



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.13

April 11th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"There may have been a time when all the members (of Parliament) responded to the cut and thrust of debate before deciding how to cast your vote. But that was a few hundred years ago. Now you vote the party line which is decided outside the parliament, so the debate is not relevant most of the speeches are just hot air."*

– Former Victorian Labor Minister of Police and Transport, Steve Crabb,
in the *Sun-Herald*, Melbourne, April 3rd, 1997

THE ZIONIST FACTOR IN AN UNSTABLE WORLD by Eric D. Butler:

Even the briefest glance at the world scene reveals growing instability everywhere. While the media devoted considerable space to reviews of the book *The Coming Conflict With China*, by well known American journalists Richard Bernstein and Ross H. Munro, headlines read "ARAB LEADERS WARN U.S. OF 'EXPLOSION'". The Arab warning came on the eve of Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu's urgent meeting with President Clinton concerning the Middle East crisis. At the same time Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat was meeting with the Non Aligned Nations in New Delhi, India. Backed by the whole Muslim world, Arafat is urging Clinton to bring pressure to bear on the Israeli Government to cease building projects on Arab territory. Anyone who takes the trouble to read the international Zionist Jewish press is well aware that there are disagreements between different sections of the Jewish people. This has been the case since the Zionist influence on global politics emerged during the First World War. It was a prominent American Jewish leader who attacked Zionism as "the most stupendous fallacy in history". The Zionist factor in modern history has been generally misunderstood.

No realistic assessment of the current international situation is possible without consideration of the fact that the U.S. Clinton Administration is the most Jewish dominated in history. This fact is openly admitted by the Zionist Jewish media.

Anyone doubting this statement might care to consider a report featured in *The Washington Times* of February 28th, 1994. Headlined, TOO-MANY-JEWS-POLICY TRIGGERS PROTEST, the report states that "The chairman of the House International Relations Committee, Benjamin A. Gilman, wrote to President Clinton yesterday to object to a report that senior foreign affairs positions are not being filled because there are too many Jews in the State Department". Mr. Gilman wrote, *The Washington Times* citing anonymous sources said, that some appointments have not been filled partly because "there are too many 'white Jewish males' in senior State Department positions". *The Washington Times* report said that "Several senior State Department officials involved in Middle East policy are Jewish men. The two top officials in the National Security Council are also Jewish." The

reports continues, "Mr. Gilman wrote the letter just weeks after Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright disclosed she had learned that while she was brought up Catholic and then became Episcopalian, her Czechoslovak parents were originally Jewish."

The Washington Times is Jewish controlled and never ceases to take a pro-Zionist stance. It is inconceivable that Clinton's masters are going to agree to any Middle East policy which does not further Zionist long term objectives. One of the early Zionists said, that the establishment of the Zionist State of Israel was but "a peg" on which to hang a "far-reaching" programme. That programme has been masked by a number of confusing and often conflicting concepts about the meaning of Zionism. There has been the romantic concept of the Jewish peoples of the world returning to their "homeland". But events have demonstrated that the overwhelming majority of the Jews of the world have no intention of moving to Israel to live. Large numbers of Christians have accepted the establishment of Zionist Israel as the fulfilment of Biblical prophecy, obviously completely unaware that the great majority of today's Jews are of non-Semitic origins. This has been documented beyond all argument in works like *The Thirteenth Tribe* by famous Jewish author Arthur Koestler, and also dealt with in Dr. Alfred Lilienthal's classic *The Zionist Connection*.

If President Clinton were a genuinely independent President, he would have little difficulty in dealing with the Middle East threat to the whole world. But he is not independent. He is not even independent of the Chinese problem, which the Zionists can be relied upon to attempt to exploit. The Arabs themselves are little more than pawns, even if unconscious pawns, in a global scenario. Once again the question of the remarkable Saddam Hussein is being discussed. Why was he allowed to survive at the time of the Gulf War? The answer is simple: he was essential to prevent the destabilisation of the whole of the Middle East. He is a convenient whipping boy, as witnessed by Clinton's pre-election military strike against Iraq. Now comes the news that Israel is co-operating militarily with Iran.

After visiting the Middle East, National Party leader Tom Fischer was unwise enough to criticise what he saw as Israel's aggression against Lebanon. There was a period when Fischer was regarded with some suspicion by the Zionist hierarchy in Australia. But according to recent reports, Fischer has been forgiven by Isi Leibler and other Zionist leaders. The almost uncanny influence of the Zionists on politicians of all persuasions is one of the most disturbing features of modern history. One thing is certain: as the world drama unfolds, no one can ignore the power and influence of the Zionist factor. Those politicians who have dared to attempt to stand against the Zionist factor have been brutally smeared. A study of the Zionist factor as it operates reveals the influence of a power which can only be described as evil, an evil which unless countered, will also engulf the rank and file of the Jewish people.

"RIGHTS" INSTITUTIONALISE INSANITY by David Thompson:

When the Racial Discrimination Act was forced through the Commonwealth Parliament by Attorney-General and committed Fabian Lionel Murphy in 1975, few foresaw the ramifications. But having established the most dubious and ill-defined principle that it was not only rude and perhaps immoral, but now **illegal** to "discriminate" on the basis of race, the floodgates of the "rights"-based legislation were opened.

The woolly-thinking liberals and left-wing youth were easily convinced by their Fabian and feminist professors that "discrimination" was unfair, and that it should be outlawed not only on the basis of race, but religion, nationality, gender, age, size and, eventually, even sexual preference. Once

"discrimination" was outlawed in principle, it naturally followed that governments of every stripe must eventually begin to change laws or make new ones to accommodate new standards. Those who break the new laws must be punished, and the victims compensated. Which brings us to the incredible case of one Christopher Tsakalos.

Fourteen-year-old Sydney schoolboy Tsakalos is to sue the N.S.W. Department of School Education and 50 schoolchildren for victimisation on the basis of his sexual preference, having declared himself a homosexual. The Department, it is alleged, failed to provide a secure environment in which he could attend school. Tsakalos has the full support of his mother and the Gay and Lesbian Teachers and Students Association, and presumably the bevy of boards, committees and commissions which investigate "discrimination" of all kinds.

Tsakalos is reputed to be claiming \$200,000 and is quoted as saying that it should help him buy a Mercedes-Benz convertible. But his homosexual supporters deny that he is milking the system, and that he should be compensated for "pain and suffering" as well as for loss of future earnings – "he has missed a lot of school because of what has happened". His father (separated from his mother) is reported as being dubious of his son's claim to homosexuality.

The N.S.W. Teachers' Federation, although strongly dominated by the political left, is apparently outraged by the threat of legal action, and claims that "education" is the answer to "homophobia", not litigation. The term "homophobia" itself is an addition to the new language that has sprung up alongside the new "rights", and is purported to mean a morbid, unnatural fear of "gay" people. (Even recent computer dictionaries do not recognise it.) This in itself is almost the essence of insanity; what could be more sane than schoolchildren vigorously rejecting one of the most unnatural acts man could devise – sodomy?

If such cases as that of Tsakalos are successful (which is only now a matter of time) where can the insanity end? Will fat schoolboys sue their classmates for teasing them? What about children who wear glasses, suffer from acne, speak with a stutter, or suffer from dyslexia? Teasing them is sheer discrimination! Off to the courts! Sue for damages!

In the wider community there can be no limits placed upon "discrimination". Marriage of homosexuals would appear merely a matter of time, and the use of sperm banks for lesbians permitted. What about incestuous relationships, or marriages of more than two people? Insane? Yes, it is, but such relationships already receive official sanction in Spain, although as yet only at local government level. The northern Spanish town of Cambre recognises "love triangles" and incestuous relationships, and offers them the same legal rights as conventional marriages.

How did Australia begin upon a path of such lunacy? Surely it was just an accident, we didn't realise what we were letting ourselves in for? Not at all. The Fabians and others have long realised that the erosion of social standards, and the legitimising of deviant behaviour has a devastating long-term effect.

Much of the momentum for this assault has come via the United Nations, but not only through new treaties and conventions, like the Convention to Eliminate all Discrimination Against Women, for example. The attack has many prongs, and includes bodies like U.N.E.S.C.O., which has undermined education systems. It eventually surfaces in almost outlandish areas, such as the "rights" of "indigenous" people to claim land. Why was no-one terribly surprised to learn that almost the whole of Eastern Victoria has been claimed by a Victorian Aboriginal group last week under Native Title legislation?

The only possible answer to the steady decline into institutionalised insanity is a return to the underlying standards that produced the social structure in the first place. Whether we are enthusiastic about it or not, the fact is that the West was a response to **Christian teaching** and the application of that teaching to all aspects of life. Christians, even more than others (even more than churches), have a responsibility to speak up in the face of mounting insanity. The application of the Christian faith is the only answer to the eventual obliteration of the West.

MR. HOWARD'S NEW ADVISER: The Prime Minister's appointment of a new adviser on "women's affairs" casts an unwelcome meaning to the office of women's affairs. Have selected A.B.C. radio host Ms. Pru Goward to the office, Mr. Howard must surely accept some responsibility for offending other women who strongly reject some of Goward's more outrageous suggestions. For example, she apparently advocates that if their wives are unavailable to meet their sexual needs, that husbands should feel free to visit brothels instead.

Having campaigned on issues such as the importance of the family, Mr. Howard has some explaining to do if Ms. Goward is retained in her new post as an adviser on women's affairs. Is adultery acceptable advice? Why does Mr. Howard need an adviser on women's affairs at all? Does he have an adviser on men's affairs, or children's affairs, or the affairs of convicted racists? Why not?

If Mr. Howard wants advice concerning women, perhaps he should do what any sensible man does first – ask his wife. In his case, he appears to have an eminently sensible wife, offering exemplary standards of behaviour, and having provided a sound environment for a young family as a full-time mother and wife. Not all families enjoy such an opportunity for many reasons, chiefly financial. Why Mr. Howard, who does enjoy such benefits, needs to waste untold thousands of taxpayers' dollars on immoral advice from Ms. Goward when he could just as easily ask his wife is a mystery.

INDIGESTIBLE MULTICULTURALISM: Mr. Bill Peach, one of those journalists who blatantly boasts that he and his fellows used the A.B.C. as a battering ram to demolish traditional Australia, exults in the new multicultural milieu. In his *Sun-Herald* column (30/3/97) Peach writes: "*Can anyone watch **The Food-Lovers Guide to Australia** (on S.B.S.) with its terrific dishes from a whole world of cuisine and still doubt the benefits of multicultural immigration to Australia?*"

Although almost completely illogical, this appears to be the main (certainly most frequent) argument advanced in favour of multiculturalism. It is illogical because Peach apparently assumes that the benefits of, say, Chinese food justifies the present large-scale Asian immigration. It also assumes that groups like, say, the Germans who established the wine industry in the Barossa Valley, have deliberately set out to remain **German**, which is not false, but an insult to the vast majority of Germans who became **Australians** first, and have not insisted that we honour their German origins as they do themselves.

Perhaps those who live in Victoria may differ from Peach at present, where at least three outbreaks of salmonella poisoning could have been attributed to "multiculturalism". In fact, in one case an Asian owner of a hot bread outlet who was found to have made over 100 people ill with a type of food poisoning, accused food inspectors of "racism".

The truth is that different cultures hold different standards on different matters, and it appears that the standards of culinary hygiene of some of our more recent immigrants are certainly "different". If Mr. Peach wants to partake of such differences, we suggest that he travel widely, rather than inflict them upon the rest of us.