



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

Registered for posting as a Publication —
Category "B"

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance —

Vol. 16 No. 45

November 30th, 1979.

Thought for the Week: "One measure of the physical capacity to produce was provided by the war when, while millions of people were engaged in combat, or activities sustaining combat, huge volumes of complex munitions, and ships and aircraft and transport vehicles were continuously produced and destroyed. In terms of consumer durables, the ships, aircraft, tanks, bombs, shells, small arms ammunition, etc., represent an enormous wealth of cars, pleasure-craft, household goods and furnishings, domestic labour-saving devices, and so on. Yet in America during the war the standard of living actually rose - because the distribution of income in relation to articles which did not come on to the market - munitions of all kinds. So the 'cost' of carrying on a war is a financial measure of the capacity to produce. This clearly demonstrates that the economic problem is not the 'equitable' redistribution of an inadequate production, but the artificial restraints placed upon potential production, in the interests of 'management' - people management."

- B.W. Monahan, in Alternative to Disaster (1972)

IS THE AYATOLLAH AN EXPENDABLE PAWN IN THE WORLD POWER GAME? "Iran has enormous economic and political problems. It is a fragmented polity. At the moment, the dominant political force in the country is the religious movement led by Khomeini... but there are serious conflicts...."

-Zalmay Khalilzad, in The Wall St. Journal, Nov. 14th
Zalmay Khalilzad is an assistant professor of political science, and a member of the Institute of War and Peace studies at Columbia University (U.S.A.). He has raised many queries about the Ayatollah Khomeini which have occurred to us. The Ayatollah Khomeini controls large parts of Iran through a network of more than 1500 committees and some 60,000 mullahs; but there are serious conflicts, as Khalilzad says, within the religious movement, and there are a number of other political groups challenging Khomeini's control over Iran. One is the Marxist Fedayeen, which has the support of some 10,000

armed guerrillas (doubtless armed by Communist nations). Another potential contender for power is the guerrilla group called the Mujahedeen which follows a mish-mash of ideology, mainly drawn from Marxism and Islam. A particular security problem for Iran stems from the multiplicity of armed ethnic minorities - some of which have been in active revolt over past months: e.g. the Kurds. Who supplies them with arms? The Kurds even have tanks, and anti-aircraft guns! The Communist Tudeh party, which has support in critical areas such as the oil facilities, is also challenging the Khomeini regime. There are still other groups, including Westernised moderates in the National Front who favour a social democratic system and who have the support of a significant number of technocrats, but which lack the military capability to challenge the current regime. All these challenges to the Khomeini Government are accompanied by disarray in the Iranian armed forces.

Given the unstable situation, allowing the Shah into the United States might well have increased Khomeini's fear that the United States is plotting with the Shah to take advantage of his Government's difficulties. The Ayatollah is obsessed with fear of an American-sponsored military coup as conditions deteriorate within Iran.

The American Administration might try to defuse the present crisis by making a reaffirmation that it has no intention of interfering in Iran's internal affairs, nor in rendering aid to Khomeini's opponents nor in furthering the return of the Shah to power. President Carter could try such a placatory initiative in Iran. We recall President Kennedy's pledges to the Cubans and Russians in 1962 in exchange for Soviet withdrawal of their missiles from Cuba. However, the rot in the American Administration is deeper now than in 1962.

Zalmay Khalizad observes that it is quite possible that Ayatollah Khomeini did not plan the takeover of the embassy in Iran. He has, however, used the situation to mobilise large segments of the population and to consolidate his weakening position. We have expected the Ayatollah to become more fanatical to hold his position, and agree that Khomeini's principal motive in holding the hostages, or rather in allowing them to be held, thus defying the United States, could be to buttress his own position of authority within Iran.

We can be sure that the Kremlin is watching all the power play, swirling around the Ayatollah, intently. There could be many opportunities for the Kremlin as he loses his grip, and the armed services sink into disarray. We have always suspected that the Ayatollah is intended to be but a temporary focus of power for a particular purpose. He mobilised the anti-Shah forces within Iran; and he has seen the rug pulled from under the Shah by the Americans, as was reported earlier this year in *On Target*. There is no doubt in our mind that Iran is being prepared for an eventual Marxist revolution. Yet another time-bomb is ticking away in the Middle East.

MR. HAWKE DEFINES MERE EFFECTS OF FINANCE-ECONOMIC SYSTEM: 'That (full employment) cement is crumbling and, as it crumbles, we can discern the beginnings of fracture in our society. Indeed, it is not difficult to perceive the emergence of two societies - the employed and the unemployed....'

- Mr. R. Hawke, extract from Third A.B.C. Boyer Lecture.

The Age - Melbourne November 26th.

Mr. Hawke, in this third A.B.C. Boyer Lecture, concentrated on two issues: the status of women, and the effects of technology. We have no intention of participating in the Women's Debate of the 1970's except to observe that we believe most women would prefer to be women. In fact there is an organisation of Christian, conservative women in Australia, the name of which is "Women Who Want to be Women". As this is the United Nations Decade for Women, no doubt Mr. Hawke felt it appropriate to make an issue of the role of women in the workplace. We wonder what the attitude of most women would be if they were provided with a genuine choice concerning their role in society. If the economic necessity for a wife and mother to work were "magically" removed, would she still, out of choice, "prop up the economy and standard of living"? We have the greatest doubts. Over one third of the "work force" in Australia now consists of women, and of this figure, over 40% are married. We have read, sympathetically, all of Mr. Hawke's assertions with respect to "discrimination" against women, and consider that these are to some extent, exaggerated. The truth is that there are many tasks for which women, because they ARE women, are not suited. One could talk and argue about this till the cows come home, and it is difficult to withhold the question: "if women really wanted to enter a man's world, why has it taken all these thousands of years for them to do so? On the other hand, we believe that there are many tasks for which men are not suited - because they are MEN. There certainly has been discrimination against women in the past. Women were not allowed to own property in some societies. Women were not allowed to take part in government. Many anomalies like this. Silly things!

If women now want to enter the professions they can. There are very many clever women at the top of their chosen professions, in medicine, Law, politics, and in the business world.. What irks us is that the Women's Liberation issue is exaggerated by the Lefties, and used to radicalise women. The present spate of Women's Conferences now taking place around Australia provides a good example of that: we reported on this recently in these pages.

Mr. Hawke is, rightly enough, praising the role of women in the work force. Our comment is that this, in itself, is an effect of the present finance-economic system, and that their percentage, from choice, would be vastly less.

Nothing will stop the continuing technological revolution. The League of Rights foretold this as long ago as the early 1950s in a brochure it issued at the time. Indeed, Mr. Hawke is quite correct we believe, when he speaks of the coming of two societies: the employed and the unemployed. He does not suggest ways of dealing with the implications apart from summit conferences of government, employer and trade organisations etc. What are they going to do?! The way out has been outlined by other thinkers, apart from C.H. Douglas who foretold this state of affairs some sixty years ago. Now a prominent British historian has pointed to the same path, and this is given prominence in the latest issue of Enterprise (December) which accompanies the December issue of The New Times, the League's monthly journal of political economy. We urge those supporters who are not subscribers to The New Times to ask for this December issue. Price: \$1.00 posted from your nearest League office.

BRIEF COMMENTS: Dr. Michael Bialoguski, former Australian secret agent who was a central figure in the Petrov affair of 1954, has said that he does not accept one piece of Professor Antony Blunt's confession. Neither do we. There are many unanswered questions to the nasty business which we shall probably never know.

He also has described the incompetence of Australia's security head personnel at the time of the Petrov affair as "frightening". We wonder if it is still frightening?

We have no reason to be convinced that our security forces understand the trained Communist mind; and we think that Dr. Bialoguski is right enough when he describes the permanent armed service officers, and senior public servants - the type of men from whom very many security personnel are chosen - as "babes-in-the-woods".

BASIC FUND: The state of the Fund now, is that over the week past, twelve supporters have pledged/donated \$1460, to take the Fund to \$15,662. This means that we are over one third of the way to reaching our target of \$45,000.

Supporters will bear in mind that we have deliberately kept the Fund target down to \$45,000 again this year, in spite of inflation, as some of the League activities, themselves, can and do generate income for the League.

W.A. supporters please send donations to P.O. Box 16, Inglewood, W.A. 6052. In Queensland and Northern N.S.W. donations to Mr. Jeremy Lee, P.O. Ravensbourne, Qld, 4352. All others to G.P.O., Box 1052J, Melbourne, Vic. 3001.