



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.15

April 28th, 1995

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Morality is as basic as the truth that two plus two are four; that gravitation draws the falling stone and supports the standing man."

American poet E. Merrill Root

VIETNAM REALITIES by Eric D. Butler:

Robert McNamara, the former U.S.A. Defence Secretary, has, in his book claiming that American intervention in Vietnam highlighted what Malcolm Muggeridge described as the "great liberal death wish", shown it had deeply permeated the West in the face of the global Marxist-Leninist bid for world power. It was the same wishful liberalism which, when it came to economics, blinded even many who thought they were genuinely anti-Communist. It was the master strategist Lenin who enunciated the claim that the "decadent West", unable to solve its own problems, would be delighted to export to the Communists, "providing the rope with which we will hang them". The great Alexander Solzhenitsyn constantly made the point that the Communist Empire was only sustained by the massive economic blood transfusions from the West. While supporting the military defence of a South Vietnam threatened by a Marxist-dominated North Vietnam, I constantly made the point that defence of South Vietnam, containing at least one million North Vietnamese who had fled South to try to escape the Marxist-Leninist tyranny imposed by the Hanoi Government, was not only defence of the whole of South-Eastern Asia, but ultimately of Australia itself.

However, it was essential to draw attention to the vital fact that Robert McNamara and his Liberal Establishment friends had insisted that American military leaders conduct a "no-win conflict" and that, under no circumstances, must they apply one of the basic principles of military war, cutting the enemy's major supply lines. North Vietnam's major military supplier was the Soviet Union, and it was the settled policy of the American Establishment, of which Robert McNamara was a major figure, that a direct conflict with the Soviet must be avoided at all costs. Calls for the American bombing of Haiphong, the North Vietnam port through which most Soviet supplies

reached the Communist military machine, were rejected as "extremist". Dr. Henry Kissinger, American Secretary of State, was prominent among those who believed that if direct confrontation with the Soviet Union and Communist China could be avoided, ultimately they could be encouraged to join some type of a World Federation. Kissinger was the man who negotiated the "Peace agreement" with Communist North Vietnam, this paving the way for the North Vietnamese final assault on South Vietnam. Kissinger was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his achievement.

Representing those International Banking Groups which had consistently bankrolled the Soviet, Kissinger was the man who also pressured the South Africans and Rhodesians to settle for "majority rule" in Southern Africa, starting with Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe). The end result was the elevation of Communist Robert Mugabe as Prime Minister of Zimbabwe and the election of Communist Mandela as President of South Africa. International Finance obviously sees both Mugabe and Mandela as suitable fronts for their on-going programme of internationalisation.

One of the heavily censored stories to come out of the Vietnam affair was the startling report by British born research expert Dr. Antony Sutton to the American Republican Party in August, 1972. Sutton's detailed research work at the prestigious Stanford University had established that the whole Soviet industrial system had been provided by the West, primarily the U.S.A. Several American Republican Congressmen grasped the far-reaching significance of Sutton's work and arranged for him to testify before a sub-committee of the Republican Party at Miami Beach, Florida, on August 11th, 1972. In 15 minutes Sutton dramatically documented how Americans in Vietnam were being killed with equipment from the Soviet Union, this provided by the U.S.A. He listed the ships being used to carry the Soviet military equipment into Haiphong, these ships in the main also built in the West and powered by engines built in the West.

Antony Sutton summarised his testimony with the charge that 100,000 Americans had been killed in Vietnam with American technology, adding, "The only response from Washington and the Nixon Administration is the effort to hush up the scandal." The Zionist-dominated media in the U.S.A., which had generally been opposed to the American involvement in Vietnam, almost completely suppressed the Sutton revelations. One of those present at the Miami conference told me that after those Republicans present got over their shock, agreed as loyal party supporters that if the Sutton revelations were made public, Nixon could lose the elections!

Any attempt to understand why Robert McNamara has decided after 20 years to provide such a misleading assessment of the Vietnam War, one bringing further hurt to Americans, Australians and others who served in Vietnam, it should be recorded that eventually he moved on to become Chairman of the World Bank, this international organisation playing a prominent role in financing Communist Vietnam and other former Communist countries. The real betrayal in Vietnam was that of Robert McNamara and his fellow internationalists.

IGNORING ANZACS' ROLE IN PACIFIC WAR: In the T.V. documentary, *The World At War*, narrated by Sir Laurence Olivier, there was no mention of the Kokoda Trail campaigns or the Battle for Milne Bay. Both these campaigns, by Australian troops, were decisive in halting the Japanese drive southwards. The American domination of public relations aspects of the Pacific Campaign tended to "play down" the valuable Australian contribution to the defeat of the Japanese. Sir William Slim, hero of the campaign against the Japanese in Burma, has recorded how news of the Australian victory at Milne Bay had an uplifting effect on the morale of his troops.

MULTICULTURAL CHICKENS COMING HOME TO ROOST by D. Thompson:

The Global Cultural Diversity Conference, which starts in Sydney just before we go to press, is the first of its kind, and intended to observe the International Year of Tolerance. But as with the Bureau of Immigration Multicultural and Population Research Conference earlier in the year, tolerance is perhaps the first response to depart when it is suggested that ever stronger arguments are emerging to undermine the utopian policy of forced multiculturalism, driven by what has now become a pro-Asian immigration policy.

Reality is the great disciplinarian, and in every corner of the world identifiable racial or ethnic groups are demanding recognition in their own right, and in countries like Yugoslavia, Chechnya, and Rwanda, suffering for it. Even Phillip Adams, in a 'cultural diversity' series in *The Australian* (22/4/95) concedes that the "notion of the melting pot will become as unfashionable in Australia as it has in the U.S.", and that nations will continue to explode under the tensions of forcing differing cultural groups into close proximity.

It is clear that such Global Conferences are designed to shore up the crumbling support for immigration policies that further contribute to cultural pressures that blow nations apart. In Australia leading up to the Global Conference, the President of the European Union's Migrant Forum, Mr. Tara Mukherjee, criticised the Coalition's "extremist" immigration policy, in which the Opposition calls for **no increase** in immigration while unemployment is high.

Mr. Bolkus, Minister for Immigration, has deliberately linked trade to immigration policy, claiming that if we expect to expand Asian trading opportunities; we cannot cut the immigration programme. Clearly Mr. Bolkus is conceding that the immigration policy **favours Asians**, and that this is to **our trading advantage**.

REALITY INTRUDES ON UTOPIA: The truth is that the evidence is now almost overwhelming that multiculturalism is highly destructive to the concept of the nation-state. The proponents of

high immigration and multiculturalism should be forced to state their position: are they in favour of multiculturalism because it destroys the nation-state? Are they advocating some new order, in which the nation-state is replaced by a plethora of regional tribal ghettos, all demanding equal status from a new international government based on the U.N. model? Are they prepared to accept the consequences of increasing "inter-tribal" conflict, including military conflict like that in Chechnya, Rwanda, or Yugoslavia?

New N.S.W. Premier, Mr. Bob Carr, was again confronted by reality when he undertook an early tour of drought-affected regions. Carr came to the conclusion that a **depopulated rural Australia** was a disaster. What to do? Mr. Carr now believes that decentralisation of population from the environmentally-sensitive coastlines is essential. He made the highly significant point: "I think we've gone overboard thinking that high immigration targets and maximising population growth is going to produce a stronger and better Australia ..." The task is before Mr. Carr.

As reality further intrudes upon the utopian multicultural agenda, it is clear that this will result in electoral expression **somewhere**, or else perhaps degenerate into violence. The experience in France is that Mr. Jean-Marie Le Pen's National Front is presently polling around **20 percent** of the vote in French Presidential elections. Groups like Australians Against Further Immigration in Australia can expect the same sort of electoral attention, if they are competently and credibly led, irrespective of virulent press campaigns against them. As we go to press, final results of the N.S.W. Legislative Council election results are still unavailable, but indications are that while the A.A.F.I. group may have missed out on a Council seat, the strength of their electoral showing confirms our analysis.

HOMOSEXUAL FAMILIES LEGALLY RECOGNISED? The new N.S.W. Industrial Relations Minister, Mr. Shaw, has indicated that he is sympathetic to some form of legal recognition to homosexual relationships. The N.S.W. Labor Council opened its family leave test case in the Industrial Relations Commission last week, asking for the same leave entitlements to care for sick "spouses" for homosexuals. Mr. Shaw supports this, but maintains that **this is not** leading to the recognition of homosexual marriages. Read his lips: no homosexual marriages.

Clearly there is division within A.L.P. ranks on this issue, especially from the large proportion of Catholics who support the A.L.P. One backbencher, Mr. Bob Harrison (Kiama) notes that none of this has so far been discussed at Caucus level: "If it is just another step towards the recognition of gay marriages and child adoption, then count me out," he said.

The key to any such legislation, which is now obviously being debated, despite Shaw's denial, is the **Legislative Council**, where the Carr administration does not have a majority. Rev. Fred Nile, who, together with his wife Elaine, holds the balance of power in the Council, has sworn that homosexual rights legislation will not be passed. But will Mrs. Nile retain her seat?