



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.17

May 12th, 1995

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "A truth that disheartens because it is true is of far more value than the most stimulating of falsehoods."
– Maurice Maeterlinck

WHO REALLY WON THE SECOND WORLD WAR? by Eric D. Butler:

The Second World War was not long under way when C.H. Douglas, the man who predicted that a continuation of the First World War was certain if the debt system of finance was persevered with, warned that one of the objectives of the continued conflict was to eliminate British culture, establish a World Police State, to restore the debt system, and to consolidate the Zionist State of Israel in the Middle East. Those who believe in the episodic view of history, of a series of disconnected episodes, reject what they sneeringly refer to as the "conspiratorial view of history". This can best be described as the village idiot theory of history; that, for example, Julius Caesar was not assassinated by his former colleagues as a result of a conspiracy, but just happened to see Caesar one morning as they were taking a stroll and spontaneously said, "Here comes Caesar, let's stab him to death". Rejection of the concept of conspiracy in the human drama results in large numbers refusing to believe that there was such a thing as a Communist conspiracy, which in essence meant acceptance of the Marxist view of history: that the coming of Communism was "historically inevitable".

The famous German military philosopher Clausewitz observed that military war is the pursuit of policy by other means. One of the central features of real history is the constant attempt to centralise power. Both the Marxist-Leninists and Hitler shared a common philosophy concerning power. Communist leader Trotsky was one of the first to advocate the establishment of a United States of Europe. Hitler set about establishing it by force. A Fabian Socialist statesman immediately said that Hitler had paved the way for the continuation of such a Europe after the war. Hitler is recorded as having said that he would win the war because progressively his military opponents would be forced to adopt his philosophy.

The conventional view of history is that the Second World War started in order to protect the independence and integrity of Poland. British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain was quoted by American Ambassador Joseph Kennedy as having said that he had been tricked into the conflict. If the objective of the British declaration of military conflict was to restore the independence of Poland, and to preserve long term British security, then the real war was lost in spite of the heroic

military achievements of the British and their Commonwealth colleagues. At the end of the military conflict, not only Poland, but the whole of Eastern Europe, from the Baltic States in the North to the Balkans in the South, was dominated by a tyranny even more brutal than Hitler's. That tyranny was sustained for nearly half a century.

And what of the British? Before the First World War Great Britain was a creditor nation. She finished that conflict as a debtor, the International Bankers imposing conditions which undermined the British economy. At the conclusion of the Second World War Great Britain was forced to accept more economic and political defeats, the major one being a surrender to the concept of joining a United States of Europe. This surrender had far reaching implications for peoples of the old British Empire. The most successful example of true internationalism in the history of mankind was progressively undermined to be replaced with the concept of some type of a World State, built around a United Nations organisation which is having little success in policing the numerous conflicts taking place around the world.

It was said after the First World War, that the British people played the major role in winning the military conflict, but then lost the peace. The same has happened after the Second World War, primarily because of those power groups who crave for a world in which all power is centralised. The reality about today's world is that it is further removed from genuine peace, one in which individuals are genuinely free and secure, than it was before the glorious promise beckoning before the first great disaster of this century, the First World War. Just as the peoples of British stock everywhere were in the forefront of showing mankind the way forward to real world peace, they should now seek to make real the military achievements by regenerating their own societies. This means going back to their philosophical, spiritual and cultural roots. It means a rejection of the philosophy which undergirded both the Marxist and Hitler totalitarian structures.

FAILURE OF THE 'GLOBAL MELTING-POT' by David Thompson:

The last round of the French Presidential elections (being decided as we go to print) is serving to focus on the failure of one of liberalism's great dreams: the global melting pot. If all individuals, and hence all races, are equal, then the merging of the races should eliminate discrimination, to be achieved by racial distinctions eroding in the global 'melting-pot' about which the Beatles once sang. Ultimately, nationalism itself must be undermined, along with all the friction that nationalism generates.

However, the gruel in the global melting-pot is decidedly lumpy, as racial groups stubbornly cling to their distinctive identities. Such expressions of unique identity are suppressed as much as possible, but occasionally they exert themselves. The success of Jean-Marie Le Pen's candidacy for President of France, in which he was eliminated in the first round, but polled more than 15 percent, shocked many of the 'moderate' observers. Le Pen has campaigned against GATT and the Maestricht Treaty, and against immigration, suggesting that non-European immigrants be encouraged to return to their countries of origin. He has now emerged as something of a 'king-maker', as his suggestions for how his National Front supporters might vote in the final round could decide who wins the Presidency.

The conservative candidate, Mr. Chirac, feeling the pressure of the support for Le Pen, proposed a

new policy in the dying hours of the campaign: a referendum on European Union. It seems ludicrous that the newly independent former Soviet states are prepared to go to war for their independence, while western European nations are being herded into a European Union. It is clear that throughout Europe there is great resistance to open borders, shared citizenship, integrated economies, and cultural dilution. Switzerland has simply refused to become a part of the great experiment.

AMERICA'S RACIAL TIME-BOMB: In the United States a vigorous, sub-terranean debate concerning immigration occasionally breaks out into the open. The recent publication of a book, *Alien Nation: Common Sense About America's Immigration Disaster*, by Peter Brimelow, is a blunt warning that the present open-door immigration policy will 'Balkanise' the U.S. That is, make the United States a nation of tribes. Brimelow has documented the change in population mix, and notes that an enormous majority of ordinary blacks at the grassroots are deeply concerned at the necessity to compete with other racial groups for a portion of the welfare budget designed to help blacks.

Brimelow has infuriated the liberals in the American press by taking the official figures, and using them to estimate that by the middle of the next century, white Americans will be in the minority. His call for an immediate halt to U.S. immigration has been supported by the Federation for American Immigration Reform (F.A.I.R.). References to the Brimelow book (*Weekend Australian*, May 6th) note that in Florida a grassroots group has announced that it would propose a referendum like Proposition 187 in California last year.

Proposition 187 was supported by 60 percent of Californian voters, and, if approved by the Federal Court in September, will deny social services such as schooling, healthcare and welfare to illegal immigrants, mainly Mexicans in California. For some time, as Graeme Campbell points out in his book *Australia Betrayed*, the U.S. had a very similar immigration policy to that of Australia, known here as the White Australia policy. As in Australia, tensions over the racial mix of the population rise mainly for a single reason: the immigration mix is seen to be a decision imposed on the majority, rather than a conscious decision taken by Americans. At least in some States of the Union there is a mechanism that can be used to quickly exert grassroots pressure initiative and referendum.

(*Australia Betrayed*, by Graeme Campbell & Mark Uhlman, \$20.00, or \$24.00 posted.)

'PRIVATISATION' BOWLING AHEAD: The latest huge development project to be let to foreign developers has been the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line, regularly promised for decades. News that the giant South Korean corporation Daewoo has signed a secret agreement with the Northern Territory Government leaked out late last month, although Federal Transport Minister Laurie Brereton apparently knew nothing about it.

This enormous project, which has inevitable defence implications, is now to be built by foreigners. Early in the century the transcontinental railway, stretching from east to west coast, was built by Australians, using Australian materials, Australian labour and Australian finance. The Commonwealth Bank, belonging to the Commonwealth Government, financed a large portion of the railway by simply issuing credits. The new Alice Springs-Darwin railway will be financed by further foreign indebtedness, and built by foreigners.

As a result of the adoption of a national competition policy (from the Hilmer Report) many more "Australian" projects will be run by foreigners. This is already emerging, to the fury of many Australians. The operation of the entire Adelaide water supply and sewerage system is now being "out-sourced", as part of the privatisation of South Australia's Engineering and Water Supply Department. In the first contract of its kind, and one of the biggest in the world, the \$2 billion agreement is expected to "catapult the successful bidder into Asian markets". But Australian-controlled interests have been excluded from the tender process.

The South Australian Government is inviting four foreign-controlled multi-nationals to tender for the contract, and even the Federal Government is shocked. The Minister for Industry, Science & Technology, Senator Cook, is said to be furious. Several French and a British consortiums have been invited to tender, because no Australian company has ever operated an entire municipal water system before. While the State Government will retain ownership of the assets, foreigners will run the system. Local companies say this will eliminate them from the Asian water supply "market", arguing that companies who cannot win contracts to run such systems in their own countries have no chance of gaining Asian contracts.

The full consequences of committing Australia to the global market are as yet unforeseeable. But Australians are likely to see developments that they never believed possible. If foreign companies will be competing for domestic services, we may yet see Chinese companies collecting the household rubbish instead of local government. Few social amenities will survive the economic rationalists. In Sydney it is now being seriously suggested that Defence Department land on North and South Head of Sydney Harbour should be sold to the highest bidder, and subdivided for residential development. The break-up of traditional Australia is well advanced.

THE CRIMINAL ASSAULT ON THE FAMILY: A new type of crime has developed in Sydney in predominantly Asian areas: home invasion. A gang breaks down the door with a sledge hammer, and perhaps six heavily-armed thieves terrorise the family until all valuables have been surrendered, perhaps killing a family pet to demonstrate what happens to those who resist. Should a family have the right to protect itself? In some States, the law forbids the ownership of firearms for the protection of families and property. But it is still a common-law right to use "reasonable force" to defend the home.

The case of the crippled Adelaide pensioner, aged 84, who shot dead a 32-year-old intruder, has reignited the debate about protecting property. Prosecutors are considering whether to charge the Adelaide man, who has suffered several previous burglaries, and his garden shed being burned, prompting him to install extra security screens, and live in terror of further raids. This follows a police decision in Brisbane not to charge a man who shot and killed a 16-year-old intruder last month.

While the anti-gun lobby is demanding that the possession of guns be illegal in all circumstances, it will be interesting to see what happens to the statistics on the incidence of burglary in Brisbane and Adelaide. As an experiment, perhaps a city council should pass a by-law to make it compulsory for every householder to keep a firearm to deter burglary, and study the effect on crime rates.

It is quite clear that a burglar forfeits his "rights" to the protection of the law the moment he breaks into someone else's property. Let the victims of crime protect themselves, and crime levels will certainly fall.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,
145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Telephone: (03) 650 9749, Fax: (03) 650 9368.

Subscription \$30 p.a.