



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The pride of Freedom is eternal vigilance—

Registered by Australia Post — Publication No. VBH 0999

Vol. 21 No. 23

July 6th, 1984.

Thought for the Week: "Nothing is safe that does not show it can bear discussion and publicity". — Lord Acton.

THE TREACHERY OF THE INTELLECTUALS: The distinguished British historian, David Irving, points out in his book on the 1956 Hungarian uprising, that it has been falsely claimed that academics played a major role in initiating the brave attempt by the Hungarians to throw the Communists out. The uprising was in fact the result of the frustration of the students and the workers. We were reminded of this in considering the role of Australia's academics concerning the controversy which Professor Blainey has provoked by his warnings on Australia's immigration policy.

Professor Blainey is probably Australia's best-read historian. He can hardly be described as one of those dreadful "right-wing extremists". Until he made his famous speech on immigration at Warrnambool, Victoria, three months ago, Blainey was regarded highly by all those who describe themselves as liberals. Blainey was not saying anything that conflicted too strongly with their dogmas. But then he committed the "crime" of saying in a most moderate and lucid manner what the majority of Australians were feeling. From then on there was a dramatic change. There have been violent demonstrations against him. However, as Professor Blainey says in an interview with Mr. Tim Duncan, published in "The Bulletin" of July 3rd, "Much worse than the picketing is that a major newspaper should challenge the right of someone to speak out". After Professor Blainey's Sydney meeting "The Sydney Morning Herald" criticised him for going close to promoting "racist canards" that Australia was being Asianised.

A survey of the major Australian newspapers shows that while some of the columnists who like to regard themselves as liberals, did grudgingly admit that Professor Blainey had every right to speak out on immigration, they have qualified this by saying, in essence, that it was really a pity that Blainey had opened a debate which could inflame those "dark" and "racist" passions which lurk just below the

surface in Australia. A typical example of this is provided by author Thomas Keneally, in an open letter to his friend Blainey, in "The Herald" Melbourne, of June 22nd. The Keneally letter tells Blainey that he knows that he is not a "racist", praises his contributions to history, but then finished imploring Blainey "to be aware of the fact your imprimatur could be used by dangerous radical movements within this country and that you way well influence Australian history in a way I know you never intended, by unleashing a latter day Lambing Flat lunacy".

In his interview with Tim Duncan, Professor Blainey makes the telling comment that "No academic body or academic group has asserted the right of free speech during this last week. Yet that group has more to gain by defending its right of free speech. Its activities depend more on free speech than almost any other group in society". Professor Blainey went on to say, "I'm very interested that the Human Rights Commission has not made any statement on this issue of free speech that's come to the fore. Free speech is one of the most important Human rights. Which rights does the Commission deal with and which rights does it find inconvenient?" As far as we know, The Human Rights Commission has said nothing. Obviously the Commission is very selective in assessing who has rights and who hasn't!

We are not surprised to learn that the greatest pressure on Blainey to discontinue the immigration debate "came from small numbers of academics in the humanities and the social sciences". These are the people who have been polluting the Australian social and political bloodstream with liberal poison for so long. Many of them are Marxists. It is to be hoped that Professor Blainey is not over-optimistic with his view that Australia will have a more moderate immigration policy within twelve months. But he is right when he says that multiculturalism is "in tatters". Unfortunately this will not prevent the multicultural faddists from continuing to fragment the Australian nation by spending millions of the taxpayers' money on a variety of weird and wonderful projects.

Yes, Professor Blainey may have opened a debate which will help to change Australian history - but off the course preferred by treacherous academics.

NONSENSE ABOUT ASSET TESTS: Veteran Gippsland, Victoria, supporter Mr. Harold Hotchkin, himself a pensioner, offers the following realistic comment on the assets test for pensioners: "The real argument is not about assets at all. The basic objective has been declared as 'saving money' by reducing the incomes of some 40,000 wealthy pensioners and giving it to the poorer section. Some 1,500 more bureaucrats are to be employed prying into the pensioners'

business at an estimated cost of thirty million dollars. The 'profit' from this exercise will be some \$45 million for re-distribution. In a total Welfare Budget of \$16,4 billion a year this is mere chicken feed. Surely an exercise in futility.

"Our economists and politicians have been 'fiddling' around for years devising endless taxation schemes in their efforts to maintain the Welfare State, with their policy of 'Robbing Peter to sustain Paul'. This country can produce all that it needs: food, clothing, housing and untold luxury items. We also have about 650,000 unemployed waiting to produce more if we need them".

Mr. Hotchkin goes on to observe that "Having just recently printed five million new \$100 notes, one wonders why our politicians continue to bleat about 'where is the money coming from'. They appear to be so ignorant that they forget billions were created for the Second World War effort - so why not do the same now - instead of taxing the shirts off our back. It's about time they did something constructive".

Mr. Hotchkin suggests that letters be sent to Federal Members telling them as representatives to oppose the implementation of the Assets test or any similar type of legislation, and consider some way in which the material assets in our stores are available for distribution. Asset testing for pensioners is a further attempt to level down and to ensure that pensioners do not have too much independence. It leads towards the re-introduction of a form of death duty. Victorian Senator Ray, described as Prime Minister Hawke's numbers man, last year circulated a paper stressing the Socialist view towards death duties: "Socialists cannot hope to ensure the material well-being of all Australians in the long term without confronting the higher inequalities of wealth brought about by the unchallenged inheritance of the dead's property".

In Karl Marx's famous ten steps for Communising a State, outlined in Mr. Eric Butler's "Fabian Socialist Contribution To the Communist Advance" (\$1 posted) the destruction of the principle of inheritance is recommended. By cutting people off from any form of inheritance as a right, people are progressively forced to become more dependent on the State.

THE EVILS OF PARTY POWER POLITICS: The edited version of a chapter from Mr. Paul Kelly's coming book on the Fraser years, based on a dossier kept by the late Sir Phillip Lynch dealing with the crisis of 1977, when Lynch, at that time sick in hospital, was forced to resign as Treasurer, does not make very pleasant reading. Not only is the general picture of Fraser as a ruthless power man confirmed, but the type of bitter party in-fighting starkly revealed. Further

examples of the destructiveness of party politics was provided at the recent Victorian ALP State Conference, where the application of four Unions to rejoin the Labor Party, was rejected. It was sad to see the daughter of the late Mr. Arthur Calwell, speaking so bitterly at the ALP Conference, urging that the four unions be denied re-admittance because of what had happened nearly 30 years ago when the ALP split with the DLP being formed. Whether or not the four unions, allegedly still associated with the Democratic Labor Party, now but a pale shadow of its former self are permitted to join the ALP, will not in our opinion have much bearing on the main development of Australian politics. Much of the talk about Hawke's battle with the radical Left of his party, which suggests that Hawke is some type of a conservative simply because he now favours uranium mining, tends to mask the reality of the Hawke Fabian Socialist programme for Australia. The very existence of the radical Left provides the Prime Minister with the perfect cover for a programme which is much more dangerous because it is offered as a genuine alternative to the openly declared radicals.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE EQUALITY MYTH: In "The Age", Melbourne, of June 27th, Louise Carbines quotes the newly-elected President of The Australian Council of Churches, The Rev. D'Arcy Wood, a former Moderator of the Uniting Church in South Australia, as saying, "In the New Testament Christ said that all people were equal". Christ said nothing of the kind. The meaning of "equality" is no equality at all. The essence of the Christian Revelation is that each individual is unique, is different. How can there be equality among individuals when Christ taught that the greatest would be the servants of all? And there was His biting advice, "Cast not your pearls before swine, lest they turn upon you, and rend you".

Having accepted the collectivest equalitarian doctrine, it is not surprising that the Rev. D'Arcy Wood expressed concern about "racism". Professor Blainey and Mr. Hugh Moran are criticised for contributing to "racism". If, of course, all men and all races are equal, then they can be manipulated by central planners of all types. But, thank God, reality still prevails in the world, and individuals and races continue to demonstrate that they are DIFFERENT.

(Recommended reading: "Is The Word Enough". Price \$1.35, and "Releasing Reality", price \$2.00. Both works by Eric D. Butler).

"ON TARGET" is published and printed by The Australian League of Rights, 273 Little Collins St., Melbourne. Subscription rate \$18 p.a. posted.