

THE NEW TIMES

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

\$7.00 per annum post-free. Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

Vol. 42, No. 1

JANUARY 1977

"BACK TO 1939"?

By Eric D. Butler

After gloomily surveying the events of 1976, with specific references to the many clutches at straws concerning the alleged evidence of "recovery" by the non-Communist nations' economies, one financial writer concluded by asking, "Is it a case of back to 1939?" Those old enough to recall the destructive years of the Great Depression will remember how in spite of the same type of wishful thinking and double-talk so prevalent during 1976, large-scale unemployment persisted right up until the outbreak of the Second World War. Productive capacity was throttled by a restrictive financial policy, which was coming under increasing criticism, particularly throughout the English-speaking world. But a dramatic change came with the declaration of war in 1939. Suddenly thousands of millions of pounds and dollars were created and depressed economic conditions disappeared overnight

During my visit to the World Anti-Communist Conference in South Korea last year, I pondered on the incredible capacity of the modern industrial system to pour out a torrent of production. Here was a nation which only twenty years ago, at the end of the war against the Communists, was little more than a rubble heap. Now it has nearly achieved complete self-sufficiency in rice production and has developed steel, shipbuilding and car-manufacturing industries. Massive dams for irrigation and electric power have been built. Over the past five years economic growth has been at the average rate of a remarkable 11.1 percent a year. The key to this economic achievement has been the importing of the latest technological know-how and capital equipment from the Western industrial nations and Japan and a highly disciplined work force. No strikes. Adequate financial credit has been made available, much of it borrowed internationally.

"AGGRESSIVE EXPORT POLICIES"

The Korean industrial expansion has been duplicated in Taiwan. But what is to be the end result of this type of expansion? I posed the question when being proudly shown over Korea's car manufacturing industry. "Where are your cars going to be sold?" I asked. The Koreans have not only imported Western technology, but have also imported Western financial policies and the philosophy of "economic growth." So I was informed that Korea planned to export an increasing number of their rather moderately priced cars. I recalled the incident as I learned just before Christmas that Korea is going to export cars to Australia! They will be competing with the Japanese, the British, the Continental Europeans, the

Americans — and, of course, the Australians. The Australian motor industry is so concerned about the prospect of a car sales slump in 1977 that it is pressing the Fraser Government to reduce the current Sales Tax of 27.5 per cent by 10 percent. Every industrialised nation is now feverishly attempting to make its finance-economic system work by stressing the necessity for "aggressive export policies." That is why there is growing friction between the non-Communist nations, much to the great satisfaction of the Communists.

The Fraser Government's devaluation policy was designed to increase exports while making it more difficult for other countries to export to Australia. But other nations have already taken some form of protective action. Very few Australians are aware that immediately following the big Australian devaluation, Brazil did likewise. Brazil, the fast-growing giant of South America, is also driving for increased export markets. There have been harsh words between the Common Market nations and Japan. The Japanese have been pouring so many exports into the Common Market nations that they are seriously affecting the Western nations' production systems. "You are helping to create more unemployment in our countries," complain the Europeans. And just when hard-pressed Australian beef producers were taking some comfort from reports about the EEC taking more Australian beef, EEC officials have announced the imposition of almost prohibitive import levies. The Australian Government has been attempting to pressure the Japanese Government in to taking more Australian beef with vague suggestions that retaliatory action may be necessary.

The new Japanese Prime Minister, Mr. Fukuda, has

formed a Cabinet which has made it very clear that it is going to take strong measures to "protect Japanese trade." Rather ominously Mr. Fukuda has echoed the view that the situation was similar to that of 1939. In a statement on December 26, Mr. Fukuda said, "The economic situation was very similar to that in the 1930s or just before World War II." The new Japanese Minister of International Trade and Industry, Mr. Tankaka, has spelt out the grim realities even more clearly than his Prime Minister. He claims that one reason Japan had to fight the U.S.A., and Great Britain in the Second World War was to defend its markets in South-East Asia against Anglo-American pressures. Those who know their history will remember how the anti-Japanese policy of the Roosevelt Administration brought the militarists to power in Japan, this in turn leading to Pearl Harbour. Mr. Shintaro Ishihara, the youngest member of the new Jukuda Government, leader of the well-known Right-wing movement of the Japanese Liberal Democratic Party, supports the movement to arm Japan with nuclear weapons. An unstable political situation is developing in Japan and could quickly become more acute if the Japanese find themselves being locked out of overseas markets.

The Carter Administration in the U.S.A. is faced with the problem of how to promote an internal "expansionist" policy, to attempt to reduce the high unemployment level, without at the same time stimulating a higher inflation rate. Under present debt-financial policies this is mathematically impossible. And greater American production can only result in America attempting to increase its exports. The Trudeau Government in Canada, which was going to "wrestle" inflation, has, in spite of rigid wage and price controls, failed to do so. The shock vote for the secessionists in Quebec is symptomatic of the growing revolt everywhere against excessive centralisation of power. The Common Market "miracle" in Western Europe has become a mirage. Spokesmen for the international financiers are now openly advocating that the Communists should be permitted to come to power in Italy. This will, it is claimed, result in "stability."

A BRITISH SURRENDER

And what of Great Britain, once the proud senior member of a group of nations which between them could - and still can - have led mankind away from the disasters of this terrible century of revolution, war, violence and the undermining of the very foundations of Civilisation? Surrendering her sovereignty, not to a military enemy, but to the International Monetary Fund, the British Socialists have agreed to the conditions imposed by their financial masters. And Prime Minister Callaghan has told the British that their "salvation" depends upon increased exports. British businessmen and trade union leaders have launched a major export drive for 1977. More than 1500 companies, including some of Britain's largest exporters, are supporting the drive. Like Japan, Britain realistically must export to pay for that

which cannot be produced domestically. But an enormous amount of British production is merely the processing of imported materials for exporting to obtain more materials. The over-riding objective is to provide "full employment." The end result is massive economic sabotage. Having drawn upon their enormous coal resources to sustain a programme of unnecessary exports, for which they have received no real payment, the British now propose to use their oil resources in the same way. Under a sane finance-economic policy the British, like the Japanese, would only be using sufficient of their own resources to pay for genuinely required imports.

ECONOMIC SABOTAGE

It is impossible to calculate the complete economic sabotage of the post Second World War years. Studies like Vance Packer's *The Waste Makers*, dealing with "built-in obsolescence," only touch the fringe of the subject. We laugh at the stories of those exploiting the rules of the Common Market, by moving the same production from one country to another and receiving a subsidy every time they do so. But, for example, how many unnecessary ships have been built to move production from one country to another while the reverse procedure has been taking place? A recent letter in an Australian paper by a large-scale caterer observed how he found it astonishing in a country famed as a primary producer that he had received offers from wholesale grocery firms which included frozen chips from Canada, canned green beans from Thailand, tinned tomato paste from mainland China, frozen vegetables from New Zealand, and much else. Those attempting to export food products to Australia are also operating under the "export or perish" dogma. They have been brainwashed into believing that a nation becomes wealthier by exporting more than it imports -thus achieving a "favourable balance of trade." As the Communists are not unduly concerned about the "favourable balance of trade," they are quite happy to be subsidised by the "decadent capitalists." Much of the programme for helping the "under-developed" nations is

BASIC FUND

The 1976-77 League of Rights Bask Fund has moved past \$20,000 at a brisk rate. Just prior to Christmas two of our Christian clergy supporters donated \$100 each. It was a sacrifice for both of them. But this is representative of the spirit of the League as it braces itself for the shocks of 1977. More equipment associated with League printing activities is being purchased. Large paper stocks are necessary for the massive brochure programme planned. More capital must go into maintaining adequate book supplies to meet the growing demand for books.

All Northern N.S.W. and Queensland contributions should be sent to Mr. Jeremy Lee, Kingstown, via Armidale, N.S.W: All others to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

but another policy of attempting to make the finance-economic systems of the developed nations operate. But the result is continuing inflation and the magnification of associated problems.

THE "LAST CHANCE"?

If the world is "back to 1939," then it is faced with catastrophe dwarfing all previous disasters. In 1939 the international crisis exploded into the Second World War. In 1977 the explosion is more likely to be worldwide revolutionary ferment, with Southern Africa a major feature of that ferment. It is as certain as the sunrise that the inane statements by the politicians, irrespective of their party labels, will have no relationship whatever to reality. The only possible hope for mankind is for one

nation to give a practical example of how to reverse inflation constructively and to make the economic system serve the individual. Exporting will then be reduced to its proper place. It is now over 50 years since C. H. Douglas analysed the basic cause of inflation and the flaw in the present finance-economic system, and put forward a constructive policy for correcting that flaw. Douglas warned that if the flaw was not corrected, then mankind was threatened with a collapse into another Dark Age. The only hope was that a small minority, who knew what to do and how to do it, could guide the majority away from threatened disaster. 1977 may well see if that hope is possible of becoming a reality. Mankind is now entering that period which might be described as the "last chance."

THE ZIONIST "CHOSEN RACE" HOAX EXPLODED

The publication last year of Arthur Koestler's book, "The Thirteenth Tribe", was an event of the greatest significance. In his comprehensive exposure of the Zionist hoax that the Jews in Israel are fulfilling their destiny by reoccupying their historical homeland, Koestler is saying nothing new. A synthesis of the subject is, for example, given in Eric Butler's "Censored History". But such is Koestler's background and status that his work, dealing with the Khazar origins of the overwhelming majority of Jews, could not be completely ignored. However, after a number of highly emotional and illogical reviews by Zionist Jews, "The Thirteenth Tribe" was given the silent treatment and copies became increasingly more difficult to obtain.

Those who have taken the trouble to make an objective study of the history of Zionism have come to the same conclusion: It is a power movement whose leaders have in the main been men who mastered the technique of credit-money creation, and who have exploited the "Chosen Race" myth to treat the rank and file of Jews as a collectivity serving purposes which are detrimental to themselves as individuals. As explained by the Jewish scholar, Bernard Lazare, in his classic, *Anti-Semitism*, the fundamental historical cleavage between Christians and Jews has been philosophical. The collectivist philosophy of Judaism has resulted in a disproportionate number of Jews supporting Socialist movements. Lazare writes of Marx as follows: "The descendant of a long line of rabbis and teachers he inherited the splendid powers of his ancestors. He had that clear Talmudic mind which does not falter at the petty difficulties of fact. He was a Talmudist devoted to sociology and applying his native power of exegesis to the criticism of economic theory. He was inspired by that ancient Hebraic materialism, which, rejecting as too distant and doubtful the hope of an Eden after death, never ceased to dream of Paradise realised on earth."

A non-Jew describing Marx as Lazare did leaves himself open to the charge of "anti-Semitism," even though as Koestler demonstrates, the overwhelming majority of those termed Jews are of non-Semitic origins. The documentation amassed by Koestler leaves no doubt that the ancestors of Eastern European Jews "came not from the Jordan but from the Volga, not from Canaan, but from the Caucasus, once believed to be the cradle of the Aryan race; and that genetically they are more closely

related to the Hun, Uigar and Magyar tribes than to the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob."

THE KHAZARS IN HISTORY

Koestler chose the title of his history of the Jews, *The Thirteenth Tribe*, to make clear that the great majority of Jews have no relationship with the original Twelve Tribes of Israel. Koestler's Thirteenth Tribe was Mongol-Turks, known as Khazars. Koestler shows the Khazars to have been one of the offspring of Attila's hordes, aggressive but with sufficient organisational ability to have gained control of other tribes and to establish an empire which for at least 150 years dominated the Southern half, of Eastern Europe. The acceptance of Judaism, in preference to Christianity or the Moslem religion, was a political decision by the Khazar rulers. Koestler makes it clear that the descendants of the Khazars are not Jews as a result of Divine Choice, but because their forebears had Judaism imposed upon them. As shown by Eric Butler in *Censored History*, a number of Jewish authorities have dealt with the progressive Judaizing of the Khazars, the first population of people in Eastern Europe to be called Jews. Koestler mentions the case of the distinguished Jewish historian, Abraham N. Poliakov, who came to Palestine from Kiev, Russia, in 1923. He occupied the chair of Mediaeval Jewish History at Tel Aviv University and is the author of many works. When his article on "The Khazar Conversion to Judaism" appeared in 1941 in the Hebrew periodical *Zion* it resulted in considerable controversy. When Poliakov's *Khazaria* was published in Hebrew in 1944 it was bitterly denounced by Zionists and their supporters. Koestler states that Poliakov is not even mentioned in the 1971-72 edition of *Encyclo-*

paedia Judaica.

It is interesting that the Soviet authorities have also frowned upon any historians examining the Khazar background of Eastern European Jews.

Needless to say, Koestler's work, *The Thirteenth Tribe*, has not been acclaimed in Israel. Even though Koestler's mother was Jewish, and he proclaims once again his long pro-Israeli sympathies, his work completely undermines the "Chosen Race" myth.

"ILLUSORY PREMISES"

As Koestler says, "... the Jewish religion — unlike Christianity, Buddhism or Islam — implies membership of a historical nation, a chosen race . . . The Jewish faith, as shown by 2000 years of tragic history, is nationally and socially self-segregating. It sets the Jew apart and invites his being set apart. It automatically creates physical and cultural ghettos. It transformed the Jews of the Diaspora into a *pseudo-nation* without any of the attributes and privileges of nationhood, held together loosely by a system of traditional beliefs based on racial and historical premises which turn out to be illusory."

But having exposed these illusory premises, Koestler then attempts to justify the establishment of the State of Israel, not on "the mythological covenant of Abraham with God" but by "international law" as proclaimed by the United Nations in 1947. All civilised people will agree with Koestler that the clock cannot be put back in Israel. But as Koestler feels that the true history of the Jews should be known, surely it is equally important that the true history concerning the creation of Israel be known. The principal Zionist argument for dispossessing the Palestinians of their country, one they had inhabited for thousands of years, was that Palestine was their ancestral home and that God had chosen them to return to it. While large numbers of Jews and non-Jews, victims of the "Chosen Race" myth, genuinely accepted this viewpoint and a turned blind eye to the uprooting of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians from their homes and properties, what were the real motives of those who made the Zionist conquest possible?

THE REALITY OF ZIONISM

Back in 1918, a prominent American Zionist Marshall wrote: "The Balfour' Declaration with its acceptance by the Powers, is an act of the highest diplomacy. It means both more and less than appears on the surface. Zionism is but an incident in a far-reaching plan; it is merely a convenient peg on which to hang a powerful weapon." It is a matter of fact that the Balfour Declaration was imposed upon a desperate British Government by Zionist international bankers during the First World War. The same Zionist pressures were great enough to ensure that sufficient members of the United Nations, with Moscow and Washington in complete agreement, voted for the acceptance of Israel as a new nation in 1948.

Writing in *The Brief for the Prosecution*, C. H. Douglas

said that "Zionism is something very different to a simple scheme for the return of the Jews to Palestine. That is incidental to the moulding of events and Governments to procure a World Dominion for 'Israel'. The objective involves a perfectly clear, coherent, and continuous policy on the part of the Zionists. The conditions for successive and major crises must be created and maintained in the world; the means required to deal with each crisis as it arises must be in the hands of Zionist Jews, directly or indirectly . . ."

Douglas went on to observe that the Zionist financiers' primary weapon had in the past been control of gold, money and credit, but the "legal control of raw materials is essential to the pursuit of the policy to a final and successful issue." During the thirty years since Douglas made the above comments, the world has been convulsed by one crisis after another, each crisis being used to foster the "inevitability" of mankind submitting to more centralised control of both credit and raw materials. Immediately following the October 1973 Arab-Israeli conflict and another worldwide crisis as a result of the Arab use of oil sanctions, Dr. Henry Kissinger was ready with a United Nations project for an international "economic rights charter." The essence of the Kissinger project was that energy, food, and populations should come under a "new international order."

The future of what is left of Civilisation now depends upon a frank assessment of the role of Political Zionism in creating and exploiting crises which are a continuing process leading in the one direction: towards the "World State." Whatever his intentions, Koestler has in *The Thirteenth Tribe* effectively demolished one of the most dangerous myths of history. If sufficient other demolition work can be undertaken in the immediate future, permitting sufficient people to grasp an understanding of one of the major elements in international power politics, there may be just enough time to prevent a complete break-down of civilised societies.

STRANGER THAN JAMES BOND!

"State Secrets" (1975) the last major work off the famous French scholar and historian, Count Leon de Poncins, makes James Bond seem tame. This work is in essence a collection of a unique selection of secret documents, which unravel the mainspring governing the revolutionary movement, which has this century destroyed Empires and advanced International Communism. Here is the stuff of real history, the suppressed documents that students are not supposed to see. The role of Zionist Israel emerges clearly.

Price \$3.40 posted.

"RHODESIA UNDEFEATED"

By Fr. Arthur Lewis

The Rev. Father Arthur Lewis, Anglican Priest who has given years to missionary work in Rhodesia, has never been backward in standing up for the Rhodesian cause. A man of great Christian courage and optimism, Father Lewis refuses to accept that Rhodesia has been defeated. He outlined his faith in a little booklet, "Rhodesia Undefeated", published in November. Because Rhodesia is going to be a major focal point of the deepening international crisis of 1977, and because Father Lewis strikes a note of hope, we are devoting a major part of our first issue for 1977 to republishing extracts from "Rhodesia Undefeated":

Rhodesians know well the three-pronged attack, which for years has been designed to bring us down.

First, we have been subjected to what is probably the biggest and most sustained campaign of sheer defamation ever directed against a small country. The volume and magnitude of the barrage of untruth have left our own information services helpless. The world has simply been told that Rhodesia is a bad thing, and told it with a deafening insistence and repetitiveness which amount to downright brainwashing. In many "democratic" countries legal prohibitions stifle facts about Rhodesia, while numerous church publications and church leaders—almost silent about the appalling tyrannies of communist lands—fulminate against one or the few countries still trying to be Christian.

Secondly, the malicious international policy of persecution, misnamed "sanctions," has made us outcasts and pariahs because we have stood by our principles and insist on responsible and civilised rule for the sake of all the races of Rhodesia. Uganda, with its pogroms and megalomaniac leader, escapes all but unscathed. The churches exhibit the persecuting zeal, which characterised them in the Middle Ages and at the Reformation: bigotry and the ecclesiastical closed mind triumph now as they triumphed then.

THE TERROR WAR

Thirdly, there is the terror war.

On August 16th, 1976, gasps of horror were heard in our multi-racial Senate when the Minister of Education said: "I regret to tell the Senate that one of our newly appointed school supervisors, while doing such a splendid work to improve the education in our African schools, was foully tortured, then tied to a stake and burnt to death in front of his wife and the assembled school staff."

Another African school supervisor was burnt to death with paraffin while his murderers danced to the tune of a radiogram. Of the beatings from which so many black tribes people have died, an African priest said to the present writer: "It would be kind if the terrorists just killed their victims." The hundreds of cases of murder, torture, maiming and rape defy any attempt at description. Pliers are used to cut off ears, noses, and lips: wives are compelled to roast and eat the severed flesh. African children driving an ox-cart have been blown to bits by a landmine—the fate of the passengers of dozens of buses in the tribal areas. A black policeman and a black district

assistant were stripped naked, as were some nearby women, forced to have intercourse with them and then beaten and shot.

Is it surprising that the silent African majority is very silent indeed? If race relations in Rhodesia were not good the whites would have been swamped long ago: they were outnumbered more than twenty to one. The world has not even noticed that African moderates were very much in the background at the Geneva "settlement" talks. If the reports are accurate, every prominent African leader, clerics included, associated himself in one way or another with the reign of terror. (In some cases, of course, this was for the gallery: not all African nationalist leaders are in fact involved in terrorism.)

Through the World Council of Churches and its ancillaries, terror has been given the stamp of respectability. Churchmen, of course, tut-tut about it occasionally, but seldom is any effective action taken. It is more common, on the official level, to denounce the misdoings of the security forces who have the unenviable task of trying to defend the innocent and fight the guilty, and who sometimes make grave mistakes or act excessively. Has any war yet been fought with clean hands? Who started this one? Was it the Rhodesian government which in cooperation with the black people has developed African welfare services far in advance of anything in black Africa—and which is trying to introduce Africans into government without handing over to extremists? If these efforts have been tardy, it needs to be remembered that the same extremists have wrecked each opportunity of settlement or compromise, demanding total power and leaving the moderates silent, frustrated and impotent.

These words are being written at Inyanga, a stone's throw from the church on the border, which stands for a Christian Rhodesia. All is quiet at the moment: but who knows the future? To the north, in the farming country which makes Rhodesia a granary of Southern Africa, a defenceless white couple in their seventies have recently been beaten and bayoneted to death. To the south lies the Honde Valley and St. Peter's Mission, Manda, where my wife and I completed the latter half of our two decades of missionary work among black Africans. The great church dominates the valley: the schools have raised the standards of the people immeasurably: the hospital has saved hundreds of lives. Now the Honde Valley is one of the hottest spots in Rhodesia, Christians

and pagans alike are being murdered, the innocent are suspected with the guilty and the hospital has been ransacked at gunpoint.

IS RHODESIA TO BE SHARED OR LOOTED?

Not for a moment is it intended to put Rhodesia on a pedestal and pretend there are not wrongs to be righted. But the white people whose home is Rhodesia, and who have contributed most to the country's advance, are not going to throw away everything they have built. Since they have a Christian tradition they will gladly share it. The ordinary African people have shown in practice that this is precisely what they want. But try to seize, expropriate and ruin (as would the black extremists egged on from outside) and you inevitably get a backlash. It is useless for Christian leaders—as some do—to throw up holy hands in horror. They, after all, do not stand to lose. Moreover, they exercise political influence without carrying political responsibility. Some have disappeared from Rhodesia altogether, leaving others to suffer the consequences of their provocative pronouncements.

The moral justice of Rhodesia's case is, of course, one thing: her practical ability to survive is another. The Unilateral Declaration of Independence provided a breathing space: without it we should have trodden the path of the black African states prematurely given "independence" with massive "aid" and waste-paper-basket constitutions. But no one could foresee the ferocity and vindictiveness of the British reaction. The purblind politicians of a post-Christian and apostate nation have never recognised that friendship and help for Rhodesia's African development programme would have transformed Rhodesia and brought about the sort of country they profess to want. This policy of persecution has indeed done some good: it has helped us to stand on our own feet. But it has hardened attitudes to a point where Christian reconciliation can only be brought about by a miracle. For this miracle Christians must ceaselessly pray.

THE COMMUNIST DESIGN FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

Equally, of course, few people could foresee the rapid collapse of the Portuguese Empire. The inside story of this has not yet been told: but one facet of it was manifestly the communist design to take over the whole of Southern Africa and its vast wealth and resources. The "Christian" countries stood idly by while Mozambique and Angola was reduced from prosperity to ruin—merciless, godless tyrannies being established in each. Rhodesia, South West Africa and even South Africa were exposed to the communist onslaught. And plainly landlocked Rhodesia was too small and vulnerable to stand alone.

Moreover, the Marxists' game was being played by Christian Churches. Rhodesia's political leaders were entitled to expect Christian guidance and a Christian stand from the churches: instead they found themselves ceaselessly berated for their imperfect efforts to maintain order

and peace.

But, of course, the churches were no longer their true selves. From the time of Lenin onwards, the Marxists have made no secret of their plan to use Christianity for the destruction of Christianity. Hence the Marxist infiltration of the churches. Ordinary priests, ministers, pastors and lay folk carry on their work and worship faithfully. But through the World Council of Churches—and much of the so-called "ecumenical movement"—the Marxist poison seeps downward and transforms the very nature of the historic Gospel.

CHRISTIANITY INFILTRATED BY MARXISM

The World Council of Churches' "Programme to Combat Racism" is, in fact, simply a programme to promote communism, and finance Black Nationalist and terror movements to that end. It has nothing to do with Christianity or race or with genuine African aspirations. "The basic underlying concept of the Special Fund is that of a redistribution of power, economic, political, social, cultural, ecclesiastical" (Background Paper to the Recommendation to Extend the Special Fund to Combat Racism, Utrecht, 1972).

This programme has achieved a success in Rhodesia beyond all proportion to the small amounts of money expended on the nationalist and terrorist movements. (U.S. \$83,500 was granted to the Rhodesian African National Council in 1975). A relatively tolerant, Western-style government, unwilling to interfere in religious affairs, has proved quite incapable of protecting Rhodesia from this subtlest form of psychological attack, the attack on Christianity—our greatest strength—by what masquerades as Christianity itself.

The Christian Council of Rhodesia, an associated "national" council of the W.C.C., is required by the latter's constitution to carry out the policies of the W.C.C., determined in Geneva (Section X, Sub-Sections 2, 3 and 10). It is provided with the finance to do this. These policies include the "Programme to Combat Racism." It is not surprising, therefore, that the C.C.R. condemned the 1972 Anglo-Rhodesian settlement proposals *before the Council had met* and became in effect the midwife, which brought the African National Council to birth. Today, its newspaper (describing itself as "Rhodesia's Top Ecumenical Paper") is the voice of the Muzorewa A.N.C. Black nationalists are entitled to their views: but hardly to such breathtaking disingenuousness in propagating them.

It is interesting to note that in the president's report at the 1976 Annual General Meeting of the C.C.R., it was (a) admitted that W.C.C. money inadvertently "finds its way into the hands of the communists' arms factories," (b) stated that opposition to the W.C.C. would split the church on racial lines, and (c) asserted that "The idea of evolutionary change of individuals so that they would

change their stand in racial policies is no longer a practical proposition and remains an ideal now impossible to achieve."

Any attempt to condemn terrorism in the C.C.R. had been abandoned as far back as 1973. The major churches have in practice gone along with the Council, or at least avoided public criticism of its policies. The C.C.R. holds the purse strings of substantial grants from overseas.

Anglicans may be interested to learn that they and the externally based United Methodist Church were the only two Rhodesian bodies to pay their subscriptions to the C.C.R. in 1975. The Anglican contribution was paid through the Diocese of Mashonaland, but not specified in the accounts.

GOSPEL OF HATE

It cannot be denied, therefore, that official Rhodesian Christianity -- in spite of the immense amount of good work done by the various churches—has strayed from the path of the Prince of Peace and from the Gospel of Reconciliation.

How well the Marxists have done their work through the W.C.C. is shown by a poem in the latter's youth magazine. "Risk" (No. 1 of 1976): —

"You!
White whore,
With your colonial coloured styles,
how, you,
have turned me
into an expatriate-bourgeois-play boy . . .
Just you wait,
till the moon is ripe,
when my black and brown
ancestral spirits
rise up in anger,
to wrinkle
your white-starched soul
with justice."

Is this the "black theology" which, without theologians, has taken Christendom by storm and made our inherited Christianity look like the quaint survival of a civilisation passed away?

SURRENDER AT LAST?

The magnitude of the onslaught on Rhodesia, physical, moral and psychological, is such that our survival for so long is itself little short of a miracle. But Christians must expect miracles, and countless men and women throughout the length and breadth of this country have long been praying that we may win through, at the cost of whatever sacrifice, to hand on the torch of Christian civilisation to a darkening future.

However, on September 24th, 1976, when the Prime Minister broadcast to the nation, it seemed that all was lost. Rhodesia had finally surrendered to the enemies who had so long and remorselessly planned our destruction.

Briefly, Dr. Kissinger needed Negro votes for Mr. Ford: and the U.S.A., paralysed during the communist takeover of Angola, had at last wakened to the deadly peril to the survival of the West posed by the impending Soviet seizure of Southern Africa. Christians should be clear that no moral considerations entered into Dr. Kissinger's plan for a Rhodesian "settlement." It seems not to have occurred to this peripatetic diplomat that he could have offered genuine friendship to South Africa and Rhodesia, and that such friendship would not only have transformed Southern Africa but would have given the U.S.A. everything it needed of us. No, it had to be the normal stock-in-trade of "diplomacy" and duress, all concealed by the most urbane of professional smiles.

Mr. Vorster, the South African Prime Minister, has tried to help Rhodesia and is no believer in boycotts. But what if South Africa herself were to be throttled by the United Nations? What if there was an oil embargo in the offing? The Rhodesian Prime Minister found himself presented with a take it or leave it deal. The abandonment of evolutionary change, the acceptance of "majority rule" within two years (the term usually means "black minority rule"!) and an interim government to work out a new constitution giving power to the "majority" and safeguards to minorities.

No such arrangement has yet worked in Africa, and by no stretch of the imagination can the plan be squared with the concept of a best man government. The evident drawbacks are the fact that the black political leaders represent only a fraction of the people—hence the need for intimidation—and the inability of these leaders to agree among themselves. None of them has enunciated a practicable policy by which the country might actually be governed. (Of course, the term "majority rule" is itself strictly meaningless; even *representative* government is almost unknown in Africa).

However, Mr. Smith, with our country economically throttled, had no choice but to accept the so-called "package deal." He won concessions before it was finalised and laid down conditions: the end of sanctions and the cessation of terrorism upon the establishment of the interim government. But on the main point capitulation was inescapable, as the greater number of his supporters subsequently appreciated. There was supposed to be some comfort in the prospect of American aid (which left alone, Rhodesia could have done without) and the protection of the American "umbrella." An assurance was given that no further demands would be made.

RHODESIA FIGHTS BACK

It was apparently the end of the Rhodesia of peaceful progress. The Chiefs, the traditional leaders of the African people, had no place in Dr. Kissinger's plans. At best the scheme was a wild and cynical gamble with a nation's destiny, a bludgeoning of a small country into submission to contemporary political superstition. But Rhodesia's

peoples mean little to the politicians of the West. Maybe there would be an exodus of many thousands of expendable white refugees and an inter-factional bloodbath: these, of course, must be avoided if possible. Dr. Kissinger was careful to see neither the country nor the people for whom he was playing God.

After his long struggle for a civilised and Christian Rhodesia, Mr. Ian Smith might well have returned home a broken man. But no. He quickly turned to trying to make a success of this unpromising deal, insisting only that its terms be adhered to by all the parties concerned. After all, he had been aiming at a multi-racial government for some time. Now it had to be attempted in vastly more difficult conditions. But Mr. Smith does not give up easily.

There was worse to come. In Africa, appeasement—however enforced—only leads to more extreme demands.

THE FRUITS OF BETRAYAL

Radio Mozambique, following the policy of President Samora Machel, totally rejected the plan and said the fight would continue until Marxist rule had been imposed in Zimbabwe (September 25th). "Whatever is decided will not be in the interests of the people." Subsequent broadcasts called for an intensification of terrorism, denounced the accepted nationalist leaders and identified the struggle with international communism. On October 4th the text of a memorandum was released which had been sent to the five black presidents whom Dr. Kissinger had consulted. (It is said that this was the document, which had influenced the presidents, at their Lusaka meeting of September 25th, to turn down the Kissinger plan). Signed by Rex Nhongo, Commander of the "Zimbabwe People's Army," it rejects all American and British participation, all Western proposals whatever, the projected transitional period, responsible rule and white participation in government. "Unconditional surrender now" is the only demand: it is to be achieved solely by war and will be followed by secession from the Free World.

Many of these sentiments were subsequently echoed at Geneva. One Rhodesian nationalist, claiming leadership of the terrorist forces, was reported as saying that whites would not be encouraged to stay but would be replaced from communist countries.

Of course, Black Nationalism is not necessarily Marxist, and is indeed professed by some sincere Christians. But the rival leaders have had to compete in extravagance in order not to be left out in the cold, and any who may gain power will find it very difficult to retain it without communist support and consequently a large measure of communist control.

Faced with this disastrous escalation of folly, what attitudes are thinking Rhodesian Christians to adopt? The dismantling of outdated and hurtful discrimination in Rhodesia (as distinct from concessions to real differences

and special African needs) was already afoot before Mr. Smith met Dr. Kissinger. So was the increasing participation of black Africans in government. These things are, therefore, not in question. The two-year period leading to a black majority in government might conceivably be a reasonable variant of the same policy—it would depend entirely on the quality of the Africans—though it would have been vastly preferable had a similar result been reached by natural development from the agreement enshrined in the 1961 Constitution, an agreement which was the basis on which the majority of Rhodesians asked for recognition of independence in 1964. (They were snubbed by the British at the instance of the nationalists).

POLITICAL FOLLY AND ECOLOGICAL CATASTROPHE

Those who shout so loudly today about power and about violence as a means to achieve it forget that you cannot eat guns and that Marxism does not produce food. Even Russia can concentrate on the production of weapons to further the cause of world revolution only because America is prepared to provide her with food and technology. Marxism in Rhodesia would be the ultimate human catastrophe for black Africans, since a population exploding at a possibly unprecedented rate of 3.6% would find itself with rapidly dwindling food supplies. Nationalism, votes, constitutions, power: all will be forgotten as men die like flies and a people, which grew from 400,000 to six million under white Christian rule is decimated by the slow agony of famine and disease. If the Russian leaders have our chrome and mineral wealth they will not worry about ordinary folk—or the political aspirations of those who proved useful tools in the seizing of Southern Africa. Angola, after all, is only an earnest of things to come.

"Time is on our side" cry the extremist leaders as they race blindfold to the edge of the precipice. "War is the only way." "We have come not to give but to take." But time and war are on the side of starvation. And when all is taken there remains only ruin, slavery, destitution and death.

Speaking of World Evil, that contemporary Christian prophet, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, has said: "We have to stand up against it and not hasten to give to it, give to it, give to it, everything that it wants to swallow" (Washington speech, June 30th 1975).

These, then, are the facts. Unhappily very few black Africans will believe them till it is far too late. The wealth and superior conditions of the white man—things to be seized, they are told, rather than to be worked for—these are much more immediately obvious. What hope then is there for Rhodesia's future, with East and West against us and the black African neither seeing nor believing the threatening doom?