

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 45 No. 17

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1965.

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

RHODESIA—My reply to the Prime Minister

by S. W. Alexander

This article which appeared in *The City Press*, October 22, 1965 is reprinted by kind permission of the author.

At Brighton last week, the Tory Opposition provided evidence for the first time of a difference of opinion in regard to the Government's policy in respect of Rhodesia.

The difference was revealed not only by Lord Salisbury's triumph—for triumph it was—but also by the statement from Sir Alec Douglas Home in opposition to Lord Salisbury. It was Lord Salisbury's triumph because the leaders of the party dared not put the issue of Rhodesia to the vote at the Conference.

It was quite clear that the conference would not have approved, what at first sight seemed to be a blanket approval given in the previous week by Mr. Heath, of the Government's indicated action in the event of a seizure of independence by Mr. Smith's government. There can now be no blanket approval.

Apart from Lord Salisbury's disapproval of sanctions Sir Alec Douglas Home showed conclusively that he would not agree to intervention by the United Nations.

PROMOTE PEACE

The problem, he said, was one which concerned Britain and Rhodesia alone. That, too, was a victory for Rhodesia. That opinion accords with Sir Alec's previous expression of opinion in respect of members of the United Nations.

At a United Nations meeting at Berwick-on-Tweed on December 28, 1961, he emphasised that the United Nations was brought into existence to promote peace and security. But what did he find?

He found that many of the delegates to the United Nations had been instructed to vote for proposals which, in respect of the Congo, were in support of men totally unprepared for the responsibilities of government and which could only result in chaos, not only there but in other places as well.

He emphasised that several of the countries whose delegates had been instructed to vote for mischievous proposals had not even paid for their subscriptions to the United Nations.

If it were clear that the United Nations would be kept out of the Rhodesian question, the position would be less difficult than it is.

Unfortunately Mr. Wilson has deeply obligated his government to the United Nations and has given no assurances on that aspect of the situation.

Indeed, there have been indications that he would like to hand over responsibility for Rhodesia to the United Nations. The dangers of so doing must be obvious not only to Rhodesia but to other western nations.

Such a proposal should be resolutely opposed. Mr. Smith and other Rhodesians have publicly stated that the one step which would unify all white and many African Rhodesians in a fight to the death would be for a United Nations force to attempt to intervene.

The need in this situation is for cool heads and a serious appraisal of the situation.

Mr. Smith made an impressive impact on all who saw him during his visit to London. His impact was so great that he was regarded by the British Government as extremely dangerous in respect of the formation of public opinion. Accordingly, he had to be prevented from answering the statements made by Mr. Wilson through the B.B.C.

Mr. Wilson had obviously been frightened and accordingly we had him presenting what he doubtless felt was a reasonable statement over the television on "the nightmare I had to live with."

Though Mr. Smith was not allowed to reply through our television there is no doubt that he could have done so very effectively. Mr. Wilson's statement that since the war 700 million people had been given independence on the basis of majority rule laid him open to a very serious exposure of his case.

Indeed, Mr. Smith has since, in his own country, with devastating effect pointed out that those democracies have largely vanished; that in one case where independence was granted on the basis of majority rule, three million people were ruthlessly massacred in a matter of days—twice as many as the Commonwealth's deaths in both world wars—and that elsewhere good rule has been lost, corruption and intimidation have broken out and so-called Commonwealth countries have begun to fight amongst themselves.

This is not a matter for pride. It is a terrible story of abdication and cowardice.

The writer of this article is not a Rhodesian and has no connections with Rhodesia, but if one is in public life one has a duty to consider the facts of major situations and to come to a decision as to what is just and right.

SYSTEM

With this purpose in view, I have given careful consideration to Mr. Wilson's broadcast and to other elements in the situation.

(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: 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E.11.

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—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

The late C. H. Douglas expressed his conviction not only that the cause of the world's troubles was international conspiracy, but that that conspiracy had no hope of ultimate success, though it had a very real chance of setting civilisation back by some hundreds of years. This latter, of course, has already happened. But whether by ultimate success Douglas meant the actual establishment of One World Government, which would subsequently collapse, is not clear. There are signs, however, that the attempt to establish One World Government itself is failing. The most obvious aspect of the conspiracy, International Communism, all over the world looks less and less like "the wave of the future"; the United Nations has steadily discredited itself; and the intoxication of new-found national consciousness in the 'emerging' nations has unleashed centrifugal forces which, while setting back civilisation, also render less credible the mystique of the brotherhood of man. But most important of all, the patient strategy of exposure is having an increasing effect. International Communism, considered once as a 'bogey', is seen now by millions for what it is in itself; and within those millions, is seen by an increasing number as a manifestation of a deeper Conspiracy.

We have from time to time in these pages referred to a number of books each bearing on some important aspect of the International Conspiracy—books now for the most part readily available, and vital in the work of exposure.

An invaluable book recently to hand is *A Texan looks at Lyndon*, by J. Evetts Haley*. Subtitled *A Study in Illegitimate Power*, it lays bare the corruption and blackmail by which Lyndon Baines Johnson has risen to become the President of the United States. The record is clear and unequivocal; but the important point is that this record is well-enough known to those in control of the mass communications media which continue to glorify a man with the record of a gangster. The ability of Johnson to 'handle' Congress so that it has been no more than a rubber stamp for 'his' policies is the product of relentless pressures and blackmail. But Johnson himself is vulnerable, should he step out of line; he has become a multi-millionaire while spend-

*Palo Duro Press, P.O. Box 390, Canyon Texas.

ing his adult lifetime on the public payroll.

In the light of the campaign to stop Goldwater, it is quite evident that Johnson could not have got where he has got without serving interests with far more power than that even of a multi-millionaire. What those interests wanted is evident in the policies not initiated but intensified by the ruthlessness of Johnson. What is not evident is any stupidity, only deadly intent.

CORRECTION, PLEASE!*

ITEM: From a Column by DREW MIDDLETON of the *New York Times News Service*, October 18, 1965:

The new United States representative [Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg], it is generally believed here [at the United Nations], has more freedom to act within the limits of Washington's foreign policy than had his predecessor. Other delegates know the reins still extend to Washington, but feel they are loosely held.

They believe that Goldberg, without consultation with Washington, took the initiative in drafting the resolution on Rhodesia that Guinea presented to the General Assembly last week. The resolution, which was adopted, called on Britain to take all necessary steps to prevent Rhodesia's 220,000 whites from seizing independence for the colony while its 4 million blacks lack a voice in the government.

In his consultations with Guinea and other African delegations, Goldberg again exhibited an ability to find a common denominator for agreement, to win friends for the U.S. with judicious hints of parliamentary help and to emerge with wording generally acceptable to all.

CORRECTION: In a quarter of a century Drew Middleton, as a foreign correspondent, has amassed a familiarity with the mechanics and protocol of diplomacy that is matched by few American newsmen. Therefore it is relatively easy to accept the conclusion that Mr. Middleton is aware of the import of his remarks.

What has Middleton said? He has said that Ambassador Goldberg—acting within the limits of U.S. foreign policy, but without consultation with Washington—has served as a ghost writer for the U.N. delegation from the Communist regime of Guinea to encourage British aggression against the white population of Rhodesia. It is somewhat surprising that Mr. Middleton makes no comment as to the predictable chaos if every one of the more than one hundred U.S. Ambassadors begins to institute major steps in U.S. foreign policy without consultation with Washington. But what is even more surprising is that Mr. Middleton dismisses Goldberg's venture into ghost writing as "judicious hints of parliamentary help."

ITEM: From WALTER SCOTT'S "Personality Parade," October 17, 1965:

Q. Please identify the following quotation: "The fundamental defect of fathers is that they want their children to be a credit to them."—Walter Rich, Wilmington, N.C.

*A Selection of extracts, reprinted with permission, from *The Review of The News* which is published weekly by Correction Please!, Inc., 395 Concord Ave., Belmont Massachusetts 02178, U.S.A.

A. Bertrand Russell, writer, mathematician, philosopher.

CORRECTION: Writer, mathematician, philosopher? Believe it or not, Mr. Scott, in the introduction to his column, asks his readers: "Want to learn the truth about prominent personalities?" Yet, all that Mr. Scott deigns to say about Bertrand Russell is "writer, mathematician, philosopher."

Not a word about the fact that *for seven decades* Bertrand Russell has been heaping aid and comfort upon the International Communist conspirators. Here are a few samples:

Russell in 1896, speaking of Karl Marx's Communist Manifesto: "Almost unsurpassed in literary merit. For terse eloquence, for biting wit, and for historical insight, it is, to my mind, one of the best pieces of political literature ever produced . . . In this magnificent work we have already some of the epic force of the materialistic theory of history; its cruel, unsentimental fatality, its disdain of morals and religion, its reduction of all social relations to the blind action of impersonal productive forces."

Russell in 1918: "The world is damnable. Lenin and Trotsky are the only bright spots . . ."

"The world grows more full of hope every day. The Bolsheviks delight me; I easily pardon their sacking the Constituent Assembly, if it at all resembled our House of Commons. How they succeed! They have stirred revolt in Austria and Germany; they have even made some English people think—but they will never make America think."

Russell in 1926: "America is essentially a country of pious peasants, like Russia."

Russell in 1957: "Two great men propounded ideologies which have not yet run their course: I mean the authors of the Declaration of Independence and the Communist Manifesto."

Nor does Mr. Scott mention Bertrand Russell's leadership in the Communist-ridden Pugwash Conferences, or the fact that Russell is the founding father of the international Better-Red-Than-Dead brigades and the Ban-the-Bomb Boobs.

There is nothing mentioned of Russell's notorious atheism or his idiotic views on religion: "Religion discourages honest thinking, in the main, and gives importance to things that are not very important." This was Russell as recently as 1960. But as far back as 1927, he had discovered "one very serious defect" in "Jesus Christ's moral character."

Mr. Scott also overlooks Russell's friendship with Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Kosygin, and Chou En-lai

Mr. Scott does not even mention that, less than two months ago, Russell's Peace Foundation in Britain applied for visas for three Viet Cong leaders so that they could visit Britain and propagandise for their cause in country-wide lectures.

RHODESIA

(continued from page 1)

He told us that after forty years of limited self-government, the control of Rhodesia lay in the hands of 230,000 Europeans while nearly four million Africans remained effectively without the vote. He admitted that a complicated system provided that as more Africans reached a given educational standard, or get into a higher income bracket, they could have the vote.

"But this," he said, "is a very slow process." Mr. Wilson claimed that Britain has never granted independence except on the basis of democratic majority rule.

This, he said, Mr. Smith and his colleagues resolutely rejected. Not in their lifetime would they allow it to happen. Mr. Wilson insisted that there must be guaranteed and unimpeded progress to majority rule.

"Before we can recommend independence for Rhodesia," said Mr. Wilson, "we must be satisfied that the conditions proposed for independence were acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole."

It is evident that there is great difficulty in finding out the opinion of the Rhodesian people as a whole. Vast numbers of them have no opinions at all.

All they desire is that they should be left in peace to carry on their occupations. But what were the choices before the Rhodesian Government?

It could ask the opinions of the tribal chiefs. The process seems to be a chain of communication from the kraal to the head of the village to the chief of the tribe. Mr. Smith held an Indaba and the chiefs supported him.

It is true that the chiefs are paid but so are members of Parliament who are probably the nearest thing that we have to tribal chiefs.

ELECTION

Mr. Wilson said in his broadcast that he did not look for "one man one vote" immediately. That at least is a concession to the view that not all male Africans are yet ready to choose a sound government.

Nevertheless, what is demanded from the Rhodesian Government is a vastly extended franchise and an election to decide for or against a majority government. There is little doubt that, if there were an election, passions would be inflamed by extremist politicians; there would be attacks on the white population, and capital and qualified people would flee the country.

That is an immediate choice for the British Government. Which should it choose? The answer is that it should abandon the folly of one man one vote and postpone its insistence on early majority government.

It should accept the view that it is good government that is needed and that for at least the immediate future only an experienced white government can fulfil that requirement.

Mr. Wilson said that he felt that he and Mr. Smith were living in different worlds, almost different centuries. Mr. Wilson makes a grave error.

We should not be concerned in this situation with differences of opinion which are thought to be related to this century or the last, or somebody's date of birth, but with what is right or wrong.

Mr. Smith is faced with a situation which he and his friends have to live with. Mr. Wilson is but a passer-by on the political stage. He expresses opinions which it is not unreasonable to suppose accord with what he feels the United Nations will support.

They have little relation to the facts. His compelling idea appears to be that Mr. Smith must be brought to book to satisfy enemies of Rhodesia in the United Nations. As with others the votes of the United Nations appear to be important to Mr. Wilson.

Maybe that suggestion is wrong, but if it is wrong, Mr. Wilson should say so for a considerable body of British opinion is beginning to believe that in several aspects of foreign policy Britain is being governed by the United Nations and not from Whitehall.

In his speech, Mr. Wilson said, "We have told Mr. Smith that we are prepared to work out with him a programme for early independence based on guaranteed progress towards majority rule." He suggested "a massive and dynamic programme of education and training for government."

In that connection it has been implied that the Rhodesian white people have failed to provide sufficient education for the Africans. That is far from the truth. In fact 90 per cent of African children get primary education for five years. And as education is extended, as is fully intended, by the present government, so will the numbers of Africans on the electoral roll increase. It also has to be recognised that it is primarily taxation of the white minority that provides resources for educating the Africans.

In that and in other respects the white Rhodesians endeavour to live within their means which itself provides a lesson that a modern dynamic twentieth century British government has yet to learn.

Mr. Smith is not unreasonable in rejecting a crash programme of education. The ability to govern is not merely a question of literacy.

It is not merely a question of higher education. It is a matter of character. And one of the best tests of character in this situation is whether a government has respect for minorities.

ASSURANCES

What assurance will the British Government provide that any majority government brought into existence in Rhodesia will have respect for the white minority? If it could give that assurance the situation again would be different. But it cannot be so. The British Government asks for assurances from the present Rhodesian Government but it is also right that it should itself give guaranteed assurances to the white Rhodesians in regard to respect for minorities.

Last week the Daily Mail took an opinion poll on this issue of Rhodesia. It reported that 82 per cent of those asked favoured Mr. Wilson's Government's attitude. "Eight out of ten Britons say Wilson is right", it blazoned on its front page, but what was the question?

"The British Government insists that independence can be granted only if the conditions are acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole, and not just to the whites. Do you think this is right or wrong?"

I have shewn how difficult it is to find any reasonable method of judging African opinion. Was any consideration given to that important fact by those who so readily answered the question?

The next question asked by the Mail was "Do you think Britain's first responsibility in Rhodesia is to the white population, the African population or to the population as a whole?"

Seventy-five per cent said that Britain's responsibility is to the whole population of Rhodesia. John Dickie, the Mail's reporter, commented on this result. "This result is an indication of the strength of the "kith and kin" argument which is used so often by Mr. Smith in seeking support for the 220,000 whites who are surrounded by almost 4,000,000 Africans in Rhodesia."

That statement is unjustified. The response has no relation to the so-called "kith and kin" argument or anything else. Britain's responsibility in Rhodesia and the present Rhodesian Government's responsibility is first and all the time recognised as being toward the population as a whole. The problem is to find a means of continuing responsibility to all the people with the maintenance of law and order and justice to all concerned. These opinion polls are extremely misleading and one of their most serious faults is that among unthinking people they tend to promote the wrong points of view for the wrong reasons and to be accepted as evidence of required policy.

Mr. Smith has complained that African opponents to the white regime are continuously approaching the British Government, the United Nations and other organisations. Because they believe they can influence the British Government, he says, they do not approach him and his colleagues. He says that he would always be prepared to see them and that one of the advantages of independence, if granted, would be that there would be no outside barriers preventing reasoned discussion.

Mr. Smith has turned down Mr. Wilson's proposals for a meeting between him and Commonwealth Prime Ministers. He has very good reasons for so doing.

My own belief is that the British Government should grant independence freely and abandon all proposals for offensive action.

The undertaking in the 1961 Constitution to proceed towards greater African representation should be enough. And, if there should be protests from the United Nations or any other peoples the British Government should be prepared to send in the troops—not to compel the white Rhodesians to a course of action which may prove to be against the interests of all the people—but to help to maintain law and order so that the well-being of all may be promoted.

Mr. Wilson has set out on a course of action which can lead on to bloodshed and chaos.

And what is it all about? It is about the difference between decisions based on an extended franchise or decisions based on meetings of tribal chiefs. Neither can secure proper decisions from simple peoples who have no proper opinions at all. Mr. Wilson's responsibility is tremendous.

THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM

A brochure dealing with the conspiracy behind the Vietnam "peace" moves, and behind Indonesia's threat to Australia, and containing a comprehensive list of books on the Conspiracy.

Free—on request

China was deliberately betrayed into Communist hands by members and agencies of the American government. The Korean War was not fought to be won, and the generals in the field were forbidden by Washington to take the necessary steps to win it. In

WHILE YOU SLEPT

by John T. Flynn

8/3d.

it is clearly shown that the whole purpose of the Korean War was to lower American prestige, to increase the prestige of the Communists, and to demoralise anti-Communists everywhere.

from K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,

5 New Wanstead, London, E.11.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd. at 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E.11.

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