

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 47 No. 2

SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1967

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Goa*

In the conviction that it would easily obtain a favourable majority, the Indian Government decided to hold a plebiscite in Goa, Damao and Diu for the purpose of securing their integration with neighbouring territories, and, to this end, it exerted every kind of pressure.

However, although it decided at the last minute to refuse the vote to the 100,000 Goans living in Bombay and tampered with the electoral rolls in which it included thousands of Indian nationals who have gone to live in Goa, the plebiscite, by a large majority, proved hostile to integration.

It was reported that the people of Goa noisily celebrated their victory and defied the Indian Police who were forced to resort to violent means to prevent demonstrations.

The significance of the result transcends the plebiscite's restricted scope and reflects the feelings of the Goans who clearly wish to preserve their individuality, culture and traditions and have in this way shown their hostility to the Indian occupation.

On this question, the Portuguese addressed a Note to the Secretary-General of the U.N. The following is a translation:

"I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency the complete text of a declaration by the Portuguese Government regarding the territories of Goa, Damao and Diu, and a plebiscite or 'referendum' carried out there by the Government of the Indian Union. According to the results announced in the international press, and notwithstanding all the pressures of which they were the victims, and despite the position of disadvantage they were placed in, the people of Goa, Damao and Diu have expressed clearly their wish to maintain and defend their own individuality and affirmed unequivocally that they reject any annexation or integration with the Indian Union. Despite the results of the plebiscite and its significance, we must understand that it represents a mere phase in the process of destruction of Goa, Damao and Diu, and that this process will continue to be developed and applied by the New Delhi Government with the object of opposing and annihilating the legitimate desires of the Goan people, as is attested by the repression already unleashed after the plebiscite. But for the protection of the Goan people indeclinable duties are incumbent upon the United Nations. Since Goa is a territory expressly mentioned in the General Assembly's Resolution No. 1542 (XV) of December 15, 1960, and since the Goan people have a right to the protection provided for by the norms of international conventions relating to respect for minorities and their language and culture as well as their religion and nationality, it would thus seem that there can be no legitimate doubts as to the explicit responsibilities of the U.N. in this matter. In the consultation now made to the people of Goa, Damao and Diu, the only licit choice was between two options, neither of them pleasing to the population as

a whole. The Indian Union has a duty to allow the people of Goa, Damao and Diu a choice between direct submission to the Government of New Delhi or the status answering to their legitimate aspirations. To this end, an intervention by the U.N. Secretary-General appears essential. Finally, the Portuguese Government, without prejudice to its position and its rights, desire to be informed as to the situation of the many thousands of Portuguese nationals, and as to the way in which their political rights have been or will be protected."

The following is a translation of the declaration referred to in the above Note and issued to the press by the Portuguese Ministry for Foreign Affairs on January 18:

1. "Before the aggression on Goa, the Government of the Indian Union gave solemn and repeated assurances as to their respect for the personality of that territory. In a Note addressed to the Portuguese Government on January 14, 1963, it was stated: "The Government of India wish to declare that it is their intention to maintain the cultural and other rights, including the language, laws and customs of the inhabitants of Goa, and not to introduce any modification in them or in similar matters without the consent of the populations." In the ensuing years similar promises were made. On May 4, 1961, the then Prime Minister Nehru declared before the Indian Parliament: "We are not going to integrate Goa in any district. Goa will remain an independent entity."

2. As soon as they had completed the violent conquest and the occupation of Goa, the Indian Government revoked the laws by which the territory was governed, substituted Indian for Goan officials, initiated religious discrimination, introduced the caste system, forbade the use and the teaching of the Portuguese language, and began the persecution of those who wished to retain Portuguese nationality. Poverty, unrest, revolt, took hold of Goa.

3. During 1966, on the allegation of wanting to ascertain the wishes of the Goan population, the Indian Government submitted to Parliament a Bill authorising them to hold in Goa a plebiscite or referendum concerning the integration of the territory in the State of Maharashtra, and of Damao and Diu with the State of Gujerat. Examining the Bill, the Indian Deputy, Dr. Dandekar, said: "This Law is fraudulent and dishonourable, and is calculatedly worded to secure a pre-determined result." The reaction raised in Goa was profound, and it became manifest from the symbolic date of June 10, 1966, the Indian authority having been led to arrest in Goa, for the purely political reason of opposition to the Bill, at least 3,061 persons, to mention only the cases of which there is definite knowledge. Notwithstanding, on the 1st December, 1966, the Indian Parliament converted the Delhi Government's Bill into law.

4. To increase the disadvantage of the Goan population,

*From 'Portugal Information Bulletin', Jan. 30, 1967, issued by the Portuguese Embassy, London.

(continued on page 4)

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 NW1
Telephone: EUSton 3893.

N 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

It will come as a surprise to most of our readers to learn that the U.S.A. is now a net *importer* of agricultural products. This was disclosed in the June 20, 1966 issue of the *Dan Smoot Report*, and has been elaborated by Dan P. Van Gorder in a book *Ill Fares the Land*.^{*} Dan Smoot's report was entitled *Planned Famine*, and Van Gorder shows that this is indeed the case. With the inauguration of the New Deal, the Agricultural Adjustment Act was implemented, with the objective of cutting back America's agricultural capacity, under cover, of course, of raising prices for the farmers. Continuously since then, agricultural output *per head of population* has fallen, until now the U.S.A. depends on imports to maintain its food supplies. Parallel with this has been an equally steady decline in the farm population—a process irreversible except over a long period of time, and in a political climate very different from that of the 'Great' Society.

Van Gorder's book is based on statistics issued by the Department of Agriculture—statistics which he reproduces as tables and graphs. He shows that there are no surpluses. "For the whole agricultural overproduction theme song sung to us since 1933 is a hoax. It is a plain and simple unmitigated lie. It is a lie told to hide the work of men who have set up the conditions for famine.

"The overproduction hoax was originated, not to help the farmer, but to weld the chains of slavery on him as the initial step in the socialization of the entire American economy.

"It was devised, not by loyal defenders of constitutional government, but by a small group dominated by trained agents of Communist infiltration . . . the infamous 'Ware cell'".

Thus the conditions have been brought about where a crisis, international or national, could precipitate an actual famine and the introduction of ration cards—the ultimate weapon in the hands of militant revolutionaries.

We have frequently predicted that the culmination of the Conspiracy which already engulfs us would appear as an 'accident'; and here we see its planned mechanics. The *evidence* of Conspiracy is overwhelming, and can be studied in the books listed in our list of recommended reading. A

^{*}Obtainable from K.R.P. Publications, 6/3 posted.

Conspiracy extending so far back, of such magnitude, and now visibly approaching culmination, is not going to recoil from the use of famine and terror to make its dominion, as it thinks, perpetual. But until that time comes, as Manuilski said, "the bourgeoisie must be put to sleep".

As Rostow, Chairman Ashley & Co. and American businessmen champion East-West trade, some historians are recalling an old Lenin quote found in the archives. Recently reprinted by the authoritative *Bulletin* of the Institute for the Study of the USSR, it says:

"On the basis of observations gathered during my years of exile, the 'cultured' class of the capitalist countries of Western Europe and America; i.e., the ruling classes, the financial aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the idealistic democrats should be regarded as deaf-mutes and treated accordingly . . .

"The deaf-mute capitalist hoarders, their governments, the Chambers of Commerce, the federations of industry, bank groups, steel kings, rubber kings, aluminium kings and others will close their eyes to the above-mentioned truth and so become blind, deaf and dumb. They will grant us credits, which will fill the coffers of the Communist organizations in their countries while they enlarge and improve our armaments industry by supplying all kinds of wares, which we shall need for future and successful attacks against our suppliers . . ."

—*Human Events*, March 11, 1967

The deaf-mutes, however, have found voice enough to call for the building of bridges to the East, and have heard and heeded the East's call for a Consular Treaty to give diplomatic status and immunities to Soviet spies and agents in the U.S.A.

In his book *It's Very Simple* Alan Stang describes and documents the very long-range plans of the Communists to use the Negroes in the U.S.A. as a major component of their strategy for the revolutionary overthrow of the U.S. Government—plans which began to mature with the desegregation of schools orders, and reached a peak last summer with the Watts and other riots.

But now a Negro author, journalist and lecturer, George S. Schulyer, writing in *American Opinion*, April 1965, comes to the conclusion that this drive has failed. "There never was a chance that it would bring anything but tragedy for the Negro. And now the great masses of Negroes are recognising it.

"So the so-called *mass* revolution is dead, or dying, as even dolts and morons could predict; and the 'educated' blacks and whites who promoted it with demonstrations and dollars are generally as discredited as Benedict Arnold . . . Oh yes, the professional revolutionaries are still around, and active. But the masses of Negroes have caught on to the game. And that will make all of the difference."

The results of last year's Congressional elections were perhaps the first major indication of the quiet but rising counter-revolution against the Conspiracy-controlled U.S. Government and mass communications media; and the failure, if such it proves to be, of the 'Negro' 'revolution', may be the second. If the counter-revolution succeeds, it will be because of the exposure of the Conspiracy achieved by patriotic Americans.

Although the British Prime Minister has, with evident relish, personally identified himself with the onslaught on Rhodesia, his briefings, like those of his predecessors, have

come from the Commonwealth Relations Office. Unfortunately, there are in Britain no investigating committees like those of the U.S. Congress, able to call witnesses and take evidence on oath. Although in the U.S. the Congressional Committees have now largely been muzzled by Executive Orders, they were formerly able to establish conclusively the deep penetration of government by identified Communist agents, and to demonstrate the *modus operandi* of such penetration. The Commonwealth Relations Office (like the Cabinet Office) is an obvious target for Communist penetration, and the war on Rhodesia bears all the marks of a Communist operation.—Mr. Wilson's flamboyance distracts attention from the long continuity of the provocations which led to the Unilateral Declaration of Independence.

Mr. Kenneth Young has narrated* the background and events leading up to and flowing from UDI. "The narration is based on printed sources and on primary research into unpublished documents and private statements made to me by some of the leading participants in Britain and Rhodesia". Mr. Young does not suggest or imply that British actions have been Communist-inspired; but his account is full enough for anyone familiar with Communist objectives and techniques to see the links with the International Conspiracy. Harold Soref's *The Puppeteers* lists and describes the many interlocking organisations and fronts which have concerned themselves with Rhodesia, and this book, read in conjunction with Mr. Young's narrative makes it plain enough where the master-minding comes from.

Rhodesia and Independence, while it includes a full account of the confrontation aboard *H.M.S. Tiger*, ends before the UN imposition of mandatory sanctions, and therefore does not include an account of how the Rhodesian Government's requests by telegram and letter to the UN Secretary-General requesting that Rhodesia's case should be heard by the Security Council were 'mislaid'; but it does include as an Appendix a full account of Rhodesia's attempt in May 1966 to be heard on the question of blockading Beira.

It is becoming more apparent almost daily that the fate of this civilisation may well hinge on the success or failure of the attempt to subjugate Southern Africa. For one thing, successful subjugation is evidently vital to the Conspiracy's ultimate victory; for another, the courageous resistance of Rhodesia is forcing the Conspiracy—or the workings of the Conspiracy—more and more into the open. The failure of the initial British onslaught on Rhodesia is probably the first real set-back to the Conspiracy since 1923; and it is, correspondingly, the greatest opportunity yet offered to the opponents of the occult forces working for World Government. What is required now is sufficient pressure on Members of Parliament to have Rhodesian independence recognised. Even the threat of such pressure is likely to force the Conspiracy more and more into the open. And when the Conspiracy is sufficiently visible, it will be destroyed. When a community recognises the presence of a rogue animal, it eliminates the danger, illustrating, as Douglas put it (in *Programme for the Third World War*), the combination of A with B for the elimination of C. If a new slogan is needed, let it be: "VICTIMS OF THE CONSPIRACY, UNITE."

**Rhodesia and Independence*: London, 1967: Eyre and Spottiswoode
Pp. 562 plus index. 42s. net.

U.S.A. and Rhodesia

Through the courtesy of a correspondent in the U.S.A. we have received a copy of the *Massachusetts Friends of Rhodesia Newsletter*, March 15, 1967 with an opening paragraph "Included with this newsletter is a copy of H. J. RES. III. We request all our readers to go all out in an effort to have this Bill passed. Passage of this Bill will end all dangers of our being called upon by the United Nations to invade Southern Africa."

We reprint the House of Representatives Joint Resolution (H. J. RES. III) submitted to Congress by Congressman James B. Utt, on January 10, 1967:

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the resumption of trade with Rhodesia.

Whereas the United Nations has acted illegally and in contravention of chapter 1 of its own charter, which prohibits interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign nations, in ordering economic sanctions against Rhodesia; and

Whereas the United States is involved in a bloody and interminable war in Vietnam against an enemy that is being supplied by Great Britain, which has refused our requests that it cease doing business with the enemy that is killing American boys every day; and

Whereas the United States has never sought economic sanctions from the United Nations against its enemy in Vietnam, and Rhodesia has refrained from engaging in trade with North Vietnam; and

Whereas United States trade with Rhodesia is in the best interests of this Nation, particularly in view of the fact that such trade in the past has been two to one in our favor; . . . Whereas the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence is in the same honored tradition as our own such Declaration, and deserves the full support of every American who is proud of our great national heritage; . . . Whereas the continuation of the United Nations illegal sanctions can lead only to a bloody struggle in southern Africa from which our enemies alone can benefit; and . . . Whereas the Congress of the United States is vested with sole authority to regulate foreign commerce under article 1, section 8, paragraph 3 of the Constitution, while the only authority delegated by Congress to the executive branch to restrict trade concerns the control of trading with the enemy; . . . Whereas the executive branch of the United States Government has undertaken to honor the illegal sanctions without seeking the advice and consent of the Congress; . . . Whereas the United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia, in addition to being illegal under the Charter of the United Nations and in contravention of the United States Constitution, since they have not been approved by the United States Congress, are clearly against the best interests of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That the President of the United States is authorized and directed to notify the United Nations and all other interested parties that the United States will not honor the United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia.

SEC. 2. The provisions of Executive Order Numbered 11322, of January 5, 1967, relating to prohibitions against imports of certain commodities from Rhodesia, are hereby rescinded. All orders, regulations and other directives and

all decisions promulgated or made under such Executive Order Numbered 11322, are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 3. All Executive orders, Presidential proclamations or other orders, regulations, or directives promulgated or made under the authority of the Export Control Act of 1949, which relate to the export of commodities to Rhodesia, are hereby rescinded.

The H.M.S. Tiger Talks

Speaking in Parliament of the talks aboard H.M.S. Tiger, Mr. J. H. Howman, Minister of Information, who accompanied the Prime Minister, paid tribute to Mr. Ian Smith's unflinching courtesy, his calm and his quiet yet unbending resolution and unflinching courage in the face of considerable pressure and the greatest provocation on occasions.

He asked that Members should consider the build-up for this meeting, the setting and the drama of the occasion.

"The ancient fortress of Gibraltar, the impressive dignity, the competence and the hallowed traditions of the Senior Service. All these things were no doubt designed to awe, perhaps to overwhelm.

"On the conduct of discussions—I find it impossible to describe them as negotiations in the accepted sense of the term—the Victorian paternalism, condescension, sometimes benign, but at other times insufferably arrogant.

"Perhaps this is understandable, for from the British point of view had we not had the impertinence, the audacity to defy, indeed to challenge the power and the authority of Her Majesty's Government and were we not the first of our kind for 200 years to do so?"

Reading the British version of events, one could not but be appalled at the misrepresentations that had occurred, said Mr. Howman, who gave Parliament examples.

At the resumption of the debate at 9.30 p.m. on December 3 "an entirely different and sinister atmosphere surrounded the talks".

"We came into the Admiral's day cabin to find Mr. Wilson in an absolute fury. I have never before seen a man indicating such vicious malevolence as this man did at that moment.

"It was quite the most extraordinary change of mind . . . and for hours this went on. At first Mr. Smith broke in in his rather usual way, saying 'What's bitten you, we have agreed to this'".

Mr. Howman went on: "We came to THIS, as it eventually developed: *You will sign these documents, I will not have Britain humiliated, you will sign before you leave this ship*', said Mr. Wilson, and back again came Mr. Smith's answer, again and again and again, *I have told you I will take this back to Salisbury, I will give it a fair run. If you want an answer now it is no, it is no, it is no, it is no, it is no.*"

Said Mr. Howman: "This extraordinary man and this extraordinary change, from where one had a fairly amicable meeting until this evening.

"I believe something happened to Mr. Wilson that evening, that he received a call from either his own Government or from another source, that he was put in a spot, and I am convinced to this day that he was petrified that we should leave the ship without submitting ourselves to his jurisdiction.

"Something frightened him, and I do not know that any-

one can ever explain his attitude, except as one of a fearful, panicked man who, in seeking to ride a tiger, was trying to pull us on too".

—*Rhodesian Commentary*, March 17, 1967.

Goa (continued from page 1)

the Indian authority authorised 200,000 Indians, who have become established in Goa, to vote, hampered the vote of 100,000 Goans who are in Bombay, and practically denied the vote to those wishing to retain their Portuguese nationality, as is their right. On the other hand, numerous electoral registers were forged while thousands of names were omitted from others. Such was the framework in which a "popular consultation" was fixed for the 16th of the current month of January.

5. Save for Diu and Damao, which, by an overwhelming majority, rejected integration in the State of Gujerat, the results of the so-called plebiscite are still unknown in respect of Goa. Whatever they may be, however, it seems pertinent already to stress that we have before us a first attempt at the integration of Goa in the powerful State of Maharashtra. If carried out, this means the total destruction of the Goan people, of their individuality, their customs, their language, and the disappearance of Goa as an autonomous entity. All the written and solemn promises and assurances of the Indian Government are thus repudiated. On the other hand, and having regard to the wealth and the geographical position of Goa, her absorption by the State of Maharashtra will greatly reinforce the latter's power and influence, and the present equilibrium will be altered to the detriment of the neighbouring State of Mysore which will be of very small size in the face of what would become an enlarged and powerful State of Maharashtra. This fact brings a profound change to the balance of forces within the Indian Federation itself, with all the consequences arising therefrom and from which Goa would not in future be exempt. Finally, the political extermination of Goa and its population constitutes a typical case of cultural and social genocide. It is an act that is contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to the international conventions for the protection of minorities and their cultural and political personalities.

6. The Portuguese Government, aware that they interpret the feelings of the overwhelming majority of the Goans, denounce before world public opinion the whole of a conduct on the part of the Indian Government directed at annihilating a small people whose well-rooted personality and ancient autonomy are in grave peril, and appeal to the international circles to defend Goa from destruction. To this end, they are acquainting the Secretary-General of the United Nations with this Note."

St. George's Day

In a letter to this English Edition of *The Social Crediter*, the St. George's Day Association has asked "through the courtesy of our columns" to "remind all readers that Sunday, April 23, is St. George's Day, and appeal to them to attend their own church or chapel to pray for the Divine Assistance for our country, and to wear a rose throughout the day."

Third World War and Second Front

Free on request

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.