



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.42, No.17

May 5th, 2006

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:

Alexander Downer is busily lecturing the leaders of the Solomon Islands on the need to get rid of corruption in government. Does he mean the Australian Wheat Board variety? – Janis Luks, 2006

As we have seen, John Howard and Lord Downer are terrific at casual swagger, although neither has ever heard a bullet go pffwt-pzzz through the rubber trees. Luckily, they have not had results to bury. But next time we might not be so easily conned. After the never-ever GST, children overboard, Iraq, WorkChoices, AWB and now Papua, Howard has lost public trust. The moment we hear him blather that no decision has been made for war, that everyone is working for a peaceful solution to the Iran crisis - that's when we know the SAS is already there. When the shoulders go back, the chin goes up and the lower lip juts out, you know the Prime Minister is lying.

– Mike Carlton, 22 /4/06, *Sydney Morning Herald*

FREEDOM OF THOUGHT : PART TWO: ISRAEL LOBBY by Ian Wilson LL.B.: In my article "Africans and Crime" I raised the point as a legal hypothetical about whether it would be possible in principle to draft a statement expressing an "extremist" view (say Holocaust denial) which could successfully meet section 18 D defence of the Racial Discrimination Act. It is worthwhile to pursue this line of argument while considering the controversy generated by the publication in the *London Review of Books*, 23/3/06, by two American academics. The authors are John Mearsheimer, professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, and Stephen Walt, professor of International Affairs at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. Their controversial paper is entitled "The Israel Lobby".

The thesis of these academics is that there is an "Israel lobby" that consists of a network of Jewish elites in journalism, the media, finance and the machinery of U.S. government that is essentially controlling U.S. Middle East policy. The lobby has convinced Americans that US interests and the interests of Israel are identical. Thus the US gives more military aid and direct economic assistance to Israel than any other nation. Since World War II Israel has received \$US 140 billion (in 2004 dollar terms) in direct economic and military assistance. But, the authors argue, Israel is not of particular strategic importance to the United States. The authors say that "Israel is a liability in the war on terror and the broader effort to deal with rogue states."

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *Freedom Of Thought : Part Two: Israel Lobby* • *A 'Smart Card' John? But Not An ID Card?* • *What Will It Take For Real Aussies To Mount A Fightback?*

The authors then state: "The U.S. has a terrorism problem in good part because it is closely associated with Israel, not the other way around." Rogue States in the Middle East "are not a dire threat to vital U.S. interests, except inasmuch as they are a threat to Israel". And: "The relationship with Israel actually makes it harder for the US to deal with these States. Israel's nuclear arsenal is one reason some of its neighbours want nuclear weapons, and threatening them with regime change merely increases that desire." Worse, Israel "does not behave like a loyal ally... Israel has provided sensitive military technology to potential rivals like China, in what the State Department Inspector-General called 'a systematic and growing pattern of unauthorized transfers'.

According to the General Accounting Office, Israel also 'conducts the most aggressive espionage operations against the U.S. of any ally.'

Mearsheimer and Walt reject the idea that the Holocaust gives Israel a blank cheque to do what it likes in the Middle East and towards Palestinians. They quote a revealing passage by Israeli leader David Ben-Gurion told to Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress:

"If I were an Arab leader I would never make terms with Israel. That is natural: we have taken their country... We come from Israel, but two thousand years ago, and what is that to them There has been anti-semitism, the Nazis, Hitler, Auschwitz, but was that their fault? They see only one thing: we have come here and stolen their country. Why should they accept that?"

The authors say that the creation of Israel "involved acts of ethnic cleansing, including executions, massacres and rapes by Jews, and Israel's subsequent conduct has often been brutal, belying any claim to moral superiority." Then a long litany of statistics are quoted; for example during the first intifada the Israeli Defence Forces encouraged troops to break the bones of Palestinian protesters with truncheons, and up to 29,900 children required medical treatment from such beatings.

The authors then go on to detail how the Israel lobby operates, being based upon Jewish power in the U.S. This material is of lesser importance for my essay. Nor do I wish to assess whether what the authors have said, which I have quoted is correct. I am not an expert on the Middle East history and cannot make an informative comment. As a civil libertarian my chief interest is freedom of speech. What I want to explore is whether two Australian academics could have said the same things which Mearsheimer and Walt have said and survive our "system". Keep in mind my remarks made in my article "Africans and Crime".

U.S. comments on this paper by leading Jewish intellectuals have been that the paper is anti-Semitic and non-scholarly. Harvard Law School Professor Alan Dershowitz, a leading defender of Israel has said that the paper is "trash" and could have been written by "some of the less intelligent members of Hamas." (*The Weekend Australian*, 1-2/4/06 p.13) Professor Marvin Kalb of the Kennedy School said that the paper failed to meet basic academic standards, and contained among other things, factual errors. (*The Australian* 31/3/06, p.9) Democrat Congressman Jerrad Nadler said that the authors' thesis was "preposterous" and that the authors were saying that there were "Jewish conspirators under every bed and controlling every major American institution".

Jewish writer Eliot Cohen said in *The Washington Post* that the two authors were "anti-Semitic". (*The Australian*, 6/4/06, p.1) According to this writer accusing Jews of "disloyalty, subversion or treachery... of participating in secret combinations that manipulated institutions and governments... is anti-Semitic." Presumably even if true, this would be anti-Semitic. As well it is anti-Semitic to "systematically [select] everything unfair, ugly or wrong about Jews as individuals or a group and equally systematically [suppress] any exculpatory information." This is a strange critical standard. It admits that there could in principle be unfair, ugly and wrong things done by this group, but vilifies critics who may state these "truths" without also balancing the view by giving exculpatory information. That seems to beg the question at issue in this debate. Mearsheimer and Walt appear to be saying there is no such

exculpatory evidence. Why in any case can't an author attempt to balance a one-sided debate by giving a purely negative critique without attempting to dilute the point of the criticism by throwing in a few good deeds?

Michael Ledeen in the National Review Online said that the academics should be "punished". He said, "The Israel Lobby" should dissuade rational Harvard and Chicago donors from giving any further money to the Kennedy School or the Chicago political science department." (*The Australian*, 6/4/06, p.1)

Is it True? Let me see if I have got that right: punish two whole departments because of the sins of two academics? In any case, according to Ledeen it is in the "grand tradition of anti-Semitism" to say that the Israel lobby has manipulated American foreign policy. Okay, but does that mean that it is not true? Whom should I believe?

Martin Peretz, editor-in-chief of *The New Republic* (*The Australian*, 3/4/06, p.11) raises a number of questions about the factual accuracy of Mearsheimer and Walt's paper and concludes that the paper is "nonsense scholarship". He says: "Their paper is not research in any serious sense, although its academic paraphernalia are intended to lend it an undeserved seriousness." What then is "serious" research?

The Financial Times, surprisingly enough, has come to the defence of these academics. "Moral blackmail – the fear that any criticism of Israeli policy and US support for it will lead to charges of anti-Semitism – is a powerful disincentive to publish dissenting views." (*The Australian*, 3/4/06, p.9) Columbia University's Mark Mazower, also writing in the *Financial Times*, observed that criticism of Israel is taboo in the U.S. To illustrate this absurdity he pointed out (*The Australian*, 6/4/06, p.11) that the U.S. Jewish watchdog, the Anti-Defamation League "last year levelled a similar charge at a faculty in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem".

He went on to conclude: "There is something peculiarly Kafkaesque about the idea of an American Jewish watchdog monitoring Israel for anti-Semitism, yet once the mechanism and mindset exist, this is where the logic of vigilance leads: anti-Semitism may be found anywhere..."

Slaves to the System? It seems inevitable then that if the two academics were Australians and published this paper in Australia they would be convicted under Australia's race hate laws. Like Professor Andrew Fraser their remarks would be found not to be balanced and proportionate. Their academic defence would fail because there would be any number of hostile academic expert critics happy to bury them.

J.S. Mill argued in *On Liberty* that freedom of expression is our most fundamental liberty. Without it, we are no more than slaves, however much bread and circuses the system permits us to have. These debates clearly show that we are slaves.

So what are we going to do about it? As I have suggested it is about time that we pursued a "race-hate" case through to the High Court of Australia. Professor Andrew Fraser's case, as I have said in my previous paper, is an excellent test-case. Professor Fraser, a legally trained person, has refused to apologise and no doubt will next face the federal Court of Australia. The outcome is predictable. If this outcome occurs let us all encourage him to appeal to the High Court of Australia.

A 'SMART CARD' JOHN? BUT NOT AN ID CARD? by Betty Luks: When is a National ID Card not a National ID Card? That's correct my Orwellian students, it's when your 'leader' says it's a "biometric access card".

Let there be no mistake, John Howard in obedience to his underling-bosses from the evil realm of IMF-WB-Mordor is testing the waters and has proposed a 'smart card' for those who will want access to Medicare, welfare and tax benefits by 2010.

The card would include a computer chip with biometric information and photograph, and is 'designed to reduce welfare and identity fraud, and protect against terrorists'.

(Oh, of course! Our beloved leaders *always* have our welfare as their primary concern! Don't they? Why those naughty terrorists might attempt to gain access to the health and welfare systems and expect free treatment themselves! Why, they might even want a 'face job'.)

Who remembers the attempt by the Hawke Labor Government to introduce a national ID card in Australia in the mid-80s? At the time, such a system was fiercely opposed by the Liberal Party, including the now Prime Minister, John Howard, on the grounds of infringement of liberty. Now Howard serves another master – and it is not the Australian people. He is firmly entrenched within the globalist power structure and has completely changed his stance on ID cards and the accompanying biometric database recording control system.

He pontificates: "You have to put that against the right all of us have to expect of our Government that it takes all reasonable measures to protect us against the behaviour of terrorists."

The proposed Australian ID card agenda is the identical twin of the British ID card agenda. The overall movement is global and it is one being implemented right under people's noses, piece by piece in a stealth, stepping stone like fashion.

In addition to changing the rhetoric surrounding the card, the compulsory nature of it is also being coated in Orwellian doublespeak.

"It will not be compulsory to have the card," Howard is quoted as saying. But, "It will be necessary for everybody who needs a card to apply for one." (Read anyone wanting access to the health system through Medicare, and/or jobless and on the dole, and/or pensioners receiving a pension – you are the first 'cab off the rank' in this imposition of a national identification system. If you don't submit to this Orwellian system – you don't eat and you don't get access to the health system!

Any number of upgrades could see the card used in all aspects of life in the two countries. The ID systems in Britain and Australia equate to lifelong surveillance and an end to life as a private citizen.

WHAT WILL IT TAKE FOR REAL AUSSIES TO MOUNT A FIGHTBACK? It is way past time Australians of all political persuasions put aside their differences and through their coming together and wisely targeting their massive political vote ensured John Howard is soundly trounced in the 2007 federal election.

Steve Watson of Infowars wrote, 27/4/06: Plans are being considered by the Scottish Executive to issue ID cards storing details of every aspect of Citizens lives. Hundreds of thousands of Scots have already been issued with the Citizens' National Entitlement Card – a microchipped card that carries the holder's name and photo. The cards are used to access free bus or coach travel, but there are plans to link them to a central database.

This would give the Executive access to such details as people's travel movements, gym visits and reading habits. There are fears that the system could be expanded to include other information such as NHS records and benefits payments.

Scotland, a nation that fought for centuries for freedom and independence. Scotland, birthplace of William Wallace and Robert the Bruce, two huge and heroic icons of Freedom, may now have every one of its citizens registered, monitored and controlled like prisoners – unless the Scots also unite and take a stand.

"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.