



IN THIS ISSUE

ANZAC Day and Nationhood [<i>On Target</i> 28 th April 1967]	1
Communism from the Inside By Douglas A Hyde (<i>Continued from previous issue</i>)	2

“It’s been said this mystery shall never cease: The priest promotes war, and the soldier peace.” – William Blake



ANZAC DAY AND NATIONHOOD [*On Target* 28th April 1967]



“To many of the younger generation the Anzac march was a spectacle largely meaningless...If it is meaningless, the reason is largely because their elders have not tried to enthuse them with the glory of their great traditions.”

“But we shall affirm that patriotism is rooted in the divine order...” A leading Church dignitary in *The Age* April 24th 1967

We are often told that Anzac Day, April 25 originating at the Gallipoli Peninsula in 1915, is the day Australia came of age and achieved Nationhood. There is some truth in this view and Anzac Day more than any other day in the calendar pinpoints for Australians the virtues, which we admire, tenacity, courage, sacrifice and loyalty to a common purpose. Nationalism and the solidarity, which comes from it, is the fruit of many factors.

A homogeneous population, a strong religious base, a broad agreement on loyalties, no serious political divisions; these are some of the essentials.

All these were present when Australians answered the call to join their British compatriots and fight beside them in the First World War. There was little or no dissension then, or in the 1939-45 extension of the 1914-18 war - although it should be remembered that an influential minority opposed the Australian war effort until Russia was attacked in 1941. But broadly we had national discipline and unity of purpose. In the twenty-two years that have elapsed since 1945, the basis of national strength in Australia, as in other parts of the civilised world, has been sapped of its inbuilt strengths, patriotism, religious belief; all of which are constantly attacked and are now in full retreat. It seems trite to point out that this erosion can only take place if the processes governing thought, understanding and the resultant spiritual values are perverted in the younger generation. ***



Historical images of Anzacs departing Albany in 1914. Source: City of Albany.

***“THE WAR BEHIND THE WAR, REAL NATURE OF THE OPPOSING FORCES”* E.D. Butler**

The military conflict raging to-day has much more deeply seated causes than those which, appear on the surface. The military conflict is only one part of a much bigger conflict which is taking place on a world front. It is a final clash between two fundamentally different philosophies, and the importance of understanding the real nature of these two opposing forces cannot be over-estimated. These two philosophies can rightly be termed the Christian philosophy and the Judaic philosophy. While the Judaic philosophy had its foundation in the Mosaic Law as taught in the Old Testament, the Christian philosophy is essentially a direct result of the New Testament.

While the Christian philosophy, as expressed in the statement, “The Kingdom of God is within you,” the Judaic philosophy postulates that the individual “doesn’t know what is good for him;” and further, that he must suppress his individuality for some abstraction. The Old Testament taught that the individual must worship “The Law.” To-day, he must worship “The State,” and tomorrow, “The World-State.” ***

COMMUNISM FROM THE INSIDE By Douglas A Hyde

(Continued from previous issue)

Communist teachings on morality are reflected, too, in the personal lives of Communist Party members. The sneers at bourgeois marriage, the sanctity of the marriage vows and the home, and the evil theories they are taught, inevitably have their effect on the members' personal behavior and leave their mark on those who pass through the Party's ranks. Thousands of young men and women and sincere workers are annually corrupted as a consequence.

From the network of organizations which surround the Communist Party and are created by it, goes out an ever-widening influence against all accepted Christian ideas on the home, family, children and morality which results in a growth of cynicism and immorality in circles far removed from Communism and which are by no means Marxist.

It undermines, in fact, all those conventions which have their origins in Christian teaching and practice over a period of centuries. It represents a way of life quite unlike that which grew out of our Western Christian civilization. And although it is true that in our largely pagan England of today immorality, inverted values and an absence of an affective ethical code are to be found among wide masses of the people, it is only in the Communist movement that these things are elevated to a theory and practice which is set up in opposition to that of Christianity, consciously pursued in an organized way.

Is it undemocratic?

Communists are the most active of propagandists, constantly seeking to spread their influence and increase their numbers. But they do not hope ever to win a majority by persuasion and propaganda, neither would they be prepared to wait for the completion of that process even though they thought it might in time be achieved. The whole of Communist hopes for the achievement of power are dependent upon the use of violence as a means of imposing a system of Communism upon an unwilling and unprepared majority. Their aim is, not to win a majority, but to build up a hard, reliable core of determined supporters who, by superior organization and strategy, can exploit a difficult situation when it arises.

This is how power was achieved in Russia and the process has, since the war, been repeated many times in the countries of Eastern Europe. There the presence of the Red Army and the opportunity to 'deal with' many of the Communists' opponents during the war itself, by means of the resistance movements and, later, purges of 'collaborators', reduced the violence at the time of the seizure of power to a minimum. But those conditions are recognized as peculiar ones, unlikely to occur again except by means of Soviet warlike 'expansion'.

ON TARGET

Elsewhere 'heavy' revolution on the lines of the Russian model is anticipated and prepared for.

Following the usual tactics, however, the Communists use parliamentary institutions and democratic organizations for the pursuit of their aims whilst having nothing but contempt for them and every intention of abolishing them at the earliest possible moment.

Harry Pollitt, the British leader, had many times, on the radio and elsewhere, claimed that 'Communism is simply Socialism in its working clothes'. This is one of those 'homely' meaningless phrases which the Communists use so successfully to deceive the unsuspecting. On the face of it, it appears, in so far as it means anything at all, to suggest that this is just a working-class version of something with which we are already familiar, and which is accepted as part of our democracy. But we should not be taken in by such phrases.

The whole theory of Marxism builds up to the need for revolutionary action and on this the leading writers are quite specific. Said Lenin in his book, *What is to be Done?* (p. 28); also quoted by Stalin in *Foundations of Leninism*:

'Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement.'

And that is the main goal of all the Communists' theorizing and practical activities. Karl Marx, in *The German Ideology* (p. 69), wrote:

'This revolution is necessary, therefore, not only because the ruling class cannot be overthrown in any other way, but also because the class overthrowing it can only in a revolution succeed in ridding itself of all the muck of the ages and become fitted to found society anew.'

What sort of society is intended we have already seen. And so each of the leading Marxist theorists has written at length on the theory and practice of insurrection, or as Engels and later, Lenin called it, 'the art of insurrection'. Works by these writers in which the guiding principles are clearly laid down are published by the Communist Party publishers in this country and sold in numbers to their sympathizers. They are studied with great care, and education courses are based upon them in which all Party members are expected to participate. The lessons learned from the failure of the Paris Commune in 1871 and the success of the October Revolution in Russia in 1917 are learned by heart and kept ready for the day when they may be applied here in Britain and throughout the world.

In *The Condition of the Working Class* (p. 296), Engels declared:

'The war of the poor against the rich will be the bloodiest ever waged.'

And Marx, in *The Poverty of Philosophy* (p. 147), said :
'Combat or death ; bloody struggle or extinction. It is thus that the question is inexorably put.'

And after the revolution, what then ?

There have, after all, been other ideals that men have thought worth shedding blood for. Communism, too, claims to be an ideal. It fights, it says, on behalf of the working-class who are the majority class in any modern society. According to the Communist leaders and pamphleteers, its purpose is to end the exploitation of man by man, introduce social and economic justice at last, and establish a classless society. May it not be that such ends justify the means ?

It is by reasoning in this way that many people find themselves inside the Party. But there is a vast gulf between the slogans and the reality. Between the braided dictators of the Eastern European countries and the common people lies a vast gulf and the Communist Parties of those countries, far from bridging it, simply widen it as time goes on and the Communist leadership becomes more and more entrenched as a class apart.

The so-called 'dictatorship of the proletariat' is in fact a dictatorship of the Communist Party, and, because of the way in which it is organized, that in turn narrows down to a dictatorship of the four or five who constitute the Party's political bureau.

The form of organization employed by the Communist Parties of the world is known as 'centralized democracy', but it has nothing to do with democracy as it is known and practiced elsewhere. Its methods of election and determining of policy are the exact reverse of that which obtains in genuinely democratic organizations. Instead of policies being determined by the membership and imposed upon the leaders, the opposite obtains. Policy is decided by the political bureau, which is made up of a handful of the top leaders. They then see that the policy is endorsed by the larger executive committee. 'Leads' and directives are then handed down to the district and branch committees.

There is considerable discussion at every level - but it is within the well-defined limits set by original political bureau recommendations and usually turns on their local application rather than on their content. A branch finding itself in disagreement with the main line of the Party may express its point of view at Annual Congress but, if defeated, must then accept the majority decision as absolutely binding. If it persists in raising the question again it will find itself dissolved, with its leaders expelled. This happened quite recently in the case of a branch of the British Party. So that, in practice, the very few individuals who make up the political bureau are all-powerful on policy questions.

So far as their position in the organization is concerned, they are in an equally strong position. Instead of elections coming through nominations from 'below' the 'panels' method employed. Nominations are accepted

from the branches and district committees prior to Annual Congress, but the political bureau itself selects a full list of those whom it would like to see constituting the Executive Committee and presents the names as a 'panel' to the Executive Committee for endorsement. Then, at Congress, a small 'panels commission' is set up, led by a member of the political bureau and filled with 'reliable' comrades. The branch nominees and those of the executive are considered by the commission. The panel of names put forward will be accepted in whole or with only the slightest of alterations and then put before Congress for endorsement as a whole - not individually. Congress can in theory reject them but again it must reject the list as a whole. In practice it, of course, accepts, and the people selected by the political bureau then constitute the new Executive who proceed to *appoint* the new bureau - which they re-appoint the existing one.

Thus the Communist Party leader is in an almost unshakeable position, provided that he plays ball with the other leaders. And if and when his party captures power he inevitably becomes one of the tiny-ruling clique with a power greater than any ruling monarch ever enjoyed in the past.

Stalin in Russia, Tito in Yugoslavia, Dimitrov in Bulgaria - these men have a power such as has never been known among rulers before - and they are all the stronger for the fact that they have a disciplined party of zealots supporting them and believing that by their 'centralized democracy' they are controlling them.

So it is that the achievement of power by the Communists means the destruction of democracy and of personal liberty. Behind the slogans and the shouting is the cold Science of Marxism, concerned, not with human beings as such, but with the establishment of a guinea-pig world based on the anti-religious, soulless teachings of Marx and Engels.

Does it serve the cause of Communism ? That is the only consideration. The individual Communist in the State counts for nothing, yet by skillful propaganda, education in dialectical materialism, and terrorism where necessary, he can be brought to believe that he is participating in a great experiment in which he has a part to play and responsibilities to fulfill. So it is that decisions can be made and operated which will blight the lives of hundreds of thousands and the party membership, at least, will believe the sufferings involved to be justified because it serves the cause. Thus entire populations can be uprooted and shifted to another part or dispersed throughout the land to serve some tactical political consideration. When Tito's Government in Yugoslavia found it impossible to destroy an armed opposition which was functioning in the mountain areas the entire populations of towns and villages were moved out and scattered throughout the land in order to destroy the guerrillas' base.

In the U.S.S.R. areas occupied by the Nazis suffered appalling devastation as the war swung to and fro across them. The people were subjected to the worst of humiliations and cruelties by the invading Germans. But at the conclusion of the war the Russian leaders took the view that the population of such areas was likely to have been corrupted by 'bourgeois' influences during the occupation and so, after all the horrors they had already endured, they were torn up by their roots from the places which had been their homes and sent east to the vast, under-populated areas of Siberia where they can do no harm.

Such decisions, appalling in their tragic human consequences, are normal to Communism and can be fully justified according to Marxist standards for, it can be argued, the victims suffer that the cause of Communism may prevail. The utter abandonment of all ideas about the sanctity of the individual, which is a feature of Christian teaching, leads inevitably to such consequences.

Is it Inevitable ?

Half-a-dozen countries of Europe have now fallen to the Communists. Communism knocks at the door of several others. Large parts of China, Mongolia, Manchuria, are already Communist. In 1848 Karl Marx in his Communist Manifesto, wrote :

'A spectre is haunting Europe, the spectre is Communism ... let the ruling classes tremble.'

It was largely wishful thinking on his part then. Today it is a reality. Communism is haunting the world. But it is not just the ruling classes who tremble. The working-class in the conquered and threatened countries tremble too for they are learning that Communism means tyranny, the destruction of personal liberty and the end of all those Christian values which in the past we have taken for granted but which are the basis of our way of life. There can, therefore, be no question of the end justifying the means, for they are equally evil.

Here in Britain Communism is not numerically strong. Membership of the Communist Party has never been above 60,000 and has often been much less. But more than 10,000 members pass through its ranks each year and several thousands more through the Young Communist League, and in doing so lose their faith and accept new, cynical, inverted standards.

And the Party's influence is vastly in excess of its numerical strength. This is partly because of its form of organization and its hold on leading positions in the trade union and Labour movement but, still more, because of the devotion and energy of its members.

A number of the most important trade unions have Communists in their leadership and almost all unions have an over-weighting of Communists in responsible positions at district and branch levels. Those positions have, first and foremost, been obtained because of the readiness to accept responsibility and to do the most

routine and least-sought-after jobs where necessary.

Membership of the appropriate trade union and co-operative society is made a condition of membership of the Party and members are taught that they must be the best possible members of those organizations. The result is that Communists everywhere tend to be elected to positions of responsibility and quickly move up the ladder from one level to the next. That process is at times accelerated by the aid of 'packed' meetings and even by subterfuge, but far more often it is due to the energy of the Communists and the apathy of non-Communists. It could quickly be brought to an end by an increased sense of responsibility on the part of the opponents and, in particular, Catholics who are aware of the real danger of Communism and the urgent need to defeat it. Vigilance and energy on the part of such organizations as the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists could break the Communist hold on our Labour movement in a very short time.

But out-maneuvring the Communists will not be enough if the victory is to be a lasting one. The greater sense of responsibility and willingness to give time and work to such organizations will require to be an enduring one or the pertinacity of the Communists will gain prevail.

And the same may be said of all those other organizations which the Communists have captured or penetrated, student bodies, tenants' organizations, co-operative societies, sections of the Labour Party, cultural organizations, the factory organizations of the workers and so on.

The strength of the Communist Party lies in the zeal of its members, for whom no sacrifice is too great, no job too hard. Fired with enthusiasm for the teachings which are for them their religion, they put Christians and non-Communists to shame. Their success is a measure of our failure to make the same sacrifice for a better cause, and to the extent to which we see this and act upon it shall we defeat them. ***

DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT TRAINING

Douglas Social Credit is the disciplined science of social engineering measured in terms of human satisfaction.

Available Online or from our Head Office

Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.

NewTimes Survey \$30.00 p.a. Donations can be performed by direct bank transfer: A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch) BSB 105-044 A/c No. 188-040-840

to: 'Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)'

Postal Address: **PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.**

Telephone: **08 8322 8923** eMail: **heritagebooks@alor.org**

Online Bookstore : **<https://veritasbooks.com.au/>** Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and Freedom Movement "Archives" :: **<https://alor.org/>** **On Target is printed and authorised by A. J. Luks 13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.**