

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 46 No. 14

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1966

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

South Africa

THE FOLLOWING ANALYSIS IS REPRINTED FROM *The Review Of The News**, SEPTEMBER 14, 1966:

On July 18, 1966, the World Court handed down its long-awaited decision on the suit brought against South Africa by Ethiopia and Liberia concerning South Africa's handling of its South-West Africa mandate. In the Court's words, it found "that Ethiopia and Liberia could not be considered to have established any legal right or interest in the subject matter of their claims, and, accordingly, decided to reject them." In other words, the Court, which is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, decided in an 8-to-7 verdict, that the dispute was beyond its jurisdiction, and that it was a political issue rather than a judicial one.

The decision was hailed by South Africa as a victory. But it angered the black Africans and "liberals" in the U.N. who had hoped to use a World Court decision as a legal mandate to impose U.N. sanctions on South Africa or make war against her. Having failed to obtain this legal mandate, the enemies of South Africa have had to revise their strategy. Mr. Graham Hovey, a member of the editorial board of the *New York Times*, wrote in his column of August 29, 1966:

African Governments are preparing their annual United Nations assault on the Republic of South Africa, but not from the strategic new vantage point they had anticipated.

This was the year the Africans had expected to come to the U.N. General Assembly armed with a World Court ruling against South Africa. . . .

Had South Africa flouted such a decision, the Assembly inevitably would have recommended Security Council to force compliance. . . .

Here was to have been not only a practical move to break South Africa's 46-year grip on South-West Africa but a meaningful assault on the Republic's apartheid policy. . . .

Such a U.N. action might have hastened the end of Rhodesia's white rebellion. It would have influenced the course of those struggling "accidents of colonialism" in South Africa's backyard—Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland—now moving rapidly to independence from Britain. It might even have jarred Portugal into modifying its policies in Angola and Mozambique.

All such African hopes were dashed last month when the Court threw out the case altogether, avoiding the question of whether extension of apartheid violated South Africa's mandate and declining even to say if the mandate is still valid.

Of course, what Mr. Hovey did not say was that the African governments were merely the tools of the international despotic conspiracy in their drive to take over all of Southern Africa. This is the same conspiratorial clique which waged a war against the black African government of Moise Tshombe in Katanga. At that time Tshombe was smeared as being a tool of the white capitalists, notably the Union Minière copper mining corporation. Today, Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia, who runs the same kind of government in his country that Tshombe did in Katanga, but with Bilderberg copper interests on his side, is considered some kind of hero. He gets a good press in the *New York Times* while Tshombe was painted as an arch villain. Obviously, the race question is phony. Please note Mr. Hovey's reference to Portugal's "policies" in Angola and Mozambique. The Portuguese, unlike the South Africans, believe in complete racial assimilation to the point of intermarriage. In other words, the race issue is merely being used by the conspiracy to inflame Africans into doing its takeover dirty-work. For, when all is said and done, the Bilderberg clique pushing the Africans into revolt and revolution against the former colonial powers and the white settlers of Southern Africa are just as white as the people they hope to dispossess.

So what South Africa, Rhodesia, and Portugal have gained from the World Court decision is merely time, and the conspiracy knows this. According to the knowledgeable Mr. Hovey:

The United States is too involved in Vietnam to seek trouble in South Africa. Britain, engaged in a desperate effort to save the pound, could ill afford sanctions against a country containing British investments worth \$2.8 billion and which bought \$740 million worth of British goods last year.

In fact, Dr. Verwoerd can count many short-term blessings. With South African help, Rhodesia's white rebel régime is standing up stoutly so far to sanctions imposed by Britain and others. Dr. Verwoerd's other unofficial ally, Portugal, is still harassed by African underground fighters in Mozambique but the rebellion in Angola has faded. . . .

Of course there are specialists on Africa who believe these short-range blessings of Dr. Verwoerd will only make the ultimate struggle bloodier and more terribly racial. . . .

This longer-range problem is one with which the United States inevitably must become involved. No one who appreciates its proportions will relax for long just because the Court's decision and other events have made Security Council action against South Africa unlikely this year.

*Published weekly by Correction, Please!, Inc., Belmont Massachusetts, 02178, U.S.A.

(continued on page 2)

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.

A Strong Man Disarmed

The Archbishop of Canterbury suggests, in a letter to *The Times* (August 9, 1966), that to establish peace, "fellow-Christians in Great Britain would accept the need for an initiative even if it involved some limitation of sovereignty." He adds the hope that our leaders will give a lead "by disregarding claims of national prestige for the sake of general world security." We may disregard such questions as the compatibility of these statements with the part played by the Archbishop in the Coronation of the Sovereign and the oath of loyalty, and as to whether our leaders are in a position to give a lead on anything. But I should like to know who or what is to take over the share of sovereignty which we are urged to disclaim; he does not mean that the Rhodesians are to take over the part of sovereignty which we claim over them and can hardly refer to Gibraltar; in fact he means that some discredited body like UNO is to have more say in our affairs or that we are to fall in more closely behind America or Russia.

A confirmation of this view is found in a letter (*The Times*, August 18, 1966) over several signatures (including that of "John Woolwich", presumably the bishop) of members of the "Conference on Christian Approaches to Defence and Disarmament". They hold that in the international field "we should strive for the restriction of the national possession of nuclear weapons to the Governments of the United States, the Soviet Union and China." Within our Atlantic and other alliances, they say, Britain should be prepared to forego national nuclear weapons and to "accept the same status as other non-nuclear allies" in any use of tactical nuclear weapons which the alliance as a whole may judge to be necessary.

In fact these left-wing prelates are determined that the British shall in no case appear as a strong man armed. The prophet Jeremiah certainly warned Judah against the futility of resisting Babylon, but the modern Jeremiahs have for long been determined to reduce the British to the impotence of Judah, Belgium or Poland, and to thwart the emergence of a financially and materially strong British alliance. Perhaps they might note that their colleagues of the *New Christian* say (July 28, 1966). "International financiers, with little, or no regard for the internal economic well-being of Britain,

can dictate to any British government the shape of its economic policies."

The contributors to *The Times* also refer to "the guilt and danger of our present situation", but do not explain who is guilty or dangerous. The guilt theme reappears in C. C. Aronsfeld's report on the Cambridge conference on Christian-Jewish Co-operation, where he heard a declaration of the "moral bankruptcy of Christian civilisation", and we read of Auschwitz, the Crusades and the Inquisition. But financial pressure can also be cruel: we learned years ago of the close correspondence between the suicide and the bankruptcy rates; apart from this non-Christian races have suffered and are suffering deplorable casualties. Mr. Aronsfeld admits the "profound metaphysical abyss between us", but writes less convincingly of "the Jewish State in which I trust Christians too will see an event of more than secular significance", for one cannot feel happy about the displaced refugees.

A report in the *Church Times* (August 19, 1966) suggests that grovelling and guilt on our part can be overdone, for Archpriest Grabbe reports the renewal of religious persecution in Russia. He writes of "the infiltration into the hierarchy and clergy of many persons whose first loyalty is not to the Church but to the atheistic Government." The Cambridge theologians and South Bank clerics may, for all I know, have little sympathy for the Russian Orthodox, yet the sufferings of the members of the Russian Orthodox Church and the liquidation of millions in Russia and China, should at least remind these writers that White Christians have no monopoly of cruelty and that they will only suffer moral bankruptcy if they fail to oppose falsehood and to show the light of reality.

—H.S.

SOUTH AFRICA

(continued from page 1)

In other words, while the conspiracy finds its hands tied this year, it has no intention of giving up its ultimate and crucial effort to take over Southern Africa. Southern Africa is indeed proving to be a hard nut to crack, but since the conspiracy can no more stop trying to take over Southern Africa than a compulsive murderer can stop murdering, it must develop an alternative strategy. That strategy includes escalating the campaign against South Africa's *apartheid* policy, continued economic pressures against Rhodesia, continued anti-colonial pressures against Portugal, the waging of long-term guerilla warfare against Southern Africa, and the penetration of South Africa through Bilderberg-controlled corporations.

So far, the world-wide agitation against South Africa's *apartheid* policy has managed to create a tremendous amount of animosity toward South Africa, not only among black Africans but also among liberals in all of the Western nations. The aim of this campaign is to create so immoral and despicable a picture of South Africa that public opinion will be persuaded that war against South Africa is not only morally justified but a moral necessity. To counteract this campaign of vilification, the South African government has instituted a public relations campaign of its own, explaining the theory and meaning of *apartheid*—separate development—and how it has been put into effect through the construction of vast housing developments, Bantu schools, hospitals, industries, etc. As a result, most people outside South Africa no longer think of *apartheid* in terms of racial extermination à la Nazi Germany. In addition, the incredibly barbaric performance of some of the newly "independent" black African nations has tended to convince many uncommitted observers that the

Africans are not quite ready for the kind of responsible leadership they are demanding. Nevertheless, the U.S. State Department has put itself on record as opposing *apartheid* and being committed to its eventual overthrow. It was President Johnson who explained the Administration's position in his last State of the Union message delivered in January as follows:

The fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence—the right of each people to govern themselves, to shape their own institutions. . . . [Except those dominated by the Soviet Union.]

We follow this principle by encouraging the end of colonial rule.

We follow this principle abroad as well as at home by continued hostility to the rule of the many by the few, or the oppression of one race by another.

Thus, in one breath, the President summed up American hostility to all of Southern Africa, which includes the two Portuguese overseas provinces (not colonies), Angola and Mozambique, independent Rhodesia, and the Republic of South Africa. And, of course, the Western liberal press continues to defame South Africa *ad nauseam*. The August 26, 1966, issue of *Time* magazine was typical of the Western mass media when it wrote:

But nowhere has the violence of one race against another reached the proportions of the apartheid of South Africa. It is not the bloody violence of hurled bricks and broken bones, but it is violence nonetheless—the moral violence of oppression imposed by a dominating minority. To most of the world, South Africa is the very symbol of racial conflict.

So much for the race question. As for economic pressures, the United States and Britain are determined to do everything in their power to weaken the government of Rhodesia. However, the pressures have only strengthened Rhodesian determination to win. According to the *New York Times* of August 9, 1966:

Sanctions against Rhodesia have failed so far to achieve their avowed purpose of arousing pressure from Rhodesians for abandonment of their Government's unilaterally declared independence.

This is the picture here nine months after the declaration of independence. . . .

The belief that sanctions are pushing white Rhodesian opinion toward a willingness to renounce independence—a belief held in some sections of the Labour party in Britain—is, from all the evidence here, a fantastic illusion.

In the meantime, while Britain boycotts Rhodesia, the latter is seeking new customers and new suppliers. According to the same article:

Already West German and French and Italian salesmen are here, changing old Rhodesian habits of buying British.

And there is South Africa. One foreign observer put it, "Every day that sanctions go on, this country moves a little closer to South Africa, economically and psychologically."

As for exports, the Rhodesians are managing to get their products to market despite American and British efforts. The *New York Times* of July 3, 1966, reported:

The main leakages are stated to be in sales of copper and asbestos to West Germany, asbestos to Japan, meat to Switzerland and sugar and tobacco to Portugal.

The major economic move by the conspiracy, however, is in disengaging Zambia from its dependence on Rhodesia. This is proving to be an extremely costly process. But no effective war against Southern Africa can be waged as long as Zambia's economy and copper mines are dependent on Rhodesian railways, electricity, and coal. The Zambian mines, controlled by the Bilderberg world-government clique, supply Britain with 44 per cent of its copper. This makes it possible for little Rhodesia to affect Britain's economy should a war break out. Thus, Zambia must be made independent of Rhodesia no matter what the cost. According to the *New York Times* of August 1, 1966:

President Kenneth D. Kaunda announced a \$1.12-billion four-year development programme today to reduce Zambia's dependence on Rhodesia.

The main project is a railway to link Zambia and Tanzania, providing Zambia with a reliable route to the East African coast.

Please note that a railway through pro-Communist Tanzania is considered to be more reliable by the Bilderberg clique than a railway through anti-Communist Rhodesia or Mozambique.

The cost of the project is estimated at \$280-million. It is expected to take five years to complete.

At present Zambia is reluctantly using Rhodesian Railways for vital copper exports. . . .

President Kaunda . . . also told of plans for a new hydro-electric project at Kaufe, 30 miles south of Lusaka.

The Kaufe dam will provide an alternative source of power for the copper belt, which relies on the giant [Rhodesian controlled] Kariba dam which straddles the Zambesi River, the boundary between Rhodesia and Zambia. . . .

Mr. Kaunda said a new oil pipeline to Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, would be completed by 1968. Oil, which previously came through Rhodesia, is rationed in Zambia. Truck convoys bring in fuel from Dar Es Salaam, 1,000 miles away.

Half of the massive development plan will be financed by the Government, the rest by private enterprise, mainly the two Zambian copper-mining companies, Roan Selection Trust and Anglo-American Corporation.

Of course, the smelting of copper also requires a great deal of coal. In fact, it takes almost one ton of coal to smelt one ton of copper. Until now all of Zambia's coal requirements came from the Wankie field in Rhodesia. Now all that is to be changed. Zambia has decided to develop her own coal field at Nkandabwe. The *New York Times* of August 17, 1966, reported:

Nkandabwe coal is not so good as Wankie's but the copper companies are now prepared to use it. . . .

There are two giant copper companies, Anglo-American and the Roan Selection Trust. Their natural economic inclination is to keep established links southward. But they now recognize that they cannot and are fully committed to altering their trading patterns.

Thus, it is going to cost Zambia over a billion dollars to disengage herself economically from Rhodesia. You can be sure that the United States government, either directly or through the World Bank, will put up much of the capital for the project. It has already cost the American taxpayer several millions to subsidize Zambia's airborne "pipeline" (see *Analysis*, May 4, 1966). Thus, the sanctions imposed on Rhodesia have probably cost the American taxpayer more than they have the taxpayers of Rhodesia.

What do all these plans to re-orient Zambia's economy mean? They mean that the conspiracy has finally acknowledged that it can no longer take over Southern Africa piecemeal. It will have to be done via a massive military assault sometime in the future. Meanwhile, they are conceding defeat in Rhodesia by making new permanent arrangements for Zambia.

As for the campaign against Portugal and her overseas provinces, Angola and Mozambique, the determination of the Salazar government to resist the "winds of change" has greatly reduced the effectiveness of Communist-inspired guerrilla warfare. For example, a *New York Times* dispatch of August 3, 1966, reported:

The Portuguese armed forces reported today that they had inflicted heavy losses on nationalist guerrillas in Northern Mozambique within the last fortnight. . . .

For the first time the guerrillas were reported to have attempted a frontal attack against a Portuguese Army camp, at Olivenca, in northeastern Mozambique. The attack was said to have failed, with the rebels suffering heavy losses.

The army statement charged that the guerrillas were being "paid by foreigners to maintain insecurity in the northern border zone."

Mozambique's northern border is shared with Tanzania, the peace-loving country through which the Bilderberg copper interests in Zambia are building a railroad, highway, and pipeline. It is from Tanzania that the guerrillas come to raid Mozambique. Guerrillas are also being sent against South Africa. According to a *New York Times* dispatch of August 26, 1966, from Johannesburg:

The Minister of Justice, Balthazar Vorster, said today that terrorists against South Africa were being trained by the United Arab Republic, the Soviet Union, Algeria, North Korea, the Congo Republic (Brazzaville), Communist China and Tanzania. He warned that the terrorists were being sent "to certain death."

Mr. Vorster announced in Parliament in Capetown that the South African police had killed two Africans and arrested eight of a group of armed terrorists encountered at dawn in Ovamboland, the northern part of South-West Africa. Some of those arrested were wounded, he added. . . .

The police reported the terrorists were heavily armed with weapons that included machine guns of Soviet and Chinese origin. . . .

Mr. Vorster reminded Parliament that he had already warned of a phase of subversion yet to come—that of infiltration of "well trained sophisticated saboteurs who would be armed with automatic weapons."

And so guerrilla warfare goes on against Southern Africa. Bilderberg penetration of South Africa through the corporate structure of its economy is also taking place. For example the 1965 annual report of the Rockefeller-controlled Chase Manhattan Bank reveals:

Through a subsidiary, the Chase Manhattan Overseas Banking Corporation (CMOBC), the bank became an important shareholder in The Standard Bank Limited, one of the oldest and largest financial chains in Africa. Standard and its wholly owned subsidiaries, including the Bank of West Africa, have some 1,100 offices in 17 countries of sub-Saharan Africa. . . . Two Chase executives have been elected to the Standard Board of Directors, and a Chase officer in Lon-

don serves with Standard's central management group. Four of Chase's African branches—three in South Africa and one in Nigeria—became part of the Standard organisation.

It should be noted that the Chairman of Chase Manhattan's International Advisory Committee is Jonkheer John H. Loudon, Chairman of Royal Dutch Petroleum Company. David Rockefeller, top member of the Bilderberg world-government clique, whose Chairman is Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, is President of Chase Manhattan. The *New Yorker* of January 9, 1965, described the Rockefeller bank as a "worldwide power structure with over twelve billion dollars in assets and the kind of influence that that kind of money begets." That same *New Yorker* article, a "Profile" of David Rockefeller, curiously enough revealed the following bit of intriguing information:

In South Africa, where the businessmen are preponderantly white proponents of Apartheid, he [David Rockefeller] arranged for a clandestine rendezvous with several underground black leaders.

We wonder if the South African police or the Minister of Justice were aware of Mr. Rockefeller's "clandestine rendezvous." It would be interesting to know how the rendezvous was arranged and *who* arranged it.

The struggle to subdue Southern Africa, as Mr. Hovey of the *New York Times* suggests, is a long-range one. But the countries of Southern Africa, particularly South Africa, need not wait idly by for the final attack to come. There is much they can do to thwart the plans of the Bilderberg-Communist combine. They must, of course, develop nuclear weapons to deter a military attack against them. That will cost a lot of money. Their only alternative is to spend as much money trying to influence American public opinion, for United States foreign policy holds the key to the future of Southern Africa. Only by helping the conservative, anti-Communist elements in America make significant gains against the entrenched liberal establishment can the Southern Africans hope to change American foreign policy to a more friendly one. We can only pray that Southern Africa will use the time it has gained wisely.

As for the assassination of Dr. Verwoerd, one can only say that the internal strength of South Africa will be put to a severe test during the next few months. If anything will awaken the people of Southern Africa to the seriousness of the peril they face, the particularly horrible assassination of the Prime Minister will do it. For in the murder of their Chief of State the citizens are bound to say to themselves, "There, but for the grace of God, go I."

One Against The Mob

by Anthony Harrigan

How the U.S.-U.N. meddling in Rhodesia may cause another war—our grim stake in Rhodesia's ordeal of Independence. Should mob violence, lawlessness and coercion by either individuals, mobs, nations or the U.N. be rewarded? Should someone or a Nation finally stand up against threats to responsible liberty and say "NO"? Mr. Harrigan's comprehensive analysis highlights the basic issues and contains the answers to many questions in Mr. Ian Smith's own words, as well as the full text of the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence.

18/9 including postage.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E11

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11.
Printed by E. Fish & Co. Ltd., Liverpool.