

ETHNIC BLOCK VOTING

ONE NATION PREFERENCES AND CONSERVATIVE POLITICS IN AUSTRALIA

Dr. Rodney Spencer

Western nations are now experiencing the phenomenon of ethnic, minority block voting. In Western societies fairly evenly divided between left and right, who will be the beneficiary of this new voting pattern? So far it appears to be the politicians and parties of the left. Is this voting pattern a local manifestation of Huntington's theory, that future conflict/politics will not be fought over ideology but over civilisational/ethnic values? Well Conservative parties be able to withstand both the ideological and ethnic challenges, have they a strategy to deal with this, or is ethnicity about to do what Communism never could, moving us into the "Brave New World" of ascendant left politics?

We are used to seeing governments change every few terms, swinging back and forth, between Labour and Conservative in the U.K., Democrat and Republican in the U.S.A. and Labor and Liberal in Australia. A new factor to this pattern is the growing numbers of ethnic-block votes resulting from immigration and multicultural policy, with racial voting patterns world-wide.

The recent American elections saw over 90% of Blacks, 77% of Jews and 70% of Hispanics vote Democrat, according to exit polls from the Voter News Service. Democrats traditionally get their support from poorer voters, so is it poverty or race that gains votes for the Democrats? The Jewish 77% vote for the Democrats suggests race trumps economics. Asian Americans 20 years ago voted in a pattern similar to white but in the last federal election changed to support Gore over Bush. As Asians economically are becoming more affluent their new voting pattern can only be attributed to racial voting again. The "us" against "them" syndrome.

President Bush fared poorly among ethnic groups despite proclaimed ethnic friendly policies, political messages and support for higher immigration. Had it not been for Ralph Nader splitting the Democrat vote, Bush would have lost the election. In the United Kingdom, similar problems beset the Conservative Party. Prime Minister Blair, like Labor here, runs a rainbow ethnic friendly party but the Conservatives, unable to argue their philosophy on immigration and multiculturalism, have back peddled and their immigration, multicultural and ethnic policies are virtually indistinguishable from Labour's. So voters in the U.K. have two parties with similar policies and no nationalist alternative. Should a credible Nationalist Party arise in the U.K., many unhappy Conservative voters could then express their dissatisfaction as voters and defect, as we have seen in Australia with One Nation.

Australia is the only country of those under consideration, with a Nationalist Party of significance to take disillusioned voters away from the traditional conservative party.

Yet we see the Liberal Party here following the English and American right wing or conservative philosophy of moving social policy to the left so as to be perceived as being ethnic friendly. By moving to the left on social policy, will a right wing party gain or loose votes, and will ongoing and increasing immigration and multiculturalism eventually lead to their moving further and further to the left resulting in the death of conservatism in the U.K., USA and here? After all, conservative forces can never compete with the far left on ethnic matters. Conservatism by its very nature resists social change. Saying "sorry" to native peoples, reparations, deep multiculturalism, ethnic quotas etc., can never satisfy both the rainbow coalitions and the white conservative voters in England, USA or Australia. The left can keep offering more to the ethnic voters until the time that this drives their blue collar supporters to the conservative side. In the USA the Republicans have dropped the Southern strategy, which aimed to increase white votes, and instead have adopted rainbow Republicanism but, as seen in President Bush's case, this was unsuccessful in increasing ethnic votes and his white vote declined to 54%.

Only, therefore, by getting white Christians to vote ethnically/religiously for the Republicans, in the same percentages as Jews, Hispanics and Blacks vote Democrat, will the Republican Party continue in power.

What is the Liberal Party in Australia doing to position itself for ethnic changes which, if immigration continues unabated, must also threaten the survival of Conservative politics in Australia. Moving to the left socially, by having Peter Costello as a leader who supports all the politically correct agenda of immigration, multiculturalism, Asianisation, aboriginal reconciliation with "sorry" statements, republicanism, enhanced social welfare, soft drug policies and a rabidly "anti racist" agenda, and therefore copying Labor is not an option as Liberal notes will desert to One Nation, a party of the right. So far the most obvious move has been to put One Nation last at all electoral opportunities, to convince ethnic voters that the Liberal Party is an ethnic friendly party. The Liberal Party obviously has put its faith in Asian Australians being entrepreneurial, small business inclined, caring little for social welfare for the community, and hopes these capitalist attributes will make them Liberal Party voters, especially as they become more affluent. But even in July 98 The Australian reported that the Chinese community, usually split 60% Labor and 40% Coalition, would now vote solidly pro Labor because John Howard had not unequivocally opposed One Nation. This mirrors the American experience of Asian block voting. The desire among Asian Australians to bring in more of their own people and own way of life to Australia, probably alone would result in votes for Labor, the more migrant accommodating party. Multicultural policy, now supported by the Liberals, will also exacerbate block ethnic voting to the detriment of the Liberals.

One million people voted One Nation at the 1997 election and the vast majority of these votes, if One Nation and the Liberals exchanged preferences, would go back to the Liberals and ensure Liberal electoral success. What is more natural than exchanging preferences with a party with a social policy to the right of the Liberals as Labor exchanges preferences with parties to their left - the Greens and Democrats. Instead, to show their ethnic friendly nature, the Liberals put One Nation last, refuse to exchange preferences and "ostrich like" are prepared to risk electoral defeat. A high price to pay. Of course, the Liberals can simplistically state that One Nation is a racist party and on principle take the high moral stand regardless of the consequences. Looking principled always goes down well with martyrs. But we must ask has the Liberal Party been manoeuvred into a self destructive position by the left and the media who have promoted this idea of evil and racism being inherent in One Nation?

The Liberals have an alternative. Firstly exchange preferences with One Nation. Secondly attract those who support traditional western civilisation values, mostly Anglo/Europeans, to vote Liberal in the same way that the Labor Party attracts Jewish, Asian, ethnic migrant and aboriginal voters. The only way to neutralise ethnic voting for Labor is to have Anglo/European voting for Liberals. This can be done by promoting policies such as immigration control, abandonment of multicultural policy, strict refugee policies, no reparations or "sorry" statements for imagined crimes, stopping the Asianisation of Australia and showing pride in our history, traditions and way of life - all issues Labor has manipulated to create its racial block vote. If the Liberals did this, it would create a real difference between Liberal and Labor, would be popular with the majority and would draw in votes from the blue collar supporters of Labor. As long as Labor maintained its racial and divisive policies to attract ethnic votes the Liberals would then be in power with no foreseeable ethnic electoral threats. This would then finally bring about a change in Labor policy.

If the Liberals persist along their current path which comes from aping the English and American experience, a situation not analogous to ours as we do have a nationalist alternative, then minority demographics and ethnicity, not policy and philosophy, will decide the direction for Australia. As the Liberals are about to see the folly of their policy in upcoming elections, could we ask them to "please explain"?