



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.40, No.16

April 30th, 2004

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"So we find that provision in the Preamble which summarises briefly and succinctly the pith and substance of that great act of unity, that the people of each of the State(s)... 'humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God, have agreed to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under the Crown... and under the Constitution hereby established."*

– Professor David Flint in *"The Twilight of the Elites"*, 2003

THINKING ABOUT NEOCONSERVATISM by Kevin MacDonald continued.....

Kevin MacDonald is Professor of Psychology at California State University-Long Beach.
http://www.vdare.com/misc/macdonald_neoconservatism.htm

Last week the article finished with...*"The most common rhetoric used by Jewish intellectual and political movements has been the language of moral universalism and the language of science – languages that appeal to the educated elites of the modern Western world. But beneath the rhetoric it is easy to find statements expressing the Jewish agendas of the principal actors..."*

"For example, anthropologists under the leadership of Boas viewed their crusade against the concept of 'race' as, in turn, combating anti-Semitism. They also saw their theories as promoting the ideology of cultural pluralism, which served perceived Jewish interests because the US would be seen as consisting of many co-equal cultures rather than as a European Christian society.

Similarly, psychoanalysts commonly used their theories to portray anti-Jewish attitudes as symptoms of psychiatric disorder.

Conversely, the earlier generation of American Jewish Trotskyites ignored the horrors of the Soviet Union until the emergence there of state-sponsored anti-Semitism.

Neoconservatives have certainly appealed to American patriotic platitudes in advocating war throughout the Middle East – gushing about spreading American democracy and freedom to the area, while leaving unmentioned their own strong ethnic ties and family links to Israel.

Michael Lind has called attention to the neoconservatives' 'odd bursts of ideological enthusiasm for

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *Thinking About Neoconservatism (continued)* • *News In Brief* • *Constitution Fund Australia* • *Senate Committee Enquiry Into 'Republic'*

"ON TARGET"

April 30th, 2004

Page 1 (61)

'democracy' – odd because these calls for democracy and freedom throughout the Middle East are also coupled with support for the Likud Party and other like-minded groups in Israel that are driven by a vision of an ethnocentric, expansionist Israel that, to outside observers at least, bears an unmistakable (albeit unmentionable) resemblance to apartheid South Africa.

War for 'democracy' and 'freedom' sells better: These inconsistencies of the neoconservatives are not odd or surprising. The Straussian idea is to achieve the aims of the elite ingroup by using language designed for mass appeal. War for "democracy and freedom" sells much better than a war explicitly aimed at achieving the foreign policy goals of Israel.

Neoconservatives have responded to charges that their foreign policy has a Jewish agenda by labelling any such analysis as "anti-Semitic". Similar charges have been echoed by powerful activist Jewish organizations like the ADL and the Simon Wiesenthal Centre.

But at the very least, Jewish neoconservatives like Paul Wolfowitz, who were deeply involved in pushing for the war in Iraq, should frankly discuss how their close family and personal ties to Israel have affected their attitudes on US foreign policy in the Middle East.

Wolfowitz, however, has refused to discuss this issue beyond terming such suggestions "disgraceful". A common argument is that neoconservatism is not Jewish because of the presence of various non-Jews amongst their ranks.

But in fact, the ability to recruit prominent non-Jews, while nevertheless maintaining a Jewish core and a commitment to Jewish interests, has been a hallmark – perhaps the key hallmark – of influential Jewish intellectual and political movements throughout the 20th century.

Freud commented famously on the need for a non-Jew to represent psychoanalysis, a role played by Ernest Jones and C.G. Jung.

Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict were the public face of Boasian anthropology. And, although Jews represented over half the membership of both the Socialist Party and the Communist Party USA at various times, neither party ever had Jews as presidential candidates and no Jew held the top position in the Communist Party USA after 1929.

In all the Jewish intellectual and political movements I reviewed, non-Jews have been accepted and given highly-visible roles. Today, those roles are played most prominently by Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld whose ties with neoconservatives go back many years. It makes excellent psychological sense to have the spokespeople for any movement resemble the people they are trying to convince.

In fact, neoconservatism is rather unusual in the degree to which policy formulation – as opposed to implementation – is so predominantly Jewish. Perhaps this reflects US conditions in the late 20th century.

All the Jewish intellectual and political movements I studied were typified by a deep sense of orthodoxy – a sense of "us versus them". Dissenters are expelled, usually amid character assassination and other recriminations.

This has certainly been a feature of the neocon movement. The classic recent example of this "We vs. They" world is David Frum's attack on "unpatriotic conservatives" as anti-Semites. Any conservative who opposes the Iraq war as contrary to US interests and who notes the pro-Israeli motivation of many of the important players, is not to be argued with, but eradicated. "We turn our backs on them." This is not the spirit out of which the Anglo-American parliamentary tradition was developed, and in fact was not endorsed by other non-Jewish pro-war conservatives.

Jewish intellectual and political movements have typically had ready access to prestigious mainstream media channels, and this is certainly true for the neocons. The anchoring by the *Washington Post* of the columns of Charles Krauthammer and Robert Kagan and by the *New York Times* of William Safire's illustrates this. But probably more important recently has been the invariable summoning of neoconservatives to represent the "conservative" line on the TV Networks. Is it unreasonable to suppose that this may be somewhat influenced by the famously heavy Jewish role in these operations?

Immigration policy provides a valuable acid test for the proposition that neoconservatism is actually a vehicle for perceived Jewish ethnic interests. I believe I have been able to demonstrate that pro-immigration elements in American public life have, for over a century, been largely led, funded, energized and organized by the Jewish community. American Jews have taken this line, with a few isolated exceptions, because they have believed, as Leonard S. Glickman, president and CEO of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, has bluntly stated, "The more diverse American society is the safer [Jews] are."

Having run out of Russian Jews, the HIAS is now deeply involved in recruiting refugees from Africa. When, in the middle 1990s an immigration reform movement arose amongst American conservatives, the reaction of the neoconservatives ranged from cold to hostile. No positive voice was permitted on the Op-Ed page of the *Wall Street Journal*, by then a neoconservative domain.

(Perhaps significantly, a more recent exception has been a relatively favorable review of the anti-illegal immigration book *Mexifornia* – whose author, the military historian Victor Davis Hanson, has distinguished himself by the extreme hawkishness of his views on the Middle East.) The main vehicle of immigration reform sentiment, *National Review*, once a bastion of traditional conservative thought, was quite quickly captured by neoconservatives and its opposition to immigration reduced to nominal. Prior to the post-9/11 US invasion of the Middle East, this suppression of the immigration reform impulse among conservatives was probably the single most important contribution of the neoconservatives to the course of US history. It may yet prove to be the most disastrous."

NEWS IN BRIEF – Adelaide Advertiser, 23/4/04:

- Since March 2003 the American Congress has approved US\$220 Billion for the continuing war of aggression against the people of Iraq; the figure includes \$120 billion for this year and it has been estimated that figure will blow out by US\$69-103 Billion.
- Jane Errey, whose job in the Defence Department involved preparing briefings for Australia's Minister for Defence, Robert Hill, is contesting her dismissal claiming she was sacked for refusing to exaggerate briefings on Iraq. She has lodged an unfair dismissal claim against the Federal Government.

CONSTITUTION EDUCATION FUND – AUSTRALIA: We have received notice of the initiative by the Constitution Education Fund – Australia (CEF-A) to establish a Constitutional Prize Programme with the principal aim of encouraging young Australians to think and learn about the history and operation of the Australian Constitution and the Australian system of government. His Excellency, Major-General Michael Jeffery AC CVO MC, the Governor-General of Australia, has agreed to be Patron-in-Chief of the prize programme.

The competitions will target different age groups and will be judged by eminent Australians who have expertise in areas related to the prize competitions. Judges and advisers will be drawn from the highest echelons of the academic, legal and business community and from the public sector. Prizes will include significant cash sums, overseas trips and travelling scholarships.

We have received a request to inform our readers: If you would like further information go to