

WHO OWNS WHITE AUSTRALIA?

ANDREW FRASER VERSUS KEITH WINDSCHUTTLE

R. J. STOVE

Lord Macaulay, chronicling a coup (William III's 1688 accession to the British throne) spectacularly tame compared to the social and cultural paroxysms characterizing today's West, nevertheless articulated a truth as universal as his immediate subject was insular. "In revolutions," he wrote, "men live fast: the experience of years is crowded into hours: old habits of thought and action are violently broken; novelties, which at first sight inspire dread and disgust, become in a few days familiar, endurable, attractive."¹

This observation comes to mind when one contemplates recent events in official Australian historiography. What ten years ago was a stagnant, brackish pond (some would use the term "sewer") is now a whirlpool. Ten years ago it reflected, indeed it did little else except reflect, Cold War preoccupations. Many Australian academics and most Australian journalists continued, a decade back, to bestow the title of chief local historian upon the unrepentant Leninist professor Manning Clark. Dead since 1991, Clark — though not, apparently, a formal card-carrier or willing Soviet agent — continued to impose his vulgar Marxian orthodoxy from the grave. Even when Clark's posthumous reputation finally crumbled to dust (a process hastened when his own former publisher, Melbourne University Press's Peter Ryan, repudiated him), Clark himself had trained so many successors that academic debate on major Australian historical issues, when permitted at all, tended to be conducted on terms which Clark himself had set well beforehand. The cleverest and most effective of these successors, Stuart Macintyre by name, quietly discarded Clark's crazier romancing and his more fatuously millenarian tactics. Yet the centerpiece of Clark's strategy found as firm a champion in Macintyre as it had ever done in Clark himself: this strategy being the comprehensive defamation and delegitimization of white, Christian, English-speaking, middle-class Australia. Clark, to his great credit, had spelt out his goal in the plainest possible terms, assuring readers of a Melbourne tabloid (*The Herald*) on March 22, 1989: "I believe very strongly we must fight for the end of the [country's] Anglo-Celtic domination."

Autres temps, autres mœurs. In 2006 we find ourselves contemplating an Australian academic culture which no one in 1996 could have dreaded or longed for. Geoffrey Blainey — who in 1996 had only just emerged from the ostracism into which his 1984 opposition to uncontrolled immigration had plunged him — has come into his own again, lauded almost as much by leftist

media (even Melbourne's overwhelmingly Trotskyist-abortionist-multiculturalist broadsheet *The Age*) as by what now passes for a right-wing Australian commentariat. A much younger and less celebrated historian, Mark Lopez, has surveyed with calm monastic clarity the gradual statist imposition upon us of Frantz Fanon-style Third World chic.² Keith Windschuttle's *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History* literally annihilated the whole "Indigenous Studies" slum, leaving not one stone of that unhappy metropolis atop another.³ Above all, interpretation of the White Australia Policy is now up for grabs, with two whole books and one long article having been devoted to it in the past year alone: Windschuttle's *The White Australia Policy*;⁴ *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia*, by Gwenda Tavan;⁵ and — perhaps most immediately relevant to this magazine's readers — Andrew Fraser's "Rethinking the White Australia Policy," an essay [reprinted as a revised and expanded article in this issue] submitted to the Melbourne-based *Deakin Law Review*, rejected by that hitherto obscure periodical, and afterwards given international publicity, in part by VDARE.⁶

Of these productions, Tavan's need detain us the least. Eager to transpose back to the early 1970s the subsequent public enthusiasm for (or, in any event, tolerance of) massive non-European immigration, Tavan imagines that the 1974 reelection of Gough Whitlam's anti-White Australia Policy Labor government — in office since 1972 — vindicated, in voters' eyes, the policy's dismantling. She thereby must ignore two crucial facts. First, Whitlam's "inevitable" 1972 victory, resulting in a mere nine-seat parliamentary margin, had been almost as narrow as John F. Kennedy's 1960 success (although Whitlam, unlike Kennedy, shunned explicit ballot-box fraud). Second, Billy Snedden, Whitlam's opponent in 1974, was perhaps the most complete clown ever to lead a major Australian political group. Having greeted the 1974 defeat with the immortal analysis "We didn't win but we didn't lose," Snedden afterwards tried to rebut a Whitlam policy speech via the bizarre retort "woof woof." In 1987 Snedden followed Nelson Rockefeller's shining example by suffering a fatal heart attack during illicit sex, thus prompting the tabloid headline "Sir Billy Dies on the Job." To suppose for a moment that Whitlam's vanquishing of Silly Billy amounted to a joyous vote of confidence in Whitlam himself, let alone in a multicultural nomenclatura, is at best specious. Faced with Snedden, the main challenge for anyone of Whitlam's intellect would not have been to succeed, but, rather, to fail. Besides, Tavan's assumption that Whitlam had a popular mandate for importing non-European masses accords ill with her fears (more temperately expressed than is usual in official literature) that the White Australia Policy is not dead at all, merely sleeping. Such fears evoke Joseph Sobran's mordant observation: "Women and minorities never have a nice day."⁷

Windschuttle's study deserves far more attention than Tavan's, and has received it, not least in *TOQ*. Having learnt the hard way from the *Fabrication* fracas Windschuttle's determination to take on all comers, Windschuttle's opponents mostly either ignored *The White Australia Policy* outright, or else

treated it with weary politeness. Some critics in Australian newspapers and magazines showed active enthusiasm for it, of course. None more so than social-democratic columnist Max Teichmann, who exulted in his review: "He [Windschuttle] is to be congratulated. This is the intellectual Stalingrad for our New Class mythmakers."⁸ Teichmann could have added (though he did not) that Australia's plutocratic-neoconservative front organizations, which had cheered Windschuttle's exposé of Aborigines' "genocide" nonsense, shied away from *The White Australia Policy* — just as some of us had predicted in print that they would.

The lack of ad hominem abuse towards Windschuttle's analysis of White Australia led to hopes — fully shared by this writer, alas — that the "diversity" monster in Australia's midst had actually shriveled to almost nothing, like a salted snail; that, by some miracle, Prime Minister John Howard might have been telling the truth when he expressed, in 1996, his pleasure that Australians "could talk more freely" than they could under his immediate predecessor Paul Keating.⁹ It took the fate of Andrew Fraser, professor of public law at Sydney's Macquarie University, to show otherwise. The hound of the multi-culti Baskervilles, so obligingly and so noticeably silent when Windschuttle's book appeared, resumed his baying in *altissimo* once Fraser dared to question this canine's right to exist.

By now all Americans concerned with intellectual freedom will have at least a rough notion of the Fraser Affair. They will be familiar with his audacity in writing a letter to a suburban Sydney newspaper (*The Parramatta Sun*) about African immigration; the rage this letter inspired within Australia's "multiracialist mullahs" (Fraser's own words) and, above all, among these mullahs' mass media stooges; the original cautious response from Macquarie University itself, followed by the frenzied public denunciations from a seven-member academic panel, from the lumpenethnic rent-a-mobs which invariably materialize when there is a "racist" to be castigated, from Macquarie's ineffable vice-chancellor Di Yerbury, and — to most dramatic effect — from TV guru Ray Martin (a local counterpart to Oprah), who described Fraser's research as "Adolf Hitler stuff." Further data of Fraser's experiences are given in such detail via Steve Sailer's "Another Oz Outrage: Andrew Fraser Furor Continues,"¹⁰ and in particular via Fraser's own *American Renaissance* cover story,¹¹ that to spell them out here would be supererogation. Besides, the article which Fraser submitted to the *Deakin Law Review* has now — the Internet be praised — reached several thousand times as many readers as would ever have encountered it had it been confined to the *Review's* own pages. Yet several aspects of the Fraser Affair have been comparatively seldom discussed.

One of them is the fact that a very few individuals have dared to defend, if only on Voltairean grounds, Fraser's right to be heard. Since Australia possesses

no First Amendment, this right has to be spelt out again and again. In this respect, by far the most notable instance of courage is the *Sydney Morning Herald* article from Michael Duffy, prominent radio broadcaster, newspaper columnist, and book publisher. This article includes a most useful résumé of *The Bell Curve's* findings, about which hardly any *Sydney Morning Herald* readers would formerly have known. Better still, Duffy (alone among Australia's public intellectuals) has mentioned an earlier and almost entirely forgotten example of this country's intellectual corruption: assembled yahoos' threatening and howling down of H. J. Eysenck, during the latter's 1977 campus tour. Eysenck's scheduled speech at Sydney University had to be canceled, through fears for his personal safety. At least his planned Macquarie University lecture went ahead. Duffy, himself a Macquarie undergraduate at the time, had been obliged to complete a course on the glory of Marxism

run by people who appeared to believe in it. At least one was a member of the Communist Party of Australia, dedicated to the overthrow of our social system by force. This situation was public knowledge, by no means unique to Macquarie. It was deeply offensive to the many Australians who'd suffered at the hands of communist regimes, but it was generally tolerated on the grounds of free speech.¹²

Meanwhile those Australian intellectuals most vocal in their approbation of Bolshevik gangsters and their apologists knew full well that free speech was too precious a pearl to be cast before swine. *Au contraire*, between their shrieks about being persecuted at "McCarthyist" hands, they routinely launched take-no-prisoners, knock-'em-down, kick-'em-in-the-private-parts attacks on...Pauline Hanson. Duffy again:

It was also widely predicted that Hanson and One Nation would excite violent racists and produce blood in the streets. But it was her supporters who were beaten, abused and intimidated around Australia. It was her meetings that were shut down due to violence and threatened violence. We need to remember this now, when Macquarie University evokes concerns about safety to justify its extraordinary decision to ban Fraser from teaching...

Fraser says Tim Sprague, Macquarie's director of human resources... told him his comments on immigration were interfering with the university's capacity to attract [full-fee-paying foreign] students, most of whom are Asian... Di Yerbury has denied that Sprague had said this and said, "our earnings from international education have not been part of our thinking on this matter." Nor was there any wish "to stifle debate on campus." She also said that if Fraser had agreed to resign, as the university wanted, this would have given him "even more opportunity, not less" to exercise his right to free speech.

And they say the art of satire is dead.¹³

By such remarks, Duffy has demonstrated a clear grasp of what the Fraser Affair means in the long term. To aver that Windschuttle had revealed comparable perspicacity on this theme would be, in a phrase of Evelyn Waugh's,

“agreeable but not altogether candid.” One pities any reader who gains his first impressions of Windschuttle’s intellectual credentials from his diatribe against Fraser, because there is little to be said for it, and a fair amount which suggests hopeless disorientation on its author’s part. So accustomed had Windschuttle become to parrying feeble blows from the left, that he appears to have been taken entirely by surprise at being dealt a powerful blow from the right. That Fraser (in the *Deakin Law Review* submission) administered such a blow harshly is indisputable:

As committed racial egalitarians, both writers [Tavan and Windschuttle] desperately want to drive a stake through the heart of racial realism, once and for all. Tavan and Windschuttle still worry that, despite having been in a state of suspended animation for several decades, residual forms of racial identity might someday reawaken in the hearts of white Australians, perhaps even with renewed vigor and enhanced vitality. For that reason, Windschuttle happily joins the left in its attack upon race as “an unscientific category,” as a thoroughly modern, bad idea “engendered by the new social sciences and brought to maturity by the evolutionary biology of the nineteenth century.”¹⁴ In the battle between racial realism and racial egalitarianism, former Professor Windschuttle joins his old revolutionary comrades on the barricades, resolutely denying that differences between “races” have a biological or genetic foundation...to anyone familiar with the rapidly expanding literature on the genetic character of racial differences, Windschuttle’s dogmatism is a clear case of what...Steve Sailer calls racial flat-earthism.¹⁵

Fighting words—but did Windschuttle make any considered answer to them? He did nothing of the kind. In his attempted riposte (which *The Australian* published) to Fraser,¹⁶ he admittedly, and gratifyingly, stopped short of defending Di Yerbury and Macquarie’s other thought-police, who had “given [Fraser] the cachet of a banned book.” Elsewhere Windschuttle confined himself to four strange gambits. He regurgitated—notwithstanding Hurricane Katrina—all his own volume’s least plausible race-is-a-myth assertions. He blandly referred to “Enlightenment and Christian principles of human equality,” as if these were somehow the same (had he read any theologians whatever?). He revealed a chilling propensity to lapse into commissar-speak (“deserves to be consigned to the dustbin of history”). Above all, he accused Fraser of being an unreconstructed leftist, purely by virtue of his interest in racial matters. Presumably Sir Robert Menzies and every other conservative, pro-White Australia Policy political leader counts, in Windschuttle’s present view, as leftist also.

This is all eccentric enough, but the original version of Windschuttle’s harangue is more eccentric still. On his website www.sydneyline.com, Windschuttle obsesses over Fraser’s private life, or what he imagines to be Fraser’s private life: “Kathe [Boehringer, listed in the acknowledgements for Fraser’s essay] has since become his live-in partner and today publicly defends his ideas.”¹⁷ It seems never to have occurred to Windschuttle that

most of us could not care a snap of the proverbial fingers about Fraser's domestic arrangements, and that a prurient interest in these arrangements discredits Windschuttle rather than his intended target.

As for Fraser ostensibly continuing to channel leftist dogma, he himself has been outspoken, indeed self-mocking, about his own intellectual background. In *American Renaissance* he called his 1970s self "a typically bumptious boy Marxist...with the sure conviction that I was on the cutting edge of intellectual and political progress."¹⁸ Responding in *The Australian* to Windschuttle's censure, Fraser said: "since the early 1980s my scholarly research and writing has sought to adapt the political theory of classical or civic republicanism to the modern world."¹⁹ He went on to establish how this purpose had determined his publications. This all makes a rather instructive contrast with Windschuttle's coyness about specifically when *he* vacated the Marxist bandwagon, a coyness which does impair his otherwise impressive recent articles for *The New Criterion* and for Australia's *Quadrant* on Western shills for Communist China.²⁰ Windschuttle may, or he may not, have fallen out of love with Marxism (as certain print accounts of his career have stated) after British "scholar" Malcolm Caldwell, an ecstatic partisan of Pol Pot, had visited the Kampuchean workers' paradise and there been murdered by his beloved Khmer Rouge. But if – repeat, if – these accounts are true,²¹ all one can suggest is that Windschuttle really was leaving it rather late in the day for discovering Marxism to be the god that failed.

Given Windschuttle's personalized anti-Fraser contumely (of which no hint had emerged until recent months), it might well be inevitable that an unflattering light of retrospection would shine on even Windschuttle's best books, and that these would suffer from what we now know of Windschuttle's worst output. We should not, however, dismiss those books on that account. *Fabrication* and *The White Australia Policy* – along with his earlier critique *The Killing of History* – still have numerous valuable things to teach, quite apart from their pungent prose style. Yet, much as it is hard to read Tertullian's major works without a jarring awareness of how that Church Father afterwards betrayed his intellect in his adoption of heresy, it will grow increasingly hard to reread Windschuttle's major works without an awareness that notable scholarly equipment can alternate with deplorable coarse-mindedness, and can in fact be supplanted by it. Fraser, explaining his own doctrines of classical republicanism, acerbically commented:

Keith Windschuttle has damaged his reputation as a careful researcher and fact checker...I don't know whether Windschuttle deliberately lied about my book and my supposed long-term love affair with Marxism and critical studies. Perhaps he really doesn't care whether what he says is true or false.²²

On a subject that traditionally generates lots of heat and precious little light, it is essential for any writer to explain where he stands. He should do so by outright statement, rather than by mere sidwinding hints.

Myself, I know Windschuttle slightly, but have never met Fraser. I support an immediate end to Australian immigration until the unemployment rate among native-born Anglophone citizens reaches zero. (The Howard government has actually *raised* immigration levels, although we are getting a slightly higher proportion of New Zealand and European immigrants today than previously arrived here.) A racial realist, I nevertheless cannot honestly call myself a white nationalist.²³ I am a Catholic traditionalist paleoconservative, or, to speak more exactly, a Catholic Carolingian Eurocentrist. First, I belong to a religion; secondly, I belong to a particular social rank (the shabby-genteel white-collar class, such as hyperinflation ruined in Weimar Germany and globalism ruins now); and only thirdly do I belong to a race. Catholicism's universalist tendencies put an obvious brake upon any *sensus Caucasianus* which I might have. While I do not relish the company of most blacks, if a Catholic black has confessed his sins and done wholehearted penance before he kneels next to me at the communion rail, I have no right to recoil from him. For if I have not prepared myself similarly for communion, then Catholic teaching holds that I, and not the black, shall rot in hell. This leaves me skeptical of those who use race as a Unified Field Theory to explain everything. It also leaves me skeptical of the most deterministic IQ fetishists, a skepticism hardened by the astounding ability of the superintelligent – an ability which did not end with Leopold and Loeb – to be psychopaths.

Unlike Fraser, I have publicly extolled a Christian Australia Policy (CAP) as a higher priority than a White Australia Policy. Under a CAP, we would have no Muslims – and thus no Muslim terrorists – at all, unless Muslims either converted (Spain's *reconquista* shows they would not) or accepted a state of de facto dhimmitude (which did sometimes happen in Spain between 1492 and 1609, but is currently unthinkable). A CAP would not automatically prevent trouble from Fraser's Sudanese – and nominally Christian – tormentors. (Describing what he underwent at Ray Martin's hands, Fraser noted: "The Sudanese, most of whom were well-dressed and, as they made sure to let me know, university graduates...sprayed me with invective and insults for well on an hour, until even Mr. Martin had had enough.")²⁴ Yet it would make such trouble a good deal harder to wage, because employing Christian shibboleths to disguise a Europhobic program would be much riskier in an environment where people had sufficient theological expertise to distinguish Christendom from black-supremacist thuggee.

Naturally a Christian Australia would not permit a penny of government spending upon the upkeep of infidel, heathen, or New Age institutions. Within these limits, it would allow – since it would have no conceivable motive for disallowing – complete intellectual freedom and physical safety for the Frasers

in its midst, something that post-Christian Australia in 2006 is demonstrably unable to ensure, or even to postulate. Let it be stressed that all I am advocating in law is what used to prevail *in actuality* among Australians until the late 1970s; among Americans, during their low-immigration economic Golden Age of 1945–1965; and among Canadians, pre-Trudeau.

Perhaps two more quotes, both longish, make a suitable finale. The late Sir Walter Crocker – diplomat, centenarian, and former South Australian lieutenant-governor, whose ambassadorial achievements took him to Rome, The Hague, Brussels, Ottawa, New Delhi, Jakarta, and Addis Ababa – reflected thirty-five years ago:

I used to be opposed to the “White Australia” policy and in the past have written against it. After first-hand experience of the Negro problem in America, and of what has happened in Britain since over a million non-whites were allowed in after the war, and of the tensions between Africans and Indians in East Africa, and between Indians both inside and outside India, I have little doubt that this policy is the right one for Australia for the time being...Let Australians have no illusions on this point: there is no lack of politicians who for reasons of political self-promotion, or of ignorance, or of both, would be perfectly capable of betraying the interests of Australia by shoveling in immigrants just as much as by letting American combines take over segments of the economy.²⁵

And Fraser himself has stated:

In my case, unemployment holds no terrors; my pension is secure and I have years of practice in pariahdom. I have a place to stand and the will to fight...The other lesson, taught long ago by classical republican thinkers, is that there is something miraculous about *action*. Departing from the regular, predictable patterns of everyday *behavior*, anyone who acts in a spontaneous, unpredictable manner in defense of our people may create an unexpected new beginning.²⁶

Even if one does not concur with all that Fraser has said on this issue, the main thing is clear: Each morning he can look at himself in the shaving-mirror with a clear conscience. As much cannot be said for those educators and willfully obtuse antipodean magazine editors who simply wish Fraser would go away. Arnold Schwarzenegger has a celebrated epithet for such types: “girly men.”

*R. J. Stove lives in Melbourne. His last article for **The Occidental Quarterly** was “Goodbye to All That: Reflections on White Australia,” vol. 5, no. 1 (Spring 2005).*

ENDNOTES

1. Thomas Babington Macaulay, *History of England from the Accession of James II* (London: Dent, 1906), vol. 2, 90–91.

2. Mark Lopez, *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics, 1945–1975* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2000).
3. Keith Windschuttle, *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History* (Sydney: Macleay Press, 2002).
4. Keith Windschuttle, *The White Australia Policy* (Sydney: Macleay Press, 2004).
5. Gwenda Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia* (Melbourne: Scribe Publications, 2005).
6. Andrew Fraser, "Rethinking the White Australia Policy," *VDARE.com*, September 26, 2005.
7. Joseph Sobran, "The Era of Bad Feelings, Cont'd", *Sobran's* (October 2005).
8. Max Teichmann, "Keith Windschuttle on White Australia," *National Observer* (Winter 2005). For other predominantly favorable critiques, see Peter Coleman, "Between Facts and Fudge," *The Weekend Australian*, December 24–26, 2004; and R. J. Stove, "Goodbye To All That," *National Observer* (Autumn 2005) (a slightly different version of the essay that appeared in *TOQ's* Spring 2005 edition).
9. Guy Rundle, "Taking Aim at the Rich and Powerful," *New Internationalist* (August 2003).
10. Steve Sailer, "Another Oz Outrage: Andrew Fraser Furor Continues," *VDARE.com*, September 25, 2005.
11. Andrew Fraser, "Adventures of an Academic Pariah," *American Renaissance* (November 2005).
12. Michael Duffy, "Freedom of Speech Takes a Fall," *Sydney Morning Herald*, August 6, 2005.
13. *Ibid.*
14. Windschuttle, *White Australia Policy*, pp. 28–35.
15. Steve Sailer, "Racial Flat-Earthers Dangerous to Everyone's Health," *VDARE.com*, May 11, 2003.
16. Keith Windschuttle, "Racist Essay Is from the Left, Not the Right," *The Australian*, September 29, 2005.
17. Keith Windschuttle, <http://www.sydneyline.com/Racist%20essay%20from%20the%20Left.htm> (last accessed October 31, 2005).
18. Andrew Fraser, "Pariah," 1.
19. Andrew Fraser, letter, *The Australian*, September 30, 2005.
20. Keith Windschuttle, "Mao and the Maoists," *The New Criterion*, October 2005; "Mao and the Australian Maoists," *Quadrant* (October 2005).
21. In a letter to *The Australian* published on September 16, 2003, Windschuttle said about a recently published feature which that newspaper's Jane Cadzow had produced: "Cadzow wrote, accurately, that Pol Pot's murder of my friend Malcolm Caldwell was a catalyst that led me to abandon not Pol Pot but Marxism." This passage's vocabulary mystifies. For instance, had the Khmer Rouge *not* killed Caldwell, how long would Windschuttle have continued to find it satisfactory? Does "not Pol Pot" signify "not only Pol Pot"? And whatever did Windschuttle mean by "catalyst"? More to the point, how many "catalysts" did any literate adult of Windschuttle's age — as distinct from a Fraser-style "bumptious boy Marxist" — need by 1978 (the year of Caldwell's slaying) to discard Communist ideology? Given that *The Gulag Archipelago* had appeared in 1974? Given that Orwell, for one, had turned against the "actually existing" (to coin

a phrase) Spanish Republic no later than 1937? And given that Pope Leo XIII had condemned all militant socialism back in 1891?

22. Andrew Fraser, letter, *The Australian*, September 30, 2005.

23. Nor am I convinced that white nationalism, even if desirable, would be viable. The complete collapse of white-nationalist sentiment in South Africa during 1994 is educative.

24. Andrew Fraser, "Pariah," p. 5.

25. W. R. Crocker, *Australian Ambassador: International Relations at First Hand* (Melbourne University Press, 1971), 193.

26. Andrew Fraser, "Pariah," p. 6.