



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

Registered
for posting
as a periodical
Category B.

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—

Vol. 9 No. 1

January 19th, 1973.

Thought for the Week: "Modern education, press, and propaganda have almost eradicated memory. If the public memory could last ten years, few ministers would hold office twice. If the public memory could last ten weeks, how many newspapers would be read for the accuracy of their news, or the consistency of their opinions?"

- The Earl of Northbourne in Alternative to Death. (1943)

THE DANGEROUS MYTH OF "PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE": Most of the major developments of the international scene during 1972 flowed from the Nixon mission to Peking and Moscow and what appeared to superficial observers as a dramatic and historic change of attitude towards International Communism by the policy-makers in the U.S.A. But as shown by Cleon Skousen in The Naked Capitalist and Gary Allen in None Dare Call It Conspiracy, the Nixon mission of early 1972 was but the open continuation of a long-term policy of financing Western economic support to the Communist Empire. Without this support the Communist Empire would have collapsed long ago and the present state of the world would be rather different.

It is now known that the massive American credits to both Peking and Moscow were essential for the Communists to import the huge supplies of grain desperately required to avert the threat of large-scale famine. Collectivised farming and drought had brought the Marxist planners face to face with a disaster which had serious internal political implications. The Soviet leaders had the problem of open mounting unrest amongst many of their oppressed national groups. But instead of using the internal Soviet crisis to apply pressure for real concessions in exchange for wheat, the policy makers in the U.S.A. did exactly the opposite. A chain of astonishing events then unfolded, one of the highlights being the visit by Mr. James Needham, Chairman of the New York Stock Exchange, to Moscow in October to discuss with Soviet officials the credit they would require from Wall Street.

It was Mr. "Victor Louis" - his real name appears to be unknown - the mysterious Jewish courier from the Kremlin who used his position as Moscow correspondent for the London Evening News to "leak" the news in September that a "break-through" had taken place in the trade negotiations between Dr. Henry Kissinger and the Soviet leaders. "Louis" also revealed that the Soviet's repayment of war debts to the U.S.A. had been "cleared" and that apart from credits for wheat imports, there had also been a multi-billion oil deal. Subsequent developments proved the "Louis" report correct.

The Japanese quickly followed the American lead, offering to provide both China and the Soviet Union with credits for joint economic enterprises, such as the exploitation of Soviet natural gas. The Western European nations were also invited to provide credits to assist the Communist Empire. They readily responded, claiming that their exports would be beneficial to all concerned.

Either eating, or conveniently forgetting his own previous harsh comments about the Peking Communists, the British Foreign Minister, Sir Alex Douglas Hume, quickly got in the growing line-up of all those wishing to kow-tow to Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. Australia's former "very, very anti-Communist" Prime Minister, Mr. W. McMahon, also indicated that he was interested in "normalising" relations with Peking.

Where is this acceleration of the development of economic links between the Communist and non-Communist nations leading? The notoriously short-sighted business men reply that by increasing exports to the Communist Empire the non-Communists are contributing towards the "easing of world tensions". Gullible and wishful thinkers, mentally drugged by the mass media, murmur about "peaceful co-existence" and how much better the world looks since the "cold war thaw" and the nasty "Fascist extremist" Senator McCarthy died after being "thoroughly discredited". If only "extreme Right-wing" organisations like the League of Rights would go away, all would be well.

But how do the Marxist power-lusters in Moscow, Peking and elsewhere see the situation? It is only necessary to read what the Marxist policy makers are saying to know the answer. They are informing the Marxist faithful that increasing economic contacts with the "capitalist nations" does not mean that the classical Leninist definition of peaceful co-existence has been abandoned. Every good Marxist-Leninist knows that such co-existence merely proves the superiority of the Soviet economic system over the "decadent" capitalist system. And did not Lenin observe that a World Communist State was impossible without an international economic system? Both Moscow and Peking are sustaining and where possible expanding their international programme of subversion and revolution. "Liberation" movements and "freedom fighters" are backed in every possible way. Special attention is being given to Southern Africa. Moscow has been preparing for some time for the internal explosion it believes will come in Yugoslavia when Tito dies. The Soviet will then invade Yugoslavia to impose the same "Brezhnev Doctrine" applied to Czechoslovakia. The self-styled intellectuals of the world will "tut-tut" as usual, but denounce as "extremist" and "enemies of world peace" those who point out that Moscow power men have not changed and must be resisted at some time if complete world tyranny is to be averted.

The truth is that no genuine Marxist can believe in real "peaceful co-existence". As Lenin said, the Marxist must regard it as a tactic of warfare which must be waged to the death against the free society. The Marxist believes that the "inherent contradictions" of the "capitalist" system make growing conflict inevitable, this leading ultimately to the establishment of Socialism. But the most insidious and destructive social and economic policies undermining the free society, continuing inflation, is not inevitable. Those who accept this view have no realistic defence to offer against Marxist pressure, both international and national.

So far from the events of 1972 taking mankind towards greater security and prospects of a genuine peace based upon freedom, they have intensified the advance towards more social conflict, disintegration and tyranny. In a special document issued by the Soviet Central Committee last year, warning party members against accepting the Western view that the coming security talks were evidence of a period of genuine peaceful co-existence, a 1971 statement by Brezhnev is quoted:

"In striving to uphold the principle of peaceful co-existence we are aware that the success in this important matter in no way signifies the possibility of a relaxation of the ideological struggle. On the contrary, we must be prepared for this struggle intensifying and becoming an increasingly acute form of antagonism between the two social systems."

"ON TARGET"

January 19th, 1973.

Page 2 (2)

It is a hard New Year message to report that the struggle concerning freedom is going to be intensified, not modified by the events of the past twelve months. But as we were told a long time ago, it is the Truth which makes men free. There was never a greater need for those who value their freedom and Civilisation to face the truth about the realities of the world.

THE BOOK OF THE MOMENT....

It was inevitable that Rhodesia would eventually be forced by events back to the centre of the world stage. Following the International Marxist "line", the Whitlam Government is joining in to assist the mounting international campaign against Rhodesia. As the major basis of this campaign is that the Rhodesian Government is "illegal", Dr. Walter Henderson's brilliant book, Rhodesia. A Re-Orientaton of Australian Policy, is essential reading. As yet not one of the Rhodesian critics has even attempted to answer the eminent author. Ask your MP can he provide an answer. Test the self-styled intellectuals. Try it on your local editor. Always have a copy ready for ready reference. Price 62 cents posted from all League addresses.

HOW BIG WAS THE WHITLAM GOVERNMENT'S KOW-TOW TO PEKING?: "Australia has agreed to 23 of 29 demands by China as the price of becoming friends with Peking, says a professor. The Federal Government has not yet announced terms of the pact it signed with Peking on December 21." - The Sun, Melbourne, January 12th.

Professor Marchant is associate professor of Chinese history at the University of West Australia, has been studying Chinese cultural history for about 18 years and has published several books on the subject. His latest is Mainland China Today. In 1971 he became the first Australian to be appointed Associate Visiting Professor of Taiwan's research institute of Modern History in Taipeh.

After studying the Peking reports of what has transpired between Canberra and Peking, Professor Marchant alleges that Australia agreed to the following as part of the agreement with Red China:

- * Attack the U.S. for its Vietnam bombing and condemn it for its involvement in the war.
- * Condemn and apply sanctions to Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal.
- * Agreed to the downgrading of Taiwan to a province of China and the removal of Australian official representation from Taiwan before January 25th.

The recognition pact between Australia and China was signed in Paris on December 21st, by the Chinese Ambassador to France, Mr. Huang Chen, and the Australian Ambassador to France, Mr. Alan Renouf. All the available evidence indicated that the Whitlam Government was prepared to rush into an agreement as quickly as possible, making concessions which other countries have not been prepared to make. For example, Japan refused to expel officials from Taiwan and has subsequently maintained its valuable trade links with Taiwan. Japan also insisted that in its agreement with China that this was not aimed at other Powers, thus enabling it to maintain a neutralist stance.

Professor Marchant comments that "There is no indication that Australia stood firm on Peking's demand for Canberra to confiscate Taiwan's properties in Australia, but facts about this are obscure... Canberra publicly conceded too much before it commenced to negotiate. In particular it withdrew from Taiwan. It acted like a poker player who threw away his aces and then invited the other player "ON TARGET"

January 19th, 1973.

Page 3 (3)

to sit down and play. Then, having made one concession, it was forced to throw away all the colored cards before play commenced, with the real difficulty being that all along China was not, in fact, going to play poker but something else." (The Advertiser, Adelaide, January 13th)

The Peking Communists did not even make any firm trade agreement with Mr. Whitlam's Government in exchange for his grovelling attitude, one which has no doubt been carefully noted by Indonesia and the other nations of South-East Asia. A genuinely strong independent Australia would be providing a lead to the nations of South-East Asia, not bending so readily to the will of Peking.

Mr. Whitlam and his associates have had much to say about "open government". Concerned Australians look forward to the Australian Prime Minister frankly telling the Australian people of the details of the agreement reached with Peking. And they would also like to know if Dr. Jim Cairns is speaking for the Government when he says that recognition of North Vietnam is inevitable. Does this view reflect yet another Peking wish? This statement by Dr. Cairns, and the subsequent statement that North Vietnamese Communists are coming to Australia as the guests of the Australian Association for International Co-operation and Disarmament, can only help to further convince the peoples of South-East Asia that Australia is more concerned with placating the Communists than with their future. Australians should rally behind the RSL policy of protesting strongly against this type of defeatism.

REFERENDUM ON GREATER INDUSTRIAL POWER FOR CANBERRA?: "Brisbane - The Federal Government may seek wider industrial power by referendum. The Labor Minister, Mr. Cameron, said this yesterday."

- The Sun, Melbourne, January 12th.

The Commonwealth Government already has more than adequate powers to remove the major causes of industrial unrest - progressive inflation. If the Labor-Socialists do hold a referendum to seek greater powers for Canberra it will be interesting to see how many Liberal-Socialists and Members of the Country Party support the proposal. Mr. McMahon indicated before the Federal Elections that he was in favour of this policy of further centralising power. We are confident that in a clear-cut vote on the subject of giving more power to Canberra, the sturdy commonsense of the Australian electors will prevail. We will be in the forefront of the campaign of opposition to any increase of powers for Canberra. Canberra's powers should be reduced and those of the States and Municipal Government increased. This would enable the individual to have more say over his own affairs.

PASS THAT FINANCIAL "AMMUNITION" - QUICKLY!

The League of Rights' 1973 strategy is already fashioned. The major battle fronts have been selected. It will be a year of historic decisions. But no war can be fought without an adequate flow of ammunition. Since our last issue 74 supporters have contributed \$1704.64 to the Basic Fund of \$25,000. We trust that we can shortly report that the Fund has been filled. Northern N.S.W. and Queensland contributions to Box 17, Alderley, Queensland, 4051. All others to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

"On Target" is published by the Australian League of Rights, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.
Subscription rate \$4.00 per annum. W. & J. Barr (Printers) Pty. Ltd.
