

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 46 No. 10

SATURDAY, AUGUST 13, 1966

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Rhodesia

AN AMERICAN WIT SAYS IT ISN'T FUNNY

By TOM ANDERSON* in *American Opinion*, June, 1966

●The following letter, dated February 17, 1966, is from the Office of the Prime Minister of Rhodesia:

Dear Mr. Anderson:

At the direction of the Prime Minister I write further to my telegram of the 29th of January to advise you of the present position regarding the proposed lecture tour of the United States by a Rhodesian Cabinet Minister.

Following an instruction by the Prime Minister, the Ministry of External Affairs enquired from Mr. Gebelt, the United States Consul in Salisbury, if his Government would permit such a tour, and the reply now received indicates that the United States Government would be averse to such a tour either by a Cabinet Minister or any person representing the Rhodesian Government.

In the circumstances perhaps you would now like to make representations regarding this ruling through your own channels to the White House because it does appear that someone along the line is afraid of the full details of Rhodesia's case being put frankly before the American public.

If, however, you are unsuccessful in this regard, the Prime Minister is prepared to consider sending someone unconnected with the Rhodesian Government to the States for this tour.

With best wishes,
L. R. THOMPSON

Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister

If the Prime Minister anticipates that I can exert my influence on Caesar-Bird, I'm afraid the Prime Minister doesn't understand the situation.

Castro, you see, can come here. Tito can come here. Guss Hall can stay here. Brezhnev, Kosygin, Nkrumah, Sukarno, Nasser, Gomulka, Mao Tse-tung, and practically all the world's leading criminals can come here. And Nikita Khrushchev, who was personally responsible for more murders than was Adolph Hitler, can even be received royally at the White House by Dwight Eisenhower. That, naturally, is quite all right. But one must never, simply never, offer American hospitality to anti-Communist Christian gentlemen like Prime Minister Ian Smith and members of his Cabinet. Why those wicked men even patterned their Declaration of Independence on that of the United States! Obviously they are walking fossils, below the Bantu, lower than a sow's belly, and bad.

*Tom Anderson is President and Publisher of the Farm and Ranch Publications, with massive circulation throughout America. A former President of the American Agricultural Editors Association, Mr. Anderson is nationally known for his witty column, "Straight Talk," as well as for his powerful and humorous speeches on behalf of Conservatism and anti-Communism.

I

A little bird has just told me that Biggest Bird has quietly ordered the Rhodesian office in Washington to close, at the behest of Arthur Goldberg, the United Nations' Ambassador to the United States. Meanwhile, the ruler of our Animal Farm has decreed that no American shall sell anything to nasty Rhodesia . . . despite the fact that Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 3, of what Senator Fulbright calls our "out-of-date" Constitution, says that only Congress has the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. Thus, President Johnson and his henchmen in "our" State Department, and in the Communists' United Nations, are once again directly violating the Constitution of the United States to harass anti-Communists. But of course there's nothing new in that.

It's insane. The United States is punishing anti-Communist Rhodesia with a trade embargo but selling billions of dollars worth of products on credit to the criminals of the Kremlin and their Eastern European puppets. We have insisted that a large part of the so-called "free world" cut off all trade with Rhodesia, but permit those same nations to sell indiscriminately to the Vietcong. One reason our Leftist politicians refuse to let our Air Force bomb Haiphong, the great port of North Vietnam, is that we might sink the British ships there unloading supplies to our enemy. Britannia waives the rules.

Yes, it's insane. The United States gives billions of foreign aid to "friends," neutrals, and enemies busily engaged in trade which is helping to kill our soldiers in Vietnam; and, the State Department has just concluded another deal to ship 700,000 tons of wheat to Earl Warren's bloody buddy Tito, arch-criminal of Yugoslavia; and, our government is even selling agricultural surpluses to East Germany, Egypt, and other enemies, who, in turn, ship them to North Vietnam. But when an anti-Communist, pro-American country like Rhodesia asks for our help, we refuse it—and kick them in the teeth. It's crazy. And pretty confusing to the Rhodesians.

When I was in Rhodesia, many citizens of that brave new nation asked me: "Why does America promote Communism and oppose us, when we are your friends?"

"I suppose it's because racism is now a crime in the United States, but—according to the Supreme Court—Communism is not," I replied.

"But why do you oppose Communism in Vietnam and not in Cuba and Washington?"

"I'm not even convinced we will continue to oppose Communism in Vietnam," I replied. "Or anywhere else. Our

(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 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.

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 these pages I ask you—you, the people of the United Kingdom, you people of the older dominions, you people of the United States of America, you people of Europe—and the respective governments of each one of you . . . are you not, perhaps, even as I write now, guilty of, and contemplating yet, the perpetration of that final treason: the unconscious furthering of the ends of evil in the name of all that is most holy?"

These words from the Introduction appear on the cover of *Rhodesia Accuses*, by A. J. A. Peck, a Rhodesian solicitor. This quite excellent book describes the Rhodesian situation from every point of view, and gives the history leading to the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, a history of unquestionable duplicity and deception by successive British governments—if the real government of Britain is any longer British.

The essential fact is that the 1961 Constitution was presented to the Rhodesians in the form of two British White Papers. Of these White Papers, it was stated in the House of Commons, on behalf of the Government, that the Constitution to follow would "follow the White Paper in every detail. It will include a few minor points for which provision has to be made, which were not mentioned in the White Papers since these, of necessity, were expressed in layman's language." In opening the Fifth Session of the Ninth Parliament in Rhodesia His Excellency the Governor, Sir Humphrey Gibb said: "My ministers have received the clearest assurances from Her Majesty's Government that they cannot revoke or amend the new Constitution."

But one of the "few minor points" was the inclusion of a Section, 111, in the new Constitution providing: "Full power and authority is hereby reserved to Her Majesty by Order in Council to amend, add to or revoke the provisions of Sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 29, 32, 42, 49. . . . Provided that the power and authority herein reserved to Her Majesty shall not be exercised for the purpose of amending this section or adding to it a reference to any Section of this Constitution not included in this Section on the appointed day." This Section gives the British Government practically unlimited powers of intervention in Rhodesian affairs.

The White Papers, containing no suggestion of Section

111, were approved by Referendum in Rhodesia in the belief, in which Rhodesians were encouraged, that the new Constitution would be in effect the granting of Independence. Mr. Peck characterises this procedure as a squalid confidence trick, and says: "With this despicable hoax so clearly in mind, and with the knowledge that the British Labour Party did not even go so far as to accept the constitutional proposals for Rhodesia as contained in the two White Papers, is it to be wondered at that Rhodesians were not, and are not, disposed to place much reliance upon Mr. Wilson's statement on 11th December, 1965, that he proposed to adhere to those principles 'which have throughout inspired the approach of successive British governments?'"

The Wilson régime has made much play of censorship in Rhodesia, but so far as we know there has been no publicity in Britain for this piece of treachery—a treachery which fully accounts for the lack of confidence felt by the Rhodesians in planning for their future. Nor have we seen anywhere any statement to justify the assertions of the Wilson régime and of the British press that the European Rhodesians intended to perpetuate "White minority rule". Mr. Peck specifically states that the European Rhodesians recognised and accepted that the African Rhodesians would in time predominate in government, their only concern being that this should come about in an orderly way, and that government should remain continuously competent.

Rhodesia Accuses is a damning further piece of evidence that the world is in the grip of a conspiracy, in which the stakes are so high that the only hope for a decent future lies in exposing and punishing the conspirators. We hope Mr. Peck's book will be given very wide and effective circulation.

RHODESIA ACCUSES

By A. J. A. Peck

PAPERBACK EDITION 170 pages
Price 10/3 including postage

Copies are available from
K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone,
London, E.11.

In August 1960 we published an article entitled *The Last Chance: A Conspectus*. The Advisory Chairman of the Secretariat, the late Dr. Tudor Jones, approved the article, but thought that perhaps to call it the *last* chance was unduly pessimistic. The article said: "Our last chance lies in facing the fact that there is a ruthless bid for World Hegemony, and in dealing with the conspirators."

As to strategy, the articles advised: "The first step should be to estimate what our essential import requirements are, bearing in mind that a large part of our present (British) imports are merely the raw materials for further exports, and that others are things we can just as well provide for ourselves, once we have got over the hypnotic belief in the virtue of trade as an end in itself. These necessary imports should then be obtained on the best terms possible.

"This course of action would rapidly bring into the open the real situation we are in, and we should soon see whether it is still possible to extricate ourselves, or whether it is already too late. If we do not do this, the end is certain, so that at least we should be backing a chance against a certainty."

But the economic policies which were predictably leading to the present situation were, if anything, intensified; and the catastrophic further intensification now being applied and promised provide evidence that "the necessary arrangements to put down discontent have been achieved."

It is not an economic theory but an arithmetical certainty that 'Mr. Wilson's' new harsh measures will fail in their *ostensible* objective; but it is an almost equal certainty that they will succeed in their *calculated* objective—the abolition of prosperity, for equal poverty is the indispensable basis of the coming slave state.

If there are still those who believe that the present state of affairs has come about merely through incompetence, we beg them to consider the deliberate destruction of the Tory party, open and visible in the handling of the Profumo scandal, the attack on Mr. Macmillan, and subsequently on Sir Alec Douglas-Home. And for ourselves, we should regard Mr. Wilson's appointment as temporary only.

RHODESIA

(continued from page 1)

leaders, whatever their motives are surrendering us and the world to the Communists."

Fortunately Rhodesian leaders, unlike our own, understand the Communists. Prime Minister Smith has even accused Britain's Harold Wilson of being a Communist or a Communist sympathiser: "If the British Prime Minister isn't one" [a Communist], Smith asks, "why does he allow British ships to pour British provisions to the Vietcong, thus assisting them in their deadly wars against Americans, Australians, and New Zealanders?" Smith also revealed that Wilson's Government is assisting Communist revolutionaries in Cuba, "aiding Communist forces in their march down the African continent," and financing "the Communist countries of Ghana and Tanzania." No wonder Prime Minister Smith isn't popular with our State Department: He tells the truth, and he means business—anti-Communist business.

After speaking with many Rhodesians and with the Prime Minister himself, I am convinced that Ian Smith is not only a rigorous anti-Communist but a devout Christian, and a devoted family man; I know he was a war hero, and that he is a dedicated patriot with great moral and physical courage. And he's even honest! Although he's been a winner in politics for years, he's not even rich. Imagine!

He flew for the R.A.F., had his face shot half off, had it repaired, and went back for more—in the same war in which neither of our dauntless leaders could find a uniform to fit them, although Johnson did *try one on* for a few months.

Now since I spent only thirty minutes with Prime Minister Ian Smith, I can't certify that he's perfect. It's like the preacher who was preaching on the imperfections of man: "I, myself, am guilty of many sins of omission and commission," he said. "I dare say there's not one among you who even *thinks* he's perfect." He was appalled when a little fellow timidly arose in the rear and held up his hand.

"Sir, do you mean to say you think you're perfect?"

"Oh, no, Reverend! I'm just standing up in lieu of my wife's first husband!"

Well, maybe Ian Smith is not perfect; but his honour and courage and honesty and guts would stand up awfully well in lieu of the Leftist pomposities of Great Britain and Child Harold.

II

For a week during my recent trip to Africa I stayed in what the Left calls the Rhodesian "police state," and I saw

fewer policemen than accompany Humphrey Dumpty from the White House to his home. It is even safe to walk in the park at Salisbury at night. You can't say that about Washington, New York, and Chicago.

Salisbury is a city of wide streets, modern buildings, beautiful parks, and friendly people. I did not see an average of one policeman there a day, except at the Prime Minister's headquarters. I saw no soldiers on the streets. Blacks there appear to be far friendlier than in Chicago, New York, or Selma.

I was in Salisbury shortly after the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence, and the place was swarming with "newsmen" from the press and networks of the world. They were up to their propaganda efforts as usual. One enterprising "newsmen" placed candy in the bottom of a refuse barrel and then got a picture of "starving black children half submerged in a trash can in search of a morsel of food."

Another cameraman took a picture of Negroes lying in the park in the central square of Salisbury and captioned it: "They don't even bury their dead." Of course Negroes lie in that beautiful park continuously in fair weather—well-fed, well-dressed, free Negroes.

Another favourite gimmick was to acquire pictures of police dogs snarling at Negroes. (Like in Birmingham when a Negro in padded clothing kicked at a tethered police dog to produce a now-famous picture of a "vicious dog" attacking an "innocent" Negro.) In Rhodesia, police dogs are regularly used in police vans to help catch all lawbreakers, black and white.

I talked with a Rhodesian who developed some pictures for some of our "news" media. "Why do you resort to such trickery as this?" he said he asked an American "newsmen."

"To make a living. This is what they want so this is what I give them."

"But how can you live with yourself?"

"I need their fat cheque, and if I don't do it somebody else will. Someday maybe I'll come back and do a factual story," the reporter replied.

From reading the phony reports in American newspapers and magazines one would inevitably conclude, if one had no other background, that Rhodesian policy towards the blacks is most extreme. Actually, Rhodesian policy will lead to eventual integration and control there by the blacks. Under the present Constitution, blacks will gradually take over as they acquire education and property. They outnumber whites eighteen to one.

There are, however, good reasons to believe that the average, unintimidated black African would *rather* be governed by whites than by tyrannical Black Nationalists. A former Prime Minister of the defunct Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Sir Roy Welensky (who opposed the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence) has declared that today Rhodesians would not hesitate to choose Mr. Ian Smith's régime over a Government headed by Mr. Joshua Nkomo, leader of the banned Zimbabwe African People's Union. In fact, Welensky added, "Black Nationalists in Rhodesia have failed completely to convince even the Black Africans that they are capable of guiding their supporters along the right path, never mind convincing white Africans they are capable of providing a moderate and responsible government."

And why shouldn't the black Africans support the Smith Government? In Rhodesia—unlike South Africa—the only

public segregation is economic, not racial. The Rhodesian Constitution, the most liberal in all of Africa, extends the right to vote on a non-racial basis to all of its citizens who can qualify in regard to education, income, and property ownership. Blacks are even guaranteed (but not limited to) at least fifteen seats in the sixty-five seat legislature; and they can greatly influence the election of the remaining fifty seats if they so wish. The fifty seats compose the "A Roll." It represents educated, propertied voters and is not limited only to whites. The "B Roll" (fifteen seats) is reserved exclusively as a bonus for blacks, actually giving them a special legislative advantage.

Unlike South Africa, Rhodesia has no laws against Africans going to movies, bars, hotels, and the like, if the management permits. (Negroes were registered at the fashionable Meikle's Hotel in Salisbury while I was there.) The issue you see, is not of colour but capacity, not race but fitness to shoulder responsibility for the advancement and happiness of all. As a matter of fact, the great majority of black Rhodesians I saw—and I saw plenty—live better than the black tenants on Lady Bird's Alabama farm; and they seem to be happier. Actually there are no places in Africa and few in the world where the Negro is better off than in South Africa and Rhodesia. In Rhodesia 1 out of every 6 people is in school; under the black governments of Liberia and thopia the ratio is 1 in 40 and 1 in 108, respectively. (In Britain, it is only 1 in 5.) In Rhodesia there is 1 hospital bed for every 250 blacks; in Liberia and Ethiopia, it is one for every 3,500 and 4,000, respectively. Rhodesia has 1 doctor for every 7,300 people; Liberia has 1 doctor for every 29,700. I am sure Ethiopia has doctors—both witch and non-witch—but I was unable to get any statistics on the matter.

In number of gold Cadillacs, however, Ian Smith defaults to Haille Selassie.

III

Among the many curious things I learned during my visit to Africa is that there are actually few cannibals there, even in "states" which are members of the United Nations. By cannibals I mean people who eat people for food. Some of the people-eaters, you see, are not really people-eaters at all. They are merely people-tasters. They partake of humans not for sustenance but for ritual. And they eat only certain parts prescribed by the witch-doctor, tribal tradition, and Voodicare. There are actually people there who believe that certain goodies, eaten, bestow certain qualities on the eater. The top delicacy is the liver; not because of its succulence, but because these people believe the liver is the source of strength and courage. (I don't know, but I suppose the gall bladder is the source of gall; and for several reasons, I hope so.) They don't it seems, always eat their delicacies right away—they sometimes parch some of the tasty parts to powder (instant people!), and insert the powder under their skin. (It's not the colour of the skin which counts, but the colour of the powder.) Or, they might mix the powder with water and have liver-ade, or a gall bladder on the rocks!

Yes, Africa is a strange place, and it has become a Pandora's box opened by our own misguided idealists and our guided "Liberals."

The United States was mainly responsible for the retreat of the West from Africa and the creation of a conglomeration of cannibal nations there who take from us with one hand and throw spears at us with the other. South Africa and Rhodesia, however, have stable, peaceful, prosperous. Christian governments. There aren't even any people-eaters there. So naturally the fruit flies in our State Department

are constantly buzzing around making trouble for them.

Our aid and proffered friendship to the nations and tribes of the world have been returned for the most part with envy and hatred. Prehensile characters a generation out of the trees tear down our flag, stone our Embassies, and spit on our Ambassadors as we continue to deliver billions of dollars worth of our grandchildren's seed corn to them. As for our *real* friends, such as South Africa and Rhodesia—we spit on *them*. We boycott them. We give no foreign aid to them. We even threaten—through the United Nations—to invade them.

The Rhodesians and South Africans are great admirers of ours, or used to be. Now they are hurt. They can't understand us. They have few Communists or pro-Communists and are violently opposed to Communism. They don't realise how far gone *we* are.

Many times during my trip I heard Rhodesians volunteer: "If we can't get oil, we'll walk. If we can't provide enough food, we'll pull in our belts. If we are attacked, we'll fight to the last man."

Wish I could hear some Americans say that.

IV

If the Smith régime is toppled it won't be from within, and it won't be knocked over by Black Nationalists. Only the big powers, or the United Nations, can defeat the Ian Smith Government and bring chaos to Southern Africa

But the Rhodesians are a tough people; they won't go down easily. In 1893 Rhodesia had its "Alamo." Thirty-three of her soldiers fought 3,000 warriors of the Matabele tribe near Bulawayo. Barricading themselves behind their dead horses, they fought until only seven of them remained. At that point, the seven snapped to attention and sang the first verse of "God Save the Queen" before charging the black horde that annihilated them. Rhodesians are like that—tough and proud. Few people will long endure discomforts to save comforts. To warrant sacrifice, the cause has to be "bigger than oneself." To Rhodesians, their cause is bigger than life itself.

Remember that the battle of gallant little Rhodesia could be the turning point. If Rhodesia falls, all Africa falls. Europe, thus outflanked by the Communists, would probably then go "neutral." And after Vietnam is "neutralised" by a coalition government as advocated by the Communists and Bobby Kennedy, next assaults would doubtless be on Thailand, Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. Europe would, with the fall of Africa, be isolated from the trade routes to the Far East. Shipping through Suez and around the Cape of Good Hope would be prevented by the Communists. Then, if we were warring with Red China, our Russian ally would pick up the marbles—the game would be over, and our traitors in Washington would probably surrender us.

Yes, Rhodesia could be the turning point.

FRANCE, THE TRAGIC YEARS

By Sisley Huddleston

This important book about the true role of Marshal Petain as chief of occupied France reveals the sinister background of Charles de Gaulle's postwar seizure of power. It is essential to an understanding of de Gaulle's present role in European politics.

8/3 including postage

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

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