



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.32

August 25th, 2006

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: Now the Real War Begins: The real war in Lebanon begins today. The world may believe – and Israel may believe – that the U.N. ceasefire due to come into effect at 6am today will mark the beginning of the end of the latest dirty war in Lebanon after up to 1,000 Lebanese civilians and more than 30 Israeli civilians have been killed. But the reality is quite different and will suffer no such self-delusion: the Israeli army, reeling under the Hizbollah's onslaught of the past 24 hours, is now facing the harshest guerrilla war in its history. And it is a war they may well lose.... If the ceasefire collapses, as seems certain, neither the Israelis nor the Americans appear to have any plans to escape the consequences.

– Robert Fisk, *The Independent*, August 15th, 2006, U.K.

IN DEFENCE OF ERIC BUTLER by James Reed: Eric Butler has gone – and Australia is the poorer in his passing. But predictably enough, the mainstream press took a last swing at Eric. Let's swing back.

D.D. McNicholl "Anti-Jew Figure Dies", *The Australian*, 9/6/06, p.6, was wrong from the first two words. Eric Butler was not 'anti-Jew' and nor is the Australian League of Rights "Nazi-orientated". Eric Butler was a critic of Zionism and of those pursuing what Professor Kevin MacDonald calls the Jewish group evolutionary strategy – but he was not anti-Semitic or anti-Jew.

Like MacDonald, and more modern writers, he argued that the strategies of Jewish elites (not the ordinary Jew) were contrary to the interests of his own kind. Butler was, in the social credit tradition of Major Douglas, a champion of the freedom of the individual and of decentralised power structures. The politically correct left and rightist-globalists have more philosophically in common with Hitler than Eric Butler's philosophy ever did. McNicholl's piece exhibits no evidence of even reading Butler's work, it is so distorted and inaccurate.

Writing a few days later Philip Adams ("Anti-Semitic Zealot Held Surprising Political Sway", *The Australian*, 13/6/06, p.10) repeated the same abuse as McNicholl and added his own mud. Butler, he says during World War II "had been consorting with the enemy via the Japanese Chamber of Commerce", and the Attorney General H.V. Evatt at the time sought to lay subversion charges against Butler because of the articles which he had written criticising the war loan campaign. This says more about H.V. Evatt than it does about Eric Butler. The claim of consorting with the enemy is false and was amply refuted by Eric Butler's book responding to Phillip Adams' attack, *"The Truth About the Australian League of Rights"*. Published in 1985 the book is now out of print.

Eric served his country during WWII and was honourably discharged. In later life, former Victorian

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *In Defence Of Eric Butler* • *Checks, Balances And The Division Of Power* • *A Glimmer* • *Politically Correct Pleadings?* • *Suicide Of The West*

RSL president Bruce Ruxton presented him with his war medals at one of the League's *New Times'* Dinners. The Eltham RSL would hardly have given such a splendid farewell to Eric if the lies about his war record were truths.

Speaking of Phillip Adams – Adams has for a long time been a particularly nasty, unfair and unbalanced critic of Eric Butler. Hearing Adams' diatribe against Butler, a reasonable person would ask: why is such a level of passion being aroused?

An alternative vision of Australia: Criticism passes into personal hatred, animosity and vilification. One cannot explain such behaviour rationally because it is not rational. Left wing critics of Israel and the Jews have been far harsher than Eric, critics of immigration have said more and other groups have been more relentless on issues of race and nationality than the League. So why the vilification?

My hypothesis is that the League – and Eric of course – symbolised in one bite-sized piece, the vision of Australia which the new class elites and professional ethnics wished to junk. Eric and the League represent a sound conservative alternative to their own distorted and disintegrating world view. Hence the hatred.

The Australian Jewish News, 16/6/06, quoted Dr. Rodney Goutlman, who said: "For the Australian Jewish community particularly, his death will not be lamented, but surely welcomed."

Jeremy Jones in *The Australia Israel Review* dismisses the League saying: "The League is more alive than its founder, but barely."

I am disappointed: I often imagined that the obituary in these distinguished Jewish periodicals would be particularly biting. But at the time of writing Israel is being pounded by the rockets of real anti-Semites, who from what I have read in *The Australia Israel Review*, will not stop until Israel is destroyed. All of the problems which concern us are minor compared to the immense difficulties which Israel faces in a region with expanding Islamic populations, hostilely surrounding Israel. And, on the horizon is the Islamic a-bomb. So, the League may outlive Israel if these evils come to pass.

Eric Butler was truly a "lion of freedom" as Mr. Auchterlonie described him. He received from the morally corrupt establishment vitriol, bile and abuse for his selfless devotion to the cause of freedom and truth.

However, his vision of a financially-free West, grounded in Christian values, and an Australia blessed with British Constitutional Monarchical government, will continue to inspire generations of actionists.

CHECKS, BALANCES & THE DIVISION OF POWER by Jeremy Lee: After a dream run for ten years the Liberal-National Coalition is looking decidedly tatty. It has squandered the huge advantage it gained at the last election, when it commandeered both Houses. For the first time in a decade backbenchers are crossing the floor, and a Senate revolt is impending. A backlog of issues, from rising interest rates and high fuel prices to poverty and dispossession threaten to dog the Government from day to day until the next election. Even defence and immigration, once issues that Howard skilfully exploited, are beginning to bite the hand that feeds them. The Howard government only has one thing going for it – Kim Beazley and the Labor Party. It may not be enough. But history reminds us that governments are voted out – not in.

Illusions of Grandeur: Like a punch-drunk boxer, John Howard no longer knows when to retire. He could have retired undefeated, handing all the chickens coming home to roost to his successor. While history could never regard him as a statesman, it would probably have portrayed him as an astute politician who came along at a fortuitous moment in Australian politics.

Professor Greg Craven of Curtin University (*Australian Financial Review*, Weekend, 9-12/6/06) accurately portrayed the loss of a philosophical base in the Liberal Party. He pointed out that the

original Liberal Party founded by Menzies held valid four principles: firstly, a suspicion of centralised power; secondly, a clear recognition of the limitations of government; thirdly, a profound respect for society's institutions, from the Constitution to the Courts and Judiciary, to the Senate – no matter how inconvenient they might be at particular moments; and, finally, traditional Liberals once firmly rejected the venal policy "Whatever it takes" introduced by Labor's Graham Richardson in the Hawke era.

Pragmatism: All these principles – the bare minimum for reasonable government - have been shed by the modern Coalition in favour of survival at any cost, "whatever it takes" From here on the slide will be rapid. The 'blind eye' which a complacent electorate once turned to the shallow lies and broken core-promises will, from here on, be wide open and unforgiving.

If a change eventuated, could a Beazley government be trusted to reverse the disasters, revive our institutions, recharge the federal system and 'whip the money-changers from the temple'? In Eliza Doolittle's immortal words in Shaw's Pygmalion: "Not bloody likely!" Beazley is at best a globalist in the Blair tradition.

So where is an increasingly desperate Australia going to turn?

A GLIMMER? A little-publicised event took place earlier this year. Twelve independent members of State and Federal parliaments met in Canberra on February 4 to see whether they could help each other, and any new Independent contemplating standing for election. They made it clear they were not nominating anyone. They did not deny that political parties, smelling the wind, are quite capable of putting up their own 'dummy' independents. But the fact that we have enough Independents to make such an association potentially worthwhile is, perhaps, a heartening sign of the times.

Initiated by the already well-known federal Independents Tony Windsor (New England) and Peter Andren (Calare) others attending were: Craig Ingram (Gippsland East, Vic.), Russell Savage (Mildura, Vic), Robert Such (Fisher, S.A.), Dawn Tardell (Dubbo, N.S.W.), Richard Torbay (Armidale, N.S.W.), Peter Draper (Tamworth, N.S.W.), Chris Foley (Maryborough, Qld.), Dorothy Pratt (Nanango, Qld.), Liz Cunningham (Gladstone, Qld.) and Don Wing (Patterson, Tas.).

For those who want to know more, the association has its own website – www.icanonline.net.au.
Great oaks from little acorns grow.

POLITICALLY CORRECT PLEADINGS by Ian Wilson LL.B.: Former Federal Court judge, and Jew, Marcus Einfeld, is being subjected to a N.S.W. police inquiry which could lead to him facing perjury charges. (*The Australian*, 9/8/06, p.1) He said in sworn testimony that he was not driving his Lexus car on January 8th, 2006, when that car was detected by a police speed camera. The speeding fine was \$77. Einfeld said that he loaned his car to a friend, Professor Teresa Brennan of Florida. Only problem: Professor Brennan died three years earlier! Was her spirit driving? No, Einfeld said he was referring to another Professor Brennan. And this professor brennan has also died since returning to the U.S. This Professor also was named "Therese" or "Terese" and he was unsure of her U.S. address. Indeed he didn't even know her occupation "except that she was in academia". Does this all sound true to you, oh reasonable people out there?

Einfeld is a leading human rights activist and foundation president of the Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission and now a major human rights/immigration/refugee lawyer. If convicted of perjury his legal career could end. Let justice be done and seen to be done.

SUICIDE OF THE WEST by James Reed: In 1964, James Burnham, a former communist, but at that time a fierce anti-communist and conservative pessimist, wrote the book "Suicide of the West:

The Meaning and Destiny of Liberalism," (Jonathan Cape, London 1964). Burnham argued that consulting an atlas readily shows a contraction of western power. Burnham put the blame upon liberalism and he said: "Liberalism is the ideology of Western suicide... the ideology of modern liberalism must be understood as itself one of the expressions of Western contraction and decline... Liberalism permits Western civilisation to be reconciled to its dissolution."

Richard Koch and Chris Smith have now published another book of the same title, "Suicide of the West," (Continuum, London, 2006). Richard Koch is a businessman Chris Smith (The Rt. Hon. Lord Smith of Finsbury) was a former Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport. They note, in commenting on Burnham, that it was communism which collapsed, not the West and that decolonisation did not derail the West. Burnham got it wrong. Nevertheless the core values of Western civilisation – Christianity, science, optimism, economic growth/progress, individualism and liberalism – are under attack from within. The West has lost a sense of pride and belief in itself. The philosophical foundation of the West – ethical individualism – "an indefinable blend of rationalism, activism, confidence, knowledge-seeking, personal responsibility, self-improvement, world-improvement and compassion" (p.22) – is under challenge by intellectuals who see the core values of the Enlightenment as shipwrecked. Christianity has been subject to a rigorous foundational critique by its own theologians for over two centuries. But only with increased materialism and secularisation has the decline of religion in the West accelerated, accompanied by social angst, selfishness and nihilism. (p.44)

History has also caught up with the doctrine of optimism, brushed by the Great Wars and by the nuclear and other technological threats. That technology which brought so many marvels could ultimately destroy man, in a kind of Faustian revenge – shakes to the core the notion of progress. In its wake it also brings with it a loss of faith in science itself.

Although both the ancient Greeks and Romans, and Islam and China accumulated empirical knowledge about the world, applied through inventions, only Western Europe created science, the study of nature through systematic observations, theorisation about underlying mechanisms and experimentation.

Liberalism has also generated an "internal compulsion towards self-destruction" (p.131) Koch and Smith say: Indiscriminate respect for all cultures, all peoples and all views shades into acceptance of anti-intellectualism and anti-liberalism. If everything is relative, then anything – cannibalism, genocide – can be justified." (p.133)

Despite these problems, Koch and Smith see Christianity, optimism, science, growth and individualism surviving. Liberalism faces the greatest threat, but the authors believe that with will, it too can survive.

A 'politically correct' take: Koch and Smith though have failed to address the survival of the West problem from the perspective from which it should be addressed: racially as done for example by Simpson in "Which Way Western Man". Immigration and changing demographic patterns and all of the problems written about by the writers of this movement are ignored.

"Suicide of the West" is a politically correct take on a serious problem and as such avoids confronting unpleasant realities. Will the West be the West, and Europe Europe, if it is majority non-White and Muslim? We get no answer from Koch and Smith because this is the sort of "street" question which comfortable upper class people do not want to confront.