

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 46 No. 16

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1966

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Southern Africa

The survival of Western, Christian, Civilisation, almost certainly now depends on an awakened and focussed public opinion in the U.S.A. The alternative to this survival is at present most starkly visible in Africa, and probably the last bastion of our defence is Southern Africa—the Republic of South Africa, and Rhodesia—and the Portuguese Overseas territories. Southern Africa is marked down by the Conspiracy for an overt attack which yet could be averted by sufficient public recognition of the intention behind it. This is the context of a speech by the Prime Minister of Portugal, Dr. Salazar, at Lisbon on April 13, 1966, which, because of its profound analysis of the problems of Africa, we reproduce in full from the text issued by the Embassy of Portugal in Australia.

* * *

Chairman of the City Council of Luanda,
Chairman of the Commercial Association,

Gentlemen:

I am deeply moved by your long journey to this Palace, the headquarters of the Government and of the representatives of all the Portuguese Nation. By so doing you have sought to recall some words spoken here in Lisbon five years ago today, at a tragic moment in our life in Angola when the Government decided to defend that province "at once and on the largest scale". This phrase is far from being a mere literary expression: it gave expression to a policy and was above all a serious governmental decision, which sprang from no sentimental access of feeling but was the fruit of long mature thought affecting us and all the peoples of Africa. It was then easy to justify this decision; today with the experience we have lived and gained, it is even easier to understand it.

In the first place it expressed your determination, your decision to *stay*. Any man who stays, alive or dead, does in fact occupy the land; he who leaves, is deserting and abandoning it. It is only the former with his posterity, who gains the right to occupy and possess that History recognises as the basis of society and a share in authority. The latter lacks those ties that bind land and blood and link the generations in their long succession, body and soul, in their work and their culture. He voluntarily renounces creating anything like a nation that he can consider to be his motherland.

But there was also the wave of terror spreading in all its ferocity over the north of the province, killing and torturing its victims to show its hate, in the name of destruction and chaos alone. At one time to kill, to burn factories, to lay waste plantations, to spread terror and death among defenceless folk were criminal deeds. Nowadays, however, they are technique on which is based a theory of revolution that does its best to justify them. But in our view, the view that used to prevail, any government that in such cir-

cumstances does not intervene to carry out the primary task of guaranteeing the security and life of its inhabitants and the wholeness of the territory loses thereby its legitimacy and its very justification for existence. In carrying out its foremost duty there is no call to thank it.

A third reason for the decision that was taken arose from our way of envisaging the problem of "de-colonization" that had developed in the continent of Africa since the end of the last war. This matter would call for complex observations and I will try today to sum them up briefly.

The African peoples, and by this term I refer to those who live south of the Islamic Mediterranean nations, sought to de-colonize themselves, either by liberally receiving their independence from the nations that held sovereignty over them, or by claiming it until they got it. But very few of them, due to their geographical position and size, scanty population, frontiers drawn according to the chances of occupation, the wealth of the soil or subsoil, possessed that indispensable minimum of economic resources and facilities to sustain a society with an organised form of life and work. The cultural backwardness of their inhabitants, too, meant that such territories did not enjoy a minimum of people able to plan economic life, direct work, carry out day-to-day administration, form governments and the highest authorities of the State. Independence is expensive and these peoples had not sufficient wealth to support it. Independence is difficult and these peoples had not sufficient men trained to face the problems, not so much of a modern State but of a society that has to be able to organise itself to be able to survive. The social organisation to be found in most of the territories had still not risen above the tribal concept, or the strictly racial principle, and of itself would have great difficulty in creating among the people links of a national character and scope. Only we, with our traditional notion of integration, have created around the Portuguese reality and the name of Portugal, the necessary cohesion of our Overseas Provinces, all held to be members of one Nation. In those territories outside Portuguese suzerainty, independence spread like a kind of epidemic: it was, therefore, inevitable, whatever the merits of the work of colonization carried out by the European nations might be, that in such lands States should have arisen without the support of nations and without the material and human resources they needed to build themselves up and progress. Life comes first and so two factors of the greatest importance appeared in the life of these peoples: systematic subsidies to replace work: and foreign techniques and advisers replacing the local government. As independence seems to be an irreversible tendency, these peoples seem to me to be condemned, some to a kind of undefined protectorate, others to weakness and instability of institutions, and thus open to all forms of ideological influence and political pressure.

(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.

Soviet Apologists

Enthusiasm for the Soviet system bemused a section of the "intelligentsia" in the thirties, and then Russia became "our gallant ally" in the war, but nothing they have since done (even the detention of Hess) can spread disillusionment. Messrs. Kiralfy, of the Faculty of Laws, and E. L. Johnson, Reader in Soviet Law, both of the University of London, spring to the defence of the Soviet legal system which had come under fire from Professor Schapiro. "I must protest," writes Professor Kiralfy (*The Times*, Sept. 8, 1966), and explains how various sections of the code are used against religious groups, like Baptists, or against priests, and that the interpretation by the courts "is what was in the legislature's mind." Once the premise of state tyranny is accepted, a twisted legalism follows inevitably, which violates any Law of personal freedom. But Mr. Johnson refers to the decree of March 18, 1966, which increases penalties, and concludes that, "one may disapprove of these enactments, but it is surely the duty of the Soviet judiciary to read and apply them."

The Rev. Michael Bourdeaux (*Church Times*, Sept. 9) appraises the opposing forces in the Russian struggle between Church and State: he notes the campaign to represent certain Baptist groups as inciters to ritual murder, but still the leading atheist paper "seems to be conducting a campaign against incitement to violence." The Orthodox Church found a leader in Archbishop Yergomen, who protested against the resolutions of the Council of Bishops which in 1961 "smoothed the way for the present State control of Orthodox affairs," but he was dismissed and sent to a monastery. But two priests, recently suspended, took up the work and complained that the highest Church governing body "has satisfied the illegal demands of atheist functionaries." The author, who notes that the State still needs the Patriarchate as an instrument of its foreign policy, concludes that we are likely to see "another demonstration of the astounding resilience of Christian Russia."

Soviet strategy, which aims to crush independence, receives wider support than their legal system. *The New Christian* writes (Sept. 8) of "a police state in which imprisonment without trial, brutality, a system of informers, and censorship have become part of daily routine," but at-

tributes this state of affairs not to Russia but to Rhodesia. The situation, they allege, is "an appalling menace to world peace and human happiness," and as Britain has failed to discharge her responsibilities, "the problem must be transferred to the United Nations," and a strong force must be despatched to Zambia and then "take control of strategic centres in Rhodesia." The writer makes these allegations, which apply to many other countries but not to Rhodesia, as far as can be ascertained, and then gives *carte blanche* to U.N.O. in complete disregard of previous experiences in Africa. A writer in *The Times* recently deplored the attacks on the Archbishop about a year ago when we should, he said, have followed his clear lead. Yet even the Archbishop did not understand the implications of his words or even their meaning.

After so much vague and irresponsible appealing to emotion, Tom Stacey (*Evening Standard*, Sept. 15) suggests we "look coolly" at the communique issued after the Commonwealth conference. He calls his article, "Oh Mr. Wilson, What have you let us in for now?" Mr. Stacey says that the Rhodesian Government is presented with "an ultimatum it cannot possibly accept," and Britain has endorsed "a sadly naive interpretation of democracy." Mr. Stacey adds that among the African countries which have brought pressure on Britain, two are revolutionary military regimes (Ghana and Nigeria), five are one-party states (Kenya, Tanzania, Malawi, Uganda, Zambia) and two have a combined population "about the size of Dulwich and Croydon", namely Sierra Leone and Gambia. The communique records that most of the Commonwealth favours force, i.e. war. "Can diplomatic irresponsibility go further?" asks Mr. Stacey.

—H.S.

The New Lord's Prayer

"Our Father in heaven, your name be hallowed.

Your Kingdom come.

Your will be done, as in heaven so on earth.

Our bread of the morrow give us today.

And forgive us our debts

As we too have forgiven our debtors.

And do not bring us to the ordeal,

But save us from evil.

For yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory, for ever. Amen"

—*Canberra Times* Sept. 15, 1966.

* * *

The following letter appeared in the *Canberra Times*, Sept. 28, 1966:

SIR, — Judging by the sample translation of the Lord's Prayer recently published in *Canberra Times*, Mrs. Green and the others who attacked it with such spirit and justice were, for all that, barking up the wrong tree. Clearly, if this is the best our clergy can do, there is no point in protest. Our only recourse is to prayer. May I suggest that, in place of the well-known Collect added to the Order of Morning Service in the days of a former Queen Elizabeth, the Anglican Synod should adopt the following variant while they are dealing with the Liturgy:

"Almighty and everlasting God, who alone workest great marvels; send down upon our bishops and curates the healthful spirit of thy grace; and that they may truly please thee, open their ears we beseech thee to the music of thy word; take away their illiteracy

and purge their mouths from imbecile speech; turn back the desire of their hearts from the tongue of Sodom and, moving them to a true repentance, inspire them with that wisdom which ever lies in letting well alone".

If this prayer does nothing for them, the language may help.

A. D. HOPE

Forrest.

Southern Africa (continued from page 1)

One thing I have not yet understood: how, in such circumstances, African leaders can protest against colonialism and against neo-colonialism. For, having destroyed the former, there are only two alternatives before them. Either they progress thanks to the benefits of foreign capital and international skills, with inevitable, shocking limitations of their independence—and this is rightly called neo-colonialism; or they resign themselves to mediocrity, if not to a return to primitive ways of life in which indigence, disease, tribal rivalries and struggles will continue to be the price to be paid for the independence that can only be termed precipitate. I do not seek to defend the mistakes or abuses that may have characterised colonialism, but the truth is that this 'cursed' colonialism brought peace to Africa, enabled the inhabitants to live together, promoted a growth of population, endowed the continent with more extensive means of communication, discovered and exploited natural wealth and brought its 270 millions into contact with civilisation, whose secrets it revealed to them and placed at their disposal. Naturally, where the process of integration was not adopted, this work was done through a clear-cut discrimination of races and a certain inferiority socially of black Africans, and such a state of affairs necessarily had to change sooner or later, simply because it would have been unnatural for it to go on indefinitely. But the political nostrum of independence could not solve the problem, which could in fact only be solved through the gradual rise of the masses through work and education to that level at which men can aspire to all positions and where social differences no longer have any justification. The policy that was adopted, by raising to power subjects of great empires who had long nursed their hate, of necessity caused the outburst of another form of racism—black racism, with the repudiation and risk of destruction of everything that could act, as it still does, as the pledge and guarantee of progress. So the present unhappy situation has been reached.

Our reluctance to accept the general pattern is based on historical reasons that form the structure of the Portuguese Nation and inspire its Constitution. Facts, deriving moreover from sociological causes, have amply justified it. Yet in spite of this our attitude is widely condemned, although no one can deny at least one merit it has had: that it has given both whites and blacks, Europeans and Africans, time to reflect, has made it possible to survey the damage done, to measure the ground and the time lost, to calm exacerbated passions and to reveal, by comparison, the real worth of our methods. The political and social integration that we have always advocated leads us, as it leads most cultured people nowadays, to the conclusion that either the African countries must organise themselves on the basis of multi-racialism or they can be considered to be lost to civilisation.

Proof that a multi-racial society is possible is forthcoming from Brazil, the greatest Latin-American power and a nation of Portuguese roots. It would, therefore, be necessary to

deny this fact, as well as many others, to sustain the impossibility of any social constitution of this type of African territory. On the other hand, and this is a further conclusion derived from experience, black racialism itself has been forced to recognise its inability to create or maintain a civilisation in African lands without the aid of the white man. And since, the initial competitive onrush once passed, no way has been found, or can be discovered, to de-personalise or de-nationalise capital and technical aid in the service of Africa, the African countries not structurally linked by political ties to a European power will find themselves compelled to accept the implications of the power influences which inevitably derive from the active presence of such capital and such technical aid. Many may spread or nurse illusions on this point, but the setting-up of national economies that can, having absorbed and incorporated abundant foreign capital, be determined exclusively by their own interests calls for political structures that the independent African countries are very far from possessing.

All these circumstances and problems were well to the fore in our minds when terrorism broke out in Angola. The anguished cries of the province, and later of Guinea and Mozambique, echoed in our ears. The calls of blood, the spirit of past generations, the force of History, set our Portuguese hearts vibrating, and vehemently aroused our reason as responsible rulers. We felt, as a matter of conscience, that we had to act and that we had to proclaim, in the name of truth and the sincerity to which all, white and black, are entitled, that for them to sever themselves from their Nation would be to lose their liberty, only to submit, in the name of independence, to the authority of strangers, would be to go backwards instead of forward, would be to become less and not greater. It is found that only the Nation that embraces all its sons is strong enough in its economy and its might to defend them from hostile ambitions and sensitive enough to understand their feelings and lead their aspirations along the best road.

This has not prevented our 'colonialism', so-called, from being widely criticised. But perhaps the mere description of one fact will enable us to estimate the worth of the charge. And because Beira is in the limelight at present because of the Rhodesian question, it is there that I will seek an example of Portugal's work overseas.

From January 1, 1949, the port of Beira has been handed over to the authority of Mozambique. In that year it was found that the port and the railway were unable to deal with the increase in traffic forecast as likely to come from the then Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. Negotiations held in Lisbon found no solution for the problem, which consisted basically in obtaining funds to improve the permanent way, providing new rolling stock, increase and extend services and, as regards the port, to dredge out and build new quays. The British concessionary company declared itself unable to obtain the necessary capital and pay a dividend on it without new contractual conditions that we could not agree to. The difficulty had to be eliminated by the Portuguese Government buying out the company for four million pounds, which it paid out at once as soon as the necessary formalities were gone through in London. Working was handed over to the Province's Railway Department and work began. The economic expansion of our own territories and those served by the Beira railway and port has been such that at the time they dealt with 1,200,000 to 1,500,000 tons of traffic, the

maximum capacity, but nowadays work over 4 million tons, which can be raised in present conditions to 5 millions. Since then the Government has received no interest or dividend on the capital it has invested, and none of it has been redeemed, because it has left everything to the Administration of the Province to invest in sidings, alterations and improvements on the track, permanent housing for the personnel and buildings for the various departments, and for further work and building in the port. Given the narrowness of the latter, work goes on for 24 hours a day and it possesses the highest figures in the world for return per metre of waterfront. There are no longer delays in loading and unloading and everybody recognises that the fears expressed at the time of the take-over negotiations as to our efficiency have been completely unfounded. Both our province and the neighbouring territories have only reason to be pleased at the services provided.

Now let us note this: the British capital was repatriated, it received dividends and could continue to receive profits after the sale of the company. The Treasury acquired the railway and to this day has received neither capital nor income on it. The net profits of the Beira Railway, about 2,500 million escudos, have been left in Mozambique and invested for the general benefit. This case could not be repeated indefinitely, for our resources are limited, but it serves to show that in our 'colonialism' it is foreigners that pocket the profits while we pay for improvements, with merely the political advantage of freeing a crucial zone of Mozambique.

I cannot, unfortunately, conclude these remarks with a word of optimism, for our difficulties and hazards are likely to continue for some time.

A cooler, more realistic understanding of social factors and their political repercussions has recently brought about some improvement in the general state of African problems. Even if we shared the belief, which I definitely do not, that the European effort north of the Equator has been nullified for a considerable space of time, the fact is that we had already noted, through the political changes and declarations of responsible leaders, specifically from the line that connects the Congo river to the Rovuma and thence to the Cape of Good Hope, a cooling-off in the passions and a great spirit of collaboration among all the territories. Mutual confidence gave rise to the greatest hopes that this vast Southern African zone was beginning to become more stable in an atmosphere of peace, to progress and to be able to be considered once and for all saved for itself and for the civilisation of the West. And at this very juncture the way in which the matter of independence of Rhodesia has been dealt with has covered the African sky with dense, black clouds, although it is not too late to solve the problem with the agreement of London.

We are not called upon to express an opinion on a matter that from the outset has been considered the exclusive internal responsibility of Great Britain, even if, paradoxically and on British initiative, the question has today been internationalised by the intervention of the Security Council. The mere intervention of the Council, and its deliberations are being very carefully considered by the Government, so that it is premature to interpret in any manner our attitude as regards our direct concern in these most serious deliberations. What I can state at this point is that one further false step in the solution of the Rhodesian problem by the powers responsible may light a great fire that will endanger all those who think they are immune because they are far from the flames. Everything can still be saved, but by the same

token everything can still be lost, if passions make themselves heard above the voice of reason, and if certain imperialistic expressions, which we, side by side with all the African peoples, should openly repudiate, gain more general currency and, in spite of the changed times, resume their sway in the regions affected.

This being the case, I can only give you a word of confidence in the firmness of our attitudes, and also give you a warning. Although the reasons for the slowness and patience of our actions are sometimes difficult to estimate, we should remember that one rule is forced on us as the principle of our actions. It is that we should never in any circumstances fall in with those who seek, or who act as if they sought, to fight against our legitimate interests and spurn our rights.

And that longed-for visit to Angola? I think the best thing is to put it off until the time when the last terrorist has been dominated or expelled and there we can together celebrate the heroic defence effort.

Now Available The Art of the Possible

by Dr. Bryan W. Monahan

This booklet is the text of an address given in Sydney in May 1966 which appeared in "The Social Crediter" of July 2nd, 16th and 30th. It endeavours to delineate the large background of today's extremely dangerous international situation, which has come about despite the fantastic technological progress which should make life more pleasant and secure on an ever-widening scale. If we understand why this contradiction exists, and how it has come about, we may be able to take action to remedy the situation. But if we do not understand, the destruction of Western Civilisation, probably within a very few years, and its replacement by a police-state collectivism, appears certain for those who survive the revolution which already engulfs us.

Prices including postage:

1 copy 3/- 6 copies 13/-

3 copies 7/6 12 copies 22/6

We apologise for the unavoidable delay in making this booklet available.

Recent Additions to our Recommended Reading List.

THE "SUPPRESSED" REPORT	1/4
"SCOREBOARD 1966"	
Edition of American Opinion	8/3
SEEDS OF TREASON,	
The True Story of the Chambers-Hiss Tragedy,	
by Ralph de Toledano	8/3
THE WHOLE OF THEIR LIVES,	
by Benjamin Gitlow, former head of the American Communist Party.	8/3
ONE AGAINST THE MOB,	
Rhodesia's Ordeal of Independence, by Anthony Harrigan.	18/9
FRANCE, THE TRAGIC YEARS	
1939-1947,	
by Sisley Huddleston.	8/3
UNITED NATIONS PACKET	16/6
Prices include postage from K.R.P. Publications Ltd.	

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

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