THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 45 No. 24 SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1966 1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Escalation in Rhodesia*

Anyone who understands the mind of the invisible World Government, which controls Washington, London, Paris, Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi, could have predicted exactly what Rhodesia would face when it declared its independence. The example of Katanga is certainly fresh enough in the minds of those anti-Communists who rooted for pro-capitalist Moise Tshombe. It was to be expected that Rhodesia would face a similarly hostile world.

Of course, the reason why the invisible World Government cannot tolerate the existence of an independent Rhodesia governed by a man like Ian Smith is that it may serve as an example to other people suffering under the yoke of the invisible World Government's viceroys. It might give them hope that they may eventually overthrow these henchmen. Other reasons are as follows: (1) Neither South Africa nor Portuguese Angola and Mozambique can be Communised as long as Rhodesia is independent; (2) independent Rhodesia is a potential anti-Communist base in the heart of Africa; (3) independent Rhodesia is a country of free enterprise in a continent which is being socialised, and its economic prosperity will only highlight the fraud of socialism to the Africans; (4) Rhodesia has enormous mineral wealth which the international conspiracy must control if it is to impose its economic stranglehold over the world. These are the same reasons, incidentally, why the government of Katanga had to be crushed.

Now the Rhodesian situation is important to anti-Communists because it forces the invisible World Government to make itself a lot more visible than it prefers to be at this time. It also permits anti-Communists to evaluate with some degree of accuracy the control the conspiracy maintains over so many free-world and neutralist governments. In addition, it exposes the democratic pretenses of those who wield this enormous power. The iron fist suddenly comes out of the velvet glove, and the Fabian wolf sheds his sheep's clothing.

Rhodesia also teaches us a great deal about the United States Government. We learn, for example, that the State Department knows that economic sanctions can be used to weaken a government and bring it down. We learn, in fact, that the State Department is far more determined to overthrow the Government in Rhodesia than it is to win the war in Vietnam. According to an *Allen-Scott Report* of December 10, 1965: "State and Defence authorities make no secret of their profound concern over the Rhodesian crisis. A high State Department official is privately calling it the 'most dangerous situation in the entire world *not excepting Viet Nam.*' " [Our emphasis.]

Really? Does the State Department mean that the Ian Smith Government in Rhodesia is more dangerous than the Ho chi Minh Government in Hanoi, or the Mao Tse-tung Government in Peking? It is significant that Mr. McNamara offers us the alternative of spending $20 billion to defend ourselves against Communist missiles or disarming ourselves into a world government. The thought that the Communist threat might be averted by overthrowing a Communist government never occurs to the State Department. What would it cost to overthrow the Communist government in China, Russia, or North Vietnam? Certainly not $20 billion. Why must all pressures be brought to bear to force Ian Smith out, but none to force Ho chi Minh out? Why are Communist régimes so inviolate?

In the *Boston Traveler* of December 10, 1965 we read that London is sending two hundred pedigreed sheep to Mao Tse-tung "to improve the flocks of Red China." In the *New York Times* of December 20, 1965 we read that "China has turned to neutral Austria to buy the most modern equipment available for a new steel plant," that "an Italian company would build a tube plant, presumably to provide pipes for overland oil lines from areas where petroleum has been discovered," and that the Red Chinese have "purchased from a German-British consortium a plant to make seamless and welded pipes and a $12 million rolling mill from a German consortium."

It is also a fact that Canada, which enthusiastically joined the oil embargo against Rhodesia, is the largest supplier of wheat to Red China. According to the *Boston Globe* of December 16, 1965, "the Chinese feel they must continue wheat purchases at least at the present level—and probably until the end of the decade." In other words, Red China is to a very great extent dependent on the West for its subsistence. Yet no efforts are being made by the Johnson Administration to use an economic blockade to bring down the Red régime in Peking or the Red régime in Hanoi. The McNamara-Rusk-Johnson solution is that thousands more American men be blown to bits by shells and hand grenades built by Western machines in Communist countries. Apparently, our administrators feel that Americans are cattle and good for nothing else.

The *Boston Globe* of December 12, 1965, also informs us that a West German "businessman" by the name of Hans Joachim Seidenschur, who achieved fame by selling arms to the Communist Algerian terrorists, is acting as a broker to arrange for the sale to Red China of 122 American planes "inactivated" by Mr. McNamara in Europe. Other items offered to the Red Chinese by Herr Seidenschnur are an $80 million chemical plant to produce a variety of basic chemical elements; German speedboats of 190 tons, more modern than those in service with

(continued on page 3)

*Reprinted from **The Review of the News** (Dec. 23-29, 1965) which is published weekly by Correction, Please!, Inc., Belmont Massachusetts, 02178, U.S.A.

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 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1. Telephone: EUSton 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—
Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1, Telephone EUSton 3893). Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

In our issue of August 20, 1960, we published the following paragraphs:

The Situation

It appears probable that the disorders in Africa inaugurate the final phase in the strategy of World Dominion. The reason is that it is unlikely that the same situation would be brought about twice.

The objective of the UN's handling of the situation is not to restore order, but to prevent such restoration, and discreetly to increase disorder.

The break-down in Africa will be an economic blow to Europe, and the effect of this will be exaggerated and intensified by financial policy to produce a situation in which Communists can seize power with the assistance of the Red Army.

The coup is intended to be so swift and complete as to 'prevent' any effective U.S. intervention.

• • •

And now we add: *Circumspice.*

• • •

Even amongst the most prominent—or notorious—political commentators, it is always possible to negate the conclusions of one by those of another. The only concensus appears to be that as a collectivity political commentators believe they command a great deal more wisdom than the politicians at the centre of affairs—another version of the view that the world is run by village idiots, and that from their all-to-be-expected errors our mounting misfortunes arise.

But most of the commentators began as reporters, which makes them susceptible to swallowing a 'line' and the Communists (in the comprehensive sense), have made a science of manufacturing subtle and contradictory 'lines'. The confusion thus engendered in the public mind, the division and sometimes even the clash of public opinion, together with the posturing of politicians—all support faith in the village-idiot myth, and form the best possible cover for the relentless application of a policy aimed at and now visibly leading to naked World Dominion.

Students of Communism have long known that the major strategy for the conquest of Europe and the elimination of Christian civilisation from even the memory of man consisted, in large part, in first destroying the achievements of civilisation in Asia and Africa. But the conception seemed too huge to be credible. But we can all see now, if we forget what the commentators tell us, how it has been done. The secret is by securing the adoption of destructive policies under sentimental slogans. Thus Mr. Macmillan spouts of the "winds of change", and the grim task of depopulating Africa is begun, and with occasional U.N. assistance, as in the ex-Belgian Congo, is carried out by the natives themselves.

Once begun, this process gathers momentum, which is judiciously increased by "aid to underdeveloped countries", which provides the prize-money for the leaders of warring factions. And, as the socialists are fond of saying, you can't unscramble eggs—but you can pour them down the drain.

This process of the decay, and in some cases putrefaction, of orderly civilisation has reached the point where only the southern tip of Africa maintains order and progress. And there the Rhodesian Front stands guard. So "the illegal Smith régime" must be destroyed to the accompaniment of jeers and gibes from the commentators.

It is clear enough that the Rhodesian Government was provoked into UDI. The game was given away in advance by the *Guardian*, which complained that if there were no UDI the Rhodesian government might achieve permanent "white supremacy" under the 1961 Constitution. So Wilson played the Pearl Harbour strategy of forcing the 'enemy' to strike the first blow, and then the commentators got to work on 'public opinion'.

But when on the morrow of the Lagos conference, where Wilson gloated over the 'bite' of sanctions, Nigeria, that jewel of the anti-colonial crown, shattered, and Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa the Prime Minister and others were murdered, commentaries were few and restrained. What goes on in a *truly, legally,* independent member of the Commonwealth of nations is, after all, its own business. It is *legal* disorder and murder, as against *illegal* maintenance of peace and order. And that latter is held to impede 'progress' towards swift majority rule (never mind the teething troubles; they don't 'bite'). And where will 'progress' lead? Why, it will clear the way for a direct U.N. military confrontation with South Africa, and the job will be done. Q.E.D.

• • •

FOR THE RECORD: "Portugal today is no longer just a minor member of NATO useful because of the Azores. She is the key to the unfreezing of the Iberian peninsula. And the future freedom of South Africa will depend in large measure upon the prior emancipation of the Portuguese colonies—Angola and Mozambique." The *Guardian,* Jan 21, 1966.

The item is well worth memorising. There is not much of the world which is not now *effectively* under the Conspiracy's control—control meaning the degree to which a country can be made to conform to the Conspiracy's objectives, open or concealed, and whether such control has been achieved by Fabian or Communist infiltration, or by Communist or other dictatorship. And as this control spreads and intensifies, so the remaining bastions of resistance become more isolated and vulnerable.

At some point, not yet reached, resistance to Communism or whatever World Government likes to call itself, will become impossible. That this point has not yet been reached is, we believe, increasingly due to the hard work and dedication to freedom of thousands of informed American patriots, in the U.S., where now alone is effective resistance possible. Everybody knows that without America the world would already be lost; but not enough yet realise that the U.S. government is largely but not yet absolutely under the control of the Conspiracy; but they will if they will study some of our recommended reading.

The Divinity of Kings

"In Mushin, about fifteen miles outside Lagos, in the Western Region, one of the favourite methods of political extermination was by 'wetting'—soaking the occupants of a house with petrol and threatening them with fire if they failed to change their allegiance. In most cases they went up in flames with their homes." So Llewellyn Chanter describes the political methods in the Western Region of Nigeria, where Chief Akintola ruled and where Chief Awolowo was imprisoned until the recent attempted coup d'état. Journalists were warned not to reveal the facts outside Nigeria. Mr. Chanter says that "at root the rivalry was tribal, the Moslem North against the Ibo and Yoruba Southerners. The Ibos, a more sophisticated tribe, felt themselves to be the political victims of the North." (*Daily Telegraph,* Jan. 17, 1966.)

Such was the scene of the recent Commonwealth Conference, and such were the people who ruled, in virtue of which, according to the Archbishop*, they were apparently performing a divine function. The divinity that "hedged" kings in Shakespeare's phrase derived at least in part from the unction they received to perform the office, partly from their work of keeping law and order, and partly from legitimacy.

Yet few would accord a divine office to Mr. Smith, although he maintains law and order—which the party politicians unanimously describe as running a "police state"—and he was elected according to the law at the time, and professes loyalty to the Queen.

Mr. R. Paget, the Labour M.P. for Northampton, described an interview he had before leaving Salisbury with Sir Humphrey Gibbs, together with the Chief Justice, in which they agreed that the only alternative to disaster was to negotiate with Mr. Smith (*Sunday Express,* Jan. 16, 1966.) In the same issue Mr. Fell, M.P. for Yarmouth, was reported as sympathetic to those who had jostled the three Members of Parliament who caused something of an uproar in Salisbury. Yet Messrs. Paget and Fell, together with the Marquis of Salisbury and such advocates of common sense as Messrs. Amery, Hastings and Wall, would give place to none in their loyalty to the Queen.

The Lagos Conference was of course described as a triumph for Mr. Wilson, but perhaps fancy triumphed over fact. We had the fanciful background of stability in the person of Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa ruling a democratic federation, together with the fanciful threats from Sierra Leone, and it issued in the self-righteousness of further damaging a centre of order and a former friend.

To the real threat of communist subversion and of tyranny in the new states we must add the threats of famine and of chaos in Zambia, all of which Mr. Smith has indicated and none of which they want in Rhodesia.

*See T.S.C., Dec. 18, 1965, page 4.

Several M.P.s have visited Rhodesia recently, doubtless because they are ignorant of enough facts to form a judgment. Mr. Nkomo, we know, first agreed to the 1961 constitution, but we cannot answer for the Rev. Sithole, nor do we know whether the rival Africans are leaders of rival tribes. Mr. Wilson enjoys a position of apotheosis through a majority of three and can do no wrong; in fact when the Conservatives had disposed of Sir Alec Douglas-Home, they nearly all followed Mr. Wilson's lead on such matters as oil sanctions, with the concurrence of Mr. Heath. But Mr. Smith knows the facts and has to deal with sickness and hunger among the poorer Rhodesians, even if the theorists strip him of any shred of legitimacy. We too had better deal with the facts, sooner rather than later.

—H.S.

Escalation in Rhodesia (continued from page 1)

N.A.T.O.;heavy-duty trucks; and electronic equipment for mineral exploration—all of which would tremendously increase Peking's war potential.

Yet, on December 15 con-man McNamara frightened everybody at the N.A.T.O. conference with the growing menace of Red China but kept mum about the enormous amount of industrial equipment now being shipped to the enemy by N.A.T.O. members themselves. Who is fooling whom?

So far, the Johnson Administration has not penalised one single nation for doing business with Hanoi or Peking, although such commerce has contributed directly to the murder of American men in Vietnam. Yet the Johnson Administration has taken the following severe measures against a friendly government in Rhodesia: it has (1) banned Rhodesian sugar imports to the U.S., (2) closed the U.S.I.A. library in Salisbury, (3) seized Rhodesian assets in U.S. banks "to provide an example for other countries where Rhodesia has deposited its slim overseas reserves," and (4) invoked an oil embargo against Rhodesia.

In addition, Washington has provided Rhodesia's neighbour Zambia with a costly oil airlift—compliments of the American taxpayer—and pressured the Portuguese and South African governments not to circumvent U.S. efforts to destroy the Rhodesian government. All of which proves that, when it comes to fighting anti-Communists, Dean Rusk and Ho chi Minh are on the same side.

Fact and Fancy

The Church Times (Jan. 21, 1966),in contrast to some other writers who claim to be more Christian than anyone else, gives a balanced view of the current crisis. The Summary says, "The pitifully thin veneer of democracy in Africa has been cracked again this week by the sudden eruption of violence in Nigeria." It adds, "The remarkable silence in Whitehall on the subject . . . was proof of consternation at this unexpected smashing of the image of the ideal African democracy." The writer asks whether Mr. Smith is not entitled to draw attention to what is happening in other parts of Africa.

Yet Mr. Wilson speaks, on January 25th, as if nothing at all had happened in Africa outside Rhodesia. The first stage after a return to constitutional government would be "for the Governor to form an interim government of Rhodesians responsible to him," he said, adding that conditions should be created in which "political activities may be conducted in security and freedom from intimidation from any quarter." The omnipotent Mr. Wilson must have in mind some scheme for isolating Rhodesia from any activity directed from Moscow or Washington and for eradicating tribal differences overnight. Mr. Amery doubtless spoke the truth when he said that it was "quite un-

realistic" to believe that any responsible body of Europeans would co-operate with Mr. Wilson on such terms.

In the House of Lords, Viscount Dilhorne asked whether this statement required unconditional surrender, and the Leader of the Government replied that he did not think that it was useful to talk about unconditional surrender.

Yet a ferocious rebel, Major Nzugwa, who helped to kill Sir Ahmadu Bello, the Premier of the Northern region of Nigeria, is interviewed on television, "just as though he were a successful footballer", as a former Governor of Northern Nigeria expressed it. This rebel was reported as regretting that the insurgents failed to "get" other Nigerian officials, according to a newspaper interview. Surely it could percolate through the fog of Mr. Wilson's theories that the treatment of Rhodesian officials —Sir Humphrey Gibbs, for example—differs fundamentally from the fate of the Nigerian prime ministers.

Yet (*Daily Telegraph*, Jan. 26, 1966), "In reality the terms that he envisages are those which Sir Hugh Beadle warned him would be impossible for Rhodesians to accept. . . . Mr. Wilson, after the horror of Nigeria, could have taken a more realistic attitude towards Rhodesia."

One might have hoped that the Opposition, numerically strong, would by now have produced an alternative to Mr. Wilson's hymn of hate. Yet, as *The Church Times* accurately puts it, "Mr. Heath's leadership has so far failed conspicuously to . . . give an effective cutting edge to its attacks on the Government . . . the economic policies favoured by the new Conservatism are hardly distinguishable from those of moderate Socialism." Mr. Heath's problem is "to discover some ground on which he can give the impression of really differing from the Government of the day."

It might appear that the holders of power have drafted a memorandum that whatever happens, Rhodesia must be destroyed; and that no local power will be allowed (in England for instance) to any who dissent from this. —H.S.

South Africa and Rhodesia

That the British press (after listening to ministerial hint-dropping about treason?) is giving a very one-sided, and in some ways grossly misleading, account of the Rhodesian situation, is exemplified by the suggestion this week that South Africa will deny oil to Rhodesia. Dr. Verwoerd's New Year message (not reported verbatim in London, but given below) should effectively refute any idea that Rhodesians are unhappy about their neighbour's support.

"The declaration of independence in Rhodesia, with whom bonds of friendship and economic ties have grown through the years, has created a situation from which South Africa cannot escape. We have blood relations over the border. However others may feel or act towards their kith and kin when their international interests are at stake, South Africans on the whole cannot cold-shoulder theirs.

"The Government carefully avoids participation in this domestic confrontation between the United Kingdom and Rhodesia by continuing regular relations with both. It would be idle to hide, however, that most South Africans are convinced that it would neither be just, advantageous or wise to White or Black in Rhodesia to seek to hasten Black Government, whether at a very rapid or a slightly slower rate.

"Very few South Africans are impressed by the attempt to appease African states, or to relieve their crude pressure by the actions taken against Rhodesia, or believe that this will serve their purpose. Neither do South Africans give any credence to the bogey that a race war in Africa or armed invasion can only be avoided by enforcing so-called majority government upon Rhodesia. Most South Africans state freely that should Black supremacy be established there or placed in the offing, that would indeed ultimately damage peace and harmony in this part of Africa, and would lead to economic deterioration and unemployment, and create either distress or danger on South Africa's border.

"I feel compelled to point out these strong South African views, because they clearly indicate that I may not remain silent on attempts by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, if reported correctly, and certain newspapers, to suggest that the South African Government is acting or will act in such manner, or has privately given certain assurances to Britain which would be tantamount to secret support of certain measures or sanctions aimed at Rhodesia. This would in fact mean participating in them, and therefore actively choosing sides. I must therefore state unambiguously that South Africa makes her own decisions in her own intrests and will not be coerced into participating in any form of boycott by suggestions that by not doing so, she would be helping one party or the other.

"I re-emphasise that South Africa's policy is one of non-interference in what she regards as a domestic issue between the United Kingdom and Rhodesia, that she deprecates the intervention of others and that in accordance with this policy, she has submitted to no pressure and supports no boycotts."

—*Political Intelligence Weekly*, Jan. 7, 1966.

To enable wider distribution, additional copies of this issue of **The Social Crediter** are available at the following prices which include postage:

6 copies 6/6	25 copies 18/6
12 copies 10/6	50 copies 32/6

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd. at 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.

Printed by E. Fish & Co. Ltd., Liverpool.