



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.27

July 18th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"A people may prefer a free government, but if, from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertion necessary for serving it, they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if by momentary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet of a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions; in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty, and though it may for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely to enjoy it."*

– Famous English libertarian of last century, John Stuart Mill

THE ANTI-HANSON BARBARIANS by Eric D. Butler:

The brutal bashing of a man who claims that he attended the Pauline Hanson meeting at Dandenong primarily as an interested observer, has highlighted the fact that Australia is now threatened with anarchy. The most sickening aspect of what is taking place is that many of those who have contributed towards creating an anti-Hanson hysteria, are now, like Pontius Pilate, attempting to wash their hands of any responsibility for what is happening. The fact that many of these appear to be respectable members of society cannot disguise the reality; they are barbarians. These barbarians include members of the mass media, and even some clergy, who have contributed towards painting a picture of Pauline Hanson as a manifestation of incarnate evil. Some politicians have joined in the chorus of blaming Pauline Hanson for the unemployment and other problems which their policies have created. The Zionist Jewish press calls for Zionist Jews to play a more "active role" in combatting Pauline Hanson. Writing of the French Revolution, the great Lord Acton said that the most disturbing feature of the violence and confusion was evidence of "design". Every student of psycho-political warfare are familiar with the tactic of blaming those you plan to destroy with the very evils which the aggressors are themselves practising. Pauline Hanson is charged with creating "hate" and "division". And yet at every anti-Hanson demonstration there is a striking difference between those who are genuinely interested in what Pauline Hanson has to say and those present to demonstrate and hurl abuse. Their hate filled faces can be seen on film and in photos. Their mindless chanting and gutter-type abuse is the ugly face of a mob manipulated by evil people.

Concrete evidence of the existence of a sophisticated strategy behind the anti-Hanson protests was provided at the Dandenong meeting where a "pocket" anti-Hanson booklet was available for "only \$2". This booklet is provided by the "Socialist Alternative". On the back cover we read: "How do you answer Hanson's lies? Who benefits from racism in Australia? Should Hanson be allowed free speech? How can we fight the Hanson movement?"

Not surprisingly, the "fascist League of Rights" is mentioned on several occasions. In the chapter **What About Free Speech?** there is a classical presentation of Marxist-Leninist dialectics. In essence, the handbook says that because of the wide publicity Pauline Hanson has received through the media, it is ridiculous to say that she is being denied free speech. No reference is made to the fact that in all the realms of media publicity for Pauline Hanson, most of it is blatantly dishonest and carefully ignores publicising what Pauline Hanson is really saying or advocating. In view of this, state the Marxist-Leninists, there must be anti-Hanson demonstrations. Unless this is done, the Hanson movement could grow like Hitler's Nazi movement. The Hanson public meetings must be challenged because they help "the racist movement grow". The handbook states, *"... it is clear that there is a direct correlation between the emergence of the Hanson phenomenon and an increase of physical attacks upon minority groups Jewish organisations have recorded record numbers of reports of anti-Semitic threats, intimidation and vandalism since Hanson achieved prominence."*

The mass media is making its contribution towards generating a dangerous political climate by distorting or manufacturing "news". The media was responsible for the "beat up" story about Hanson's alleged association with the American Ku Klux Klan. There was the story of this organisation emerging in North Queensland. Careful investigation reveals that this story is completely without foundation. But it is all grist to the psycho-political warfare mill which leads to the Marxist-Leninist handbook concluding that "That's why demonstrating against Pauline Hanson – **even to the extent of closing her meetings down** – is not about Hanson's right to free speech. It is about the right of Asians, Aborigines and other minorities to live in this country without the fear of the racist attacks that will be an inevitable consequence of Pauline Hanson successfully building a racist political organisation." (Emphasis added)

Prominent commentators like Phillip Adams make their contribution to increasing the level of political ferment by using the most abusive language to describe people like myself. I am, according to Phillip Adams, the most dangerous and evil man in Australia, describing me as "toxic sludge". In a recent **Weekend Australian** column Adams suggested that all those who wished to protest against Pauline Hanson should wear a yellow ribbon. At my Taralgon meeting last week a man identified himself as a school teacher and warned how teachers were using the children to carry the anti-Hanson campaign, encouraging them to heed the Adams advice. Phillip Adams is not, of course, directly responsible for children following his advice. But obviously some teachers have accepted the Adams technique. Needless to say, any survey of children expressing anti-Hanson views reveals that they are only echoing what they have been told by their subversive teachers.

Such is the state of Australia today that unless the politicians of all parties unite to make it clear that a properly elected Member of Parliament is free to express his or her views without what has been happening to Pauline Hanson, they are merely adding to the creation of a state of national anarchy. Australians must face the reality that the barbarians are now operating within the nation. If the present politicians cannot face this reality, and act, they must be quickly replaced by representatives who will insist on law and order being upheld throughout Australia. The time for action is running short.

COMPULSORY WORK OR POVERTY by David Thompson:

Prime Minister Howard's discussions with British Prime Minister Blair and United States President Clinton on the thorny question of unemployment obviously provided him with few solutions. The news from the northern hemisphere is that unemployment is a chronic "problem" in industrialised nations committed to the global market, and there is no short-term solution. Mr. Howard said so himself in his first major interview since his return from overseas.

While he was in the United States, Mr. Howard is quoted as saying that it may be necessary for Australians who are unemployed to move to other locations where employment opportunities are available. He noted that the United States is a highly mobile society, where families move home more frequently than almost any other society.

Last week, Mr. Howard made the significant observation that the high guaranteed minimum wage that was a part of the "Australian ethos" might have to be reconsidered, as it is an important factor in the nation's high unemployment levels. He offered no alternatives to this, because the only available alternative is to lower wages, which could be political suicide. But the truth is that the Government's Workplace Relations Act, which encourages individual enterprise agreements, will progressively deliver lower wage structures as the unemployment crisis becomes more acute.

His northern hemisphere trip has confirmed for Mr. Howard that his most serious electoral challenge is unemployment. He now knows that big business will not deliver job opportunities, because business will continue to introduce technology to achieve "greater efficiency". It will increasingly pursue "labor market flexibility", "outsourcing" and "downsizing", all of which means no new jobs, except lower wage jobs.

Mr. Howard also knows that small business, the nation's greatest employers, will not readily provide new jobs, because any economic "up-turn" that results from lower interest rates, is more likely to be used by small business to reduce debts.

Mr. Howard is forced to conclude that the best he can look forward to is slow, long-term job growth, over many years. Even this depends upon Australia being able to exploit opportunities for new high-technology industries, which means that the Government intends to introduce incentives to attract new businesses to Australia. If this is possible, one might well ask why the same kind of incentives are unavailable to **keep the industries that still remain.**

Mr. Howard is presently positioning himself to escape responsibility for high unemployment. He must use the time available to him before the next election to try to convince voters that high unemployment in the global market is "inevitable", but in the long-term it will ease. He must begin to emphasise that a lower wage structure (and therefore a lower standard of living) is essential to be "internationally competitive". The term "internationally competitive" is presently political code, which means "lower wages".

It seems clear that the emphasis on compulsory work, as opposed to conditions and wages levels, will underlie the Coalition's position. If anything, it may even begin to resemble the old Soviet Union's religion of the glory of "work", and the elevated status of "the workers" – or, in Mr. Howard's case, "the battlers".

The principle is the same: the individual is not permitted access to the fruits of the amazing technological marvel which he inherits in common with his neighbours, unless he has a job. He may have to uproot his family and move thousands of miles away to find "work". But undermining family stability, and creating an Oceanic region of semi-nomadic work-oriented automatons will more closely resemble George Orwell's *1984* than the free society.

Reality is pursuing John Howard in the form of the displacement of the human being from the production process by the machine. What is his answer? So far, the Coalition offers band-aid answers, like the work-for-the-dole" scheme now being introduced. But can the human benefit, by shorter working

hours, a higher standard of living, and better-quality leisure, or is this a life sentence of abject poverty for the increasing proportion of those unemployed? Mr. Howard's political future could depend upon his answer.

FRASER SURRENDERS ON REPUBLIC: Former Prime Minister Fraser, in his column in *The Australian* (2/7/97), offers further comfort for the republican cause by appearing to endorse the end of monarchy in Australia. Fraser, who sets out to demonstrate how difficult it might be to select an alternative, writes the following: *"Political divisions . . . are taking our eyes off the main issue. It is not if we are going to become a republic, but when. Whether it is in five years, 10 or 50, the most important thing is to make sure that when it does happen we make changes that are sensible and which continue the stability, the checks and balances in our system . . ."*

Malcolm Fraser has obviously become the victim of the old Marxist psychological weapon, "the inevitability of gradualism". Fraser now appears to accept that abandoning the monarchy is not a matter of choice, but historical inevitability. He denies the sovereignty of the individual, which the monarchy itself symbolises.

For a former Liberal Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser's position is pathetic. But it is symbolic of the condition of the Liberal Party as a whole. Is this the same party that once issued the little brochure *"We believe"*, in which the monarchy was described as the **central plank** of Liberal Party ideology? What has happened to the Liberal Party? Even more amazing is the position of the National Party, theoretically even more staunchly monarchist than the Liberals. Will the Nationals resist the spiritual rot that has poisoned the Liberals?

The truth is that the Coalition is the architect of its own discomfort. Over the many years that Coalition Governments have graced the Treasury benches, they have not attempted to ensure that every generation of Australians was **educated** about the strengths of their heritage.

FREE SPEECH AND VISITORS VISAS: The case of the visiting black American, Lorenzo Ervin, is of close interest to those who had hoped that the British historian David Irving might have been permitted a visa to speak in Australia.

Ervin, former Black Panther convicted of hijacking an aeroplane, was initially arrested for having lied in his visa application, and threatened with deportation, rather than continue his speaking tour. But Ervin was released, and his visa reinstated after the High Court raised concern that Ervin may not have been accorded natural justice. The Government was forced to pay Mr. Ervin's costs, while it considers as a matter of urgency whether Mr. Ervin is "of good character".

It will be remembered that David Irving could not get an Australian visa because of his own conviction in Germany for having allegedly "defamed the dead", a law unknown in any other part of the world. This is apparently much more serious than a terrorist hijacking an aeroplane. We apparently need time to consider whether an activist who advocates terrorism to overthrow legitimate governments is "of good character". It may or may not be of significance that Ervin was invited to Australia by a national anarchist group known as "Angry People".

Although Mr. Ervin's incarceration in a Brisbane mail provoked angry protests by "human rights groups", these same groups were conspicuously absent when David Irving's visa was refused. Perhaps the difference is that Irving is white, and therefore only enjoys second-class "human rights"?