

ON TARGET

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY ON THE COLD WAR

"We will bury you ... your children will grow up under Communism ..." Krushchev.

FALSEHOODS
DISTORTIONS
SUPPRESSION

Registered at the G.P.O. Melbourne for transmission by post as a periodical.

Vol. 2. No.39.

28th October, 1966.

Thought for the Week: Beware of the half truth: particularly the wrong half.

Anon.

THE KOREANS AND THE MANILA CONFERENCE: Now that the turmoil and shouting of the L.B.J. tour is completed we should turn our minds back to the ostensible objective behind the staging of such a circus. We take it that all parties gathering at Manila were sincere in searching for a concrete and lasting peace.

There is no excuse now for ignorance of what Communism's basis for "peace" is: Communist "peace" is total victory - for Communism. Any negotiations, truce or treaty, entered into will have this objective as its end.

Against the realism of the Communists we note the attitude of President Johnson at Manila. "We must remember this: It takes only one side to begin a war. It takes two sides to end it, short of unconditional surrender." "When a decision is made by the other side to seek its goals through peaceful means - not through terror and violence - we shall be first at the conference table." Melbourne "Age" 24.10.66.

We have been assured by Mr. Arthur Goldberg, America's delegate to the U.N. that negotiation with the National Liberation Front will be accepted by the Americans. Thus the American policy is to wait for the Communists to take the initiative. The main point of agreement at Manila - to accept the principle of partition is further victory for the Communists, it establishes them as acceptable, and opens the way for the future advance from a secure base.

The only realism displayed at Manila came from the South Koreans who declared that there was only one way to deal with the Communists "to hit them, and hit them, again" until defeated. It appears that we will have to learn the same lesson the Koreans were taught before we achieve the same sense of realism.

MR. ST JOHN Q.C. EXPOSES HIMSELF: In our issue of the 14th October we commented on the strange and disturbing case of Mr. Edward St. John Q.C.

endorsed Liberal candidate for the blue ribbon seat of Warringah at the coming Federal Elections, who as President of the South African Defence and Aid Fund in Australia, has associated himself with visiting African Nationalist Congress representative, Mr. Robert Resha. Mr. St John has refused to accept established facts about Mr. Resha. But now he has gone further. In a long letter in "The Daily News-Pictorial" of October 12, Mr. St John not only attempts to defend himself against many local critics, but he attempts to smear Mr. Eric Butler. "The Daily News-Pictorial" is a local paper circulating in the electorate of Warringah.

Following a comment on the type of people allegedly opposing him - "the people who bring nothing but discredit to the anti-Communist cause" - Mr. St John continues: "For those who wish to read more about them and their activities I recommend 'Voices of Hate', by K.D. Gott, and the authoritative article in 'Quadrant' of March-April, 1966 entitled 'Australia's Radical Right.'" The article in "Quadrant" was special smear effort by Mr. Isi Leibler, who was subsequently taken very strongly to task by Sir Wilfrid Kent-Hughes, M.P., and by Mr. George Bracken, well-known aboriginal. Mr. Leibler has also recommended the Gott hate booklet.

In a letter to "The Daily News-Pictorial" Mr. Eric Butler has observed that Mr. St John is recommending a smear booklet also recommended by the Communist Party. Mr. Butler refers to Mr. Gott's past Communist background and the history of the hate booklet, and asks, "I hope that Liberal Party supporters in Warringah will ask Mr. St John how he justifies recommending a hatchet booklet by a man like Mr. Ken Gott."

By recommending the Gott booklet in an attempt to defend his support for Mr. Robert Resha of the Communist-influenced African National Congress, Mr. St John has exposed himself to the charge of being at the very best extremely naive about Communism. It is distressing to consider the possibility of yet one more weak Liberal going to Canberra at the present critical time.

WHERE DOES MR. HOLT STAND ON RHODESIA? It is no secret at Canberra that Government Members, including Cabinet Members, express in private pro-Rhodesian views while making public statements to the contrary. This is part of the double-speak technique so prevalent today. Irrespective of the implied threats of trade or other sanctions, it is time that Australia supported policies which they believe to be right. Only such policies will serve the long term security of this nation. Which brings us to the question of just where does the Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Holt, stand on Rhodesia, one of the most important questions before the Free World today.

Government statements earlier this year indicated that the Holt Government was opposed to any increased sanctions against Rhodesia. But our attention has been drawn to a press report in "The Telegraph", Brisbane, of September 9, which quotes Mr. Holt at the Prime Ministers Conference in London saying: "I believe continued and tightened sanctions along the lines taken by the British Prime Minister, Mr. Wilson, will have the effect we desire. I and my country accept that." If Mr. Holt believes this, he must be as poorly informed on the situation in Rhodesia as he is about Australians supporting his Rhodesian policy. Increasing numbers of Australians are opposed to the economic war against Rhodesia.

Further in "The Telegraph" report Mr. Holt is also quoted as saying: "Because I am not convinced of the practicability of force and doubt the power of mandatory sanctions, I support the British Government's line of action." It must be inferred from this that the only reason Mr. Holt opposes force is because it would not be practical, not because it would be damnably immoral. Now as Mr. Wilson's policy clearly is not having the effect Mr. Holt says he desires, the question arises: "What is Mr. Holt going to do when Mr. Wilson attempts to take the Rhodesian question to the United Nations? This is one of the most important questions ever to face an Australian Government.

SOCIALISM ROTTS THE HEART OF BRITAIN: The rising severity of the economic restrictions of the British Socialist Government in its measures to implement a planned economy is not merely unfortunate. It is part of a pattern readily discernable in all countries of the world which have embarked on the socialist voyage. Far more conclusive than the relationship between cigarette smoking and lung cancer is that of socialism to failure.

The more complete the socialism the more widespread the restrictions on freedom, the lower the living standard, the more degenerate the morality and morale. The present tragic state of Britain is forecast in the foreword by Professor Frederick Hayek to the 1944 edition of his classic, "Road to Serfdom". "I should remind the reader that I have never accused the socialist parties of deliberately aiming at a totalitarian regime...What I have argued...is that the unforeseen but inevitable consequences of socialist planning create a state of affairs in which, if the policy is to be pursued, totalitarian forces will get the upper hand. I explicitly stress that socialism can be put into practice only by methods of which most socialists disapprove." Professor Hayek endorses the remarks of Mr. Ivor Thomas, an earlier defector from the socialist party, "in all its essentials not only is completed socialism the same as communism but it hardly differs from Fascism."

THE HYPOCRICY OF MR. ARTHUR GOLDBERG: "Let it be noted that this action by North Vietnam contravenes not only the United Nations Charter but also the terms of General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), adopted unanimously only last December and entitled 'Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protecting of their Independence and Sovereignty.'

"That resolution declares, among other things, that "no state has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal affairs of any other state." It further declares that 'no state shall organise, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed toward the violent overthrow of another state, or interfere in civil strife in another state.'" Mr. Arthur Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., on 22nd September, 1966.

In the same address Mr. Goldberg said that his Rhodesian policy was to oppose the 'minority' Government there and "to open the full power and responsibility of nationhood to the people of Rhodesia - not just 6 per cent of them."

Mr. Goldberg does not favour overthrowing the minority Government of Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam!

NEED TO SUPPORT DR. BANDA AND MALAWI: "I could not boycott Mozambique, Rhodesia or South Africa because there would be economic breakdown and political chaos here if I do." We refer again to our item in last week's "On Target". A further report from John Westoby in "The Australian" 21st October, Dr. Banda elaborates on his reasons, "Why? Simply because land-locked Malawi with its 3½ million Africans, Asians and Coloreds, and 9000 whites, needed these three countries."

Dr. Banda has given the lead which no other member of the Commonwealth has dared to give. The importance of this stand at present by Dr. Banda cannot be over estimated. Attempts to destroy Rhodesia or South Africa must help destroy Malawi. Is this what the Australian and other Governments desire?

It will be recalled that Dr. Banda in December 1964 expelled a group of Ministers who turned against him because he refused to accept Chinese "developmental aid". Australian politicians advocating trade (aid!) to China please note!

ON TARGET is published by the Australian League of Rights, Post Office Box 1052J, Melbourne. Subscription rate: \$4. per annum.

W & J Barr (Printers) Pty. Ltd. -