawks so as to learn something of their treaty endeavours.

#### **A Bloody New Australian**

Ladies and Gentlemen, I say all this being quite conscious of the fact that I am one of those Australians who in the past was called a 'new Australian', perhaps a 'bloody new Australian'. I was ten years old when in 1954 my parents left their farm in Lower Saxony, North Germany. They packed their belongings and together with their four children set out not for Canada or the United States, as many did before them, but they headed for that 5<sup>th</sup> continent, the home of the Kangaroos, Koalas and millions of fine sheep.

When we arrived in Melbourne there was no multi-lingual service to help us find our way. My mother's and father's school English served them well during these early days. The virtue of learning a second language proved to be a wise

educational policy. Once on the Australian continent all immigrants were made to feel at home, but they were also made well aware of this other business. They were acquainted with the dictum 'when in Rome, do as the Romans do'. We were expected to fit into the social fabric without too much mollycoddling. We were also expected to contribute to the wellbeing of our new home country, and that usually meant working in some factory or at some mining project.

Migrants came to Australia for a number of different reasons. To me the overriding consideration has always been the fact that such a move of leaving one's homeland is generally made in the spirit of free choice. There are of course the exceptions, the lucky ones who succeed in escaping persecution. Hence those immigrants who do not feel at home in Australia have the freedom to leave again. It is interesting to note that a large number of southern Europeans are doing just that, thanks to the generous reciprocal pension arrangements that exist between the Australian Government and those countries.

#### **Nationalism**

Last night we heard Mr Ruxton say 'why don't you go back where you came from'. This was indeed one of those trite but very hurtful remarks which many immigrants had to endure when they dared whinge about conditions in their newly adopted country. Such a remark certainly reflects a callousness that can hurt and deeply wound the newcomer who really tries to fit into mainstream Australian society, but for whatever reason feels rejected by the general community.

Interestingly enough though we heard a while ago of an English couple, who after spending only a few weeks, or was it days, in Australia denounce their new homeland quite vehemently. I wondered then what had happened to that great British pioneering

spirit that had colonised the world. I concluded then that their criticism must be a reflection of their personal inadequacies, rather than that of a serious critical comment of our society. After all it is not possible to settle into a new environment within a matter of days or weeks. It takes months, years even to feel at home in new surroundings. Moving from the familiar to the unfamiliar tests anyone's adaptability, inner strength and personal values. Not only must we forge a new physical home for ourselves, but we must also find a home within ourselves, within our mind, and that very fact stresses the importance of having nurtured a cultural, a mental and a spiritual home within ourselves.

It appears to me, however, that advocates of multi-culturalism are using the mental approach only. The physical aspect of our human make up which is reflected in concepts such as nationalism is thereby neglected. No, in fact it is actually being denied to us. Advocates of multi-culturalism deny us a physical home. Yet without a physical home we shall lose that vital balance between head and heart, between mind and body.

This was the very argument used by the Zionists to justify the founding of the State of Israel. The Jewish people it was held were too cerebral, too top heavy because they had never had a physical home, having been denied the right to such for centuries. A physical home was therefore needed for the Jewish people.

#### **Race and Religion**

If I may briefly digress for a moment – unfortunately the fraudulent rationale in this issue is the claim that being of the Jewish faith confers a racial status upon you. Hitler was a fool when he accepted the argument that the Jews are a racial entity. Judaism is a religion, and I met orthodox Jews in Jerusalem who would have nothing to do with the physical state of Israel. They were aware of



the painful fact that once you adopt a physical reality that you have to defend a physical state, rather than a religious state of mind, then problems emerge as we are witnessing in Israel and Gaza at the present moment.

Recently the NSW Anti Discrimination Board advised me that its jurisdiction has as yet not determined whether Judaism is a race or religion. The Board did advise me that the United Kingdom and New Zealand had made relevant determinations giving Jews and Seiks standing under race discrimination status.

Personally I sense a little fraud here. To claim that Judaism is a racial category is utter nonsense, but it enables this type of mentality to have both feet in different camps. It is double protection, once on a racial basis and then on a religious ground. After all, anyone who is aware how ferocious the battle for survival is, will know how valuable legal protection is when extended into both conceptual regions - racial and religious.

However, there is a price to be paid for such legal protection, that of intellectual honesty. Anyone who has been to Israel will be amazed to see the great racial mix, and have trouble accounting for such. For example, there are Jews from Tunis who are Semites, Indian Jews from India. Chinese Jews from China, Black African Jews from Zimbabwe, Russian and Polish Jews who are not of Semitic origin. If Judaism is a race, then we also have Jewish Jews, from no doubt Israel or is it from New York, the Kazars?

All this troubles me greatly because such contradictions seem to be unashamedly propped up by a kind of racial superiority claim made by the Nazis. The claim of racial superiority is too close to the claim of the Chosen People - a Master Race and the Chosen People! I cannot accept such thinking because it invites conflict. To me Judaism is like any other dominant religion. It has followers from all

major racial groups, hence to claim racial status is simply to confuse the issue. In any case Arthur Koestler has exposed the whole matter in his *The Thirteenth Tribe*, as being one of conceptual manipulation.

To have all this sanctioned by law makes our legal system oppressive, instead of us offering genuine relief from real distress.

Let me return to the matter of multiculturalism and why I consider it being divisive, primitive and tribalistic. Multicultural nations, and there are only a very few functioning ones, and badly at that, are culturally divisive. In order for a nation to reach cultural maturity, to be strong and productive, we need a dominant culture otherwise the nation's energy is not focused on positive growth values.

In Australia the dominant culture is still Anglo-Saxon, though now they have been eliminating the Saxon element for whatever reasons, so its Anglo Celtic, European, Christian. If we dilute this culture into a multicultural mix then we are actually giving recent immigrants two major hurdles to overcome. One hurdle is made up of their own ethnic ghetto-like communities' structure, and the other is that of mainstream Australian society.

I have always found it inherently dishonest to slot newcomers to Australia into the highly developed ethnic groove. Often this groove becomes very possessive and loyalties are forged to prevent individuals from moving beyond its parameters. The ethnic mould can therefore become extremely restrictive and stifling for those who wish to transcend it and move into mainstream Australian society.

#### **British Common Law**

A month ago, at a police conference, mention was made of the importance of the ethnic factor in maintaining law and order. I could just imagine sociologists having a field day with impressionable young police cadets. I was pleased to hear though that

the Law Reform Society apparently dismissed such claims and it continues to uphold the common sense point of view that law is law, and there need not be special dispensation made for ethnic origin. The recent criminal trial of a radical rightwing group in Western Australia indicates that ordinary laws are adequate in apprehending those who break the law, even racially motivated acts.

I was amazed to hear Aboriginal artist Mr Terry Yambalo claim, we have to accept that now there are two sets of laws. On 8 September in *The Age* he made this claim in reference to his legal action against the Reserve Bank of Australia, for allegedly reproducing one of his works on the plastic \$10 note. Mr Yambalo claims that he did not give the Reserve Bank permission to use his painting for that purpose. The image is supposed to be a very sacred one, one of the Warramirri Tribe of which he is an Elder. Tribal justice demands that someone be speered through the leg for permitting this sacred symbol to be copied. The dilemma facing Black justice is of course that because it involves Whites, there will perhaps be a confrontation between the two forms of justice. Inevitably tribal justice will have to take second place to the law of the land, our Common Law.

#### **Journey through non-multicultural Australia**

The energy needed to overcome the ethnic hurdle, now so keenly imposed by certain types of people, on all newcomers to Australia, would be much better spent if the newcomer used it to enter mainstream Australian society from the very first day of arrival - and that would mean learning the English language. I suspect though that this would create extra challenges for the multicultural buffs, who by the very keenness to help the immigrants into one of the hundred odd ethnic grooves, by directing the newcomer into an ethnic groove, they are basically

derailing or neutralizing that person, long enough for the multicultural advocate to bring his own sheep to greener pastures.

It is in this light that I would like to re-trace for you my personal journey through non multicultural Australia. And it has been a journey in the sense of a voyage of discovery, which has been at times, and can be expected, to be painful, always challenging, often very rewarding.

I well recall my first day at Sylvan Primary School. I managed to complete the required maths work on time – I was in fact way ahead of the others in the subject, because the German school system had operated very tightly from Grade 1 onwards. I did however, have a language problem. There was no integration aide to help my twin brother and I with the language work.

There was no bi-lingual material available for us, not the way it is today. Some of our government schools are almost total ethnic schools in which integration aids and multi lingual material saturate the student population. My brother and I were thrust into a school environment where English was the dominant language – ‘the’ language.

We soon picked up a working vocabulary – yes, no, please, thank you, good morning, good afternoon. I still recall having confused the word ‘who’ and ‘where’. One day I was looking for a boy, our next door neighbour, and I asked someone in the school yard ‘who is Jimmy?’ The person smiled at me and pointed to the boy standing at the rainwater tank having a drink. Indeed that’s how I found Jimmy. So for a time I used the word ‘who’ instead of ‘where’ until someone told me otherwise, and it wasn’t an integration aid. Trial and error got me there in the long run.

Another interesting incident that I recall from my Sylvan days concerned our first student confrontation, the first of many,

though the later fights were far nastier because it brought in the Nazi German pig nonsense.

The boy in this case involved was called Rocco. He was a big boy for his age and he loved to fight. One day he challenged my brother ‘you want fight, you want fight?’ My brother didn’t respond because he didn’t know what he was talking about. So our older sister said possibly he means do you want a fight.

So next time Rocco challenged us on ‘fight’, my brother said ‘up tree’, ‘up tree’. So, pleased with the prospect of at last having a fight on his hands, Rocco enthusiastically climbed a huge oak tree standing in the school yard. He then sat on one of the branches and in great expectation called out ‘come up, come up’. When my brother and I walked away from the tree, we could hear him calling out to us ‘you bloody bastards, you bloody bastards’. I think eventually Rocco climbed down, but he never again challenged us to another fight.

My brother and I didn’t know what Rocco’s words meant, so we asked a kindly lady teacher who expressed great anxiety as we repeated Rocco’s word to her. She implored us that these words were swear words, terrible words, naughty words, words that little boys should never use.

This was my first conscious lesson in language restraint. Suddenly there appeared words that had become off limit, no-go areas had been set up for us. Today of course things are different, students not only swear at one another, they also swear at teachers, and teachers do likewise. They are not setting a standard to their students anymore, i.e. they are following the great example set by our Prime Minister Mr Hawke, when he called an aged old gentleman a ‘silly old bugger’. Mr Hawke’s most recent contribution to the language scene has been in his harsh words to Bishop Hollingsworth – ‘this is a

bloody disgrace, and I am going to say so’ – and he did,

I wondered then whether this incident between the Bishop and the Prime Minister could actually develop into another *Murder in the Cathedral*.

At the beginning of 1955 we attended another primary school, Lucindale Area School in South Australia. We were pleased to find some German speaking students at that school. The headmaster Mr Bohm was also of German extraction, but he spoke no German, and our expectations of receiving some sympathy and understanding for our language deficiencies were not fulfilled. If anything, it put more pressure on us – mercilessly applied a blowtorch to our learning values, and there was no mercy in matters of English learning.

I cried a lot, not because of any punishment but simply because of pure frustration of not knowing what was going on in the class room – and that can be a punishment and it highlights how important information is to our wellbeing. Ironically, when I left the school a few months later, I again cried, I was actually very sad to be leaving the school because despite the difficulties I had made a number of friends, and was rather sad to be leaving them behind.

This taught me an indirect lesson – the value of determination, to accept challenges and to give your best at all times.

My next school was Beveridge Primary School back in Victoria where Mr. Black wished to demote us to a lower grade. I this time, however, we actually felt that our English was quite reasonable and we told Mr. Black that our demotion was not on. We worked doubly hard at our set task, and Mr. Black didn’t mention a demotion again.

#### **Parasitic Impulses**

I also recall how, we as a group of children, had a fight over a grass hut. One group of children had built a nice grass hut next to the pine

plantation, and the other group of children wished to occupy it without having contributed anything to its construction.

Such an attitude seems to me to be so reminiscent of certain types of people who behave just like parasites. A person works hard to establish something and then another person with some dubious claim seeks possession of it.

Multiculturalism to me seems a kind of parasitic mechanism. It feeds on the host culture without which it could not survive, yet it denounces that host culture. It demeans the host by enslaving it in a framework, often conceived from impure motives.

Back to Mr Black and his solution to a schoolyard gang fight. All students had to line up in his office which was also the school's classroom. He then produced his thick strap, and without accepting another word of protest from his students, asked us all to hold out our hands, and in swift firm motion down came the leather strap – and that was collective justice. I do not recall Mr. Black ever holding a grudge against any of his students because of this incident, nor did we. We accepted our medicine without protest. It must have been some innate sense of justice that made us realise that fighting just wasn't on at this one teacher primary school.

My most memorable primary school time was spent at Macedon State School. There Mr. McCarthy, a returned soldier, ran the show for some time. I enjoyed marching into the classroom to the strains of *Sussex by the Sea*. No one at that time ever said 'you bloody German bastard, you are a militarist'. My brother had the job of setting up the loudspeaker and operating the record player.

But we also learnt more about our new country through poetry. We learnt the verses of *The Bushfire*, *The Drover's Wife*, *Clancy of the Overflow*. My brother and I topped the class in this work. We literally learnt and recited hundreds of

verses. And the more verses we learnt the more marks we received. Mr McCarthy also inculcated in us a sense of pride and honour mixed with the sense of individualist achievement. We practiced English with enthusiasm. And in retrospect I think we were lucky that we did not have an integration aid to help us overcome those difficult times. I was forced to overcome them myself, and that gave me a sense of pride, a sense of independence, a sense of achievement.

At the end of primary school we had to sit the entrance examination for Kyneton High School, and of course, we survived that challenge as well.

Today's students are automatically promoted to higher classes. I do not think that this is helping them at all. Nothing is gained without sacrifice, nothing is won without effort. Yet, so it appears to me, the present climate in our schools and elsewhere is encouraging the culture of 'she'll be right', which is just the opposite to the now somewhat legendary pioneering spirit that gave rise to this country's development.

Mind you, there is the other method of survival – that of the bureaucratically determined collectivism which shuns individual effort and which all too often shows parasitic tendencies.

#### **The Beauties of Literature**

Let me return to my productive years at Kyneton High School. It was there that I was introduced to the more serious aspects of our literary tradition. Our English teacher was an elderly Irish lady called Miss Kitty O'Shea. Her face was care worn and full of wrinkles, and she always came into the classroom carrying lots of books. So many in fact that she always needed help, and my brother and I gave that help willingly. As I said, she had a care worn face, but when she spoke:

\*

No Nightingale did ever chaunt  
More welcome notes to weary bands

Of travellers in some shady haunt,  
Among Arabian sands:  
A voice so thrilling ne'er was heard  
In spring-time from the Cuckoo-bird  
Breaking the silence of the seas  
Among the farthest Hebrides.

\*

Miss O'Shea managed to imbue some of us in this all boys' class with the beauties of the English language. There was *Romeo and Juliet*, *Julius Caesar*, *The Merchant of Venice*.

Years later I heard a principal say that people can get along without the knowledge of English literature, without a knowledge of Shakespeare. No doubt they can. It is not vital for survival, but I would have thought that anyone interested in doing more than just surviving, that such a person would wish to have the seeds of culture sown early in life – at school.

I recall how concepts such as truth, honour and justice – even moral development – flowed from the work we did in Miss O'Shea's classes. She implored us at regular intervals to leave those girls alone and to concentrate on our school work. This perhaps trivial admonition developed my sexual restraint, i.e. the impulse of desire to seek sexual gratification without reflection.

#### **Destructive Educational Liberalism**

Today in many secondary schools almost anything goes. Students openly engage in explicit petting behaviour while frustrated teachers look on from behind staffroom curtains. It is not done to stop such nonsense. After all, who as a teacher would think of setting their students a personal example in matters of morality? It's not becoming – anything goes, and that is the result of the 'me and my feeling' philosophy put into practice. Students are not being encouraged to exercise sexual restraint anymore, much to the detriment of guaranteeing a full, mature human development.



Of course I am aware of the extreme of repressed passion mutating or stunting healthy sexual development. All the same, I do not think I shall ever get used to the idea that so-called teachers, educators, persons who have actually studied for many years, that teachers have to conduct sexual programs in which students are taught how to put on a condom. To me such things border on kinky sexperts – and they get paid for it. There is just no restraint put on students except that which is given to them from home. And those students that come from broken homes often flee into relationships for the sake of comfort, much to the detriment of their schooling. Once children lead the life of adults, then schooling all too often becomes irrelevant and that much used word 'boring'.

I personally regards this kind of educational approach as bordering on criminal negligence. And many English teachers have a lot to answer for on this business of not worrying about correct language use. Even the ABC has been taken over by people who advocate that language standards ought to be viewed from an ethnic perspective. During my school years there was no such subject called 'English as a second language'. There was no concession made to my immigrant status. At Kyneton High School my brother and I also had the rare experience of feeling the weight of prejudice. A boy of Latvian extraction succeeded in galvanising the whole school against us. He was going to teach the German Nazi pigs a lesson. We didn't then know anything about the Second World War conflict, and we were amazed that this boy suddenly made us his hate object. To date we had been quite unaware of our special status which demanded that we'd be given some special treatment.

When my brother surged forth with the rest of the students to the football oval I wondered why this fight had begun. We had actually

been good friends with the boy who had out of the blue had developed such hatred towards us.

To cut the story short, there was no fight. A teacher, Mr Thompson, didn't let it happen and somehow everyone drifted back to afternoon classes. However, on the way home that night I encouraged my brother to teach the boy a lesson. The whole school bus journey from Kyneton to Macedon was taken up with taunts about us being German Nazi pigs.

Once off the bus my brother invited the boy to repeat these words which he sneeringly did, much to his regret. My brother told me later that he didn't know how flabby this big bully really turned out to be – all huff and puff and bluff.

Needless to say, that evening my father received a phone call from the local police. The boy's parents were pressing for a charge of aggravated assault. When the officer heard the other side of the conflict, he indicated that the matter would not proceed, that the boy would have to go to school with a couple of blackened eyes. The boy never again touched or verbally provoked us.

During my final school year at Edenhope High School I studied English literature without any special dispensation, and I was proud of my honours in the external Matriculation examination. I'd matched myself against all Victorian students, and I was pleased with the effort. Hard work during that final school year made it possible for me to continue my studies at Melbourne University. But it was not only hard work, the fact that my parents had provided me with a good solid family home environment, freed me of other pressures.

#### **Fracturing of Cultural Heritage**

In education I fear that with all this emphasis on social justice and multiculturalism, we have lost the focus, concentration upon essentials. This fracturing of our cultural heritage in our schools, I

believe, is not by mere accident – it is by design. Just look at the teachers who claim to be carriers of our cultural tradition. Why has there not been a parental outcry to have the teaching of English purified? No doubt such state of affair has been the result of denying that Australia has a dominant culture. The attempt at levelling our cultural tradition by diluting it, in a multicultural mix, is socially divisive.

When an English teacher tells me that ethnic literature, mind you not culturally significant literature, very often about some dreamtime, that this literature is just as important, if not more important than for example Shakespeare's works, then I must charge that teacher with malfeasance of public office.

It is high time for courageous teachers to breathe new life into the rotting corpse of English. A teaching attitude that fails to stress our cultural heritage signifies a neglect of duty, if not an act of blatant fraud. It certainly is being intellectually dishonest. I wonder what cultural civilizing values are being transmitted to our students when multicultural nonsense is being officially sanctioned. I personally see a connection between the multicultural push in our schools with that of denying our teachers some disciplinary clout. Why, may we ask, is our educational bureaucracy not giving its teachers this much needed disciplinary clout? It appears as if some demonic bureaucratic spirit is delighting in messing up teachers and pupils alike. Why is this allowed to happen? In whose interest is it to have a whole generation of Australians turning out to be quite seriously functional and culturally illiterate?

Perhaps the words of educator Frank Tate are relevant here. In 1895 he said:

*'The success of the education system depends on the character and culture of its teachers – character and culture of its*

teachers', and to that I would add: and it's bureaucrats.

I personally wonder in whose interest it is to decry our cultural heritage, who feels threatened by Australia's mono-culturalism? I would like to stress at this point that my definition of mono-culturalism does not imply that we ought to neglect the study of other cultures, on the contrary, we should know other people's cultural traditions in quite some detail.

Multiculturalism to me means that there is a denial that Australia has a dominant cultural tradition. i.e. the Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Celtic, European, Western, Christian. Ancient Greek tradition, going back over 2000 years. By studying our literary heritage we tap into this great tradition, and I have personally found much more tolerance of differing points of view in people who have absorbed such a tradition than the narrow minded ethnic multicultural groove.

I have noticed that the well established cultural nations of Europe do not seem to be too worried about the present world trend of declining standards in secondary schools. This to me seems to be based on the fact that their cultural level ensures that national standards are upheld and self-correcting, because there is a huge volume of culture which serves as a reference point to those who do worry about declining standards.

### **Cultural Tradition and Values**

For example during my stay at Oxford University I discovered that academic standards there had been so low during the 1850s that it was possible to just buy your degree. Often the price was cash or sexual favours. This great university, one of the oldest in the world, had reached an all time low in its operations in its academic tradition, in its claim to fame. You may say 'so what's new'? Well the interesting point about all this is that Oxford, with its 500 year tradition to fall back on, managed

to pull itself out of the doldrums. It survived a cyclical low because it could draw upon a great tradition.

Tradition can give us strength in time of need, just as it can also stifle those who cannot be bothered to become involved in it. We all know of people who rationalise away their own ignorance of cultural matters. Tradition always obliges. It obliges us with a core of values, and that is something which the illiterate student often thirsts for – a direction, a purpose beyond the immediate, beyond the present moment. We need the reference points of the past in order to understand what a present and future holds for us. Tradition conserves values, is that not what being a conservative is all about? To conserve, to save up something considered worthwhile by a lot of people.

We must remember though that in our society the pathetic consumerism of an unbridled capitalism can be just as stifling as the perverse ideology of Communism was to the peoples of eastern Europe and elsewhere. Today it's become a cultural event, an outing, to go shopping at one of the great plazas. I speak from personal experience. Consumerism is stage-managed, for example with the aid of television.

My nine year old son Karl is enthralled by this programme, 'The Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtle' craze – I could never get that – from America. When he sees this TV programme he knows he can go to a shop and buy objects, and he wants to buy them, no question about it.

It is interesting that nothing equivalent came out of the Russian Empire – this 'Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtle' craze came out of America. Out of the Russian Empire we had Westerners writing spy stories. We can almost conclude that in the very recent past the United States gave our children the rehashed cape crusaders of Superman and Batman while

Europe fought the thought driven, not the profit money materialistically motivated, revolution of right-leftwing ideology.

In 1976 while I was completing my studies at Heidelberg and Stuttgart Universities, I became fully aware of this battle for Europe. I noticed then that many academics who fled Europe before, during and after the Second World War, were eagerly seeking to return. Intellectually, so it was perceived, the United States of America had nothing further to offer.

The Europeans certainly regard the Americans as culturally illiterate and immature. I found that many Europeans of various nationalities, but especially the French, entertain the vast superiority complex about their cultural heritage.

And it was illustrated to me quite graphically when I returned to visit a colleague in Stuttgart after I'd spent three years in Rhodesia. I presented him with a small Zimbabwe bird figure, and quite tactlessly he asked me what I was expecting him to do with that object. After all, he told me that he had the most significant cultural symbol hanging on his lounge room wall, and he told me that I would do well to note its presence. It was a huge crucifix – that, he said triumphantly, is the most significant cultural symbol to emerge for over 2000 years.

I mention this matter to indicate that during the 70s and 80s the cultural battle for Europe was already in full ferocious swing, and the Soviet Union had to lose this battle. The fall of the Berlin Wall in December last year merely sealed victory for this cultural tradition. The reunification of Germany just three days ago continues this cleansing process – this elimination of that cancerous growth called Communism.

Yet, we cannot become too complacent about this European victory over this spent ideology. And unbridled form of capitalism

which certainly nurtured the arise of Communism can be just as damaging to people's wellbeing. It could again created a situation in which a revamped form of communism emerges from its own ashes. Already there are apologists claiming that the world misunderstood the clearly humane message of Karl Marx and *Das Kapital*.

An interesting memory of my 1974 Oxford days is that of visiting some of their great cultural shrines – Shakespeare's birth place, at Strathford upon Avon, the Lake Districts and Wordsworth. I also discovered how relatively easy it was to talk to a few of the leading lights in the intellectual world – to historian A.J.B. Taylor and Arnold Toynbee, sociologist A.H Halsey, literary critics Barbara Hardy and Walford Davies, cultural critic Arthur Koestler and philosopher Sir Karl Popper on whose works I wrote my thesis.

If I may digress for a moment and focus on an aspect of literary studies. In her works Barbara Hardy distinguishes three important aspects on the art of writing fiction. Firstly, there has to be a good story, then there has to be a working out of a moral problem, and thirdly there has to be a lively presentation of reality, i.e. the author must concern himself with a search for truth. This to me is normal thinking about literature.

When I returned home to teach English in secondary schools I found that the moral dimension of our human makeup was being denied by certain groups of teachers' unions. But not only the unions, English teachers themselves had given up imbuing their students with basic moral and cultural values. The trend was patterned on *A Country Practice, The Flying Doctor, Prisoner, Neighbours*, and so on.

The Teachers Unions' claim that there is such a thing as value free education is of course blatant fraud. They were the ones who filled the

moral vacuum with such nonsense union ideology and their mass mentality. Such claims of course merely highlighted their morally bankrupt educational philosophy. To me many English teachers relinquished their duties when they abandoned the moral dimension and replaced it with such nonsense as multicultural studies, with process writing studies and with 'me and my feelings' ideology. The focus was on the process rather than on content, instead of a balanced mix of both.

In many schools the former English faculties had been absorbed in suspect social studies or social science faculties. Such absorption of the subject English has diluted its purity, has begun to question its relevance as an autonomous subject. At one school we had English rolled up with History and Geography. Of course this kind of mishmash suited the teachers who felt threatened by what English had to offer as a pure subject. Undiluted English language and literature studies imbue students with a full knowledge of their cultural tradition. It exposes students to working out their own moral problems, and it imbues them with the worthy concept of truth, of honesty.

#### **Popper v Wittgenstein**

It bothers me that so many teachers still deny the moral dimension. The philosopher Sir Karl Popper told me of an interesting confrontation he'd had with the language philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein. Since the 20s Wittgenstein was resident philosopher at Cambridge University and before his death in 1951 he'd invited Popper to be the guest speaker at one of his seminars. Wittgenstein introduced his guest by stating quite clearly that his own language philosophy held the key to solving all problems. If only we would analyse our language correctly, Wittgenstein claimed, then all our problems would disappear.

Upon hearing this introductory remark Popper could not help himself: 'What about our moral problems?' he asked. Wittgenstein became agitated, picked up a fire poker, began waving it about and replied: 'There are no moral problems'.

To this Popper replied: 'What about the moral problem when a host threatens a visitor with a fire poker'.

Wittgenstein threw down the fire poker and stormed out the room. He'd not in all his many years of thinking learnt this one lesson of life, that life is more than logic. The moral dimension of human behaviour, the search for truth and the enquiring of values – this is what English teaching is all about.

I am often amazed how slack some of our teachers and students are at school, then again what can you expect of this 'me and my feelings' attitude?

#### **Non-education Education**

More seriously though it worries me that competition in the classroom is considered to be a dirty word. It appears to me that many teachers encourage this deceptive attitude. This encouragement of the non-competitive spirit because they are thereby neutralising students' challenges to their own teaching competence.

The result of this is that when students leave school they are ill equipped to face the vicious world outside, inevitably many will be crushed by a ferociously competitive world. To me this is an attitude and it indicates how empty and bankrupt the education system vision has become over these past two decades.

The hedonistic stance has revealed itself to be the great fraud. After all the pursuit of pleasure only is advocating mere cultural emptiness, and ultimately again, self destruction.

I just cannot understand how supposedly educated teachers can decry our cultural tradition because without a knowledge what precedes



us, of what came before us, without a knowledge of what was, we cannot understand our present and future desires, dreams and directions. We must not neglect our tradition, we must carry the dead with us if we are to make any sense of our cultural tradition. The dead speak to us through books. They teach us lessons about life. The dead imbue us with wisdom derived from our own cultural traditions, but also the wisdom that is absorbed from other cultural traditions.

At present the cultural standard in our secondary schools is generally one of despair. English teachers, certainly in the lower classes, have been absorbed into the social science of general humanities faculties, often run by non English teachers who themselves have little regard and respect for our cultural tradition. I know of English subject advisors who are historians or other such related science matters.

#### **Non-Failure Policy**

This is also reflected in the problem of adult literacy – a problem that begins in our lower forms. The high number of illiterate adults is an indication that something is wrong in our schools. How can illiterates appreciate our written cultural tradition? Is this why there is an emphasis on oral dreamtime traditions?

Today's students don't have to worry about correct spelling. There is no failure to fear and hence there is no urgency to work hard, to perform better, to challenge others, and ultimately to challenge oneself. What an irresponsible attitude that is.

How can such an attitude make us a strong nation. In South Australia, so I read somewhere recently, the Department of Education has decided that ticking students' work creates anxiety among students. Every tick implies a cross, and every cross underlines painfully the absence of a tick – it is therefore an instrument to create anxiety. Such comments are made by leading

educators, and I just wonder how they get away with it, because it is certainly not helping students, nor is it what students really want.

Recently a young apprentice plasterer told me that he enjoyed his two year military service in the regular army. He said that school for him had been a joke. His stint in the army taught him to become self-reliant and to be proud of his country. Dare a teacher mention to his class that word patriotism? What about school cadets? Some years ago Horsham Technical School disbanded its cadet corps, and I need not state here under what political influence such a decision was made.

I spent the 81/82 academic year in Nigeria. I found it very interesting because we totally were starved of resources and at the same time we had student enthusiasm at the maximum. When I returned from Nigeria, I was disturbed to see how our students just coasted along, and teachers cried out for more emergency teachers, more money for equipment, more computers, more in-services, more of this and more of that. And still, basic spelling didn't improve and basic literacy, especially cultural literacy was still abysmal.

And the result of all this, I saw in a tertiary institution, where I found students couldn't even write a decent essay. However, I did not worry about this because the problem wasn't mine. I'd received instructions to pass all students. So I personally could not understand such an attitude because I myself experienced failure at university, but such failure made me develop a more determined effort to overcome that failure – to put in that little bit of extra effort and avoid failure the next time. It seems to me that where there is no failure there cannot be any success either. Something is terribly wrong and there it's a gut reaction that I have – and I came across this kind of gut reaction, a disturbance, when I visited the Soviet Union in 1971. I

didn't know too much about Marxism, but once I was in the country I realised there was something wrong. I couldn't bridge the gap that existed between the rhetoric of that wonderful socialism and the visual and factual reality that presented itself. For example, the best hotel in Moscow Hotel Rossia has over 1,000 rooms – they're wonderful statistics – but it seemed to lack polish. It was shoddy in its finish and similarly with the so-called Russian luxury cars. They all lacked that quality control.

The communist system just did not deliver the goods, let alone quality goods. So how could anyone support such an ideology? As a simple farmer's son I could see there was something wrong, there was a lot of hoodwinking going on. And there were many influential people doing just that, and to me that was just being blatantly intellectually dishonest.

The greatest problem facing the Soviet Union at that time, and perhaps even now, was its inability in handling its critics. This inability, therefore, took away the self correcting mechanism that comes from such criticism in the way that less ideologically structured societies possess – especially if they retain a lively moral dimension. If such criticism is silenced, then a kind of dictatorial censorship mentality stifles this self-correcting process. After all the process of self-correction relies upon as much information as possible, if effective decisions are to be made.

I know that during Mr Cane's Victorian premiership he blatantly used the Olympic Games bid as a kind of silencing mechanism which to me spelled doom not for Mr Cane's critics but for himself. I recall how he used the Games bid to silence discussion about a proposed South African sports tour. He believed such a tour could prejudice Melbourne's chances of gaining the Olympic Games in 1996.

Ironically enough, from a letter published in *The Age* last week, it appears that something much more mundane caused Melbourne to miss out on the Games. It was written by a Mr. L. McTaggerty: *Why Melbourne wouldn't get the Olympics*. He says:

*'Now that the Olympic battle is over, visiting Melbourne from the airport to the city in a dirty cab with a smelly driver who finds it hard to converse in English, leaves one nonplussed. Your train service is deplorable and filthy, your bus drivers need a bath and are robots grafted to the driver's seat. And down Spencer Street and Footscray Road are on a par with Lima and Santiago. Nobody in their right mind would want to come to Melbourne when there are nicer and cleaner cities. Atlanta since 1983 has upgraded the city – good roads and very clean trains. Think what Melbourne could have been if your government had not squandered billions – it could have given your city what you will never see in two hundred years.'*

I am not sure how authentic this is. It could be something else, but at least I certainly share the sentiments.

The way Mr Cain used the Olympic Games bid, so too Mr Hawke is using the multicultural push. It is a mechanism of silencing the majority of Australians. I wonder what has happened to Mr Hawke's much-repeated statement with which I began this talk – 'The People of Australia'. We are not allowed to express our cultural preference, because it could upset some minority group, and there are hundreds of them in Australia. An expression of a majority view could offend an ethnic or religious group, couldn't it?

I am always amazed how in this respect the ABC TV programme *The Big Gig* is permitted to be so critical of Christianity? Never have I seen this programme take the mickey out of the Jews – I wonder why?

### **Culture and Nationalism**

Culture is a national unifying principle, and I see nothing wrong with that. I cannot understand why there are people who wish to fracture Australia's cultural unity. It seems wrong to me to suggest to students that they had better get used to a multicultural Australia. That would be the same thing as saying to young boys 'you better get used to kissing each other'.

It just does not work – what this push does do is to fracture the social fabric into so many different cultural tribes, one competing against the rest – all against one. This to me is a waste of precious energy, it is so unproductive, and again I ask a simple question – in whose interest is it to split our cultural heritage like that?

There must be some form of cultural parasite that thrives on the back of this dominant culture. Worse still, it appears to me that the host culture is about to be enslaved in its own legal frame work. The racial vilification laws of NSW and WA point in this direction, and I think it is time to react.

It appears to me that the dismembering of the nation has begun with this multi-cultural push – the next step is multi-racialism. We are now being forced to express our concerns for our nation in multicultural terms. Why? Why is our nation being knobbed like that? In whose interest is it to have a submissive Australian population that is floundering in its own multiculturalism?

I say all this bearing in mind that we must at all cost avoid the charge of being hypocritical in our expressed concerns. We must continue to search for truth in the context of our own human fallibility. This does not imply that this search is for a plurality of cultural values or a relativism that dislocates social institutions. Far from it – what I would like to see is a rigorous, ruthless if necessary application, of our critical faculties to the search for truth in the light of our world tested human values.

In the words of the American philosopher Charles Saunders Peirce a warning:

'Where there is a large class of academic professors who are provided with incomes and looked upon as gentlemen, scientific enquiry must languish. Wherever the bureaucrats are the more learned class, the case will be still worse' – something to be borne in mind if we look at the crumbling Russian Empire. It was basically run by bureaucrats. Unless we retain a rigorous stance in cultural and scientific matters, we shall fall behind the world into a defeatist slumber from which other cultural movements will profit. No one, I sincerely hope, will consider cultural suicide as a viable option, as a way out of all these challenges.

To me multiculturalism is exactly that – cultural suicide. The mechanism is simple – confuse the people, divide the people and fleece the country of its wealth. That seems to be the unwritten dictum guiding certain interest groups that are pushing multiculturalism. Get as much out of the country as you can, without having to put anything into it, except that of an ever increasing debt burden.

I am beginning not to wonder why there is no referendum on this multicultural issue. The force that is behind the push of a multicultural Australia is very strong. This force, i.e. the people who exercise the power think nothing of destroying the family unit or individual people's careers. After all, once you have destroyed the basic structure of our society, the family unit, the restructuring of the social fabric can begin.

Multiculturalism is a mere euphemism for tribalism, which in turn will fracture the healthy national unity that a strong country automatically gravitates towards. The other side of the coin of multiculturalism is multiracialism – and that's another problem. One may well ask in whose interest is to have a nation thus divided? –

husband against wife, son and daughter against parents, brother against sister, neighbour against neighbour, so it goes on. Such futile battles must surely drain a

country's health and morale. Making it ripe for external, foreign exploitation. I salute the League of Rights for having the courage to swim against

the present official government policy, for having the courage to listen to the people's voice. Thank you.

