



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.10

March 27th, 1998

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"By its very nature and structure, the modern state is contrary to the entire Christian public project, as understood from the early Church fathers to the present. Not a day goes by when the central state doesn't violate all the commandments with impunity. The Leviathan state cannot be made compatible with Christian public concerns because it represents and attempts to become the Supreme Authority. It seeks nothing less, as Protestant theologian R.J. Rushdoony says, than to be God walking on earth."*

— Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr., in *The Wanderer*,
USA conservative Roman Catholic weekly, March 4th, 1998.

MIDDLE EAST TIME BOMB STILL TICKING by Eric D. Butler:

A growing number of courageous Jewish scholars are writing in the tradition of the distinguished American Jewish expert on the Middle East, Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, who, in a series of prophetic books starting with *What Price Israel* (1953) in which he warned of the far reaching implications of attempting to establish a Zionist Jewish state in the Middle East. The visiting editor of *The Jerusalem Post*, during a recent visit to Australia, warned of a time bomb ticking away inside Israel. Editor Jeff Barak says that the time bomb is in the form of 100,000 – possibly more – immigrants who have arrived from the former Soviet union who have arrived in Israel since 1990. There are large numbers of foreign workers who refuse to convert. In Mr. Barak's view, who migrated to Israel from London in 1984, the very character of Israel as a Jewish state is at risk.

But, as witnessed by the Israeli Government insulting treatment of British Minister Cook, demonstrates a continuing Zionist Jewish arrogance as witnessed by the determination to go on building homes in Palestinian areas. Cook's "crime" is that he met, apparently unofficially, with Palestinians. The double standards which have dominated the world stage since the creation of Israel, continue, as witnessed by the latest resolution concerning Israel which was carried by an overwhelming majority at the General Assembly of the United Nations – the Assembly vote, 120 to 3, in support of a Palestinian demand for an international conference to force Israel to protect Palestinian rights. As usual the United States voted together with Israel. The Palestinian representative gave details of continuing Israeli violation of Palestinian rights. British Ambassador John Weston, representing the European Union, said that Israel was flouting UN resolutions condemning Israeli settlement buildings "contrary to the provisions of the fourth Geneva convention".

Large numbers of UN resolutions have been passed over the years, with Israel blatantly ignoring them. They have been nearly always supported by the US. The USA threatened to launch a military attack

on Iraq because Saddam Hussein was allegedly defying UN resolutions. And where was Australia on the latest UN vote concerning Israel? It refrained from voting! This was to be expected from an Australian Prime Minister who consistently eulogised Israel, on one occasion stating that supporting Israel was the "cornerstone" of his foreign policy. It should not be overlooked that one of the major charges against Saddam Hussein is that he has been developing the means of creating mass destruction with biological warfare. With its development of a nuclear arsenal, in open defiance of the international resolutions concerning non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, Israel is the one Middle East state capable, if it thought fit, to impose mass destruction. But it escapes criticism.

The basic problem in dealing with the Zionist movement which created and sustains Israel, is that even when those promoting the Zionist movement are non-religious, they exploit the "Chosen Race" myth. It is this myth which allows the Zionists to continue pressuring the Christian Church to continue apologising for what it allegedly did in the past. The latest example of a Zionist Jewish campaign against the Vatican is the Zionist Jewish rejection of the long awaited statement by the Vatican concerning the Roman Catholic Church and its alleged role in what is generally described as "the Holocaust". The headlines summarise the organised Jewish refusal to accept anything less than an admission of complete guilt: "VATICAN DOCUMENT DISMAYS JEWS"; "10 PAGES ON THE HOLOCAUST BUT VATICAN WON'T SAY SORRY". One of the main targets of the Zionist campaign against the Vatican has been Pope Pius XII, one of the most distinguished of the modern Popes. The framers of the Vatican document have gone as far as any reasonable person could expect. Of course all Christians "deeply regret" what happened to some Jews during the Second World War. But the "Chosen Race" philosophy has resulted in the Zionist-Jewish propaganda machine claiming that Jews have a monopoly on human suffering.

There is no evidence whatever to support the claim that Pope Pius was aware of the "Holocaust" and closed his eyes. One commentator slyly smears Pius by stating that perhaps he should be excused for not condemning the "Holocaust" because it was only after the war that knowledge of this event became known. Poland is a Roman Catholic nation and through the confessional Priests in Poland would have learned about an event such as the alleged mass gassing of Jews. The truth is the Holocaust story was created after the war, and it has been perpetrated ever since.

It was the "Chosen Race" myth and the insistence that the suffering, real or invented, of Jews during the Second World War, must be punished that led to the notorious war crimes trials. As a footnote to this article it is interesting to study an article in *The Australian Jewish News* of March 6th, by Jewish editor Sam Lipski, entitled "Bob Santamaria and the Jews". Lipski confirms what I wrote in my *New Times* assessment of Santamaria that his popularity with the Jews started to wane when as a Christian he opposed the war crimes trials. Lipski says that he was upset when Santamaria started writing about the influence of "the Zionist lobby".

It was C.H. Douglas who described Jewish philosophy as that of the one way street. There will be no genuine peace in the Middle East until that truth is faced. The task is enormous when even the Christian church finds it difficult to placate those who have never accepted the Christian revelation.

HOWARD THREATENS FUTURE OF FEDERATION by David Thompson.

Last week's Premiers' conference, at which the Premiers walked out after only 90 minutes, was a public relations disaster for Mr. Howard, but it also signals the sorry state of the Australian federation. Mr. Howard sought to impose his own agenda on the Premiers, much as he had managed to do to the Police Ministers on May 10th, 1996, when he bluntly told them what the new uniform firearms legislation was going to be. In this case, Mr. Howard bluntly told the Premiers what funding they would be getting for their hospital systems.

When the Premiers rose to walk out in disgust, Mr. Howard, staring disaster in the face, sought to entreat their return by begging them to discuss the firearms issue. This was perhaps a panic tactic, since little could be calculated to irritate the Premiers more than to remind them of the Howard "iron fist/ham fist" approach to the Commonwealth-State relationship than the way uniform national gun laws were imposed on them.

The essence of the disagreement at the Premiers' conference is not about health, or even about firearms. It is about whether the States really have any role any longer in determining where taxes are spent. While the Constitution is clear that it is the States that have powers to administer health matters, and it is the States who have powers to administer firearms legislation, while ever the Commonwealth holds the purse strings, the State powers, and the future of the federation are quite academic issues. If the Constitution is to be amended, it would be to the advantage of all Australians if the issue of the republic were dropped, and the issue of the future of federation were addressed responsibly. As he has demonstrated with the firearms issue, **Mr. Howard is philosophically a centralist**, whatever he may actually say. Not only is he a centralist, but he is a **dishonest centralist**, since he has failed to take the steps available to him to ensure that he can legitimately exercise powers over firearms, health, etc: by going to referendum, and asking the people to whom the powers **really belong** - the Australian people.

If an election is to be fought on questions of tax reform, then the real issues about taxation - the underlying principles - should be addressed first, rather than the technical details about how important a GST is. The most important issue is **who should raise the taxes**, and then who should spend them? That is, the issue begins with principles of authority and responsibility concerning power.

For the federation to work at all, the relationship between the States and the Commonwealth must mirror that laid out in the Constitution; a partnership between States and Commonwealth in which each exercised its own powers. But almost as soon as the ink was dry on the constitutional document, one of those responsible for framing it realised that there was a problem that had not been properly addressed.

In 1901, Alfred Deakin noted that the new Constitution left the States "legally free, but financially bound to the chariot wheels of the Central Government. . .

"Our Constitution may remain unaltered, but a vital change will have taken place in the relations between the States and the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth will have acquired a general control over the states, while every extension of political power will be made by its means, and go to increase its relative superiority."

What the Premiers have seen since Mr. Howard was elected, is a continuation of the Fabian/Marxist objective of the centralisation of power by the means predicted by Deakin. The only answer is to **challenge the agenda**, which only one of the present Premiers has really done. WA Premier Richard Court has shown the best awareness of the problem, and published a paper on the issue, **"Rebuilding the Federation"** in 1994. This is an audit and history of State Powers and responsibilities usurped by the Commonwealth in the years since federation.

Although Mr. Court has done little to redress the problem, he has at least identified it. He and other Premiers should be asked what they propose to do about it, rather than just walk out of Premiers' Conferences. Copies of his paper are available from League bookservices for a donation - say \$5.00.

DOES TELSTRA SELL-OUT MEAN LATER ELECTION? Perhaps it is the next step in Mr. Howard's dream of making Australians "a nation of shareholders". Or perhaps it is only a diabolical

strategy to emasculate the ALP during the next Federal election campaign, but the complete sell-out of Telstra will be extremely difficult to get through the Senate during the life of this Parliament. Senator Mal Colston has sent notice to Mr. Howard that he has not really gone away, just been temporarily indisposed, and that his vote must be taken into consideration.

If Mr. Howard is to press the sale of Telstra through the Senate, he may find it impossible following a double dissolution of the Parliament. As the numbers men have pointed out (psephologist Malcolm Mackerras in particular), a full Senate election rather than the usual half Senate election would probably result in the Coalition having even fewer Senate seats than they occupy now. This would make it much more difficult to sell off Telstra.

Mr. Howard's best prospects of getting the Telstra sale through - as with a number of other bills, like the "Wik bill", is to ensure that they constitute the "trigger" for the double dissolution itself. That is, if the Senate refuses the legislation twice, the Prime Minister can legitimately go to the Governor-General and seek dissolution of the entire Parliament.

Since it will take at least three months for Mr. Howard to push the Telstra sale bill through the system, and have it refused by the Senate, this could delay an election until at least December, and perhaps January.

Mr. Howard's "nation of shareholders" comment also reveals an interesting attitude. It reveals that Mr. Howard is a thorough economic rationalist. The sale of the first third of Telstra was, in effect, the purloining of a third of Telstra from its owners (Australians) to be flogged off (at bargain rates) to about 16% of Australians who happened to have enough money to buy in. The rest of Telstra is now to be purloined from its owners, and sold off - partly to foreigners. What do the former owners get from this 'theft'? A promise that some of "their" massive debt will be liquidated!

Being Australians obviously means that we are only 'voters' or 'stake-holders' in Australia at best. But to be real 'shareholders', we have to pay up. And stockholders are obviously more important than 'stakeholders', since it is in the stockholders' interests that the management must act.

WA ABORTION DEBATE: While the Feminists move for the complete decriminalisation of abortion in WA, the present crisis offers the 'conservatives' the chance to tighten up effective abortion options. The debate in the WA Parliament has been rugged, with some surprisingly telling blows being landed. One of the surprises was the normally mild-mannered Paul Omodei (Liberal) nailing the feminist agenda. As the first speaker in the debate, Omodei really opened up.

"In one ward at King Edward [maternity hospital] we have doctors competing to keep alive ever more premature babies, and virtually in an adjoining room we have doctors killing babies in their mothers' womb," he said. He accused the Health Department of spending millions to teach teenagers to wear condoms, "but there has been a deafening silence about the long-term effects of abortion on physical and mental health." Teachers now spread "blatant untruth to schoolgirls and schoolboys so that many of them are educated to regard abortion as natural." Doctors who "pretend that it is more dangerous to a woman's mental health to have a baby than it is to kill one" should be disbarred for incompetence. A rape victim who chose an abortion after a brutal attack chose to "attack her baby even more brutally and kill it. . . There is no rational basis for a law that allows the killing of infants in womb. If we as a Parliament surrender to such a demand, we will surrender our authority to make all laws." (*The Australian*, 18/3/98).