

# ON TARGET

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY ON THE COLD WAR

"We will bury you ... your children will grow up under Communism ..." Krushchev.

FALSEHOODS  
DISTORTIONS  
SUPPRESSION

Registered at the G.P.O. Melbourne for transmission by post as a periodical.

Vol. 3 No.48

December 15, 1967.

---

Thought for the Week: "The citizen must know how to obey before he is fit to command, and the only man who is fit to help govern the community is the man who can govern himself."

- William Graham Sumner.

---

DESTROYING BRITAIN BY FINANCE: "A tough, uncompromising budget designed to jerk Britain's economy out of the rut was clearly forecast by the new Chancellor, Mr. Jenkins, in the House of Commons last night. He said the future following devaluation was hard because it would involve some immediate check in the standard of living and much personal sacrifice."

- The Australian, December 7.

The new British Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Roy Jenkins, is a dedicated Fabian Socialist and supporter of World Government. As Minister for Aviation he dealt the British aircraft industry some savage blows, the main one being the sabotage of the TSR 2. At the Home Office Mr. Jenkins' term coincided with the highest number of escapes from prison, the most notorious one being that of the top Communist agent George Blake, a big increase in the number of murders and crimes of violence. Mr. Roy Jenkins has had a close association with circles demanding a charter for homosexuals, an end to censorship, a new deal for criminals, LSD on the health service and better and quicker abortion. Mr. Jenkins appears to be the ideal man to deliver the knock out blow to the British.

In a report dated May 29, 1942, the London Chamber of Commerce said that "It was palpably absurd that nations should be desperately anxious to export more of their real wealth to the other countries than they received in return." In the same report the Chamber submitted "that international trade must now be raised to its true function: that is, nothing more or less than an exchange of goods and services of a mutually advantageous character." Here was the commonsense of practical businessmen as opposed to the dangerous academic financial theorists and those who use financial policy to advance their revolutionary programmes.

It is elementary that Britain must export that which she is most skilled in producing, industrial goods, in exchange for the food and raw materials she cannot produce herself. But necessary exports for necessary imports is not the policy being imposed on the British. Under the much-parroted balance-of-payments slogan, the British are told that they must consistently export more than they import. From a physical point of view, this means a consistent economic loss to the British. Socialists of all types have over the years spoken and written the most fantastic rubbish about the British "exploitation" of India and other former colonies. The truth is that any exploitation was of the

British, who provided far more goods, services and fixed assets to the "exploited" countries than was received in exchange. Non-Socialist economists have pointed out that before World War 1, a number of European countries, particularly Germany and Switzerland, built up their economies on a consistently adverse balance of trade, at the expense of the British.

We need not concern ourselves here with the technical aspects of how a consistent policy of exporting more than is imported is financed. But it is obvious that every country in the world cannot have a "favourable balance of trade"; some must have an unfavourable balance. The real meaning of the British Socialists' devaluation programme is that the British must now export 14 per cent more production to obtain the same imports. The theory is, however, that with lower export prices, the British will be able to sell more. But other countries also desperately striving for a "favourable balance of trade" will automatically take steps by tariffs and other measures to protect their own industries. A trade war, which is realistically unnecessary, between the Western nations, and a highly-industrialised Japan, merely plays into the hands of the Communists, exactly as Lenin predicted.

The British Socialists' devaluation policy has given one further impetus to the break up of the British Commonwealth. It has set in motion a whole wave of disastrous results. And yet the British Commonwealth nations, particularly Britain, Australia, New Zealand and Canada, have between them the basic raw materials and industrial skills to provide their people with a high material standard of living while at the same time providing themselves with sufficient military strength to act as a major stabilising force in international affairs. They could provide an example to the world, as they have done in the past, by devising ways and means to effect a flow of trade between themselves which would be to their mutual advantage. But to devise the necessary financial ways and means they should look beyond all Socialist financial advisers, and turn to the type of realists responsible for the London Chamber of Commerce Report we have mentioned. (Because this Report contains so much that it is applicable at the present time, the League of Rights proposes to re-publish it in the New Year.)

QUESTIONS CONCERNING WHEAT EXPORTS TO RED CHINA: "The question whether Australia lost about \$30 million in return from its wheat sales to China following sterling devaluation is looming as a major political issue in coming weeks. Under the sterling contracts with the Chinese for wheat already delivered and wheat yet to be sent there was roughly £st.80 million owing. Before devaluation it was worth \$200 million. Now it is worth roughly \$170 million."  
- The Age, Melbourne, December 5.

If, as appears to be the case, the Chinese Communists have reduced their debt to Australia by \$30 million as a result of Mr. Harold Wilson's devaluation of sterling, this suggests why the Red Chinese changed from cash payments for Australian wheat some time back to credit buying. Perhaps they were merely guessing? Or their financial intelligence is good? Whatever the truth devaluation has provided the Red Chinese with a nice windfall. But at whose expense? This is a question exercising the attention of DLP Senator McManus, who asks is the Australian taxpayer to be called upon to pay for the \$30 million dollar loss resulting from sterling devaluation.

There have been statements in trade journals that the Australian Wheat Board wished some months ago to insure wheat sales to Red China against the risk of devaluation, but that the Government opposed this proposal on the grounds that it could become public information and interpreted as a lack of confidence in Britain's economy. To date there has been no official explanation whatever.

Senator McManus rightly complains that as a Member of Parliament he is expected to vote on legislation for subsidies for wheat, but that when he asks the questions concerning wheat trade with Red China, he is denied the information sought. The Government has claimed that the Wheat Board is independent of Government influence. But apparently the Government could influence the Board not to take out insurance against sterling devaluation.

It is high time that all the facts concerning Australian wheat exports to Red China were made available to the Australian taxpayers, who are entitled to know whether or not they are subsidising the wheat industry for the benefit of Red China.

CAMPAIGN CONTINUES TO FORCE BRITAIN INTO EEC: "Western Europe's three leading political groups today called for the immediate opening of negotiations on Britain's application to join the Common Market. The groups - Christian Democrat, Liberal, and Socialist Parliamentarians from the Six Common Market countries and Britain - made the call in a 'Declaration of Paris' announcement at a press conference here." - The Age, Melbourne, December 7.

Mr. John Paul, Chairman of the British Anti-Common Market League, reports in his Political Intelligence Weekly of December 7, that his reliable French correspondent warns that "we must be careful to distinguish between 'no' and 'never', in dealing with de Gaulle's views on Britain joining EEC. We should be guided by this remark made by the General to a number of visitors on several different occasions: 'Britain will come in, but she will be naked.'" President de Gaulle, Moscow's number one favourite Western political leader, has consistently made it clear that he will permit Britain to join the European Economic Community when the British have renounced all international connections, and are prepared to be but one State in a United Europe. The Age of December 7 quotes a member of the French Gaullist Party as saying: "We of the Gaullist majority in the French National Assembly have never been opposed to Britain's entry, providing she fully subscribes to the Common Market's rules."

The Common Market's rules are laid down in the Treaty of Rome. No double-talk can alter the fact that acceptance of the Treaty by Britain means a major step towards abdication as a sovereign nation. This could prove the death blow for the British Commonwealth. That, of course, is the Big Idea of Charles de Gaulle - and those whose revolutionary programme he promotes.

"PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE" IN WESTERN EUROPE: "The U.S. and its 14 Nato partners have agreed on a plan for closer political consultation on relations with the communist bloc, diplomats said yesterday... Officials said the ministers would adopt the Harmel plan for closer political consultation, on which Nato experts have been working for a year. The plan takes its name from the Belgian Foreign Minister, Mr. P. Harmel, who called on Nato last year to review its policy in view of improved relations with the communists rather on defence against them." - The Australian, December 11.

The "improved" relations with the Communists are but a reflection of the Soviet's tactic of "peaceful co-existence" with Western Europe while the strategy of encirclement is advanced through the Middle East and Africa. Communist global strategy regards Western Europe as a "global city" to be encircled through the "global rural areas" and cut off from its sources of vital raw materials. At the appropriate time the "global city" can be captured as a result of subversion and chaos promoted within and pressure from without. Soviet influence continues to grow throughout the Middle East and in Africa.

THE SOVIET INVASION OF NIGERIA: "Nigeria's Federal Government military chiefs met privately yesterday for talks on the next steps in the five-month old civil war... United Press International reports that: In the air, the Federal Government's Russian-built MiGs have bombed oil plants near Port Harcourt, the largest town and port in rebel hands since Enugu, the capital of the breakaway province of Biafra, was captured." - The Australian, December 11.

The Federation of Nigeria, with its population of approximately 55 million people, was the last hope of those who preached that the "winds of change" would bring new life to the "oppressed" victims of European colonialism in Africa. But, as the Communists foresaw, the retreat of the Europeans in Africa, not in the face of Communist armies but because of a world-wide anti-colonial campaign, would create the conditions in which they could move in. Consider Nigeria now: The break up of the Federation as a result of tribal conflict, has enabled the Soviet Union to move in in force. The usual "technicians" came in with the considerable military equipment for the Federal Government. Soviet propaganda is being flown in every week, Russian-Nigerian Friendship Societies are being set up, Russian writers contribute to the Nigerian press, a new cultural centre has been opened by the Russians in the Middle-class suburb of Surulere in Lagos, and there are also Russian car agencies opening up.

Why is it that the Soviet Union can almost immediately send experts to any part of the world where they find an opportunity to entrench themselves? Because they have special institutes for training these experts in Moscow and elsewhere. These experts are regarded as part of the Soviet army conquering the world. Rhodesia, the Portuguese territories of Angola and Mozambique, remain the major bastion against the Communist thrust through Africa.

#### FURTHER SUPPORT FOR EXPANSION FUND

Since last week 55 supporters have subscribed and/or pledged \$971.00 to the Expansion Fund for 1968, making the total \$26,144.00. Contributions still welcomed.

---

ON TARGET is published by the Australian League of Rights, Post Office Box 1052J Melbourne  
Subscription rate: \$4. per annum - W. & J. BARR (PRINTERS) PTY. LTD.