



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –*

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.16

May 5th, 1995

---

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** "If we do not restore the institution of property, we cannot escape restoring the institution of slavery."  
– Hillaire Belloc

---

**50 YEARS LATER** by Eric D. Butler: The wise Lord Acton, who said that all power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely, also said that all great men are evil men, exercising power which no human being should have. Many of the so-called great men of history have emerged during periods of great social ferment. Napoleon emerged following the first major revolution of modern times, the French Revolution. Celebrations associated with the 50th anniversary of the end of the Second World War have seen a flood of articles analysing the Hitler factor and why the Germans initially saw him as some type of hero. C.H. Douglas has observed that anyone who believes that if Hitler had been dropped from a tall building when he was born, there would have been no Second World War, are capable of believing anything. Hitler was the product of a Germany centralised by Bismarck and his Socialist allies – "we march separately but we march together" said Bismarck – and the disastrous policies imposed upon the defeated Germany at Versailles after the First World War.

The Germany of Schiller and Goethe, generally admired throughout Western Civilisation, was the Germany of the decentralised German States. The Bismarck-Socialist centralisation of power, the creation of the first modern Welfare State along with an education system which stressed the necessity of soulless efficiency, completely changed the character of the German people within a few lifetimes. As C.H. Douglas has pointed out, a highly centralised Germany became a curse to the German people and to the rest of Europe. It became the chosen instrument of International Finance. Hitler's National Socialist movement was only able to flourish in a Germany demoralised by the economic conditions which followed the First World War. The Weimar Republic was corrupt. Two totalitarian movements emerged: the National Socialists and the Communists. Inflation was rampant, the German middle class, the most stable of the German nation, suffered badly. Hitler the demagogue exploited the widespread anti-Jewish feeling, primarily the result of Germans witnessing that because of their greater access to credit facilities, Jews were taking over their assets, these being sold at giveaway prices. The Great Depression, imposed upon the world in 1929, dramatically escalated German support for Hitler and his National Socialists. Large numbers of frightened Germans saw Hitler as the only alternative to a threatened Communist Revolution. As documented by Dr. Antony Sutton in his *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*,

Hitler was being financed by International Finance. Hitler's anti-Jewish rhetoric did not prevent the German Jewish banks from also helping to finance Hitler. Several courageous anti-Zionist Jews have endorsed the findings of Douglas Reed in *The Controversy of Zion*, that there was a close relationship between Hitler's government and the Zionists. It is not regarded as being politically correct to draw attention to this aspect of German history.

One of the major lessons to be learned from the role of Hitler in modern politics is that when suffering acute economic and social problems, with the threat of even worse to come, desperate people will naturally support what appears to be a plausible alternative. While The Bank "Of England" was one of the financial groups helping to finance Hitler, the same Central Bank imposed policies of credit restriction which prevented the British from introducing an urgently necessary re-armament programme. In the short term Hitler was warmly applauded by the German people as he abolished unemployment with a programme of impressive public works. But the Hitler programme was in essence "guns before butter". If the Germans had been granted direct access to their own financial credit, they almost certainly would have "voted" for more butter rather than guns.

Hitler was the classic example of a man so corrupted by power that he was vulnerable to those forces which wanted a Second World War. Generally overlooked is that the Soviet strategists, headed by Stalin, said that they wanted a Second World War, and directed German Communists to allow Hitler to come to power, correctly believing that a Hitler regime would lead to war. The Hitler-Stalin pact was the trigger for the start of a war which both the Communists and International Zionists wanted. The British Government, headed by Neville Chamberlain, was the only government genuinely striving to avoid war. Chamberlain was the British leader who refused to plunge Britain into conflict in 1938 at a time when the nation was still militarily weak. Chamberlain knew he needed time. The Zionist press everywhere viciously attacked Chamberlain.

Whatever his real motives, Hitler must answer before the bar of history as one of those responsible for the desperate plight of Western Christendom today. "The evil that men do lives after them.....".

**FINANCIAL DEREGULATOR EATS HIS WORDS** by D. Thompson: It was only a matter of time before the looming reality of debt, volatile markets and increasing international "market" influence on the Australian economy forced the proponents of financial deregulation to admit that they might have gone too far. One of the key deregulators, Mr. Fred Argy, has done just this. As a government adviser, secretary to the Campbell Committee, and signatory to its 1981 report, Argy was at the very heart of the decision to float the Australian dollar, and deregulate banking. Last week he expressed his doubts to the Committee for Economic Development of Australia (C.E.D.A.).

Argy pointed out that many of the promised results of deregulation, like lower interest rates, better service, ending currency speculation and more foreign investment, failed to materialise. Instead we had the "recession we had to have", the debt explosion, increasingly volatile financial markets which destabilise the whole economy. All this, Argy argued, constrains rather than enhances the ability of governments to pursue social goals.

Argy's confession, something akin to the child at the parade, pointing out that the emperor was stark naked, seems to have earned him a volley of abuse from the economic rationalists. But reality is the great disciplinarian, and the reality is that financial deregulation has been devastating to Australian sovereignty. We recall Mr. Keating's admission, while he was Treasurer, that financial deregulation was essential in order to internationalise the Australian economy.

In the end, who will take responsibility for what happens to Australians: their elected representatives (however poor or self-interested they are), or that new deity, "the Market"? Argy argues that *"governments must have the courage to defy financial markets when their policy expectations are clearly unreasonable, or threaten vital social concerns. Our national sovereignty and way of life depend on it. It may mean at times accepting even greater market instability . . ."*

But with what can governments defy "the market" except regulatory legislation making it clear that the final responsibility for financial policies rests with elected representatives, not "markets".

**KEATING CALLS FOR "AUSTRALIA FIRST":** Perhaps the chill breeze of a strong (and growing) social backlash against 'multiculturalism', and an eye to an impending election, had a hand in producing Prime Minister Keating's extraordinary demand that ethnic communities confirm that their first loyalty is to Australia. In his address to the Global Cultural Diversity gabfest in Sydney last week, Mr. Keating said:

*"All Australians must accept the basic principles of Australian society, including the Constitution and the rule of law, parliamentary democracy, freedom of speech and religion, English as the national language, equality of the sexes and the right of every Australian to express his or her views and values."*

This is only a rather basic "motherhood" statement that was once taken for granted, especially from M.P.'s. and particularly Prime Ministers, but for Mr. Keating, it is either tongue-in-cheek electioneering, or a major policy reversal in a number of areas. First, the proponents of a blatantly racially biased immigration policy in favour of Asian groups which results in ethnic ghettos in the first place, cannot in the next breath call for "one Australia". As historian Geoffrey Blainey has pointed out, we are creating a "nation of tribes".

Second, the Prime Minister who bends over backwards to accommodate even the most outrageous demands from the Aboriginal 'industry', and pushed so hard for a new form of racially discriminative land title, can hardly expect 'ethnics' not to also hold their hands out for special favours for nationally divisive agendas. On the matter of respect for the Australian Constitution, perhaps Mr. Keating would like to practise a little himself first. Who was it who began the most divisive, abrasive debate about the central pillar of the Constitution – the Crown? Hon. P. Keating. How can he expect 'ethnics' to respect the rule of law if he proposes to keep changing the rules?

The most blatant double standard of all is to demand that ethnic communities respect traditions of

free speech which the Prime Minister himself is aggressively undermining with the new racial vilification legislation. It seems clear that the ethnic communities present at the conference in Sydney will wink and nudge each other in the full knowledge that Mr. Keating was not speaking to them at all, but to the "international community" and to the "old Australia" anxious about the new internationalist cultural agenda. The lesson for all Australians (including the "ethnics") is clear: believe nothing they say, but watch what they do, like a hawk.

**VIETNAM WAR REVISITED . . . AGAIN:** In a further footnote on the agonising over the rights and wrongs of Australia's involvement in Vietnam, some of Australia's most senior military commanders in Vietnam were interviewed by *The Weekend Australian* (28/4/95) in regard to former U.S. Defence Secretary Robert McNamara's "we were wrong" statement. Some of the military chiefs are scathing about McNamara's memoirs on Vietnam, and the manner in which he has attempted to re-write history.

In each case, the seven generals interviewed strongly defended the performance of Australian troops in Vietnam, saying that the war was lost in Canberra and Washington, rather than on the battlefield. Major-General Douglas (Tim) Vincent, who commanded the Australian forces in Vietnam in 1967, said: *"The only thing wrong with that war was that we lost. The U.S. simply wasn't prepared to take the necessary military action to achieve results – they should have gone in quicker, with a bigger force."*

Military men, being practical people, are understandably sceptical of politicians' enlightenment in hindsight, but with all the breast-beating, little of the truth of the Vietnam drama has emerged. The military men touch on it; why didn't we attempt to win the war? Why did the U.S. politicians hamstring their military, refusing to bomb Hanoi?

Dr. Antony Sutton, the eminent military researcher from Stanford University, staggered the delegates to the 1972 Miami Beach Republican Convention, which re-elected Richard Nixon as their candidate for President, when he told them the truth in an electrifying 11-minute address. He said that the Soviets were killing American servicemen with American technology and materials, as he later documented in his book, *National Suicide: Military Aid to the Soviet Union*. This massive, three-volume research work was subsequently published in abbreviated form in paperback by the Australian League of Rights, to prevent the truth of the Vietnam war disappearing down George Orwell's "memory hole". A few copies are still available: \$12.50 from League book services, or \$15.00 posted.

**YET ANOTHER SURVEY: KIDS NOT A LOST CAUSE:** Hugh McKay, a well-known researcher regarded with some respect, last month released a report entitled *Young Adults*, being the results of research among 18-25 year olds of various racial backgrounds, living in different Australian cities. Some aspects of the report are interesting, especially the conclusion that young Australians, while conscious of the republican debate, regard it as unimportant. However, this report confirms previous surveys that indicate that young people are concerned about high levels of immigration, and the effect of increasing Asian immigration. Typical comments were that "We're too much of a soft touch when it comes to immigration . . . all these Asians want to pour in here because they know they are going to get an incredible deal ...".