

Austria, Hitler and Howard's Australia

by nano *Sunday, Feb 26 2006, 2:38pm*

national / social equality/unity / opinion/analysis

Pauline Hanson recently announced on news radio that her political views have been "vindicated"; she cited the overt racist attitudes of John Howard and Peter Costello as proof of her claim. Who could deny it? Hanson's imprisonment on trumped-up charges was an act of political assassination instigated by Howard but executed by his then errand boy, Tony Abbott. Hanson's trial and subsequent imprisonment effectively eliminated her and her party from the Australian political landscape; mainstream racist ideology was re-established in its rightful home, the white Australian conservative ultra-right Liberal Party of Howard! The world watches Australia take a giant leap backwards as Howard continues to divide the nation.

You have done us all proud, Johnny, but please excuse me while I spit! Approximately fifty percent of today's Australians do not have an Anglo background and we all (Europeans, Asians and others) remember our kids not being served in shops and the abuse that was levelled at all of us; you remember, Johnny, the good old days before vilification laws. We can't thank you enough for giving us all the opportunity to drag the lot of you filthy racist scum into court. It will be lawyers picnic day in litigation paradise!

Do you really think your (highly paid) advisers and marketing consultants got it right this time Johnny? Costello's announcement came hot on the heels of the David Irving verdict in Austria - a radical historian/revisionist gaoled for denying the holocaust. [This judgement is extremely disconcerting for advocates of free expression and free speech. Irving's sentence is an example of a psychological/ideological issue, "denial", becoming a criminal offence. The absurdity of this judgement becomes apparent when the American population is considered!]

Armed with a modern legal precedent and 'expert' advice, Costello, with the support of Howard, made his pathetic bid for (some) recognition. Will Australia be the second nation to prosecute an ideology (religion)? It is certainly possible under the present government.

The Jews were offended and someone was gaoled for that 'offence' - and the world sleeps - now the Muslims are offended and it's fair game. Does that reek of double standards Johnny? I would remind the conservative racist scum of Australia, that Howard has not yet completely subverted two hundred years of Australian law, social convention and culture. This great nation was built by immigrants who happily adopted the egalitarian ideal of the freed convict, "I am now free and you and I are equal"; in this way those stigmatised re-integrated into Oz society. However, the British colonial elite (landed 'gentry') officials and large business concerns never admitted or became party to egalitarian principles; nonetheless, egalitarianism prevailed until the Howard government (interruption).

Various unrelated groups and individuals eagerly await Howard's next move, especially the lawyers who are often heard lamenting the good ol' days of the compo smorgasbord!

The crucial aspect to these events is the rise of international neo-conservatism. Events in the US, domestic spying; Europe, 'denial' as criminal offence and now Australia, religious/ideological

persecution attack basic democratic freedoms, not the least being the right to pursue one's religion. Democracies are founded on the right of all individuals to express their point of view without direct interference to or from any quarter. If Howard and Costello wish to alter the behavioural codes of Muslims it would also be refreshing to see the Jews of Bondi relinquish their undertaker's apparel for Hawaiian floral shirts!

Never in recorded history has any totalitarian regime succeeded in stifling freedom; new technological devices purported to finally solve the issues of social conformity and obedience are just another of Big Bother's wet dreams (but we do know these devices/methods will be deployed). In anticipation of technological attacks on personal freedoms various counter-measures have been developed. Pre-emption is neutralisation in the digital world; it has been clearly demonstrated in the world of IT that whatever one person makes another breaks. However, the obvious is always lost on the conservative mentality.

Attempting to undermine social freedoms via legal channels is doomed to failure. I do not interpret a Jew dressed like an undertaker or a female Muslim dressed like a silkworm as "confronting", Johnny, why would you? However, I do find you and your racist government offensive.

Which of us reflects the popular view, Johnny? [There goes another few hundred thousand of taxpayer's money on advisers, consultants and demographers.]

Cleaves Alternative News. <http://cleaves.lingama.net/news/story-177.html>