

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 42, No. 3

SATURDAY, MAY 26, 1962

6d. Fortnightly

The Invasion and Occupation of Goa by the Indian Union

(Speech delivered by the Prime Minister Prof. Doctor Oliveira Salazar, during the Session of the National Assembly held on January 3, 1962, issued by the Secretariado Nacional da Informacao.)

Mr. Chairman of the National Assembly

Honourable Members:

It is not my habit to write for History and I regret having to do so today, but the Portuguese Nation has every right to know how and why it has been dispossessed of the Portuguese State of India. For Goa to have been Portuguese for 450 years and now to be occupied by the Indian Union is one of the greatest disasters in our history and a very deep blow suffered by the Nation's moral life. The Portuguese State of India made a very minor contribution to the Portuguese economy or Portuguese political strength; but for us it counted above all as the landmark of one of the greatest happenings in the history of the world and in communications between the East and the life of the West. It should be a matter of honour and pride for all civilised nations and those which have benefitted from Portuguese action in the world to leave Portuguese India in the care of a small country which made the great discoveries at the cost of tremendous sacrifices. This notion has clashed with the concept of mere expansionist ambition, and this is a further, flagrant proof of the decadence of legality and the depreciation of moral values in our time. Yet this explanation does not satisfy the Portuguese, who may have forgotten that the Indian Union is not susceptible to historical, legal or simply human reasons but who did place their trust in influences able to oppose effectively, in the manoeuvres of world politics, the ambitions to which Goa has fallen a victim. We must thus go deeper into the question and explain in some detail how all this has come about.

I

It would be true to say that the case of Goa began at the moment when the Indian Union became independent. The Indian Empire broke up into various States, a cision which the Indian Union was very reluctant to accept, because it began to consider itself the real successor of Great Britain in the peninsula and fundamentally as the State which sooner or later would incorporate all the others. For the leaders in New Delhi the terms "Indian Union", "India" and "Hindustan" have come to represent in their minds one and the same thing, thus confusing geography with political ambition.

Faithful to this concept the Indian Union took advantage of the confused situation of the first years of its existence to effect a vast plan of unification through agreements, the exertion of pressure and conquest, and controls other territories, for example Kashmir, even in the face of repeated votes and the formal condemnation of the United Nations. Pandit Nehru, the Indian Prime Minister, is the greatest representative of this imperialistic idea against which all the

other ideas he claims to profess, pacifism, non-violence and good neighbourliness, are powerless. He is not perturbed by contradictions, either in thought or in action, which some, moreover, would benevolently attribute to changes in public opinion. He is illogical to a fault, or at least his logic is different from ours. The years he spent in London may have taught him something of European culture but they did not affect his fundamental mentality. He has sought for something to bind together the mosaic of peoples and races that inhabit the sub-continent, to assure their extremely precarious political unity, and he believes that the solution lies in the Hindu substratum. Fundamentally, however strange it may seem to those who listen to his lectures, the Indian Prime Minister is a racist, prejudiced against the West, a pacifist in theory but an aggressor in practice. Not only in Asia either. He is beset by the problems of excess population and misery and he has plans for an empty Africa where he hopes that the Indian will be able to take the white man's place.

The observer who does not keep these points very clearly in mind will be unable to understand the Indian action which will be taken in the not far distant future in Asia and Africa, or to comprehend what has happened in the case of Goa.

Naturally enough the Portuguese State of India was respected as part of Portugal's sovereignty by the British. A nation like Great Britain could have no interest in incorporating such tiny territories nor could it ever contemplate such an act, having come to India two centuries later than us, but once unscrupulous ambitious men came to power this was no longer the case. The mechanism would continue to function, even to the detriment of sovereign powers outside the British Empire.

The case of Goa underwent successive changes of aspect in the Prime Minister's policy and speeches. To begin with he called for extensive autonomy, which Goa in fact already enjoyed, then for independence and finally for the annexation which was indeed the aim in view. In this process the Indian Union appeared at one point as the holder of the right to protect identical or similar races, wherever they dwelt, then as a great power ardently inspired by the anti-colonialist struggle to free enslaved peoples. The Indians persevered through the years in their campaign against Portugal or against a Portuguese Goa, but they were unable to convince the world that they were right and far less able to prove that we were wrong.

As far as we are concerned, our discovery, the agreements reached with local chiefs, the undisputed possession of centuries, the peace, spiritual cohesion and progress of peoples

(continued on page 3)

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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices—Business: 9 AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: Stratford-on-Avon 3976.

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—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones, Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36 Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSton 3893). Canada: L. Denis Byrne, 7420 Ada Boulevard, Edmonton, Alberta. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O. Sydney, N.S.W.

From Week to Week

It is clear enough that West New Guinea is of little use even to its native inhabitants, let alone to the Dutch or the Indonesians. But it is almost equally plain that the moral reluctance of the Dutch, under the threat of Indonesia's "determination to annex West Irian", to abandon the responsibilities they have undertaken in the territory provides a perfect cover for the Washington-Moscow axis to set up and equip an overseas military and naval base in that area of the southern hemisphere. No doubt in due course the base will be moved further south.

In his speech on March 10 to the Ministerial Council of Western European Union, the main points of which were, it is said, covered in a report in *The Times* of March 13, 1962, Mr. Heath, the Lord Privy Seal said, "There is no doubt in my mind that, with the closer integration of our industries which will follow British accession to the European Economic Community, . . ."

For "closer integration" read "advance to monopoly."

What sort of control is 'democracy' going to have over the giant international monopolies which are being steadily consolidated? Whether or not the circus of the ballot-box will be allowed to continue when it has served its purpose of facilitating the transfer of individual property to international organisations, we do not know. What is apparent, however, is that even an election system reformed and modified along the lines proposed under the title "A Light Horse" would be useless. The essence of liberty is possession and control of property, and what we are witnessing is the final alienation of such possession and control from the individual, and its concentration in "integrated industries" and supranational commissions.

It must be realised that while we are asked to speculate on the possibility of a world war in a year or two, the final

alienation of property is being accomplished under our noses at the moment. The role of Communism, of course, is to provide the police to safe-guard the property rights of the new owners.

Summer, 1962: The Third Swallow

The Debate following the motion by Lord Reith in the House of Lords and his speech, which ran to nearly 3,000 words, caused something of a sensation, as *The Times* admitted quite freely ("admit freely what is already known").

The Motion itself was unusually explicit: "That there be laid before the House Papers relating to the work of a political pressure group for the introduction of commercial broadcasting, as disclosed in a book by Professor H. H. Wilson, of Princeton, published last June called *Pressure Group*." The book was noticed in *The Social Crediter* soon after its appearance.

So now we have had, within a very few weeks, Professor Leavis, Mr. John Betjeman and Lord Reith, all attacking the same thing though from different angles. We are not sure that Mr. Betjeman's effort was not the best of the lot. It was the only speech (not counting the President's) at the Royal Academy which drew signs of excited enjoyment from the diners, neatly ticked-off *The Times* for its constitutional inability to see that there never really are *two* sides to a genuine question, put 'something' above even the Treasury itself, and ridiculed Money, Bankers and architects who hadn't seen a drawing-board for thirty years but lived on expense accounts. Curiously the 'free' Press does not seem to have had a word to say about the speech, an omission to some extent repaired by the BBC in its Home service. There, disregarding the other speakers (including Lord Hailsham), the speech was twice repeated, whether in whole or in part we do not know; but the bankers were accorded a triple appearance.

The three men we have named as attacking the same thing from different angles were all attacking false standards. That is what they said. In two cases Money had something to do with it, the implication being that Money was somehow 'filthy'. They didn't say so. They just showed contempt for its ways. But also, they showed—at least Mr. Betjeman and Lord Reith did—contempt for the government, particularly this reputedly 'conservative' government. Possibly Lord Reith's mistrust of politicians is less comprehensive than Mr. Betjeman's. Lord Reith's Motion was put down 'months ago, without naming a day'—'Silly position, I thought to myself last night, *apropos* this Motion of mine, and rather sickening. What is the use of raising it here? What can come of it, in an atmosphere heavy with hostility? I nearly telephoned to someone, but I did not know to whom to telephone, to cancel the Motion or to transfer it to the Liberals or to Labour, or to anyone willing to receive it. But I changed my mind in the middle of the night . . . As to the decision made entirely as the result of this pressure group, of course I considered it, as did many of the most respected leaders of this House—Lord Halifax, for instance (who said in one or two momentous debates that if I were to take the matter to a Division he would vote with me against the Party of his life's dedication and service), Lord Brand, Lord Hailsham, Lord Waverley, Lord

Radcliffe and Lord Samuel. Of course I considered it, as they did—will you excuse me, my Lords, if I talk frankly—as one of the most deplorable, shocking and subversive actions in British political history. I think so more than ever to-day, and I believe that there is an appreciable number of Conservative politicians who now regret what was put across them ten years ago . . .”

Hansard (House of Lords) for May 9 contains a good deal of quite sensational material; but, like *The Times*, we know all about that. There is little doubt, despite the slight ambiguity of Lord Reith's own words, that the particular assortment of Peers prepared to cast aside a 'life's dedication and service' to support him ten years ago left it to the inspiration of 'the middle of the night' on May 8 1962, for Lord Reith's mind to light up. Ostensibly, the immediate occasion is whether the Lord Chancellor approves "of what is being planned and done now by way of discrediting and baulking Harry Pilkington's Report? Does he approve of the Conservative Central Office being used as it was ten years ago?" The Peers who spoke in the Debate, which lasted from 2.48 in the afternoon until 8.47 in the evening, were, in order of speaking, the Earl of Woolton, Lord Shackleton, Lord Balfour of Inchrye (an interjection), Lord Rea, Earl de la Warr, Lord Francis-Williams, Lord Lloyd, the Lord Bishop of Worcester, Lord Fraser of Lonsdale, Lord Connesford, Lord Hailsham (an interjection only), the Earl of Longford (an interjection), Lord Strang, Lord Walston, Lord Milverton, Lord Auckland, the Earl of Bessborough, Lord Taylor, and the Lord Chancellor. The names of Lord Reith's backers of ten years ago are not among them. Are they waiting for the Common Market? There seems to be a pretty strong pressure group involved in that issue too.

Lord Reith's interest is, of course, largely personal—he is 'the policy of the BBC'. He would hold the same views as he does at any time, and express them at any time, Pilkington Report or no Pilkington Report. Lord Reith asked himself: "What can come of it, in an atmosphere heavy with hostility?" He might well ask.

One thing that can come of it is a further descent into disrepute of the Conservative Central Office, the 'Conservative' Party and 'Conservative' politicians. No wonder *The Times* refrained from showing any displeasure. *The Times*, when it tires of being a five-penny *Daily Worker* is nowadays almost a Liberal paper. Even Lord Reith had noticed the Liberals and thought his Motion might be 'transferred' to them. Lord Rea? Well, he found "the allegations in (the book) grave and the position which it discloses is, if true, damaging to the reputation of British politics." He would support Lord Reith and his supporters if they should press for an enquiry.

And so we come on to May 12 and *The Times* leading article entitled "On the Move". In May 1959, "the Tories, whose party was having it never-so-good, scored a net gain of 200 seats," says *The Times*. The special emphasis is ours. The newspaper concludes the article by saying that "the mixed and often vague dissatisfaction behind the present trends of voting still lack positive political expression. Without it they are in danger of going to ground in political quietism or evaporating in the heat of non-political activity." Historically, the Liberal Party is *par excellence* the party of Trade and Commerce, mercantilist to its roots. Even as industrialists, the Liberals were traders, traders in *labour*.

THE INVASION AND OCCUPATION OF GOA BY THE
INDIAN UNION

(continued from page 1)

as a foundation for the legitimacy of our sovereignty cannot be questioned or denied in the western world. But the Indian Union thought quite differently from us in this matter, its view being that the age of these title deeds and the continued exercise of power were a further reason for their extinction, not for their maintenance.

The accusations against the Portuguese administration, the lack of freedom in Goa, the supposed aspirations of the Goans to separate from the common homeland and the taunt of colonialism were so clearly contrary to visible fact that they could not be seriously supported; they were generally considered to be a mere weapon of political propaganda. Many facts undermine and utterly refute the accusation that the State of India, though dressed out as a province, was in fact no more than a colony: all Goans have always been full Portuguese citizens, they have their own legislative assembly, they have sent representatives to the Portuguese Parliament since 1822, they have risen to the highest posts in the public departments and in the Government and have carried on their professional activities in all Portuguese territories, at home or overseas. The Goans were even more difficult than others to convince of the truth of the charge.

After diplomatic relations had been established between the Indian Union and Portugal, a proposal was made to the Portuguese Government in February 1950 for immediate negotiations on the future of Goa or, more explicitly, for definition of the terms on which the Portuguese State of India would be incorporated into the Indian Union. Unless we would deny ourselves and betray our compatriots we could not negotiate the cession of national territories or the transfer of their inhabitants to foreign sovereign powers. We could only legitimately negotiate the solution of the many problems which arise in the everyday life of neighbour States. We have maintained this attitude since the very outset, but the only form of negotiation which the Indian Union sought and understood was not this, while it put forward one that for us had an impossible objective.

This attitude of ours was the basis for the subsequent measures taken by the Indian Union against Goa and the Goans, to persuade them or to overwhelm them. They form a long list of acts of violence against persons and their property, their beliefs and their lives which in civilized countries spring from a state of war but in the Indian Union were officially considered manifestations of pacifist policy. It would be impossible to mention them all at this point. I shall merely say that the Portuguese position has at all junctures been not to reply to the offences committed and to try to overcome the difficulties created for us. The purpose of the prohibition of traffic of people and goods by land and sea, the interruption of railway services and of communications, the closing of ports to our ships, the freezing of deposits, the suspension of transfers, the provocations of *satiagrahis*, the attacks on frontier posts protected by the Indian authorities, terrorist outrages and the activity of subversive agents inside Goa was to render life unsafe or impossible and to make Portugal responsible for the suffering of the inhabitants. The Indian Union had been able to stifle the French establishments in India but forgot the circumstances that we, with some imagination, goodwill and some resources, made use of to overcome the difficulties.

I mean the wide ocean before Goa, Damao and Diu and the air space which could not be disturbed except by express violation.

These elements cast life in the State of India in a new mould. Communications were intensified with Portuguese Africa, Portugal proper and the rest of the world. The land's economy and mining output were developed. The port of Mormugao was fitted out on a scale that has perhaps few equals in Asia, and certainly not in the Indian Union, exports increased and the railway system began to show a profit. Goa was enabled to breathe and live as if the Indian Union did not exist and did not display its constant hostility on her frontiers.

Thus a firm decision was able to parry all the blows and heal all the wounds. Faced with this the Indian policy suffered successive setbacks, which exasperated the mentors of the Prime Minister, who had, in the meantime, allowed the diversion of Dadra and Nagar-Aveli. There the Indian Union's position was more favourable, that of Goa correspondingly less, for Nagar-Aveli and Dadra were enclaves completely surrounded by enemy territory and the Indian Government, within its constantly proclaimed respect for legality and peace, ceased to allow any links with the outside world. Nor did it allow them again, even after the International Court at The Hague had recognised Portugal's rights in its decision of 12 April 1960, which the Indian Union could not ignore. To set the seal on the most absolute disregard of Portuguese sovereignty and contempt for the verdict of the highest international tribunal, the New Delhi Parliament finally approved by a decree the annexation of the two territories.

Our conclusion may justly be that the Indian Union, though abetted by its powerful influence in various forms, was unable to defeat Portugal either in the sphere of facts, the grounds given or in law and before the courts, or even at the highest political levels, as we shall soon see. Its ambitions were opposed by our right, so simple, so clear, so innocent that all were forced to recognise it and many were obliged to recognise its advantages for the inhabitants concerned, at peace among themselves and in the heart of the Portuguese Nation. This was too much for the Indian Union to bear.

The Indian Union could not shake off its obsession with Goa and so, beaten in all spheres, its last resource was to use force. Our only possibility of preventing this eventuality was to force the Indian Union to set in motion a large-scale operation, to the utter detriment of its pacifism and the scandalised astonishment of the world at large. It was long thought in the Union that a sham rising in Goa could serve as a pretext for a mere police intervention which the Prime Minister could then present as a free service rendered to the cause of peace. This notion revealed ignorance of local circumstances: on the one hand, the morale of the population, the absolute non-existence of racial or religious conflicts, the standard of living, modest but still far higher than in the Indian Union, the liberty enjoyed by all in their little country, as they called it, and, finally, the centuries-old union with Portugal, did not tempt them into the adventure of plunging with their interests, their traditions and the nobility of their history into the pandemonium of struggles and misery in the Indian Union. On the other hand the watchfulness of the authorities made all the plans miscarry. This method was thus seen to be impracticable, although it was only finally abandoned at the last moment.

(To be continued)

Russia

Following is the substance of a letter by an Australian Social Crediter addressed to a correspondent overseas:—

"Many thanks for your long and informative letter. I was very interested in your notes on Russia; I had just received a letter from an old man of over eighty—a socialist—who thinks **Russia is doing a wonderful job.** 'People pay no taxes, and they issue money interest free.'

"It is not only Socialists who turn an admiring eye on Russia. In fact anyone today who tries to debunk Russia is very much on the outer and in a very small minority. Others who object to Russia for various reasons look to the U.S.A. as the only hope of challenging the colossus of the East, and very much resent our criticism of the motives of the U.S.A.

"I think it would be very opportune and very helpful if you were to send some articles on Russia to the Social Crediter for publication.

"As for an appeal to the electorate on monetary reform this has been discussed and tested over a long period. The immediate reaction and the very definite results of a strong monetary reform movement would be centralisation of banking. We are very nearly there now, but not quite.

"I have enclosed *T.S.C.* for 17/3/62 which sets out the Social Credit point of view. The question of a philosophy, or a culture may sound very theoretical, and is held up to contempt by all the forces of the Left but what kind of society can grow in an intellectual desert where nobody knows the philosophy behind the policies which determine their existence.

"If the British people had been a little more theoretical and had known a little more about alien policies which forced them into two disastrous wars, they might have escaped the serfdom of living in a Jewish civilisation.

"What kind of organising principle can harmonise the activities of an economic community based on Full Employment and Automation. The only answer to that question is—War. If the basic problems of our technological age are never discussed where do you think "Monetary reform" will take us? Without a National Dividend Automation is a ghastly tragedy.

"But I don't know if you are old enough to have met the contempt and ridicule with which the mere suggestion of a National Dividend was greeted not only by the financial interests, but by 'Us Workers'.

"The tragedy of the world situation is causing many people to lose all hope for the future, and it appears to me that if there is anything we can do which will enable people to get back their belief in the future, and their faith in the power of Truth, then this should be stressed.

"'God is not mocked' sounds very good, but we have got to make at least a fighting minority feel that it is good."

Aldous Huxley

"Armaments, universal debt and planned obsolescence—those are the three pillars of Western prosperity. If war, waste and money-lenders were abolished, you'd collapse."

—Aldous Huxley, *Island*, 1962, p. 146.