



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.15

April 23rd, 2004

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"It appears to us to be axiomatic that ...religion, in the sense of binding back to reality, is of primary importance. Until you have some kind of reliable chart, you are a mere waif on the ocean. Clearly religion in this sense is a seven-days-a-week matter, and requires to be distinguished carefully from 'good conduct'. It ought to result in good conduct, and in fact is the only test of good conduct, but that is something else again."*

– Clifford Hugh Douglas

THINKING ABOUT NEOCONSERVATISM by Kevin MacDonald – Kevin MacDonald is Professor of Psychology at California State University-Long Beach.

http://www.vdare.com/misc/macdonald_neoconservatism.htm

While Prof. MacDonald is dealing with the situation in the USA, Australians will have no trouble in relating the article to what has happened in this country – as well as the UK.

"Over the last year, there's been a torrent of articles on neoconservatism raising (usually implicitly) some vexing issues: Are neoconservatives different from other conservatives? Is neoconservatism a Jewish movement? Is it "anti-Semitic" to say so?

The dispute between the neocons and more traditional conservatives – 'paleoconservatives' – is especially important because the latter now find themselves on the outside, looking in on the conservative power structure.

Neocon foreign policy fits well with plausible version of Jewish interests: Hopefully, some of the venom has been taken out of this argument by the remarkable recent article by neoconservative 'godfather' Irving Kristol ('The Neoconservative Persuasion', *Weekly Standard*, August 25th, 2003). With commendable frankness, Kristol admitted that 'the historical task and political purpose of neoconservatism would seem to be this: to convert the Republican party, and American conservatism in general, against their respective wills, into a new kind of conservative politics suitable to governing a modern democracy'.

And, equally frankly, Kristol eschewed any attempt to justify US support for Israel in terms of American national interest:

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *Thinking About Neoconservatism* • *Liberals (NSW) Have Rescinded 'Republic' Motion* • *Regional Director's Report*

"ON TARGET"

April 23rd, 2004

Page 1 (57)

'[L]arge nations, whose identity is ideological, like the Soviet Union of yesteryear and the United States of today, inevitably have ideological interests in addition to more material concerns... That is why we feel it necessary to defend Israel today, when its survival is threatened. No complicated geopolitical calculations of national interest are necessary.'

If the US is an "ideological" nation, this can only mean that the motivations of neoconservative ideology are a legitimate subject of intellectual inquiry.

For example, it is certainly true that the neocons' foreign policy fits well with a plausible version of Jewish interests, but is arguably only tenuously related to the interests of the US. Also, neocons oppose the isolationism of important sections of traditional American conservatism. And neocon attitudes on issues like race and immigration differ profoundly from those of traditional mainstream conservatives – but resemble closely the common attitudes of the wider American Jewish community.

'Ethnicity' is a *practical* matter not a moral one: Count me among those who accept that the Jewish commitment of leading neoconservatives has become a critical influence on US policies, and that the effectiveness of the neoconservatives is greatly enhanced by their alliance with the organized Jewish community. In my opinion, this conclusion is based on solid data and reasonable inferences. But like any other theory, of course, it is subject to reasoned discussion and disproof.

We shouldn't be surprised by the importance of ethnicity in human affairs. Nor should we be intimidated by charges of anti-Semitism. We should be able to discuss these issues openly and honestly. This is a practical matter, not a moral one.

Ethnic politics in the US are certainly not limited to Jewish activism. They are an absolutely normal phenomenon throughout history and around the world. But for well over half a century, with rare exceptions, Jewish influence has been off-limits for rational discussion. Now, however, as the US acquires an empire in the Middle East, this ban must inevitably fall away.

My views on these issues are shaped by my research on several other influential Jewish-dominated intellectual and political movements, including the Boasian school of anthropology, Freudian psychoanalysis, the Frankfurt School of Social Research, Marxism and several other movements of the radical left, as well as the movement to change the ethnic balance of the United States by allowing mass, non-traditional immigration.

My conclusion: Contemporary neoconservatism fits into the general pattern of Jewish intellectual and political activism I have identified in my work. I am not, of course, saying that all Jews, or even most Jews, supported these movements. Nor did these movements work in concert: some were intensely hostile to one another. I am saying, however, that the key figures in these movements identified in some sense as Jews and viewed their participation as in some sense advancing Jewish interests.

Key founders originated as followers of Trotskyite theoretician: In all of the Jewish intellectual and political movements I studied, there is a strong Jewish identity among the core figures. All centre on charismatic Jewish leaders-people such as Boas, Trotsky and Freud – who are revered as messianic, god-like figures.

Neoconservatism's key founders trace their intellectual ancestry to the 'New York Intellectuals', a

group that originated as followers of Trotskyite theoretician Max Schachtman in the 1930s and centered around influential journals like *Partisan Review* and *Commentary* (which is in fact published by the American Jewish Committee). In the case of neoconservatives, their early identity as radical leftist disciples shifted as there began to be evidence of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

Key figures in leading them out of the political left were philosopher Sidney Hook and Elliot Cohen, editor of *Commentary*. Such men as Hook, Irving Kristol, Norman Podhoretz, Nathan Glazer and Seymour Martin Lipset, were deeply concerned about anti-Semitism and other Jewish issues. Many of them worked closely with Jewish activist organizations. After the 1950s, they became increasingly disenchanted with leftism. Their overriding concern was the welfare of Israel.

Astonishing number well placed to influence political leaders: By the 1970s, the neocons were taking an aggressive stance against the Soviet Union, which they saw as a bastion of anti-Semitism and opposition to Israel. Richard Perle was the prime organizer of Congressional support for the 1974 Jackson-Vanik Amendment which angered the Soviet Union by linking bilateral trade issues to freedom of emigration, primarily of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel and the United States.

Current key leaders include an astonishing number of individuals well placed to influence the Bush Administration: (Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, Douglas Feith, I. Lewis Libby, Elliott Abrams, David Wurmser, Abram Shulsky), interlocking media and thinktankdom (Bill Kristol, Michael Ledeen, Stephen Bryen, John Podhoretz, Daniel Pipes), and the academic world (Richard Pipes, Donald Kagan).

As the neoconservatives lost faith in radical leftism, several key neocons became attracted to the writings of Leo Strauss, a classicist and political philosopher at the University of Chicago. Strauss had a very strong Jewish identity and viewed his philosophy as a means of ensuring Jewish survival in the Diaspora. As he put it in a 1962 Hillel House lecture, later republished in *Leo Strauss: Political Philosopher and Jewish Thinker*:

'I believe I can say, without any exaggeration, that since a very, very early time the main theme of my reflections has been what is called the 'Jewish Question'.'

Strauss has become a cult figure-the quintessential rabbinical guru with devoted disciples.

Nothing 'conservative' about their goals: While Strauss and his followers have come to be known as neoconservatives – and have even claimed to be simply "conservatives" – there is nothing conservative about their goals. This is most obviously the case in foreign policy, where they are attempting to rearrange the entire Middle East in the interests of Israel.

But it is also the case with domestic policy, where acceptance of rule by an aristocratic elite would require a complete political transformation. Strauss believed that this aristocracy would be compatible with Jewish interests.

Strauss notoriously described the need for an external exoteric language directed at outsiders, and an internal esoteric language directed at ingroup members. In other words, the masses had to be deceived.

Common 'rhetoric': But actually this is a general feature of the movements I have studied. They invariably frame issues in language that appeals to non-Jews, rather than explicitly in terms of Jewish interests. 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..." *to be continued*

LIBERALS (NSW) HAVE RESCINDED 'REPUBLIC' MOTION: According to a paper received by us, the NSW Young Liberal Movement has unanimously passed a motion rescinding the original statement calling for Australia to become a republic.

In fact they go so far as to ask a Mr. John Brogden, who has publicly committed himself to a republic, just which one of the over 140 models in the world did he have in mind?

They thought he could be reasonably asked: Which type of republic did he support – the Indonesian, the USA, the Ugandan? What about the present Zimbabwe one?

The paper does go on to ask all Australians to support Liberal values. Well, first we need to know just what are those values. Australians can only go on their 'fruits' and we haven't seen to many good ones for quite some years. What's the saying? One swallow doesn't make a summer.

The original 1949 Liberal Party Statement of Beliefs including the following:

- We believe that national financial and economic policy are not to be designed to control men's lives, but to create a climate in which men may be enabled to work out their own salvation in their own way. (How can Australians 'work out their own salvation' under the present oppressive debt-monopoly financial system supported by all politicians of all parties.)
- We believe in the great human freedoms; to worship; to think; to speak; to choose; to be ambitious; to be independent; to be industrious; to acquire skill; to seek and earn reward." (Not any more you don't! What about the anti-Discrimination Legislation for one example?)

REGIONAL DIRECTOR'S REPORT – Senate Committee meeting on republic in Melbourne: Five Senators sat, and the meeting was chaired by Senator Bolkus. Thirty two people were in attendance with two thirds of them republicans. The witnesses called were all republicans except a 99-year-old very-British Major who was an Australian by choice and "I have a vote". He was so deaf he couldn't hear the chairman, he had his grandson there to shout messages in his ear. He good-heartedly injected some humour into the day.

He had rung up the particular newspoll the terms of reference had quoted: of 1200 people 52% voted for a republic – and the newspoll told him 39% voted for a republic, 13% were neither for or against and 48% didn't want a republic. The chairman tried to quote different figures for the same poll.

Most of the republicans spent a great deal of time agonising how they could educate the voters of the need for a republic.

One let the cat out of the bag! He was at the Corowa conference and at the conference in Brisbane, where the Democrats had undertaken to set up this Committee.

Points to learn:- Don't all sit together, scatter throughout the audience. Some sat near the front and they had an open microphone for 30 minutes at the end of the meeting. The Chair took only those who had identified themselves as republicans.

Constructive suggestion: Run a training session at Albury Weekend in October for speaking into a microphone and reading a speech.

"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.