

T.M. WIXTED & CO.
(Established 1929)

“In his humiliation justice was denied him”

Pamphlet No. 31,	Public Forum,	Public Forum,	Public Forum,
First Issued:	Centenary Place,	The Domain,	Yarra Bank,
1967.	BRISBANE, Q.	SYDNEY, NSW.	MELBOURNE, V.

The international intrigue and systematic press campaign which led to

**AUSTRALIAN INVOLVEMENT
IN THE VIETNAM WAR**

There are two main reasons for Australian involvement in the Vietnam War:

1. A carefully directed and systematic campaign waged by the Australian press from 1949 onwards (ie throughout the period of Liberal Party government in Australia).
2. Intrigue on an international level designed to frustrate the possibility of an alternative government taking office, by weakening, destroying or subverting all opposition to the policies of the Liberal Party.

Events in Australia and Vietnam trace out a clear and unmistakable pattern.

THE PATTERN ANALYSED

A short Preface: On Australian political parties.

Section 1: The propaganda campaign 1949-1966

- (a) the magic formula: the psychological basis of the campaign
- (b) the unholy trinity: press, priest and politician
- (c) building up the status of the Vietnam War –
 - (i) ‘sentimental’ journeys
 - (ii) medals announcements
- (d) building up the status of politicians
 - (i) Johnson’s election
 - (ii) Holt’s election

- (iii) Air Vice Marshal Ky

Section 2: The variety of reasons for 'democratic' intervention in Vietnam

- (a) a list of reasons constructed from many sources
- (b) the spuriousness and contradictoriness of the reasons given
- (c) how the USA manoeuvred allied nations into a false position, concealed her intentions, then committed herself to full-scale war

Section 3: Isolation and identification of forces supporting Australian involvement

- (a) the election of 26th November 1966
- (b) the issues: how the press saw the election – before and after
- (c) the ballot: nobody knows where the votes came from!
- (d) The same unholy trinity
 - (i) The press keeps an escape route open
 - (ii) The priests talk double-talk
 - (iii) The politicians abnegate responsibility

Section 4: Vietnam, the world stage: the isolation of the interested parties

- (a) the Roman Catholic Church
 - (i) the lady of Fatima and communism (1917)
 - (ii) the papal encyclical 'Divini Redemptoris' (1937) – and communism
 - (iii) the Roman Catholic exodus from North Vietnam in 1954
 - (iv) Cardinal Spellman and Vietnam. 1954-1966
 - (v) The Pope's messenger in Saigon. 1966
- (b) the USA : double-talk from 1954 onwards
- (c) Australia : rustics manipulated

Section 5: Australian politics: the possibilities of international intrigue

- (a) deep in the heart of Texas
- (b) the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)
- (c) the Santamaria Labour Party and the Roman Catholic hierarchy
- (d) the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO)
- (e) the Liberal Party and the Roman Catholic Church

Section 6: Australian politics: the evidence of international intrigue

The Petrov conspiracy of 1954: A separate analysis introduces this section. Canada, France, the United States, and the executive and judicial branches of the Australian government were all involved – in greater or lesser degree – in the intrigue surrounding the defection of Vladimir Petrov in 1954. An appendix deals with the Petrov documents.

Appendix: The Petrov documents

The documents allegedly delivered by Petrov to the Australian Security Service are analysed.

The conclusion is drawn that the documents were actually delivered **to** Petrov – not **by** Petrov.

It is suggested that a computer analyse the known data.

Section 7: Vietnam and Australia: Conclusions

A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO AUSTRALIAN POLITICAL PARTIES

There are three main political parties – the Australian Labor Party (ALP), the Country Party (CP) and the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party is the present name of the party which had many other names prior to 1946. The ALP governed Australia from 1941 until December 1949. Since December 1949 the Liberal and Country Parties (L-CP) have held office in coalition. This coalition has maintained itself in office with an election policy of anti-communism. A fourth political group, calling itself the Democratic Labor Party (DLP) also has a policy of ‘anti-communism’. The nucleus of the DLP was a dissident Catholic Action group ejected from the ALP in 1954-55.

The DLP exists for the purpose of keeping the ALP out of office. In the November 1966 election it fielded 113 candidates without winning one seat. The main point of interest concerning this party is the source from which it derives its apparently inexhaustible party funds.

The ALP is opposed by the DLP, the CP and the Liberal Party. The defence policy of the ALP may be stated broadly as non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other nations, and non-involvement in overseas wars.

(Interpretation of this policy should be tempered by the knowledge that the ALP governed Australia in both World War I and World War II). At the present time – or at least until 7th February 1967 when the political wing of the ALP came under new management – the ALP stands representative of the forces in Australia opposed to the Vietnam War.

SECTION 1: THE PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN 1949-1966

THE MAGIC FORMULA:

Australian newspapers are controlled by groups which have a long history of opposition to the Australian Labor Party. Throughout the period 1949-1966 these groups engaged in a systematic propaganda campaign designed to destroy the ALP. The full effects of this campaign were

reflected in the results of the November 1966 elections. At these elections the ALP received 40% of the total vote and was reduced to its lowest parliamentary representation in many years.

The magic formula used in the newspaper campaign is simply a well-known psychological technique.

The campaign developed in 3 stages.

First stage: 'Communism'.

By ceaseless repetition the press conditioned the minds of Australians to react in a given way whenever the term 'Communism' was mentioned. 'Communism' came to signify everything that was odious impious, undemocratic and unpatriotic. Australians were conditioned to respond accordingly.

The elements of this deliberate campaign were:

- (i) ceaseless repetition designed to
- (ii) condition the minds of the Australian people to
- (iii) respond automatically and unthinkingly on hearing
- (iv) the stimulus term 'Communism'.

Scientists use the same technique when studying animal behaviour. Rats and other animals are conditioned to respond automatically to stimuli provided by scientific means. Many examples of the scientific use of this technique may be found in journals such as Animal Behaviour.

Second stage: The Australian Labor Party.

All the odium attaching to the term 'communism' was transferred to the ALP. The press incessantly identified the ALP with 'communism' and the Australian people were conditioned to respond to the one as to the other. To many among the rising generation of voters – responding in behaviour patterns that are as conditioned and as predictable as the behaviour patterns of the rats used by the scientists in experiments – the ALP came to signify everything that was odious, impious, undemocratic and unpatriotic. This propaganda campaign was designed to weaken electoral support for the ALP and to strengthen those forces of reaction within the ALP which were clandestinely endeavouring to subvert the party's aims. It achieved only partial success.

Third stage: Vietnam.

The propaganda campaign found a natural focus in the Vietnam War. From its beginnings this war was presented to the Australian people by the newspapers as a war against 'communism'. Only a direct confrontation of the enemy in Vietnam itself would stop 'communism' from spreading. If Vietnam were to fall, 'communism' would be at Australia's very gates.

The magic formula went to work again:

The terms 'North Vietnam', 'Ho Chi Minh', 'Viet Minh', and 'Viet Cong' became press synonyms for 'communism' which stimulated predictable Australian responses. Australian support of American intervention in the domestic affairs of Vietnam was translated by this technique into a justifiable war against aggression – communist aggression. The reasons advanced by the Australian government to justify the sending of Australian troops depend heavily for their acceptance, on an automatic response by the people to the stimulus term 'communism'.

Note:

The propaganda campaign – the Great Australian Brainwash (GAB) – also worked in reverse.

To be anti-communist in Australia 1949-1966 was to become endowed automatically with the virtues of Liberalism, Idealism and Patriotism (LIP).

The newspaper campaign, with its consequences, might therefore reasonably be codenamed 'GAB' and 'LIP'.

AN UNHOLY TRINITY: PRESS, PRIEST and POLITICIAN:

This systematic propaganda campaign can be traced through every vital political event. So too, can the role played by the priests and politicians. Here we examine –

- the 1949 election campaign
- Menzies' "Communist Party Dissolution Bill" introduced in Parliament in 1950
- The High Court rejection of this Bill on 9th March 1951
- The 'double dissolution' of Parliament and the 28th April 1951 election
- The 1954 election campaign (April-May) following Petrov's defection
- The 1955 election campaign in which Menzies capitalised on the presence in politics of the Anti-Communist Labor Party (7 members of a Catholic Action group ejected from the ALP after Evatt's call of October 1954).
- Subsequent elections in which Archbishop Mannix, Santamaria and the DLP figured prominently

Here is the story as it gradually unfolded. The period 1949-1951 is dealt with extensively. Events of later periods are summarised. Quotations are from the Brisbane **Courier Mail** except where otherwise stated. That this concerted campaign was aimed at a specific objective from the very beginning will become clear as the pattern develops.

The 10/12/1949 election (the ALP lost office)

CM 1/11/49: "BEWARE OF COMMUNISM ON THE DOORSTEP. Archbishop's warning on socialisation ... The following special interview was given last night by Archbishop Duhig to a Courier Mail staff writer: 'There is no freedom in Russia, or in any of the small countries that have come under communistic domination ... Today, every serious student of our times and conditions must realise that Labour is in danger of being misled by cunning, designing people, whose characteristics are lust for power and hatred of any rule, or economic system but their

own, and that it needs wise and courageous leadership ... I warn men and women of this land ... that socialisation leads only one way, and that if it prevails, communism, which is its natural consequence, will swiftly be on the doorstep to take its place and bring about in Australia the conditions of serfdom that have replaced freedom in so many countries of Europe today. Poland is the last and saddest example of socialism dethroned by Russian communism.’ ”

CM 5/11/49: “RSL MOVE FOR BAN OF COMMUNISTS. A total ban on the Communist Party and ban on communists in the State and Federal Public Service will be urged at the Returned Servicemen’s League annual congress in Sydney next week.” (page 3).

CM 8/11/49: “The Federal Labour government, if returned, is ‘pledged to destroy Australia's main defence against communism.’ This was stated to night by the Federal Country Party leader (Mr. Fadden). ‘Communism’, Mr. Fadden added, ‘was at Australia’s front door. Australia’s communists were no different to those of Burma or China or the nearer South East Asian countries’ ”.(Front page).

CM11/11/49: Menzies opened his election campaign: “Communism in Australia is an alien and destructive pest. If elected he shall outlaw it. Subject to appeal the Attorney General will be empowered to declare other bodies substantially communist.” (Front page).

CM 15/11/49: “Mr. Chifley (ie Prime Minister and leader of the ALP) made no new promises and used the word ‘Communism’ only once in his 36-minute broadcast.” (Newspaper comment on speech opening ALP campaign. front page).

CM 18/11/49: Fadden gave his policy speech on behalf of the Country Party: “The measures to be taken by the C.P. and Liberal parties against Australian communists will, we are confident, eradicate these foul and traitorous individuals who know neither decency nor Christianity.” (Front page).

CM 21/11/49: “ Labour close to Reds. ‘Socialism and communism had a close affinity’, said Mr. J. Francis MHR, Liberal candidate for Moreton last night.”(page 3).

CM 5/12/49: “COMMUNISM IS THE ENEMY OF CHRISTIANITY. INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM MUST NOT BE SUBORDINATED TO ANY SOCIALISTIC STATE.” This was the heading on a Courier Mail article which featured lengthy statements by representatives of the Roman Catholic, Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregationalist Churches. The article was accompanied by photographs of the 5 churchmen. (page 2). In a subsequent editorial the Courier Mail stated: “VOICES TO TRUST. If you are searching for truth in the fog of election propaganda, you can have no more trustworthy guides than the spokesmen of Queensland’s Christian Churches.”

On 10/12/1949 the Liberal-Country Party coalition was elected as the government. Its policy had been ‘anti-communism’. From this it may be deduced that the government was christian, democratic and patriotic, and that all who opposed the policies of the government were anti-

christian, undemocratic and unpatriotic. Obviously, such opponents must be ‘pro-communist’. Such, at any rate, was the underlying theme of subsequent propaganda.

The 1950 “Communist Party Dissolution Bill”

This Bill, ostensibly aimed at Communism, was introduced into Parliament on 27/4/1950, temporarily shelved, then reintroduced by Menzies on 28/9/1950. It was passed by the ALP dominated Senate, under threat of a double dissolution and in the face of an extreme press campaign, on 19/10/1950. The legislation was immediately challenged in the High Court by several trade unions. Dr. H.V. Evatt accepted a brief and appeared in the High Court on 25/10/1950.

Mr. H. Holt, later to become Prime Minister, whined in Parliament “that the people of Australia would draw very definite conclusions from Dr. Evatt’s acceptance of the brief in this particular matter.” (CM 26/10/1950).

The March 1951 High Court decision

On 9th March 1951, by a 6-1 majority, the High Court ruled the “Communist Party Dissolution Bill” to be invalid. The extreme, totalitarian nature of the legislation, is made clear in the judgement delivered by Mr. Justice Williams:

“The Act’s outstanding character is that in its main provisions it prohibits no act, enjoins no duty, creates no offence, imposes no sanction for disobedience to any command and prescribes no standard or rule of conduct.

The Act purports to dissolve the Australian Communist Party and forfeit its property to the Commonwealth. It also purports to make other bodies, or persons, who in the prescribed period were, or were likely to be tainted with Communism, liable to be dissolved and their property forfeited to the Commonwealth. The Act makes prescribed people or Communists liable to be deprived of important rights without creating any offence the commission of which would entail such consequences. Indeed, no proof would be needed that they had committed any offence. There would be no trial in any court, and those prescribed would have no right to prove that they had not done anything prejudicial to the security, defence or the maintenance of the Constitution. In peacetime the legislation to be reasonably capable of aiding defence, must be reasonably necessary for the purpose of preparing for war.”

(CM 10/3/1951).

The double dissolution and the April 1951 election

Within 10 days of the High Court decision Menzies convinced the Governor General that the ALP dominated Senate made Parliament unworkable. The famous ‘double dissolution’ followed. 28th April 1951, was set as the date for the election. The campaign ran to pattern:

CM 29/3/1951: Fadden –

“Mr. Chifley has tried to cloud the real election issue – Communism – the Federal Treasurer and Country Party Leader (Mr. Fadden) said last night.” (Front page).

CM 2/4/1951: Mannix –

“PRELATE ON REDS. Electors should do the right thing for Australia by returning a government that would deal with the menace of Communism, Archbishop Mannix said today at a Hibernian communion breakfast. Unless the Communist menace was dealt with drastically and successfully, nothing worthwhile was likely to be done in Australia.” (page 3).

CM 4/4/1951: Menzies –

“That Labour’s action (ie the ALP dominated Senate passing the Communist Party Dissolution Bill) was based, not on opposition to Communism, but on fear of your votes, is also proved by the part since taken in the matter by its Deputy Leader (ie Evatt’s brief in the High Court). I know that there are loyal Labour men who detest this sorry business, but they are in a minority ... Communism is a materialistic doctrine, void of spiritual content. It is not only anti-Christian, but is opposed to all those nobler aspirations which spring from the religious faith of decent peoples If returned we will seek new powers to deal with Communism either by referendum or by a transfer of State powers...” (pp 1,2).

CM 6/4/1951: Menzies –

“Let us have a majority in the Senate and if we cannot come before you in three years with a record of having smitten the Communists hip and thigh you have the perfect authority from me to sack us, and sack us with contempt.”

CM 10/4/1951: Fadden –

“... the High Court has disallowed the Anti-Communist Bill on constitutional grounds. The government, however, still had the evidence of a conspiracy.”

CM 13/4/1951: “WALSH HITS AT FADDEN ...

Mr. Fadden’s statement that he would declare the Labour Party a Communist organisation if he found it guilty of subversive activities clearly indicated what would have happened to political parties who disagreed with Mr. Fadden if the Anti-Communist Bill had been declared valid.”

‘Communism’ was the main issue of the election according to:

Menzies at Cairns (CM 6/4/51), Mannix (9/4/51), Fadden at Warwick (10/4/51), Menzies in Sydney (10/4/51, 11/4/51), O’Sullivan in Maryborough (12/4/51), Menzies in Melbourne (16/4/51), Mrs. Menzies in Brisbane (17/4/51), Menzies in Adelaide (18/4/51), Casey in Brisbane (19/4/51), Fadden in Adelaide, Holt in Brisbane, O’Sullivan in Innisfail (20/4/51), Menzies in Newcastle, O’Sullivan in Mareeba (21/4/51), and Menzies in Brisbane (25/4/51); to mention just a few. Liberal Party advertisements induced fear: “Don’t hand Australia over to

Moscow's fifth columnists" and "What is the difference between a socialist and a communist?" (CM 10-12/4/51).

On 13/4/1951 the Courier Mail editorial was headed "Labour's Red Link". On the 18/4/51 the editorial of the same newspaper contained the words: "Mr. Chifley is now complaining that practically the whole of Australia's newspaper press is against the Labour Party in this election. He is quite right".

But in the very same election, legitimate ALP political comment on the failure by Menzies-Fadden to carry out their 1949 election promises was rejected by radio stations:

"ALLEGED RADIO REFUSAL. Four Queensland commercial broadcasting stations had refused to broadcast a Labour recording featuring the actual voices of Mr. Menzies and Mr. Fadden making election promises in 1949 ... Mr. Chifley said the feature 'Disillusion Dan' had been passed by the censorship board of the Federation of Australian Commercial Broadcasting Stations." (CM 5/4/1951, p3. The stations were 4BC, 4GR, 4MB, and 4RO. Nothing – not even the 1949 Mr. Menzies – was going to distract the attention of the electors from 'communism').

The September 1951 referendum

The Menzies-Fadden coalition was returned at the 1951 election with a majority in both houses. A referendum was scheduled immediately for 22 September 1951. A YES vote would give Menzies the powers he sought in the 1950 Bill. The result seemed a foregone conclusion. But the tide was beginning to turn:

CM 1/9/51: Burgmann – "CLERIC SAYS VOTE 'NO'.

Anglican Bishop of Golbourne and Canberra (Dr. E.H. Burgmann) has urged a 'NO' vote at the Federal referendum on Communism. He wrote in a letter to his diocese that Australia was not now at war in any form which called for such a drastic change in the Constitution. The legislation was said to be aimed at Communists. 'Are we sure that it will not be extended to include others?' he asked. He was sure that a way would be found to bring a person under the power of the Act if the Government seriously wished to liquidate him." (p 1).

CM 3/9/51: Duhig – "AUSTRALIA ALONE NOW.

Australia now has no intermediary powers on which to rely for protection," Archbishop Duhig said yesterday ... Archbishop Duhig was reading in St. Stephen's Cathedral main portions of the statement of the Roman Catholic bishops on the future of Australia, He described the statement as "the most important pronouncement ever made by the official representatives of the Catholic Church in Australia." (p 4).

CM 10/9/51: Duhig – “RED AIM ERASE CHRISTIANITY.

‘The aim of Communism was to wipe out the Christian faith in every country where it could get control,’ Archbishop Duhig said in St. Stephen’s Roman Catholic Cathedral yesterday. ‘Yet we are asked to be gentle towards Communists here in Australia and to give Communism a trial,’ he said. ‘If we did so, persecution of Christianity would come to this country as it did to others.’” (p 3).

CM 13/9/51: Editorial –

“All electors who are convinced that more drastic measures must be taken to defend Australia against international Communism and its agents in this country have one good reason for trusting Mr. Menzies rather than Dr. Evatt on this issue. Mr. Menzies is the head of a government that has been trying since the end of 1949 to carry out its undertaking to the people to outlaw the Communist Party ... Mr. Menzies says that it must have more power under the Constitution to achieve this task ... The Commonwealth Parliament will be able to use the power a “YES” vote will give it only for such purposes and in such ways as a majority of Federal electors may sanction ...”

CM 19/9/51: Duhig – “DR. DUHIG ON REFERENDUM. ‘NO’ VOTE WILL FAVOUR REDS.

Archbishop Duhig said last night he would not cast ‘any vote that would favour Communism.’ He said: ‘By voting against the government I would vote for a continuance of a false liberty ...’ Archbishop Duhig said he had determined to say nothing on the Communist referendum until he had seen a statement in which 10 clergymen had opposed a ‘YES’ vote ... ‘I do not agree with the statements of those clergymen,’ he said. He said he could not imagine Russia holding a referendum ‘I do not think anyone who stands for Communist principles can be loyal to Australia,’ Dr. Duhig added. ‘...If it is a matter of loyalty to some foreign power or to Australia, I will always put Australia first.’”

(NOTE: The Vatican state is a foreign power. Archbishop Duhig’s first loyalty, according to the Sacred Canons, is to the Bishop of Rome).

The same newspaper added: “The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sydney (Cardinal Gilroy) has advised people to vote in the referendum on Communism according to their consciences, and not according to party politics. He said that whatever the referendum result, the government should take quick and effective action to deal with Communism.”

CM 22/9/51:

the Courier Mail editorial pointed out that the powers sought by Menzies were set out in the 1950 Act which the High Court had rejected. The editorial advocated a YES vote. Later the same day, at the polling booths, Australia voted NO.

CM 24/9/51:

the Courier Mail, commenting on the NO vote said: “Dr. Evatt flew up and down the country sowing doubts about ‘justice for all’. His professional propagandists played up those fears with a cunning unequalled in Australian campaigning.”

The Australian press combined selective reporting with a systematically biased pattern of emphasis. Such tactics cannot be conveyed simply by the citing of press reports and comments. The above reports, though taken primarily from one newspaper as representative of all, indicate the course which the press was following and the intellectual climate which was being deliberately created.

A series of summaries

Summary 1: 1949-51.

By September 1951 the Liberal Party policy of ‘anti-communism’ had proved an election winner. But the attempt to segment society on the basis of legislation directed at the civil liberties of citizens had met with disaster at the hands of the High Court and the people. The propaganda campaign intensified. Two specific objects began to emerge. Throughout 1949-51 general political groupings and alliances had become clear:

- A ‘minority’ group of ‘loyal Labour men’ were in sympathy with Menzies’ aims,
- Archbishop Mannix of Melbourne had connections with this group,
- Leading members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy had shown themselves more than favourably disposed towards Menzies’ attack on Civil Liberties (though representing them as attacks on Communism),
- When Menzies-Fadden spoke of ‘Christianity’ being menaced by Communism the appeal was to the Roman Catholic voter,
- Leading members of other churches at first supported, then declared against Menzies, stating that Australians generally and not only Communists were endangered by his totalitarian legislation.

Summary 2: 1951-54:

The High Court decision expressed the will of a 6-1 majority of judges and the referendum result expressed the will of a majority of Australian citizens. The newspapers insulted this body of opinion when they henceforth smeared Evatt as pro-Communist. Priests and politicians joined the chorus. If Evatt was pro-Communist so were the 6 judges who rejected Menzies’ legislation. The alliance between Menzies and the Roman Catholic hierarchy – the ‘Menzies-Mannix Axis’ – continued as before. But for this Axis to triumph it had now become necessary for some definite and concrete evidence of a ‘communist conspiracy’ to be produced. Glib oratory was no longer enough.

The propaganda campaign focused on two objects – the smearing of Evatt and the fomenting of intestine divisions within the ALP by assisting the minority group favourably disposed towards Menzies’ aims.

Twice in 1951 Evatt had triumphed over Menzies – first in the High Court and second in the referendum.

Twice in 1951 Menzies, with the whole of the Australian press working for him, had been mortified in defeat. Evatt was a man marked down for destruction. The attempt was made in the infamous Petrov Frame-Up of 1954.

Summary 3: 1954 onwards:

In the United States a period of ‘McCarthyism’ – judgement by Inquisition – had followed the passage through Congress in 1950 of the ‘Communist Control Bill’. Australia had successfully withstood a similar type erosion of civil liberties. While Evatt became the object of an unparalleled vilification campaign in the press, the ALP remained the bulwark against the irruption of Fascism. April 1954 brought the Petrov defection and the Royal Commission. In 1954 and the following years, the unholy trinity of press, priest and politician attacked the ALP remorselessly from without. Within the ALP the position changed abruptly in October 1954 when Evatt forced a showdown with the white-ant Catholic Action group – the ‘minority’ of ‘loyal Labour men’ spoken of by Menzies in April 1951. Discussion of this period involves:

- The ‘Movement’ founded by Santamaria and Archbishop Mannix in 1941
- Catholic Action cells (Industrial Groups) in the trade unions
- The Anti-Communist Labor Party of 1955 which eventually became the DLP
- The Pastoral Letter of the 33 Roman Catholic Bishops issued in April 1955 in support of the Industrial Groups
- Archbishop Mannix’s statements directly supporting the DLP at the 1955 and 1958 elections and his TV interview with the ABC in 1962
- Other support of the former white-ant group, now the DLP, by members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy (eg. Tasmania)
- The Cardinal’s Dinner in Sydney in 1964 at which Menzies was present. Menzies’ reception was described at the time as illustrating the entente between the Liberal Party and the Roman Church.

For a discussion of this period see Pamphlets No.22 and No.28.

Summary 4: Vietnam.

The Indo-China issue had been on the front pages of the newspapers since 1946. To most Australians, but not to the Roman Church as we shall see later, Indo-China was far away. With the division of Indo-China there came a sudden emphasis upon Vietnam. This country became an external focus for all that had been attempted within Australia since 1949. This time the same unholy trinity responsible for the Great Australian Brainwash, and for the attempt at Inquisition, was more successful. The propaganda campaign of the press, the partial dismemberment and consequent loss of electoral support by the ALP, the conniving and chicanery of the Menzies-Mannix Axis, led inevitably to Australian involvement in the Vietnam War. The 1966 Australian election bore a surprising similarity to the 1949 election: many leaders of the Protestant churches were again led by the nose by Rome’s propagandists.

The statement after the election by **A.A. Calwell**, leader of the ALP is instructive:

“The Vietnam War will be escalated unless the forces of reason prevail, and this escalation will have the benediction of some, but not all, Anglican and Catholic divines, and some Protestant church leaders too. More shame on them. But such blessings cannot sanctify the barbarities of the Vietnam War.” (Brisbane Telegraph 9/12/1966, p3).

As Australia entered 1967 there were straws in the wind indicating that the facts at long last were beginning to catch up with those responsible for the Great Australian Brainwash and for the Vietnam commitment of Australian forces. The press had cried “Communism” once too often.

BUILDING UP THE STATUS OF THE VIETNAM WAR

Building up the states of politicians (Condensed)

While Australians were being conditioned to react automatically to the stimulus term ‘communism’ in the external focus of Vietnam, it also became necessary for the propagandists to build up the status of the Vietnam War and of the politicians committed to it. (Elections were due in the US and in Australia in November 1966). This was attempted in a pattern of tactics which can now be considered stereotyped:

- At short notice the President of the USA (Johnson) visited Australia for the first time (October 1966) bringing with him the prestige of the United States. The visit stirred nostalgic memories of 1942-45 for many Australians.
- A peace conference of nations opposing communism, held in Manila
- An election campaign in Australia based on a ‘fear of Communism and China’ theme that outdid all previous Liberal efforts
- The visit to Australia in January 1967, by Air vice Marshal Ky (somewhat euphemistically described as “Prime Minister of South Vietnam”).

Johnson’s visit:

The Presidential visit arose from necessity. Elections were approaching in both the United States and Australia, and a campaign boost was needed. To achieve this effect the visit set out to demonstrate the existence, at the very highest levels, of an astonishingly close working relationship between the US and Australia. But the public display of solidarity, ostensibly arranged at short notice, revealed much – much too much – of what had been going on behind the scenes. There was talk in the Bulletin of Australia as “the fifty-first (US) state”. Holt’s “All the way with LBJ” election theme, and his attitude throughout the President’s visit, cemented the impression. But the elections safely past, the necessity over, Mr. Holt attempted to conceal what had already been revealed. In a speech delivered early in January 1967, he tried to recreate the illusion of an Australia independent of Washington. Australia, in carrying out orders from a foreign power, must seem to be acting independently: it was obvious this theme of Australian independence was to be the Liberal Party’s new line of election propaganda. It will require a ‘hard sell’ campaign. The newspapers may be expected to co-operate.

Present propaganda notwithstanding, the question is intriguing: For how long have Australian Prime Ministers been acting as secret agents for foreign powers?

Ky's visit:

The purpose of Ky's visit was to obtain for himself, as America's nominee, the imprimatur of political acceptability from the Australian people. This visit, like the earlier visit by Johnson, demonstrated Australia's willingness to carry out orders from the United States.

Two Bruce Petty cartoons in the Australian reflected the thoughts of many Australians.

The first, without caption, showed Mr. Holt and Mr. Ky blowing each other up to toad-size by means of each other's umbilical cords.

The second showed a dapper Mr. Holt saying with the approval of an equally dapper Mr. Ky: "We had a frank exchange of US views".

Ky's visit, again like that of Johnson, was originally described by Holt as a "sentimental journey". This was true. Politicians are very sentimental over their political futures. An American visiting Australia commented:

" 'South Vietnam's premier, Air Vice Marshal Ky, was using his tour of Australia to better his political image at home', a visiting American said in Canberra yesterday ... Speaking of Marshal Ky's visit next week (the American) Mr. Stringfellow said: 'As in some other trips, Australia is being used for the internal politics of other countries ... When President Johnson came here he was making a political campaign in his own country' " (Australian, 10/1/1967).

Throughout the visit by Ky there was a fantastic propaganda effort on the part of the Australian press. Meetings of protest were played down, and in some cases blatantly misrepresented. But all the efforts of the press went for nothing when Ky said:

"When some people ask me if there is any possibility that North Vietnam will ask Red China to send troops to North Vietnam, I say no. Because if the Hanoi leaders do so, then I am sure that all the Vietnamese from the North and South will unite in one bloc, stand up and destroy the regime and defend our land" (Australian, 25/1/1967).

This one statement by Ky cut the whole foundation from under the propaganda used by the Liberal Party during the November 1966 election; propaganda that depended heavily upon an automatic response to the term 'Communism' as embodied in the threat of 'Communist China' acting through Communist North Vietnam.

In the period of the Johnson-Ky visits there was only one newspaper of consequence that allowed events to develop their own emphasis and impact. That newspaper was the Australian, a comparative newcomer to Australian journalism. As to whether circulation was the determining

factor in shaping the policy of this newspaper would be difficult to say. The fact remains that through its columns, for the first time in many years, Australians began to get news in the raw instead of manufactured.

Peace pronouncements. Medals announcements. Military reinforcements:

Shortly after his re-election Mr. Holt announced a build up of Australian forces in Vietnam. There had been speculation on this matter before the election, but Mr. Holt had been non-committal when questioned.

The timing of the announcement revealed once more the close working relationship between the Australian and US governments.

Three consecutive newspaper bill boards read:

- “NEW VIETNAM TRUCE BID” (20/12/1966, Midday Tuesday. Brisbane Telegraph).
- “MORE MEN FOR WAR” (20/12/1966, Late afternoon, Brisbane Telegraph).
- “CONSCRIPTS GET VIET BRAVERY AWARDS” (21/12/1966, Morning Wednesday, The Australian).

Peace pronouncements fly thick and fast. They are part of a propaganda war. This peace bid was a piece of US window dressing at the United Nations. It was intended for Australian consumption on the eve of the announcement, highly important to the United States, of this country’s increased commitment. The timing of the medals announcement by the Australian government could not have been other than deliberate.

The propaganda techniques, and the palliative techniques of the Liberal-Country Party government are wearing very thin.

**SECTION 2: THE VARIETY OF REASONS FOR
“DEMOCRATIC” INTERVENTION IN VIETNAM**

There are at least 5 main reasons advanced to justify “democratic” intervention in Vietnam –

American Defence

1. It is necessary to hold Vietnam in order to preserve America’s Pacific defence line between the Aleutians and Hawaii.
2. “If the US gives up Vietnam the Pacific Ocean will become a Red Sea”.

Trade and Commerce

3. The Indo-China area provides the vital commodities tin and tungsten
4. A stable South East Asia means better trade

Moral obligation

5. The US is “there at the request of the South Vietnamese government to help them stop Communist intervention”.

6. It is not a civil war; “it is naked aggression on the part of North Vietnam”.
7. “We believe every nation should have the right to choose the system of government that best fits its needs. We came to Vietnam to protect that right. The communists are there to destroy it ”

Surgery

8. It is necessary to “stop the cancer of communism spreading”.

Defeat China

9. “If South Vietnam falls then the rest of Asia will fall to the communists.”
10. “The true enemy behind the Viet Cong and North Vietnam is China.”

Examine the reasons closely. Most of them have been used by men in responsible positions – Eisenhower, Nixon, Senator Bridges, Holt.

Note this important fact; that 7 at least of the 10 reasons are attempts to avoid judging the Vietnam issue on its own merits. The three exceptions are Nos. 5, 6 and 7. It is these that must be examined for their truth or falsity.

Reason 10 - which played such a large part in Liberal Party election propaganda in 1966 – was shown to be false by Marshal Ky on his recent visit.

Ky’s statement was in agreement with that of Harrison Salisbury of the New York Times:

“The volunteers have not been called so far. The Hanoi leaders make it abundantly clear it is their fervent hope that the call will never go out. They see in the presence of (Chinese and other) volunteers a possible deadly blow to their most cherished ideal – national independence. (Courier Mail, 18/1/1967, p 4).

The Australian government adduces a reason which is additional to the above – ‘the Australian-American alliance’.

Much was heard of this during the 1966 election. But no one seemed clear in what the alliance consisted or how it was related to Vietnam. The public was left to choose between the ANZUS pact and SEATO. Let us spend a moment examining these pacts before returning to a detailed investigation of the reasons for “democratic” intervention in Vietnam.

The ANZUS Pact was signed by Australia, New Zealand and the USA in 1951. The following press reports summarise the significance of this pact exactly:

“The plan, which falls short of a Pacific military pact, is to induce Australia and New Zealand to sign the Japanese peace treaty. Mr. Dulles said the plan was necessary because Australia and New Zealand feared Japanese militarism might grow.” (Courier Mail 12/4/1951).

“Each party to it recognises ‘that an armed attack in the Pacific area on any of the parties would be dangerous to its own peace and safety, and declares that it would act to meet the

common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes,” (Courier Mail editorial 3/9/1951).

“The ANZUS Pact is not an armed alliance like the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. It pledges its partners to nothing more than consultation on matters of common security”. (Courier Mail editorial 17/5/1954).

The ANZUS Pact has no relevance whatever to Australian involvement in Vietnam.

SEATO was signed on 8th September 1954, in Manila. Fifty days before, on 20th July 1954, France and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam had jointly signed the Geneva Agreement. The signatories to SEATO were: Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom, and the United States of America. Article 4 prescribed that the signatories would act in accordance with their own constitutional processes, should there be an armed attack “against any State or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate”.

A protocol to the treaty designated Cambodia, Laos, and the State of Vietnam (ie South Vietnam) as falling into the provisions of Article 4.

As Britain had been co-chairman with Russia of the Geneva Conference, and France one of the two main signatories of the Geneva Agreement, it is clear that Britain and France were parties to SEATO on the assumption that it contained nothing intended to destroy the Geneva Agreement, and on the further assumption that the United States would respect such requirements of the Geneva Agreement as -

1. an election to be held by 20th July 1956, to “bring about the unification of Vietnam” (ie unification of North and South Vietnam, which called themselves the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the State of Vietnam, respectively).
2. “the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary.”
3. Neither the DRV (North) nor State of Vietnam (South), or more properly, the regrouping zones, were to enter into military alliances and “no military base under the control of a foreign State” was to be established in either of the two regrouping zones.

The following consequences flow logically from the inclusion of Britain and France as signatories of SEATO –

1. if the present military action in Vietnam falls within the scope of SEATO, Britain and France were guilty of duplicity at the time of the Geneva Conference,
2. if the present military action does not fall within the scope of SEATO, but was so intended by America in 1954, and if it was also America’s intention falsely to invoke the provisions of SEATO at some later date to obtain support for her contemplated military action, America was guilty of duplicity at the time of the SEATO conference, and is guilty of continuing duplicity whenever she invokes SEATO as the authority for her actions,

3. if the present military action does not fall within the scope of SEATO, (because the American military presence explicitly conflicts with the terms of the Geneva Agreement), and if Australia accepted the Geneva Agreement in 1954, the SEATO pact cannot be invoked by America to support a demand on Australia for collaboration in her military activities in Vietnam,
4. America can demand collaboration from Australia in the military action in Vietnam only on the explicit and unequivocal statement by both nations that at the time of signing SEATO (8/9/1954) each had rejected the terms of the Geneva Agreement (20/7/1954),
5. In the event of these explicit and unequivocal statements being forthcoming, America and Australia adjudge themselves guilty of duplicity, both towards their own people and towards the Vietnamese.

The correct position is stated in points Nos. (2) and (3). SEATO has no relevance whatever to Australian involvement in Vietnam.

THE REAL REASON FOR AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT:

In determining whether the reasons advanced to justify American involvement are valid or not, the reader should discriminate carefully between two issues:

- The initial position in Vietnam in 1954, and
- The current position in Vietnam as it is represented to be by the United States.

The current position can be comprehended only after an evaluation of the following facts:

- The reign in South Vietnam of the US backed Diem (1954-63).
- The activities of the Central Intelligence Agency from 1955 onwards, using Michigan State University activities as cover,
- The failure of the forces supporting South Vietnam to observe the requirements of the Geneva Agreement, particularly with regard to unifying elections,
- The support for Diem and criticism of the Geneva Agreement by Cardinal Spellman,
- Vietnamese opposition to the repressive measures of Diem,
- The period of the “burning Buddhists”,
- The outbreak of hostilities involving the National Liberation Front,
- Relations between the NLF and Hanoi,
- The tremendous increase (more than 20 times over) in US forces since the election of L.B. Johnson in November 1964.

It is not the intention of this Pamphlet to enter this labyrinth. There is no need to. It can be shown that American actions in 1954 led inexorably to the present situation, and that by an examination of the events of 1954, the later pattern becomes clear.

The key that unlocks the mystery of American involvement in Vietnam is the mass exodus in 1954, from North Vietnam to South Vietnam, of three-quarters of a million Roman Catholics.

- This exodus was organised,

- It was preceded by an American psychological warfare campaign directed purposefully at the Roman Catholic population (“Christ has gone South”, and “The Virgin Mary has departed from the North”).
- Whole bishoprics “from the bishops to almost the last village priest and faithful” removed themselves to the South,
- Land was specially prepared for these Roman Catholics on arrival in South Vietnam.

For an account of this exodus see Bernard Fall: *The Two Vietnams*, pp153-154. (An interesting segment also appeared on ABC TV “Weekend Magazine” on 12/2/1967. This dealt with the villagers of Binh Gia and their priest, Father Dong, who had “led the villagers south” in 1954).

The effect of this exodus was the aggregation in South Vietnam of a population of 1½ million Roman Catholics.

Free movement between the north and south ‘regrouping zones’, within a period of 300 days from 20/7/1954, had been provided for in the Geneva Agreement.

The significance of the Exodus arises from 4 points taken in conjunction:

- It was deliberately organised to aggregate the Roman Catholic population in the south,
- The influential Cardinal Spellman was a bitter opponent of the Geneva Agreement,
- The Geneva Agreement stipulated elections to unite Vietnam by 20/7/1956,
- There was general agreement that these elections would be won by Ho Chi Minh

Several conclusions may be reached on the purpose of the Exodus –

- If the Exodus took place on the assumption that the elections would be held as stipulated, it was a pointless gesture of defiance,
- If the Exodus was deliberately organised on the assumption that the elections would **not** be held, Spellman and the Roman Catholic hierarchy must either have received assurances to that effect from the United States government or were already working to that end,
- The fact is certain that the elections were never held. Just as certain it is that by 20th July 1956, the supporters of Diem – Cardinal Spellman and the United States Government – had declared against the Geneva Agreement.

Subsequent events in Vietnam should be judged against this background.

From this time onwards all attempts to have the Geneva Agreement complied with was represented as “communist aggression”. Vietnamese opposition to the repressive measures of Diem – opposition which expressed itself by self-immolation by a number of Buddhists – was represented as “communist subversion”. The organised Exodus which helped bring this situation about was represented as a “flight from Communist terror”.

The present American labyrinth of lies on Vietnam has developed as a natural consequence of events of 1954.

There is one reason for American involvement in Vietnam –

The refusal of the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, in Vietnam and elsewhere, to concede the opportunity, possibility or probability of the election to power over the minority Roman Catholic population of a united Vietnam, by a majority vote of the Vietnamese people, of a government led by Ho Chi Minh.

This, and nothing more. But what other minority group is anywhere accorded such a privilege?

SECTION 3: ISOLATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF FORCES SUPPORTING AUSTRALIAN INVOLVEMENT

Introduction:

The participants in, and the techniques and development of, the Great Australian Brainwash were dealt with in Section 1. In Section 2, the reasons given officially for “democratic” involvement, particularly Australian involvement, in Vietnam were critically examined. The purpose of Section 3 is to show how the groups supporting Australian involvement were brought into the open as a result of the policy of confrontation deliberately adopted by the ALP under the leadership of A.A. Calwell, before during and after the election campaign of November 1966. This period saw the Johnson visit to Australia, the Manilla “peace” conference, elections in the United States, Australia and New Zealand, additional Australian forces committed to Vietnam, Holt’s speech to the Moral Re-Armament Conference concerning Australian independence, and the visit by Ky to Australia and New Zealand. (See Australian newspapers for September 1966, to January 1967).

Conscription and ‘communism’:

The Liberal-Country Party coalition introduced conscription of 20 year-old Australians for military service overseas during the life of the Parliament 1963-1966. In the same period, Australian forces were committed to the Vietnam War. At the 1966 elections these policies were opposed by the Australian Labor Party. This election was marked by two strange features, one of which resulted, perhaps, from the attempted assassination of Calwell earlier in the year. Communism was linked with the Vietnam War, but not directly with the ALP as in previous elections. The result, of course, was the same. Those who supported the government still did so on the basis of anti-communism; few gave any evidence that they knew anything of the facts of the Vietnam conflict.

This gave rise to the second strange feature of the election – deliberate dissimulation, by many who intended to vote Liberal; unacquainted with the facts of Vietnam, but determinedly ‘anti-communist’ they remained at a disadvantage until polling day gave them opportunity to express their Liberalism, Idealism and Patriotism.

Church and state:

The uncertainty of the result forced parties with a stake in the issues to show their hands. Calwell nominated some of these interested parties:

“Unlike Mr. Holt and his friends in Church and State and those who vote for him tomorrow, I will never stain my hands or conscience with the blood of our conscripts

dead in Vietnam. Those who die in Vietnam will never have reason to haunt me all the days of what remains of my life.” (Australian 26/11/66, Front page).

The Church friends of Mr. Holt included members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Cardinal Gilroy of Sydney, the outspoken Bishop Fox of Melbourne, the less assertive Archbishop O'Donnell of Brisbane, all made their support of the Vietnam War clear at various times. (See Sydney Daily Telegraph, 17/11/66, Front page, and the controversy commencing in Australian 27/8/1966).

In the Courier Mail 23/11/1966 we read:

“The American Roman Catholic hierarchy supported the United States presence in Vietnam today. But the bishops said: ‘We must clearly protest whenever there is a danger that the conflict will be escalated beyond morally acceptable limits ...’”.

The statement by the Roman Catholic hierarchy had several built-in safety devices. It was clear only in its support for the Vietnam War. On the other hand a papal pronouncement, used by the ALP to oppose Australian involvement, was apparently capable of being used to support Australian involvement: it was clear on nothing. But others were involved beside the Roman Catholic hierarchy. A Queensland Cabinet Minister, a Liberal, publicly opposed withdrawal from Vietnam and cited a statement by the Anglican Archbishop Loane of Sydney:

“... Can we doubt the end-result of such action would be large scale liquidation as in China after 1949, or in North Vietnam itself after 1954? What would become of the million Catholic refugees from North Vietnam who have resettled in South Vietnam?”

As press, priest and politician combined in the drive for votes, a vague suggestion of the basic nature of the Vietnam War began to emerge. **It was a holy war and the ‘communists’ were the infidels.**

The church vote:

After the election the political scientists were strangely silent. Perhaps they did not want to inform the people that the bloc Roman Catholic vote had gone to the Liberals in NSW (who acquired it first in the ‘State Aid’ election of 1963), in fairly considerable strength to the DLP in Victoria, and consistently throughout the rest of Australia to the LC-P coalition.

Propaganda media:

The Australian press gave the L-CP coalition complete support. Calwell’s age concerned them greatly. The ALP’s social services policy would cost too much. There were doubts about ALP leadership. It had all been said before. It had been said so often at so many elections it had become standard. No attempt was made by the same newspapers to calculate the possible cost of the Vietnam War. Australia’s participation was supported by all newspapers. China, ‘Communist China’, was the great enemy of Australia. Communism was spreading. It was better to fight the Communists in Vietnam than in Australia. North Vietnam was actually China’s agent. One major Liberal Party advertisement played unashamedly on the fears of the people. It showed a

gagged Australian writhing, while behind him on a map, the 'Red' influence was seen to be spreading across Asia. When ultimately the gag was removed, the Australian stopped writhing long enough to proclaim: "I'm voting Liberal, mate!"

Read those few lines on the TV advertisement again ... slowly.

The nature of the Liberal-Country Party coalition:

The leader of the Country Party was reported in the press as having stated, during the election campaign:

"I don't like working in false charges, nor with people who seek to benefit from them and seem to pursue them as a regular diet." ... Mr. McEwan accused the Liberal Party of twice before, mounting a campaign of calumny against him ... "It is not a new experience," he said. "It is a well-developed technique". (Courier Mail, 23/11/66, Front page).

This Country Party complaint against the Liberal Party echoed a similar complaint made many years before by the ALP leader Ben Chifley:

"My main complaint about the Menzies' government is this – the deluge of political lies they have spread". (Age. Quotation by Evatt, 8/5/1954).

After the election the coalition continued as before.

The motives of the Australian electors:

There were 4 main motives –

- craven fear of communism,
- integrity (ie Australians don't rat on their mates),
- expediency (ie we must help the US if we want the US to help us),
- pseudo Liberalism, Idealism, Patriotism.

The L-CP was returned with an increased percentage of votes and an increased majority of seats. But one or two electorates did not follow the general trend. In these electorates there were local issues which touched electors more deeply than the national issue of Vietnam. A sudden and unhappy loss of Liberalism, Idealism and Patriotism resulted. The Liberal Party received unexpected setbacks. It seems that the elector votes "LIP" while all that is demanded of him is LIP; its obligations must not impinge upon his own interests. The Australian voter has been developed by "GAB" into the Great Untouchable of the 20th century: he will support Vietnam for as long as it costs him nothing.

But the Great Untouchable is going to be touched. Those who voted for Australian support of the United States in Vietnam on the grounds that this support is "Australia's insurance policy" will learn that premiums have to be paid; and paid in blood, not ballot-box liberalism.

Escape routes:

The newspapers know this. After the L-CP had been returned as the government they tried to change the subject; this was their escape route from responsibility and complicity

Sunday Truth had come out strongly in support of the government with an editorial stating that “AUSTRALIANS DON’T RAT ON THEIR ALLIES” (20/11/1966), then piously hoped that Holt would “not automatically regard yesterday’s vote as the green light for increasing our forces in Vietnam”. (27/11/1966).

The editor of this newspaper was one of those drawn out of cover by the uncertainty of the prospective result.

Before the ballot, Vietnam was the central issue of the election according to the Courier Mail and other newspapers. But within a few days of Holt’s victory with all it signified in terms of an increased Vietnam commitment, the Courier Mail reported:

“CALL-UP AND VIETNAM MINOR ELECTION ISSUES, SAYS GALLUP.

Despite the efforts of politicians, conscription and Vietnam were relatively minor issues at the Federal election, and probably helped the government only slightly, the Gallup poll says.” (30/11/1966, p 2).

The press foiled:

The get-away tactics of the press were foiled by none other than Mr. Holt himself. Two months after the election he wished Air Vice Marshal Ky on to the Australian people. The newspapers were forced to champion the American’s puppet. Holt firmly welded the press to an increased Vietnam commitment in this somewhat accidental manner. The press were unable to change the subject and achieve their usual get-away.

But on 6/1/1967, at the Moral Re-Armament Conference, Johnson’s Vicar made good his own escape.

**SECTION 4: VIETNAM, THE WORLD STAGE:
THE ISOLATION OF THE INTERESTED PARTIES**

The Vietnam War, as it progresses and increases in ferocity, serves to isolate and identify the long range objectives and motives of the participants. The United States, South Vietnam and the Roman Catholic hierarchy, by their actions, have long since declared against the Geneva Agreement of 1954. Australia, without any apparent policy or purpose, and seemingly without any consciousness of the present moral isolation of the United States and her allies, has thrown in her lot with South Vietnam.

The following are key statements, which index the basic attitudes at present being translated into military activity in South Vietnam. For the significance of these statements in the total pattern refer back to the analysis on page 1.

The Roman Catholic Church:

The basic attitude of the church towards Communism is expressed in statements attributed to ‘the Lady of Fatima’ and in the general directives of the papal encyclical “*Divini Redemptoris*”.

The Lady of Fatima and Communism (1917)

“Fatima is a tiny Portuguese town, where the Virgin Mary is said to have appeared six times to three children in 1917. The miracle is considered the most sensational in the Church’s recent history. The Madonna gave the children three messages – two predicted the early death of two of them, the end of the First World War, and that a Godless Russia would do great harm to the world. The third secret is in a sealed envelope kept under lock and key in the Vatican ...” (Sunday Mail 12/2/1967, p 4).

The Lady of Fatima allegedly said:

“If my wishes are fulfilled, Russia will be converted and there will be peace. If not, then Russia will spread her errors throughout the world, bringing new wars and persecution of the church ...”

A. & M. Armstrong: Fatima – Pilgrimage to peace, 1955 p 45).

The message of Fatima, which strangely coincided with official pontifical attitudes of the previous 70 years, was popularised by many methods. A “Lady of Fatima” statue made a royal progress throughout Australia a few years after the end of World War II. The claim that the Virgin Mary had appeared with a message of this nature provided a basis for a continuing crusade against Godless Russia and Communism.

The Papal Encyclical ‘Divini Redemptoris’ and Communism (1937)

This encyclical was issued on 19th March 1937. It is a concise papal pronouncement directed against the evils of “atheistic communism”. All Australians should make themselves familiar with this encyclical. The Great Australian Brainwash can be traced directly to its influence. Here are some representative statements:

On Communism:

“With reference to Communism, our Venerable Predecessor, Pius IX, of holy memory, as early as 1846, pronounced a solemn condemnation, which he confirmed in the words of the Syllabus directed against ‘that infamous doctrine of so-called Communism which is absolutely contrary to the natural law itself, and if once adopted would utterly destroy the rights, property and possessions of all men, and even society itself’ ”.

On Liberalism:

“Liberalism prepares the way. 16. If we would explain the blind acceptance of Communism by so many thousands of workmen, we must remember that the way has been already prepared for it by the religious and moral destitution in which wage-earners had been left by liberal economics.”

On the role of the press:

“Silence of the press. 18. A third powerful factor in the diffusion of communism is the conspiracy of silence on the part of a large section of the non-Catholic press of the world. We say conspiracy, because it is impossible otherwise to explain how a press usually so eager to exploit even the little daily incidents of life, has been able to remain silent for so long about the horrors perpetrated in Russia, in Mexico, and even in a great part of Spain; and that it should have relatively so little to say concerning a world organisation as vast as Russian Communism.”

The Roman Catholic Church certainly has no reason to complain about a “conspiracy of silence” by the press of this country in the period of the Great Australian Brainwash. In this period legitimate opposition to communism transmogrified itself into a deliberate and systematic attempt to control and manipulate the people by stimulating them to react in a predetermined way whenever the term “communism” was used.

The ultimate extent of what was attempted may be gauged from a judgement delivered in the High Court on 9/3/1951 by Mr. Justice Williams. This judgement is recorded on page 4 of this pamphlet. It is suggested that you refer back to it at this point before proceeding further.

The Roman Catholic exodus from North Vietnam in 1954

This exodus was described by Bernard B. Fall in “The Two Viet-Nams”, pages 153-154, as follows:

“Although there is no doubt that hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese would have fled Communist domination in any case, the mass flight was admittedly the result of an extremely intensive, well conducted, and in terms of its objective, very successful American psychological warfare operation. Propaganda slogans and leaflets appealed to the devout Catholics with such themes as ‘Christ has gone to the South’ and ‘The Virgin Mary has departed from the North’; and whole bishoprics – Bui-Chu and Phat-Diem, for example – packed up, lock stock and barrel, from the bishops to almost the last village priest and faithful.

Of the 860,000 who fled South at this time, 600,000 were Catholics. Although 65 percent of the total Catholic population left North Vietnam, more than 99.5 percent of the non-Catholics stayed put. The Tongkinese Catholics fled because they had a long experience of persecution at the hands of their non-Catholic fellow citizens – not because of the psychological warfare campaign ...”

Surely this could not be the Exodus held up to the world as a “Flight from Communist terror”?

Professor Fall lost his life in Vietnam on 21st February 1967.

“He took pride in the fact that his books – and articles, some of which were published in the Australian – on Vietnam and guerilla warfare in general were based not on conventional scholarly research in libraries, or even in the capital cities of South-East Asia, but on first hand combat involvements.” (Australian 23/2/1967, p9).

Cardinal Spellman and Vietnam. 1954-1966:

In the New York Times of 31st August 1954, Cardinal Spellman was reported as having said:

“If Geneva and what was agreed upon there mean anything at all, it means ... Taps for the buried hopes of freedom in South-east Asia! Taps for the newly betrayed millions of Indochinese who must now learn the awful facts of slavery from their eager Communist masters! Now the devilish techniques of brainwashing, forced confessions and rigged trials have a new locale for their exercise.”

(See M.E. Gettleman: Vietnam, 1966, Fawcett Publications, p239).

The history of Cardinal Spellman’s support for the Diem regime, and his influence on the course of events in Vietnam, will be found documented in a number of publications. His attitude was nothing if not consistent and in a News Bulletin broadcast by the ABC on 29/12/1966 he was reported as having said:

“In a sermon to American soldiers in Vietnam for a Christmas Eve Mass, Cardinal Spellman said the Vietnam War was a war for civilisation and anything less than victory was inconceivable. He said offers for negotiations had been spurned by the Communists. Yesterday in the Philippines the Cardinal said he stood by his statement.”

The Cardinal had declared against the Geneva Agreement in 1954. He remained fixed in his opinions.

The Pope’s messenger in Saigon. 1966

The following statement is considered sufficiently representative and sufficiently important to cite at length. It appeared in the Australasian Voice of Fatima on 1st November 1966:

“As reported in the news, the Holy Father recently sent a personal Legate to Vietnam to attend a meeting of the South Vietnamese Bishops. The Legate, Archbishop Pignedoli, who is Apostolic Delegate to Canada, stressed in Saigon that the Holy Father was not seeking a “peace at any price” solution. He emphasised that it must be a just peace, with freedom – particularly freedom of worship. This is of course the official position taken by the Catholic Church generally. It could take no other. It is important because it assures Catholic parents in Australia that their sons are serving and dying in Vietnam in an honourable cause, the cause in fact of Christ himself. For it is certain that, if the Communists were not resisted, they would overrun South Vietnam, burn and profane the churches, hinder the preaching of the gospel and kill and persecute Christ’s anointed. It is interesting to note that Archbishop Pignedoli returned full of optimism in regard to the situation in Vietnam ... Christians who understand the fundamentally spiritual nature of the upheaval in Vietnam will realise that a spiritual basis is being laid for peace which the enemy will not long be able to resist. Archbishop Pignedoli gave as a reason for his optimism over the future of Vietnam the rather obvious reliance on God to answer the worldwide peace through prayer crusade inaugurated by the Holy Father in his encyclical on the Rosary and the prayers and sufferings of the Vietnamese people. It is here that the Blue Army was greatly privileged to play a significant role. . For it is freely admitted that

the Pilgrim Virgin tour of South Vietnam was a great success, uniting the Catholic people at a critical hour, behind their bishops and clergy, impelling, in their hearts the fervent recital of millions of Rosaries and acts of consecration to Jesus through Mary. The greatest fear that the Vietnamese will have now is the Conference table. They dread a settlement, which will make permanent artificial division of their country at the 17th parallel. But ... In fact, Marshal Ky, Prime Minister of South Vietnam, seemed to be resigned to this division at the recent Manilla Conference ...”

In the 18th October 1966, issue of the same publication the editor had said:

“The Catholic Vietnamese, having seen how Our Lady has liquidated the political chaos of the past years, are now confident that this month of worldwide prayer called by the Holy Father for Vietnam will finish off the enemies of God as a major problem for their country. I hope that there is justification for this great optimismDuring my recent visit I asked about the possibility of an invasion of North Vietnam from the South. I received some knowing looks but little comment. The Vietnamese want their country completely liberated from the Communists and will not easily be persuaded to accept a settlement which makes the partitioning of their country across the 17th parallel permanent. Fortunately they are placing their hopes of a completely free Vietnam largely in Our Lady of Fatima. There is little likelihood that America would support a drive to the North ...”

The Vietnam War is a Holy War against the infidel Communists. This is clear from the above representative Roman Catholic comments. The Vietnam War is being fought solely for the reason already stated.

THE UNITED STATES: double talk

On 3rd April 1954 a high-level meeting was held in Washington. Its purpose was to clear the way for President Eisenhower “to use air and naval power in Indochina”. (M.E. Gettleman: Vietnam, p 97). Leaders of Congress who were present deflected Dulles from his immediate purpose but the policy persisted. A flow of press reports subsequently revealed the nature of American policy. “We have made our decision to attempt to hold Indo-China” Senator Bridges, Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, was reported to have said. (Brisbane Telegraph, 20/4/1954, p10).

From Vietnam came signs of a build-up: “Evidence accumulates as Americans fly in four star general after four star general, that United States plans are already reaching an advanced stage. My guess is that within a month, probably a good deal less, the American Air Force will be here in great numbers with an army following in short order if the French fail to hold Dien Bien Phu.” (Rowan Rivett in Brisbane Telegraph, 19/4/1954, p 2).

The definitive attitude of the United States toward Vietnam was stated on 3rd April 1954, at the Washington meeting addressed by Dulles. There was no deviation in American policy after 3rd April. But the declaration made by Bedell Smith on behalf of the United States on 21st July at the conclusion of the Geneva Conference, was significant mainly for what it suppressed of American intentions. (Declaration is recorded in Gettleman: Vietnam, p156).

America's policy – in prospect as well as retrospect – was to prevent the provisions of the Geneva Agreement from being implemented. More particularly it was intended to prevent a communist government being elected by majority vote of the Vietnamese people to rule Vietnam: a distinct possibility in 1954-56. Events have since made clear that America will pursue this policy despite the cost to herself or Vietnam: a very high price indeed, for the privilege of interfering in the political affairs of another nation. The luxury of professional anti-communism may sell well on the home market. It has no place in international affairs.

The United States in 1954 committed two major acts of duplicity – the statement at the conclusion of the Geneva Conference, and the subsequent forging of the SEATO treaty as an instrument, in part, for the projected subversion of the Geneva Agreement. In addition, the United States furthered its policy by such practical measures as the psychological warfare campaign designed to aggregate the Roman Catholic population in South Vietnam, followed up by direct support for Diem.

Cardinal Spellman, South Vietnam and Australia, supported American rejection of the Geneva Agreement. No definitive statement has ever been made by the Australian government on Vietnam, but the opposition of the Liberal government to Geneva can be gauged from a statement attributed to External Affairs Minister, R.G. Casey, on 20/4/1954:

“Those who speak of an armistice followed by an evacuation of foreign troops should realise that this would mean the almost immediate handing over of Indo-China to the Communists”. (Brisbane Telegraph, p10).

The essence of the Geneva settlement was thus rejected in advance. South Vietnam made its position clear on 20/7/1964 when official anniversary advertisements appeared in Australian newspapers referring to the 20/7/1954 Agreement as “Vietnam's Shame Day”. Cardinal Spellman's objection to Geneva was immediate, explicit and public.

How strange it is that the acts of aggression and provocation allegedly committed against South Vietnam between 1954 and 1960 achieved nothing more than to provide justification for American military intervention – a policy decided on by America long before Geneva and long before such acts were allegedly committed.

AUSTRALIA: rustics manipulated

American and Australian forces are killing Vietnamese in the land of Vietnam. The significance of this is concealed from most Australians. The Great Australian Brainwash technique is to refer to opposing troops as “Communists”. American actions in Vietnam are represented as the salvation of Australia. Understanding this, the following Courier Mail headline becomes comprehensible:

“WE WILL STAND BY YOU – LBJ PROMISE TO HOLT”. (29/11/1966, Front page).

And LBJ's visit to Australia. Subsequent reports from the United States spoke of Johnson's rating climbing 4%, in the findings of a Gallup poll, as the result of his Asian visit. A political bonus on the eve of an election.

Let us not dwell too long on Australia's role. Holt's election theme was "All the way with LBJ". If this was the policy of a responsible person in a responsible position, it was the equivalent of abdication: Holt was Johnson's Vicar.

On 6th January 1967, in a world of revolving doors, Holt entered the Moral Rearmament Conference as Johnson's Vicar and emerged as Australia's Prime Minister:

"We are free: when I say we are all the way with America that does not imply that we do not have an independent mind and judgement". (Australian, 7-9/1/1967, speech, editorial and cartoon).

Are overseas readers beginning to get the picture of Australia 1966-67?

SECTION 5: AUSTRALIAN POLITICS: THE POSSIBILITIES OF INTERNATIONAL INTRIGUE

Deep in the heart of Texas:

On Holt's re-election in November 1966, the American President cabled:

"With steadfast devotion we will stand by your side as long as freedom is being challenged and peace is being threatened. We know we stand with a man of conviction, integrity and wisdom. We know we stand with a friend. The world has taken note of the great vote of confidence given you by your countrymen yesterday. Your gallant men and ours are grateful for the courageous and far-sighted leadership that you are providing in the Pacific and Asia". (Courier Mail, 29/11/1966, Front page).

The cable raises one question. How long have American Presidents voted Liberal?

The Central Intelligence Agency:

Refer to two books:

1. Allen Dulles – The Craft of Intelligence,
2. David Wise and Thomas B. Ross – The Invisible Government.

Dulles, brother of John Foster Dulles, was Director of the CIA for 9 years.

"It (the CIA) has been accused by some knowledgeable congressmen and other influential citizens including a former President, Harry S. Truman, of conducting a foreign policy of its own, and of meddling deeply in the affairs of other countries without presidential authority ... This book ... discloses how the Invisible Government has operated in Washington to expand and consolidate its power, and how it has operated overseas in attempts to bolster or undermine foreign governments.

(2, p 4/5).

“The Kennedy Administration, while Dulles was still the CIA Director, made some efforts to reduce the number of agents operating under diplomatic cover in American embassies. But embassy cover is still central to the agency’s operation.” (2, p 252).

“An American Ambassador is the commanding officer and everyone stationed under him, including the CIA personnel, is responsible to him.”(1, p 195).

CIA Director Allen Dulles understood the magic formula underlying the Great Australian Brainwash. He imputed its use to the Russians: “Often Soviet moves seem to be influenced by Ivan Petrovich Pavlov, the famous Russian psychologist who induced certain reflexes in animals ...” (1, p 167).

Recent reports spoke of the CIA using front organisations to pipe funds, as subsidy, to the American National Student Association. The practice of subsidising chosen groups was clearly widespread. During the Australian elections of November 1966, a Liberal Reform candidate alleged that he could name “the two chief US Central Intelligence Agency operatives in Australia”. He was dissuaded from this action. (Brisbane Telegraph 16/11/66, 22/11/66).

No breath of scandal had ever linked the CIA with interference in Australian politics, with using the American Embassy as cover, or piping funds to Australian groups whose political attitudes are in sympathy with those of the CIA.

Australia is indeed fortunate!

The Santamaria Labor Party (DLP) and the Roman Catholic hierarchy:

The main points are summarised on pages 5 and 6. Pamphlet No.22, issued 19/12/1965, listed a series of statements which linked the 1954 white-ant group within the ALP with Archbishop Mannix and B.A. Santamaria, and traced the development of this white-ant group into the DLP via the “Anti-Communist Labor Party” of 1955. The Bishops’ Pastoral Letter of April 1955, signed by 33 Roman Catholic bishops, revealed not only the support of the church for the Industrial Groups, but also an attitude towards “Communism” remarkably like the precepts of the Great Australian Brainwash. The Bishops’ Pastoral, the papal encyclical “Divini Redemptoris”, and Mr. Justice Williams’ judgement on Menzies’ “Communist Party Dissolution Bill” of 1950, are essential reading for all who would understand the present position in Australia. The ABC TV interview with Mannix (1962) would also be essential viewing.

Of the 113 candidates representing the DLP who stood for election in 1966, none was successful. Neither the Liberal Party nor the Country Party fielded as many candidates. The main point of interest concerning the DLP is the source of its apparently inexhaustible party funds.

Australian Security Intelligence Organisation: (ASIO).

The Bulletin dealt generally with ASIO activities in its issue of 10th December 1966. A clearer picture of the functional divisions of ASIO emerges from the Report of the Royal Commission on Espionage, 22nd August 1955. The activities attributed to Russia in this report should be read as

the activities of Australia's Security Service. Special Squads of the States are extensions of ASIO. The Santamaria "Movement" and ASIO were linked by Senator J.P. Ormonde in a letter to the Australian:

"... The 'Movement' was a secret organisation – admission to its meetings was by password and generally 'Movement' organisers had hot-lines to Australian security organisations. Australian Security and 'Movement' were synonymous terms."
(20/12/66, p 6).

After the anti-Ky demonstrations in Brisbane in January 1967, the Queensland Trades and Labor Council complained of a physically observable affinity between the State Special Squad and the pro Ky DLP demonstrators.

The Liberal Party and the Roman Catholic Church:

The history of the Menzies' era in Australian politics is the history of the close involvement of the Liberal Party and the Roman Church. (The 'Menzies-Mannix Axis'; Refer earlier sections of this pamphlet and to Pamphlet No.22, p 7-8).

The Great Australian Brainwash was created by the unholy trinity of press, priest and Liberal Party politician.

SECTION 6: AUSTRALIAN POLITICS: THE EVIDENCE OF INTERNATIONAL INTRIGUE

Australia alone supports the United States in strength in Vietnam. The political importance of this support transcends the military effect of Australia forces in the field. In terms of the Vietnam War, Australia occupies a special position: it is the bridge of Asia and Europe. It was the intention of Dulles "to use air and naval power" in Vietnam in April 1954. The attitude of Australia at the time was vital to US planning. There seemed every possibility however, that the Menzies' government would be defeated at the May 1954 election.

The defection of Vladimir Petrov from the Russian Embassy in Canberra in April 1954, became the focal point of international intrigue. An attempt was made to destroy all opposition to the policies of the Menzies' government and to ensure Menzies' re-election. Had Menzies not been returned, the "revelations" of the Petrov documents at the Royal Commission would have ensured a further election immediately. An essential part of the intrigue was the political destruction of Dr. H.V. Evatt: the natural consequences of his victories over Menzies in 1950-51.

The Petrov intrigue links Ottawa, Washington, Moscow, Saigon, Canberra and Paris as well as the CIA, ASIO, DLP (or white-ant group as it then was), Liberal Party and Australian press. The Appendix to this pamphlet sets out the relevant information.

SECTION 7: VIETNAM AND AUSTRALIA: CONCLUSIONS

Australia is now inextricably involved in the Holy War of which Aneurin Bevin warned in April 1954:

“Mr Aneurin Bevin, leader of the British Labour Party’s left wing, said at Dudley (Worcestershire) last night that Britain should tell the US she ‘was not going to join in a sort of holy war against the extension of Communism in South East Asia or any where else.’” (Courier Mail 10/4/1954, p5).

No middle ground remains between Vietnamese Roman Catholicism and Communism. The United States, having committed itself, must pursue military intervention to its ultimate logic – the complete destruction of the military and political power of North Vietnam. We may expect to hear of incriminating ‘captured’ documents, of atrocities perpetrated by the Viet Cong, of provocation directed at the United States. This is in order to justify, little by little, a ‘final solution’ of the Vietnam problem. The solution suggested by Bernard Fall – the isolation of the National Liberation Front from Hanoi for the purposes of arranging a separate ‘southern’ agreement – will be ignored. It is not acceptable to the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Because the Vietnam War is a Holy War the various ‘peace’ and ‘truce’ bids are meaningless.

Two steps are essential before there can be any hope of a cessation of the conflict.

First is to isolate the policies of the United States,

Second is to isolate the Roman Church.

Rome’s antagonism to Communism, in Vietnam and elsewhere, ostensibly has a religious basis. It is not intended to enter into theological controversy in this pamphlet, but the falsity of Rome’s religious pretensions can be demonstrated on theological grounds. Suffice it, for the present, to say while Rome accuses Communism of being a “false messianic ideal”, the same accusation might very readily, and with complete justification, be levelled at Rome itself.

The first step towards isolating the United States is to bring about a reversal of the present Vietnam policy of the Australian government. The Australian policy has been made possible as a direct result of the Petrov Conspiracy of 1954. The political effects of “Operation Petrov” were cemented in subsequent years by a systematic and carefully directed press campaign. From the direct connection between present policy and Petrov, a most peculiar fact emerges:

The Achilles Heel of American intervention in Vietnam is the Petrov Conspiracy of 1954.

AUTHORISATION: This pamphlet and accompanying Appendix has been compiled by E.P. Wixted