

# RHODESIA and WORLD REPORT



Registered at the  
General Post Office  
as a Newspaper

★ The Voice of ★  
Rhodesian Conservatism

Price 15c

Vol. VII, No. 5

NOV./DEC. 1972

## CONTENTS

	Page
CHRISTMAS MESSAGE	1
W.C.C.—A Subversive Body	2
EDITORIAL	3
RHODESIA: A Re-orient- ation of Australian Policy	3
AROUND AFRICA A S.A.B.C. Survey	5
CANDID COMMENT	6

## MY NAME IS ECCLESIAN

*Rhodesia and World Report* readers are aware of Satan's devices in the world today; of the deceptions practised in the field of semantics. (How the West is being lost by the incantatory misuse of the word "democracy" is dealt with by C. S. Lewis in "Screwtape Proposes a Toast".) Then there are words that have fallen into disrepute like Church, Churchman, etc. Today's press places an aura over Churchmen and Churchleaders. Pronouncements become authoritative because they are those of a churchman—though they be so often double standard moralisings. And we do not like it. Church, in any case, conjures up the institutional church, the World Council of Churches, with funds for terrorists, etc., etc. It's a wonder your Editor asked a Churchman of Salisbury to write in his paper.

So let us resort to new words—Ecclesia for church, and Ecclesian for a man of the church. Ecclesian is my name. Now Ecclesia is a Greek word, which means "that which is called out" and it is used hundreds of times in the Greek translation of the Hebrew scriptures for the gathering and congregation of the Israel nation. It is translated "church" 127 times in our English New Testament.

### Why must there be an Ecclesia in the World?

One of the earliest ecclesias was that of Noah's family, when they were "called out" from the rest of humanity, to be set apart in the ark. Why was there an ark? The Bible says "that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually". That was why there had to be an ecclesia, and it is the same today. Jesus Christ said, "As were the days of Noah so shall the coming of the Son of Man be . . . so will it be in the days of the Son of Man". (Matthew 24 and Luke 17 referring to the end of this age and Christ's second Advent in judgment.)

Students of world affairs prophesy doom and destruction for Western civilisation. Students of Bible prophecy believe that demon powers are leading nations to the abyss. That Britain is a "Nation bewitched" is the only rational explanation Mr. Enoch Powell

can find for his country's determination to commit economic and national suicide.

### Why must there be an Ecclesia in the World?

Francis Schaeffer of Switzerland gives a very suggestive theological answer. "Everywhere you turn man is coming to see that man is less than men know the human should be." Now God calls His Ecclesia, he writes, out of humanity "in order to be humanity before a lost humanity". The Bible speaks of the last phase of the Ecclesia concept as the Body of Christ. This is exciting news. This is what Christmas and the Incarnation of God is about. God, in Christ, came to be the head of the Body. God's Ecclesia of redeemed people is to have God's Christ as its Head. "The word that was God . . . was made Flesh" (John I: 1, 14) in order that the Ecclesia can be headed by the New Man, the God-Man. To believe this, said Jesus, is the Rock on which He builds His Ecclesia. (Matthew 16: 17-18). To deny this is to have a monster on our hands—a headless body—a spastic Ecclesia. This is exactly what the liberal anti-supernaturalists have contrived for their world church . . . A MONSTER. Their body is a nobody with a no-Christ . . . for they do not believe in the proper deity of Jesus Christ. The World Church can now become an automaton manipulated by deceivers and deceived. Where there is no Head (Incarnate Christ), there can be no vision. Where there is no vision, the people perish.

Through the courtesy of the columns of *R. & W.R.*, Ecclesian calls any of the Ecclesia of God among our readers to reaffirm their faith in their Vibrant and Vital Head this Christmas.

"O Come let us adore Him  
. . . CHRIST THE  
LORD"

Rhodesia needs you today. The task is formidable, and the days are dark. But the Christmas story reminds us that IT WAS NIGHT THAT THE SAVIOUR GAME; that IT WAS NIGHT when the shepherds watched their flock. Let us watch over the flock, the little lambs of God's flock till the day dawns, till He shall come.

(Rev.) Bernard H. Wright.

## A Christmas Message from the Editor



AS another year draws to an end, we can look back on it again as one of frustration, tension and indecision.

Nevertheless, the holding operation of Rhodesia continues and the new year may bring radical alterations in our position.

First of all, Britain's entry into the European Economic Community affects not only Britain's Sovereignty but also her relations with the Commonwealth.

Secondly, the continued failure of most black African states to achieve economic viability in spite of lavish financial, technical and administrative aid is beginning to become too noticeable to be swept under the carpet. The imbecile actions of Uganda's Amin may be the turning point of the liberal world's tolerance of black Africa.

Thirdly, the continued steady progress of Rhodesia's economy, of law and order and the maintenance of civilised standards to the benefit of all its inhabitants is the sheet anchor of our future—not the jabberings of the Afro-Asian bloc, of press-manufactured "world opinion" and the enmity of the envious.

Our readers will by now have observed that the facts of political events are of more significance than the words and opinions of politicians. The facts of Rhodesia's survival, internal absence of strife and peaceful economic progress are clearly seen and will become too obvious for the outside world to ignore. Immigration and tourism remain two of the most important factors in bringing Rhodesia's success story to the notice of the world and both are likely to increase in strength and influence in the coming year.

I see no reason for any pessimism over Rhodesia's future—I consider Rhodesia's isolation from the turmoil and economic upheaval so evident in many parts of the world as a positive advantage. Rhodesia has but to remain true to herself in order not only to survive as an independent sovereign state but eventually to be recognised as such by other states in the fullness of time.

In wishing our members and readers a very Happy Christmas and a prosperous and peaceful New Year, I do so with gratitude to the many friends, well-wishers and subscribers both in Rhodesia and overseas, without whose constant support the task of holding together Candour League as a stronghold of conservatism and the monthly production of Rhodesia and World Report would be far more arduous than it has been.

God bless you all and send you and us peace, prosperity and progress in the coming year.

IAN G. ANDERSON,

Editor,

National Chairman of Candour League of Rhodesia.

# The World Council of Churches - A Subversive Body!

AN "INTELLIGENCE DIGEST" SPECIAL

The "World Council of Churches" receives a great deal of publicity nowadays. Consisting, as it does, of the principal Christian Churches (except the Roman Catholic Church), it naturally commands considerable respect among those who are unaware of its background and outlook. A very large number of people listen to its voice as that of ecumenical Christianity and esteem it as such. It therefore has considerable influence on the thoughts of many Christians.

It is time for the truth to be told about this organization. This Service has therefore commissioned an observer who has made a close study of the WCC to provide a report. Our Observer writes:

## Steady Infiltration:

Communists and fellow-travellers did not lose much time before trying to infiltrate and manipulate the WCC after the multi-denominational body was founded in Amsterdam in 1948. They are still warmly welcomed by Dr. Eugene Blake, WCC Secretary-General at Geneva, a minister of the United Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A.

Again and again, the infiltrators have aimed — and are still aiming — at making Marxism-Leninism, Russian or Chinese type, acceptable to Christians all over the world and at mobilizing them against what they call western imperialism, colonialism, racism and suppression — handy and tempting catchwords for the unwary.

What follows in this report is a summary of facts containing clear evidence of the influence of Communist agents and sympathisers on the deeds and resolutions of the WCC, of which about 240 Anglican, Protestant, Orthodox and other non-Roman Catholic observers attend WCC meetings.

The initiating body organizing this international council was the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. The NCC invited British and other European Churches to the first assembly in the Dutch capital.

## Red from the start!

The NCC of the U.S.A. was — or should have been — red from the start. Several persons connected with it had Communist front records, and the organization became so heavily infiltrated with pro-Communists that an intelligence agency of the U.S. Government declared it to be a subversive group.

Throughout, the NCC-USA has promoted Communism in a number of different ways — urging clemency for convicted Communist spies, and opposing loyalty oaths and anti-Communist security laws in the U.S.A.

The Council demanded abolition of Congressional committees set up to investigate Communism, and lobbied for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations — long before President Nixon decided to do this and even before the Soviet-Chinese quarrel started.

All this can be documented from the NCC-U.S.A.'s own publications.

However, not only was — and still is — the founding father of the WCC corrupted by Communist influence, but the same applies to several Churches in Western Europe. For example, the West German Evangelical Church (Lutheran) and the Netherlands Reformed Church (partly Calvinist). Both these Churches are infiltrated. The same thing is true about a number of emerging African, Asian and Latin American Churches.

## The Geneva Curia

During the WCC world conference held in Geneva in 1968, the leaders — nicknamed the "Geneva Curia" — openly accused or even praised Marxism in the context of their theme "Christians in the technical and social revolutions of our time."

It is worth quoting some of their unequivocally leftist statements.

Dr. M. M. Thomas, Chairman of the Central Committee, Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar, Bangalore, India:

"The concern of the revolution for the human being should be held in tension with the strategy of the revolution, even when certain dimensions of the human are denied in certain stages of the strategy."

(These words are very similar to those spoken by Lenin when explaining the plans of Communism to dominate the world.)

## Bole Igi, Nigeria:

"The revolution our people desire is one that will completely knock out all existing, suffocating constitutions, systems and the powers that keep them going. What do the nations have to look at now — that which symbolizes the best amongst themselves? They have the Chinese People's Republic — nationalistic, militant, economically free, and at the same time yielding in its commitment to the freedom and full emancipation of the nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America."

## Charles C. West, U.S.A.:

"Marxism is still, as everyone knows, an ideology based on faith . . . in many societies of great social injustice its analysis seems closest to human need and hope."

## Archpriest Woronov (Russian Orthodox Church, USSR):

"As early as 1951, it was acknowledged by the Executive Committee of the WCC that the motto of the Communist society, formulated by Karl Marx, 'to each according to his needs, from each according to his ability,' is rooted in the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ."

## The Metropolitan — a KGB agent:

In 1959, Metropolitan Nicolai (replaced after his death by Metropolitan Nikodim) of the Russian Orthodox Church and later representative of that Church in the WCC, was identified under oath before the Un-American Activities Committee of the U.S. Congress as a KGB agent "since World War II".

(This information was published in *Life* magazine on March 28, 1959.)

Metropolitan Nikodim (then Archbishop) in 1963 at a press conference in Denver, Colorado, spoke enthusiastically about the Russian Socialist State, declaring that "the state does not interfere in the internal affairs of our churches." He stated, moreover, that his Orthodox Church "fully supports the aspirations of all our people for peace."

Everybody knows, however, that true Christians in Russia cannot openly worship God according to their consciences and that the Soviet Union does not seek peace, but for trouble wherever it is in its interest.

## Money for anarchists:

Under the direct Communist influence, it is easy to understand that the WCC grants large amounts of money to known anarchist and revolutionary movements in Africa and other places. The WCC has departed from Christian principles and adopted atheist humanism as taught by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The WCC's Church and Society Conference of 1966 declared:

"Revolution should be actively promoted and supported by Christians." They made it clear that this "revolution" means "violent overthrow of an existing order," (page 143, Official Report).

## Financing terrorists:

Last year the WCC had a gathering in Sofia and decided to enlarge its subversive activities by financing terrorist groups in both Africa and Latin America.

Early this year the Executive Committee met in Auckland, New Zealand, from February 8th to 12th. WCC headquarters released a list of 39 persons who attended. Among the seven Presidents was Patriarch German (71), Serbian Orthodox Church, a loyal and obedient admirer of the Yugoslav Communist regime.

The others included Metropolitan Nikodim of Moscow, a willing instrument of the Kremlin, and Professor T. Sabej, Bulgarian Orthodox Church.

## Campaign against Africa:

In May the WCC's anti-racist committee asked the Council to intensify the WCC campaign against southern Africa by urging investors to withdraw all their capital from South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese territories.

The committee decided to choose its targets among the big companies with international interests, and now wants to take measures to compel these firms to cut off relationships with the "doomed" subcontinent, strategically so important to the West.

Of course, this form of blackmail can suit only the purposes of the Soviet Union. However, unfortunately for the WCC conspirators, this effort to boycott and isolate white-ruled countries in Southern Africa has so far failed. A lot of American, British and continental concerns have refused to give up their promising investments in these lands full of precious and useful minerals and other natural riches. The more so as both the Russians and the Chinese try to get strong footholds there.

Recently, the General Synod of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (nominally Calvinist) asked the WCC Secretary-General, Dr. Blake, how the Churches have to react to the violation of human rights in eastern Europe. The Synod's second thoughts were that the WCC criticises only "abuses" in the West, but never those behind the Iron Curtain.

## Marxism popular, says Blake:

The Synod got a public answer — an answer of tolerance for Communism. Dr. Blake said:

- (1) In eastern Europe the Churches are an important channel for reliable information.
- (2) The ecumenical movement is offering a great chance for visits and exchanges.
- (3) Each Church has to protest at the right place as effectively as possible when she feels called upon in conscience!

## Dr. Blake:

"The Western Churches have to occupy themselves intensively with the Eastern European situation, for the Marxist view is growing more and more important in the Churches of the West.

"It is evident that of all the secular philosophies Marxism is going to be the most popular and the most convincing one among our young intellectuals."

"This development deserves — however critically or positively we experience it — more attention than it has had so far. The theological reflection on Marxism has now become a common necessity for all Churches, notwithstanding the form of government they have to live with."

## Whitewashing suppression:

Moreover, Dr. Blake pretends that religious liberty is guaranteed in Eastern Europe, apart from some restrictions with a view to Western ideas.

"Keeping in touch with Eastern European Churches is more important than complaints or protests addressed to them," he says.

In conclusion, Dr. Blake has written to the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands that "apart from Eastern Europe, there are a large number of discrimination spots which the Churches cannot fail to notice."

It is clear that the WCC's Secretary-General tries to whitewash the suppression of Christian believers who do not want to mix their faith with atheist Marxism-Leninism, and that he prefers to sustain revolutions against the Western establishment.

GET THE U.S.  
OUT OF THE U.N.

It was Rockefeller money that in 1945 gave us that monster building in New York that not only pollutes the East River, but everyone in America who still puts trust in it. It is your tax money that sustains it now, paying a minimum of one-third of its annual bill.

Despite what the American people have been told so many times, by our California U.S. Senators for example, the purpose of the United Nations is world government, plain and simple. It is the same world government that Lenin called the United States of the World, that Karl Marx called for when he spoke of the eventual establishment of a single world socialist state. And this is the idea and the goal which is really meant when President Nixon speaks of a 'new world order' and when Hubert Humphrey speaks of the brotherhood of nations.

Let's consider the history of this United Nations where God knocked on the door in 9145 and was rejected forever. It was identified Communist Alger Hiss who was the first Secretary General (temporary) from America and its primary organizer. Every one of the sixteen men listed in the State Department volume *Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation, 1939-1945* as principal U.S. Government planners for the United Nations has been identified in sworn testimony as a Communist. So from the very start we have had persons running the United Nations who don't believe in the sovereignty of the United States, spied for Russia, and are aiming at a one-world socialist government.

Extracted with acknowledgements to Congressman John G. Schmitz' Weekly News Report.

## Tories Attack Rhodesian Sanctions Farce

The British Government is having a hard fight in Parliament to pass once again the sanctions order against Rhodesia, both in the House of Commons and the House of Lords.

There are signs that the Conservative Party is wearying of what has been called "this November ritual."

Lord Coleraine and some 80 other Tory members of the House of Lords on October 29 fired a shot across Mr. Heath's bows in a toughly worded letter to the London "Times".

"If the tragic experience of the past seven years has any lesson for us, surely it is that the problem of Rhodesia can only be solved by Rhodesians themselves, Black as well as White, and that the maintenance of sanctions does no more than hold out to the Black Africans a false promise, one that we know we cannot fulfil — the promise of an imposed solution, sometime, somehow?" wrote Lord Coleraine and his colleagues.

—S.A. Observer, Nov. 1972

## EDITORIAL . . .

# Settlement: Now or Later?

For the first time since UDI Candour League did not hold an Independence Day reception for overseas visitors. The reason was that there is considerable doubt as to whether or not Rhodesia is still an independent country.

It was established by several actions in the High Court of Rhodesia (e.g., First and Second Constitutional Cases, 1968) that Rhodesia is *de facto et de jure* an independent sovereign country. Moreover, it enjoys diplomatic recognition, by exchange of diplomatic representatives, with at least two countries. It complies with the requirements of international law in that Rhodesia (a) has an organised Government carried on in civilised fashion and capable of dealing with other States in the manner prescribed by international law; (b) possesses a fixed territory; (c) has actually or virtually brought to an end in its own favour the contest between itself and the parent State. (Ref. Lawrence, "A Handbook of International Law".)

However, the Rhodesian Government has cast doubts on the validity of this independence by negotiating with a foreign power (Britain), not for recognition of this status (which would be reasonable), but by requesting the British Government to confer independence on Rhodesia after certain requirements of the British Government have been met. (See "Proposals for a Settlement", page 9, para. VIII.)

Until the position is clarified, it seemed to us hypocritical to celebrate an independence, the existence of which is in doubt; and which has now, by the action of the Rhodesian Government, been converted from an accepted fact into a negotiable commodity.

Meanwhile we continue to live in a state of cliff-hanging suspense. The Smith-Home agreement is still on the table, signed by representatives of both Governments and requiring only a "test of acceptability" to implement it. This, as we pointed out in our last editorial, leaves us at the mercy of the Africans—a situation fraught with the gravest dangers.

But if the Africans are to be allowed a chance to change their minds, should this not also apply to the European electors? In spite of the Pearce Commission's comfortable assurance to the Rhodesian Government that 96% of Europeans accept the provisions of the Settlement Proposals, this was in no ways a referendum, nor were there any safeguards to obviate plural voting. Moreover, many employers, societies and associations recorded a "Yes" on behalf of their employees and members without any reference

to them. Nothing so unrepresentative in the way of canvassing public opinion has been seen in Rhodesia before.

Moreover, there is no doubt that many Rhodesians, after the champagne euphoria of the prospects of settlement has subsided, have undergone a change of heart. Many have by now actually read the Settlement Proposals on which they voted sight unseen. They will have noticed that all is for the African and nothing for the European. They have also had time to reflect with alarm on the significance of Para. 13 (3) and (4) (relating to the authorisation of UN troops on Rhodesian soil) to which we have drawn the electorate's attention. We have been told that the whole of the Second Schedule, or Declaration of Rights, is "standard drafting" and much the same for every constitution handed out by Britain in black Africa. We have not been able to get hold of a copy of the constitutions of, say, Zambia or Tanzania, but are prepared to bet a sizeable donation to the Prime Minister's Pension Fund that Para. 13 (3) and (4) are not included in their Declarations of Rights.

### Two Schools of Thought

There are two main schools of thought in R.F. circles. One says that we must get a settlement on any terms and then tear it up; the other is convinced that the Prime Minister has some fantastic ace of trumps up his sleeve which, at the right moment, he will produce and scoop all the winnings for which we have planned and hoped. Neither school likes the *terms* of settlement. In fact, they like them so little that they cannot bring themselves to believe we could ever be forced to comply with them. We have yet to encounter anybody who even talks of living with such terms.

We are pleased to note that the newly formed Rhodesia Party in its manifesto castigates the R.F. for—

- (a) Racial election of the main body of the legislature, which will intensify the racial battle for power.
- (b) Dispensing with qualifications for direct elections of African representatives, which undermines the basis of the qualified franchise.
- (c) The concept of parity, which is unrealistic and believed by few.
- (d) A senate, which is an extravagant facade.

We could not agree more. The manifesto further comments:

"This drive to racial confrontation is the crux of the dilemma and will not be averted by juggling the num-

ber of racial seats in parliament nor by hypocritical and paper safeguards dependent on the integrity of the politicians in power. Failure to grasp this reality or evading it accounts for the Rhodesian Front's abortive efforts."

And later on:

"To achieve this (i.e. a meaningful constitution) there must be a division of constitutional authority between the various instruments of government, vesting powers in separate, non-political bodies whose purpose will be to vet legislation and to ensure that these decisions are respected and implemented. *Safeguards afforded by a justiciable Bill of Rights and constitutional mechanisms to block any change in entrenched clauses will then be meaningful.*" (Our italics.)

### No Safeguards for Whites

Scepticism of the integrity of Government and lack of safeguards for European rights in Rhodesia in the proposed Constitution (what, another?—yes: the Proposals are not an amendment of, but an abrogation and replacement of, the 1969 Constitution) have done much to reduce the R.F. to a new low of popularity; and any proper method of ascertaining the wishes of the electorate on the Settlement Proposals would probably yield a very different answer today from that obtained by the Pearce Commission.

The Government must therefore act quickly if it wishes to implement the Proposals or leave them to die of inanition. The former situation was foreseen by Dr. J. Redmond, chairman of the United Front, who stated:

"Speed is essential if the Prime Minister is to succeed in gaining his 'first prize', for when ordinary John Citizen awakens to the full realities of what the Settlement Proposals hold for him and his future, there will be unleashed a cold, unrelenting, political fury such as this country has never experienced."

### Britain's Powers

On the other hand Britain's entry into the European Economic Community in the New Year raises a whole lot of new problems about Britain's sovereignty and her powers to impose any conditions on Rhodesia or anyone else. At the time of writing, we are on the eve of another session of Parliament: who knows but much of what is written here may be obsolete or irrelevant by the time it is published?

As stated already the cliff-hanging suspense is getting unbearable. If we can survive as an independent sovereign State into 1973, our hopes of recognition improve; and, as the *Daily Telegraph* has stated, it is doubtful if sanctions will be renewed in November, 1973.

Under the circumstances we wish our readers a very Happy Christmas and a relief from tension in the New Year. May 1973 bring all we have planned and hoped for during the last seven long and troublesome years!

## RHODESIA

### A RE-ORIENTATION OF AUSTRALIAN POLICY

The following is a major part of the brilliant Paper on Rhodesia presented to the Annual National Seminar of The League of Rights, by Dr. Walter Henderson, of Gray's Inn, President of the Federal Council of Australia/Rhodesia Associations.

I have been invited to speak to you today on the conflict between the United Kingdom and Rhodesia. I am going to place what I have to say on that subject within the compass which the Australian Government has chosen to occupy in that conflict by intervening in it and waging economic war by that intervention against the Rhodesian people. It has done so because the Rhodesian Government, by its own voluntary act, decided to govern itself in its own way. By its economic warfare the Australian Government has denied to Rhodesia the freedom which it itself enjoys.

You will observe as I go along that one of the main currents running through my subject is the tainting of reason and law by international imposture and spoofery and the perversion of the public mind by doctored opinion resulting from such fraud and deceit. I can accordingly do no better than start what I have to say than by citing a fable of Aesop. I give it in the earliest English translation in the beautiful fifteenth century language of William Caxton:

"The lamb and the wolf had both thirst and went down to a river for to drink. It happened that the wolf drank above and the lamb beneath. And as the wolf saw and perceived the lamb he said with a high voice: 'Ha knave, why has thou troubled and fouled my water which I should now drink?' 'Alas, my lord and save you grace, for the water cometh from you toward me.' Then said the wolf to the lamb 'Hast thou no shame nor dread to curse me?' And the lamb said 'My lord with your leave . . . And the wolf said again to him 'Thou hast ate my father.' And the lamb answered 'I have no teeth.' Then said the wolf 'Thou art well like thy father and for his sin and misdeed thou shalt die.' The wolf then took the lamb and ate him."

I have cited that fable mainly, although not exclusively, for the moral attached to it which has recently been translated into these words by an American scholar:

"This fable shows that those who are set on doing wrong are not to be deterred even by a legal argument."

I do not propose to say anything of the colonial history of Rhodesia. It is not material to my theme. The Anglo-Rhodesian conflict is a constitutional conflict, that is a dispute as to where the power to rule a country shall take its origin. So I start with the Rhodesian Constitution of 1961. That is the document which contains all the seed of the conflict which was to break out acutely four years later, on November 11, 1965, when the Rhodesian Government declared its legislative independence of the United Kingdom Parliament. It is necessary for me to extend myself somewhat on the origin of the conflict, for it seems not unlikely that on the side of the British Government it may go on indefinitely, although British sanctions against Rhodesia have to be renewed this coming November. And I do not see the Security Council of the U.N. drawing its claws out of the Rhodesian question.

It seems to me to be necessary at this point in time for Australian electors to have all the main facts and materials presented to them, in the round and not in scattered bits, so that they may decide, in the light of that material and those facts, when they are going to persuade or compel their government to disinvolve itself from the whole Rhodesian imbroglio and cease its senseless vendetta against the Rhodesian people. The Australian Government will have to accept the logic and truth of things that the Rhodesian Government is the lawful government of a peaceful independent State, with which the Australian people want, and will have to have the normal relations that exist between such States. How the Australian Government blundered into its intervention in Rhodesian internal affairs will become plain as I proceed.

The Rhodesian people got their 1961 Constitution from the British Government through the hands of Sir Edgar Whitehead, their then Prime Minister. They believed that it was going to set out unequivocally their legislative and political independence of the Parliament in London, placing them in this respect on the same footing as is Australia. There had been a referendum on this very issue in Rhodesia in July 1961, approved by a large majority. When, however, the new Constitution came out of the hands of the Privy Council in London—it was not in the form of a statute of the United Kingdom Parliament, which would have been debated in public, but in the form of a statutory instrument which is given the imprimatur of law in secret—it was apparent that an important part of the independence the Rhodesians were expecting, and had approved of, had been, by a stroke of legerdemain, sliced away. At some point there was present a state of mind which expresses itself in tergiversation, and tergiversation has been a prominent characteristic of the British Government's handling of the Rhodesian case. The essential point is that instead of getting law they had consented to and approved of, they got law imposed upon them by the British Government to which they had not consented. I shall have occasion to go into this matter later on as it dominates the whole question of the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence.

Continued on page 4

## RHODESIA: Dr. W. Henderson

Cont. from page 3

The 1961 Constitution came fully into force in Rhodesia on November 1, 1962. Immediately afterwards, its acceptor, Sir Edgar Whitehead was swept out of office. His Government was replaced by one of which, in April 1964, Mr. Ian Smith became the head. I am giving these facts, not because I have any special interest in Rhodesian domestic politics, but because they supply the strong thread that holds argument together. At the time I mentioned, that is from and after April 1964, the British Government was in no doubt about the state of mind of the Rhodesian Government on the independence issue and the action that was going to follow it.

Australians are a very constitutionally minded people. They know that the constitution of a country is the most important part of the law of that country for it lays down the kind of political society they shall have and live in and how they are going to be required to relate themselves to those laws that issue from the constitution.

By 1961, the time I am dealing with at present, the British Government, through its parliament, had granted complete independence to many of the British colonies in Africa. Standing out alone, as conspicuous as a pearl tie-pin in a black tie, in that plethora of so-called States in which there was no experience of autonomous responsibility, and no likelihood of any being born in the foreseeable future, was the sole exception of Rhodesia, which had already had successful self-government, achieved by its own efforts and ability, for over a generation. Also, the British Statute of Westminster, passed in 1931, that is a generation away, had unambiguously stated the position of the then British Dominions to be one completely freed from any possible legal interference by the British Parliament. Although that Statute did not specifically apply to Rhodesia it created more than a persuasive ambience, it contained explosive stuff.

I have pointed out that from the middle of 1964 the British Government was in no doubt about what the Rhodesian Government's attitude was on the matter of independence. For an understanding of the political atmosphere prevailing in London and Salisbury prior to the Declaration of Independence by the Rhodesian ministers on November 11, 1965, I am greatly indebted to a memorandum written just before his death early this present year by Sir Roger Allen, Deputy Under-Secretary of State at the British Foreign Office from 1965 to 1967, that is during the crucial period which preceded and followed the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence. It may be accepted as something more than an expression of personal views; I would regard it as an expression of the considered views of the Foreign Office.

Sir Roger Allen was in Salisbury in April 1965. He records that it was then clear that the Rhodesian Government was not going to wait much longer for the British Government to grant independence to Rhodesia and that it therefore behaved the British Government quietly to come to a settlement which at that time, he says, was possible. Such a settlement would have entailed total legislative independence of Rhodesia from the British Parliament. At the London end, 6,000 miles away, the British Prime Minister (Mr. Harold Wilson), blind to the importance and the realities of the case, was frittering away valuable time in gross miscalculation and futile exchanges, indulging in irresponsible rhetoric shouting that no one in his senses could now embark on the "dangerous lunacy of an illegal declaration" of independence. Socialist followers of his in the House of Commons were demanding that sanctions be imposed upon the Rhodesian people with the use of force, if that was necessary to break their resistance. During this time the Labour Government's Commonwealth Secretary was seeing the black African leaders, apparently whipping up racial hatred in them against the Rhodesians. Sir Roger Allen points out that the British Prime Minister at no time looked at the question of Rhodesian sanctions realistically and that he completely miscalculated their effect.

I have cited this testimony, which is completely objective, for two reasons. One is that Sir Robert Menzies, who initially took the decision to plunge Australia into economic war against Rhodesia and its people, had been, to use a useful expression in this connexion, so well groomed by Mr. Harold Wilson as to be, in the Rhodesian question, almost indistinguishable from Mr. Wilson himself. The second reason is that it shows the ignorant and incoherent leadership which the Australian Government followed, compelling Australia to wage an economic and personal war against the friendly people of Rhodesia, in a quarrel in which we, the Australian people, had not a scintilla of national interest except that of neutrality.

At this point I shall read a letter from the Prime Minister's Department signed for the Prime Minister by an Assistant Minister. It is dated June 28 last. I have read many such letters over the last six years signed by one Minister or another. I cite this one because it is the most recent and sets out the present policy of Government. It runs:

"The Australian Government recognises the British Government as being legally responsible for the constitutional development of Rhodesia. Neither the Australian nor any other Government has recognised the Smith regime in Rhodesia since it unilaterally and illegally declared independence although not empowered to do so by the Constitution of Southern Rhodesia then in force.

"The United Nations Security Council made its decision to apply economic sanctions within its legal competence under the Charter. By Article 25 of the Charter all members of the United Nations have agreed to carry out the decisions of the Council.

"Australia applied sanctions against Rhodesia initially at the request of the British Government and subsequently in

conformity with mandatory decisions of the United Nations Security Council which are binding on all members of the United Nations."

You will notice the bald statements with no reasons given. Everything is expressed with the detached infallibility of a remote dictator. I have never read any document which is more deceiving than this one. Every Rhodesian sanctions resolution of the Security Council is, by the overwhelming weight of the best legal opinion of the world, void and a complete nullity, and those resolutions are not "decisions" within the meaning of the Charter. There is no duty on any member of the U.N. to enforce such resolutions. The Australian Government, in enforcing them, has obeyed orders, of no lawful authority, coming from a New York *camarilla* which, as you know, means a body of secret intriguers. Why the Australian Government did this, I shall show later. It has lit false fires which have deceived the Australian electors, thus wrecking, and intending to wreck, true Australian opinion on the Rhodesian question. All of those false fires have been lit with alien tapers.

From now on, for the rest of my address to you, I propose to extinguish those false fires. I shall take them one by one. Then I shall propose a positive policy so that the Australian Government's present economic and personal war against the Rhodesian people may be replaced by peace between the two countries.

There are three notions tied up together which are within what I have called the compass of the Australian Government's intervention in the Anglo-Rhodesian constitutional dispute. Those notions are that the people of Great Britain, through their Parliament, are responsible for Rhodesia, including the making of laws binding Rhodesian people without their consent, that the people of Great Britain hold, through the same Parliament, trusteeship for the Rhodesian people, and that if the Rhodesian Government thinks otherwise, and acts accordingly, it has acted illegally and is therefore an illegal Government. All of those three notions, responsibility, trusteeship and illegality are set out in the letter I read to you from the Australian Prime Minister's representative, two of them stated expressly and the other impliedly. The Australian Government took over all three notions from the British Government, just a ready-mix, and committed all Australians to them, not knowing what they entailed or what they meant. I shall now tell that Government what they do mean.

The essential thing to realise is that the economic war that the Australian Government is waging against the Rhodesian people is for and in defence of those notions on behalf of the British Government. All of them are false within the Rhodesian context. Within that context, not one of them is of the slightest concern to Australia and to Australian national interests, or has any meaning for these.

I shall deal first with responsibility. To be responsible for anything or for anyone, you have to be in a position of authority or power to discharge that responsibility. So far as Rhodesia is concerned the facts show that for more than a whole generation the Rhodesians have been responsible for themselves and the welfare of their own country. By their good government they have acquired a prescriptive right to the continuance of that state of things. No other persons or authority have contributed anything to that good government and the material and other benefits that have accrued therefrom. Even before the 1965 Declaration of Independence the British Government had no instrumentalities of its own in Rhodesia to ensure the discharge of any responsibility it might have or claim to have. Indeed, at the U.N. itself the British Government, before U.D.I., made it clear that having no instrumentalities in Rhodesia it was not responsible for what the government there did. The claim that the British Government was responsible for Rhodesia did not show its face until it was plain, in the months that preceded the Declaration of Independence, that the Rhodesian Government was going to take its own independence itself. The historical ground on which that claim rested vanished with Rhodesian self-government which started as far back as 1923. At the time of U.D.I. such a claim was a fiction and a sham, invented to serve British foreign policy, racial in character, aimed at promoting its material interests in the former black African colonies.

I shall show later the manner in which the Australian Government adopted, as part of a policy, the notion of British responsibility for Rhodesia, a notion, even if it were valid and not a fiction, which was of no conceivable concern to the Australian Government and people.

The notion of "trusteeship" does not stand up any better to an examination of what it means in the Rhodesian situation than does the notion of responsibility. The claim of the British Government that its parliament is the trustee of the Rhodesian people until such time as it transfers that trust to the Rhodesian people by an express enactment granting independence with "Majority Rule" is something that it has taken on loan from political mythology. Such a notion, of course, is a protuberance of the notion of responsibility, and falls to the ground with that notion. But it has a particular fall of its own.

It is regrettable that an expression such as "trustee", which bears a precise and honourable meaning in our domestic law should have been dragged in where it does not belong and used to decorate sanctimoniously what is nothing else but humbug at the best and crime at the worst.

What characterizes a trust is that it is formed and administered solely in the interests of the beneficiary or all the beneficiaries, whether those interests be material or non-material.

Translate this into the political context of Rhodesia which

Continued on page 5

## AROUND AFRICA

An S.A.B.C. Survey

Six news flashes received in the past 24 hours provide a kaleidoscopic view of Africa, 1972:

**Flash 1 — Mafeking:** Bophuta Tswana reaches a new milestone in its constitutional development as Tswanas go to the polls to elect their government. Their leader, Chief Mangope, sees separate development as the only policy which will give the Tswana people full control of their own affairs. He will be opposed in the election by the Unity Party under Chief Pilane. Bophuta Tswana has invited entrepreneurs to help exploit the homeland's rich mineral potential, which includes manganese, iron, chrome and platinum deposits.

**Flash 2 — United Nations:** Nigeria's Foreign Minister calls for massive assistance to guerrilla movements to secure the immediate overthrow of White governments in Southern Africa. He accuses Pretoria of pursuing a policy for the total dehumanisation of Black people in the Republic and beyond. The South African Prime Minister's policy of dialogue is designed, he says, only to create confusion among Black African countries and other mixed societies.

**Flash 3 — Kampala:** President Amin persists in his charge that the Tanzanian Government is directly involved in the "invasion" of his country. He says the November 8 deadline for the expulsion of non-citizen Indians cannot be extended; and that while they remain there is the danger of intervention by British troops to protect them. Meantime, a Ugandan military spokesman reports that mopping up operations continue and that 16 guerilla supporters were killed by villagers during the week-end.

**Flash 4 — London:** The Foreign Minister of Zaire, Mr. Nguza L'Bond, arrives in London to mediate in the Ugandan Indian dispute. His R50-a-day suite in a plush hotel is not ready for him, and he is dissatisfied with the two rooms put at his disposal until it is: "Dreadful treatment", cries Mr. L'Bond, "a disgraceful snub!" He refuses to be placated by an invitation to stay at the residence of the British Foreign Secretary — or even by champagne, caviarre, flowers and chocolates. He says he will leave Britain immediately — and that is what he does.

**Flash 5 — Lusaka:** The United People's Party is formed by released detainees to replace the United Progressive Party which was outlawed by President Kaunda on February 4, after numerous clashes on the Copperbelt. The new political organisation is committed to opposing a one-Party state. The Times of Zambia comments: "Unless

Continued on page 5

# RHODESIA : Dr. W. Henderson

lies 6,000 miles away from all the authority and instrumentalities of the self-appointed trustees in London who long ago divested themselves in favour of the Rhodesian Government of everything of value to the beneficiaries that could possibly be brought within the ambit of a trust.

Since the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence another body has thrust itself up competitively claiming to be the trustee of the African Rhodesians, as well, presumably, of the European Rhodesians. Put more accurately, the U.N. claims to be acting for the British Government as the trustee of that Government; its intervention in the Rhodesian question bears this meaning. This claim is even more empty, if you can have degrees of emptiness, than is the British claim. It seems to be quite clear that the U.N. intends to elbow the British Government out of the Rhodesian question altogether.

I pass over the Organization of African Unity whose members and leaders, with hatchets in their bloodstained hands, are also claiming competitively to be the trustees of the Rhodesian people. Such a claim can be left to the victims of their own trusteeship in their own countries.

Finally, place this notion of trusteeship in the situation called "Majority Rule". "Majority Rule" is the bastard offspring of the copulation of white European parliamentary democracy with primitive black tribal Africa. It has been given a mystical aura to curtain off the misdeeds, corruption, torturings and murders by men whose legality to rule and so act have been granted to them by the United Kingdom Parliament. The butcheries of Africans by Africans under the trusteeship of "Majority Rule" has been recently condemned by even a black African church dignitary.

That has been the history of the "trusteeship" handed over by the United Kingdom Parliament to the "trustee" countries with "Majority Rule" since it started with the Ghana Independence Act of 1957, spreading from there like an uncontrolled and uncontrollable contagious disease to places like the Sudan, Tanzania, Nigeria, Uganda and elsewhere. I see no reason to think that the transfer of its so-called "trust" by the United Kingdom Parliament to the Rhodesian Africans under "Majority Rule", with those Africans divided into two great tribes who have never lived, and who cannot be expected to live in amity, will follow a course any different from the course it has followed in the rest of Africa.

I have been at pains to examine this notion of "trusteeship" because, as I pointed out, the Australian Government stands on it in support of the British Government, and on it the Australian Government seeks to justify its economic war against the Rhodesian people.

It has been and is the presence and power of the European Rhodesians which have created and maintained order and peace among the two main antagonistic Rhodesian tribes. I have seen and felt that peace and order myself. I am not going to be talked into talking nonsense by "Majority Rulers", or by world-betterers with their covetous associates, or by any other people who are suffering from the mentally degrading consequences of their own moral self-approval. It is time that the British Government realized that the only responsible thing for it to do is to accept that the trust for the Rhodesian people should remain where it is now and has been for the last fifty years, that is in the hands of the present competent holders of it in Rhodesia.

In this connexion I would like to cite a passage from my "Report on Rhodesia" which I wrote last year after nearly six weeks of close enquiry into things there:

"The European Rhodesians have made contemporary Rhodesia, with its material prosperity and its insignia of civilization. It is a plural society, and in it they are the creative administrators. From them, all impetus comes. On them falls the responsibility for the good government of the country. To them the people look for the administration of

Cont. from page 4

justice than which there is none of a higher standard in the world."

I now pass on to the notions of illegality and illegal, expressions used with unconscionable iteration and reiteration in the Rhodesian question. The din of them has filled and still fills the palace of the U.N. in New York. It has filled and still fills discussions in parliaments and press. On December 28, 1965 Sir Robert Menzies said that he and his government regarded U.D.I. as illegal, which to him and to his government entailed the illegality of what he called the "Smith government". This is still the view of the Australian Government, the grooming that Sir Robert was subjected to by Mr. Harold Wilson having passed along inexpensively to all his successors in office.

But in all this **claque** (*claque* being a word meaning the loud-mouthed applause that producers of plays in theatres pay people to make to advertise the play), no one has stopped to ask two simple questions. The first is: "What does illegality exactly mean, if it means anything at all, in the Rhodesian situation?" And the second is: "Whatever it may mean, is it any concern of mine?"

When anyone with an adequate knowledge of the history of the Church in Western Europe, with its heresies, conflicts and divisions, over the last 2,000 years hears the word "Christian" used, he is entitled to ask: "In the name of Heaven what do you mean exactly?" And anyone with a knowledge of law going back over even a less period of time than that who hears the word "illegal" used is entitled to ask: "In the name of law what do you mean?"

I am going to answer the latter question and place my answer in the Rhodesian context, that is in the context of the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence, for anything that is said to be legal or illegal has to be related to the particular facts to which such label is attached. So amid the din of the Tom-Toms at the U.N. (a Tom-Tom being defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as a drum used by barbarian people), and above the windbag rhetoric of politicians and the mass-media, I shall try to induce the quiet, cool voice of sense and reason to make itself heard.

I yield to no one in a realization of the vital importance of law, and its ensuing legality or illegality, in our lives within the community in which we live. Never, within any community of people, has the Rule of Law assumed the importance that it has today. Without it, the life of man becomes poor, nasty, brutish and short. But it is law that is law that must be understood. Law is law because it is accepted as such by the community ruled by it. It has no other ground except consent on which to rest. Take away that ground of consent, and the law that was resting on it goes away with it.

With acknowledgements to the "Intelligence Survey"  
Box 1052 J, G.P.O. Melbourne

## THE ORIGINS OF THE ZIMBABWEAN CIVILIZATION by R. Gayre of Gayre

(Galaxie Press, Salisbury, Rhodesia. Rh. \$9.00)  
We have just received a copy of this beautifully produced and authoritative work on Zimbabwe. At first glance, the quality of print, layout, illustrations and general production, are a fine example of superior workmanship of which Rhodesia is capable. We shall review the book in our January issue. Meanwhile we suggest that those who are racking their brains for a suitable Christmas present in the prestige range need look no further.

# AROUND

## AFRICA

Cont. from page 4

the Government acts quickly, we have a premonition that the events which preceded the banning of the United Progressive Party will recur."

**Flash 6 — Turfloop:** Le-bowa, the homeland of the North Sotho, becomes the fourth to achieve self-governing status — after the Transkei, the Ciskei and BophuthaTswana. Its leader, Chief Matlala, observes that it is strange indeed that the same people who acclaim independence for Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland should condemn independence for other South African Bantu nations, numerically and economically far stronger. The Republic's policy of separate development is by no means out of step with what has taken place elsewhere on the continent. "The only difference", he declares, "is that independence is coming to the Bantu people of South Africa in an orderly way, as against the haphazard way in which it was achieved by the former colonies of Belgium, France and Britain — resulting more often than not in political and economic chaos."

Right or wrong? Where in Africa today is there evidence of reason, order, maturity — where of hysteria, confusion and childishness? Our 24-hour kaleidoscope points unerringly to the answer.

SABC Survey, 4th Oct.

**SUBSCRIPTION FORMS AND ADVERTISING RATES**  
Available on request from  
Box 1871, Salisbury,  
Rhodesia.

**Roll of Honour**  
**KILLED**  
Sgt. Jeffrey Hill, R.R. Regt., as the result of a land mine explosion while on duty, 28th October.

## TOP FRELIMO LEADERS TALK OF LOW MORALE AND COMMUNIST DISSENTION IN THE RANKS

In a unique encounter in Mozambique, two former leaders of the terrorist movement FRELIMO have discussed the rebel movement and the degree to which Communist influence is exerted.

Wills Symes Kadeweel, until recently FRELIMO's provincial secretary in the sensitive Niassa district of northern Mozambique, was interviewed by Dr. Miguel Murupa, former 'Foreign Minister' of FRELIMO who defected to Portugal last year and who is now the Deputy-Editor of the publication 'African Voice'.

The meeting between the two was unprecedented, and some of the dialogue was as follows:

### A Meeting

**Murupa:** Kadeweel, when

did you first begin to have serious doubts and when did you decide to defect?

**Kadeweel:** It was in the last days of February during a meeting of FRELIMO's operational leaders called to discuss problems about Niassa. It was in Nova Olivenca that I presented myself to the Portuguese authorities at the end of April.

**Murupa:** What is the present state of morale among the guerrillas?

**Kadeweel:** Low! Very, low!  
**Murupa:** What is the reason for this?

**Kadeweel:** Basically, the defeats suffered by FRELIMO in Niassa at the hands of the Portuguese army. There is also the conviction among the guerrillas that FRELIMO really

cannot win this war not only because of its tactical and military insufficiency but also because of its self-defeating propaganda and the total lack of respect it has for non-combatant civilians. After all, the bad treatment now used to force people into battle is hardly conducive towards establishing good feeling or faith.

### Strength

**Murupa:** In the light of what you have said, what is the guerrilla strength in Niassa?

**Kadeweel:** It is difficult to be precise about this because of the constant propaganda lies told by FRELIMO. But, speaking honestly, I do not think there are more than about 400. And that would include armed villagers who, without any will to fight, have

arms which they fire in the air when Portuguese soldiers approach, shouting 'slogans' in which they, the villagers, do not believe. These villagers, too, are considered to be guerrillas by FRELIMO, although they know nothing about it.

**Murupa:** How many guerrillas are there in Nashingwea, FRELIMO's main training base inside Tanzania?

### Only 200

**Kadeweel:** At the present time there are no more than 200 guerrillas in training in Nashingwea, and this is a reflection both of the hostility towards FRELIMO and the difficulty which the organisation has in getting recruits these days.

**Murupa:** How many Chinese instructors are there in this camp?

**Kadeweel:** It may seem to you to be unbelievable, but today

only four of the original 25 Chinese instructors are left at Nashingwea. What a change from the situation down the years!

**Murupa:** How do you explain this change?

**Kadeweel:** Basically to the ideological battle between Russia and China, which has had side-effects on the support they give to the liberation movements. As you are aware, after the death of Mondlane an ideological battle was fought in FRELIMO by the Red Chinese. But the Russians did not stand by with their arms folded. They established their own, new training camp at Moshi in northern Tanzania. And it is to this camp that the elite of the FRELIMO guerrillas are now sent for training with the armed forces of Tanzania.

**Extracts from 'Portugal' Monthly, June 1972, with acknowledgements.**

## Candid Comment

by "BREVITY"

### THE MATETSI LAND GRAB — THE SEQUEL

Following on the confiscation from private owners for land in the Matetsi area, the Government has put out an official statement inviting tenders for renting the seven units for a period of five years. It is stated that the Government will only consider tenders offering a fee of \$3,000 or more per annum.

To confiscate land from longterm private ownership and to rent it out for five years at a time (a period so short as to discourage proper game cropping) is ridiculous enough. It is even more so to disclose the reserve rent and to fix this as low as \$3,000.

Leaving aside the value of the units for both camera and shooting safaris as such, does the Government realise the value of gameskins alone? The writer has recently ascertained in regard to an insurance claim that a single rough dried leopard skin is worth over \$400. Other commoner gameskins, e.g. of the antelope and other herbivora are also surprisingly valuable on the world market.

In the scattered areas concerned, no Government official can exercise proper control over actual numbers of animals shot. How much better it would have been to leave the Matetsi units in the hands of those who would have every motive to look after them — private landowners.

### THE T.T.L.'S — BOTTOM-LESS PITS FOR PUBLIC MONEY

All sorts of business interests are welcoming the Rhodesian Government's decision to pour out further large sums of public money into the Tribal Trust Lands. Not only is Tilcor to be provided with much more capital, but public money is to be put directly into private concerns willing to operate in these areas.

There has already been much unfavourable comment on Tilcor's action in financing an almost bankrupt company which in fact was not operating in the T.T.L.'s. There will also no doubt be similar scandals to follow.

What is more important is whether in the light of experience elsewhere it is possible to vitalize particular areas in any country. Economists such as Peter Drucker have been emphatic that it is not. Such areas must in their view be carried forward in the main stream of national development if they are to progress. Local subsidies to industrialists, though very much welcomed by interested parties, have not in practice produced results in the least commensurate with the sums of Government money expended.

The stock instance always quoted is that of the depressed areas of Britain (at various times euphemistically labelled "special" areas and "development" areas). Since 1925 it

has been repeatedly said that with the injection of large sums of public money a new day would dawn in these areas. The areas concerned remain essentially depressed and have not changed at all in this regard.

It should be noted that in Britain the population of these areas is homogeneous with the rest of England, Scotland and Wales. The problem with the T.T.L.'s is far worse. The T.T.L.'s are inhabited by a backward population many of whose male members (as high officials of the Ministry of Internal Affairs have pointed out) go from the cradle to the grave without doing literally a hand's turn of work.

The Rhodesian taxpayer is already being bled enough for the benefit of the T.T.L.'s without further sums of public money being allocated for this purpose — which in fact is often drained off by unscrupulous business interests.

The process of stealing by taxation the money of the industrious European population and handing it over to native areas where the ethos is one of the minimums of industrious effort, is to go one stage further. Under the Home/Smith Settlement Proposals, a further sum equivalent to British \$50 million is to be spent by the Rhodesian Government on this purpose, in addition to the sums already provided by the Rhodesian public each year.

A similar sum is also to be stolen by taxation from the industrious British taxpayer for the benefit of the idle African in the T.T.L.'s.

To take from the industrious and to give to the idle is neither fair play nor moral. Yet both the Prime Minister and numerous Rhodesian ecclesiastics have commended the settlement proposals on these two grounds.

### PEOPLE IN GLASS HOUSES

We note that a West Indian negro called Potter has become the secretary of that maniacal anti-white-civilization body, the World Council of Churches.

Potter could be much better employed among his own people. Apparently at the present time the V.D. rate among negroes in the West Indies is something like 60% per annum. There are also in Britain large numbers of West Indian children abandoned by their "happy-go-lucky" parents ("negroes are so fond of their children" the social anthropologists tell us.)

The problem is particularly acute in Stepney, the diocese of another fanatical anti-white, Bishop Huddleston.

What about Potter and Huddleston attending to their own affairs instead of preaching bullet and bomb against both Europeans and Africans who do not support Communist inspired terrorist movements? Or is this the usual Communist trick of diverting attention from their own shortcomings by attacking the innocent?

### FRAUDULENT SALES TALK FOR THE HOME/SMITH SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The Rhodesian public needs to be reminded that the British Labour Party has made it clear that when it comes to power it will not stand by the Home/Smith Settlement Agreement. Mr. Harold Wilson emphatically re-stated this at the recent Labour Party Conference.

The Labour Party has at least a fifty fifty chance of being re-elected to power in Britain. On this ground alone there is no point in Rhodesia endeavouring to conciliate the A.N.C. in regard to the Settlement Agreement. To suggest, as some have, that the agreement should be hustled through at all costs with a Conservative Government in power in Britain is both disingenuous and unpatriotic in regard to Rhodesia's interests, as well as unrealistic.

### THE WISDOM OF THE VICTORIANS

"And it is our further will, that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to office, in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity duly to discharge." (From the Proclamation by Queen Victoria to the Armies, Chiefs and People of India, November 1st, 1858, on the occasion of the takeover by the British Crown of the administration of India for which the East India Company had been previously responsible.)

We who have seen what has happened in the last three decades in territories formerly ruled by Britain realise how right Queen Victoria's advisers were in stressing 'integrity' in the Proclamation. Rather a different approach from MacMillans 'winds of change'!

### THE BRITISH POUND & THE U.S. & RHODESIAN DOLLARS

The "floating" British pound has recently fallen to a fraction less than 2,33 U.S. dollars. At the same time after allowing for commission two U.S. dollars fetch only one Rhodesian dollar.

This is in itself an interesting comment on the Rhodesian Front contention about Rhodesia's need for a settlement with Britain.

The same facts also reveal the stupidity of the ignorant people in Government circles who forced on the Rhodesian public the name of "dollar" for the main unit in the country's new metrified currency. Since the world's best known dollar is worth only half a Rhodesian dollar what could be more stupid? There is now always confusion on quoting prices to United States interests, since the latter, unless the point is made abundantly clear in detailed statement, naturally accept the dollar sign as meaning the United States dollar.

How much wiser the South African Government was, in giving to their main currency unit the name of rand, which is not duplicated anywhere else in the world.

### THE SMITH/HOME SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS — ANOTHER TRAP

As we have pointed out many times the Smith-Douglas Home settlement proposals are designed to produce black majority rule in Rhodesia within less than ten years. If necessary the transition to black majority rule is to be enforced by a United Nations military force which under the proposals will be able to trample upon human rights. No Government spokesman has denied our contention in the above regard.

There is another trap in the settlement proposals. The paragraph at the bottom of the joint White Paper runs as follows:

We do not dwell on the fact that the proposed independence is not independence at all, or on the legal reality that as Rhodesia's own judges and outside legal authorities have asserted that Rhodesia is independent already.

We deal simply with the last two words "British Parliament". Knowing the slippery dishonesty of the British Government we suspect strongly the use of these two words, instead of the ones which one would expect "the British Government". What is the constitutional position? British legislative procedure involves the passage of measures through both House of Parliament and then the Royal Assent. We appreciate the fact that the Sovereign has to give her assent when so advised by the politicians, but they need not so advise her if they, for reasons

of their own want to indulge in prevarication and delay. This happened during and after the last war when measures such as those for compensation to private property holders were not put to the Sovereign for the Royal Assent — the publicity for their passage through Parliament being sufficient to reduce the heat of popular feeling against the politicians concerned.

To sum up our point, why are the words "the British Parliament" used in the White Paper — not "the British Government"?

### EXPENSIVE PEARLS OF WISDOM

According to the London Daily Telegraph a European woman who has been a re-strictee in Rhodesia, and whose name therefore we cannot mention, has published a booklet fervently attacking white rule in Rhodesia.

According to the author "Rhodesian Africans infinitely prefer to vote themselves whatever the cost." Reviewer in the Daily Telegraph points out that the cost, judging by the experience elsewhere in black Africa involves murder, robbery, torture and extermination camps. Further the African Nationalist does not appear to relish ruling only Africans, judging by their hostile comments on the system of black autonomy obtaining in South Africa — he wants to rule Europeans as well, and to confiscate their wealth.

The pearls of wisdom in the booklet may not be precious, but they are certainly expensive. The booklet of 40 pages with a paperback costs £2,75d. Presumably the publisher does not anticipate any considerable sales, to charge so much. Perhaps those who are interested in such extremist black nationalism are not very numerous, though they may be very vocal.

## SUBSCRIPTION FORM

To: RHODESIA AND WORLD REPORT,  
P.O. Box 1871,  
Salisbury,  
Rhodesia.

P.O. Box 3063,  
Durban, Natal,  
South Africa.

Please post me twelve issues of RHODESIA and World Report by Second Class Air Mail/Surface Mail for which I enclose Cheque/Postal Order, etc., for : starting with the : issue.

Name (Mr./Mrs./Miss) \_\_\_\_\_  
(Block Letters)

Address \_\_\_\_\_  
(Block Letters)

I also enclose : contribution towards funds of the Candour League of Rhodesia to enable them to expand their activities.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

### N.B.—ALL SUBSCRIPTIONS ARE QUOTED IN RHODESIAN CURRENCY

2nd Class Airmail Subscription—per annum  
S.A. Rh.\$2.85; Aust., N.Z., U.S.A., Canada, Rh.\$5.00;  
U.K. & Europe, Rh.\$4.35.

Surface Mail Subscription—per annum  
S.A. Rh.\$2.75; Aust., N.Z., U.S.A., Canada, Rh.\$3.00;  
U.K. & Europe, Rh.\$2.90.

The above covers all Bank Charges, etc.  
Rhodesia

Annual Subscription \$2.04 plus Bank Commission for country cheques.

Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to:  
RHODESIA AND WORLD REPORT