A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 100000815

Vol. 53 No. 20 **26th May 2017**

IN THIS ISSUE

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "LIBERALS HAVE LOST. WE'RE ALL LEFTISTS NOW"…

writes Andrew Bolt on his Blog 11 May 2017.

Betty Luks reporting: The headline reminded me of an article Ivor Benson wrote as former Rhodesian Front prime minister Ian Smith was fading from the limelight of world history.
(It is well to remember Marxist Robert Mugabe took over the leadership of that little nation now known as Zimbabwe–and is still in power as the Marxists brought the nation and its people to their knees.)

> **Ivor Benson:** "How else are we to explain the dazed incomprehension with which the rank and file members of the Rhodesian Front (RF), even members of parliament, even cabinet ministers, looked on as one by one all those 'evil geniuses' of whom Harold Wilson was later to speak, genuine opponents of the socialist world revolution, were defamed, tricked, driven out of the party, or in some other way deprived of any influence?"

As Ivor Benson observed in *The Tragedy of Rhodesia's Ian Smith*:

> The truth about what happened to the country once known as Rhodesia may be of little value to those still forced to live in the country now known as Zimbabwe, but there is a lesson to be learned by the rest of the world…

Mr. Ivor Benson examined the tragic role of former Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith.
(Mr. Benson was employed as Information Adviser to the Rhodesian Government during 1964-65, but resigned when he felt that the Smith Government was pursuing a course, which he felt must ultimately end in disaster.)

> The Ian Smith saga, which has made headlines all over the world since 1964 is drawing to a close. Rhodesia's "Good old Smithy" finds himself transformed into Zimbabwe's "Poor old Smithy", the persecuted leader of an embattled White minority party in what is now on its way to becoming yet another African one-party Marxist state. *(Remember, this was written in September 1983…ed)*
> Mr. Smith and several of his Republican Front colleagues were hauled off to a police station because their presence at an art exhibition looked too much like defiance of a recently imposed ban on political meetings. His farm near Gewlo (Gwem) was ransacked by the police and all his personal papers seized. A couple of days later, under de facto arrest, Smith was taken to Salisbury (now Harare) to be present when his townhouse was also ransacked and more personal papers carried off. Since then, the police have descended on his farm again and have seized all his personal weapons–shotgun, pistols, etc. Ian Smith has become, as one South African newspaper headlined it, "the target of Zimbabwean fury"; and Republican Front members of parliament have expressed the fear that their leader's life might even be in danger.
>
> **Why the persecution of the leader of Zimbabwe's White minority?**
> **Answer:** because Mr. Smith was recently in the United States and Britain bitterly complaining about the Mugabe Government and calling on leaders of the so-called "free world" not to allow Zimbabwe to become a one-party state and to slide into the Marxist sink-hole.
>
> Since 1963, when Ian Smith succeeded to the leadership of the country's White community, the Rhodesian drama has unfolded with the iron inevitability of a Greek tragedy. There is only one way in which the latest news from Zimbabwe can be rendered intelligible and worthy of any comment, and that is to re-tell the story in the fewest and simplest words, and to show that what is now happening is the inescapable consequence of what Mr. Smith believed and tried to do—in defiance of repeated warnings. This is something Mr. Smith never understood, still does not understand, and probably never will understand.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

The whole truth is compressed into one paragraph in the September 1977 issue of *Behind the News*:

"Mr. Ian Smith is not a conservative, let alone a rightwing extremist, never was a conservative and never will be. He is a liberal or progressive, or leftist, always was and always will be. Thus an astonishing situation has been created in which a dyed-in-the-wool liberal finds himself today the prime minister and leader of a small country which has adopted a posture of defiance towards a revolutionary imperialism, which is essentially liberal, leftist, call it what you will".

The weirdness of Ian Smith's behaviour as leader of the Rhodesian Front Party (RF) can, therefore, be easily explained: he was playing a double game; he was betraying the party whose programme of principles he had publicly endorsed; and he was doing this from a position of strength, profoundly convinced that he was advancing the cause of truth and justice, and always covertly supported from sources outside his RF party.

Therefore, it was not the outside powers trying to enforce revolutionary change in Rhodesia that Mr. Smith was fighting—his real opponents were the RF members of parliament who had chosen him as party leader and prime minister plus, of course, the rank and file members of the RF, whose energy and enthusiasm had secured the defeat of the frankly liberal United Federal Party in 1962.

No one expressed this portion of the truth more simply and more clearly than did Sir Harold Wilson in a BBC interview in September last year (1982):

"I got on very well with him" (Mr. Smith), "but there were a number of occasions when we had negotiations when we would agree and all was going well. Then he would "go back and the evil geniuses got at him; they held a pistol at his head; they were going to sack him".

More confirmation of Mr. Smith's real role will be found in the weirdly ambivalent attitude of Rhodesia's Big Money Argus Company Press, later to be converted into all-out encouragement and support.

In a word, Mr. Smith, as a dedicated liberal and proponent of multiracialism, had decided that there was no better position from which to advance his "ideals" than from inside a political party that was most effectively opposing them. And the then newly created Rhodesian Front, with all its political novices, was the ideal environment for this bold exercise.

PSYCHOLOGY OF GROUP DYNAMICS ANIMAL FARM

As events were to show, Ian Smith was a shrewd, tough and ruthless party-political operator who knew very well how to exploit to the utmost a psychology of group dynamics which makes it well nigh imperative for any group that is threatened from without to render blind loyalty and submission to its leader.

The Rhodesians were thus reduced to a moral condition described in the Gospels: "Having eyes, they could not see, having ears they could not hear, and having minds they could neither understand nor remember." How else are we to explain the dazed incomprehension with which rank and file members of the RF, even members of parliament, even cabinet ministers, looked on as one by one all those "evil geniuses" of whom Harold Wilson was later to speak, the genuine opponents of the socialist world revolution, were defamed, tricked, driven out of the party, or in some other way deprived of any influence?

Today when Ian Smith complains so bitterly of being persecuted, and about the suppression of Press freedom, it is appropriate, surely, that he should be reminded that it was by applying precisely the same methods that he made possible the Rhodesian transformation of which he now complains. In particular, he could be reminded of the way in which he persecuted Mr. Wilfred Brooks, and crushed Mr. Brook's monthly journal *Rhodesian Property and Finance*, a paper whose great offence it was that it dared to publish the truth—that same truth which Mr. Smith needs now if he is ever to understand his present nasty and imperilled situation.

Many more were to be the target of Mr. Smith's enmity as, in an atmosphere of bewilderment reminiscent of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, he picked off one by one those who opposed him or might do so in future, the most important of these, of course, being cabinet ministers (such as William Harper, John Gaunt, Lord Graham). Having got rid of the men whom Harold Wilson himself would have recommended for elimination, Mr. Smith then summonsed reinforcements from the ranks of those who had always hitherto been the most vehement opponents of the Rhodesian Front…

Twelve RF members of parliament rebelled and formed an opposition Rhodesian Action Party (RAP). A deputy minister attached to the Prime Minister's office rebelled and resigned from his job. The national chairman of the RF Party—no less—rebelled and resigned. All that now remained of the original party was a clustering together of weak elements, accurately described by Dr. R. Gayre of Gayre, in a personal letter:

> **"There is a big mass of people in leading positions everywhere who will not face facts, who would prefer to live in a conservative atmosphere but rather than face up to the aggressive dynamism of the left will either remain silent or will even try to persuade the real conservatives to compromise with the extreme forces of destruction, in some blind hope that this will appease and at least gain for them some respite from the strain of making decisions".**

These, never numerous but most of them well positioned in the party structure, Dr. Gayre correctly described as "the real traitors".

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)
There were, of course, a few exceptions, members of the party who tried in vain to rescue the Rhodesian Front from within, one of the most notable of these being Lord Graham (the Duke of Montrose, a signatory to the Unilateral Declaration of Independence in 1965).

Now commanding a party fortress manned only by self-selected compromisers and appeasers, and heavily dependent on the wealth and influence of his new-found Zionist allies, Ian Smith responded to the RAP challenge swiftly and ruthlessly—for he was now in great danger of losing his grip on the electorate…

THE GRAND DESIGN

So, why was Ian Smith then in trouble'?
Answer: Those who backed him in the past and his admirers, like Harold Wilson, tell him that his "ideals" have been "realised": Zimbabwe has been "liberated" and admitted to the United Nations amid universal applause as a "free and independent nation" in which every form of racial discrimination is condemned—or so the world has been led to understand.

Why, then, does Mr. Smith not go along with the country's new rulers? Why is he out in the cold when in the opinion of liberals and leftists all over the world he should be helping to make a success of "the great multiracial experiment?"
Answer: because the Zimbabwe that has come into existence is almost entirely out of register with the picture he had formed in his mind of a "new" Rhodesia, which was to have been an example and a source of inspiration to the whole world.

What inspired Ian Smith and justified a considerable exercise of deception and ruthlessness was certainly not a Marxist one-party state—and he could never have imagined such a state enjoying international recognition and receiving seemingly boundless financial aid from nations that had always echoed his own 'ideals' and his distaste for Marxism. Mr. Smith's unhappy situation was foreshadowed in a sentence written by Oswald Spengler, shortly after the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia:

> **"There is no proletarian movement, not even a Communist one, that does not operate in the interest of money, in the direction indicated by money, and for the period permitted by money, and all this without the idealist in its ranks having the faintest suspicion of the fact…"**

Ian Smith passed in 2007, one imagines, a sad old man.

The Liberal 'Broad Church'!

As one studies the direction the Liberal Coalition have taken this nation over the last 40 or so years, one is struck by the similarity of events to that of that former little nation of Rhodesia. What does the so-called 'conservative' party now describe themselves as? Why 'the broad church' of course!

FRASER MISREPRESENTS MENZIES

On Target 7 August 1987: In *Crime and Punishment*, famed Russian novelist Fyodor Dostoyevsky depicts with brilliant insight the criminal's compulsion to confess. It is not surprising that the Communists, the greatest mass murderers in the history of the world, share this compulsion– though their moments of candour have more the air of bragadoccio than penitence. To a man, the Soviet leaders from Lenin to Gorbachev have boasted of their intentions to enslave the world. Unlike the common criminal, however, who expects to be punished for the crimes to which he confesses, or to be restrained from the commission of those he has acknowledged plotting, the Communist who publishes his evil deeds and evil plans seems confident that he will go unchallenged. His impunity derives from the inability of his intended victim to understand his motivation.
- - F.R. Duplantier in a review of Richard Wurmbrandt's book, *Marx and Satan*

Following his dismissal by the Australian electors, Malcolm Fraser sought a new public platform from which to project himself, and welcomed the invitation by his successor, Prime Minister Hawke, to become an "Eminent Person" and to give vent to his almost pathological hatred of South Africa. It was the Fraser government, which directed that Qantas cease flying to South Africa. We warned at the time that Malcolm Fraser's display of "morality" was not being matched by African states, which still maintained direct air links with South Africa.

Malcolm Fraser and his fellow "Eminent Persons" led the campaign for total sanctions against South Africa, but Fraser's friends of the "front line States" have deserted him, Dr. Kaunda of Zambia recently stating, "It is quite clear that sanctions on air links will not work."

Undeterred by the failure of his anti-South African policy, Malcolm Fraser has directed his attention to the problems of the Federal Liberal Party. Following the recent elections, the man who led the Liberals to disaster, modestly offered to provide "leadership" as Federal President.

Outlining his views on how the Liberal Party should be re-organised, Malcolm Fraser indicates that he would like a Liberal Party structured similar to the Labor Party. He wants more "discipline", which means even less independence for M.P.s than exists now.

Like Bob Hawke, who praises Labor Prime Minister John Curtin betraying everything Curtin represented, Malcolm Fraser invokes the spirit of Robert Menzies, founder of the Liberal Party, while supporting policies, which Menzies would reject. In a recent interview with Geoff Kitney of *Times on Sunday* (August 2nd) Malcolm Fraser said: *(continued on next page)*

(continued from previous page)

"Menzies formed the Liberal Party by the drawing together of a number of disparate groups." The many groups, which Menzies brought together, were motivated and united primarily in their opposition to the centralist policies of the Chifley Government. The Menzies Government had many failings, most of these resulting from a blind spot concerning financial orthodoxy. But, unlike Malcolm Fraser, who played a major role in undermining Australia's traditional immigration policies in favour of the multicultural society, Menzies was a staunch supporter of a predominantly homogeneous European nation, with a high Anglo-Saxon content. Malcolm Fraser is on record as saying that he was pleased that the Anglo Saxon element in Australia was being weakened. Malcolm Fraser has a point when, in criticising Rupert Murdoch, he says:

"We ought to be enraged by someone giving up something as precious as Australian citizenship for a business deal..." But the same Malcolm Fraser was responsible for putting part of Australia, South West Tasmania, under the World Heritage Commission, preparing the way for the historic High Court decision, which, in essence, said that the original spirit of the Federal Constitution was dead. And it was the same Malcolm Fraser who strongly supported the international programme for building the New International Economic Order. Fraser says that if not invited back to play a significant role in Australian domestic policies he still intends to play a role in international affairs. The only role Malcolm Fraser can play is one which meets with the approval of David Rockefeller and his fellow Trilateralists. **Yes Andrew, Liberals are no more. They are all Leftists now!** ***

TARGET FOR THE WEEK

'Asylum seekers' take us for mugs: Keith Moor, Advertiser

Lying boat people granted asylum in Australia after claiming their lives were in danger in Iran have been busted returning to their homeland for holidays - but the Immigration Minister has been blocked from booting them out of our country.

The Advertiser can reveal the Administrative Appeals Tribunal has repeatedly foiled Peter Dutton's attempts to deport six Iranians who paid people smugglers to get to Australia then falsely claimed their lives were under threat.

One man who claimed on arrival he was at real risk of execution has made three return trips to Iran after getting his Australian visa, including one visit to get married under Islamic law. an event conducted by the Iranian authorities he claimed to be terrified of.

Another claimed to be on an Iranian wanted list but the Immigration Department later discovered the person was in no danger by returning to Iran and was an economic migrant rather than a genuine refugee, while a couple claimed to have no identification documents and said they would be killed if they returned to Iran but returned on valid Iranian passports.

Despite accepting the asylum seekers lied to authorities, the tribunal still overturned the decisions by the minister to deport them and allowed them all to stay in Australia.

The revelations will put further pressure on the tribunal, already under fire for overturning thousands of visa decisions made by Mr Dutton or his delegate in the past year.

Here is a good case on which actionists will be keen to make an effort. Minister Dutton has uncovered absolute dishonesty among some asylum seekers. Their claims that they would be killed etc if they were forced to return home have been laid bare - they lied.

The Administrative Appeals Tribunal has on a number of occasions, prevented the common-sense approach by Minister Dutton, to deport these undesirable 'refugees'. Letters to the press, MP's, Senators (especially the cross-benchers) and of course Minister Peter Dutton should support the Minister's action and question the basis on which the Tribunal refused to allow the deportation of the offenders. Ask for the Tribunal to be reformed to reflect the justice that would be meted out to us if we faked a document. - ND

THE LEAGUE'S WEBSITE: — alor.org
blog.alor.org thecross-roads.org

Subscription to On Target $45.00 p.a.
NewTimes Survey $30.00 p.a.
and **Donations** can be performed **by bank transfer:**
Account details are:
A/c Title Victorian League of Rights
BSB 083-004
A/c No. 51-511-5296
or by cheques directed to:
'Victorian League of Rights'
or on the Veritasbooks.com.au website:
https://veritasbooks.com.au/cat/subscriptions

"On Target" is published by Australian League of Rights
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001.
Telephone: (03) 9600 0677 **email:** hub@alor.org
Head Office Hours - Monday and Tuesday 09.30am - 3.00pm

All electoral comment authorised by Ken Grundy, Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queen Street, Melbourne, 3000 Victoria

South Australia: Heritage Book-mailing Service,
P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.
Ph:08 7123 7131 **email:** heritagebooks@adam.com.au