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The Portuguese Nation Has Chosen Its Course
(From an address by Prof. Dr. Joaquim Moreira Da Silva Cunha, Under-Secretary for Overseas Administration, on 13th July, 1963, at the International Congress of Ethnography in Santo Tirso.)

... Providence willed that it should be Portugal that engaged in the mission of bringing the peoples of the other continents into contact and intercourse with Europe. With European civilization we carried to them the light of the Christian message. Our mission has kept us active and demanded of us sacrifices in these five centuries, and its result has been the constitution of a national community spread out over various territories and made up of peoples of differing races.

This reason, so simple, is why Portugal wants to remain in the Overseas Provinces, in spite of the almost general lack of understanding and hostility of many that face her. The inhabitants of those provinces, no less than the citizens of Portugal in Europe, are part of the Portuguese Nation. They are integral elements in it, and if we repudiated them or abandoned them we should be maiming Portugal.

It is clear that our world is dominated by utilitarian values and led astray by the influence of ideologies which, while ill-defined, are but the more strongly felt. I am quite aware that our persistence in this view is held to be mere obstinacy that must come to an end because it is bound to be overcome by the so-called “winds of change”. But those whose opinion this is are utterly mistaken.

Those forces able to decide the domination of the world are divided between the United States and Russia. . . .

The American and Soviet views on international problems are fundamentally opposed to each other but they have some things in common, even if they are based on different ideological premises. In many cases, then, their attitudes coincide on certain aspects and problems of international life. I will point out especially the systematic encouragement of all movements that favour the secession of African and Asiatic territories, without any previous enquiry as to their suitability for, and capability of, independent life and the genuineness of the separatist movements themselves.

For the Russians this policy is part of their strategy in the struggle against the Western States. The principles were defined by Lenin, polished by Stalin and are still in essence unchanged.

Much is said about the communist danger in Africa but little thought is given to what that danger in fact consists of, and the attitudes taken to the peril are often inconsequential and incoherent. The communist danger, taken in the sense of an implantation of Marxist-Soviet regimes in Africa is not a very real one, if we consider the features of the various social systems and way of life and thinking of the African peoples.

We should not, I believe, be far from the truth if we say that so far Russia has never thought very seriously about communising Africa in this sense.

Russia’s aim is to make Africa inaccessible to Europe. That is why she encourages all rebellions and riots and why she reproves with such violence the action of all European states. But America’s purpose is different. During the last war a committee was set up in the United States called the Committee on War Peace Aims, to contribute to the definition of the aims of peace. Intellectuals and financiers belonged to the committee. One of the aims it called for American post-war policy to attain was to integrate Africa into the sphere of American interests. To keep up North American prosperity new markets were necessary for its output, for those accessible before the war started would become restricted due to European reconstruction of the economy and the fact that China went communist.

This was the main reason for this celebrated doctrine: wherever European influence is extirpated, that zone is gained for North American influence. That was the idea when Indonesia, Indo-China and Suez were involved. The same principle is still adhered to in the case of Africa, in spite of the lessons that experience has subsequently brought and which have been more than enough to show the fundamental error in this point of view. Where European influence ceases to make itself felt, a void is created. It may not be exactly true to say that Soviet influence is directly felt in this void, but it is quite certain that American influence does not take it over. Almost always the result is to create a zone of turbulence favourable to Soviet purposes.

The succession of defeats suffered by American diplomacy, the fact that Soviet influence has come to be felt inside the western hemisphere, the growing insouciance of the representatives of African states at international gatherings, the enormous financial burden borne by the U.S. Treasury because of the United Nations’ presence in the Congo—all of these facts has been able to alter in the slightest the policy that the United States have adopted and carried out.

With doubtful appositeness the British Prime Minister has called this attitude of the two great powers the “winds of change” or the “winds of history”. The question is, can we hope to resist them? Before us we see the example of all the European states that had interests in Africa and which have now withdrawn from the continent. Should their example be (continued on page 3)
The Press

"The other secret I learned in darkest Pressland was that of the power the place wields. That was true: 'the power of the press' existed. But it was not the power I had believed. It was not wielded to inform, but to misinform—to misled. That was a very grave thing, because the power was so powerful, and because not even the most diligent explorer could discover exactly by whom it was wielded, or precisely why. It looked like a conspiracy..."

It is, as Douglas Reed assumed in 1946, a conspiracy; concentric with the Financial-Communist Conspiracy.

He also said: "The inference is irresistible that there is some hidden power, some third party, which seeks to gain its ends by them (modern wars). The immediate aim seems to be the extinction of the laws and liberties, lands and lives, of the European peoples (to which we inseparably belong). Much progress towards that goal has been made through the second war. The really guilty men, in my belief, may be convicted out of their own mouths: for they continue Hitler's work while most clamantly decrying him.

"Their most powerful weapon is a Press which has become corrupted. By the use of applied misinformation in our time masses of people have been reduced to a state of mind of all-believing scepticism, in which both groups are left unable to distinguish truth from untruth, tyranny from democracy, or right from wrong."

Douglas Reed, it may be remembered, resigned from the Times because it suppressed certain of his reports, consistently.

The function of the Press can be largely defined as paralyzing resistance to the plans of the Secret Power.
As it is an important function of the Press, with the subsidiaries television and radio, to mislead and confuse, so we must enlighten.

No Co-existence

The article printed in these pages on May 9 is now available in booklet form from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 5 New Wanstead, London E.11.
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Honest To Man

From a correspondent

In the first chapter of Honest to God by the Bishop of Woolwich, there is a section entitled "Theology and the World", in the course of which he refers to the Bishop of Middleton and Dr. George Macleod "who are as exercised as any in our generation by the relation of theology to the real world". A question that arises here is: why the qualifying and distinguishing adjective, as though there existed an unreal world of fantasy, lies and illusions, one unrelated to reality and truth? Indeed it should be a question of first importance for those exercised in relating theology to the world. Theology, according to the dictionary, is "The science treating of God". Then, however we interpret that science, if we agree that its relation to the real world is important (and how could it be otherwise?) it is essential that theologians should first enquire into the nature of the real world if their object is to be honest to God, and also one would say of equal importance to be honest to man. Without this enquiry into the nature of reality we risk falsifying the nature of theology by striving to relate it to a world divorced both from reality and truth. And this whether God is "up there or out there", or, according to Professor Huxley, whether "true religion consists in harmonising oneself with the evolutionary process as it develops ever higher forms of self-consciousness?"

It is a matter for comment that the nature of reality itself is never accorded an exact definition. One is left free to state its nature by a term that suits the purpose of one's subject matter, or of one's general attitude to, or experience of, life, however acquired. For example, M. André Malraux, who has been appointed French minister of culture, recently answered questions as guest of the Anglo-American Press Association in Paris, in the course of which he stated: "The destiny of the world is forged by harsh reality, not by good intentions". (Incidentally, he did not state whether good intentions, if actualised and realised in fact, would change the nature of reality and render it beneficent.) "Stark Reality"—to be obliged to face Realities—to be up against Reality, are common enough phrases that endorse M. Malraux's estimate, giving Reality a bad name and presenting it as something too avoidable at all costs if possible. And one might suppose that M. Malraux would agree here since he states: "It is certainly necessary for people to be happy now". Also: "... our absolutely over-riding problem is how to reconcile the fundamental reality of the nation with our desire—our hope—for the happiness of the world..." But how to reconcile this necessity and solve this over-riding problem in the face of "harsh" reality he does not tell us. Indeed he increases our difficulties when he states: "Make no mistake about it, modern civilisation is in the process of putting its immense means at the service of what used to be called 'the Devil'". And following this he states: "There is a great realm of darkness in man..." and asks: "What is there strong enough to set against the appeal to the realm of darkness by the powers of money? This is the only real problem for me that exists behind the word 'culture'." But until M. Malraux has solved the problem of "who are directing, or putting, the immense means of modern civilisation" at the services of "the Devil", and directing the "powers of money" to create the realm of "darkness in man" that he postulates, he will not even be able to state realistically his "only real problem", let alone solve it. For man has himself progressively evolved "the immense means of modern civilisation" not for the purpose of putting them at the service of "the Devil", but for the purpose of increasing the amenities of his life, and releasing him from the necessity of earning his living by the sweat of his brow—unless, of course,
he chooses to—and freeing himself as an individual to follow pursuits more congenial to him; whether cultural or not is beside the point. Put briefly, it was leisure not servitude that has been his consciousness—perhaps at times unconscious—aim.

Man's fault, a grievous one, has been to allow this, his inheritance of the ages, to be filched from him and put at the service of "the Devil", and transformed into an unemployment problem by means not of "the powers of money", but by those who hold and control these powers and direct them for their own end, namely the subjugation of man.

The problem of the Bishop of Woolwich, however, as stated by himself, is essentially a religious, not a cultural, problem, and the question of the real world or reality cannot be begged by accounting for it as "harsh", or by any other derogatory epithet applied to it, for by such summary treatment the nature of God can be distorted to fit in with any arbitrary estimate of reality.

Reality ultimately rests on facts, and any attempt to evade them in the interests of a theory or a policy distorts judgment. For the business of a judge, whose aim is to arrive at the truth of a case brought before him, is to determine the facts of the case which the evidence may be designed to conceal.

The Bishop of Woolwich, whose self-imposed task is to be "Honest to God", is under the same obligation to examine the facts relating to the real world, since it is the relation of "theology to the real world" that is the concern, according to the Bishop, of "the intelligent thinking churchman". One has a right then, indeed an obligation to ask the Bishop, and "the intelligent thinking churchman", what they believe are the facts of the real world to which theology must be related if we are to be honest to both God and man? Would the Bishop, for instance, accept the "facts" as set forth by M. Malraux? Is the problem of unemployment* a real problem brought about by "the immense means" of modern civilisation put to the service of "the Devil", or is it a false problem imposed on man in the interest of governmental control and dictatorship?

How can "the powers of money" create a realm of darkness in man unless they are in the hands of those who consciously employ the unemployed and find new ways and means of employment in face of this further encroachment on, and annexation of, territory by civilisation, which formally depended on man's activity? Is this then the real world, brought about by such manipulation and devices to which it is the purpose of the Bishop to relate theology? Today the question of prices is much to the fore. At one point in her history the Church was concerned with the question of the "Just Price", as Douglas observed, though then it was a matter of Usury that concerned her.

But today it is a matter of the people's own credit that is at stake, which has been annexed and turned into an ever-increasing and unrepayable debt with interest charges attached, and permission for the use of it accorded or withheld at the will of the self-constituted owners.

Why, one is driven to ask, does the Church remain silent now? Is it through ignorance or fear that she has lost all sense of justice, and has allowed herself to stand—mute—an accessory after the fact of the monstrous fraud in History?

B. C. BEST

THE PORTUGUESE NATION HAS CHOSEN ITS COURSE
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followed? Those observers who are dominated by anti-colonialist prejudice will not hesitate to agree, as will the timid and those who are satisfied by a superficial examination of the situation. Yet it is obvious that serious and momentous a choice cannot be decided merely in obedience to an ideology fashionable in certain countries and in the United Nations Organisation, but which is quite foreign to the national tradition and unanimous wish of the Portuguese people, or merely to content the timid and the frivolous who are quite incapable of understanding the real meaning of the present moment in history.

The Portuguese Nation has chosen its course and has clearly shown its admirable capacity for fighting. I would like here to mention especially the young people, the more wholesome of Portuguese youth. Their behaviour at the most crucial moments has so vehemently proved will to go on with that course.

To change course now would be to assume so great a responsibility before the spirit of our history that I doubt whether there is any conscientious person among us sufficiently brave to try it.

Since this is the decision of the Portuguese Nation, shall we not be forced to conclude when we study the panorama of international affairs that we are confronted by a collective delusion? Do not all, friends (or seeming friends), and enemies, seem to be geared against us? Is there not a siege of hatred beginning to take up positions around us, to choke us into submission, thanks to the decisions of the Addis-Ababa conference, a tactic which takes the form of breaking of diplomatic relations; boycotting our representatives at international gatherings and even the recognition of the leader of a gang of terrorists, Holden Roberto, as the head of a pseudo-Government of Angola? Surely it is impossible to resist such pressure and overcome it?

In the first place, if we study our history from the viewpoint of common sense and probability, we shall conclude that it has always been a chain of apparent impossibilities, from the very foundation of the nation down to our time. The fight for our independence, the Reconquest, the epic of the

* A report entitled Cybernation: the Silent Conquest by Donald N. Michael and published in Santa Barbara, California, is a horrifying document. After a brief survey of what it regards as "The Advantages of Cybernation", it devotes the main of its Report to its problems. This section is entitled "Unemployment and Employment". More accurately stated it should read: how to re-employ the unemployed and find new ways and means of employment in face of this further encroachment on, and annexation of, territory by cybernation, which formally depended on man's activity whether of mind or muscle for its use or development. A quotation from section "After the Take Over" indicates this over-employment that would result. These people will work short hours, with much time for the pursuit of leisure activities." And then the author asks: "What will they do all their long lives ...?" A solution, however, is offered for: "We shall presumably have found some way to give meaning to the consumption of mass leisure. It would seem that a life orientated to private recreation might carry with it an attitude of relative indifference to public responsibility. This indifference, plus the centralisation of authority, seem to imply a governing elite and a popular acceptance of such an elite." (Emphasis added.) Surely the word "authority" is wrongly used and "power" is intended.

Since "short hours" mean short pay, that's why we will spend "their" leisure lives applying to the Welfare State to supplement "their" inadequate incomes.
Discoveries, our expansion to carry European civilisation to heathen people, all these seemed to be impossible dreams. If our Kings, our Missionaries, our Captains and our people had let themselves be intimidated by the sheer size of the task in which they engaged their whole strength, they would not have taken one step forward and Portugal might now be nothing more than some obscure, all but unheard-of corner of the Peninsula.

However great the difficulties appear to be, we must face them with the same spirit. There is no alternative to this. And perhaps these difficulties are not so grave as they appear, after all. The unity of the anti-Portuguese front is more apparent than real. The coincidence of the anti-colonialism defended by the U.S. and by Russia does not correspond to a real identity of opinion. In essentials the two great powers differ in everything: both in their interests and in their way of looking at the World and Life. There must come a time when the exigencies of the defense system will reveal to everybody the incoherence of American policy in Africa.

Nobody will deny, I assume, that it is impossible to defend Western Europe with a system whose right flank is completely uncovered, and where the rear is threatened by positions that the enemy has already occupied or which have been undermined by its persistent propaganda. If we look at the world map what do we see? North and Central Africa may not be under Russian domination but they do not support Europe. In the western hemisphere many South American states are threatened by subversion. Asia is in turmoil, ravaged by discord and threatened by a simmering Chinese imperialism.

The only zone of the dark continent that remains true to the European spirit is southern Africa, where we find the Portuguese territories of Angola and Mozambique and the Republic of South Africa. That is why the offensive is aimed primarily at us and at the South African Republic. When the United States discover that, however many dollars they spend, their African policy will gain them not one friend, but will indeed lose them some, then they will eventually understand that they need us, that it is important for them that we should remain in Africa.

So far the Russian leaders have moved so as to avoid repeating the mistakes they made at the end of the war. It was the excessive harshness of Stalin's policy that provoked a change in American policy, which took shape in the institution of NATO. His successors have tried to convince the world that Stalin's death opened up a new era in Russian home and foreign policy, characterised by mildness and by a "rapprochement" with the West, what they have called "peaceful co-existence". And many people have believed it . . .

On the other hand, even the united front of the Africans against Portugal is far from being an irresistible force. In the first place the young African states cannot go on indefinitely distracting the attention of their leaders from home problems to the struggle against Portugal. The euphemistic expression "territories in the process of development", used to describe their economic and cultural situation, merely masks their very real underdevelopment, their backwardness, which call for a massive concentration of financial and technical resources merely to attenuate their gravity.

Before independence everything was the responsibility of the so widely slandered colonisers. After they became independent, in theory, everything has become the responsibility of the new States. The fact is, however, that the necessary resources, technical and monetary, come from outside. For how long will financiers be prepared to watch their gifts and loans being wasted on an adventure that is opposed to the spirit of the United Nations Charter and dangerous for world peace? Not only this: how much longer will the fragile African solidarity hold out, based as it is on purely negative values of hate without reason directed at the white man: deep-rooted divergencies, rivalry and envy, which are in fact the real basis of relations among the various African political leaders? . . .