



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—

Vol. 9 No. 42

November 9th, 1973

Thought for the Week: "A great civilization is not conquered from without until it has destroyed itself within . . ."

—Dr. Will Durant, in "The Story of Civilization, Vol. 111

THE WHITLAM KOW-TOW IN PEKING: "More than 100,000 Chinese gave an emotional and colorful welcome to the Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, when he arrived in Peking today. Children, workers and students turned up to greet Mr. Whitlam and other Australians chanted 'welcome, welcome, warm welcome Australian Prime Minister Whitlam and distinguished visitors', as Mr. Whitlam left his Qantas jet."

—From a "Special Correspondent" in "The Australian", November 1st

The Chinese Communist leaders know their Mr. Whitlam, and organised a typical highly disciplined demonstration for the benefit of the vain Australian Prime Minister. The Peking strategists, like their competing fellow Communist strategists in Moscow, are well aware of the vital importance of Australia in their global conceptions. And there are the vital food and mineral supplies which Dr. Jim Cairns is ensuring that the Communists obtain under the best possible terms.

The "Special Correspondent" in "The Australian" said that the welcome given to Mr. Whitlam "was far bigger than that given President Nixon and reportedly is bigger than that for Canada's Mr. Trudeau." Which demonstrates that Chairman Mao and his fellow Communists, men responsible for the murder of millions, rate Mr. Whitlam more highly than either Mr. Nixon or Mr. Trudeau. But they have organised even bigger welcomes for other political leaders. Special attention has been given to African leaders.

The Australian "Special Correspondent" also reported that the Chinese welcomed Mr. Whitlam "in a style reminiscent of the greeting Australia gave the Queen in 1954." He neglected to point out that the Government of Australia does not have to organise the Australian people to turn out to welcome the Queen on her visits to Australia. In spite of a very low-key approach by the media, over a million people turned out recently to see the Queen drive through Sydney and open the Sydney Opera House. We predict that Her Majesty will receive the same warm, spontaneous welcome when she visits Australia again, early next year.

While Prime Minister Whitlam has been quick to react to the tremendous display of Australian support for Monarchy, as did Prime Minister Trudeau early this year when

Canadians also demonstrated that they want no Republican Watergates, he showed his contempt for the democracy he prates about when he asked the Chinese Communists to play his own selection of a new Australian National Anthem when he arrived in Peking. Perhaps he felt that in doing this he was demonstrating to his Communist hosts his own brand of the "new nationalism".

We have no doubt that Chou En-lai was sincere when he told Mr. Whitlam, "I am glad to welcome you back on your second visit and in your present capacity. The visit has shown that your perspectives of that time were correct." It was the same Chou En-lai who offered to attempt to influence the last Federal Elections by cancelling a wheat sale negotiated while the McMahon Government was in office. And it was the same Chou En-lai who, together with his colleagues, backed the abortive Communist coup in Indonesia in 1965.

In his statement upon arriving back in Australia, Mr. Whitlam said that his visit to China "marked the end of a generation of neurotic fears and lost opportunities." Presumably the people of Indonesia were amongst those experiencing unfounded fears as the Peking-backed Communists sought to seize control of the country. Chou En-lai and his fellow revolutionaries must have smiled to themselves at the thought of Mr. Whitlam offering to "explain" their policies to those nations of South-East Asia who do not recognise Peking. Mr. Whitlam's offer is but one more example of this man's incredible conceit and vanity. The nations of South-East Asia are painfully aware of Peking's real policies. So far from accepting Mr. Whitlam's statement that "I believe the example of fruitful relations between China and Australia will be reassuring to the Asian nations", the leaders of these nations are more likely to regard the Whitlam Government as a victim of dangerous self-delusions—if not worse.

If Mr. Whitlam really believes that "Australia has now set up a firm and cordial friendship with a Government representing a quarter of the earth's population", he is capable of believing anything. It would be instructive to learn what method Chairman Mao and his colleagues use to ascertain if they are representing the Chinese people. Why the "Bamboo Curtain?"

Eulogising Mr. Whitlam for "having established himself as an international Australian of rare, if controversial, repute", "The Australian" of November 5th claimed that one of Mr. Whitlam's achievements was to confront "Mao face to face with a protest against China's nuclear tests." But according to Mr. Laurie Oakes, representing "The Sun", Melbourne, it was Chairman Mao who raised the question of the tests himself, asking Mr. Whitlam and Chou En-lai if they had dealt with the tests in their long series of talks. Oakes reports that "Mr. Whitlam said they had not but since the chairman had brought up the subject, he wanted to state clearly Australia's attitude." Mr. Whitlam's "forceful presentation" amounted to no more than the same type of verbal wrist-slapping used earlier by Dr. Jim Cairns. There was, of course, no suggestion whatever of the Whitlam Government treating the Peking Government as it had the French Government. No talk of trade boycotts, no cutting off of mails. No wonder Chairman Mao was smiling at the end of his talk with Prime Minister Whitlam. And why shouldn't he? He had helped Mr. Whitlam to score a little propaganda. But in exchange Mr. Whitlam was going to attempt to "sell" his Communist criminal Government as one which all reasonable people could accept. And Mr. Whitlam had also discussed with Chou En-lai what was to be done about Southern Africa, one of Peking's special targets for destruction.

If real history is written, it will record the Whitlam 1973 visit to Communist China as one of the most dangerous pieces of kow-towing ever performed by a Western political leader.

“MURPHY ABSURD ON THE RHODESIA QUESTION”: “Senator Murphy has expressed the opinion that the Rhodesian Government is a rebel Government; that is to say, a Government in rebellion against the Crown in respect of Rhodesia. Senator Murphy is talking as if it were a case of rebellion against the Crown in respect of Australia. As the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth of Australia it is neither proper nor licit for him to talk in such a way. The Anglo-Rhodesian constitutional case gives rise to English law only. Senator Murphy is not an English lawyer. I am. No member of the Rhodesian Government has at any time committed an act of rebellion or treason. This view is accepted by English lawyers and by the Crown law offices.”

—Dr. Walter Henderson in a letter in “The Age”, Melbourne, of September 21st

Next Sunday, November 11th, marks the eighth anniversary of the Rhodesian declaration of independence. British Labor Prime Minister Harold Wilson predicted that sanctions would bring down the “illegal” Rhodesian Government within a few months. Wilson had to eat his own words. In spite of difficulties, and mounting Communist-backed terrorist attacks, Rhodesia has now survived eight years in the face of an international campaign of unrelenting virulence. It is a blot on Australia’s national honour that the Whitlam Government should now be a front-runner for the International Communist campaign against Rhodesia, a country in which there are many people of Australian background.

Senator Murphy is indeed absurd on the Rhodesian question as so brilliantly shown by Dr. Henderson. It is significant that no reply was attempted to his “Age” letter of September 21st, commenting upon a statement by Senator Murphy in the Senate on September 12th, when he claimed that it was “conceded on all sides” that “in Rhodesia there is rebellious illegal regime”. As Dr. Henderson wrote, “No Parliament in Australia has legislative power over Rhodesia. Accordingly, the Commonwealth Parliament has no power to overrule, with legal effect either within Rhodesia or in Australia, the Rhodesian judgments which decided that the Rhodesian Government is lawful.”

There is no better way in which Rhodesian well-wishers can commemorate Rhodesia’s eighth year of independence than by obtaining copies of Dr. Henderson’s brilliant booklet, “Rhodesia”, and by making use of it. They should also take up with Opposition Members and Senators the question of why they do not oppose the Whitlam Government’s pro-Rhodesian policy on Rhodesia. (Dr. Henderson’s book is 57 cents posted.)

MASS MEDICATION FOR VICTORIANS: “Fluoridation of Victoria’s water supplies will start early next year. Legislation giving the Public Health Commission power to order water supply authorities to fluoridate went before State Parliament yesterday. The Bill provides for fines of between \$200 and \$1000 for breaches of the Act and a further daily penalty of \$40 for a continuing offence.”—“The Sun”, Melbourne, November 1st.

We are not competent to express any opinions on the medical and scientific aspects of fluoridation. But certain facts and fundamental principles are beyond dispute.

The World Health Organisation and other organisations have proclaimed that fluoridation of public water supplies reduces dental decay and is completely safe. But a large number of reputable scientific and medical organisations have opposed fluoridation of public water

supplies. Some of the world's most qualified experts on fluorides, like Dr. D. Steyn of South Africa, have warned against fluoridation of public water supplies. One of Australia's most eminent dental authorities, a man who gave the subject deep study, Professor Sir Arthur Amies, has remained unconvinced by the claims of the fluoridationists. The internationally-recognised nutritional authority, Sir Stanton Hicks, former Professor of Physiology at the Adelaide University, has strongly opposed fluoridation of water supplies on a number of grounds, stressing that mass medication of the whole community is contrary to medical principles and ethics. He agrees that decay can be reduced by the use of fluoride, but that it should be administered to children on an individual basis. Some people are allergic even to fluoridated tooth paste.

Claims for impressive reductions in tooth decay are based upon statistics. Dr. Phillip Sutton, Melbourne research dentist, who originally accepted the claims of the fluoridationists, did a research project on the data used by the fluoridationists, and showed how their claims could not be sustained by their own statistics. The Melbourne University Press published his findings in 1960. A recent examination of data provided by the fluoridationists in the United Kingdom proved that all that they demonstrated was the decay was being delayed.

Exaggerated claims by some anti-fluoridationists have been used to obscure the basic fact that fluoridation of public water supplies is compulsory mass medication. Most of the fluorides will be poured on to gardens, down the drains and consumed by adults. This is, of course, good business for those supplying the fluorides. But surely it is a most wasteful and unscientific manner of allegedly improving children's teeth. Before the Victorian State Elections Premier R. Hamer, one of the idols of the trendy small-l liberals now dominating the Liberal Party in Victoria, clearly stated in letters that the Victorian Liberal Party had no policy for fluoridation of public water supplies. But like an increasing number of present-day politicians, once the elections were safely won, Mr. Hamer reversed himself.

It is not without significance that although the Marxists and their philosophical blood brothers have been quick to exploit all problems of pollution, they are strangely silent on Premier Hamer's new version of Liberal policy.

The Marxists support fluoridation because it is but another step down the collectivist road to the Slave State. Victorians opposed to having fluorides, or any other form of medication, however good it might be for them, imposed upon them without a say, should let their political servants know they insist upon freedom-of-choice.

One final point: If some dentists—not all of them—are successful in helping to rob the individual of freedom of choice concerning fluoridation of their water supplies, we hope that the same dentists will not have the effrontery to protest when it comes for their turn to be socialised by Big Brother!

"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.