

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 57 No. 1

JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1978

Southern Africa and the World Crisis*

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

The following, originally completely confidential, appreciation addressed to the Prime Minister of the Republic of South Africa was forwarded via the Embassy in Australia some eighteen months ago. No acknowledgment has been received, nor is there any evidence that South Africa is following anything but an orthodox economic policy. Because of the great problems of expansion and development Keynesian economics is still practicable in South Africa, whereas they are visibly breaking down in such fully developed countries as Britain and the U.S.A. The evidence is that these policies, basically unsound, are persisted in to the point of economic breakdown when a World Remedy under the auspices of a World Government—Communist or otherwise—can be imposed. In the meantime, Southern Africa is being politically isolated.

I. POST-WAR DEVELOPMENTS

At the conclusion of the 1939-1945 war, with Germany and Japan decisively defeated, world power was shared between the U.S.A., Britain, France and the USSR—the so-called Big Four. The U.S.A., however, with its immense mobilisation of both man-power and resources, its invulnerability, its logistical ability, and its exclusive possession of the atom bomb, was by far the leading world Power, and could have imposed on the world a *Pax Americana* of either a militant or benevolent nature.

Twenty-two years later the world is confronted with two so-called Super-Powers in apparent confrontation but which, if they came to agreement, could impose an impregnable World Government over the whole globe. The USSR, however, has *always* maintained that its objective is a totally socialist world, and it means by this a fully centralised world government managing the economy of the world as a whole, and able and intending to enforce its writ and to put down rebellion against policies which would inevitably run counter to national aspirations. Thus the immense productivity of the U.S.A. and other highly industrialised countries would be dispersed in pursuit of planned global re-organisation.

National groupings, however, under suitable conditions throughout history have striven for separate development, resulting in the development over the centuries of highly distinctive cultures and consciousness in individuals who contact differing cultures of a feeling of national identity. Thus the movement towards total world government is contrary to the historic development towards differentiation—a situation which requires the use of force, or the credible threat of the use of sufficient force, to stamp out national aspirations.

Yet in the past twenty-two years immense and visible

progress towards world government has been made. The early post-war years saw an immense expansion of Communist domination geographically in the face of American demobilisation. But progressively also there has been the destruction of national economies and institutions by subversion; and the promotion of de-colonisation has practically everywhere set back severely both economic development and progress towards civilisation.

One would think that the fruits of these years would bring into question the validity of the policies pursued. But in fact one finds that the U.S.A. has in every important instance supported Communist objectives by its actions, whatever verbal confrontations have been indulged in. Currently, though fighting Communist controlled Vietnamese in Vietnam, the U.S.A. is supplying the USSR with critical materials, though unquestionably aware that the war could not be sustained for a week without massive Russian supplies and technical assistance to North Vietnam. The American involvement in Vietnam under such circumstances undoubtedly furthers Communist purposes.

Similarly, after a period of denying that Russian missiles were being deployed in Cuba, the U.S.A. Administration acknowledged their presence. The outcome of the subsequent 'crisis' was an American undertaking not to invade Cuba, and to withdraw American missiles from Turkey. Since then it has been repeatedly reported that Russia has built Cuba into a virtually impregnable fortress, stocked with missiles and provided with huge underground storage facilities and underground tunnels suitable for aircraft take-offs.

There are many other instances where U.S.A. actions and pressures belie words and ostensible positions. The main ostensible U.S. position has been the "containment" of Communism; but in fact the whole post-war period has seen the continuous expansion of Communism. This can be explained only by the incompetence of those in control of U.S. foreign policy, or by their complicity in a strategy designed to secure World Government.

II. THE STRATEGIC SITUATION

In 1904 the English geographer Halford Mackinder enunciated the theory of geo-politics which was adopted and developed by the German General Staff. In this theory the Eurasian land mass and its peripheral water areas is the pivotal area of world politics. Control of this area, called by Mackinder the Heartland, would provide the basis of absolute world conquest; and such control was the objective of the strategy of the German General Staff. Control has, however, been achieved by the USSR.

* The increasing predicament facing Southern Africa has recalled this appreciation which was originally published in *The Social Crediter* in mid-1970.

This is the central fact of the present world strategic situation.

Russian Communism is commonly portrayed as an expansionist military power seeking conquests, as in Africa. But the USSR is an instrument of International Communism, whose strategy is control of the Heartland, and disintegration of peripheral areas important to the "West". Thus the assistance the USSR provides for the "newly-emerging nations", of Africa in particular (except for the southern border of the Mediterranean) is assistance in self-destruction. And again, the U.S.A., in its anti-colonialist posture, and by its "aid to under-developed countries", is furthering Communist objectives. Such "aid" was explicitly laid down as a Communist technique by Communist theoreticians before the war ended.

Now Communism, so largely identified in the public mind with the actual and potential military exploits of the USSR, is in fact the contemporary manifestation of an attempt to institute a World Government—an attempt with a documented history of continuity going back a quarter of a millennium. The early steps were the destruction of the monarchical and feudal order, and the substitution of government masquerading behind the forms of what has become known as majority rule. Actual government has increasingly been exercised through personnel indoctrinated in socialism in the first place by the Fabian Society of London, and latterly in institutions such as the London School of Economics and Political Science founded or inspired by the Fabian Society. Originally the doctrines of Fabianism were recognised as revolutionary, but by generations of permeation into universities, education, and churches they have become the established orthodoxy.

Fabian Socialism, however, has always envisaged the eventual destruction of national sovereignty, with the consequences sketched in Section I herein. Marxist revolutionary doctrines and techniques were developed parallel to Fabianism to cover this development.

The transition from Fabianism to Communism may be said to have begun with the first World War, which, looking back in the light of subsequent developments, prepared the way for the second World War.

During the first war, and as part of a complex deal to secure American entry into the war on the Allies' side, the British Government agreed to issue the Balfour Declaration, "viewing with favour the establishment of a National Home for Jews in Palestine". After the second war Jews from Europe and Russia were flooded into Palestine, which eventually, with international connivance, was declared the independent State of Israel, thereby creating an intractable Arab problem, and a perfect cover for Russian penetration of the Middle East—rightly described as the cross-roads of the world.

The objective of this long-term strategy was revealed in the June 1967 Israeli-Arab war. This has made the Arabs far more dependent on the USSR, has enabled the establishment of a formidable Russian naval presence in the Mediterranean, and with the evacuation of American air bases in the region, and the handing over by the French Government of their Algerian air base to Algeria long ahead of time, the Middle East is now virtually denied to the West, accessible to the USSR, and Europe's oil supply is in jeopardy. Europe, in effect, is now surrounded, and its lightning conquest a major possibility. In such an event American public opinion

probably would not sanction an American endeavour to retrieve the situation by conventional means, or the use of strategic atomic weapons with the threat of retaliation.

As well as the Balfour declaration, the "deal" between Great Britain and the U.S.A. included drastic economic conditions, such as Great Britain's underwriting the Allies' war debts—conditions which imposed external sanctions over British internal policies. By these means, Great Britain was reduced in strength to a position where she could not avert renewed war by Germany—a war the real purposes of which are revealed in the present consequences.

Britain has occupied a unique position in world affairs by virtue of its island position at the heart of civilisation, and the homogeneous character of its people. The Anglo-Saxon character has always been recognised as the great barrier to world domination by a World Government. Both world wars, the economic policies of the inter-war years, internal subversion, and US pressures combined with immense debts have eroded Britain's position to one of virtual impotence. Economic policies under Mr. Wilson's administration, so apparently idiotic, could only be deliberate, designed to end forever British autonomy.

Bearing in mind Stalin's dictum that in Communist practice "words must bear no relation to deeds", and examining the deeds of the USSR, the U.S.A., and France under de Gaulle, it is evident to the perspicacious observer that the strategic conquest of the world has been accomplished, but not consolidated. Although the U.S. Administration is unquestionably in the control of the World Planners, American public opinion is not, and if mobilised and directed to an understanding of the true position, would at this stage constitute a formidable threat to the final plans for World Government. There are some signs of this occurring. This probably introduces a time factor as against the patient gradualness which has obscured the real significance of both major and minor occurrences. But a point has now been reached where such significance is appearing, as the moves that have been vital can be perceived from the perspective of the end-play, as in a game of chess.

And as in chess, the end of the game is "checkmate" on the world scale. The World Planners want an intact world, not a nuclear holocaust. The occupation of Europe, taking the U.S.A. "by surprise", and therefore credibly without response, would create a situation where the American public would probably accept a surrender of their national sovereignty to the United Nations, which would arrange international inspection teams to ensure that its disarmament directions were policed. This situation would confront Southern Africa with a nuclear ultimatum.

III. THE SOUTH AFRICAN SITUATION

In the context described above, it appears that the Republic of South Africa occupies a critically unique position. It is the one country of significance which retains the power of independent initiative, and the fate of the world may be decided by the use it makes of that power. The lives of many millions of the human race are still at stake, and many will yet be murdered or pass into slavery. But though at present the forces of evil are in the ascendant, good-will predominates in human nature, and one sufficient example might unleash the power of that good-will. This is a small chance against a great certainty. Southern Africa cannot survive as an island of freedom and prosperity if the rest of the world

is enslaved. In this situation, the Republic of South Africa has nothing to lose, but possibly everything to gain by a correct and successful use of her initiative.

The vital and vulnerable factor in the whole situation is that what can only be called the world conspiracy has progressed by ensuring adherence to certain rules, just as the strategy of chess depends on the rules of chess. In the international sphere, the vital rule is that so long as you can keep control of economics so long you can keep control of politics: but no longer. The greatest threat to world tyranny is individual prosperity, if the latter is unconditional.

Prosperity is a relative term, not necessarily to be seen in modern terms. Some natives live in a kind of paradise in the Pacific Islands, and throughout the world there have been contented and, relative to their way of living, "prosperous" peasants. Discontent has as often as not been the result of subversion, or contact with an alien culture, just as urbanisation alienates the farmer. And on a simple base great civilisations with noble accomplishments arose.

With the industrial revolution, however, an entirely new factor was introduced. Depending on the harnessing of power derived originally from the sun's energy, this revolution continuously multiplied the effectiveness of man-power, thus ever more rapidly expanding and extending the basis of prosperity. Because there has been great misrepresentation in this matter, it is most important to emphasise that true prosperity begins in the provision of the fundamental necessities of life—food, clothing and shelter. Unimpeded access to those necessities is the very basis of freedom. Obstructing such access is the fundamental instrument of government. This is exemplified in the fact that when the Communist Party seizes a country with a peasantry, it nationalises the land and collectivises the peasants. This is the most fundamental form of keeping control of economics.

In industrialised societies the problem is much more complex, because the greater the production of physical wealth, the less justification there appears for denying access to it on the scale which expanding production makes possible. This is the fundamental problem of the World Planners, and the reason why national sovereignty—i.e., independence—must be destroyed. Then the resources of the industrialised countries can be dispersed.

The industrialised world lies between the extremes of free private enterprise which is progressively capable of enormously expanding the production of wealth, and of World Government with unlimited capabilities of dispersing wealth at least for several generations, by which time Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* would be established. In this interim period, the Planners are faced with the problem of maintaining political control by continuous economic control. The accumulation of wealth in private hands threatens this economic control, and this is the vulnerable aspect of the threat.

Distribution of production in industrialised countries is in the main by the payment of monetary incomes. The problem of the controllers is to prevent to any large extent the accumulation of incomes as *personal* (as opposed to institutional) savings, since savings confer independence. Reliance on continuous income subject to conditions leads to dependence, and hence control. The present solution of this problem of maintaining control has several aspects, the most important of which are: Inflation, Taxation, and Confiscation (Death Duties and Capital Levies). Hire-purchase which both in-

creases prices, and creates a form of economic bondage, contributes to the control.

Progressive taxation and confiscation are items in the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels—i.e. they are political rather than economic measures in intention, and can be replaced by other methods of providing government revenue. However, they have been incorporated in Fabian Socialist economic theory, and their Marxian origin has been lost to view in current economic theory.

But inflation is also a political instrument, and the problem is always stated as being one of "controlling" rather than of eliminating inflation. Continuous price-rises offset the natural rise of productivity, create wage-demands and industrial unrest, and wage demands when granted enter into prices, thus making the process a self-sustaining one. The over-coming of inflation would in all probability be a mortal blow to the World Planners. It is precisely here that the Republic of South Africa's unique opportunity lies. A Government policy of reversing gradually the inflationary spiral is entirely practicable and would progressively ameliorate social pressures.

Some draft proposals, which are in the nature of fundamental principles whose application would depend on particular circumstances, follow:

IV. DRAFT PLAN FOR THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

(1) *National Resources Inventory:*

Draw up an inventory of all South Africa's capital assets, including estimates of mineral and other resources, and of the man-power, this being the average earning capacity per average working-life multiplied by the number of the workforce; the complete inventory to be in terms of current money-values. Re-value the inventory annually.

(2) *National Resources Account:*

Establish a National Resources Account (N.R.A.) and credit it with "interest" on the valuation of the National Resources at a rate to be determined annually.

(3) *Reduction of Prices:*

Draw on the N.R.A. to subsidise producers in individual cases in consideration of their agreeing to reduce prices of products by, in the first place, 5% of their current selling price, such reductions being carried to the consumer level, whether of capital production or consumer goods.

(4) *Compensation of Wages:*

Where due to changing economic circumstances rises in wage rates are determined by *arbitration*, subsidise the employers by draft on the N.R.A. so that the new wage rates do not increase prices.

(5) *Reduction of Taxation:*

Reduce all forms of taxation by 5% in the first place, and re-imburse government revenues from the N.R.A. The Government to have no other access to this account.

6) Gold Production:

Subsidise from the N.R.A. presently uneconomic gold mines, and offer gold freely on the world market at current world price. Republic of South Africa gold reserves in excess of industrial requirements could also be used for this purpose.

V. EXPLANATION OF THE DRAFT PROPOSALS

(1) The proposal to evaluate resources is essentially normal company procedure as in a re-valuation of assets with a view to an issue of bonus shares. In the case of the National Resources Inventory the value does not need to be exact. The purpose is to establish a base on which Proposal

(2) can be carried out, and to indicate variations from year to year. Under normal conditions of expanding productivity the valuation would increase each year, and would tend towards greater precision. It is to be noted that the valuation is *not* monetised, but "interest" credited to the N.R.A. is.

(2) The N.R.A. represents a drawing facility, equivalent to a bank overdraft, the limit of which in this case is the "interest" on the Inventory. The difference is that the "overdraft" is not repaid, but is replenished by annual "interest", and does not attract bank interest. The Bank or other instrumentality handling the account would be entitled to handling charges.

In considering this Proposal, it is important to recognise that the only "money" which has an inherent *commodity* value is gold, and to a much lesser extent coins. Paper money has a relatively small cost of production. But the greater part by far of what functions as money is bank-credit, created out of nothing by book-entries and circulating in the form of cheques. Thus the monetisation of "interest" derived from the Inventory Valuation does not differ from normal bank procedure in method. In principle, however, the difference is crucial.

A full technical explanation of this procedure is too complex for inclusion here, but can be provided if required.

(3) This Proposal and Proposal (4) and, optionally, Proposal (6) are the key to the situation. The percentages expressed are tentative and illustrative only.

Insofar as the Government assumes responsibility for the overall control of the economy, its difficulty is in controlling the financing of industrial and other expansion without causing inflation. Proposals (3) and (4) introduce the money needed for expansion of the economy by *reducing* prices, and this and lowered taxation (both of which should be slowly progressive) are the economic equivalent of an increase of income for the individual, since increased productivity requires increased purchasing power to absorb it. An increase in incomes appears as an increase in prices overall, and is self-defeating, being offset only to the extent that an increase in productivity exceeds an increase in costs of production. By financing increased productivity directly, the self-defeating mechanism is progressively eliminated.

The "value" of a currency is commonly held to be, in the last resort, its exchange rate with a unit of gold. This in turn is set on the international financial exchange centres. The true value of a unit of currency, however, is its purchasing-power within its country of origin. By decreasing prices *internally*, the external value of a currency is increased—an effect normally sought to be achieved by de-valuing a

currency in terms of gold.

The effect of Proposal (3) is to strike at the root of international control of internal finance, which is the key to economic control and, so long as the existing system is maintained, political control. This proposal, therefore, would force the International Planners into the open. Their only economic remedy would be to "devalue" South Africa's currency on the international exchanges; but this would immediately make South Africa's more competitive, which, together with the "revaluation" of the Rand in terms of internal purchasing-power, would make the Rand more valuable, not less, in international transactions. This move would indeed be "checkmate" in the game of international finance where the origin of the world's troubles lies.

A further commonly held mis-conception concerning economic theory may be dealt with conveniently at this point—that a country grows rich on its exports. This is not true. What is true is that a country grows more powerful under the existing financial system to the extent that it holds other countries in its debt providing, of course, that it controls the physical sanctions to enforce the debt. This is the explanation of the rise and fall of Great Britain. The headquarters of World finance has been transferred from London to New York.

But international trade in realistic terms is pure barter. A country which exported the whole of its production, and imported nothing but money, would die of starvation as soon as household stocks were exhausted. But adherence to the theory that a surplus of exports over imports constitutes a "favourable" balance places a country at the mercy of the manipulators of foreign exchange.

(6) Since purchasing-power, and not gold, represents the real value of a currency, it is obvious that once purchasing-power has been stabilised, or, as should happen with increasing productivity, enhanced, gold can be dispensed with as a basis of currency. But since the power of international finance depends on gold as the measure of a currency's value, and as the world is suffering from a shortage of gold, the offer to supply gold from "uneconomic" sources exposes still further the position of the international financiers, and makes much more difficult the imposition of an embargo on exports to South Africa which, short of war, is the only effective measure that could be taken.

Apart from physical sanctions—i.e. war—South Africa is vulnerable only to the extent that it is dependent on critical imports.

A further misconception is that a country such as South Africa should seek to attract "overseas investment". Technical skills are a purchasable commodity, and to the greatest extent possible—and it becomes increasingly possible—industrial and other expansion should be by the exploitation of internal resources, financed by internal financial resources. With the Rand of increasing purchasing-power, foreign "capital" should be re-patriated.

VI. TACTICS

A careful study of documentary evidence, a great deal of which has become available in the past twenty years, make it quite certain that an attempt to impose an invulnerable World Government on the nations of the earth is approach-

ing its climax. The attempts to coerce the Republic of South Africa by attacking apartheid, and the Republic's position in relation to South West Africa, and by the imposition and attempted maintenance of an arms embargo demonstrate the vital importance of the Republic's power of independent initiative at this time, when a conventional military assault would be both physically and psychologically difficult to sustain. But a purely defensive posture by the Republic will in the end lead to certain defeat whereas offensive action, by showing the way to break out of economic bondage, might quite possibly lead to the defeat of the Conspiracy.

In these circumstances, if it were decided to implement a strategy along the lines indicated in the Draft Proposals, it would be essential to plan in secrecy so that an economically and practically sound scheme could be brought into operation suddenly as a surprise move able to achieve a quick success. It should be announced in the first place simply as "economic measures introduced by the Government to overcome inflation". There would have to be international retaliation; but this would force the opposition onto open ground, where his attacks could be exposed for what they are. The Draft Proposals are fully in accord with economic reality, and are flexible and adaptable, whereas the manoeuvrings of international finance are political. Expansion of productivity is a fact; financial restriction is a strategy. Overcoming inflation would release ever-increasing productivity, and, basing currency on a stable and, progressively, an enhanced purchasing-power, would free that currency from a fictitious tie with gold or "reserve" currencies, and would free the economy from an equally fictitious dependence on an export surplus. It is vitally important to recognise that it is not necessary to import "money" to purchase a country's own production. Surplus exports over imports are a real economic—i.e., physical loss. The ultimate, though because of international repercussions, not the immediate, result of what is proposed would be to increase the international value of the Rand, and until other countries based currency on purchasing-power, it might even be necessary to impose an export tax to prevent a drain of the real resources of the country. Conservation, not dispersion, of real resources is a fundamental necessity of national independence.

It is impossible to foretell when and how the ultimate climax of a centuries long plan will occur, but the strategic situation has deteriorated so rapidly in recent years that it is safe to say that time is not on our side. This is epitomised in the fact that the Republic of South Africa alone now possesses the power to exercise an independent initiative without constituting a threat to anyone but the manipulators of world power. This independence can probably be maintained until South Africa becomes subject to a nuclear ultimatum. As long as the rules of international finance are adhered to in their present form, that independence is circumscribed by theoretical obligations. But it is *essential* to break out of those rules while it remains physically possible. No genuine obligations—obligations founded in economic reality—need be repudiated. The ability to supply gold, while not being bound by the economics of a gold-based currency, and the ability to supply materials vital to the economics of other countries, provide a unique and final opportunity to avert disaster for the Republic, and perhaps lead to redemption for the rest of the world. The ruthless technological tyranny which threatens us would be the worst disaster ever to befall mankind.

To repeat, The Republic of South Africa uniquely has the one chance against a final certainty of a new and probably final Dark Age.

A Short Bibliography

- Lenin, N.: *Selected Works*
 Marx, K.: *Das Capital*
 Marx & Engels: *Communist Manifesto*
 Webb, Sidney & Beatrice: *Soviet Communism*
 Keynes, Lord: *The General Theory of Employment, Interest & Money*
 Bagehot, W.: *The English Constitution*
 Hewart, Lord: *The New Despotism*
 Martin, R. L.: *Fabian Freeway*
 Hoang Van Chi: *From Colonialism to Communism*
 Lane, A. B.: *I Saw Poland Betrayed*
 Browder, E.: *Teheran: Our Path in War & Peace*
 Smoot, D.: *The Invisible Government*
 Evans, M. S.: *The Politics of Surrender*
 Garrett, G.: *The People's Pottage*
 Gitlow, B.: *The Whole of Their Lives*
 de Toledano, R.: *Seeds of Treason*
 Soref, H. & Greig, I.: *The Puppeteers*
 Griffin, I. G.: *The Fearful Master*
 Stormer, J. A.: *None Dare Call It Treason*
 American Bar Association: *Report on Communism*
 Glubb, Sir John: *The Middle East Crisis*

Homage to Rhodesia

Since no other column in the British daily Press is likely to do so (not that this is the real reason), this column sends its congratulations and best wishes to Rhodesia on the 12th anniversary of its declaration of independence.

For 12 years I have watched with admiration, mingled with shame and anger at the attitude of successive British Governments, Rhodesia's fight against lies, insults and misrepresentations and, more recently, against the incursions of terrorists who are backed not only by Communist arms and money and by the encouragement of African pseudo-States but (it seems almost incredible) by the liberal West itself.

It is a pity, since it slightly mars Rhodesia's record of forthrightness, that Mr. Smith should have accepted, even in principle, the fraudulent "Kissinger package-deal", with its insistence on the absurd concept of "majority rule" (where does such a thing actually exist, where has it ever existed, in the whole world?).

But under pressure from South Africa, Mr. Smith's natural ally, he could, I suppose, have done nothing else. He knows better now: and so, I hope, does Dr. Vorster.

How long Rhodesia can now survive as a civilised country fit for human beings, both white and black, to live in, is doubtful. But who knows what turns of fortune there may be before that 13th anniversary comes round? The conflict over Rhodesia may have merged into a wider conflict.

But whatever happens, future Western historians, if there are any, will see Rhodesia as a symbol of a nation's courage and resourcefulness on the one hand, and on the other of the treachery and stupidity of the liberal West, its seemingly irreversible rush towards its own destruction.

— Peter Simple in *The Daily Telegraph*, London, Nov. 11, 1977.

The Anglo-Afrikaner Response

WITH OUR THANKS FOR PERMISSION TO DO SO, WE REPRINT THE FOLLOWING ARTICLE, DEALING WITH THE PREMISE OF MAJORITY RULE, FROM *R S A WORLD*, PRETORIA, JAN. 1977:

Nineteen seventy-seven could be as challenging a year as any in South Africa's history: and the dangers of the situation are compounded by misunderstanding in the West of two vital issues: (i) the implications of the political demand being made on Pretoria; and (ii) the nature of the response of the Anglo-Afrikaner nation and its capacity to resist

The political demand being made on Pretoria is for majority rule. Initiated by the black militants, it is supported by the Third World-communist coalition, the United States, Britain and the West at large. There was surely no dispensation ever proposed for any country so superficial, facile, self-contradictory, hypocritical or hazardous.

First for consideration is the validity of the theory of majority rule for this part of the world. Washington speaks in the same breath of majority rule and self-determination for the peoples of Southern Africa as though the terms were interchangeable. In fact, in the context of the plural societies of Southern Africa, they are mutually exclusive; and the contradiction between them is the crux of the divergent attitudes of the West and Pretoria towards the future of the sub-continent.

The concept of majority rule has its roots deep in the political experience of Western Europe. It has no universal validity and has been accepted and applied by only a very few of the political societies which have held sway in this or any other time. It rests on a convention, developed over several centuries in Western Europe, that government should be exercised by the representatives of the majority of the people, rather than by those who hold actual military, economic or dynastic power (as in the case of other societies). The concept has succeeded in countries which are culturally homogeneous or bound together by overriding common interests: it presupposes the existence of a high general level of literacy and political education; and it entails the holding of regular elections at which the majority of the people decide who their rulers should be. Thus in broadly homogeneous, highly educated societies of the West, majority rule may indeed be synonymous with self-determination.

This is not the case in the plural societies of African countries. Here majority rule means in practice that the representatives of an arbitrarily defined majority, in an arbitrarily defined territory, at an arbitrarily appointed time, are suddenly endowed with dominion over the minority peoples unlucky enough to have been lumped with them when the imperial mapmakers were drawing lines across the continent in the last century. In Africa, homogeneity — an essential condition for authentic majority rule — is missing: African societies do not have the high level of literacy and political education which are basic requirements for a meaningful majority determination of their political affairs: moreover, and understandably, they do not share the Western convention that the majority should determine at regular intervals who their rulers should be. In the event, after the initial colonial hand-over and the first elections, the convention was promptly discarded by all but two black states. The rest reverted forthwith to the old prescription whereby the masters of the traditional citadels of power — the army or the tribe (disguised as a political party) — determined who should govern.

The West appears nonetheless to be quite happy with regimes of this nature: and when it calls for majority rule in Southern

Africa what it in fact means is black rule. Its test for the acceptability of governments in Africa is not whether they are representative or capable or just — but simply the pigmentation of their skin. In direct opposition to such pigmentocracy, Pretoria rejects absolutely the concept of majority rule for the plural societies for which it is responsible. Instead, it takes its stand four-square on the principle of self-determination. It believes that majority rule is in the first place inconsistent with African political experience, and in the second place that it would deprive the peoples of the sub-continent of their entitlement to govern themselves as they see fit. Pretoria believes that in plural societies there are no majorities or minorities, only peoples with clearly defined and inalienable rights.

This is not a democratic world: it is not a world of Western political values: attempts by America in particular to make it such a world have failed, and they are not likely to succeed in the foreseeable future or perhaps ever. Advocacy of majority rule as the answer to the world's political problems is the resort of supine, careless or misguided minds — more especially, on account of its demography and history, in the case of South Africa. Consider its demographic composition: the country's three main population groups (each in the 4–5 million range) are the Zulus, the Xhosas and the white nation — the Anglo-Afrikaners: the next largest group is the Coloureds (2-million plus); and sandwiched half way down the remaining list of six black groups are the Asians (some 750 000). The mind boggles at the proposition that majority rule could bring justice, self-determination and harmony to an assortment of people such as this.

Then there is history to contend with. Generations of strife (before order was established by the white man) lies like a sword between the black peoples: they fear domination by the numerically strong among them no less than black and brown resent domination by white. Accordingly they seek freedom in independence of their own. Thus in South Africa today there are four sovereign black nations in addition to the sovereign Anglo-Afrikaner nation (those of Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Transkei) — and the Tswana nation of Bophuthatswana has opted for independence in October this year. Is it proposed that the majority rule dispensation should apply to all these six nations? Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland would certainly not agree: but if they are entitled to independence, it cannot be denied Transkei and Bophuthatswana — each numerically stronger and certainly no less viable economically. Moreover (and this is highly probable) should any one of the other main black nations follow the example of Transkei and Bophuthatswana and choose independence, then it is the non-black groups that would constitute the numerical majority in the remainder of the Republic of South Africa.

Is this what the advocates of majority rule want? No: they want the transfer of political power from white to black hands in the country at large . . . and in that event the consequences would be disastrous. The Anglo-Afrikaner nation would be a write-off as a partner in the development of Africa and as an ally in the defence of the free world. South Africa's sophisticated administrative and financial institutions and primary and secondary industries would collapse, since black people at this stage are totally incapable of managing them. Production, not least of food, would plummet; and there would be mass deprivation among South Africa's 25-million people and among countless others across her borders who depend on her labour market for their livelihood.

These are some of the more general implications of majority rule in South Africa. We come now to the response of the

Anglo-Afrikaner nation. There is the wishful thought, cherished in certain Western quarters, that the Anglo-Afrikaners — denied the right of self-determination, stripped of political power, threatened with "Africanisation", and subject to the whims and dictates of incompetent rulers — would, or could, nevertheless continue in a subservient role to manage these sophisticated administrative, financial and industrial institutions: that, dancing to the tune of a new regime, they would keep the ball rolling. Those in the West who believe that they can have it thus both ways — that they can dismantle the structure of the Anglo-Afrikaner nation and yet have Anglo-Afrikaners operate the country in their interests — should forthwith disabuse their minds of the notion. The Anglo-Afrikaners would not respond in this way; and even if they would they could not, since the political and economic management of a country's affairs cannot so be separated. There are only two alternatives should the structure of the Anglo-Afrikaner nation be dismantled — total chaos or a communist take-over.

The Americans and British seek to console their consciences against the manifest injustice which majority rule would do to the Anglo-Afrikaner nation (and others) by affirming that the white man has the right to live in South Africa. This is, indeed, a gratuitous affirmation. When the white man arrived in the Cape in the mid-17th century, the nearest black settlement was 500 miles to the north and 1000 miles to the east. He has as good a claim to his homeland as the American has to America or the Australian to Australia. He founded his Mother City at the foot of the African continent when New York was a small Dutch settlement called New Amsterdam. When Britain took possession of the Cape in the early 19th century there were twice as many whites there as in Australia, and Cape Town was a city compared with Sydney.

Discussing the subject a quarter of a century ago Professor Edgar Brookes, outspoken representative of the black man in the Senate in Cape Town, wrote: "Taking South Africa as a whole, what rights have the Bantu to it which the Europeans have not? They are not the aborigines as so often termed; they are conquerors as foreign to South Africa in 1500 as Europeans were. If force confers rights on them as against Bushmen and Hottentots, it confers rights on Europeans as against them. The same argument applies to occupation: as far as beneficial occupation goes Europeans have the stronger claim."

It is not necessary for Americans and Britons to affirm the right of Anglo-Afrikaners to live here: history does so most eloquently. Nor is that all: the Anglo-Afrikaners, and more especially the Afrikaners, have the right to live here as a nation. Three hundred and more years ago they began the building here of their nation, with its own language, culture, Church and institutions. To live in South Africa merely as individuals deprived of the opportunity to safeguard their way of life would be national suicide. One of the most eminent of Afrikaner journalists, Mr. Schalk Pienaar, has observed: "Unlike the English in India or the Dutch in Indonesia, the Afrikaner has nowhere else to go. For him there is no central shrine of national existence to survive the death of the outposts: on the soil of Africa he and with him his history stay or perish."

The Afrikaners — and side by side with them today the Anglo South Africans — have the inalienable right to live here as a self-determining nation. This they are determined to do, and this they are capable of doing. In the early 1960s militant black organisations, backed by what has come to be known as the Third World-communist coalition, planned their strategy for the elimination of white rule in Southern Africa. It was to be liquidated first in Mocambique and Angola and then in Rhodesia and South West Africa as a prelude to the assault on

the Republic. With Mocambique and Angola now firmly in marxist hands and with the disappearance of white rule over Rhodesia and South West Africa imminent, there are those who assume that the capitulation of the Anglo-Afrikaner is today only a matter of time.

They make the gravest error of judgment: the cases are in no way comparable. Portugal, the ruler in Mocambique and Angola, was weak and impoverished, distant from its dependencies and the last defender of a system — colonialism — which had been out-dated by history. Even then it was more than able to hold its own in the field, and it was a revolution at home that caused its withdrawal. The white Rhodesians number only some 270,000. The first of them arrived at the end of the last century in a country long settled by black men. Although outnumbered some 20 — 1 they endeavoured, after their unilateral declaration of independence in 1965, to maintain a hegemony over the country as a whole. As *RSA World* has pointed out repeatedly in the past decade, this was not a tenable policy. Nevertheless, and despite the combined hostility of the Third World-communist coalition and the West, the white Rhodesians have held out: their economy has gone ahead — and they, too, have been more than able to hold their own in the field. It was not because of weakness at arms that Mr. Ian Smith agreed in September last to Dr. Kissinger's majority-rule package, but because of the pressures exerted on him by Western countries and because he was persuaded that to agree would be in the long-term interest of Southern Africa and the free world. As for South West Africa, Pretoria does not question its international status, and ten years ago spelt out the terms under which — free from interference by the United Nations or the Republic — its peoples would determine themselves the shape of their future.

The course of events in Mocambique, Angola, Rhodesia and South West Africa sets no precedent for the Republic. The totally different controls of history and demography apart, the Republic is by world standards a powerful and resourceful country while the others are not. Through the generations its economy has gone steadily from strength to strength. Despite recurrent crises — the political repercussions at home of participation in two world wars, the turmoil of decolonisation in Africa, the international assault on its policies, Sharpeville, the assassination of Dr. Verwoerd, and the American campaign against its chief export, gold — progress has been maintained, virtually uninterrupted. In the 66 years since the Union was established, the average annual growth rate has been some 5 per cent: in the dozen years following Sharpeville in 1960 (which many predicted would do irreparable harm to the economy), the gross domestic product rose from R6,000-million*. Since the fuel crisis directed attention to the general shortage of basic materials in the industrial world, South Africa's mineral resources have assumed a new significance. Gold and diamonds apart, the Republic has a quarter of the world's uranium reserves, two-thirds of its chrome and manganese, as well as extensive deposits of antimony, asbestos, coal, copper, iron ore, tin, vanadium, vermiculite and zinc. It is technologically sophisticated (its Council for Scientific and Industrial Research and its Bureau of Standards are world models), and in recent years its scientists have led the way in fields as complex as oil-from-coal and uranium enrichment.

In 1975 Dr. Ray Cline, former chief of intelligence at the US State Department and deputy-chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, published a list giving his assessment of the relative power of the world's 150-odd states. In making his assessment he assigned weighted values to a variety of factors; and he found, for instance, that in energy production the Republic

* to R22,000-million.

was ahead of leading European countries; in the category of non-fuel mineral supplies it ranked seventh in the world; and in that all important factor, surplus food production, it ranked sixth. A feature of the analysis was the wide and even spread of the Republic's sinews of power; and according to Dr. Cline's reckoning there are on earth only 14 more powerful countries.

Those who put the Republic in the same category as its underdeveloped neighbours should consider Dr. Cline's assessment — as also the one made in 1972 by Lewis H. Gann, senior fellow at the Hoover Institute of Stanford University: it appeared in the liberal American journal, *Africa Report*, in February of that year. The author described the Republic as the only sub-Saharan state with an industrial and logistical infrastructure strong enough to maintain an up-to-date system of land, sea and air defences. It could field a balanced force with a modern navy, air force arm and army complete with armoured units; and in a time of crisis could certainly mobilise 200 000 men or more. Its industrial potential was such that it was capable of manufacturing instruments of war as various as the R1 rifle, the Panhard armoured vehicle, the Cactus air defence system, computers etc. It had come to an arrangement with France for the manufacture of Mirage fighter aircraft; and "while South Africans disclaim any intention of manufacturing nuclear weapons, they now probably have the technical capacity to do so." Mr. Gann concluded that in all likelihood no power but the United States at present commands the whole array of airlift, amphibious and engineering capacity, in addition to the tremendous concentration of firepower, that would be needed to defeat the Republic.

How is it, then, that there are those who assume that Mocambique, Angola, Rhodesia and South West Africa are the writing on the wall for the Republic? Perhaps the explanation is a misreading of Prime Minister Vorster's detente policy: they may have confused it with the West's detente towards the Soviet Union. But global detente as envisaged by Washington was an umbrella for America's diminishing involvement in world affairs, while Pretoria's detente is a commitment to co-operation, progress and prosperity in Africa, which the Republic is uniquely situated to stimulate. Many years ago Prime Minister Vorster declared that he would speak to anyone, travel anywhere in Africa, to safeguard the peace of the continent. This he did. Contemptuous of charges that he was travelling cap-in-hand, he travelled as far afield in Africa as the Ivory Coast, and — outside Africa in recent months — to West Germany and Switzerland to support Dr. Kissinger's bid for peace in Rhodesia.

There was no cap in Mr. Vorster's hand: and unlike the West's approach to the Soviet Union which was accompanied by Western disillusionment in its own ideology and system of government, Mr. Vorster's approach was supported by confidence in Pretoria's philosophy — of respect for the self-determination and sovereignty of all of Africa's peoples, of collaboration with them whatever their form of government, of political independence and economic interdependence, of live and let live. Mr. Vorster's unremitting search for peace has strengthened the resolution of this nation; and should conflict nevertheless come Anglo-Afrikaners will embark upon it with a clear conscience, knowing that all that could be done to avoid it was done.

Generally, in facing and if necessary fighting for their future, Anglo-Afrikaners are free of the guilt complex which so deeply afflicts the Western world in its attitude to people of colour. They are aware of serious short-comings in the implementation of the policy of separatism, and there is an unceasing national debate on the best means for removing them. At the same

time they are satisfied that they have done as well as the best, and far better than most, in the upliftment of the underdeveloped people among them. In the whole world is there anywhere a dependent people who have advanced so far, so fast, along so broad a front, as the black people of South Africa?

The Anglo-Afrikaners will fight if need be for their right to survive as a nation with an easy conscience and with the kind of resources to support them described by Dr. Cline and Mr. Gann. The mood of the nation was well illustrated in November: in the course of a speech the Minister of Defence mentioned the desirability of men up to the age of 65 volunteering for military service, and within hours recruiting offices around the country were inundated. Men and women, young and old, will throw in their full weight; and should the crunch come, the nation will adopt whatever political measures may be necessary and will use to the limit its technological capacity to ensure that it is not defeated.

The leaders of the West should set on one side considerations of Mocambique, Angola, Rhodesia and South West Africa, and judge the South African situation according to its quite different circumstances. They should understand that the nationhood of the Anglo-Afrikaner people is not negotiable and that the demand for majority rule that they have so idly tossed into the arena is a device which could detonate the peace of the world and civilisation.

THE ANTI-INFLATION PACK

Freedom and Inflation , by Bryan W. Monahan.	50p
The Alternative to Disaster , by Bryan W. Monahan.	30p
The New and the Old Economics , by C. H. Douglas.	40p
The Use of Money , by C. H. Douglas.	20p
The Application of Engineering Methods to Finance , by C. H. Douglas.	25p
The Mechanics of "Stagflation" and Grass-Roots Economics	An economic Experiment 30p
Price £1.50 posted for complete set.	

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E11 3NL.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year £2.00; Six months £1.00, Airmail one year £2.70.

Offices:—

Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E11 3NL. Tel. 01-534 7395.

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX. Tel. 01-387 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Tidal Publications, Box 23138V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001. Editorial: 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099 (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX. Telephone 01-387 3893. General Deputy Chairman and Secretary: H. A. Scouler, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

Printed by Circular Press Ltd., Colwyn B.