



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.41, No.27

July 15th, 2005

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "These changes in money and intellect have drawn the people of the West into a dialectical trap, with money as thesis, socialism as antithesis and the new imperium (of money) as synthesis; money incessantly concentrates power, socialism promises the total dispersal and distribution of power, (and) the resolution of this contradiction supplies the new imperium with its dynamic....

The ideology of a "brave new world" with order and welfare for all mankind was offered as a replacement for a religious orthodoxy that had long since begun to crumble under the impact of a scientific 'enlightenment'. Here was something to restore to the existence of the educated and energetic a keen sense of meaning, purpose and direction, an ideology moreover which sanctified imperial expansion and the personal advancement of all its servants...The new imperium (found) its strength in the weakness of all those it seeks to control."

– Ivor Benson in *"This Age of Conflict"*, 1987

AMERICAN CONSERVATISM AND THE CULTURE WARS by James Reed:

The connection between the events of September 11th, 2001, and legal and illegal immigration have been documented but are ignored by an influential group of "conservatives" (neocons) who now dominate American cultural life. Hani Hanjour, the pilot of the jet that was, allegedly, crashed into the pentagon, legally entered the United States on a student visa. He claimed that he was going to study English at a Catholic school in Oakland, California. He never enrolled, like many other "students" who use the student visa system as a method of easy entry to the United States. In testimony before the US Senate Judiciary Committee, December 4th, 2001, terrorism expert Stephen Emerson testified that Osama bin Laden and his operatives systematically recruited US passport holders to allow terrorists easy access to the US. Bin Laden and other terrorist organizations such as Hamas operated in the US under a cover of immigration/humanitarian organisations with missions to promote "human rights". The Islamic Jihad terrorist group also used a "humanitarian" front to establish a base in the US.

Illegal immigration to the US is out of control. Bill King of the US Border Patrol Academy has said: "It should be universally recognised that our borders are out of control... Both our borders (with Mexico and Canada) are sieves. Anyone can cross our border today". (Source "The Social Contract", Winter, 2002, p.78). Thus terrorists, and terrorists possessing biological weapons and even mini-nukes, can

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *American Conservatism And The Culture Wars* • *American Version Of 'Economic Stability'?* • *The Deserving Poor*

"ON TARGET"

July 15th, 2005

Page 1 (105)

freely enter the US. So much for defending America from terrorism. The situation is parallel to making a dinner table speech while leaving the back door of one's house open.

American conservatives and "the Right" have an irrational faith in the assimilationist model of immigration. Like our own Australian race-diluters, the Right believes that America has an infinite capacity to absorb migrants. In fact migrants are ideal Americans because they help to reinforce core "American values" such as individualism, hard work and family. American culture is in decline because of the "junk culture" and moral pollution of Hollywood, and like entities. The Right believes that immigrants are stopping this slouch towards Gomorrah. This is the line run by representatives such as Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, and the Jewish intellectual-based journal Commentary. Muslims are seen as political gold, as "natural conservatives" who will vote for George Bush. About four-fifths of America's Muslim population were born abroad.

Steven Camarota in his report for the Centre for Immigration Studies, "Immigrants in the United States – 2000", estimates that the proportion of immigrant households using means-tested anti-poverty programmes was between 30-50 per cent higher than their use by native-born Americans.

The proportion of migrants aged 21 or over without a high school diploma is 33.1 per cent and for Mexican migrants it is 65.5 per cent. The comparative figure for native-born Americans is 13.2 per cent. As well, much migrant crime is unreported and does not show up in official crime statistics because of sophisticated national and international ethnic crime networks. It is doubtful whether these new migrants represent American family values: domestic violence and slavery are regarded by many of these groups as matters of fact. Finally, as far as loyalty to America goes a survey by Harvard's Centre for the Study of World Religions found that four in five Islamic migrants had a greater allegiance to a foreign country than to the US.

The Right takes this line for a number of reasons: First, there is a short-term selfish economic interest in flooding America with bucket loads of cheap labour to exploit. But the intellectuals typically don't argue along such lines. Rather, they, like the Left, are influenced by the ideology of political correctness. As in Australia, the intellectual *status quo* is that White is wrong and migrants (=Third World coloureds) are good. A sense of cultural guilt permeates both Left and Right wing intellectuals.

Frank Ellis in a paper published in *The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, vol.30, 2005, entitled "From Communism's 'Enemy of the People' to PC's 'Hate Criminal'" has traced the ideology of political correctness to its source in Marxism-Leninism. Political correctness originated in the Soviet Union. Where the hate figure for the old-Left was the capitalist, today for the new-Left the hate figure for the feminists and the multiculturalists is the White Anglo Saxon (Nordic racial type) heterosexual male.

The Right have swallowed this self-destructive nonsense as fully as the Left. Here we observe in conclusion that today the Left and the Right both in Australia and the US are almost indistinguishable on key issues such as mass immigration, multiculturalism and Asianisation. This strongly suggests that both positions are ready pseudo-positions and that those seeking the truth must free their minds from Left/Right categories. **Both positions have merely a family difference from the main dominant parent ideology of globalism produced and packaged by the same band of rootless cosmopolitans.**

AMERICAN VERSION OF 'ECONOMIC STABILITY'? "US households are nearing the limit of their ability to refinance housing debt or take out home equity loans to meeting current expenses; US households now owe a record 90 percent of the US economy's annual output, a figure that has jumped by 20 points in the last five years (*Boston Globe*, Thomas Oliphant, "Greenspan's dilemma", 7/5/2005). And, we who understand "frugality" and "green" and are living with this planet, rather than

ravaging this planet; we will, despite our prudence, be pulled down in the vortex created by those who leverage, borrow, and cause collapses. Is this any way to treat our diligence?"

From: W. Curtiss Priest, Ph.D. Editor, CITS Capital & Debt Watch, USA.

What we are witnessing is the outworking of corrupt political systems and a debt-capitalistic dominance that is sucking the life out of living.

THE DESERVING POOR by Betty Luks:

A branch of the Christian Church has expressed concern for the poverty stricken peoples of the Third World. "The Worldwide Mothers' Union Prayer today for the 'Make Poverty History campaign' is – "Make us one in heart and mind" as they support the much-publicised 'anti-poverty campaign' which includes calls for the First World rich nations to forgive Third World debt."

The issue of corruption is also a valid concern for the Mothers' Union and other anti-poverty campaigners as they write, "If we are to help make poverty history then corruption has to be tackled. It is the poorest people who are most affected by corruption and who suffer as a result of it. However, it is the responsibility of both rich *and poor* countries to tackle corruption in governments, in international institutions and in businesses... People living in poverty deserve the loans, aid and debt relief received by their governments to make the maximum possible difference to their lives. In the same way, taxpayers in the global north deserve the loans, aid and debt relief that they finance to reach the very poorest people in developing countries.

The Mothers' Union is calling for:

- **First World rich nations to forgive Third World debt.**

But let's pause for a moment and look at it from another angle. It was not the nations, that is, you, me, us – the people – who issued their monies as debts to the Third World. It was the PRIVATE banking systems of the world who issued the venal and corrupt leaders of the Third World with 'bank' money. You know, the sort of 'money' they create out of nothing, issue as a debt and demand repayment of same, along with further interest charges.

Individuals, that is, you, me, us – the people – we donate with money we have received in return for our labours, and give (free of any attached strings) to local charities we think are doing a good job in helping the Third World peoples, or we send our contributions direct to missionaries in those countries.

But if I understand the political 'spin' coming from leading politicians "we the people," that is you, me, us; we are being conned once more. Taxpaying Australians – and with the hated GST that is all of us now – need to ask their politicians to give them a straight answer to the following question:

"When the "G8 Governments" talk of "forgiving" Third World debt, does this mean it is the nations' taxes that will be used to pay the banks for the debts of the Third World governments?"

But let's go on with the Mothers' Union:

- People living in poverty deserve the loans, ...taxpayers in the global north deserve the loans, aid and debt relief that they finance to reach the very poorest people in developing countries.

Taxpayers in Australia have no say over the Foreign Aid payments made by 'our' governments. The Mothers' Union, I understand, arises from within the Church of England and does a marvellous work among those less able to help themselves. But haven't they got their wires a little crossed?

Practical Christianity requires that man's systems and institutions be directed towards serving God's

purpose for man, which traditional Christian belief accepted as freedom for the individual. He was to have the right to choose or refuse one thing at a time and it was the responsibility of Government to ensure his rights (his right to life, liberty and property and possession of same) were safeguarded.

Article of Religion No.38 in the "Book of Common Prayer" reads:

Of Christian Men's Goods Which Are Not Common:

"The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common as touching the right, title and possession of same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability." (*Alms*: meaning, voluntary contributions to aid the poor.)

The Anabaptists taught a form of communism, of collectivism. Many branches of the Church have religious orders which were/are founded on a form of 'communism', but the first principle of association is that of agreement, of consent, and usually an oath of poverty is taken upon entering the order. That type of 'communism' is not the Marxist/Soviet type which permeated Christian thinking in the 20th century.

An Anglican may have a moral responsibility to "give alms to the poor" but it is not a political or legal must. In British-Christian history the fundamental principle of consent to the taxes exacted and the purposes for which they were levied was once clearly understood – and fought for! A number of years ago I had an argument with a Liberal senator who thought it was only right that "Australia's Christians" should 'give' Foreign Aid through their taxes. When I suggested that if he chose to do so (out of his own pocket) that was okay, it was his own money he was deciding on, but I wanted Foreign Aid stopped! He was aghast at my request and thought that was so 'unchristian'!

I think those who issued the media release for the Mothers' Union are struggling with the same philosophical contradiction. They have much that is good in their statement but much that alarms me.

They want to ensure all parties to the Foreign Aid are accountable and transparent but do not touch upon the origins of the 'credit' issued through the private banking systems.

"...They should also ensure that the World Bank and IMF operate in a fully transparent manner and that their leaders are selected via a democratic process..."

There will need to be more fundamental changes than the transparency of the IMF and World Bank, even if their leaders were "elected by a democratic process"!

Do these ladies really believe we can get "figs from thistles"? The very purpose for which the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund was set up was to act on behalf of a World Government. There is nothing democratic or transparent about these institutions – and never will be under the policies of the present ruling elite.

But back to debt forgiveness. Just when was it we the people, that is you, me, us, were asked if we wanted to be landed with the responsibilities of the Third World debts owed to private banking systems and our taxes used to pay them? The banks created the 'money' out of nothing; it would be so simple for them to cross a few noughts off the debt figures – and it would cost them nothing!