



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.37, No.43

November 9th, 2001

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: This is a season of patriotism, but also of something that is easily mistaken for patriotism; namely, nationalism. The difference is vital. G.K. Chesterton once observed that Rudyard Kipling, the great poet of British imperialism, suffered from a "lack of patriotism".

He explained: "He admires England, but he does not love her; for we admire things with reasons, but love them without reasons. He admires England because she is strong, not because she is English."

In the same way, many Americans admire America for being strong, not for being American. For them America has to be "the greatest country on earth" in order to be worthy of their devotion... Patriotism is like family love. You love your family just for being your family, not for being "the greatest family on earth" (whatever that might mean) or for being "better" than other families. You don't feel threatened when other people love their families the same way. On the contrary, you respect their love, and you take comfort in knowing they respect yours. You don't feel your family is enhanced by feuding with other families... nationalism, it has often been said, is grounded in resentment and rivalry... It is militant by nature, and its typical style is belligerent.

Patriotism, by contrast, is peaceful until forced to fight. The patriot differs from the nationalist in this respect too: he can laugh at his country, the way members of a family can laugh at each other's foibles. Affection takes for granted the imperfection of those it loves; the patriotic Irishman thinks Ireland is hilarious, whereas the Irish nationalist sees nothing to laugh about. The nationalist has to prove his country is always right. He reduces his country to an idea, a perfect abstraction, rather than a mere home. He may even find the patriot's irreverent humor annoying. Patriotism is relaxed. Nationalism is rigid. The patriot may loyally defend his country even when he knows it's wrong; the nationalist has to insist that he defends his country not because it's his, but because it's right..."

– Joseph Sobran, www.sobran.com/ - October 31st, 2001

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought for the Week* • *Choosing Between the Lesser of Two Evils* • *At Last! A Christian Voice*
• *Where Does Religion Fit In?* • *Terrorism and Globalism*

"ON TARGET"

November 9th, 2001

Page 1 (169)

CHOOSING BETWEEN THE LESSER OF TWO EVILS by Jeremy Lee:

Pity the poor writer, scratching round between piles of political manure, trying to find something of meaning to say about this election!

At the time of writing, with 10 days to go until polling day, the only desire which stirs the heart is the thought that it will end (although sometimes even that thought waxes faint).

The sight of Costello and Howard kissing babies is nauseating; the news that the tax payout to any and all candidates receiving more than 4 per cent of the primary vote has been increased from \$1.68 to \$1.79 (it is now linked to the CPI figures) is a major factor for resentment; and the news that the Electoral Commission is still hunting down some 80,000 registered voters from the last election who failed to vote, is a cause for sympathy.

Last Federal election the amount of tax-money handed out to candidates topped \$30 million. This time it will be much higher.

What can one really say? If the 'khaki' election wasn't showing the first signs of a backlash, one could almost imagine the Prime Minister appearing on the hustings in camouflage uniform (with flak-jacket showing through); a sort of duck-billed Fidel Castro minus beard.

As far as the National Party is concerned, the whole campaign is built on pork-barrelling – better telephones, TV reception, medical services, etc. But nothing that could, for one moment, herald a turnaround in which dying centres gain new life, the number of family farms increases, and young rural people are given hope for the future.

It's all very sad. In the Darling Downs electorate of Groom, the poster gaining most attention says simply "PUT LIBERALS LAST". It happens to be held currently by "Chainsaw" Ian MacFarlane, who played a questionable role in the roting of the GST by Liberal Party funding schemes.

The best advice, if a return to the democratic process is considered essential, is NOT to vote for anyone who has sold out his conscience. Anyone acknowledging he will be voting "on party lines", whatever the rights and wrongs of the issue, has sold out. Voting for such a character gives the go-ahead for such a sell-out.

AT LAST! A CHRISTIAN VOICE: A small article in *The Weekend Australian* (27-28/10/01) quoted one Christian leader with something to say:

"The Anglican Archbishop of Sydney has labelled the nation's politicians a 'despised cohort' and questioned if any people of quality were standing in the Federal election.

"Addressing his first synod of nearly 800 clergy and lay representatives yesterday, Dr. Peter Jensen said there had been a serious decline in the past 30 years in the number of people standing for preselection in the major parties. 'The numbers have been slashed, the question now is are there sufficient people of quality offering?' Dr. Jensen asked.....

"We have a tendency to reward politicians and parties who reflect some of the worst features of our national life, not least our selfishness and lack of generosity to those in need," he said

"A big factor in the dearth of quality candidates was the contempt for politicians expressed almost universally in the community.

"Who would want to join the ranks of such a despised cohort?" Dr. Jensen asked"

Well it's a start. But very late in the scheme of things. Speaking of Britain, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Catholic Bishop of Westminster have both declared Christianity irrelevant as far as national affairs are concerned.

WHERE DOES RELIGION FIT IN? In a well-reasoned and hard-hitting article in Britain's *Weekly Telegraph* (24-30/10/01), Barbara Amiel argued the case for stepping up the existing war against Afghanistan, suggesting that western compromise was partly to blame for letting it get so far:

" If the Americans think that this problem can be solved, a la Kosovo, from the skies, without a proper land invasion, we are lost. This would make the war on terrorism another one of those causes for which it is worth killing, but not dying. Terrorists have made an open declaration of war on the military and civilians alike. Territories and states are at stake. The whole point about terrorism is that it cannot exist without state support. You cannot have safe houses, financial instruments, passports, mobility, training camps, and indoctrination without states encouraging and permitting on their territory the establishment of terrorist organizations. Hizbollah fires rockets into Israeli kibbutzim from the Bekaa Valley in Lebanon. How can a purely criminal organization have Katyusha rockets set up and fired into other countries without state support and acquiescence? For tactical reasons, America has left Syria and Hizbollah off its list of terrorist organizations, but it is questionable that this will serve the morality of our cause or its ultimate success....."

"As a democratic western nation state, Britain cannot exempt itself from this war. If the forces of bin Ladenism succeed in taking over Islam, there is no country in the world that would be safe from an expanding and theocratic Islam. It will not be our bombs that bolster this happening, but our indifference and ineptitude"

Barbara Amiel went on to ask: *".... Even if you accept the proposition that fanatics exist because of the creation of Israel or the allied bombing of Saddam Hussein, what are we to do? Must we allow Israel to be swept into the sea, Saddam to conquer both Kuwait and Saudi Arabia Would this make the world more secure?""*

This is a very one-sided scenario. Barbara Amiel forgot to mention the documented and extensive terrorism applied by Israel to the Palestinians, from Deir Yassin to Sabra and Shatila. Nor does she mention the ever expanding Israeli settlements, strongly condemned by western nations, in Palestinian areas supposed to be the subject of peace negotiations.

Barbara Amiel should read the incredibly well-documented *Zionist Connection II*, by Jewish author Alfred Lilienthal, for a picture of the enormous provocation applied to the Palestinians since well before the creation of Israel in 1948.

Men like Ariel Sharon and Menachem Begin have as much to answer for as bin Laden. Israel and its intelligence organization Mossad have as much to answer for as Hizbollah.

Nor is it true that the massive air raids unleashed on Kosovo have solved the problems in the

Balkans; except, maybe, for the multinational syndicates interested in the minerals at Trebca and the massive oil deposits in the Caspian.

Nevertheless, Barbara Amiel's point of view deserves consideration in any free country. But, so that they know who they are reading, it should also be explained that Barbara Amiel is Jewish, and married to Conrad Black, the media mogul who includes in his stable *The Jerusalem Post*. The massive preponderance of Jewish editors, broadcasters and journalists in the western world is obviously quite lawful. But, when writing of Middle East affairs, their likely allegiances should be made known to the reading public.

Western nations are under threat from both fundamentalist Islam and from Zionism – both in their own way messianic movements. And what of Christianity? Well, leaders from both major denominations in Britain say it doesn't apply any more.

TERRORISM AND GLOBALISM: Lyndon Rowe, from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Western Australia, lamented in *The Australian* (26/10/01) that economic reform and globalism had been put on the back burner in this election.

".... The sad fact is that, like Anderson, Kim Beazley and John Howard understand the benefits that the economic reform agenda has already delivered and can continue to deliver for regional and metropolitan Australians. But they have given up trying to win the argument, or stopped practicing what they have preached.

"Sadder still is that their silence is taken as consent to the false claims about the intent and effect of reform peddled by those politicians, such as Pauline Hanson, Bob Brown and Natasha Stott-Despoja, who really don't understand how the economy works.

"A popular consensus appears to be emerging that economic reforms haven't worked, and the reform agenda should be frozen or even turned back"

Rowe goes on to ask, if reform is so bad, why are prices for farm products at record levels? It is the same point made by people like Tim Fischer and John Anderson.

The truth is that the only thing that saved the pork industry and sent prices soaring was the disastrous outbreak of disease in pig populations in SE Asia. Tens of thousands of breeders were slaughtered, creating at one hit an entirely new market for pig producers. To claim this as a victory for globalism is stretching it.

Beef prices have also soared – on the back of the massive slaughterings in Britain and Europe due to foot-and-mouth. As northern hemisphere farmers gradually recover, prices will fall. It has nothing to do with globalism or economic rationalism.

On the other hand, dairy farmers and cane farmers have little to thank globalism for. Prices have never been so low.

It appears Lyndon Rowe is the one who doesn't understand how the markets work

Election comment authorised by Betty Luks, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne, 3000.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.
Subscription \$40.00 p.a.