

## Greens show their true colour, red

By Jennifer Oriel, The Australian, 12 February 2018

Jihadis couldn't take down Jim Molan in Iraq. Indonesian militants couldn't knock him off in Timor. But the wee men of the Australian Greens think they're in with a chance.

It is little wonder they labour under such delusions. The Greens' grand strategy reads like a Miss Universe cue card: world peace, green dreaming and love sweet love. Scratch the surface and you find nothing but fatal contradictions. For each Greens policy, there is another that cancels it out. In the end, there is nothing left.

The major contribution the Greens make to Australian life is to fragment politics by vulgarising manners and creating a culture hostile to the free world. The attack on Senator Molan is a case in point. Greens MP Adam Bandt said last week that if an inquiry into the Iraq war were held, "you would find Jim Molan would probably be up for prosecution ... for his role in the atrocities in Fallujah". It took a threat of legal action for him to apologise. His first effort sounded so insincere he had to try again before the apology was accepted.

The Greens often campaign against patriotism. They turn on their fellow countrymen to defend Islamist causes. Molan served as chief of operations in Iraq during the second battle for Fallujah. A few months before, *Time* magazine published an in-depth article on the "new jihad" in the region. The jihadi insurgency was led by fundamentalists keen to capitalise on regional instability. Michael Ware revealed their plan to transform Iraq into "a training ground for young jihadists who will form the next wave of recruits for al-Qa'ida and like-minded groups". Almost all of the jihadi groups claimed inspiration from the chief of al-Qa'ida in Iraq, Abu Mousab al-Zarqawi. After he was killed by a coalition strike in 2006, Zarqawi's men formed Islamic State.

It would be quite reasonable to form the view that the Greens have an unproductive attachment to Islamism, especially the Sunni variety. But give them some credit for consistency. They contend the 2004 battle to stop jihadis in Iraq constitutes a war crime and they protested against Western troops trying to stop Islamic State genocide in Iraq a decade later.

The problem isn't that Molan went too far in Fallujah. The problem is that the West didn't go far enough. The only solution to genocidal jihad is scorched earth.

When the Greens aren't backing jihad abroad, they're waving it ashore. Their immigration plan includes empowering refugees given adverse security assessments by ASIO to challenge the findings. Last year, the government reported that 500 refugees from Iraq and Syria were denied entry after the Five Eyes intelligence alliance warned their names were on international security lists. Dozens had adverse national security assessments.

When not defending the rights of terrorists against the welfare of free world citizens, the Greens are busy contradicting themselves. There is perhaps no more contradictory policy than pushing big immigration via porous borders while complaining about resource scarcity. If what the Greens say is true and Australia is running down its supply of natural resources, then promoting population growth by increasing the immigration intake is self-defeating.

The Australian Greens form part of the international alliance, Global Greens. Its charter opens with the odd idea that we are "citizens of the planet" — as though the planet were a nation state. The Global Greens believe "the environment ignores borders between countries". The

environment is not a human being. It can neither ignore nor recognise nation state borders. But the Global Greens want a world without borders. At the same time, they claim to support “participatory democracy” in which “all citizens have the right to express their views”.

A world without borders — the global government envisioned by greens parties — would destroy liberal democracy. The free world constitutes a minority of states and a relatively small percentage of the world’s population. In the global political system envisioned by greens parties, most votes would be cast by members of Islamist and communist states. Totalitarianism would spread its tentacles across the globe.

Despite the totalitarian threat, European greens tried to introduce a system for transnational members of parliament in next year’s European elections. The vote for transnational lists was defeated 368 to 274 last week.

In the context of a global parliament, it would make sense for politicians to appeal to Islamists and communists/socialists, given they would constitute most voters. Such a political system is not possible unless nation states cease to exist. Liberal democratic nations pose a significant problem for supranationalists because they demonstrate the nation state system can generate prosperity, security and stability for its citizens.

Greens parties protest against national security in favour of “a comprehensive concept of global security”. The Global Greens’ world security requires “a global security system capable of the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts”. But who would direct the leviathan? The greens nominate the “United Nations as the global organisation of conflict management”.

UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres could be amenable to the idea. As president of Socialist International, Guterres proposed a global government governed by a UN parliamentary assembly.

The Australian Labor Party quit Socialist International for a more moderate European alliance. But greens parties have taken up the red flag to promote a global revolution that would devastate freedom and concentrate power in a world of tyranny without borders.