



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS ON 1
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.15

April 26th, 1996

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Zionism is a hard-headed political creed which proposes to subject America's Jews to the sovereignty of Israel."

- Dr. Alfred Lilienthal in *What Price Israel?*

ZIONISM AND TERRORISM by Eric D. Butler:

Realistic comment on the current invasion of Lebanon by Zionist military forces is impossible without a background picture of what has happened in the Middle East since the fateful Balfour declaration was reluctantly agreed to by a desperate Great Britain during the First World War. This declaration, subsequently interpreted by Zionist propagandists to mean that a promise had been made to provide a "national home" for the Jewish people in Palestine, led to a train of events which poisoned not only the Middle East but made it increasingly difficult for Western governments, particularly those of Western Europe and the United States, to pursue realistic foreign policies. One of the earliest Jewish opponents of Zionism described it as the most "stupendous fallacy" in human history. One of the U.S.A.'s most distinguished Jewish authorities on the Middle East, Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, started warning of the far-reaching implications of the establishment of the State of Israel starting with an article in *The Readers Digest* in 1949, "Israel's Flag Is Not Mine". This was followed by his first major work, *What Price Israel* in 1953. As with his other works which followed, including his classic, *The Zionist Connection*, *What Price Israel* was truly prophetic. What is happening in Lebanon today is but part of an ongoing saga of violence and terrorism, innocent civilians generally being the victims.

Terrorist activities which affect civilians, whether carried out by the I.R.A. or any other group, are completely unacceptable in a civilised society. A Zionist-Jewish dominated Hollywood has managed to create a picture of Islamic extremists being the main perpetrators of terrorism in the Middle East. This picture is badly flawed because it does not point out that terrorism as a political weapon was first introduced into the Middle East by Zionist terrorists. Until the artificial State of Israel had been established, Arabs, many of them Christians, and Jews had lived together in relative harmony for centuries. They were "blood brothers", to use the title of one moving book on the history of the Middle East. The creation of the State of Israel was like injecting a poisoned thorn into the Middle East. The poison continues to spread.

No one is seriously suggesting that the Israelis deliberately bombed the U.N. refugee camp in Southern Lebanon, this resulting in a major propaganda defeat for Israel. But as with the last major invasion of Lebanon by Israel, civilian targets have been constantly hit by Israeli forces, using sophisticated military equipment made available in the main by the U.S.A. Generally forgotten is that when forced to retreat from Lebanon in 1985, it refused, however, to withdraw from the self-described "security zone" in defiance of U.N. resolution 425. It was the establishment of this zone which gave Islamic Hezbollah legitimacy. But the Israelis treat the U.N. with contempt, knowing that their main power base is the United States where President Bill Clinton must walk carefully and not upset the Zionist Jewish lobby, whose support he requires to gain re-election.

An Australian, David Forde, who spent three six-month tours with the U.N. in Southern Lebanon, writes of his experiences in a letter to *The Weekend Australian* of April 20th-21st. He describes the constant unprovoked attacks against civilian citizens by the Israeli forces. He concludes his letter by observing, "As long as America blindly supports Israel and controls the U.N., nothing will change." Like Clinton, Israeli President Peres is facing an election which at one stage the polls indicated he might lose. Reports state that his popularity rating increased substantially after he launched his massive attack into Lebanon, one argument being that this offensive was designed to extend the "Peace" campaign, and to bring Syria to the negotiating table. But a murderous attack on innocent Lebanese civilians seems a strange way to foster a "peace process". The military campaign has now blown up in the face of Peres and his supporters. Fijian troops serving with the U.N. are naturally outraged by what has happened to the refugee camp they were looking after. A number of U.N. observers have, over the years, written about their experiences with Israel, which has, in accordance with its "Chosen Race" philosophy, consistently taken the view that it is a law unto itself. But it can only continue to take that attitude while backed by an international Zionist-Jewish movement with enormous influence in Western countries, including Australia.

The first essential step necessary for a genuine peace process to start developing in the Middle East, is for Western nations in particular, to apply enough pressure, including, if necessary, sanctions, to force Israel to negotiate a direct agreement with the government of Lebanon to withdraw completely from Southern Lebanon in return for secure borders. Unless this happens genuine peace in the Middle East is impossible.

WHY NOT SCRAP A.T.S.I.C. ALTOGETHER? by David Thompson:

The new Federal Government's proposal to enquire into the financial accountability of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Commission (A.T.S.I.C.) has created the expected protests from those within the Aboriginal "industry". But even some within the Aboriginal/indigenous "community" are questioning the usefulness of A.T.S.I.C. One Aboriginal activist and writer, "Mudrooroo", has finally stated what many privately believed when he called for A.T.S.I.C. to be scrapped, saying that it was ineffective and was only ever a publicity vehicle for the Keating Government to appeal to the politically correct.

Mudrooroo, an award-winning author, questioned the Keating administration's indigenous funding programme, claiming that there was too much emphasis on Aboriginal affairs. *"Too much publicised money was going into Aboriginal affairs – which meant it went into the bureaucracy,"* he said. *"You can't have something like A.T.S.I.C. has become. It has been ineffective. Only 3% of Aboriginal people voted for it in the first place, so why try to save something we never wanted anyway?"* (*The Australian*, 19/4/96).

Other Aboriginal leaders have made the same points, including the traditional elders of the southern N.S.W. coastal Aborigines. The key to the present problem with accountability and Aboriginal representation is a **matter of policy**. Since World War II there has never been a time when Aboriginal people have not enjoyed the strong sympathy of other Australians because of poor living conditions, education, employment opportunities, etc. The policy of **assimilation** was designed to assist Aborigines and part-Aborigines into the western, European, Christian mainstream, in order to better enjoy the benefits of that culture. Some programmes, like that of taking Aboriginal children from their parents, and raising them in a European environment, have now been rejected as cruel. As a result, the **policy of assimilation** itself was rejected.

POLICY OF "SELF-DETERMINATION": When the Aboriginal "industry", under the influence of the Marxists, as Geoff McDonald documented in his books, *"Red Over Black"* and *"The Evidence"*, began to demand a new approach, the Commonwealth virtually adopted the Marxist programme. The first thing to change was **Aboriginal Policy**. Instead of being one in which Aborigines and part-Aborigines could become a part of the wider Australian culture, and enjoy its benefits, **as many clearly desired**, a policy of **self determination** was adopted. While the Marxists and the political "left" will still hotly deny it, this is basically the **same policy as apartheid in South Africa**, a policy vigorously condemned by the Marxists.

As an expression of **self determination** the Aboriginal industry has successfully made many heavy demands. In the 1970's, the first "black parliament", the National Aboriginal Conference (N.A.C.), was created and elected by Aboriginal people. Other demands have been pursued, such as land claims legislation, a Makarrata treaty, and native title, all of which clearly point to the eventual objective of a separate black nation.

A.T.S.I.C. has never been representative of Aboriginal people. The 1993 election of A.T.S.I.C. councillors was little more than a charade. Of an estimated 147,500 eligible voters, less than 46,000 voted, of which 6,000 were rejected and 2,000 declared informal. In one region in the Northern Territory, four councillors were elected by only 10 formal votes. In three other regions, only about 4,200 votes elected a total of 54 A.T.S.I.C. councillors. For the entire process, it took about six weeks to count the votes, with some farcical delays. In Deniliquin it took 41 days to count just 66 votes.

As a general result of the policy of "self determination" the perception has grown that non-Aboriginal Australians have financed a process in which only "Aborigines" can say how the funds are spent, and accountability for the expenditure is regarded as almost a "racist" requirement. A recent survey, *"A New Beginning: Community Attitudes Towards Aboriginal Reconciliation"* prepared for the Council of Aboriginal Reconciliation, has reported "huge resentment" towards the extent of Government funding. It is a common view that Aborigines received favoured treatment, and that much of the assistance provided by other Australians is, at best, wasted, and at worst, used destructively. This is an inevitable result of **the policy of self determination**.

The only reasonable alternative to further alienation between "Aborigines" and other Australians, is to abandon self determination. Australia is one nation. Any attempt to create separate "tribes" within it is a recipe for disaster.

Recommended reading: *"Healing a Divided Nation"* by Rev. Cedric Jacobs, \$5.00 or \$6.00 posted. *"Red Over Black"* by Geoff McDonald, \$10.00 or \$12.00 posted. *"The Evidence"* by Geoff McDonald, \$7.00 or \$8.00 posted. *"Land Rights Birth Rights"* by Peter B. English, \$14.00 or \$16.50 posted. Available from all League Book Services.

GOLDSMITH'S "REFERENDUM PARTY" CHALLENGES TORIES: The international billionaire, Sir James Goldsmith, has followed up his threat last year to challenge the Tories on their European policy. Goldsmith, the strength behind the founding of the Referendum Party in Britain, has announced that he will field 600 candidates in the forthcoming British general election. The campaign budget will begin at 20 million pounds and "whatever it takes" has been pledged by Sir James.

Sir James Goldsmith has embarked upon a strategy to force the Tories to hold a referendum on British involvement in the European Union, which will inevitably lead to a further gradual erosion of British sovereignty. In an interview with *The Times*, Goldsmith urged that a Speaker's conference be convened to decide the wording of a referendum, saying: *"We are trying to obtain the right to a referendum. It is inappropriate to determine what the exact terms should be."*

Prime Minister John Major has promised a referendum on Europe after the election if Cabinet agrees to British participation in a single European currency. But as political conditions now stand, Mr. Major has little hope of being involved in the formation of the next government. The Tories are trailing badly in the opinion polls, and have been badly shaken by the loss of a safe Tory seat in a recent by-election.

Sir James Goldsmith has offered the Tories a choice: either go into the next election with a firm pledge to hold a referendum, with the referendum question **already spelt out**, or face a massive challenge from the new Referendum Party as well as the other parties. Goldsmith has announced that if Major sets up the is

Speaker's conference, and commits himself to a satisfactory referendum question, he would wind up the Referendum Party. *"If he does not, we will not dissolve and we will fight our heads off,"* said Goldsmith. Already the Referendum Party has poached several key Conservative Party staff to help run their anti-Europe campaign, which enjoys strong sympathy **inside** Mr. Major's Conservative Party. The Referendum Party will be launched in Brighton in October, with a long list of high-profile British figures prepared to stand as candidates against the European Union. Some are former Conservatives. Sir James is believed to be interested in running for Putney himself, Mr. David Mellor's seat. Mellor is strongly pro-European.

Goldsmith, who regards the Government's White Paper on Europe as an act of appeasement, said, *"The Prime Minister has tried to appease the Eurosceptics and the Europhiliacs by producing a pseudo-referendum pledge subject to winning the election. It satisfies no-one."*

NATIONAL PARTY IGNORES GRASSROOTS: Mr. Bill McGrath, Deputy Leader of the Victorian National Party, has further demonstrated why the Party is in decline in Victoria. In an address to 400 delegates at the State conference last week, Mr. McGrath rebuked delegates for belittling senior Party figures during the last election campaign. He accused some members of giving the press fuel, by claiming that support in seats contested by some of the Party leaders was declining. This sounds a note of desperation, as the Victorian State election clearly demonstrated one thing: the National Party **is in decline**. In McGrath's own seat, he suffered a swing against him in the order of 14%. Rather than blaming the grassroots, Mr. McGrath might look to the Party's policy position. Could it be that Victorian rural people are disgusted with a National Party that tamely tags along with even the most outrageous Liberal Party "reforms"? Like the devolution of local government, for example? Or the "privatisation" of utilities, like the power stations? Or the closing down of schools and hospitals – many of them in country areas? What is the point of the National Party if it cannot use its partnership with the Liberals to achieve a better deal for the rural supporters?

One issue that left delegates distinctly unimpressed was the Kennett proposal to decriminalise marijuana. After heated debate, only a handful of delegates voted against a motion opposing "the legalisation of heroin and other illicit drugs". Mr. McGrath is Victoria's Minister for Police, who are strongly opposed to decriminalising marijuana, saying it would "open up a minefield" of drug abuse. The South Australian police are also very concerned. They share a border with Victoria. Victorian police would rather increase powers to permit them to deal with the drug trade, particularly dealers. The options seem clear, either deal with illegal drugs, or change the law so that they are no longer illegal. Never mind the effect on children. As yet, no-one has devised a system by which drivers can be properly tested for the influence of marijuana.

FAIRFAX PRESS – BATTLE FOR CONTROL: Last week's corporate struggle within the newspaper company John Fairfax Holdings resulted in the sacking of the chief executive, Mr. Bob Mansfield. This was achieved apparently at the behest of Mr. Conrad Black, the Canadian media entrepreneur who owns nearly 25% of Fairfax. Mr. Black has been asking the Australian Government to permit him to increase his holdings in Fairfax to 35%, which is presently prevented by law. Why was Mansfield sacked? It is almost impossible for outsiders to tell what sort of executive he was, but newspaper reports describe him variously as "independent-minded", "a dangerous man" who "can't be bought, doesn't care about job security, he is a man of independent mind ...". Not only that, but Mr. Mansfield apparently refused to defer to Conrad Black, and his board nominee, Dan Colson, preferring to use his own judgement instead. If such struggles take place at management level, what happens at editorial level? Are editors of the *Sydney Morning Herald* or *The Age* really independent? Perhaps Mr. Jeff Kennett is correct for once, when he observes that *"Here you have a situation where this group ... is being dictated from overseas ..."*. Why does Conrad Black need an additional 10% of Fairfax stock? To give him control of Fairfax? Mansfield's sacking demonstrates that Black **already has plenty of control**. He needs the additional stock to fight off Mr. Kerry Packer or Rupert Murdoch in any imminent takeover bid. This "Australian" company is heavily involved in helping to form the opinions of Australians every day. At least that influence could come from Australians, rather than trans-global profiteers. What is the purpose of the Foreign Investment Review Board, anyway?

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,
145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.

Subscription \$30.00 p.a.