ON TARGET

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

Print Post Publication Number 100000815

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance —

Vol. 50. No. 21 **30th May, 2014**

Contents

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK

Can you believe it? The truth according to Tony Abbott and Joe Hockey. 'Dog ate my homework' excuses abound as the electorate is treated to invisible definitions, provisos and fine print. Post-truth politics has just entered a whole new orbit. I've written before about how political debate seems increasingly unhitched from a normal, factual understanding of the concept of truth. But in defending its 2014 budget the Coalition has finally severed the link entirely, with truthfulness and lying becoming just another question of strategy.

The fact that the budget breaks pre-election promises about not raising taxes and not cutting funding for health, education, pensions and the ABC is really beyond dispute in most people's understanding of truthfulness.

- - Lenore Taylor, political editor theguardian.com, Thursday 15 May 2014

"The "Carrier Policy" is one of the simpler and most frequently used techniques of party politics. The technique is the use of an attractive objective proposed by a party in connection with other objectives which by themselves would not be acceptable to the electorate. When an election is declared, parties field candidates and issue a manifesto, which is usually thought of as a "Statement of policy" but which is largely a list of administrative proposals. The party candidates publish election addresses in which they declare themselves in support of the entire policy of their party's "platform"... It should be noted that the electorate are asked to choose between two sets of administrative proposals, both of which may be derived from the same policy; they are not consulted concerning policy. Debate about how to do a thing is substituted for the real debate upon what is desired..."

- - Anthony Cooney in "Social Credit: Politics" 2007

TARGETS FOR THE WEEK

The Treasurer's budget has divided the community now the financial proposals to balance the books is understood by the people expected to bear the austerity measures being imposed. Many of the alternatives offered to ease the fiscal pain are generally aimed at shifting the burden onto someone else but there are no suggestions of realistically reducing the tax burden on all Australians.

Now is the time to write letters along the following lines to the press questioning the local member, especially in coalition held areas, "how will you vote on Joe Hockey's budget? Will you abstain from voting rather than inflict further financial pain on electors".

The Coalition is vulnerable and they must be 'screwed' and made to feel extremely uncomfortable in the process.

Please write that letter!

The 'unwritten' letter will not influence anyone so please give it your best shot. Don't let the politicians get away with this impost!

ABORIGINAL CONSTITUTION RECOGNITION, THE LITTLE PEOPLE … AND THE FIRST PEOPLE'S ISSUE by Brian Simpson

We will continue to report material relevant to the Aboriginal Constitutional recognition issue and especially relating to the issue of "first peoples". In this context it is interesting to note the recent article by Nicolas Rothwell, "In Search of the Little People" (*The WE Australian Review* 3-4 May 2014).

The article reports on "the little people" Mimih, Rai or Janjarri. These were a distinct group of people who were "so short of stature they seemed to form a population quite separate from the rest of Aboriginal Australia". There is a cultural record of their existence in cave paintings and Aboriginal folk traditions. The relationships between the two groups was far from, well, embodying multicultural tolerance: "In Bardi country, at One Arm Point, on the tip of the Dampier Peninsula, it is well known that a climatic battle took place "in early times" between two groups: a tall tribe, perhaps forebears of today's people, and a smaller tribe whose memory is preserved in dance and tradition to this day. In the Rope River region of southeast Arnhem Land a similar conflict is remembered – and there are traces of just such deep-seated rivalries between two separate, physically different groups as far afield as north Queensland and the coastal community of Yarrabah near Cairns." There are also folk records of inter-tribal warfare on Groote Eylandt in the western Gulf of Carpentaria. On the island of Sexy Beach (not a typo) there was a battle between the Aborigines and the Little People and "the Little People were wiped out". Caves now have the remains of this warfare, mummified bodies.

The anthropologists Norman Tindale and Joseph Birdsell, in the 1930s, studied the last tribes of the Little People or "pygmies". They hypothesized that the pygmies were a distinct race of people who populated Australia first. Two other groups, one becoming today's Aborigines came later. This hypothesis was generally accepted until "the rise of the pan-Aboriginal political movement thrust it aside". Rothwell says that genome studies have shown a close relationship between the pygmies and the Aborigines which allegedly refutes the Tindale/Birdsell hypothesis.

On the contrary, genetic similarity only shows genetic similarity – it doesn't show that the Aborigines were first. The genetic similarity could have predated occupancy of Australia or it could have come from intermixture, which probably arose from pygmy women being the spoils of war. Further, a people can be genetically similar but still be a different physical/cultural group : genes are not everything. Consequently the Tindale/Birdsell hypothesis is not refuted, and the Aborigines are not likely to be a "first people" – maybe a second or third. So why should that be constitutionally recognised?

BUDGET 2014: IMMIGRATION TARGET UNCHANGED; STILL TOO HIGH.

From Reduce Immigration

Australia's national budget for 2014-15 was announced this evening. In the lead-up period, there was strong advocacy of the need to reduce immigration. Alan Kohler spoke out clearly: "So what's the problem? Simply that Australia's population grew by nearly 8,000 people per week last year…" (*The Australian*, 6 May 2014) and Jenny Goldie did the maths: "We could save $20 billion by bringing immigration back to under 100,000" (*The Australian*, 8 May 2014).

We are therefore disappointed to find that the Abbott (Coalition) government has utterly failed to embrace the opportunity to reduce immigration and its associated costs.

Australia's immigration targets for 2014-15 are now revealed in the Department of Immigration and Border Control's Fact Sheet 20 – Migration Program Planning Levels and are unchanged since early this year: once again, there are 190,000 places in the Migration program and 13,750 places in the Humanitarian program. The total planned intake for the coming year is therefore 203,750.

In opposition in 2010, the Coalition promised to reduce "net overseas migration … to no more than 170,000 per year". More recently, in 2013, they undertook to "ensure that our non-discriminatory immigration programme helps those in need and serves our national interest".

Our environmental sustainability, social cohesion and cultural integrity are matters of national interest but they are not well served by high immigration. In fact, as our evolving bibliography of media coverage on this topic shows, Australia's national interest is threatened by high immigration.

The national interest is what we choose to make it. Tonight's budget betrays that interest. All who have the opportunity to vote and to influence government policy should share news of the REDUCE IMMIGRATION campaign with their family and friends.

http://reduceimmigration.wordpress.com/2014/05/13/budget2014-immigration-target-unchanged-still-too-high/

"*ON TARGET*" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.
Subscription $45.00 p.a.

PATHOLOGICAL ALTRUISM OR JUST PLAIN OLD RACIAL TREASON? By Richard Miller.

The book of collected scholarly scientific articles, B. Oakley (et.al), "Pathological Altruism") Oxford University Press, 2012), has been well received by various Traditionalist sites. The book itself is full of thought-provoking material about how a seeming altruistic behaviour – behaviour that is an end in itself – it does some good to the other, is not directed toward self-gain (p.31) – can cause harm. "Pathological altruism might be thought of as any behaviour or personal tendency in which either the stated aim or the implied motivation is to promote the welfare of another or others. But, instead of overall beneficial outcomes, the "altruism" instead has irrational and substantial negative consequences to the other or even to the self." (p.4)

Is this analysis relevant to an issue concerning us at this site of the "treason of the intellectuals"? Anglo Saxon intellectuals delight in working to destroy their race/people/ethnic group. Anyone who puts their head up over the fox holes is, metaphorically, "gunned down" and also destroyed. This racial suicide serves the evolutionary interests of other ethno-racial groups, to be sure. But is it altruistic?

My view is that these acts are not altruistic, but merely thinly disguised egoism. The Anglo intellectuals can see that defending their own kind, such as resisting the Asianisation of Australia, will have a cost. Being basically weak, cowards, they have taken the easy path and gone with the dictates of the financial elite. This is not altruism or any sort of moral action, but just plain egoism and self-serving utilitarianism. Rightly we may regard our chattering and political class as race traitors. Pathological they may be, but altruists they are not.

WAR AND THE MONEY POWER by Chris Knight

An insightful article by John Papworth "War and the Money Power" (*The Social Artist* Autumn 2013), deserves mention. Papworth begins with a discussion of the First World War, which he rightly describes as a "witless, barbaric sacrifice of so many young lives". Papworth's answer is the same as C.H. Douglas' in *The Causes of War* and that is the Money Power. It was not the divorcees or single parents whom Christ chased out of the temple with a whip, but the money changers/ banking fraternity.

By the beginning of the 20th century the Money Power was out of control. It was out of control because the financial institutions had grown too big and all else connected with it was also out of control and too big to be responsive to the moral urges of the people. And if the Money Power was large then, it is at cosmological heights today, threatening us with "industrial excess, deforestation, oceanic plundering, a population-numbers nightmare and social vandalism on a global scale, which can scarcely fail to wreck any prospect of a civilised order…"

Yes, but grim as all of this is, the Christian has faith that these satanic elites will be defeated and that the world will not be destroyed.

SURVIVE THE ECONOMIC COLLAPSE: 'HOW TO' GUIDE by John Steele

Striving out here in the scrub in a tent, living off the last of my money from the sale of my house, I think a lot about "end times", the coming collapse when the Machine Stops. Arnie Luks' articles in this publication are an excellent grassroots introduction to self-reliance and "survivalism".

Those who think the same should also consult Piero San Giorgio's "Survive the Economic Collapse: A Practical Guide" (Radix/Washington Summit Publishers, 2013). The book follows the James Howard Kunster (who contributes a foreword) line that a series of ecological and socio-economic catastrophes will cause the collapse of industrial capitalism, followed by a great die-off of much of humanity. Generally speaking, those from our line of politics don't see the breakdown period as being so bleak and believe that civilisation can be saved with alternate social and economic/financial policies.

Piero San Giorgio represents the Plan B mode of thought: what if you do fail? Then it is basically going to be every man for himself, or at least families and tribal groups (networks of families). Money itself will be worthless in such times, or at least paper money, fiat money. It will be revealed as illusory. The real source of value will be actual goods, beans, bullets and buns.

San Giorgio spends about two thirds of the book setting out the scenario of collapse. The remainder of the book deals with the fundaments of survival, such as the survival mindset and basic rules of survival. All this is worth thinking about because modern man has become like a domesticated bird, soft and feathery.

He starts from advising survivors to seek out a "sustainable autonomous base", basically a retreat away from trouble spots, but within a small community that one seeks to integrate oneself in. From this one works on seven fundamental principles: water, food, hygiene and health, energy, knowledge, defense and the social bond (community, tribal ties). He then devotes a chapter to each of these topics. I cannot summarise this here, but overall I found the discussion a very good introduction from which to start. The defense chapter, the topic which I know the most about out of the seven was elementary but good.

"Survive the Economic Collapse" is a must buy for people who have even the slightest concern that we might need a "Plan B". Remember the Scout motto: be prepared.

THE BUDGET APOCALYPSE by James Reed

The most insightful headline relating to the then looming Joe Hockey budget was by *The Australian's* "editor-at-large (question: what is an editor-at-small?) Paul Kelly "There's No Turning Back from the Age of Austerity") (*The WE Australian* 3-4- May 2014 p.13) Yes, he told us, "Budget realities mean middle Australia must brace for a culture shock". He saw that what is coming is a "change in national psychology" which will "inaugurate a new and tougher agenda of curbing benefits, entitlements and unsustainable spending growth". End of Kelly discussion – now the significance.

Consider the raising of the pension age to 70. We have been told by the political class, the new class and the chattering class that taking in billions, if not trillions of migrants (most non-white) will prevent the population from ageing and prevent – you guessed it – the old age pension being raised to 70! All lies of course.

The whole agenda is as I have been saying now for almost a decade, a programme of racial genocide of Anglo Saxon Australia. Crash their birth rates and demographically swamp them with races of people who will slave for global financial elites without benefits and entitlements. Of course the political class may not consciously see this, but as the old structuralist Marxists used to say, politicians are just like balls in pinball machines, being structurally determined by the capitalist system. Having a sustainable life in a psycho-pathological economic system is just not possible. Hence, human life will end, or our insane economical/financial system will come crashing down. And soon I hope.

UPDATE ON ASIA WAR by James Reed

China seems to be eager for war in its aggressive actions towards other Asian nations over contested waters and islands. Apart from conflict with Japan, China has rammed Vietnamese patrol boats and turned water cannons on them in a disputed part of the South China Sea. The Vietnamese vessels were damaged and some people injured.

it is only a matter of time before one Asian country up to such bullying acts and before we know it we will have "Asia War". I expect that Australia will be fighting on China's side. If so, I suggest the introduction of conscription for all university students (the reverse of Vietnam days). Let us also have special regiments made up of feminists who can fight for mother China.

ASIANISATION AND THE MISTAKE OF THE VIETNAM WAR by Richard Miller

Malcolm Fraser has a new book out entitled "Dangerous Allies" where he argues that Australia should break with the US alliance. Fraser moved from ANZUS enthusiast to ANZUS critic because of the Vietnam War. His view is that Bob Menzies wanted Australia involved just to keep the US in the region. This was a flawed judgement because the US had to be involved in the region to contain China.

As much as I hate to agree with Fraser on anything, I agree that Australia should not have joined the Vietnam War. It may have held off the tide of refugees that kick started Asianisation for a little longer. However the real war was going on at home, in the universities and other institutions as cultural Marxism began its long march through. That was the real war.

SORRY ANDREW, WE DON'T BUY IT THIS TIME ROUND by Betty Luks

- **"Can we end this stupid class war against Hockey? 17 May2014.**
- **"Don't trust the Finance Minister. Psst: he's Belgian 17 May2014**

"I thought the personal attacks on Joe Hockey were bad enough - the attempts to make him seem too rich to hand down a Budget that cut spending.

Then came this: Attorney-General George Brandis has slammed as "preposterous" an ABC interview with Finance Minister Mathias Cormann that questioned whether, as an immigrant, he understood Australia's "mindset and culture". The minister's immigrant status was raised at the end of a Thursday interview by Adelaide radio -station 891's top-rating breakfast announcers David Bevan and Matthew Abraham…"

It seems the Coalition is copping flak now that the Australian people are waking up to what they are really about – and Andrew Bolt is intent on helping them regain lost ground. Playing the old 'haves' and have nots' strategy may not work so well this time round Andrew – too much water has passed under the bridge since this Marxist tactic first surfaced. With the rise of the internet people are much better informed than in the days when the news was so tightly controlled.

I think C.H. Douglas summed up the situation beautifully in his 1943 pamphlet: "Skilfully injected propaganda, always avoiding Finance, has fostered attacks on the 'haves' by the 'have nots' so that any economic independents, not the servants of Finance, might be stripped of their independence, under the name of Socialism. That is to say, Big Business and Socialism are the same thing, though some Socialists may not know it, and the present stage of servitude could never have been brought about by Big Business alone. We owe our present position to brains in Big Business, and votes in Socialism. Stated otherwise, the coming of Socialism is the triumph of Big Business."

Read further: ***The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket*** **1943—http://www.yamaguchy.com/library/douglas/land.html**

FULL SPECTRUM DOMINANCE IN THE ANGLO-AMERICAN 'GREAT GAME'

The goal, therefore, has always been a "third way" that combined the supposed best of both worlds, and embodied in what we see in modern China, which David Rockefeller has praised. The convergence is the long-term goal, and the aid given in the past by the West was to bring the communists and Soviets to power, just as the aid was given to the radical Muslims and terrorists. The parallels are exactly the same, in fact, between the Cold War and the War on Terror.

Before reading the article "Full Spectrum Dominance in the Anglo-American Great Game" by JayAnalysis, look up on our website just some of the articles going back to the 1960s that show Western leaders have a long history of supporting Communism – and betraying their own people. www.alor.org/Volume2/Vol2No3.htm : ALOR – Dialectics : www.alor.org/Volume3/Vol3No42.htm : www.alor.org/Volume2/Vol2No5.htm : www.alor.org/Volume1/Vol1No15.htm : www.alor.org/Library/Overview.htm : www.alor.org/Volume12/Vol12No20.htm

Joe (US Senator Joseph McCarthy) was right. Red China was a project of elite Anglo-American geo-political machinators.

Western Support for Communism: CFR, OSS, Soviets and Asia

Communist and fascist posters evidence the same propaganda tactics.

It is often stated in "conspiracy circles" so-called that the Western elites help train and put Mao in power. Is this true? Can we find documented evidence for the claim? If so, it would put a lot of modern "conservative" and "libertarian" analyses in perspective. In my experience, the so-called "conspiracy" sites and alternative media outlets are far more reliable (for all their shortcomings), as anyone with any sense knows, than the mainstream media, that retarded organ of Government Inc. Those that want to live in the Matrix can stay in the Matrix.

For those who want to know the real world, several factors are worth analyzing in regard to this question. First, the CIA (preceded by the OSS) was set up as a result of the National Security Act of 1947 under Franklin D. Roosevelt, springing in part from the Pratt House in New York (future home of the Council on Foreign Relations), itself modelled from the British Secret Intelligence Service. Likewise, the over-arching institutions that control and run the intelligence agencies in the West, like the Council on Foreign Relations, were modelled on the Oxford Round Table Groups and the Royal Institute for International Affairs. Indeed, the Pratt House's British counterpart was the Chatham House. We read from the Council on Foreign Relation's site as follows:

The Council's home on East 65th Street, so grand when acquired after the Wall Street crash, was proving hopelessly inadequate for these expansions. In 1944 the widow of Harold Irving Pratt, a director of Standard Oil of New Jersey and a faithful Council member since 1923, donated the family's four-story mansion, at the southwest corner of 68th Street and Park Avenue, for the Council's use. (In keeping with a prevailing reverse snobbery, the address and front door were on the side street, not the more showy avenue.) John D. Rockefeller Jr., led a slate of 200 members and companies who volunteered funds to convert the gracious residence into offices, meeting rooms, and an institutional library. When the Council moved into its new quarters in April 1945, Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, a member since 1938, came to New York, "to bear witness [he said], as every Secretary of State during the past quarter of a century, to the great services and influence of this organization in spreading knowledge and understanding of the issues of United States foreign policy."

In regard to the Pratt House and OSS one should note the prominent position of Allen Dulles in moving from the OSS to the CFR. Also important is the transition of US foreign policy from "isolationist" or perhaps non-interventionist, to openly imperial engine for the Anglo-American establishment:

In its substance, American foreign policy was similarly transformed in the first years following World War II. An isolationist frontier nation became a world power. A wartime ally, the Soviet Union, became an adversary; former enemies, Germany and Japan, became allies. The transformation did not occur without intellectual and organizational agonies—in the government and in the private associations like the Council that sought to understand and explain the changes taking place in the world.

Allen Dulles returned from the wartime OSS to assume a leading role in the Council's business, resuming his law practice at Sullivan and Cromwell for an interim between his secret work in Switzerland and a career at the soon-to-be Central Intelligence Agency. Dulles was a Republican; working alongside him in the Council was Alger Hiss (www.alor.org/Volume4/Vol4No7.htm), a newly elected member sympathetic to the left-wing of the Democratic Party, but a protégé of the older Dulles brother, John Foster."

Readers of Dr. Carroll Quigley (Tragedy and Hope) will of course be familiar with the truth that the Western establishment often aided and built up the communist and fascist regimes, but as we shall see, other sources document this trend, too.

The CFR goes on to state as follows regarding the inclusion of Soviet thinkers in 1945:

"In characteristic fashion, Council planners conceived a study group to analyze the coming world order. Notably uncharacteristic was the additional suggestion that the American members be joined by competent persons from Soviet Russia—a joint Soviet-American inquiry. In the congenial, gentlemanly atmosphere of the Harold Pratt House, ideas and visions could be shared."

The Western elites thus had no problem in joining with the heads of the "godless

(Continued on page 6)

(Continued from page 5)

Empire of evil" because they were the dialectical opposite side of the coin, and many of their own patrons had aided the Soviet cause (which the Soviets initially objected to). William Schubart pressed for massive aid from the U.S. to U.S.S.R. in the form of billions to help rebuild:
"The chairman of the study group, Lazard Frères partner William H. Schubart, a veteran of the War and Peace Studies, pressed on. "I think we can be hard-boiled and just, without doing harm," he told the Council. "The main thing is to be sure that we are not asking for something unreasonable" of the Soviet Union. Specifically, he was pressing for endorsement of a $6 billion loan from the United States to finance Soviet imports for post-war reconstruction. "It seems reasonable to suppose that if economic and political cooperation between Russia and the United States could be developed in peace as military cooperation between the two nations has been developed in war," Schubart said, "the world might look forward to an era of relative stability and considerable prosperity." Bidwell, speaking for the Council's academic staff, concurred. "It seems to me increasingly important that we should be able to break down the intellectual blockade with which the Russians have surrounded themselves."

The result of the 1945-46 panel on the relationship of the U.S. and the USSR known as the Franklin Draft concluded as follows:

"The chairman of the study group, Lazard Frères partner William H. Schubart, a veteran of the War and Peace Studies, pressed on. "I think we can be hard-boiled and just, without doing harm," he told the Council. "The main thing is to be sure that we are not asking for something unreasonable" of the Soviet Union. Specifically, he was pressing for endorsement of a $6 billion loan from the United States to finance Soviet imports for postwar reconstruction. "It seems reasonable to suppose that if economic and political cooperation between Russia and the United States could be developed in peace as military cooperation between the two nations has been developed in war," Schubart said, "the world might look forward to an era of relative stability and considerable prosperity." Bidwell, speaking for the Council's academic staff, concurred. "It seems to me increasingly important that we should be able to break down the intellectual blockade with which the Russians have surrounded themselves."

And…"We must take every opportunity to work with the Soviets now, when their power is still far inferior to ours, and hope that we can establish our cooperation on a firmer basis for the not so distant future when they will have completed their reconstruction and greatly increased their strength…. The policy we advocate is one of firmness coupled with moderation and patience."

The panel at that time was basically split as to how to accept the proposals, with Allen Dulles remaining one of the prominent holdouts, showing Dulles at least did understand the threat of Sovietisation and collectivization. Member Frank Altschul openly fought it, declaring the need to oppose the Soviets, claiming that the council was "bending over to appease them." What we can see that is so crucial here is that the U.S. was already buckling to communism and collectivism as far back as the mid 1940s. And it was the elite Western capitalists that were supporting such a move, as Quigley has noted at length in Tragedy and Hope. Consider as well that the Franklin Report emerged in May of 1946, for May 1 is the great communist holiday, the day of the founding of the Bavarian Illuminati (http://www.alor.org/New%20Times/pdf/NT2214.pdf). The CFR site goes on to claim that this great draft was unheeded, and the ominous Cold War began (oh, such a nasty thing!) because of hardliners that opposed Marxism. Again, let's stop and think about this astonishing point: the article even sites Alger Hiss, as well as other members wanting rapport with the USSR in the mid 1940s! Senator Joe McCarthy was more than right: not only was he right about hundreds of Soviet agents in the US government, the higher entities like the CFR were also half red.

This period of the 1940s is particularly worthy of attention in regard to the initial question asked: what about OSS support for Mao and Marxist guerrillas? Absolutely: the OSS helped train Mao's guerrillas during this period. We read as follows from the CIA website:

"OSS had a difficult time winning authority or access to prosecute operations in China. The Nationalist regime in Chungking was a government in name only; Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek was more China's most powerful warlord than its national leader. He was fighting a war on two fronts—against the Japanese invaders on one side and against the Chinese Communists under Mao Zedong on the other. His secret police and intelligence chief, Tai Li, wanted American aid but had no intention of allowing Americans to operate independently on Chinese soil. American efforts to assist Chiang against the Japanese thus had to navigate a labyrinth of feuds and jealousies in Chungking before any implementation. Complicating matters still further, Tai Li demanded that American intelligence operations in China be run—wherever possible—by the office of Capt. Milton E. Miles, the commander of an unorthodox US Navy liaison unit."

Did the OSS train the guerrillas? Yes, according to the CIA:

"OSS helped to train and equip Chinese guerrillas. Donovan in late 1943 personally told Tai Li that OSS would operate in China whether he liked it or not, but it still took a measure of subterfuge for Donovan's officers to win a role there. The problem was bigger than Tai Li. At least a dozen American intelligence units operated in China over the course of the war, all of them competing for sources, access, and resources. Ironically, Donovan and OSS eventually "thrived on chaos," according to historian Maochun Yu. OSS learned to provide services to American commanders that neither the Chinese nor other US organizations could match."

And… "Against the wishes of America's French and Chinese allies, OSS "Mission DEER" had briefly aided Communist insurgent leader Ho Chi Minh in his fight against the Japanese in northern Indochina."

And… "Opinions in OSS ranged across the political spectrum, from admirers of Chiang in his struggles against Japanese invaders and Communist insurgents, to unabashed advocates of Communist leader Mao Zedong and his promise of justice for the peasantry through social revolution." I recommend Douglas Waller's "Wild Bill Donovan"
Richard Harris Smith's book OSS: The Secret History of America's First Central Intelligence Agency, provides another scholarly source for Bill Donovan aiding Mao.

However, that is not all: the OSS also trained the Viet Minh:

"Among other activities, the OSS helped arm, train and supply resistance movements, including Mao Zedong's Red Army in China and the Viet Minh in French Indochina, in areas occupied by the Axis powers during World War II. OSS officer Archimedes Patti played a central role in OSS operations French Indochina and met frequently with Ho Chi Minh in

(Continued on page 7)

(Continued from page 6)

1945." The Wikipedia article cites this interview with Col. Archimedes Patti on OSS operations with revolutionary guerrillas.

The logic here being the breakdown and control of China through opium by the Brits, and then controlling China further, using that same strategy, combined with eugenics under Mao.

But that's not all: the West was, as everyone knows, supporting Chiang Kai-Shek, in a classic case of funding both sides in the classic British strategy of controlled opposition. Army.mil provides a historical analysis of this stratagem as follows:

"In Southeast Asia, as in China, OSS plans to organize guerrillas were just reaching fruition when the war ended. Great distances, difficult unpredictable weather, native apathy, and U.S. ignorance of local conditions presented formidable obstacles. Furthermore, the British and French, with major colonial interests in the region, viewed with suspicion efforts to establish an independent intelligence service there. Nevertheless, after an OSS lieutenant reached Ho Chi Minh in Tonkin in May 1945, OSS headquarters in China sent a team under Maj. Allison Thomas to arm and train the Viet Minh guerrillas of Ho and Vo Nguyen Giap for service against the Japanese. The OSS men held training sessions for 200 of Giap's best troops and supplied the Viet Minh with rifles, mortars, machine guns, and grenades. An OSS medic even cured Ho of a near fatal bout with malaria and dysentery. At the time of the Japanese surrender the Viet Minh were only beginning to establish their control over what later became Vietnam. Within twenty years they and the United States would meet again, under less auspicious circumstances."

Mao with journalist Edgar Snow

As for Mao, after much digging, I did find reference to Mao attending Yale-in-China (Yali), and even establishing his bookstore, "The Culture Bookstore," in a Yali building. The source for this is the Rockefeller-founded Asia Society, but I had to pull it up on the waybackmachine. It reads as follows of Mao. Keep in mind that Yale is run by Skull & Bones:

"After publishing four issues, the journal was closed down and Mao became editor of Yale-in-China's Xin Hunan New Hunan. When this journal was also suppressed by the local warlord, Mao continued to write for a newspaper until the failure of a student strike in December 1919 forced him to flee the province."

And… "In his autobiography, related to Edgar Snow in 1936, Mao declared that by the summer of 1920 he "had become in theory and to some extent in action a Marxist." In August he founded a Marxist study group. However, patriotism in Changsha was still as likely to become associated with anarchism as with Marxism. The Culture Bookstore, founded by Mao and his friends (in a building owned by Yale-in-china) in the autumn of 1920, stocked anarchist books more heavily than Marxist tracts. Anarchism also heavily peppered Mao's involvement with a short-lived, highly emotional movement to establish an independent nation of Hunan in the same year."

Undoubtedly, the standard argumentation provided as justification for this strategy was the threat of the Axis powers and fascism, which prompted the supposedly necessary aid provided to the guerrillas and communists as a proxy. Yet Yalta handed almost a billion people over to Uncle Joe with Operation Keelhaul. Some western elites, however, also supported and funded the fascists, as is well-known, like David Rockefeller.

Aid was given by the West to bring the communists and Soviets to power

The reality is that the internationalist communists and the trans-nationalist westerns have much in common–enough in common that Antonio Gramsci, the famed Italian communist who argued that the reds should become capitalists to destroy the West, argued that they could join.

The goal, therefore, has always been a "third way" that combined the supposed best of both worlds, and embodied in what we see in modern China, which David Rockefeller has praised. The convergence is the long-term goal, and the aid given in the past by the West was to bring the communists and Soviets to power, just as the aid was given to the radical Muslims and terrorists. The parallels are exactly the same, in fact, between the Cold War and the War on Terror. (Emphasis added ...ed)

The League stocks a large number of books on aspects of World History and the following list is recommended reading. All books can be obtained through VERITAS Book Services.

British historian Nesta Webster's important books:-

1. Bosche and Bolshevik $8.00
2. French Revolution $18.00
3. Germany and the Jews $4.00
4. Secret Societies and Subversive Movements $10.00
5. Socialist Network $25.00
6. Surrender of an Empire $25.00
7. World Revolution $16.00

Also of interest:-

Pawns in the Game
William Guy Carr $19.00

Proofs of a Conspiracy

Oliver Heydorn's new book is a beauty!

Excerpt: The Mixed Economy serves as a front – to Privatise profit and Socialise loss

"It is in relation to the apparent failures of free enterprise under the Monopoly of Credit that socialism arose in the first place. Paradoxically, socialism is permitted and indeed encouraged by the credit monopolists up to a certain point because it allows for the transfer of credit and property in even greater amounts to the financial system, under the guise of 'helping the poor'. Capitalism 'tempered' by socialism would therefore seem, in practice, to be the best combination available with which the interests of the financial overlords can be most effectively advanced. It is no accident that whatever their stated ideological preferences, all countries in the world are tending more and more to embody in appearances some highly developed form of the 'Mixed Economy'.



The 'Mixed Economy' serves as a front system which enables the financiers to privatize profit and socialise loss; it offers the best of all possible worlds and reveals that under the Monopoly of Credit capitalism and socialism are only superficially antagonistic. They are merely two methods of embodying the same policy: the centralisation of economic benefits. Should the credit monopoly ever achieve a complete centralization of economic wealth and power by means of these devices, the form which the economy must then take is clear…"

- - M. Oliver Heydorn Ph.D. in "Social Credit Economics" 2nd edition 2014.

$35.00 Posted



In "The Economics of Social Credit and Catholic Social Teaching", Dr. Oliver Heydorn argues that it is high time that all Catholics take seriously and examine closely the economic ideas of Major Clifford Hugh Douglas (1879-1952). By surveying the key principles contained within the Church's social doctrine in conjunction with Douglas' Social Credit proposals and their underlying philosophy, the author demonstrates that (in stark contrast to the dead-ends of Austrian economics and the 'Christian socialism' of 'liberation theology' et al. and the half-way houses of classical distributism and economic personalism) it is Social Credit which most fully merits the support of Catholics as the best alternative to the economic status quo.

$14.00 POSTED

Both books are highly recommended!

LETTER TO THE PRESS

To the Editor of The Australian,

14th May 2014

Adam Goodes is better at football than political philosophy ('Goodes urges Aussies to back referendum', 14/5). He does not understand that the purpose of the Constitution is not to contain history or enshrine ideology. The very 'neutrality' of the document that he deprecates is its strength. Clauses against discrimination between (not 'against') races do not appear likely to cause future injustice. The fact that all parties in the parliament currently support the proposed referendum on constitutional recognition of Aboriginals may lead to a historic contest between politicians and the people. That should be interesting!

- - Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Victoria

One of the greatest delusions in the world is the hope that the evils in this world are to be cured by legislation.

-Thomas B. Reed (1886)

LEAGUE'S WEBSITE ADDRESS: **www.alor.org/**

THE LEAGUE'S BOOK SERVICES: —

When ordering journals, ***'On Target'*** **and** ***'New Times Survey'*** – Please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to— **'ALOR Journals'** .

For educational books, videos and DVDs, etc. please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to —

'Heritage Bookshop Services'

For donations to the League please make payments to **'Australian League of Rights' or 'ALOR'**

Books are available at meetings, at our Melbourne bookshop or by mail order from the following addresses:

Victoria, Tasmania: Heritage Bookshop,

2nd Floor, 145 Russell Street,

Melbourne, 3000

(G.P.O. Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001).

Phone: (03) 9650 9749; Fax: (03) 9650 9368.

South Australia

Heritage Book Mailing Service,

P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley, 5159.

Phone: (08) 7123 7131;

All Other States: To either Victorian or South Australian addresses.

VERITASBOOKS ONLINE: http://www.veritasbooks.com.au/

http://www.alor.org/blog/index.php