

15 March 2006

Mr Hien Le,
Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission
GPO Box 5218
Sydney, NSW 1042

Dear Mr Lien,

Reference 2016307FC: Comments on Mr Hareer's Reply and the Applicant's Submissions (30 January, 2006)

The material supplied to you recently by Newhouse Lawyers is presented in a form which makes extended comment difficult. The material consists of what purport to be two separate documents: the Applicant's Reply to my response to his original complaint, signed by Mr Hareer; and, the Applicant's Submissions prepared and signed by Ms Anna Katzman SC and Mr David Knoll. The two documents are, however, substantially identical, the latter being a lightly edited, slightly re-organized and, in places, re-written of the version signed by Mr Hareer.

Since the numbering of paragraphs differs significantly between the two versions, I shall organize my comments around the final draft submitted by Ms Katzman and Mr Knoll. My comments will therefore be presented, as far as possible, under the same subject headings employed by them.

Scope of the Complaint

The complaint relates only to my letter, published in the *Parramatta Sun* on 6 July 2005 and the quotations attributed to me in a front page story in the same edition. This is an important point since there is nothing either in the Letter or the Comments that could be construed as a claim that white Europeans, or any other race, enjoy a general superiority over black Africans.

In the Letter, I merely advert to experience elsewhere suggesting that, once black African colonies in Australia grow in size and in confidence, one can reasonably expect a number of social problems and rising levels of crime and violence. That is not a claim of superiority of one group or of inferiority of another. It is simply a prediction based on my knowledge of conditions in black Africa and in the African diaspora throughout the Western world.

In the Comments, I merely point out that "there are differences between racial groups"—a remark that, surely, is utterly uncontroversial. In both the Letter and the Comment, I predict that "more ethnic conflict" will result from the settlement of large numbers of Sudanese refugees, pointing out that even closely related ethnic groups such as Serbs and Croats have a long history of violent clashes both at home and here in Australia.

Nothing in the Letter or the Comments could be construed either as an assertion of white (or even Asian) racial superiority or as an incitement to racial hatred or violence. On the contrary, my contributions to the *Sun* suggested changes to public policy aimed at reducing the chance for ethno-racial conflict in the future.

Comments I have made or published elsewhere are therefore, on the Applicant's own submission, are beyond the scope of his complaint. But, since the Ms Katzman and Mr Knoll make reference to some of the issues raised in my submission to the Commission, dated 10 October 2005 relating to racial differences in behaviour and temperament, calling into question my academic qualifications, my good faith and, indeed, even my capacity to enter into rational debate, I will respond to their claims and allegations below.

Applicant's Standing as an Individual

The Applicant declares that he came "to Australia ...believing Australia to be an accepting, multicultural society in which racial differences between fundamentalist Arabs and black Africans in the Sudan, would not lead to racial hatred." This comment is either astonishingly naïve or simply disingenuous. My feeling is that Mr Hareer is dissimulating. For reasons that I will explain in greater detail below, no reasonable person, black or white, would interpret my letter as an expression of "racial hatred."

That is not to say that racial, religious and ethnic conflict does not exist in Australia. Indeed, the point of my letter was to warn readers that current immigration policies are bound to generate increasing friction between racial and religious groups who have little or nothing in common. It is hard to believe that anyone with direct, personal experience of violent ethno-racial warfare could reasonably expect ethnic conflict to remain absent from Australia when it is so obviously endemic to every other multi-racial society.

The founding fathers of the Australian nation were well aware that multi-racial societies are prone to intractable ethnic conflict. That is why they adopted the White Australia Policy. The decision to abandon that policy has seen steadily rising levels of racial and religious strife in Australia, with recent events in Cronulla providing the most dramatic example. We also know that conflict between the Sudanese and other African refugees and Australian Aborigines has broken out in Perth and Toowoomba.¹ Mr Hareer would be well-advised to adopt a more realistic understanding of life in multicultural societies in the West. They are not immune to "racial hatred," least of all to the ancestral conflicts that Third World migrants bring with them to Australia.

Mr Hareer also claims that "[a]fter Andrew Fraser made his comments I experienced an increase in hatred and discrimination against me as a refugee from Sudan." Here Mr Hareer commits the elementary logical fallacy of *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*. Mr Hareer provides no examples or details of these alleged experiences but it does not follow that, even if such attacks on him did, indeed, *occur* after my remarks were

¹ Martin Lehmann, "Ethnic Crime: Somalian and Sudanese" (Appendix 1); B Weerheym, "Racial conflict in Perth, with a twist" (Appendix 2).

published in the *Sun*, they were somehow *caused* by me. I cannot be held responsible for the actions of other persons.

Applicant's Standing as a Community Representative

I accept that the Applicant is the General Secretary of the Sudanese Dafurian Union in Australia. One wonders, however, whether his complaint is being made solely or even mainly for the benefit of the Sudanese Union.

Material published in *The Australian Jewish News* on the 5th and the 12th of August 2005 (see Appendix 1) provides evidence that Mr Hareer is being used as a catspaw for the benefit of several organized Jewish groups that boast openly of the campaign they have organized against me. In the piece on 5 August, it was reported both that George Newhouse, a founder of the Jewish Labor Forum, would be filing a complaint against me and that the B'Nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission was lending their support to those who publicly condemned me.

The 12 August issue of *AJN* published a letter from David D Knoll, the President of the NSW Jewish Board of Deputies. In the letter Mr Knoll chided the newspaper for not giving the Jewish Board of Deputies credit for its contribution to Mr Newhouse's campaign and for its independent efforts to have Macquarie University deny me the opportunity to teach.

It therefore is significant that Mr Knoll, in company with yet another well-known Jewish lawyer, has taken carriage of Mr Newhouse's case against me. Mr Knoll is clearly not appearing in this matter to provide disinterested and independent legal advice. His role is analogous to that which Mr Hwang sought to play in making a complaint on behalf of black Africans even though he is himself Chinese.

Clearly, Mr Hareer's role in this proceeding is purely formal and utterly passive. In substance, the matter appears to be an effort by Messrs Knoll and Newhouse, with Ms Katzmann lending her professional prestige, to further their shared ethnic interest in the growth of a multi-racial society in Australia.

The link between this complaint and Jewish ethnic interests is reflected, in part, by the inordinate emphasis given in the text and notes of the two documents before us to Jewish issues, Jewish grievances, and cases involving Jewish complainants. Throughout there is a constant effort to draw analogies between me and various "Holocaust deniers" who have been pursued successfully by the same groups supporting Mr Newhouse in his campaign against me.

Indeed, the only effort made in the Applicant's Reply to provide an academic rebuttal to my position comes in the form of an extended footnote on page 11. There we find a lengthy quotation in which Professor Andrew Markus, a Jewish Professor of Jewish Civilisation at Monash University asserts that my "race-based world view has a long/dubious history."

Like Mr Newhouse, Mr Knoll and Ms Katzmann, Professor Markus supports the transformation of Australia and other Western nations into multi-racial societies,

largely because they believe that outcome would be good for Jews. That “race-based world view” also has a long and dubious history.²

Now, let me make it clear that I have no objection to Mr Hareer’s efforts to advance the ethnic interests of his own people through his participation in the activities of the Sudanese Union. Nor do I believe that there is anything inherently wrong in the efforts made by Mr Newhouse, Mr Knoll or Ms Katzmann to promote Jewish ethnic interests as they see fit.

But they must understand that, as Australia becomes a multi-racial society, it is inevitable that Anglo-Australians, having observed the self-interested activities of other racial, ethnic and religious groups, are bound to become more conscious of their own distinctive racial identity. Many white Australians already feel that they are losing their ancestral homeland to a massive influx of Third World migrants hostile or indifferent to the ethnic interests of the host society.

What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Having cast themselves as spokesmen for their respective peoples, neither Mr Hareer nor his Jewish advocates can prevent me or other white Australians from seeking to preserve and promote the ethnic interests of our own people. The simple fact is that a multi-racial immigration policy is not obviously and necessarily in the best interests of white Australians.

White Australians, individually and collectively, must be allowed the same freedom to organize and speak out in defence of their own ethnic interests that Sudanese and Jewish ethnic activists so obviously enjoy and, indeed, take for granted.

General

When framing complaints on behalf of black Africans who claim to have been insulted, offended or humiliated by my comments, Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll would be well-advised to avoid the use of insulting and offensive language themselves. To suggest, as they do, that I have resorted “to pseudo-scientific theories of racial stereotyping to justify racial prejudice” is not only insulting but, quite simply, false and offensive. It is, indeed, defamatory to suggest that the two eminent academics, Professors Rushton and Salter, who submitted letters to the Commission in support of my public comments, along with another well-qualified researcher, Mr Mackintosh, are “pseudo-scientists.”

Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll may choose to ignore the small army of scientific investigators around the world who have made important advances in our understanding of racial differences in behaviour, temperament and cognitive ability. The Commission cannot afford that luxury without becoming a laughing stock outside a small circle of politically correct ideologues.

Displaying open contempt for the facts of the matter, Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll, repeatedly, simply disregard the material I submitted with my response of 10 October.

² Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (Westport: Praeger, 1998).

That material demonstrates that there is a solid scientific basis for the recognition of race differences in public policy-making, especially in the field of immigration and refugee law and policy.

Violation of s 18C of the *Racial Discrimination Act*

Under this heading Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll take my Letter and Comments apart, line by line, adding their own spin in the process.

Ethnic versus Civic Nationalism

They purport to find something sinister, for example, in my observation that mass, non-white immigration has produced the steady erosion of Australia's national identity. They complain, first, that I have not defined that identity; then they criticize me for suggesting that the Anglo-Celtic settlers put their unique stamp upon Australia's national identity.

There is no mystery here. My Letter and Comments made the point explicitly that the Australian national identity ought to be understood in ethno-cultural rather than merely legal and formal terms. This point is not original or unique to me. It is in fact a commonplace among scholars specializing in the study of nationalism. Professor Anthony D Smith, for example, writes that the "Anglo-Saxon pioneers and settlers...created the legal, linguistic and educational framework of the new national state and supplied most of its heroes and myths of origin." He goes on to point out that "the original ethnic underpinnings have set limits on what can be admitted to the 'plural nation' without wholly undermining the community and its national solidarity."³

The position taken by Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll is hypocritical in the extreme. They seek to portray my defence of the ethno-cultural foundation of Australian identity as a vile form of "racist hate speech." But we can be sure that, as President of the NSW Jewish Board of Deputies, Mr Knoll, in particular, is a strong supporter of Israel's unconditional right to exist as a Jewish state. Zionism is perhaps the single most obvious example of an exclusionist, ethnic nationalism in the world today.

The curious thing is, however, that Jewish activists such as Mr Knoll appear to believe that, while Israel has the right to preserve its core ethno-cultural identity, Western nations such as Australia, Canada and the USA must be content with a watered-down, "civic" nationalism, effectively detaching the nation from its roots in a community of memory, blood and tradition.

Even more ironically, Mr Hareer falls in with this plan to hollow out the ethno-cultural dimension of Australian national identity. To him, apparently, being Australian means nothing more than a formal, though not necessarily exclusive, allegiance to the state apparatus providing him with a passport. But that sort of hollow, "civic" nationalism also describes the essence of Sudanese citizenship.

³ Anthony D Smith, *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*, p109.

The Sudanese “nation” has no core ethno-cultural identity. As a consequence, the Sudanese state commands the loyalty only of those ethnic, racial and religious groups in control of the government at any given moment. Combined with a multi-racial society, that sort of “Clayton’s national identity” (“the national identity you have when you’re not having a national identity”) is a merely legalistic recipe for political instability. In effect, Mr Hareer recommends that we adopt in Australia the same policy responsible for the failed state from which he fled.

Recent experience in Sydney is demonstrating that the mere possession of a common, merely legal, citizenship bestowed by the state will never eliminate conflict between racial, ethnic and religious groups. Such conflicts are a fact of life, even when the members of the clashing racial and ethnic groups have been born and raised in Australia.

“The Refugee and Holocaust Industries”

Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll also take issue with my reference to the “ever-expanding refugee industry.” They suggest this phrase is merely pejorative, having no basis in reality. I suggest that an examination of the budget for NGOs involved in the selection and settlement of refugees, including legal-aid lawyers, Human Rights Commissions, teachers, translators, social workers etc would reveal a very large and growing class of persons who work in this industry and who have a clear interest in expanding the numbers of refugees as much as possible.

The attempt by Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll to smear me by linking my use of the phrase “refugee industry” to the alleged use of the phrase, “the Holocaust industry” by so-called “Holocaust deniers” is simply a sign of the cavalier disregard for truth evident throughout the Submission prepared by Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll. It is worth noting in the interests of factual accuracy—even though the issue is not strictly relevant to this matter—that the phrase “the Holocaust industry” came into widespread public use after the publication of the book by the same title written by Norman Finkelstein.⁴

Mr Finkelstein, a Jewish writer, is not, by any stretch of the imagination, a “Holocaust denier.” On the contrary, he notes that his “father and mother were survivors of the Warsaw ghetto and the Nazi concentration camps. Every other member of his family, “on both sides, was exterminated by the Nazis.” I suspect he would find the comments made about his book’s title by Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll both insulting and offensive.

It is precisely because he is Jewish that Mr Finkelstein resents the opportunistic manner in which many Jewish organizations and individuals have sought to exploit Jewish suffering for their own personal or political gain. The fact that there is a dispute between Jews over the experience of Jews during the Second World War is absolutely irrelevant to this matter. To attempt to smear my Letter and Comments about immigration policy by association with an altogether different controversy is reprehensible.

⁴ Norman G Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering* (London: Verso, 2000).

Colonies

Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll also criticise my use of the word “colonies.” In my view, to speak of the “colonisation” of Australia by the Third World, in preference to some euphemistic alternative, is simply being realistic. But Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll are determined to enforce a politically correct linguistic code. The Oxford English Dictionary defines “colony” as “A number of people of one nationality living in a foreign city or country; the quarter thus occupied.” That is plainly the sense in which I was using the word. That usage is legitimate, correct and not at all “pejorative.”

The Target of the Letter and the Comments

Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll then charge that “Nothing the Respondent said and nothing contained in...the Respondent’s remarks relates to the conduct of any particular individual. His statements do not concern any identifiable activity such as could be addressed or remedied (if found to be a social ill.)” They claim that my remarks were aimed at the Applicant and persons like him.

The suggestion that my remarks were aimed at the Applicant is simply false. Any reasonable person reading my Letter would recognize that it identifies “governments and the ever-expanding refugee industry” (personified in the form of Community Relations Commissioner, Stepan Kerkyasharian) as the target of my criticism. No reasonable person could doubt that I looked governments and the refugee industry both as the source of the social ill under discussion and also for the remedy necessary to cure it.

The letter concerns the adverse effects, present and potential, of current immigration policies. By clear implication, the letter does hold one particular individual namely, the Minister for Immigration, responsible for the settlement of large numbers of Sudanese refugees in Western Sydney.

The Applicant takes offence at my letter, not because he or any other Sudanese *persons* were singled out for criticism by me, but because he is the beneficiary of the immigration *policies* that were the legitimate target of my attack. He does not want those policies changed and I do. That is the sole basis of the conflict between us.

I made no imputations concerning the conduct or behaviour of the Applicant or the conduct or behaviour of any other Sudanese person or persons now present in the Parramatta-Blacktown area. My comments concerned the likely effect of continued growth in the size and confidence of the African colony that has been established in my local community. My predictions were based not on the conduct of Sudanese in Australia but on the observed behaviour of black African populations elsewhere in the world.

Therefore, Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll are wrong to charge that the Applicant or other Sudanese persons in the Parramatta-Blacktown area were the relevant “target group” in my Letter and Comments. My quarrel was obviously not with Sudanese refugees, *per se*, but with the Australian government and the “ever-expanding refugee industry” produced by its mistaken policies.

No Safe Harbour under Section 18D

In the Applicant's Reply my Letter and Comments are characterized as "racist hate speech" which cannot be excused by the statutory exemptions in s 18D. Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll flatly declare, with no further explanation, that my "position is based on prejudice, not science." They refuse even to acknowledge, however, that I provided a wealth of scientific material in my submission of 10 October to support my public comments on racial differences in behaviour, temperament and cognitive ability. Some of that material had been made available to the journalist, Gerard Sutton, from the *Parramatta Sun* as he was writing the Comments piece. He chose not to refer to it for reasons of his own beyond my control.

Nor do Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll deign to acknowledge the letters that other reputable scientists have written to the Commission in support of my position. Fortunately, even if Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll prefer to do so, the Commission cannot ignore the work of the scientists and academics that I have cited in support of my position.⁵

Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll must be made aware that mere assertion is not proof. Their submission does nothing more than repeat various versions of the formulaic assertion that "there is no scientific basis to the discriminatory theories he propounds or embraces." As already suggested, there is a wealth of such evidence that I have made available to the Commission, directly and indirectly.

The Discriminatory Nature of Immigration Law

As for the reference to my "discriminatory theories," let us recall that my Letter and Comments were addressed to matters of immigration law and policy. As Professor Geoffrey Blainey observed over twenty years ago, "immigration policy in any country is based more or less on discrimination. A minister of immigration is a minister of discrimination."

Unless immigration policy opens the borders or closes the borders absolutely to all comers, immigration ministers must make choices that discriminate between categories of potential immigrants. Every nation has the right to discriminate between persons and groups it is willing to accept and those that it would prefer to reject. Israel, for example, has adopted an immigration policy that discriminates openly on racial grounds. That country grants free entry and automatic citizenship to Jews from anywhere in the world while excluding non-Jews, even Palestinians refugees who were actually born within its borders.

Until very recently, Australia refused entry to any significant number of refugees from sub-Saharan Africa. In my view, that policy was soundly based. Mr Hareer, Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll disagree with me, as they are perfectly entitled to do. But precisely because the public has been starved of any cogent criticism of current policies I was moved to write my Letter and make my subsequent Comments.

⁵ See the references in "Rethinking the White Australia Policy" as well. That article was made available to the Commission in my submission of 10 October, together with a considerable number of other relevant materials.

In that Letter and the interview providing the basis for the Comments, I gave reasons for my belief that sub-Saharan refugees are less desirable or less worthy of sanctuary in Australia than the other intending asylum seekers who will not be admitted if Ms Katzmann, Mr Knoll and Mr Hareer have their personal policy preferences upheld by the Minister for Immigration.

In my Letter and Comments, I pointed to experience elsewhere in the Western world with immigrants of black African ancestry. African immigration has a substantial downside; “expanding black populations” are typically associated with “increases in crime, violence and a wide range of other social problems.” This is not “racist hate speech.” It is simply an effort to raise relevant issues in a public discussion on the basis for the inevitable discrimination that must be made by the Minister for Immigration between different, competing groups of would-be immigrants and refugees. Can it be maintained seriously that the relative propensity for criminal behaviour should never be a relevant consideration when the Minister or her department determines eligibility for a limited supply of immigrant or refugee visas?

Ethnicity and Crime

Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll claim that I do not support my contentions about black criminality “with evidence and what evidence there is does not support my argument. Once again, they simply choose to ignore the evidence I provided on black criminality, especially in the USA and Britain where official statistics on the link between race and crime are readily available.

Instead, they cite a study by the Australian Institute of Criminology concluding that “The crime rate of foreign-born populations is lower than that of native born.” That conclusion is almost wholly irrelevant to any serious study of the links between ethnicity and crime. The study in question assumes that the fact of being born in Australia is, in itself, enough to eliminate the significance of one’s ethnicity. On that basis, one could make no distinction between Aboriginal and Anglo-Australian offenders. The fact that Aboriginals are vastly over-represented among criminal offenders would have nothing to do with their race or ethnicity.

Similarly, the current problems with Lebanese Muslim crime and criminals would never show up in the AIC study since most of the young men involved were born in Australia. More to the point in dealing with black criminality, the vast over-representation of American blacks—whose ancestors have been in the USA for centuries—in violent crime would never be recognized by the AIC as having anything to do with their racial identity. No one could take such a proposition seriously.

Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll then try to make something out of the falling crime rate in the Parramatta-Blacktown area in the five-years ending in 2004. Of course, those figures tell us nothing at all about the ethnic background of those who perpetrated the crimes that did occur. Such statistics on the ethnicity of criminal offenders are apparently of no interest to the government or the police (or the media either) who prefer to maintain the fiction of multicultural harmony.

But those local area crime statistics are irrelevant, as well, because I never suggested in my Letter or Comments that the arrival of Sudanese refugees had produced an immediate upward spike in crime rates. On the contrary, as already noted, my point

was that, if experience elsewhere is any guide, increasing crime and other social problems would emerge as the black population *grows in size and confidence*. That is to say, the problems are likely to emerge *in the future*, if current immigration policies are maintained.

States of Denial

These comments were made reasonably and in good faith. A reasonable black person should have no difficulty in considering the remarks in that light. After all, as I pointed out in my submission of 10 October, reasonable black men were appalled by the spectacle of black criminality in New Orleans in the wake of Hurricane Katrina.⁶ Other reasonable black people in the USA and Canada, Bill Cosby and the Reverend Eugene Rivers, for example, have been urging their fellow blacks to end the chronic state of denial in their community about the rampant problems of criminality, drug abuse, pornography and educational failure. (See Appendices 2 and 3, attached herewith.)

If I am right but Mr Hareer nevertheless succeeds in maintaining a high level of African immigration, we may all be forced to deal with very serious problems in the not-too-distant future. There is no point in denying the patent existence of such problems in other countries with large African populations—most obviously in sub-Saharan Africa itself. (I attach a review of a major book on the catastrophic collapse of sub-Saharan African societies in the post-colonial period, together with a collection of relevant quotations on the same subject from impeccably liberal sources.)

Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll assert that there is no “scientific basis for race discrimination.” That observation is irrelevant to the issue before us; namely, the criteria used to discriminate between desirable and undesirable immigrants in a situation where some criteria must be identified. Scientific findings as to the reality of racial differences in behaviour, temperament and cognitive ability cannot themselves determine just what criteria should be employed. That judgement must be made on other, political, moral or social grounds.

But, a decision to prefer white, European migrants over black Africans need not have anything to do with claims that one race is superior or inferior to the other. As I pointed out in my submission of 10 October, if one values certain kinds of athletic ability or musical talent, one would be justified in preferring African over European migrants since they seem to be superior to Europeans when it comes to running, jumping and jazz music.

Therefore, the quotation from LL Cavalli-Sforza in the Applicant’s Submissions is altogether irrelevant. I have never made claims that whites or Asians are superior to black Africans. My point is simply that, as a matter of fact, those races display substantial differences in behaviour, temperament and cognitive ability. How one values those differences is a different, normative, issue.

Cavalli-Sforza does claim that there is no connection between genes and behaviour. That claim was made in 1994, before the recent dramatic advances in behavioural

⁶ Leighton Levy, “The dark side of black people” *Jamaica Star*, included as an Appendix in my submission of 10 October.

genetics. He also once suggested (see Appendix) that the best way to investigate the linkage, if any, between genes and behaviour would be to study identical twins separated at birth. Such studies have been done since then and they demonstrate that identical twins separated at birth display remarkable similarities in behaviour, temperament and cognitive ability.

This would, of course, come as no surprise to dog breeders. In their experience, it is remarkably easy to produce genetically determined behavioural differences in different breeds of the domesticated dog. Vincent Sarich and Frank Miele also discuss the interesting behavioural differences between Chinese and European neonates—differences that cannot be accounted for in terms of environmental influences.⁷

Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll dismiss the research conducted since 1994 on ideological rather than scientific grounds. They are free to remain in a condition of wilful ignorance. The rest of us, however, need not follow their example, especially when it comes to public policy-making. The *Racial Discrimination Act* was not enacted to enforce perpetual public conformity to the sort of racial flat-earthism favoured by Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll.

Statements not made “reasonably”

Under this heading Ms Katzmann again simply assert that “[t]he Letter and the Comments do not present any rational argument for the assertions made.” Instead, the Commission is expected to accept on faith their claim that I engaged in “sweeping vilification of the targeted group.” No effort is made to show how, in their view, my argument might have been presented in a rational manner.

Their caveats really mean that a letter to the editor containing criticisms of public policy whenever racial sensitivities are at stake is simply not possible given the “negative obligations” imposed by the *Racial Discrimination Act*. Were their position upheld by the Commission, letters to the editor critical of multi-racialist immigration policies would dry up altogether. That outcome would certainly satisfy Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll but it cannot possibly have been the legislature’s intention when the *Act* was passed.

Not in good faith

Under this heading we are told that I should have, but failed, to express myself in a more prudent, cautious, diligent and restrained manner. In paragraph 40, we are informed that my language was instead “deliberately provocative and inflammatory” though no specific illustrations are provided.

In effect, we are told that my remarks could not possibly have been tendered reasonably and in good faith because Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll would not have made them.

⁷ Vincent Sarich and Frank Miele, *Race: The Reality of Human Differences* ()pp

Nor for a genuine academic or other permissible purpose

Here we are told that “communicating offensive material to a suburban newspaper is not an academic, artistic or scientific purpose.” According to Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll, “A suburban newspaper is not a forum for academic debate.” In fact, as any reader of any newspaper will know, academics from every imaginable discipline seek to use op-ed articles and letters to the editor as a matter of course to influence public opinion. Indeed, such activity counts as the sort of “community service” academics are expected to perform as one aspect of their duties.

It is true that there are very real limitations on the evidence that one can advance in support of one’s arguments in the context of the 250 word limit imposed by the very nature of the letters to the editor format. But those limitations would have been just as painfully evident had my letter been written in support of African immigration.

Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll, in their inimitably insulting and offensive manner, declare that “for there to be genuine academic debate the person must speak from a position of expertise.” They declare, flatly and unequivocally: “The Respondent has no relevant expertise.” Clearly, they either have not read pages 7-9 of my 10 October submission or, more likely, they have chosen, once again, to ignore the facts staring them in the face. There can be few people on the face of this planet who could fail to meet the standard of “rational debate” set by example in the Submissions made here by Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll.

Not in the public interest

In this section of the Applicant’s Submission much is made of Article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination. Once again, this long-winded passage is simply irrelevant to the matter at hand.

The fact is that nothing in the Letter or Comments was intended to, nor could it in fact, incite “racial hatred.” Reasonable readers, black or white, would interpret the Letter and Comments as a plea for changes in immigration law and policy. There was not the slightest suggestion in either the Letter or the Comments that I regard black Africans as generally inferior to whites or Asians across every measure of human worth or achievement.

I merely pointed to certain readily observable differences in the behaviour of large African populations elsewhere in the world that seem to me to be of obvious relevance to the selection of immigrants and refugees. To make such observations is not to make “[s]weeping, public derogatory generalisations” about any racial group in particular. At issue here are comparisons between racial groups.

One might just as easily condemn the observation that East Asians are more law-abiding than either whites or blacks as a “derogatory” comment: after all, one could interpret the comment as implying that both blacks and whites are less law-abiding than East Asians. Alternatively, of course, such a remark need not be construed as a

criticism of either blacks or whites but as praise for East Asians—assuming that one values law-abiding behaviour. Clearly, not everyone does, though there are probably racial differences on that normative question that would be revealed in attitude surveys.

Frank and open discussion of such racial differences in attitudes, behaviour, temperament and cognitive ability are clearly in the public interest. Racial differences are relevant across a wide range of public policy areas from immigration to public health, policing and education, to name but a few. The onus is on Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll to show how and why the suppression of scientifically validated information on such subjects could possibly serve the public interest in an allegedly free and democratic society. As always, when such a radical departure from the norms of a free society is recommended, the question arises: *Cui bono?*

Not a fair comment

Under this heading, Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll complain that in my Letter or Comments in the *Sun*, I did not include a statement to the effect “that no one race can claim comprehensive superiority on every measure of human excellence or fitness.” In fact, there was no need to include such a qualification in the Letter since it did not make any imputations regarding the superiority or inferiority of any race. In any case, when the letters editor of the *Sun* did call me to discuss the Letter, he did ask me whether I regarded blacks as an inferior race, at which point I replied in terms similar to those quoted in the first sentence of this paragraph. For reasons known only to him and his editor, those remarks were not quoted in the Comment. I can hardly be held responsible for that editorial decision.

In paragraph 54, Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll set out (in no less than 123 words) what else I would have had to include in my Letter to meet their approval. They do not actually set out a model letter of no more than 250 words that might also include the things *I* wanted to say. And, in fact, as we all know, it would have been impossible to do any such thing even if I had wanted to do it.

In any case, the *Parramatta Sun* did a more than adequate job of balancing my Letter and Comments with criticism from a number of sources. In the Comments piece itself more space was given to critical quotations from by Stepan Kerkyasharian than to my views. The paper also ran a signed “Panorama” piece by the editor, Charles Boag, which not only ridiculed my position but also seemed to hold up white Europeans as the cause of all the world’s evils.

But, even if the *Sun* had not offset my views with a weight of critical opinion, there is no reason why I should have written the letter that Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll would have written for me. After all, one only has to look at Mr Knoll’s own letter to the editor of *The Australian Jewish News* to see how little “fair comment” means to him in his authorial capacity. In that letter, he set out to justify my removal as a teacher and convicts me of teaching “racial vilification” without having the slightest idea of what or how I teach in my courses.

Nowhere in his letter does he “balance his own views against competing considerations.” Nor does he “touch upon the background” of my alleged “racial hatred and vilification.” He did not refer to the comments of anyone who had supported either the substance of my public comments or my right to make them. Compared to his example, no one could possibly doubt that my Letter represents a sterling example of “fair comment.” For Mr Knoll, it is, yet again, a case of “do what I say, not what I do.”

Conclusion

Far from being made out, the complaint is revealed as a legally groundless and self-serving effort by ethnic lobby groups to suppress the open discussion of immigration policy, the better to impose their multi-racialist agenda on white Australians.

As has become increasingly obvious and undeniable over the past few months in Sydney, the transformation of our city into a multi-racial society has generated a climate in which white Australians and their children live in fear of violence and in which anti-white attitudes and behaviour thrive.

It is not just ethnic activists who work to sow division and destroy Australia’s national identity. Governments prepared to betray the ethnic interests of their own people are principally to blame. Both need to be confronted, particularly when they work in concert. That is what my Letter and Comments were intended to do.

In their conclusion, Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll leave no doubt that, in their brave new world, resistance to the racial transformation of Australian society will not be permitted.

In paragraph 59, Ms Katzmann and Mr Knoll reveal just how, after spending 14 pages in an effort to *insult* and *offend* me, they propose to swing the Commission’s weight behind a scheme clearly intended to *humiliate* and *intimidate* me, in full view of my own local community.

In a suggestion eerily reminiscent of the Stalinist show trials during the 1930s in the old Soviet Union, they demand a public recantation of my “heretical” views, a full confession of my “unlawful conduct,” an abject apology to the “victims” of my alleged wrongdoing, and a promise never again to deviate from the party line. All of this is to be presented, at my expense, in a paid advertisement in the *Parramatta Sun*.

I have no intention of being humiliated or intimidated in this manner by Mr Newhouse, Mr Knoll, Ms Katzmann, Mr Hareer or the ethnic lobbies which they serve and represent. I have reasonably and fairly contributed to public debate and have not insulted, offended, humiliated or intimidated any reasonable Sudanese reader or, indeed, any reasonable person of any ethnicity. It is Mr Newhouse, Ms Katzmann, Mr Knoll and Mr Hareer who should be ashamed of their efforts to destroy the historic liberties of the Australian people.

In my view, the Commission would be much better advised to play a positive, conciliatory role in this matter by using its good offices to promote a public debate on

the issues raised by my Letter and Comment. I suggest that the debate be conducted between myself and either Mr Newhouse, Mr Knoll, Ms Katzmann or Mr Hareer.

In that manner, the Commission could serve to strengthen rather than to undermine Australian traditions of free thought and free expression. At the same time, the NSW Jewish Board of Deputies and the Sudanese Union could provide proof positive that they support the values of a free society. As things stand now, they represent the forces of repression.

The arrogant and narrowly self-interested manner in which this complaint has been presented and pursued, if widely repeated in response to any resurgence of white racial consciousness, is certain to exacerbate rather than defuse ethnic conflict in years to come. The Commission should dismiss the complaint while, at the same time, taking whatever steps necessary to encourage public debate on the issues raised in this matter.

Regards,