



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.34, No.4

February 13th, 1998

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"No true philosophy is possible where the fear of consequence inhibits the pursuit of truth."*
– John Stuart Mill

ZIONIST TIME BOMB STILL TICKING by Eric D. Butler:

One of the early Zionists made the comment that the creation of the Zionist State of Israel was but a peg on which to hang a "far-reaching" programme. The ultimate objective of this programme is the establishment of a New World Order. This Messianic concept is a manifestation of madness, and therefore has no possible prospect of being successful. The will to power is not exclusive to the Jewish people, most of whom in their private lives are models of good behaviour. But a collectivist philosophy, linked to a powerful Chosen Race myth, makes them extremely vulnerable to manipulation by their leaders. Although the great majority of Jews have made it clear that they have no intention of living in the State of Israel, they faithfully support their Zionist leaders in their defence of Israel. And, of course, they are also supported by those Christians who also accept the Chosen Race myth. It is important that these facts are kept firmly in mind on the eve of what appears to be another American-led military attack on Iraq.

In assessing the significance of such an attack, it is well to recall that during Iraq's long struggle with Iran, Iraq received massive military support from the Western nations, which took the view that Saddam Hussein was a barrier against the threat of Islamic extremism. Then came the Kuwait affair, triggered by the Iraqi leader being convinced that he had been given the green light by the USA to annex Kuwait. President George Bush managed to restore his declining popularity, claiming, amongst other objectives, that the conflict was about creating a New World Order. It was also allegedly essential to "restore democracy" in a Kuwait which had never had democracy. And there is still no democracy in Kuwait, but few remember this.

But to the amazement of superficial observers of Middle East affairs, the military campaign against Saddam Hussein was suddenly called off, leaving his most elite troops still intact. This was not a surprise to me. The reason for leaving Saddam Hussein in power was the fact that the destruction of his regime would leave a Middle East vacuum with the Islamic extremists and the long suffering Kurds taking advantage of the situation. Saddam Hussein has been an essential player on a giant chess board, probably without knowing it.

The central feature of American diplomacy, dictated by a Zionist controlled Clinton Administration, is to ensure that Israel is preserved at all costs. A few courageous journalists, like the British born Doug

Collins, have pointed out the blatant double standards in the USA and other Western countries concerning Israel, where blatant acts of terrorism result in little more than a diplomatic slap on the wrist. It is highly probable that Saddam Hussein is engaged in creating biological weapons of war, but Israel continues with its nuclear programme in complete defiance of United Nations resolutions. It continues to advance its programme for new settlers at the expense of the oppressed Palestinians. Like President Bill Clinton, Israel's current President has major internal problems, but these would disappear if another Middle East conflict breaks out. There is a deadly cocktail of factors which could confirm the fears of Russia's Yeltsin that a Western attack on Iraq could explode into a world war. Yeltsin is well aware of the fact that Russia shares common borders with a number of Islamic States.

If Saddam Hussein is provoked into any type of an attack threatening Israel, Israeli leaders may well respond by using their nuclear weapons. Israel has consistently refused to sign any non-proliferation agreements concerning nuclear weapons with its leaders convinced that it was their "Sacred Duty" to use nuclear weapons if it appeared that Israel's future was at risk. Such an attack would see a world wide uprising of the Islamic world. Well might Australia look at what is happening in Indonesia. What type of advice is the Howard Government offering Clinton in response to his request for Australian military support against Iraq? Although it is certain that the proposed Iraqi targets for attack have already been selected, even US Secretary of Defence William Cohen has warned that the strikes would neither destroy Iraq's capacity to manufacture arms, nor topple Saddam Hussein from power. What, then, is the Big Idea behind an exercise which Cohen says could last for days or weeks? There is little doubt that there are those in the Pentagon who would like to test out their new and updated military technology.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the current Middle East crisis is that, unlike in the Gulf War, the US policy makers have been unable to gain any Arab support. Saudi Arabia has made it clear that it will not be providing any bases for the Americans, who are now perceived throughout the Moslem world as being anti-Arab. USA policy makers are clearly taking grave risks concerning the future. All Western nations are at risk.

The probable outcome of an attack on Iraq would be to provide Saddam Hussein with more dead civilians which can be exploited in a continuing propaganda war against the West, left in a more destabilised situation than ever. No doubt there will be further calls for still more centralised power to create "world peace and stability". But as I pointed out after returning from the United Kingdom late last year, the much vaunted cornerstone of the proposed New World Order, the European Common Market, was already disintegrating. Now comes the news that German unemployment has reached 11 million with riots breaking out. The French situation also deteriorates. Germany is haunted with the vision of a resurgence of Hitlerism. Desperate situations create the climate for the emergence of the "strong leader".

Australians should face the reality that the world situation has become dangerously explosive and that internationalism has made their future dependent upon striving for the maximum decentralisation and national self-reliance.

SQUABBLE OVER A REPUBLIC – David Thompson reports on the Constitutional Convention, which he has attended as an observer in Old Parliament House, Canberra:

If one is sufficiently motivated, it is possible to access proceedings of the Constitutional Convention on the Internet, under the heading of "ConCon". Having observed some of the proceedings, it is probably a most appropriate designation. The suggestion that those assembled will become the founding fathers of a new republic to launch Australia into the third millennium is positively frightening. While

there are a number of delegates with considerable grasp of the true nature of the Constitution, and also of great philosophical depth, there are some who might not exactly qualify as deep thinkers, or people of vision. Ms. Poppy King might well be a genius at marketing cosmetics, but she has yet to indicate that she has much to offer on reforming the Constitution. Another delegate, upon being elected, commented that he would "probably have to go and read the Constitution now".

With the press attempting to project the impression that a republic is inevitable, and that we are now all agreed that it is inevitable, much of the positive, constructive argument mounted by the monarchist delegates has gone unreported, or referred to only in passing. For example, Lloyd Waddy's brilliant opening address was passed off as "pedestrian" (read 'boring'), and Bruce Ruxton's plain speaking as rudeness. Others, like Bishop Hepworth, are ignored. And it is assumed as a matter of course that all aborigines are 'republicans'. Even the extraordinary address by former Senator Neville Bonner (76) was lightly passed over. In part, Bonner said:

"You told my people that your system was best. We have come to accept that. We have come to believe that. The dispossessed, despised, adapted to your system. Now you say that you were wrong, and that we were wrong to believe you. Suddenly you are saying that what brought this country together, made it independent, ensured its defence, saw it through peace and war, and saw it through depression and prosperity, must all go. I cannot see the need for change. I cannot see that such a president, elected or appointed, would care one jot more for my people. From the bottom of my heart, I pray, stop this senseless division . . ." Bonner concluded his address with a tribal "sorry chant", and thus a 'monarchist' was accorded the only standing ovation of the Convention.

Since the republicans have the numbers at the convention, it is assumed that a consensus will develop on what type of republic is recommended. But this is far from the case, as yet. The divisions between republicans are such that no single faction has the numbers to prevail. Although those lobbying for an elected president were outnumbered and seemed defeated early in the week, the monarchists ensured that their option remained in the debate. Malcolm Turnbull's insistence that only an appointed president was acceptable has clearly made him plenty of republican enemies, who accuse him of derailing the convention.

Senator Ron Boswell's motion to ask Treasurer Costello to cost a move to a republic was narrowly defeated, with republicans scathing that the spectre of filthy lucre should be raised. In reality, it is clear that even the republicans are sensitive about the costs, and what the public would think of it in tight economic times.

As a probing strategy, the monarchists raised the issue of the flag. Former National Party MP Wendy Machin claimed that the issue should be dropped for a decade, as it was not on the agenda, and republicans (such as she) had no plans for the flag. This is clearly not true, with people like Turnbull, Greiner, etc, pushing the Ausflag barrow in their other lives, as Bruce Ruxton reminded them in no uncertain terms. It was moved that the prelude to the Constitution be changed to ensure that any change in the flag must pass a constitutional referendum, much to the fury of the republicans. This issue will be debated this week.

Perhaps one of the more pathetic spectacles of the convention so far, is the steady stream of Howard Ministers who have declared for a republic, leaving Prime Minister Howard a lonely figure prepared to support the Crown. While it is hard to feel sorry for Howard, who has brought this upon himself, it is possible to sympathise with his position, which can only improve his public standing. Perhaps he believes in something after all. But the contempt in the eyes of former Menzies Minister Sir James Killen across the convention chamber for the new breed of Liberal front-benchers, who turn their coats according to the opinion polls, is perfectly clear.

It is also obvious that the immense detail that will have to be addressed, even in the event of some sort

335.405
DNT

of "minimalist" republican model being preferred, is only now beginning to dawn on some delegates. The tedium, the precision and the legalities of the detail is mind-numbing even for constitutional authorities, and is clearly beyond the patience or scope of many delegates. Early in the week, Bill Hayden warned that the convention risked becoming a complete fiasco. The remarks of Independent Alan Rocher (former Liberal, WA) on Friday evening might have summed up the views of a number present when he said:

"... I came to Canberra last Sunday convinced by polls and editorials that an Australian republic was inevitable and that only the form it was to take was to be decided. I was wrong, and I am embarrassed because I was wrong. More than that, after listening to the arguments so far advanced, the weight of argument after hopefully open-minded consideration strongly favours the status quo as the only serious option. Certainly, logic expressed in this forum weighs heavily on the side of the constitutional monarchy. It is convincing enough to persuade me, Mr. Chairman, to back off from my preconceived notion that a republic was but a matter of course and that only the form it would take was to be canvassed at this Convention. The debate so far has converted me to the monarchists' camp - although I am not sure they really need me.

"It should also be said that, with a few notable exceptions, there is more than just a trace of disdain, contempt and/or arrogance amongst some of those pro-republicans who ignore the substantive arguments of their adversaries."

The Convention's brief flashes of idealism, or of genuine vision for the future, have been few and far between. The republicans' motivation is still unclear, and certainly does not partake of vision. From the level of debate so far, the only clear motivation for a republic is merely to have a head of state that "is not English". The more I see of Hayden's 'fiasco', the safer the Australian monarchy appears to be.

WORLD BANK "GOT IT WRONG": The (former Australian) President of the World Bank, Mr. James Wolfensohn, was forced to admit last week that they were quite wrong in their perceptions of the Indonesian economy. *"I was caught up in the enthusiasm of Indonesia. I am not alone in thinking 12 months ago that Indonesia was on a very good path. There is no doubt that this current change has taken us all by surprise and I guess that we got it wrong. . ."* he said.

This is a major danger with transglobal authorities which make decisions on behalf of ten or hundreds of millions of people. If one of those hundreds of millions makes a mistake which threatens his future, it's his own responsibility, and in the global context, remains a relatively small mistake. Such small mistakes are usually easier to rectify than that on a global scale by institutions like the World Bank.

How many other times has the World Bank "got it wrong"? In how many other Third World countries are millions of people suffering because of grandiose decisions made on their behalf by bureaucrats on the other side of the world? Even the most altruistic of motives cannot lessen the impact of disaster of central planning when it "goes wrong"

Although he admitted error, there is no record of Mr. Wolfensohn attempting restitution, or even uttering an apology. While Australians are obliged to apologise to aborigines, Americans to negroes and Canadians to North American Indians for real or imagined injustices up to a couple of centuries ago, the World Bank bureaucrats blithely shrug off huge mistakes made 12 months ago with a shrug. Such is the spectre of the global government now becoming more visible, even to the sceptics.

It was Mr. Wolfensohn who was nominated by *The Australian* as "Australian of the Year" for 1997, an award for which Mr. Wolfensohn admitted he was very surprised. Surely, he said, there must be more deserving Australians? Yes, but not of the stamp supported by internationalist Mr. Rupert Murdoch's News Limited.