



THE PLOT

against
SOUTH AFRICA

KLAUS D. VAQUÉ

Klaus D. Vaqué

THE PLOT AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

1989

VARAMA PUBLISHERS – PRETORIA

**Originally published under the title:
VERRAT AN SÜDAFRIKA (1988)**

Translated by Tom McGhee

THE PLOT AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

Copyright © 1989 by Klaus D. Vaqué

Published by Varama Publishers, P.O. Box 17200, Groenkloof, Pretoria 0027, South Africa

**Printed, set and bound by
Promedia Publications (Pty.) Ltd., P.O. Box 255, Silverton 0127, South Africa**

Cover design by Sigi Dannheimer

ISBN 0-620-14537-4

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form by any means electrical, mechanical or photocopied, recorded or otherwise, without prior permission of Varama Publishers in South Africa.

To the peoples of South Africa of all colours, whose freedom is threatened by international forces in their grasping after world hegemony,

to the true Christians of South Africa, who are being led astray by "false prophets" within their churches,

and to my sons Ralf and Mark, who will have to bear their share of the world of tomorrow.

Contents

FOREWORD	1
INTRODUCTION	5
 A. THE WHITE GIANT OF AFRICA	
Chapter 1: The Rule of the Boers	12
Chapter 2: Facts or Fiction?	27
Chapter 3: The Treasure-House at the Cape	40
Chapter 4: The Decisive Domino	47
 B. THE "NEW WORLD ORDER"	
Chapter 5: The Conspiracy of the Bankers	54
Chapter 6: The Red World Parliament	68
Chapter 7: The "Managed" Conflicts	79
Chapter 8: The Secret Rulers	87
Chapter 9: The Deception of Nations	98
 C. STRATEGY OF A PLANNED REVOLUTION	
Chapter 10: "Psychopolitics" and "Disinformation"	110
Chapter 11: Exploiting the Racial Problems	127
Chapter 12: The Rôle of the "Liberation Movements"	145
Chapter 13: The Rôle of the Churches	167
Chapter 14: The Rôle of the USA	190
 D. POSTSCRIPT	
Chapter 15: Conclusions	210
Chapter 16: Whither South Africa?	216
Chapter 17: Warning to Europe	223
 E. APPENDIX	
Letter of the International Immigrant Committee of South Africa (IIC) to H.E. Mr P.H. Moberly, C.H.G., Ambassador of the United Kingdom	230
Statement by the State President of South Africa, P.W. Botha, on 29 July 1986, on the occasion of the visit of the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe	232
Sources	236

Foreword

At some time or other most of us will have tried to put a jigsaw puzzle together; baffling little pieces that in the end form a clear coherent picture of a landscape or what not. The hardest thing about it is the beginning. The more pieces that get put in place, the clearer and more comprehensible the whole picture becomes. Many people never get past the beginning and in frustration give up trying to work it out.

It is rather like that with most of us in our attempts to make something of political events in the world. We can see only the separate bits, which often make no sense. And we are astounded at what seems to us the ignorance of many politicians displayed by their attitudes and responses to certain things, so that in our amazement we are compelled to wonder how such fellows could ever have reached high office.

To many South Africans, for example, it is inexplicable that their country should now be threatened with worldwide sanctions, where the apartheid policy of "separate development", ostensibly the greatest evil of this country, has in fact for years been undergoing demolition at an increasingly rapid rate. They cannot understand why an international world press, and consequently so-called world opinion, should damn them root and branch, while they have demonstrably achieved the highest standard of living for their black compatriots in all Africa, built schools and universities for them and given them the best medical care available.

Nor can they understand why the governments of Great Britain and America helped the marxist dictator Mugabe into power in neighbouring Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe, in very fishy circumstances and by manipulated elections, after simply rejecting the moderate black Bishop Muzorewa who had already been democratically elected. And now Mugabe is waging a genocidal war against the Matabele people, which so far, according to trustworthy estimates¹, has caused the loss of fourteen thousand lives. Yet Mugabe continues to receive support, while South Africa is constantly accused of all manner of violations of human rights.

Many South Africans find it an impenetrable mystery that "friendly" Western governments, such as Great Britain, should send military officers to train former FRELIMO terrorists in Mozambique next door to enable the communist government there to cling to the reins of power.

They really cannot understand why the big international banks should refuse any further credits to South Africa, the soundest and most reliable payer in Africa, and demand immediate repayment of all outstanding credits; which has had the inevitable effect of plunging the country into its

deepest depression since the thirties; while at the same time granting thousands of millions to communist states and banana republics in South America and black Africa without the faintest prospect of ever being repaid.

It is completely incomprehensible to them that the World Council of Churches in Geneva should stab in the back what many missionaries regard as the most Christian nation in the world, while giving moral aid and comfort and financial support to marxist-controlled "liberation movements" through the device of their Programme to Combat Racism, which is then used to wage a terror war against the godfearing Boers.

Taken separately, all these and many more are the little pieces of a worldwide political jigsaw puzzle that many find baffling and few can make out as a coherent whole; for they are only fragments of a world-revolutionary drama, which unknown to the ordinary peoples of the world towards the end of this our century is heading at an ever accelerating speed for its undeclared goal. This confusion and apparent incoherence of events, however, is not accidental; it is managed by powerful forces behind the scenes. As Benjamin Disraeli (1804-1881), a former Prime Minister of Britain, put it:

"The world is ruled by persons who are quite different from what those who cannot see behind the scenes think."²

Solzhenitsyn calls them "the powers of evil" which have now gone over to the final attack. Particularly since the beginning of this amazing century they have by craft and stealth plunged mankind into a succession of wars and bloodshed unprecedented in all human history. In the course of the years, as the jigsaw puzzle gradually took shape, it became clearer and clearer to me that there was a huge design being put into effect behind the scenes of the world stage, whose purpose is to change that world completely, with all its old established orders. It is a conspiracy with the objective of exploiting and enslaving all mankind and achieving atheistic totalitarian domination of the world; in fact, of establishing a world government, to which all the peoples of the earth shall be forced to submit.

Since of course the nations of the earth would never willingly submit to such a plan, an enemy-image, an "East-West confrontation", had to be created. It is perfectly obvious that the instrument of the conquest and subjection of the nations is imperialistic soviet communism, which the conspirators themselves created with their instigation of the October Revolution in 1917 and have ever since kept in being with enormous credits, shipments of grain and the technical and military know-how of the West.

South Africa is merely a new pawn in this cynical game of chess, which is now being put through the revolutionary wringer so that another and particularly important obstacle may be got out of the way to the New World Order, as they call it. The concentrated attack on South Africa now taking

place everywhere is, therefore, as we shall see in later chapters, not just a matter of getting rid of apartheid, more human rights or votes for the black citizens of South Africa (however desirable that might be) but plainly and simply to install a socialistic-marxist black régime which would be firmly anchored in the camp of the One-Worlders, that band of internationalist conspirators. We shall hear more about them too.

It is in the very nature of the case that a conspiracy should work away secretly and covertly; nevertheless it is inevitable that now and again, here and there, some incident should give the game away and allow the alert observer to get a glimpse through the thing, and with further study to discern the total design.

The principal evidence of the existence of a deliberate conspiracy to destroy the anti-communist and pro-Western countries is to be found in the continuity and similarity of events in different countries, where “revolutions” and subversions have all followed an identical pattern. We need think only of Cuba, Vietnam, Iran, Nicaragua, Cambodia, Rhodesia, Mozambique, Angola, the Philippines and others. We shall say more about these later.

And it is hardly conceivable that the similarities of these events could be purely accidental, when the same factors and the same external influences operated decisively.

As Franklin Roosevelt (who undoubtedly knew what he was talking about) said:

“Nothing happens by accident in world politics. Everything is well prepared, carefully planned and deliberate.”

South Africa, and with it the rest of the free world, is confronted with an enemy who exerts perilous influences and powerful blackmailing pressures on all the governments of the world with diabolical cunning and deception through manipulation of the mass media that he controls, and with almost unlimited financial resources at his disposal. By these means governments can be induced to pass measures and carry out “reforms” that often entail their own destruction, as we have seen from other examples.

After reading this book, those who have hitherto identified the arch-enemy of human civilization and liberty exclusively in Soviet communism will look to the West rather than to the East for the enemy, to New York rather than to Moscow; for it is there that the centres of power and the faceless conspirators are to be found.

When I – in spite of all of the imperfections and shortcomings of South Africa – in the first part of this book stress the more positive aspects and achievements of this great country and its white Afrikaner people, then it is done deliberately for the following reasons:

First, because I consider it urgent and necessary to present a more

balanced and realistic picture of South Africa than is being held up to the reader in other countries; even at the risk of being accused of onesidedness. I also believe that the ordinary man has been so overstuffed with negative reporting about this country that for the sake of simple fairness it is high time to show the other side as well. After all, there are two sides to every coin.

Secondly, I would like to point out the absurdity that the world-wide attack against South Africa should be aimed at "racism" or "improvement of human rights" when this country has achieved by far the greatest accomplishments in Africa on all sectors of living standards, schooling, medical care and other civilizing amenities for its black citizens, as we shall see in later chapters.

The self-appointed apostles of morality should logically begin by accusing Uganda, Ethiopia, Angola, Zimbabwe and most other African states – not to speak of the communist countries – where conditions prevail that are not even remotely comparable to those in South Africa.

And thirdly, I wish to warn over-trustful South Africans of all races not to be under any illusions about what is really happening. Their fate, and perhaps that of the rest of the free world, is at stake. Their course of action in the years ahead and their firm resolve to stand up to the fraudulent powers of darkness will determine whether this outpost of civilization in Africa shall become yet another victim of the internationalist conspiracy or not.

I pray to God that the peoples and the politicians of South Africa may be imbued with the wisdom to recognize the real enemy behind the mask of communism. Only if they can see through this greatest political intrigue of our century will they be able to make an effective stand against the enemy. If this book can provide a modest contribution to that end it will have fulfilled its purpose.

Klaus D. Vaqué
Pretoria
April 1987

Introduction

More and more observers of the contemporary scene are arriving at the conviction that the innumerable crises and trouble-spots of our era differ from all others in that **they all have a common origin.**

Thus we read in the first section of *This Age of Conflict*, by F.P. Chambers, C.P. Harris and C.G. Bailey (Harcourt Brace & Co., 1943):

"Two world wars and their intervening wars, revolutions and crises are now generally recognised to be episodes in a single age of conflict which began in 1914 and has not yet run its course. It is an age that has brought to the world more change and tragedy than any other equal span in recorded history. Yet whatever may be its ultimate meaning and consequence, we can already think of it – and write of it – as a historic whole."

In *Behind the News*³ of January 1985 Ivor Benson writes:

"The revolutionary changes which have swept the world since the beginning of this century and now appear to be headed for a grand climax had their origin in a revolutionary change which occurred in the realm of high finance.

"For a long time after the beginning of the modern industrial era, finance capitalism – not to be confused with private ownership capitalism – existed almost entirely in **national concentrations**; there was a British finance-capitalism, answerable to a British government which was in turn answerable to an electorate; a German finance-capitalism, a French one, a Dutch one, etc, each one joined to a national government and finally answerable to a national electorate. Last century and well into the twentieth, these national concentrations of financial power were in vigorous competition.

"What then happened was that the many national concentrations of finance-capitalism were drawn into coalescence to form something new in history; namely, an **international finance-capitalism** fiercely resolved to free itself from answerability to any national government and its electorate.

"This process of coalescence had already begun at the time of the Anglo-Boer War but only began to exert a major influence in world affairs in the next two decades. One of the last national concentrations of finance-capitalism to capitulate was that of the United States; this occurred in the middle 1930's when the multimillionaire American pioneering families, led by J.P. Morgan, finally lost their supremacy in Wall Street to the internationalists, as recorded by Dr Carroll Quigley.⁴

"There can be no doubt that a major factor in bringing about revolution-

any changes in the realm of high finance was the existence within the different nations of Europe of banking families or dynasties which had always specialised in transnational operations.

"The story of how these financial families consolidated their power on an international basis is told by Dr Quigley in his *History of the World in our Time – Tragedy and Hope*. He writes: 'The greatest of these dynasties, of course, were the descendants of Meyer Amschel Rothschild (1743-1812) of Frankfort, whose male descendants, for at least two generations, generally married first cousins or even nieces. Rothschild's five sons, established at branches in Vienna, London, Naples and Paris, as well as Frankfort, co-operated together in ways which other international banking dynasties copied but rarely excelled.'

"Dr Quigley names as some of the other international banking families: Baring, Lazard, Erlanger, Schroder, Seligman, Speyers, Mirabaud, Mallet, Fould and Morgan. This list could easily be extended – Warburg, Wallenberg, Kuhn, Loeb, Schiff, etc. There is no need to enquire deeply into the genealogies of these internationally dispersed banking dynasties which, as Dr Quigley put it, 'in time brought into their financial network the provincial banking centres organised as commercial banks and savings banks, as well as insurance companies, to form all of these into a single financial system on an international scale which manipulated the quantity and flow of money so that they were able to influence, if not control, governments on the one side and industries on the other.'

"All the major changes which have occurred in our century – the Bolshevik Revolution and its aftermath, the precipitation of World War II, the dismantling of the colonial empires and the creation of a bogus 'world parliament', etc. – all of these and much else can be explained as having been dictated by the needs and ambitions of the new international financial power; for there was obviously no way in which the prosperity and security of this Jewish-controlled money power could be reconciled with the continued existence of strong governments in Europe and Russia to which it would have to be responsible and answerable."

When we consider the conflicts and revolutions of this century in many countries, it becomes conspicuous that:

- a) every revolution or overthrow of a government has followed almost the same pattern;
- b) every new régime has been either socialist-marxist or at least strongly centralized and dictatorial in its nature, and in nearly every case more brutal, corrupt and oppressive than the government that was overthrown ostensibly on those very pretexts;

- c) the régimes overthrown were strongly nationalist, anti-communist and particularly autonomous or independent;
- d) although the new clique in power were more brutal than the former rulers and trampled human rights underfoot, after a little while they were recognized by practically all the Western governments and supported with credits and material aid;
- e) officials of the American State Department had a hand in all these subversions.

In his book *Behind the Scene*⁵ (1976) Douglas Reed writes:

"Hatreds, passions and prejudices are to some extent innate in man and may be reduced by wise leadership or inflamed by bad. As I have gone along I have seen that they are incited, in all countries, by organized forces from outside for the purpose of setting up the World State on the ruins of Christian nations. That key once found, the dark origins of our twentieth-century wars and the strange doublings their courses take are alike plain to understand."

It is not possible within the compass of this book to reveal the full extent of the global conspiracy in detail. Many excellent books have been written on this subject, and it is recommended to the interested reader to acquire the books listed in the Appendix. Many of the big booksellers might, however, be reluctant to stock such books, for fear of reprisals.

Although the plans of the world-rulership conspiracy go far back in time, as far as the occult notions of the *Novus Ordo Saeculorum* of the eighteenth-century Illuminati and the Freemasons, the ideas of Adam Weishaupt, Giuseppe Manzini and others were taken over by Karl Marx for his *Communist Manifesto* and then put to use by powerful high-finance groups for the furtherance of their world rule.

In this book we shall concern ourselves mainly with the events of this century, most particularly with the attack on South Africa, and we shall find parallels with similar occurrences and draw the appropriate conclusions. Never before has any nation been exposed to such a heavy and incessant barrage of vituperation from the establishment media all over the world, for decades on end, as this country; it can be compared only to the conjoint press campaign against the German Third Reich in the thirties. (Could that be a portent of coming events in South Africa also?)

While South Africa can hardly stem the flood of black refugees from the "liberated" neighbour countries, an ill-informed world public sees it as the very embodiment of racist oppression and exploitation. Unprecedented diplomatic pressures are exerted on the country. Total sanctions and economic boycotts are threatened, and have actually been put into effect by many former trading partners. Ten members of the

EEC have ordered their ambassadors back. Australia has withdrawn its embassy; Norway and Denmark have shut down their consulates. The US State Department has put South Africa on its list of "hostile foreign powers"⁶ – the first country in the free world to receive that honour. The American Congress resolved to introduce thorough-going economic sanctions.

The picture formed by the man in the street in the West from the media is one of total confusion; for how is all this hostility to South Africa to be reconciled with the fact that Yugoslavia, Angola, Red China, Mozambique and other totalitarian self-styled marxist states are still treated as friendly allied powers worthy of aid and support, while the Russian invasion of Afghanistan is apparently forgiven and forgotten?

In *Diagnosen* (no 1/86, p. 26) Ivor Benson, a former adviser to the Rhodesian government, writes:

"The first fact of decisive significance is that the real history of what is happening in South Africa is only one episode of a widespread scenario that is essentially devised for the whole world and all mankind. That means that only by understanding what has happened and is happening in the world in general can we hope to find out the truth about what is going on in South Africa at present. To put it briefly, South Africa has become one of the main targets of the worldwide revolutionary movement that started at the beginning of our century and has rapidly gained impetus since the end of the Second World War. Its goal is the centralization of political power, which is in line with its increasing, by now almost completed, centralization of financial power."

So all the talk about "apartheid" and "human rights" is mere camouflage for a political war drama, and its purpose is to conceal the identity of those who want to soften up South Africa preparatory to its incorporation in the planned new international economic order; which will in due course turn out to be a new political order: the unitary world that the UNO is assiduously working towards.

Above all we must realize that it is not communism in itself that is the chief enemy to be repelled, but the forces that lurk behind it, that control it and use it as a wedge to drive for the attainment of their goal of world domination.

Hitler fell into that trap when he mobilized his armies against Bolshevism. While he was giving the German troupes their marching orders for the East, the bankers in the West were mobilizing the forces of the governments that they controlled for the attack on Germany. They had no wish to see the fruit of their labours, the Red Empire, destroyed. Their plans were well thought out and carefully executed. On the one hand the predominantly Jewish-Zionist bankers deviously supplied Hitler with credits to make

Germany capable of waging war; whereupon they manipulated events in Europe in accordance with their own intentions. They were well aware of Hitler's feelings about the Jews and Bolshevism. If they could induce him to persecute the Jews on a vast scale and expel them from Europe, and then to invade Poland and the Soviet Union, they would have killed several birds with one stone: the state of Israel long envisaged by the Zionists would gain official support from all over the world as a home for the Jews driven out of Europe, their communist empire would be strengthened, Germany would be destroyed, and Europe would be divided and enfeebled.

As we now know, General Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of the American forces in Europe, on orders "from above" stopped his advancing troops, thus allowing Eastern Europe to fall into the hands of the communist hordes, which America had been supplying with enormous quantities of weapons and other material.

The bankers' objectives had thus come true according to their plans.

In his book *National Suicide* (Arlington House 1973) Professor Antony Sutton, a scientist at the Hoover Institute, Stanford University in America, cites irrefutable evidence that

"During the past five years we have on the one hand threatened Russia and communism with the sword, while on the other we have secretly given aid to the Bolsheviks on such a colossal scale that without it the communist despotism in Russia would probably have collapsed. In 1944 Stalin admitted that about two-thirds of all large industrial undertakings in the Soviet Union had been accomplished with American aid or technical assistance."⁷

Professor Sutton proves that the remaining third had been built by the other Western states; that the tank factories, the aircraft factories, the explosives and munitions factories came from America; that 90 to 95 per cent of Russian technology since 1918 had come from the USA and its allies; that we built, sold or gave to the communists plants for the production of copper wire, motor vehicles, tanks, missiles and calculators; that the Russians now have the largest merchant navy in the world, with about six thousand ships, two-thirds of them built abroad.

Why did the superbankers build the biggest steelworks in the world in Russia? Why did they build the biggest tanks factory in the world in Russia? Why did the Roosevelt government not only betray the secrets of the atomic bomb to the Russians but also send them at the same time the materials necessary for its production?

Question upon question that admit of only one conclusion: There has long been in existence a conspiratorial network of secret forces that spins its web in the shadow of the officially elected governments and controls them so as to manœuvre all mankind into a collective world state. Nowhere can that be seen more clearly than in the attack on South Africa.

In the first main section of the book that follows we shall examine the real state of affairs in South Africa and discuss its economic importance to Africa and the Western world; in the middle section we shall take a closer look at the "New International World Order", its significance, and the hidden wirepullers who operate it; and in the last we shall deal with the strategy of the planned revolution in South Africa and the part played by its supporters.

In the final section we shall attempt to analyse the possible future course of South Africa and the dangers that Europe and the rest of the free world will be threatened with should South Africa fall victim to the internationalist conspiracy.

A.
THE WHITE GIANT OF
AFRICA

CHAPTER 1

The Rule of the Boers

You don't want reforms. You want my country.

**President Paul Kruger to (Lord) Alfred Milner on 31.5.1899, just before
the outbreak of the Boer War**

More than any other country South Africa might well be taken as a microcosm of the world; as the advertisements for South African Airways put it: "the whole world in one country". Its population reflects not only the ethnic variety of the world in general but also its inequalities in economic and social development such as are seen elsewhere between the so-called "first" and "third worlds".

Three continents meet here in one country: Europe (the whites), Africa (nine different black peoples) and Asia (the Indians and Malays), together with a large community of mixed race (the "coloureds").

Moreover, not one of the eleven main languages of South Africa is spoken by a majority. Therefore, the South African Broadcasting Corporation transmits its programmes over the radio in all eleven languages, and in six by its television services, which are generally understood by its population of about 27 million.

Throughout its whole history South Africa has always been more of a geographical expression than a true national entity. The country did not come into being because its peoples had any particularly close affinities with one another but through purely artificial lines drawn on the map by former colonial administrations. As a result fundamentally different peoples, such as the Xhosas and the Zulus, were sometimes quite arbitrarily enclosed within South African territory, though in their own separate areas. No less arbitrarily, parts of other black peoples were excluded beyond the borders of South Africa. Thus there came about the anomalous situation that larger components of the Swazis, the Basutos and the Tswanas lived inside South Africa than in their own independent territories of Swaziland, Basutoland (Lesotho) and Bechuanaland (Botswana).

Most non-South Africans assiduously ignore the fact that the nine black peoples in South Africa are in culture, language and mentality at least as

different from one another as, say, the Norwegians and the Spaniards, the British and the Greeks or the Dutch and the Italians. In this polyethnic state there is no "black majority"; only nine completely distinct peoples split up into 757 tribes, and each constituting a minority.

Of the total population 22,8% are Zulus, 18,2% Whites, 12% Xhosas and 10,5% Coloureds. All the remaining ethnic groups amount to less than ten per cent.⁸ Like the European states, the black peoples of South Africa live in their own traditional territories, each "apart" or separate from the others. The differences between them are accentuated by ancient tribal enmities, which in the past used often to lead to bloody wars in which whole tribes were exterminated.

Although that is prevented nowadays by the national security forces, every now and again there are still outbreaks of hostility and violence. As recently as 1986 a hundred men were killed and several hundred injured in tribal fighting between the Zulus and the Pondos. It took the army and the police months to restore peace and order before they could withdraw.

The civilized European can hardly imagine the gruesome, primitive weapons that blacks use against other blacks; anything that will kill will serve: knives, spears, picks, hatchets, clubs, sickles, bicycle-spokes, blank-cartridge pistols with the barrel drilled through, all manner of ancient firearms – these are only a few of the instruments collected by the police from the mangled victims; whose guilt usually consists in no more than the fact of belonging to a different tribe.

Black "racism" and tribal animosities are so deep-rooted that the big mining companies will allow their workers to go underground only in gangs belonging to the same tribe. Nevertheless the armed security men employed by the mines regularly have to intervene in murders and man-slaughters committed in the hostels and dormitories by different ethnic groups.

The South African reality of intertribal hostility can reach such a pitch that in one case it became necessary to create two separate government organizations and administrations for the culturally identical Xhosa people because centuries-old animosities between the various branches of the tribe made peaceful co-existence impossible. The Xhosas are now living in two independent black states, the Transkei and the Ciskei, inside South African territory.

Meanwhile the South African government has complied with the wishes of some of the black peoples (and indeed made it a fundamental plank of its policy) and granted them home rule within their traditional areas, with the prospect of gaining complete national independence in due course.

So far four of them have been granted independence: Transkei, Venda, Ciskei and Bophuthatswana. A fifth, KwaNdebele, has requested its independence. Others may follow as soon as they please.

Although these countries are larger and have a higher income per head than many members of the UNO, they are not recognized by the world organisation.

The complexity and uniqueness of South Africa, however, consists not only in the multiracial structure of its peoples. Within the nine principal black languages there are twenty-three subgroups and innumerable dialects. Most groups are mutually unintelligible. For example, the VaVenda, the most homogeneous community, comprise twenty-seven clearly distinct tribes. The Zulus comprise as many as two hundred. Within the tribes there are further subdivisions into many different clans.⁹

Besides the 18,2 million blacks there are 4,8 million whites, 2,8 million Coloureds and 880 000 Asians.

Of the Asians 65,1 per cent are Hindus, 20,6 per cent Muslims, 6,9 per cent either Christians or Buddhists, while 7,4 per cent belong to "other" religions. Although most of the blacks have been nominally "christianized", many of them are still much more inclined towards their ancestral animistic cults than to Christianity. Next to the Chief, the medicine-man or witch-doctor is still the most respected and feared personage. Thus it is not unusual for black heads of state and their ministers to take counsel of the *sangoma* "throwing the bones" before making any important decision.

If we add to these South West Africa (Namibia) with its Bushmen, we may begin to imagine ourselves in the position of a government with an "electorate" covering the whole spectrum of colours and cultures, from people who have barely emerged from the Stone Age and Negro tribes that were still nomadic until quite recently to European immigrants of the Atomic Age.

Against such a background, is it really so perverse and unforgivable that the way of *apartheid* or "separate development" of peoples should have been seen as the best solution to the problems of this country?

Critics of the South African notion of separate development mostly ignore the question why distinct ethnic groups all over the world strive for their own separate development and fight for their own autonomy. They stigmatize the traditional black territories of South Africa as "Bantustans", poverty-stricken depressed areas, wicked creations of a white policy of Divide and Rule.

Why do they not equally condemn the separatist movements elsewhere: the Basques and Catalans in Spain, the Corsicans and Bretons in France, the Kurds in Turkey and Syria, the Kabyles in North Africa, the Ibos in Nigeria, the Hutu and the Tutsi in Rwanda and Burundi, the Walloons and Flemings

in Belgium, the Untouchables in India, the Eritreans in Ethiopia, the Moslems in Chad and the Philippines, the Tamils in Sri Lanka, the Greeks and the Turks in Cyprus, the Indians in Brazil, the Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland, the Lapps in Sweden, the oppressed minority groups in the Soviet Union and the many other conflict situations in the world?

When the Dutch pioneers first set foot on South African soil in 1652 under the leadership of Jan van Riebeeck they had neither the desire nor the intention to subjugate the native inhabitants or rob them of their possessions. Their task was simply to establish a refreshment station for the ships of the Dutch East India Company carrying the riches of the East to Europe via the Cape of Good Hope.

That was a year before the founding of New York and a hundred and fifty years before the settlement of Australia and New Zealand by British immigrants.

Now that a regular mud-slinging campaign is being waged by the USA and the UNO to which it plays host, it is only fair to mention, not without irony, the fact that the execrated Boers did not exterminate millions of Indians (for which read blacks) – of the estimated ten million original inhabitants of North America there are now only about four hundred thousand¹⁰ – or filch their land from them and pen the survivors up in reservations. Nor did they import Negro slaves; with their own hands they set about clearing and cultivating the almost uninhabited country. Apart from small groups of nomadic Bushmen and Hottentots, it was a hundred years later, in 1770, that they first encountered Negro tribes on the banks of the Great Fish River, a thousand kilometres north of Cape Town. Those tribes formed the spearhead of the Nguni peoples, who had originated in the region of the Great Lakes in Central Africa, hundreds of years before they began their migration southward.

By then some of the people employed by the Dutch East India Company had become "free burgers" who, together with 150 Huguenots who had fled their native France, settled an area of 170 000 square kilometres; about six times the area of the present-day Netherlands.

After a few skirmishes and several border wars they eventually came to terms. The Boers left the black migrants in possession of the territories where they had settled, and which are now the "homelands" that they themselves have chosen.

If South Africa now has problems with its present black majority proportions, that in itself is clear evidence of the difference in humanity between the pious Boers and the white subjugators of America, Australia and New Zealand, who would never have allowed any such disproportion to exist. It is the very pinnacle of hypocrisy that those countries should now be in the

forefront of those who accuse South Africa of gross violations of human rights.

The news of the remarkable abilities of the white man and his technical achievements soon had the effect of bringing more and more blacks into the territories occupied by the Boers in quest of work, protection and medical treatment. The white man did not come to Africa to take their land from them, as is often asserted. He could not take from them their schools, their hospitals, their roads or their railways; for of course they had no such things.

As we have said, he entered an almost uninhabited country, a wilderness of desert and bush with little to offer but wild beasts, a pleasant climate and some fertile coastal strips. The few indigenous peoples that he encountered lived in a state of barbarism, their principal occupation being to smash in each others' skulls at regular intervals. They did not use the wheel; they had no writing; they lived as they had lived a thousand years before.

Let me put it quite bluntly: Everything that the black man now possesses in South Africa he owes to the technical knowledge, the initiative and the creative talents of the white man. The white man owes him absolutely nothing. It is sheer nonsense, as is often alleged, that the whites owe their prosperity to the cheap labour of the blacks. Europe did not need to wait for "cheap" foreign labour to be imported to acquire its wealth and civilization. The contrary rather. It is not more necessary than ever before to spend more and more on welfare payments and unemployment benefits to over-prolific migrant workers raised through higher and higher taxes? Are there not more crime and social problems then ever before?

In South Africa at present 4,8 million whites bear 77 per cent of the total tax burden, while 56 per cent of state expenditure goes to the benefit of 18,2 million blacks who pay only 15 per cent of the taxes.¹¹

Where in all the world is there anything comparable? Probably never before have so few done so much for so many. In plain figures the picture is as follows: In the financial year 1986-7 the whites paid R9 thousand million in income tax, the blacks 171 million, the Indians 257 million and the Coloureds 315 million. (From *The Financial Mail* 11.9.1987).

Between 1962 and 1972 the UN paid out 298 million dollars to underdeveloped countries. In the same period South Africa spent 558 million dollars on the development of its black territories.¹²

By the end of 1970 the blacks in South Africa owned 360 000 motor vehicles: more than the whole of black Africa put together. While the populations of countries such as Malawi and Mozambique earn an average income per head of less than R20 a month (and only in very few black countries does it exceed R100) in South Africa the average figure is R352.

Between 1975 and 1984 the real income of black workers rose by 27,5 per cent, compared with 6,4 per cent for whites.

A black citizen of South Africa can undergo a complicated heart-valve operation for little more than one US dollar. (Between two and three thousand such operations are performed annually in one hospital in Pretoria alone.) A black American would have to pay fifteen thousand dollars for the same operation in the USA.

In 1970 the blacks earned R1 751 million, or 25.5 per cent of the total national wage income. By 1984 their share had risen to R17 238 million; a rise of over a thousand per cent in fourteen years.¹³

In Africa and most of the developing countries generally compulsory education is unknown. For years South Africa has been endeavouring to expand those areas where there is compulsory education.

Since 1970 the domestic budget for black education has been raised by nearly thirty per cent a year – the greatest increase shown by any government department.

Since 1955 the number of black pupils rose from thirty-five thousand to over a million in 1984, i.e. by a factor of 31. In South Africa the percentage of children attending school is 65, compared with 64 in Egypt, 57 in Nigeria, 52 in Ghana, 50 in Tanzania and 29 in Ethiopia.

Of black adults in South Africa 71 per cent can read and write (80 per cent between 12 and 22 years) compared with 47 per cent for Kenya, 38 per cent for Egypt, 34 per cent for Nigeria and 26 per cent for Mozambique.

On average, throughout the whole year fifteen new classrooms per working day are built for black pupils; that is, counting forty to a class, accommodation for six hundred more a day.

In 1985 there were forty-two thousand black students at South African universities. There are five black universities and twenty-eight polytechnics subsidized by the government.

The proportion of black businessmen in the total commercial life of the country rose from one per cent in 1977 to ten per cent in 1987. The industrial areas in the towns are open to all races; so are the shopping areas for black entrepreneurs in most towns.

South Africa far outstrips most developing countries in health care. (According to the UN definition South Africa is one of the developing countries.)

According to the World Bank Atlas of 1985 the South African infant mortality is 55 (i.e. per thousand live births up to the age of one year) and therefore makes a better showing than three of the six regions into which the World Health Organization divides the earth: the Eastern Mediterranean (112), Southeast Asia (110) and all Africa (119). The black infant mortality is 82, or 31 per cent lower than in the rest of the African continent.

The national health care services (doctors etc.) amount to 480 per hundred thousand of the total population; about 380 more than the average for the

"third world". Every year more than eleven hundred black patients come to South Africa from other countries to be treated by medical specialists. (*Die Vaderland* 2.3.87)

Soweto, the black metropolis outside Johannesburg with a population of some 1,2 million, has five modern sports stadiums. Pretoria, the capital, with a white population of six hundred thousand, has three. Soweto has over three hundred schools, Pretoria 229.

In its issue no. 29 (April 1987) *Vox Africana*, an independent publication catering mainly for the English-speaking churches in South Africa, reported on a visit by an American evangelist, Professor Smock, who discovered certain "shocking facts" about South Africa: "When we arrived at the Carlton Hotel in Johannesburg we began to look for the notorious apartheid. There was no apartheid in our smart hotel – everything was integrated. Nor was there any apartheid in the posh restaurants that we went to; there were people of all races eating there, and we were served by both black and white waiters."

After his visit to South Africa in 1986 Professor Jed Smock, Director of Campus Ministry, Lexington, USA, wrote as follows: "The inner city of Johannesburg reminded us of Chicago, Detroit and Dallas, with only one difference – here there were three times as many blacks in the busy streets. In the modern department stores and shops all races were served with the same readiness.

"We found the same thing in all the other cities that we visited. When we went to the bank to change our money, there were both blacks and whites behind the counter. In the bookstores we looked in vain for a book in which apartheid was defended. There were indeed plenty of books on the subject, but they were all negative. Every English-language periodical in the country condemned the vestiges of apartheid. The only newspaper that had a word of praise for the government's reforms was *The Citizen*."

Professor Smock found that the non-whites also participated in the political set-up:

- a) A tricameral parliamentary system gives Indians, Coloureds and whites authority over their "own" affairs and a say in "general" affairs;
- b) blacks administer their own townships and residential areas;
- c) Blacks have complete supremacy in the National States;
- d) Non-whites have a voice in the provincial governments. (In Natal that means that for the first time the whites are in the minority.)
- e) The integrated provincial governments have laid down the foundations for integrated Regional Service Councils;
- f) On the national level there is a multiracial National Council.

The newspaper writes: "The Professor was also impressed by the many reforms:

- a) The influx control and pass laws had been abolished.
- b) Laws that prevented migrant workers from bringing their families with them had been abolished.
- c) South African citizenship had been restored to blacks living in white areas.
- d) People of all races are issued with the same identity documents.
- e) The immigration laws are the same for everybody.
- f) Special law-courts for blacks had been abolished.
- g) Black urban police had been given more authority.
- h) It was now possible for ground and houses to be purchased in black residential areas.
- j) Some central business areas had been opened to entrepreneurs of all races."

In a paper for American students Professor Smock wrote:

- 1. "Blacks are paid three or four times as much in South Africa as in the rest of Africa.
- 2. Black South African workers have practically the same rights as American workers.
- 3. In South Africa there are more black women in executive positions than in the whole continent.
- 4. South Africa is training more black doctors than any other country in Africa.
- 5. South Africa is the only country in the continent with a black middle class of any size.
- 6. In South Africa blacks own more cars than the whites in the USSR.
- 7. The government is building five thousand houses a month and makes housing available to 92 per cent of the black population.
- 8. South Africa proposes to spend a thousand million rands in the next five years to improve underdeveloped towns.
- 9. Whites with an income of thirty thousand US dollars a year pay fifty per cent tax to raise the thousand of millions spent on subsidies for non-whites."

So much for Professor Smock of America.

These are all hard facts that cannot be argued away when it is alleged that the whites in South Africa oppress or exploit the black majority. It would be far nearer to the truth to say that the whites in this country would be much better off if they did not have to pay the enormous financial costs of supporting and advancing the rapidly proliferating black masses.

Another example of white "development aid" is the very up-to-date medical university Medunsa on the edge of the independent black state of

Bophuthatswana, 35 km northwest of Pretoria, built at a cost of seventy million rands. In what amounts to a small town covering thirty-five hectares, with dormitories for male and female students, black doctors, dentists, veterinarians and paramedical personnel are being trained with the most modern equipment and in accordance with the latest methods of instruction.

This is the only specialist university of its kind in Africa and one of the very few in the world. Practically all the students, who come from the black South African National States, are fully subsidized by the white government.

Practical training takes place in the nearby black hospital at Garankuwa, in which the whole range of human ailments can be treated. In addition to the standard equipment there is apparatus for artificial kidney transplants, isotope units and their associated specialized laboratories. Occupational therapists can instruct their patients in hospital in thirty-two different therapies to prepare them for a productive life.

Here up to two hundred black doctors are trained annually, so that they can then take over responsibility for medical care in their homelands.

In three centuries the descendants of the Boer pioneers, the Afrikaners as they now call themselves, together with generations of later European immigrants, have developed an almost European-type state at the southern tip of Africa that has grown into the greatest industrial and military power in Africa. Its economic importance to black Africa in general, but especially to its immediate neighbours, is so great that if there were to be a total hypothetical worldwide cessation of economic co-operation with South Africa it would cause severe famine and the collapse of their national economies, while South Africa, even though damaged, would survive intact.

The advocates of economic sanctions against South Africa fail to realize the fact that it produces three-quarters of the industrial capacity of all Southern Africa, employs hundreds of thousands of migrant workers and maintains the only reliable transport communications with the outside world, on which at least seven states, as far north as Zaïre, are vitally dependent for their imports and exports.

The well-known British writer and historian Paul Johnson tells us that if the South African economy were to be destroyed by sanctions, "... the driving motor of growth – even of survival – on the continent would be put out of action, and its fall would pull down all the countries of southern Africa with it, probably all the countries of the sub-Saharan zone too ... We should have to number the dead from starvation in millions."¹⁴

Besides these connections in transport, trade and labour, the regional

economic interdependence of the southern African states also extends to electricity supplies across the borders, petrol and other oil products, tourism, private investments by South African firms, technology and research.

The neighbouring states depend on South Africa not only for technical aid by South African experts; they also drive steam and diesel-electric locomotives borrowed from the South African Transport Services (SATS). South African diesel locomotives travel as far north as Zaïre and Tanzania.¹⁵

In 1985 thirty-seven diesel and forty steam engines were hired out to the neighbouring states; on average 6 195 SATS goods waggons a day travelled on foreign rails alone, as against 944 in South Africa itself.

South African technicians of South African Airways (SAA) maintain and repair the aircraft of many other African states that possess neither the technical skills nor the proper equipment to do it themselves. South Africa also trains the crews of the Swazi, Botswana, Zimbabwean and Comoran airlines. South African Hercules C-130 transport aircraft carry urgently-needed spare parts, machinery, pharmaceutical and consumer goods of all kinds to most African countries.

For example, when in 1979 the railway line to Lilongwe, the capital of Malawi, was broken by rebels, South Africa immediately came to the rescue with a fleet of air-transports carrying urgently-needed fuel in drums to keep the economy of Malawi going.

Although most African states deny any official contacts with South Africa and in the UN and other bodies vociferously call for sanctions and boycotts, in fact nearly all of them still maintain close commercial relations with South Africa.

In 1986 alone eighty thousand businessmen from all parts of Africa visited the country to make new deals. In 1984 South African exports to forty-seven African countries amounted to about two thousand million rands, or 7,6% of all exports, while imports amounted to about 480 million, or 2,2%.

For obvious reasons most of these countries issue no exact figures; however, from a study carried out by the *Economist Intelligence Unit*¹⁶ we can take it that the proportions of imports from South Africa are as follows: Angola 13%, Botswana 88%, Lesotho 95%, Malawi 36%, Mozambique 14%, Swaziland 90%, Zambia 16% and Zimbabwe 22%.

South Africa is one of the few countries in the world – and the only one in Africa – to be self-supporting in food production and still capable of exporting large quantities. By contrast, in most African countries there is a chronic shortage of food, particularly of the principal staple, maize.

Because of their geographical proximity these countries are to an increasing degree dependent on South African supplies. Experts believe that four out of five African countries could not survive without food imports.

In 1980 *African Business*¹⁷ reported that Zambia had bought 250 000 tonnes of maize; Mozambique 150 000 tonnes of maize and 50 000 tonnes of wheat; Kenya 128 000 tonnes and Zimbabwe 100 000 tonnes; and Angola, the Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mauritius, Tanzania and Zaïre all imported grain from South Africa.

In 1980 nine African states imported 1,4 million tonnes of grain, most of it directly or indirectly from South Africa. While food production in black Africa fell by two per cent per head per annum, with all its unhappy consequences in the form of famine, poverty and declining living standards, South African food production rose by five per cent annually between 1960 and 1970¹⁸, double its population growth rate.

According to the *Argus African News Service*¹⁹, at least twelve countries are so completely dependent on South Africa economically that a really comprehensive economic embargo on it would mean their own total economic ruin.

Every day on average four heavy-laden large South African aircraft take off from Jan Smuts airport outside Johannesburg bound for black African destinations. Half the copper exports of Zaïre and half its food imports flow through South Africa.

Lesotho sends about half its male population to South Africa (in 1983 it was 146 000) and depends on the estimated remittance of over 280 million rands to meet more than half of its domestic budget.

Assuming that each of the 350 000 or so migrant workers from the neighbouring countries is supporting a family of at least eight members, that means that subsistence for about 2,8 million people comes from across the borders of South Africa. That takes no account of the illegal foreign workers, who are estimated to number over a million.

In addition to sending technical experts to many African countries, South Africa also provides them with a number of governmental and administrative advisers. Although here again no official figures are published by the countries concerned, according to a press statement of February 1972²⁰ during the sixties there were 53 government officials performing advisory functions in various neighbouring states: 26 in Lesotho, 22 in Malawi, three in Swaziland, one in Mozambique and one in Botswana. In the four independent South African states, the Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and the Ciskei, in January 1983 there were 1 213 South African advisers placed at their disposal for an indefinite period.

The world press is also silent about the humanitarian contributions by South Africa in the form of relief for refugees and in emergency situations. A few examples may suffice:

- In 1964, at the request of Prime Minister Tshombe, a Hercules of the

South African Air Force flew to the Congo with urgently-needed supplies of medicaments, first-aid equipment and food.

- In 1965, at the request of Prime Minister Jonathan, South Africa sent a hundred thousand bags of grain worth R315 000 to Lesotho to relieve the famine there.
- In 1966 South Africa gave Botswana a gift of two hundred thousand rands when the country was suffering from famine.
- During the Biafra war South Africa contributed ten thousand rands to the International Red Cross for the relief of victims of the conflict.
- In 1968 twelve South African farmers lent 230 tractors to nine villages on the Lesotho border so that they could plough their fields in readiness for the maize season.
- In 1969 a Dakota of the SAAF flew emergency supplies for thirty thousand people in the Qagga's Nek district of Lesotho to relieve a famine.
- In 1972 South Africa sent eight teams of specialists to Rhodesia to help in the rescue operations after the Wankie coal-mine disaster. The SA Chamber of Mines later gave R25 000 to the Emergency Aid Fund.
- In 1976 South African doctors helped to contain the outbreak of the dreaded Marburg disease in Zaïre.
- In August 1977 a South African team of specialist volunteers flew to the Moatize mine in Mozambique, where there had been a serious explosion of methane gas.
- In 1979 South African fire-fighting teams helped to put out fires in petrol storage depots at Beira in Mozambique and Salisbury in Rhodesia.
- In 1979 South African services provided several hundred refugees from Lesotho with food and shelter.
- The chaos caused by the civil war in Angola in 1975/6 forced thousands of people to flee the country. Most fled south across the border of South West Africa (Namibia). By the middle of September 1976 there were about eleven thousand Angolan refugees in four camps in South and South West Africa. The costs amounted to about four million rands. Two more camps were run by the South African army in Southern Angola.
- In 1980 South Africa helped the Transkei with R6,6 million in drought relief and provided employment for unemployed families by the improvement of roads and earth dams.²¹
- In 1987 South Africa looked after about two hundred thousand refugees, including soldiers, from the civil war and famine in Mozambique. FRELIMO, the ruling communist party in Mozambique, was formerly supported by the World Council of Churches (WCC). Now thousands

of blacks are fleeing to "white" South Africa so anathematized by the WCC, braving the mines, the barbed wire and the wild beasts. On average two thousand refugees a month stream through the Kruger Park game reserve alone. Many of them bring malaria with them, and the game wardens are afraid that the lions, to whom many have fallen victim, will become man-eaters.²²

During recent years the various forms of official development aid have greatly increased. The estimated value of official aid to the independent neighbouring states for 1982/3 amounted to R434 million, an increase of 69% over the previous financial year. In January 1983 the total official development aid programme, including the allocation of credits, legal and technical expenditures for 1982/3 were estimated at R627 600 000.²³ If the development aid programme for the (non-independent) self-governing black states inside South Africa are taken into account, all this costs the predominantly white taxpayers in South Africa more than a thousand million rands. Unless I am much mistaken, in proportion to population this must be an absolute world record!

If you are still convinced, after all this, that South Africa exploits and oppresses its black fellow-citizens, that the mass-media and many church and anti-apartheid organizations present an objective picture of the situation and that the country deserves worldwide condemnation and economic sanctions, then please read on.

But even if by now you are beginning to have your doubts about the correctness and objectivity of the reporting, you will certainly acquire fresh insights that will help you to understand the confusing events of the present era.

Can we blame most of the black heads of states in Africa for casting envious eyes at the white giant at the Cape of Good Hope when it almost effortlessly displays such a superiority in every field as they can only dream of?

A few figures should make that clear: Within its borders South Africa contains only six per cent of the total population of Africa and covers only four per cent of its total area; yet in 1979 it produced over 50% of the total electric power, it has 74% of the total electrified railways, runs over 25% of the total gross national product and possesses 45% of all the telephones in Africa. Seventy per cent of all the school pupils at the higher levels and four out of five doctors in southern Africa live in South Africa.

South Africa produces more energy than Italy, as much raw steel as

France, more grain than Canada, more wool than the USA, more wine than Greece and more fish than Great Britain.

The South African railways run more line-kilometres than West Germany, carry more passengers than Switzerland and have a better punctuality record than Austria.

South African firms can work to the microscopic tolerances necessary for nuclear industries, build computers and Mach 2 jet fighters, export motor spare parts to a hundred countries and have built the biggest munitions factory in the world.

South Africa owns and runs one of the few highly complicated uranium enrichment plants in the world. South Africa has the biggest completely new port installation in the world, at Richards Bay, and the longest special railway in the world, 860 km connection between Sishen and Saldanha, which in the meantime is being used as a multipurpose line.

South African mine-shaft experts, whose predecessors dug the biggest man-made pit, the Big Hole at Kimberley, for diamonds, have reached a working depth of 3 480 metres, deeper than anything drilled by man ever; and they hold the world record for the deepest vertical shaft ever sunk: 2 948 m.

The oil-from-coal process developed by the vast SASOL organization is in the front rank of international technology, and its special knowledge is in great demand for similar installations in Germany, the USA and Japan.

In this part of Africa the descendants of the white settlers and later immigrants, mostly British, German, French Huguenot, Portuguese, Dutch and Greek, have created a regional super-power without equal, with a population of 4,8 million whites.

The income per head²⁴ of the total population of South Africa (including the blacks) for 1983 was 2 450 US dollars, nine times that of Mozambique, four times that of Zambia, more than three times that of Zimbabwe, and almost double that of the whole southern African region.

Compared with the whole region of southern Africa (Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe) the South African proportion is as follows:

80% of the total gross national product (1986)

77% of all electricity produced (1980)

97% of all coal won (1980)

98% of all iron ore won (1980)

82% of all chromium won (1978)

77% of maize harvested (1986)

87% of wheat harvested (1980)

67% of sugar production (1979)

39% of beef cattle (1980)
80% of sheep (1980)
82% of motor vehicle production (1986)
63% of all tarred roads (1982)
60% of railways and port installations (1985)
84% of all telephones installed (1977)

The comparative figures for the entire African continent speak for themselves. The South African share is as follows:

46% of all motor vehicles
33% of all lorries
44% of all tractors
66% of total steel production
40% of African cement production.

The government is constantly endeavouring to raise the standard of living of the whole non-white population and to create a large contented black middle class. The enormous state expenditures necessary for that are at the expense of the white minority, who have to put up with an inflation rate of nearly twenty per cent, for the increased wages of the blacks, some of it statutory, is not matched by a proportionate rise in productivity.

An American visitor who knows the country well said recently that more changes had taken place in South Africa during the past ten years than in America in the last hundred years.

Racial separation has been scrapped almost everywhere: on the railways (summer of 1985); in the cinemas (Nov. 1985); and in sport. Everybody has the same citizenship (autumn of 1985). The Immorality Act has been scrapped (spring of 1985). The blacks have been given the right to freehold ownership (beginning of 1986) and can open firms in the central business areas (1985). Reserved occupations (for whites) are on the way out, and black members have been incorporated in central education committees: Coloureds and Indians now have proportional representation in Parliament. The blacks have their own democratic governments in their National States ("homelands")²⁵. So far the urban blacks only have a say in their own local administration, but they also will shortly participate in national government by means of a newly-created board.

The former State President, P.W. Botha, said some time ago: "The more reforms we carry out, the more we are condemned. The farther we move from the era of apartheid, the more furious the international campaign against us becomes ... It is as though our critics didn't want us to carry out orderly reforms."

CHAPTER 2

Facts or Fiction?

You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you can not fool all the people all of the time.

Abraham Lincoln

Hardly a day passes but the mass-media in the West let fly at South Africa in large headlines. You need only glance at an establishment newspaper or any of the evening news broadcasts on TV. South Africa has the place of honour right at the top of the establishment hate list; the forces that form "world opinion" and manipulate it as they please.

The methods that they use range from downright lies, half-truths, falsifications to contrived pictures and "objective" reports that leave out the most important parts.

South Africa is a classic example of successful psychological warfare on the part of those who wish it nothing but ill, and indeed it is very difficult for the ordinary citizen to distinguish between truth and falsehood.

To most people everything they read in the papers or see on television is quite simply the truth. They believe in their "democratic constitutional state" and of course in a "free press" with its national patriotic duty to inform the lieges objectively and truthfully. They forget all too easily that the mass-media are in the hands of private and usually international interest groups whose aims go far beyond maximization of profits and "the public's right to information", as we shall see in due course.

Let us take a closer look at the accusations most frequently levelled at South Africa:

"Apartheid legislation in South Africa means racist oppression and exploitation of the blacks, and it is an offence against human rights in general."

The Afrikaans word *apartheid* means nothing more nor less than "separation", with the additional implication of "separate development". The ra-

tionale of such legislation is based on the recognition of the multiplicity of the population, as we saw in the previous chapter. The different stages of development of the different peoples, black, white and coloured, necessarily required a very special system of legislation to protect and preserve the characteristic culture of each, and (particularly in the case of the blacks) to avoid racially-determined disputes.

The main buttresses of the policy were separate residential areas, separate schools and separate amenities such as cinemas, theatres, lavatories, parks, hospitals and so on. (Now that some of these things are no longer regarded as necessary the restrictions are being abolished.) There can be no question of oppression or exploitation; the converse is nearer the truth. The blacks in South Africa own more houses, cars and businesses and have a higher standard of living than the blacks in any other part of the African continent. They are paid three or four times more than elsewhere in Africa. That is one of the chief reasons why so many thousands of blacks try to immigrate to South Africa from the neighbouring countries every year.

Nor, despite the views of the UNO, can *apartheid* be regarded as an offence against human rights; otherwise, surely, there would not be so many separatist movements all over the world, in which peoples fight tooth and nail for their own "separate development" and autonomy.

Nowhere is *apartheid* more strongly marked than among the blacks themselves. If a Zulu woman were to marry a Tswana – to which few would feel inclined – she would be expelled from the tribe or put to death by her own family for "disgracing" it.

In telligent and honest blacks have assured me quite frankly that they regard *apartheid* as natural and that they welcome it. Of course, what the enemies of South Africa have made of the word and convey to the world is something completely different and entirely devoid of foundation.

On 31.8.85 the South African government made an official statement to the Foreign Ministers of Luxembourg, Italy and the Netherlands and the European Commissioner for External Affairs which makes that quite clear:

"If apartheid meant

- political domination of one ethnic group by another;
- exclusion of any community from the political decision-making process;
- injustice or absence of equality of opportunity for all;
- racial discrimination or violation of human rights;
 - if apartheid meant all those things, then the South African Government also rejects that concept."

"South Africa is a police state."

To every thousand people in South Africa there are 1,4 policemen. By comparison there are 2,2 in Great Britain, 3,5 in Israel, 4,3 in New York and 10 in Moscow. The entire South African police force is smaller than the police forces of the American states of Chicago and New York. Moreover, most policemen in South Africa are non-white. At the last count there were 16 292 white policemen and 19 177 of black, coloured or Asian origin.

The South African police are also accused of murdering political dissidents and responsibility for the suicides of arrested persons. According to the most recent statistics available to me, during the years 1979 and 1980 there was not a single fatality in South African prisons. In the previous ten years 37 detainees under investigation died.

Compare for example England and Wales, where 274 detainees died between the years 1970 and 1979. In 1980 alone 63 persons under investigation died, and fifteen prisoners committed suicide in British prisons in 1981.²⁶

"South Africa pays starvation wages to its eighteen million blacks."

By 1974 the average monthly earnings of black workers in productive industry were the equivalent of 127 US dollars (usually with considerable extras in kind and other perks). At the same time 24 million workers in the USA, the richest country in the world, were earning less than 140 dollars a month. Since then black wages have risen at a proportionately higher rate than white pay. For example, a black factory-worker in Johannesburg needs to work 12 minutes to earn enough to buy a kilogram of rice, 38 minutes for 750 ml of vegetable oil and 363 hours for a colour TV set. A white worker in Moscow would have to work 54 minutes, 118 minutes and 701 hours respectively for these things.²⁷

"The blacks in South Africa hate the whites."

That is simply not true. Relations between black and white in South Africa are better than in Great Britain or the USA. It is far safer for a white to walk the streets of Soweto or any other black township than it would be in Harlem, Watts, the centre of Detroit or many other big American towns.

American visitors to South Africa are often astonished at the number of black people who smile at them in the streets.

"There are thousands of political prisoners in South Africa."

What are called political prisoners are in reality terrorists and revolutionaries working for the overthrow of the government. In 1983 there were 127 such prisoners in South Africa: eleven others were restricted in their movements and contacts with other people by a government order, and there were 32 more under house arrest: 170 altogether. By contrast, in Northern Ireland there were over fifteen hundred political prisoners, and there are many millions in the compulsory labour camps in the USSR, Red China, Cuba and other communist countries.

Where do we see demonstrations on behalf of those people? In the states next door to South Africa alone there are many more (real) political prisoners than in South Africa itself.

"The blacks are horribly exploited by the whites."

On the contrary. A million white taxpayers, two hundred thousand coloureds and two hundred thousand Asians subsidize eleven million blacks. Blacks in South Africa pay practically no income tax. The whites subsidize their housing, medical care, transport and education.

"The black majority is denied the right to vote; only the whites can vote."

In the first place there is no "black majority"; there are nine completely different black peoples and hundreds of tribes almost all antagonistic to one another. The Xhosa, VaVenda or Basuto would not tolerate living under the domination of the Zulus or vice versa.

Democratic voting is an invention of the white man's culture as it has evolved over thousands of years, and it is most unusual in the authoritarian structures of African tribal units. The chief gives the orders, and the people obey. In the African countries where the vote has been introduced, it usually turned out to be a case of one man, one vote, once. Most countries in Africa are now either marxist dictatorships or one-party states in which no opposition parties are tolerated.

In the South African tricameral parliamentary system the whites, the

Indians and the coloureds all have the vote. The blacks can vote in their own autonomous tribal territories. At present attempts are being made to devise some form of suffrage for the urbanized blacks living in the big industrial towns.

But there can be no acceptance of a voting system such as is possible in the homogeneous states in Europe; for in South Africa with its multiplicity of peoples it would inevitably lead to the exclusive domination of all the other groups by the strongest; and neither the whites nor the black tribal leaders are prepared to accept that.

"There is no freedom of the press in South Africa."

In South Africa there are more daily papers in opposition to the government than in all ten of the neighbouring independent black states put together. Apart from certain restrictions for reasons of security, the prohibition of communist propaganda and recent restrictions on what may be published during the state of emergency, the press can criticize the government and its transgressions to its heart's content. The English-language press in particular makes full use of that freedom.

Despite the restrictions, the South African press is the freest in all Africa.

"The whites took the blacks' land away from them and 'removed' them to 13,7% of the country."

Historically South Africa belongs to the white settlers, who have been in permanent occupation (as distinct from conquest) since 1652. They have "right of priority" by settlement, and there is hardly any area in white South Africa that was taken from the blacks by conquest. In the same way the blacks have priority right to possession of their "homelands", which they still inhabit and where they exercise autonomy or have acquired their independence. Historically Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland also belong to South African territory; so that the blacks actually occupy fifty per cent, not thirteen per cent, of the land mass.

It must also be borne in mind that seventy per cent of South Africa is uninhabited, since it consists largely of mountain and desert. Under normal climatic conditions only ten per cent can be cultivated.

Since the black nations had settled as pastoralists in well-watered regions, some of the best agricultural land in the subcontinent now belongs to the self-administered or already independent states.

It is estimated that 48% of the cultivable soil in South Africa is situated in those black states. Over 75% of its area receives an annual precipitation of more than 500 millimetres, compared with an average of 430 for the rest of South Africa.

“The ‘homelands’ are desolate, barren regions where the blacks can barely keep body and soul together.”

To that one can only reply that it was the blacks themselves who selected those areas centuries ago in the course of their southward migrations. Apart from that, they are in fact far from being such poor barren areas as all that.

In Bophuthatswana, the independent homeland of the Tswana people, there are the largest platinum deposits in the whole of Southern Africa; and gold is won as a by-product of the big mines.

To the question whether it was true that his people had been dumped in a worthless region the Chief Minister of another homeland, Lebowa, replied: “No, that isn’t true. We’ve got everything here but diamonds and oil. We’ve got all the other minerals. As for agriculture, we’ve got some very rich parts of South Africa with good rainfall, good soil. I think our stockbreeding is among the best, and our wheat and maize potential is pretty high. People who say that we’ve been dumped in dry and barren regions can’t be referring to us; they must be thinking about somebody else.”²⁸

Apart from the fact that conditions are similar in the other homelands, it would still be unreasonable to hold the whites responsible if things were otherwise.

“The blacks are ‘discriminated against’ in South Africa.”

Well, what does that mean? When we “discriminate” (Latin *discrimino* = I distinguish) we are simply recognizing the difference of another.

If I see my wife struggling to carry a piece of heavy iron plate and I take it from her because I am stronger, then I am “discriminating”. If I would rather be treated by a white doctor than by an African witch-doctor, then I am “discriminating”.

When in the army in South West Africa only Bushman soldiers are used as trackers rather than white soldiers, then the whites are being “discriminated against”.

These few examples should suffice to show how far the word “discriminate” has been turned into a mere catch-phrase. Of course the

blacks are discriminated against, **but not because they are black**; rather because in so many respects they are simply different from whites. Anybody who is capable of recognizing the great variety of living creatures with all their different qualities and aptitudes must inevitably "discriminate" without that being misinterpreted in a purely negative sense.

As a psychiatrist will tell you: The first sign of idiocy is inability to discriminate.

"The anti-terrorist legislation in South Africa is a violation of human rights."

Anybody who compares the South African laws, particularly those for the prevention of terrorism with others, will be astonished to find how similar they are. The Prevention of Terrorism Act passed by the British Parliament in 1974 is a parallel to the South African laws that declare membership or support of an officially prohibited organization illegal.

That Act also provides that any person suspected of any such offence may be detained for up to seven days without trial; and on one occasion 566 persons have been locked up in England by the Merseyside police under the Act. In the Netherlands a suspect may be held for twelve days before appearing before a judge. If he is charged he can be detained for a further three months before a trial is fixed.

In the German Federal Republic an Act was passed in 1983 to allow the police to break up "demonstrators" regardless of whether the demonstration was violent or not. Anybody who does not comply with the corresponding police ordinances may be sentenced to a year's imprisonment.

As a result of historical experience and the realities of Africa, the South African legislation places more emphasis on preventive measures, such as longer periods of investigation, than in Europe. That is also true of banning orders with restricted freedom of movement or house arrests. In South Africa in August 1983 there were 170 persons affected by these laws as compared with 1 560 detainees in Northern Ireland.

The effectiveness of the South African anti-terrorist legislation can be seen from the following examples (the present state of emergency cannot be taken as a criterion): In South Africa in 1982 there were 39 cases of terrorism, compared with 51 in the USA. France recorded 112 cases in 30 months. In Northern Ireland there were 382 terrorist shooting incidents and 219 bombings. In addition there were 580 cases of armed raids and 499 cases of arson in which 97 persons were killed, including 57 civilians.²⁹

“South Africa attempts to ‘destabilize’ its neighbours.”

Any time South Africa carries out a small limited commando action against a terrorist base on the other side of the border operating against South Africa and used as a sanctuary – often with the connivance of the government of the country – South Africa is accused of “destabilizing” its neighbours; although such actions are perfectly permissible under international law.

If South Africa were really trying to destabilize its neighbours (and valuable trading partners) then it has been applying some very odd strategies. South African exports of food alone to other African countries are well over a thousand million rands’ worth a year. Without those deliveries of foodstuffs the countries concerned would suffer continual famines, which would make their governments far more unstable than they already are.

In the financial year 1982-83 South Africa paid R314 million to Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland and 341 million to the Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and the Ciskei in dues as a member of the customs union of those countries.

The importance of the South African contribution to their economic stability can be seen, for example, from the fact that in 1984-85 the domestic budget of Lesotho amounted to R304,7 million, of which R109 million came from the customs union agreement with South Africa alone.

Then there is the South African labour market, which employs over two million migratory workers from the neighbouring countries, most of whose earnings are sent back home. The multifarious forms of assistance given by South Africa in all fields, as we have mentioned in the previous chapter, clearly prove that South Africa, far from destabilizing its neighbours, is precisely the factor on which their stability mainly depends.

“The blacks are housed in slums and have to live in ghettos like Soweto.”

First of all, nobody is forced to go to Soweto, the huge black township just outside Johannesburg, unless he voluntarily abandons his tribal associations in the “homelands”. Secondly, Soweto is neither a slum nor a ghetto of the sort that we are familiar with in South America, India, the other African countries and even the USA.

Anybody who has made a tour of this huge conurbation will have observed that here, like everywhere else, there are three classes: poor, middle and upper. Dwellings range from millionaires’ villas with well-

tended gardens to rows of simple "matchbox houses" which are within the resources of most blacks at a subsidized rent of about forty rands a month.

By 1978 Soweto had 115 football pitches, three rugby pitches, four athletics fields, eleven cricket pitches, two golf-courses, 47 tennis-courts, seven swimming-pools (some of Olympic standard), five bowling alleys, 81 basket-ball pitches, 39 children's playgrounds and innumerable community halls, cinemas and clubhouses. There are 300 churches, 365 schools, 2 technical high schools, 8 clinics, 63 crèches, 11 post offices and a fruit and vegetable market.

Baragwanath, the vast black hospital in Soweto with three thousand beds, is one of the biggest and most up-to-date in the world. Its 23 operating theatres are provided with the most modern equipment in the world. The maintenance costs of this hospital, in which black patients pay a nominal fee of two rands – there is no national health insurance in South Africa – are treated, operated on and given post-treatment for an indefinite period, are higher than the annual budget of some of the smaller member-states of the United Nations.

The hospital employs a staff of eight thousand, including 450 doctors on full-time service, and it treats over 112 000 in-patients and 1 620 000 out-patients a year. It is interesting that ninety per cent of the blood-donors to this black hospital are white.³⁰

At 34,8 per thousand the infant mortality rate for Soweto is lower than that for Harlem in New York.

Dr Kenneth Walker, a Canadian medical doctor, recently wrote of Soweto: "I saw many houses in Soweto that had cost a hundred thousand dollars and had a BMW standing in the garage entrance. All the houses there are single-storied. Many had been recently painted. Many have flower-pots in the windows and lawns in front. Only two per cent are shanties. If I had the choice between living in Soweto or in one of the run-down blocks of flats in New York, Chicago or Detroit, it wouldn't take me a minute to plump for Soweto.

"The Canadians will no doubt be shocked when I say that I'd rather be injured or sick in Soweto than in many Canadian towns. In Soweto there are eight clinics supported by the government and several private doctors. There is also Baragwanath Hospital, an outstanding teaching hospital ... in which 898 heart operations were performed in 1982 alone. Baragwanath is the biggest and most versatile hospital in the whole African continent. Next door there is the St John's eye clinic. It is world-famous for its treatment of glaucoma, detached retina, traumatic eye injuries and rare tropical diseases." (From *Globe and Mail*, quoted in *Vox Africana* no. 31, October 1987).

In Soweto there are over 2 300 registered firms owned by black businessmen, including a thousand private taxi concerns. Of the fifty thousand car owners three per cent drive a Mercedes-Benz. The township has more schools, churches, cars, taxis and sportsfields than many independent African countries. No wonder vehicles can be seen everywhere with stickers declaring "I Love Soweto". The same is true of many other "black ghettos" in South Africa.

"In the South African mines more (black) workers get killed through inadequate safety precautions than anywhere else in the world."

In 1986 the South African coal-mines showed their absolutely lowest accident rate. The South African Chamber of Mines announced the fact at the time. In the previous year the rate of fatal accidents had been only half the figure for American mines. For three years the rate for the mines controlled by the Chamber has been steadily falling, and that for the previous year, one death per three thousand employees, is the lowest ever attained in this branch of industry. It is less than half the rate for the year 1984.³¹

For the South African gold-mines a number of circumstances make accurate comparisons difficult. The South African gold-mines are the deepest in the world; some of them as deep as four thousand metres below the surface. That results in extraordinary conditions of heat and pressure, so that the gold-bearing quartz rock is among the hardest on earth.

If we compare the mines in the USA with those of South Africa (though they are only remotely comparable) we find a fatal accident rate of 0,93 there as against 1,25 for South African gold-mines. But if we exclude the fatal accidents resulting from sudden pressure bursts caused by the extreme depths we have a rate of 0,95 per thousand, which is not significantly higher than the American rate.³²

"The blacks are deliberately kept stupid and ignorant."

This year (1987) over six million black children are going to school in South Africa – a new record figure. In the previous year nearly eighteen hundred new classrooms were built for secondary schools, which is equivalent to about a hundred and thirty new schools. (But for the losses caused by the wanton burning and destruction of schools by mobs during the

disturb-ances a few years ago the educational opportunities available to blacks would be even greater.)

Within the last ten years the expenditures on black education have risen from R143 million to 1,15 thousand million – an eightfold increase! All this is part of a ten-year plan to bring black education in every respect up to the level of the much older and better established systems of the other population groups.

“The South African police and army are terrorizing the blacks in the townships and should be withdrawn.”

After politically-motivated black gangs in the townships had murdered over six hundred black “collaborators”, mostly by the ghastly “necklace” method, and other criminal elements had begun to take advantage of the situation, in the course of the state of emergency and at the behest of the black local authorities, the government decided to take stronger security action in defence of the black population. The army and the police were received by the overwhelming majority of black citizens with relief and gratitude – but also with the reproach: “Why do you only come now? It was high time; we were at the end of our tether.”³³

The young white soldiers on duty in the townships at night were often given coffee and biscuits by grateful black inhabitants.³⁴

In a petition to the Minister of Police over a thousand townsmen of Sebokeng asked for increased police protection. As the inhabitants said to Aida Parker, a Johannesburg journalist: “Those people who don’t want the police in the townships mustn’t come here to live and work. We need protection against criminal violence and terrorism. So many houses are being attacked and robbed, women raped, householders killed and maimed. By day or night nobody can be sure of his life any more ... We’ve had enough of being terrorized.”³⁵

“In South Africa children are being locked up in gaols.”

Under the heading “What is to be done with murderous children?”³⁶ the journalist Peter Younghusband wrote in *The Washington Times* (11.12.86): “The world reacted with indignation to the admission by the South African government that in all South Africa 256 children had been arrested without trial. This reaction was understandable. Arrest without trial is abominable and undemocratic, especially when the victims are between the ages of 11 and 15. But the reports generally fail to mention

that many of the detained children are hardened criminals and many of them are even murderers.

The South African government is now confronted with the following problem: What is to be done with criminal children? The answer ought to be: Put them before a juvenile court and sentence them. But South Africa is in a state of revolution. The police and the judiciary are heavily overburdened. The inquiries and formalities that must precede a fair trial in court are in many cases several months in arrears. Meanwhile the young detainees must be interned somewhere, somehow. A few years ago most of them would have been released in the custody of their parents until their trial came up. But now even eight-year-old children are forced into revolutionary rôles. The release of a child detained on evidence or suspicion of revolutionary violence would have his immediate return to the revolution as a consequence.

Take for example the case of 24-year-old Rosaline Skosana, who died in the black township of Duduza in July 1985. As she was attending the funeral of an anti-apartheid activist, she was accused of being a collaborator by young activists, the so-called 'comrades', on the grounds that she had once had relations with a (black) policeman. Within seconds she was surrounded by the crowd, dreadfully beaten up, doused with petrol and set on fire, and as she lay dying they continued stoning and kicking her.

Long after her body had ceased to twitch under the hail of blows with sticks, stones and kicks the corpse was still being kicked and stoned by the jeering mob dancing round it. One or two of the attackers even went so far as to throw big, heavy stones at the horribly mangled, scorched, half-naked body for the benefit of the (foreign) camera crews who were filming the scene.

The films showed that some of the murderers of Rosaline Skosana were children less than twelve years old. Hardened journalists reporting on the violence in the black townships were repeatedly shocked by the participation of small children in 'necklace executions', in which the victim has a tyre soaked in petrol placed round his neck and is set on fire.

Teenagers and younger children are often in the front ranks in attacks on the police with stones, acts of arson and sabotage. Witnesses have testified in several court cases that the African National Congress, supported by the Kremlin, urges its fighters in the black townships to use small children at the head of their attacks on property and the police, well aware that wounded or dead children would put the government in a highly embarrassing situation. Children used in that way become indifferent to death and grow up as callous criminals who carry out their tasks with the

fearlessness characteristic of young people and with astounding courage. If the security forces are confronted with children prepared for murder and arson they have no alternative but to arrest them. Then the government finds itself in the dilemma of detained children to whose predicament they are in general not indifferent. The detained children are normally not kept in solitary confinement and are usually kept separate from adult prisoners and criminals. As far as possible they are sent to 'reorientation' camps until their release.

The Minister of Justice, Kobus Coetzee, has often expressed his concern over the detained children. Only recently he arranged a high-level investigation of their social relations and living conditions. 'I would much prefer it if these children were under the care of their parents,' he said, 'but that is not always possible ...' "

(According to the most recent reports – June 1987 – only eleven children are still in custody awaiting trial for particularly serious offences.)

The Treasure-House at the Cape

Our objective is to gain control of the two great treasure-houses on which the West is dependent: the energy sources of the Persian Gulf and the minerals of Central and Southern Africa.

Leonid Brezhnev, Secretary General of the USSR (1971)

As at the outbreak of the Boer War, the battle for South Africa is still a battle for gold and the minerals of the Southern African subcontinent. Then as now the secret warmongers used the same methods to conceal their objectives; then as now they operated both inside and outside South Africa.

"The whole plan is concocted and controlled by a colossal syndicate for the dissemination of false information." These were the words of Lt-Gen. Sir William Butler, Commander in Chief of the British forces in South Africa, shortly before the outbreak of the second Anglo-Boer War, who resigned his position in disgust at what he had seen.³⁷

The chief instrument of "systematic false information" and insidious manipulation of public opinion is still the press, now reinforced by radio and television, which is still in the hands of the same financial forces as let loose the bloody conflicts then.

Before the outbreak of the Boer War the British government used the pretext of alleged abuses and violations of human rights against the *uitlanders*, mostly British immigrants in the Transvaal, where huge deposits of gold had been found. Now the attack on South Africa is being carried out under the pretext of *apartheid*, a word that the establishment presses continually bandy about as a synonym for everything evil, so that it is execrated all over the world, although hardly anybody knows what it really means.

Whoever wishes to understand the background to this tendentious propaganda must first realize that South Africa and the USSR together possess the largest deposits of minerals on earth. The wealth locked up in the South African earth is so great that the country, in its present stage of development and with an almost unlimited labour force in the decades to

come, would inevitably become an industrial super-power on whose supplies the whole Western world (in which, paradoxically, Japan must now be included), would be dependent. In the 21st century the oil wealth of the Arabs will be superseded by the mineral wealth of the South African subcontinent.

South Africa possesses the largest deposits in the world of gold, platinum, chromium ore, manganese, vanadium, fluorspar and andalusite, and large supplies of antimony, asbestos, lead, diamonds (both industrial and jewels), iron ore, mica, coal, copper, nickel, phosphates, titanium, uranium, vermiculite, zinc and zirconium.³⁸ These are all exported to a greater or less degree and constitute the most important earners of foreign exchange.

Other minerals in which South Africa is self-sufficient and can even export in smaller quantities are barytes, beryllium, feldspar, graphite, gypsum, kaolin, diatomite, corundum, salt, fireclay, talc, tiger's-eye and other semi-precious stones, silver and tin.

The importance of the strategic minerals of South Africa to the armaments industries and the economies of the Western nations is evident from a study by Dr James A. Miller titled *The Vulnerability of the West through its Mineral Reserves — from a Soviet Perspective*.³⁹

"If the Soviet Union and its allies can get control of the mineral resources of South Africa, with the exception of oil, the following percentages of worldwide reserves would be controlled by the Kremlin:

"Platinum group: 95% of world production and 99% of world reserves. Chromium: 57% of production and 99% of reserves. Manganese: 59% and 93% respectively. Vanadium: 69 and 95%. Gold: 80 and 70%.

"The United States is dangerously dependent on foreign sources for at least half of the forty minerals that it needs for its industry, and it is compelled to import 90% of its 100% needs in manganese, cobalt, chromium, niobium, mica, strontium, tantalum and bauxite.

"Moreover it has to import 75% of the metals of the platinum group, asbestos, fluorspar, tin and nickel. Over 50% of the following minerals have to come from sources overseas: cadmium, zinc, potassium, selenium, mercury, gold and tungsten. The allies of America in Western Europe and Japan are even more dependent on imported minerals.

"No wonder," Miller concludes, "that the Soviets are so eagerly working to turn off the South African tap."

The influential American research institute, the Heritage Foundation, wrote in one of its publications:⁴⁰ "There is no question but that (American) industry is now and will be in the future far more dependent on foreign supplies of non-fuel minerals than on oil. The possibility of interruption of deliveries of critical minerals must also be taken into account."

General Alexander Haig, a former Secretary of State, believed that the

loss of the mineral supplies from southern Africa would have "the most serious consequences for the existing industrial and security-political positions of the free world".

J. William Middendorf, a former Secretary of State for the Navy Department, gave warning that leftist régimes in South Africa and Zimbabwe controlled by Moscow could constitute a no less effective minerals cartel than the oil cartel of the OPEC countries, which was certainly capable of ordering an embargo on supplies.

Five essential minerals in particular give South Africa a key position in the supply of critical raw materials to the free world. These are chromium ore, the metals of the platinum group, manganese ore, asbestos and gold. Of these chromium is the most important, because there is no substitute for it in the manufacture of high-quality lightweight stainless steel. Without chromium the engines for modern jet aircraft or *Cruise* missiles could not be built. It is also much used in the petrochemical industries, in power stations, nuclear reactors, in the building industry and many other branches of industry.

In a publication of August 1981 the American Bureau of Mines wrote:

"None of the major industrial nations outside the Eastern bloc has any chromium reserves of its own. Indeed, a major portion of the world's known chrome deposits are concentrated in just two countries: South Africa and Zimbabwe."

96% of the world reserves of chromium ores is in Southern Africa, and 95% of the non-communist supplies of the platinum group metals. The USA is dependent on imports for 89% of its platinum, Japan for 98% and Western Europe for a 100%.

The same is true of manganese and asbestos. Although production of those two minerals is not so high as that of chromium and platinum, South Africa and Russia together possess 93% of the world reserves of manganese. After Russia and Canada, South Africa has the third largest supply of asbestos.

It is easy to see, therefore, why the communist rulers in the Kremlin have always taken a great interest in South Africa, and why it has always been an important component of their long-term strategy. In 1971 Leonid Brezhnev, former General Secretary of the Communist Party of the USSR, declared that the Soviet Union intended to gain control of the two great treasure-houses on which the free world was dependent: the petroleum of the Persian Gulf and the minerals of Southern Africa.⁴¹

Of course the communists know full well that whoever controls the shipping round the Cape of Good Hope controls a vital artery of the economic life of the West. Western Europe alone receives something like a quarter of its oil via the Cape route. On average seventy ships a day sail

round the Cape. Altogether they amount to one and a half million gross registered tons; which means twenty-five thousand ships annually up to a total of nearly 550 million GRT.⁴²

As *Welt am Sonntag* reported in a special issue in May-June 1986, the South African share of Western supplies of raw materials amount to the following percentages:

- manganese ore 93
- platinum 83
- vanadium 61
- chromium ore 58
- gold 63
- fluorspar 46
- diamonds 29
- zirconium 19
- antimony 17
- uranium 16

If the communists could control the mineral resources of South Africa alone, they could pinch off a central nerve of the Western economy. But since a communist puppet government in South Africa would obviously be remote-controlled from Moscow anyway, the South African resources could be added to those of Russia if it were absorbed by the Eastern bloc.

Then the total share of the combined South African and Russian resources would amount to the following world percentages:

- manganese 94
- platinum 85
- gold 70
- chromium 70
- vanadium 65

The whole world would then be dependent on the Kremlin for its precious metals, gold and platinum, and the components of high-performance steels, manganese, chromium and vanadium.

In the light of these facts the reader must by now be wondering how it is possible in the circumstances for governments in Western Europe and North America to threaten South Africa with sanctions and embargos. They would not only be cutting themselves off from the mineral resources of South Africa which are vitally necessary for the development of their national economies and their defence capabilities, but also from the supplies of raw materials of the other countries in Southern Africa, whose export routes mostly pass through South African ports.

Is it really credible that Western governments could run the risk of what would be tantamount to suicide for the sake of "violations of human rights" or apartheid in South Africa?

Why then do they support a terrorist organization like the ANC, whose declared goal is and always has been to incorporate South Africa in the communist sphere of influence? (See Chapter 12)

We shall find the answer to these questions only if we consider the attack on South Africa within the context of a global strategy in which both the East and the West share common goals.

In his book *The War on Gold* (1977) Dr Antony Sutton writes:⁴³

"... the basic reason for the attack on South Africa has little to do with its racial or domestic policies; these are propaganda counterparts to the war on gold. A moment's thought will suggest that a Kissinger who is unmoved by Soviet persecution of Jews and political dissidents is unlikely to be moved by the lack of voting rights for black South Africans."

Prof. Sutton adds: "The war on South African gold originated with the Wall Street Establishment. But this is not the place to more than hint at the complete story of Wall Street's incredible machinations. The interested reader is referred to the Wall Street involvement in the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, the continuing military and economic assistance to and protection of the Soviet Union by the Wall Street banking establishment, and the drive for a New World Order under U.S. dominance (which means dollar imperialism under Wall Street leadership), in which the USSR would become a technical and financial colony of the United States." (See also *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* by Antony C. Sutton)

It is obvious that a single unitary monetary system for the whole world, controlled from a single centre, would be an important prerequisite for the projected "new world order". That means that the ultimate prerequisite for a centralized world rule would be total control of all the raw materials in the world, including gold in particular, under the supervision of a supra-national world organization: the UNO.

Why? Because wealth (say raw materials) in the hands of its possessor means power and freedom and independence; especially if that wealth is easily exchangeable for money. The sovereignty and independence of a nation, therefore, is a matter of its state of power and financial resources. Therefore all the strenuous efforts during this century to turn the world into a socialist dictatorship (or "new world order", as the UNO prefers to call it) have been concentrated on undermining the sovereignty of all nations to deprive them of all power to resist their future absorption into the "new world order".

The whole eastern part of Europe has already fallen victim to the plot; and all the communist countries, including the USSR and China, are therefore mere vassals of high finance; exploited colonies which, because of a utopian collectivist economic system, have no chance of ever attaining

economic independence and are thus condemned to eternal bondage to their capitalist creditors.

Andrew Young, a former American delegate to the UN, paid a visit to Windhoek in South West Africa a few years ago, where he frankly admitted to the journalists present that the USA had no intention of interfering with a communistic Angola or Namibia; on the contrary, he said; the communist countries had always been the easiest markets for American goods ...

Payments are of course mainly in the form of minerals or other natural products extorted from the enslaved peoples. That is what happened with the much-lauded "decolonization" of Africa and other continents. Never had those countries been so exploited by the colonial powers as they are now by international high finance. The former colonial territories and practically all the Third World are now in the pockets of international money powers, which lend them billions of worthless paper dollars that they have to repay with the wealth of their minerals. Thus the whole business of decolonization was simply a deliberate ploy on the part of international finance groups to enable them to get their hands on those countries. The old colonial empires were emasculated and their control over their colonies was wrenched from their hands; so that now they must pay for their raw materials and natural products from the "decolonized" countries – now recolonized by the banks – in expensive US dollars. So two birds are killed with one stone and at the same time the way is paved to the assimilation of the countries into the New World Order.

A strong, white, independent government in South Africa in possession of the biggest gold deposits in the world and next to those in the USSR the richest reserves of strategic minerals is therefore necessarily a serious obstacle in the road to the projected socialist world order. On the other hand, a corrupt black communist government in the guise of the "liberation" movements that are so zealously supported by the One-Worlders in the Western governments would very soon find itself obliged to repay its credits to the financial powers of Wall Street in the form of the mineral wealth of South Africa.

From that angle we can now understand the apparently irrational handouts, the multimillion-dollar credits given to almost every country in the world; often positively forced on them and in many cases – and this is intentional – with no prospect of ever being repaid. It might not seem the soundest way of doing business; but it becomes intelligible when we realize that these vast sums are guaranteed to the banks by the Western taxpayers through their governments.

The international bankers have no scruples; and they are certainly not simple or stupid. For repayment or security all they require is the assign-

ment of the minerals, future crop yields or other economic assets of the countries concerned. Thus they are the real masters of the countries whose governments they control.

The undeclared worldwide war against South Africa can only be understood against this background. How it will end will affect not only the black and white people of this country but also all the other peoples of the – so far – free world.

The Decisive Domino

The road from Moscow to Paris leads through Africa. If the capitalist world is encircled in that way it will collapse like a house of cards.

Lenin

It is a constant cause of amazement to see how the hidden wirepullers are able to mobilize great masses of people and use them for activities that they would normally have had nothing to do with unless they had been thoroughly brainwashed beforehand. They will demonstrate and rampage and trot out their shallow arguments without the least suspicion that they might be manipulated or exploited for purposes that are ultimately often self-destructive.

As I write these words the 22nd “Church Day” has been drawing to a close in Frankfurt, Germany. According to the newspaper reports⁴⁴ an entire day was devoted to “discussing the situation in South Africa”. A hundred thousand people, including the Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, filled the Wald-Stadion in Frankfurt to hear Dr Allan Boesak, the South African president of the World Federation of Reformed Churches, conduct the closing service, “constantly interrupted by thunderous applause”, in which he pleaded for a “new world” (order?) filled with freedom and justice. Ten thousand “demonstrators against apartheid” later marched through the streets of Frankfurt, riotously at times.

It is significant that a man like Dr Boesak should have been chosen as chief speaker for this so-called Church Day, a man who is known in South Africa more for his inciting speeches under the red hammer and sickle flag than as a faithful shepherd bringing the Gospel message to his troubled flock.

What many people in Germany and elsewhere seem not to grasp is that the attack on South Africa – whatever they may think – has nothing to do with abolishing apartheid but everything to do with abolishing the whole Western system of liberal-democratic institutions. Western “capitalism” is to be replaced by “scientific socialism” – i.e. marxism. The spread of the

marxist-leninist ideology all over the globe is still the declared objective of the USSR.

As Dr Dirk Kunert writes in his study, *Moscow, the World-Revolutionary Process and the Southern Hemisphere*,"⁴⁵ the leadership of the Soviet Union is "systematically and deliberately pursuing the strategic calculation of denying the United States unimpeded access to the whole hemispherical 'world island' (of Europe-Asia-Africa) and blockading it with its maritime presence."

Again he writes: "The separation of Western Europe from the American defence forces and the attempt to turn the Mediterranean area into a *mare sovieticum* by 'finlandization' of its southern flanks and an irruption into North African space are essential components of the soviet revolutionizing policy, which has as its ultimate objective 'hemispheric exclusion'. But as long as there is a danger that the USA might use the extensive regions south of the Sahara as possible concentration areas to win back ground lost in the northern hemisphere, the prospects of a final soviet victory either by military means or diplomatic and political intimidation are diminished.

"The soviet options expand in direct proportion as the American options shrink. Geopolitical calculations determine the spasmodic advances of the USSR in tandem with proxy troops and 'national liberation movements' which, once they have seized power, turn into marxist-leninist cadre parties organically, politically and militarily bound to the USSR. Without engaging itself directly the USSR can use its newly-won allies to destabilize the local opponents, neutralize them as geopolitical partners and finally swallow them up and eliminate them as resource bases for the capitalist world.

"With these objectives in view the present leadership of the USSR is still moving along the strategic line drawn by Lenin and Stalin: 'If you regard Europe and America as the front, the theatre of the decisive battles between socialism and imperialism, then you can regard the not yet independent nations and the colonies, with their raw materials, fuels, foodstuffs and huge supplies of human material as the hinterland, the reserves of imperialism. To win the war it is necessary not only to be victorious at the front but also to revolutionize the opponent's reserves in his hinterland. Therefore the victory of the proletarian world revolution can be regarded as certain only if the proletariat is able to combine its own revolutionary struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat with the working masses of the subject nations and the colonies against the power of imperialism.' "

According to Dr Kunert, "the orchestrated advance against South Africa from Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe (which since Mugabe's recent tour of the Eastern bloc states look as though about to slip into the Russian sphere of influence) would if successful press on a vital nerve of the industrial world. South Africa, so often anathematized as a pariah, actually

performs two essential functions for the West: with its own 'containment policy' it acts as a local force against African clients of Russia and thus forms an effective barrier. It also supplies reliable trading partners with crucial raw materials which keep the non-communist industrial world in being as economic and military factors, at negotiated prices.

"If that mineral 'lung' were to collapse, then the economic and armaments capabilities of the Western defensive alliance would also inevitably collapse. And the finlandization of Europe, Japan and North America would be the immediate disastrous consequence. Clausewitz's statement: The conqueror always loves peace ... Preferably he would like to enter our country without resistance – would then become very real, at least in Western Europe."

As we have seen in previous chapters, South Africa and the USSR dominate the world market in the most important categories of crucial raw materials. A minerals cartel controlled by Moscow could manipulate world prices and drive the non-communist industrial nations into inflationary spirals, as in fact happened when the Americans were compelled to rely on the soviet market after the embargo on Rhodesian chromium.

Although South Africa has no oil deposits worth mentioning – large supplies of natural gas have, however, recently been found off the coast at Mossel Bay – the geographical situation of the country gives it a key position in the security or obstruction of tankers from the Gulf to the West. The Cape route round South Africa is the most overcrowded shipping lane in the world. It has been estimated that during the closure of the Suez Canal about twenty-five thousand ships rounded the Cape annually. Now, as a result of improved building techniques, almost ninety per cent of modern tankers are too big to get through the Suez Canal; so that the reopening of the Canal had practically no effect on the strategic importance of the Cape route.

With a puppet government established in South Africa by Moscow the USSR would command the sea route round the Cape and could turn off the oil tap to Europe and to a lesser degree to North America at will. Remember also that South Africa supplies large parts of the African continent with food, technical know-how and aid of all sorts and (despite all assertions to the contrary) acts as a stabilizing factor for many black African states. Its dominating influence reaches far beyond its own immediate territory. Add to that a great superiority in the manufacture of arms that has made it the strongest military power in Africa. Its highly-developed military machine, in the opinion of international experts, could advance as far as the Equator without much difficulty if it wanted to; not to speak of its nuclear capabilities.

South Africa is now not only the regional super-power of the subcontinent; it must be seen as the leading power of the whole African continent.

Whoever controls South Africa will have a decisive influence on the stability and the future development of the entire continent. If South Africa were to slide into the Russian sphere of influence it would most probably set off a "domino effect" that would sooner or later drag the whole continent into the communist camp. Nor would the domino effect be confined to Africa; it would have dangerous effects on the Western industrial states of Europe and North America that depend on the African raw materials.

In such a case the world-revolutionary expansionist policy of marxism-leninism would have entered its decisive phase, the object of which is not the abolition of apartheid or "the liberation of the blacks" but the throttling of vitally necessary raw materials to Europe and the USA; and the creation of a communist world empire would have taken a great stride forward.

"South Africa has become the pivot of soviet revolutionizing policy in the southern hemisphere," writes Dr Kunert. "Soviet experts on economic warfare consider that South Africa is the Achilles' heel of the capitalist-imperialist camp, the survival of which largely depends on the outcome of the political and military battle in the subcontinent."

The strategic line for the conquest of South Africa has been systematically followed for years: paramilitary operations, terrorism, guerrilla warfare, "disinformation", the use of proxy troops, the enlistment of Western "useful idiots" faithful to the leninist ideology, propaganda and psychological warfare.

The total strategy includes the following tactics:

- During the sixties and seventies the USSR shifted the fulcrum of its worldwide effort to the Gulf region and the African continent. The objectives are the wealth of raw materials and the petroleum of the oil-producing countries.
- The West, dependent as it is on its imports and its vitally important sea routes both in war and peace, is increasingly menaced by soviet control of them and the countries supplying raw materials everywhere. The possession of strategically dominating positions and strategic raw materials would bring the eastern bloc considerably nearer to a bloodless victory.
- Simultaneously the West will be stultified by deliberate "disinformation" about the actual worldwide events and the communist subversion of "third-world" countries will be carefully concealed or camouflaged.

In this *Decision in the South – the Flanking Move through the Third World* Heinrich Jordis Lohausen writes:⁴⁶

"The question whether Europe and South Africa will come to grief over America, or whether, as is more likely, America and Europe will come to

grief over South Africa, or whether both of these can be avoided at the last minute, is largely a question of that psychological warfare of which we have spoken: Europe and America will be struck at in South Africa through their war industries and by sea strategy, while South Africa will be struck at by propaganda. Moreover, that it is not a matter of more or less political rights for the black population – apart from the fact that it is the best-run and still the freest country in all Africa – but entirely a matter of minerals and naval bases, has long been common knowledge, and not only in China. But no politician in the so-called free West would ever dare to say so publicly.”

The South African “domino” is therefore pregnant with fate for the Western world, which is quite happy to saw off the branch it is sitting on. “Though this be madness, yet there is method in’t ...”

However, if we start from the assumption that the “method” is there by design – at any rate of powerful forces behind the scenes – then we can begin to make sense of the non-sense. The governments of Western Europe and America are not composed of idiots (at least not exclusively) who simply don’t know about the strategic situation of the Cape route and the critical reserves of raw materials in South Africa. Despite all the rhetoric they too know perfectly well that the blacks are better off here than anywhere else in the world. If, nevertheless, they intend to make common cause with their communist “adversaries” to force South Africa to accept measures that would lead to the extinction of the rule of the white government by the Moscow-controlled ANC terrorist organization, as we shall see in later chapters, then the reader in Europe or America may begin to realize that he is being hocused by his own government as to its true intentions in southern Africa.

During the past years has not one pro-Western country after another been pushed into the communist camp with the help of the West itself? Take Vietnam, Nicaragua, Cuba, Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique and many others. Iran, the Philippines, Taiwan, Chile, SWA/Namibia and South Africa are now on the list of those condemned to be “prepared” for assimilation by the socialist world state. Most Western governments have long been accomplices – whether willingly or under pressure – in a worldwide charade that shall be completed by the end of this century and shall herd the human race into the welcoming arms of the world-government-to-be. And that will make quite sure that there will no longer be any strong independent national states – especially those with strategic positions and their own supplies of raw materials – in existence.

Then, to all outward appearance there will be a supranational world authority that will take charge of the management and distribution of the riches of this earth; but in reality it will be in the hands of a high-finance oli-

garchy that established and controls the UNO and will then have reached the zenith of their total command of the economic and political power of the entire globe.

The fusion of communism with the socialist Western “new world order” has long since been planned in all its details, and it will be pushed ahead step by step. The people of those countries that had hitherto refused to submit to the whole-hog ambitions of the planners of the “new world” will be shown with unmistakable clarity where everything is leading: “... and if you don’t like it, we’ll give you communism.”

The reform-minded former State President of South Africa, P.W. Botha, put it in another way some time ago. He warned the white electorate who were reluctant to accept reform: “Adapt or die!”

B.
THE “NEW
WORLD ORDER”

The Conspiracy of the Bankers

The hour has struck for high finance to dictate its laws to the world publicly, as it has hitherto done in secrecy ... High finance is called upon to enter into succession to the empires and the kingdoms with an authority extending not only over one country but over the whole globe.

**Declaration on the founding of the International Bank Alliance in
Paris, 1913.**

As we learn from a report by the Bank for International Settlement in Basle, in the first half of 1986 the USSR headed the list of debtor nations deep in the red with the international banks.

“Moscow received five thousand million rands in new credits from seventeen Western nations, most of it long-term,” wrote *The Citizen* (31.12.86), “while East Germany and Hungary received 880 million each.”

That is only a tiny fraction of the billions of dollars that Western governments and private banks have siphoned off into the communist countries ever since the earliest days of the bolshevist revolution in 1917. Without funding from Western high finance, communism, with its absurd economic system, could not have survived and would have collapsed long ago. That financial support has enabled the USSR to grow into the second biggest military power in the world after the USA and at the same time to pursue its subversive activities in all the non-communist countries.

Who can understand the logic of the super-capitalists who finance a totalitarian system that has sworn to engulf the capitalist West, while at the same time – ostensibly on moral grounds – calling for economic sanctions and “disinvestment” against South Africa and refusing it new credits?

Would one not suppose that these unimaginably rich financial powers, whether on “moral principle” or for reasons of strategy or commercial advantage, would act in precisely the opposite way?

To understand these incongruities we must go back to the beginning of this century and take note of an event that was to stamp its mark on its further development.

In his book *Die Bankiersverschwörung (The Conspiracy of the Bankers)*⁴⁷, published in 1954, Eustace Mullins tells us how on the evening of 22 November 1910 certain very highly-placed personages assembled at Hoboken station, New Jersey, to board a train on a secret mission. One of them, the Republican senator Nelson Aldrich, had recently returned from Europe as chairman of the National Currency Commission.

"This commission," says Mullins, "was created by Congress to satisfy the general demand for government measures against those big bankers who had artificially caused a panic in 1907. They were charged with the duty of thoroughly studying the practice of the financial world before drafting reforms of the banking and monetary laws for Congress. At the same time some people were doubtful whether a law that came into being under the direction of a man of Aldrich's known sympathies and activities would constitute a genuine reform. But Congress remained deaf to such criticisms."

Along with Aldrich there were three well-known bankers. One was Frank Vanderlip, president of the most powerful bank in America at that time, the National City Bank of New York. It belonged to the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., which represented the Rockefeller oil interests and the railways and owned great possessions in South America. In 1898 they had been accused of leveraging the USA into the war with Spain.

The other two were Henry P. Davison, senior partner in the J.P. Morgan company, and Charles D. Norton, president of Morgan's First National Bank of New York.

These three men were leaders of the small group of New York bankers who were reputed to be in control of the entire finances and credits of the USA. It was these men who controlled all the oil, the railroads, the communications and heavy industry in the country.

Another person who accompanied them to the station, "to spend a quiet weekend in the country", as Vanderlip told a reporter, was Paul Moritz Warburg, a partner in the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. His parent institution, M.M. Warburg Co. in Hamburg and Amsterdam, was the principal German representative of the great European banking family, the Rothschilds. Warburg was accompanied by Benjamin Strong, a man who had come into prominence as an able assistant to J.P. Morgan during the panic engineered by Wall Street in 1907.

As Mullins tells the story: "Aldrich's private railway carriage, which had left Hoboken with curtains drawn, took the financiers to Jekyll Island in the state of Georgia, to the very exclusive Jekyll Island Hunt Club, of which J.P. Morgan and some other influential New York bankers were members. But on this occasion the Aldrich group were not interested in hunting. They had come to Jekyll Island to get through a lot of work, and in secrecy at that.

Why all this secrecy? Why this journey of over a thousand miles in a locked railway carriage to a remote hunting club?"

According to Mullins's investigations, the Aldrich group went there to work out the Banking and Monetary bill that had to be drawn up for the National Monetary Commission of Congress. The future control over the money and credits of the United States was at stake. According to Mullins, Congress would have been unable to pass any reform that was not approved by or favourable to the New York bankers, otherwise the powers of influence of the responsible representatives would have been put paid to.

Thus the extracongressional financial powers drafted a bill in their own favour to which Senator Aldrich gave shape for acceptance by Congress. What was the point of all this?

The plan worked out on Jekyll Island was a design for a central bank, such as already existed in Europe, controlled not by the legislators but by high finance. The reasons for this new financial reform were widely challenged by the public. It was generally believed that the artificially induced financial panics of 1873, 1893 and 1907 had been contrived by the unscrupulous bankers, resulting in great distress throughout the country. What people wanted was a law to prevent any repetition of such artificially-induced money panics.

The bankers gathered together on Jekyll Island now set themselves the task of drawing up a bill that would protect their own interests but could be passed off as a "people's banking bill". As Mullins tells us: "In Paul Warburg's opinion it was highly desirable to avoid the name of 'central bank'; and he therefore proposed the designation of 'Federal Reserve System'. That would allay public suspicion that the intention was to create a central bank. Nevertheless in reality the Federal Reserve System would possess the three most important traditional functions of a central bank: it would be able to control the property of private persons who drew their dividends from stocks and shares and the circulation of money in the national economy; it would have the right of control over all State moneys; and it could involve the United States in serious foreign wars and thus incite it to financial participation and plunge it into debt."

Another problem that confronted the conspirators was their attempt to free the system from all control and supervision by Congress whereby their draft laws became unconstitutional from their inception. Mullins describes in complete detail how the bankers nonetheless contrived by cunning manipulation to get the Federal Reserve Bill accepted on 23 December 1913 (when many of the congressmen were absent on Christmas vacation) and signed by President Wilson; and so it came into force.

"On that day," says Mullins, "the Constitution ceased to be the basis of

government of the American people; and its liberties were handed over to a small group of international bankers."

To understand this bankers' conspiracy more clearly it is necessary to have some elementary knowledge of banking, and particularly of the international bankers. It would of course be an over-simplification to blame the international bankers for the whole conspiracy that has had such an effect on this our century; although they have in fact played the key rôle in it.

In his book *Die Insider*⁴⁸ (English title: *None Dare Call it Conspiracy*) Gary Allen says we should imagine the conspiracy as a hand, of which one finger represents international banking, while the others stand for foundations, anti-religious movements, Fabian socialism and communism.

Professor Quigley, who has been quoted several times in this book and who has himself for years been closely associated with the *insiders*, says quite bluntly that the international bankers "are pursuing no less a goal than control of the whole world through the power factor of finances."⁴⁹

How are they to achieve that? Well, as we know, governments usually spend more money than they raise in taxes.

Therefore they are obliged to take out credits that the national central banks lend them – at high rates of interest, naturally. The public is led to believe that the government is borrowing these credits by means of fixed-interest bonds from investors at home and abroad. In fact, however, only a minute proportion of the national debt is borne in that form. Most government bonds, with the exception of those which because of their credit funds belong to the government itself, are in the possession of the gigantic banking firms that we designate international banks.

"Give me the powers of an issuing bank," Amschel Meyer Rothschild once said, "and I care not who makes the laws."

Since the international bankers succeeded in establishing an independent private issuing bank in the form of the "federal reserve system" in the USA, they have practically unlimited means at their disposal to lend. The legislature even transferred to them the sole right to issue banknotes. The result of this absurd situation was that the international banking empires were able to accumulate vast resources through the ever-increasing interest payments.

It is obviously in the bankers' interest to keep sending government debts higher and higher. The greater the debt, the greater the return in interest. But nothing drives a government deeper into debt than a war. It was by no means an uncommon practice among the international bankers to finance both sides in a bloody military conflict.

The first big "skim-off" for the bankers came with the outbreak of the first world war – only three years after the passing of the Federal Reserve Act;

and because it was so magnificent they built the necessary conditions for another great war into the Versailles Treaty in 1919-20.

In Europe the Rothschild dynasty had already made sure that independent national banks should be set up in the different countries as private corporations. The Bank of England, the Banque de France, the Landeszentralbank von Deutschland and the Reserve Bank of South Africa are by no means the property of their respective governments, as most people suppose. They are privately owned monopolies.

As we now know, the second world war could have been ended at least a year earlier; the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were entirely unnecessary, since the Japanese had already made overtures to capitulate; and the war in Vietnam, according to some American generals,⁵⁰ could have been won in a few months instead of lost to the communists after ten years' fighting and 58 156 American dead – if it had suited the international financiers.

As Gary Allen writes in *Die Insider* (pp. 54 / 55): "All those who work for dictatorial control over modern nations understand the need for a central bank. The fifth point in Karl Marx's programme of conquest, the Communist Manifesto, reads as follows: 'Centralization of credit in the hands of the State by a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly'."

Lenin is quoted as having said that in the communization of a state ninety per cent of the success could be ascribed to the establishment of a central bank alone. "Such conspirators knew," says Allen, "that a country could not be controlled without military force unless the country had a central bank by which the national economy could be controlled."

In his book *Tragedy and Hope* Professor Quigley writes (pp. 326/327): "It must not be felt that these heads of the world's chief central banks were themselves substantive powers in world finance. They were not. Rather, they were the technicians and agents of the dominant investment bankers of their own countries, who had raised them up and were perfectly capable of throwing them down. The substantive financial powers of the world were in the hands of these investment bankers (also called 'international' or 'merchant' bankers) who remained largely behind the scenes in their own unincorporated private banks. These formed a system of international cooperation and national dominance which was more private, more powerful, and more secret than that of their agents in the central banks."

How powerful are these central banks?

They control our money supply and the rates of interest, by which they manipulate the whole economy. They can bring about inflation or deflation, recession or boom, and send stock exchange prices up or down to suit themselves.

The Federal Reserve of America is so powerful that Congressman Wright Patman, a former chairman of the House Banking Committee, asserted: "In the United States now there are in reality two governments ... We have the regularly constituted government ... Then we have an independent, uncontrolled, uncoordinated government in the Federal Reserve System, which wields the financial power reserved for Congress by the Constitution."⁵¹

One of the most crucial events of this century, to which we have frequently referred in this book, was undoubtedly the Bolshevik revolution in Russia. That event has been abundantly misreported and misrepresented; for the historians have successfully contrived to conceal the true facts from posterity.

It is now generally alleged that communism is a movement of the oppressed masses, who have risen against their exploiting employers. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

Gary Allen gives us some insight into the historical facts (*Die Insider*, p. 92): "The success of communism in Russia is now generally ascribed to the circumstance that communism had behind it the sympathies of the Russian people, who were only too ready for another system after the tyranny of the tsars. That view misses the historical facts.

"While everybody knows that the Bolshevik revolution took place in November 1917, very few know that the Tsar had already abdicated seven months earlier, in March. When Tsar Nicolas II abdicated, a provisional government was formed by Prince Lvov, which was to be based on the American model. Unfortunately the Lvov government gave way to the Kerensky régime. Kerensky, a so-called democratic socialist, was to lead a transitional government for the communists ...

"He proclaimed a general amnesty for communists and other revolutionaries [as is now demanded of South Africa: author] many of whom had been exiled after the abortive red revolution of 1905. Thus a quarter of a million dedicated revolutionaries returned to Mother Russia to seal Kerensky's fate."

So we see: even in the Soviet Union it was not the oppressed masses who carried the Bolsheviks to power. As happened in other communist or socialist countries, the overthrow was not brought about by the people: it was forced upon the peoples from above – or from outside –. A brief summary may make that clear.

The later leaders of the revolution, Lenin and Trotsky, were still in exile: the first in Switzerland, the second in America. When the Tsar abdicated the Bolsheviks were an insignificant political force. "They did not return to Russia at the urging of the oppressed masses, **but powerful men from Europe and the United States helped them to power.**"⁵²

"Lenin was sent in the famous sealed train across a Europe at war. He had with him five or six million dollars in gold. The whole affair was arranged by the German High Command and Max Warburg ..."⁵³

Here we can quote only a few of the details of the involvement of high finance in the Bolshevik revolution. The following paraphrases from Gary Allen's *Die Insider* should suffice for the purposes of our argument. He tells us (pp. 95-98) that "The Germans had apparently a plausible justification for their financing of Lenin and Trotsky. The two who were mainly responsible for financing Lenin were Max Warburg and Alexander Helphand, who had been thrown out of Russia. They were able to claim that they were serving the interests of their Vaterland by financing Lenin. At any rate these two loyal 'patriots' refrained from informing the Kaiser about their plan to foment a communist revolution in Russia ..."

Again, Allen says, "Yet another perspective opens up when we recall that it was a brother of Max Warburg, Paul Warburg, whom we know as the chief initiator of the Federal Reserve System; and indeed, thanks to his position on the steering committee of the Federal Reserve, he played a key rôle in the financing of the American war effort."

Again: "the father-in-law of Max Warburg's brother Felix, Jacob Schiff, a senior partner in Kuhn, Loeb & Co., had a hand in financing Trotsky. According to the *Journal American* of New York on 3 February 1949: 'It is now estimated that Jacob Schiff invested about twenty million dollars for the ultimate triumph of bolshevism in Russia – so says Jacob's grandson, John Schiff.' "

Allen quotes from the book *Tsarism and the Revolution* by the Russian General Arsène de Goulévitch: "The principal suppliers of the financial resources of the revolution, however, were neither crazy Russian millionaires nor Lenin's armed bandits. The decisive sums came mainly from certain British and American circles who had long supported the cause of the Russian revolution ...

"The important part played by the wealthy American banker Jacob Schiff in events in Russia is no longer a secret, although it has not yet been even partly disclosed.

"Goulévitch quotes General Alexander Nezhvolodov in his book on the Bolshevik revolution: 'In April 1917 Jacob Schiff openly declared that, thanks to his financial support, the revolution in Russia had been successful. In the spring of that same year he began to subsidize Trotsky ... At the same time Trotsky and his adherents were also being subsidized by Max Warburg and Olaf Aschberg of Den Nye Banken in Stockholm ... also by the Rhineland-Westphalian syndicate and Zhivotovsky ... whose daughter Trotsky later married.' "

According to Allen, Jacob Schiff spent millions to procure the overthrow

of the Tsars and then the Kerensky government. Even long after the true character of the Bolsheviks had become universally known he was still sending money to Russia. It turned out to be a good investment.

"According to Goulévitch: 'Mr Bakhmetiev, the last Imperial Russian ambassador to the United States, told us that after their victory the Bolsheviks transferred six hundred million rubles to Kuhn, Loeb & Co. – Schiff's firm – between the years 1918 and 1922.' "

As Gary Allen's careful researches have proved, the financing of the Bolshevik revolution and consequently the establishment of the communist system began with a syndicate of international financiers to which besides the Schiff-Warburg clique Morgan and Rockefeller also belonged. According to documentary evidence, the Morgan organization put at least a million dollars in the kitty of the red revolution.

South African readers may find it worthy of note that, according to Goulévitch's statements, an extremely astute Englishman by the name of Lord Milner – one of the protagonists in the instigation of the Boer War – "paid over 21 million roubles towards financing the Russian revolution."

Milner had previously been leader of the secret Round Table group, which was supported by the house of Rothschild.

In connection with the Bolshevik revolution we find many names cropping up that also played a part in the creation of the Federal Reserve System. The same people were also concerned in the introduction of the marxist-inspired graduated income tax, the establishment of tax-free foundations (see Chapter 14) and the entry of America into the first world war.

Let me emphasize it once more. A revolution – in Russia then as in South Africa now – can only be successfully accomplished by skilful organizations and financed by powerful backers. As for the "oppressed masses", they are seldom in a position to provide either of those things.

What had the bankers to gain when they brought about the Russian revolution with their financial support? Well, for their plan of total world domination they needed to create a starting position, a geographical hinterland from which they could begin to threaten all the other nations in the world. In short, they needed to "create" and magnify an enemy who would serve as an extended arm.

Thus some of the richest and most powerful men in the world financed a movement whose declared purpose is – ostensibly – to strip precisely such men as the Rothschilds, the Rockefellers, the Schiffs, the Warburgs, the Morgans, the Harrimans, the Milners and so on of their wealth. That is the pretence; but the truth is otherwise. How is it, then, that these supermagnates aren't afraid of international communism? Quite simple: because they **control** it. Is there any other logical explanation?

As Allen tells us (pp. 103-4): "We know that a clique of American financiers not only assisted in the establishment of communism in Russia but also devoted considerable efforts to keeping it alive. Since 1918 this clique has been regularly transferring money and also technical information to the USSR; which is possibly even more important.

"That is clearly set forth ... in the three-volume work *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development* by the scientist Antony Sutton of the Hoover Institute at Stanford University. By citing mostly official documents in the State Department Sutton shows convincingly that essentially everything that the Russians possess was obtained from the West. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the USSR was made in the USA," Allen concludes.

This book tries to make it clear that these facts are incontrovertible. Since then communism has been forced on one country after another. As we shall see, the United States and Great Britain pursue this policy most energetically. The betrayal of Rhodesia by Britain into the hands of the communists and now a recipient of British economic and military aid is only one example from recent history.

At this point I must emphasize that it is not only certain groups in high finance that are actively involved in the international conspiracy; there are other internationalist groups, "New Age" movements, Freemason organisations, etc. that are also working for a socialist world government. They make use of a great multiplicity of disguised methods to attain their ends in the labour, religious and race conflicts. That is particularly relevant to the general attack on South Africa, as we shall see in later chapters.

Nor is it my intention to associate all big businessmen and bankers with the conspiracy. We must make a clear distinction between free enterprise and international finance capitalism of monopolists and mega-bankers.

This chapter would not be complete if we did not say a word or two about the more or less secret societies that were founded by the bankers to further their plans for world domination. In that connection I must once more quote Professor Quigley, one of the most competent experts in this field:⁵⁴

"There does exist, and has existed for a generation, an international Anglophile network which operates, to some extent, in the way the radical Right believes the communists act. In fact, this network, which we may identify as the Round Table groups, has no aversion to co-operating with the communists, or any other groups, and frequently does so. I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records."

For the sake of completeness we should at this point mention that

the conspiratorial network of which Professor Quigley speaks is not a phenomenon of this century only. It began with the satanic plans of one Adam Weishaupt, Professor of Catholic Canon Law at the University of Ingolstadt, who founded the Order of the Illuminati ("enlightened ones") in Germany on 1 May 1776. The Illuminati worshipped Lucifer, the "Light-Bringer", and the objective that they had set themselves was to infiltrate all governments of Europe and all religious institutions with their own people and so gradually gain control of all mankind. They insinuated their members into existing and new Freemasons' lodges, infected them with Weishaupt's secret plans, and in that way quickly spread all over Europe. These conspiratorial ideas were welcomed in British high financial circles, which had long been seeking a way to gaining control of governments and countries.

They financed and supported the Illuminati and later gave Karl Marx the task of writing his Communist Manifesto, based on Weishaupt's ideas, as a signpost pointing towards world domination. In 1864 Marx founded the *Internationale* for the same purpose, and on that base there arose the concept of international communism, which was funded by the same financial powers that even now control world politics behind the scenes.

The world revolution of the "proletarian worker masses" was from then on to sweep all over the globe and bring every country under the domination of the "dictatorship of the proletariat", controlled as it was by high finance.

How successful the conspirators' plan has been up to now we can see from the fact that since the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 communism has expanded to such an extent that it now has nearly eighteen thousand million human beings under its control, about 36 per cent of the population of the world. The area ruled by the marxists amounts to 47 million square kilometres; 33 per cent of the total land surface. Since the revolution up to the present on average seventy thousand people a day have been subjected under the Bolshevik slavery. They are the populations of 56 states, 41 of them since the end of the second world war.⁵⁵

With the aid of the most powerful world financial circles that have ever existed and of thousands of well-paid personages in politics, finance, industry, church organizations and the mass media – who also meet all over the world in Freemason lodges – the conspiracy is purposefully marching towards the fulfilment of its plans for a united world or "new world order".

As a future world government they founded first the League of Nations, then the United Nations. Both were and are completely controlled and dominated by them. The "democratically elected" governments supported by Wall Street – in Washington as in the Kremlin – are little more than eyewash for the people. By supporting only those candidates and party-

leaders who are prepared to steer the course set by the One-Worlders, and with all the mass media in their hands, and almost unlimited financial resources, they have absolute control over the results of elections. To the super-rich Illuminati it makes no odds which party wins, since they have their candidates in all camps.

It is therefore of no importance whatever – and the South Africans in particular should clearly understand this – whether a “liberal” like Jimmy Carter or a “conservative” like Ronald Reagan is sitting in the White House. The main line of American foreign policy is still the same; only the rhetoric changes. Under Carter it was open abuse from Washington; under Reagan it was called “constructive engagement”, mixed with sanctions, “friendly” pressure, blackmail and exhortations to commit pol-itical suicide.

In Europe also one can trace the socialist trend to the world state for decades. The proposed European union, a single European currency and the creation of a European central bank are merely stages along that road.

There is hardly any distinction left between so-called “conservative” and “leftwing” parties except that the representatives of one lot usually wear a collar and tie while the other lot prefer a more “progressive-proletarian” look.

Now I do not wish anybody to think that every member of a government and every delegate or member of a parliament is a conscious stooge of the international conspirators. Apart from occupants of vital key positions – and many of those even are unaware of their real function – most of them are honourable servants of the state who would reject any accusation that they were involved in a worldwide conspiracy with scorn and indignation. Nevertheless many of them are manipulated in such a fashion – or removed from office – that they follow the beaten track. They have no option, if they are to continue to occupy their privileged positions.

How many Americans, British, Germans or South Africans understand the real driving forces behind the general attack on South Africa? How many have ever heard of the Trilateral Commission, that liberal-internationalist group that now dictates the entire foreign and fiscal policies of the United States and strongly influences the governments of the other Western countries?

A few years ago the internationally respected South African journalist Aida Parker made a study that was printed by the South African newspaper *The Citizen* in several instalments. The title of this extraordinarily controversial and well-researched study was: *Secret US War against South Africa*. The contents of the series were apparently so “hot” that Miss Parker had to give up her job at the paper and now publishes her own excellent *Aida Parker Newsletter*.⁵⁶

In her study she explains that the Trilateral Commission really began in

New York in 1921 when a private organization under the name of the Council on Foreign Relations, or CFR, was founded. Over the years the CFR, which had the support of such financial titans as the Rockefellers, grew into the most influential private organization in the world; in fact into the “invisible government” of America.

According to Aida Parker, its (then) seventeen hundred members came from the spheres of high finance, politics, the universities, commerce and the principal foundations in America. Other members were leading representatives of multinational concerns such as IBM, ITT, Standard Oil, Xerox, Pan American, Firestone, US Steel and others, and from the mass media: *Time*, *Life*, *Fortune*, *Newsweek*, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post* and many others; in short, politically and economically the most powerful group of people in the USA.

The Trilateral Commission was founded in 1973 on the initiative of the multimillionaire David Rockefeller, president of the mighty Chase Manhattan Bank, which has a branch in Moscow, as an extension of the CFR. Rockefeller, at that time chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, appointed Zbigniew Brzezinski, a Harvard professor born in Poland, as its director. Since then members of the Trilateral Commission – as previously members of the CFR had done – have recruited up to eighty per cent of all the important government officers in the USA. Is it any wonder, then, that the main line of American foreign policy is always the same?

On enquiry the declared purpose of the Trilateral Commission was said to be to bring the peoples of Western Europe, Japan and North America together, “to promote closer co-operation on common problems between those three regions.”

Like the CFR the Trilateral Commission is financed by the mighty Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation, the Lilly Endowment and the Kettering Foundation. As Aida Parker writes: “All these are well-known liberal internationalists with the declared goal of bringing into being a world government or a superstate.”

In its issue no. 4 of 1985 *Memo-Press*⁵⁷ says of Brzezinski: “Brzezinski writes in his book *Between Two Ages* that in the face of the problems of the world a central control of the world is necessary.

“In *Encounter*, January 1968 Brzezinski stated, among other things, that with modern data-banks it is now possible to carry out an almost permanent supervision of every citizen. And according to *Diagnosen* no. 8 of 1983 he is of the opinion that a limited atomic war would have a stabilizing effect and facilitate international control measures.”

If the Trilateral Commission, together with the CFR, is the “secret government of America”, then it is important that we should pause for a

moment to become better acquainted with the person of its principal thinker. Brzezinski divides the modern history of mankind into four phases.⁵⁸

According to his assessment, the first, very primitive, phase was that of religion, in which it was insisted that the destiny of men lay essentially in the hand of God.

Such a notion is evidently quite unacceptable to an enlightened or "illuminated" mind, such as the Pole from Warsaw takes his own to be, because it bears witness to "a narrow-mindedness resulting from vast ignorance, illiteracy and a field of vision restricted to the immediate surroundings".

In his third phase Brzezinski sees marxism as "a further crucial and creative phase in the maturation of the human image of the universe." At the same time marxism represents a victory of the external, active man over the internal, passive man and a victory of thought over faith.

As for the "rivalry" between Russia and America, Brzezinski seems to find nothing wrong with the Russian position. "The final result of the contest, because of the historical superiority of the communist system, is a foregone conclusion."

These are the thought-processes of a man who, under orders from high finance, directs an "enlightened" body that has a decisive influence on world politics and whose goal is the creation of a world government. Brzezinski's ideas no doubt tally exactly with those of another influential member of the Trilateral Commission: Henry (Heinz) Kissinger.

These "illuminati" are obviously champions of a "New Age" world community ruled by an élite and influenced, supervised and controlled by means of the most up-to-date techniques.

As we learn from a brochure issued by the Trilateral Commission, a "reorganization" of the present world economic system is of cardinal importance for the creation of a "new world order", and a "new rôle" must be found for the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF).⁵⁹

A new world currency, the "bancor", must be created. This currency, as in the case of the special drawing rights of the IMF, would replace gold and the US dollar as worldwide currency. The New World Order (or new world government), it is emphasized, would ultimately encompass the whole western world, the communist bloc and the "third world".

On the international plane there is a counterpart organization to the CFR in the form of the group known as the Bilderbergers. As Gary Allen says, ⁶⁰"The man who created the Bilderbergers is His Royal Highness Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands. He occupies an important position in Royal Dutch Petroleum (Shell Oil) and in the Société Générale de Belgique, a huge cartel conglomerate with affiliates all over the world. The Bilderbergers

meet once or twice a year. They include in their number leading personages in the USA and Western Europe in the fields of politics and finance. Prince Bernhard makes no secret of the fact that the ultimate objective of the Bilderbergers is also a world government. To that end the Bilderbergers co-ordinate the efforts of the 'insiders' in Europe and America."

Allen then mentions a few revealing names. "The Bilderbergers include among their number such persons from the world of high finance as Baron Edmond de Rothschild, C. Douglas Dillon (CFR) of Dillon Read & Co., Robert MacNamara (former Defence Secretary of the USA and head of the World Bank), Sir Eric Roll of S.G. Warburg & Co. Ltd, Pierce Paul Schweitzer of the International Monetary Fund and George Ball (CFR) of Lehman Brothers."

Together with the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission the Bilderbergers constitute the "brains trust" of a financial élite whose clear-cut objective (concealed, however, from the world public) is the formation of a world government.

It is perfectly clear to the organizers of this body that this "new world order" can only be compassed by the amalgamation of the two super-powers, the USA and the USSR. Those two nations, which are still humbugging the rest of the world with their sham cold war in which they threaten one another with atomic weapons, have been secretly co-operating on many levels for years. Those nations that still refuse to play along (e.g. South Africa) and march their peoples into socialist servitude must be brought to a state of collapse by manipulated economic leverage, revolution and, if necessary, by trumped-up local wars, so that they can build their atheistic totalitarian world hegemony on the ruins of such countries.

The Red World Parliament

We are going to have a world government, whether you like it or not – by force or by consent.

**James Paul Warburg (banker), before an American Senate committee
on 19.2.1950**

The efforts of the Freemasons ostensibly to bring about a free democratic world republic on the model of the United States has no chance of ever becoming a reality. But the establishment of a totalitarian socialist world appears to be merely a matter of time.

That is the conclusion that anyone must come to who follows the developments of current events and has seen through the vast web of an international conspiracy that has spread out from America.

After the successful October Revolution in Russia the international bankers evolved a plan to create a suprastatal government of all nations that would be the forerunner of the world government that they so much desired. Thus the League of Nations was a fringe product of the Versailles peace conference. This first attempt, however, turned out a fiasco. Since the scheme had been made public beforehand, many wide-awake citizens became suspicious and spotted the hidden danger in it. Moreover, at that stage there was still a strong resistance from the American Senate.

The ingenious financial strategists, however, were not discouraged by the failure. They knew that total control of all nations was absolutely necessary for the success of their plans to create a “superbody” that could be used to pave the way to a world government.

To avoid another failure, they contemplated the possibility of filling the American government and all the important administrative posts with their own people. It was at that time that the enormously wealthy Rockefeller family through one of their tax-free foundations established the Council on Foreign Relations (C.F.R.), an organization whose purpose was to train people thoroughly for such spheres of activity and fit them for their ideological, political, financial, military and educational goals.

Its counterpart, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, was established in London. Since then, and increasingly since the end of the Second World War, every key position in the US government has been occupied by members of the CFR. Under the influence of such well-trained agents it was not difficult to found the United Nations Organization (UNO), whose main objective – as it was propagated all over the world – was the preservation of world peace. Yet the reality looks somewhat different.

In the forty-odd years since its foundation there have been no fewer than 140 different wars all over the world, in which ten million human beings have perished.⁶¹ Never before in history has there been a period so beset by war, terrorism and moral corruption. Since 1945 alone over a thousand million people have been brought under the communist yoke. The UNO has never condemned the enslavement of even a single human being; nor has it liberated anyone from communist tyranny. It has never even tried; for freedom is not the business of the United Nations!

The true purpose of this “incipient world government” is the exact opposite. From UN headquarters by the Hudson River in New York the secret instructions go out to decide whether there shall be war or peace, whether revolutions and terrorism shall be supported, whether economic sanctions shall be applied to countries – so long as they fit into the global concept of the world planners.

From its very inception the UNO was envisaged as an instrument for the accomplishment of a totalitarian socialist world order, to be secured through an international armed force that it controlled, including American nuclear weapons, on the model of soviet Russia.

In 1950 the American Secretary of State published a revealing official report titled *Preparation of the Post-War Policy of 1939-1945*.⁶² The report lists the names of the US government officials who were responsible for the planning and legislation for the establishment of the “United Nations”: Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Virginius Coe, Noel Field, Laurance Duggan, Henry Harold Glasser, Victor Perlo, Irving Kaplan, Solomon Adler, Abraham Silverman, William Ullman, William Taylor and John Foster Dulles.

All except Dulles later admitted in sworn statements that they had acted as communist agents. In the case of Dulles also it was known where his sympathies lay. He had been appointed a legal counsellor of the Soviet Union by Stalin. Moreover he had close ties with the J.P. Morgan banking house.

It need surprise no one, therefore, that the Charter of the United Nations is almost identical to the constitution of the Soviet Union; it is merely trimmed to Western linguistic idiom. Even the seals of the UNO and the USSR are very similar; and that again is no accident.

Nor need it surprise anybody that the Founding Fathers of this Red World Parliament allotted the Soviet Union three votes in the General Assembly of the UN, as against only one for the USA and all the other countries in the world.

In the planned humanistic New World Order of the UNO there is no longer any room for God. The delegates to the UN conference, Alger Hiss (USA), Maxim Litvinov (USSR) and Sir Anthony Eden (Great Britain) removed from the UN Charter everything that had any reference to God and got it ratified by the General Assembly inaugural conference in 1945.

Whoever still doubts that the UNO is in essence nothing other than a vast executive apparatus for the imperialistic objectives of the USSR, steered by international high finance to the attainment of its goal of world domination, should take note of the almost incredible fact that the post of Supreme Commander of the UN forces is regularly given to a Russian or his representative. That was arranged in a secret agreement between the American delegate Alger Hiss and Molotov and other high-ranking Russians before the founding of the UNO.

This was confirmed in an article in the New York Times of 22 May 1963, and a UN year-book contains the following names of commanders up to now:

1946-1949	Arkady Alexandrovich Sobolev	USSR
1949-1953	Constantine E. Zinchenko	USSR
1953-1954	Ilya S. Tchernychev	USSR
1955-1957	Dragoslav Protich	Yugoslavia
1958-1959	Anatoly Dobrynin	USSR
1960-1962	Georgy Petrovich Arkadev	USSR
1962-1963	Eugeney D. Kiselev	USSR
1963-1965	Vladimir Pavlovich Suslov	USSR
1965-1968	Alexi E. Nesterenko	USSR
1968-1973	Leonid N. Kutakov	USSR
1973-1978	Arkady N. Shevchenko	USSR
1978-1982	Mikhail D. Sytenko	USSR
1982-	Viacheslav Ustinov	USSR

No wonder the American forces in Korea and Vietnam drew the short straw, when their supreme commander under the UN flag was a Russian. How could General MacArthur successfully fight the communist aggressors in the Korean war when all his military and tactical plans and all directives from Washington first passed through the hands of the communist supreme commander of the UN forces, who was thereby kept constantly informed of every move on the American side?

An American, Major Arch E. Roberts, writes in a book of his published

in 1966, *Victory Denied*⁶³: "Since 1957 ... the United Nations has accelerated its usurpation of military power for subversive purposes. Today the United Nations Security Council is a prime instrumentality for global conquest."

He writes: "This war-making capability is, of course, exactly what the authors of the United Nations Charter intended."

Bear this in mind: Wars bring cash into the coffers of high finance and clear the way to the socialist world state. Nowadays it has become generally habitual to refer derisively to the UNO as a world government of farce or a futile talking-shop with no real influence on world events. A great mistake! It is a deliberately disseminated lie to fool the masses.

While the establishment media conceal and play down the aims and the significance of the world organization, its power has steadily increased to the point of becoming a deadly threat to the freedom and sovereignty of all nations. And now South Africa and South West Africa, or Namibia, are high on the list of the condemned; and a gullible public all over the world is conditioned to believe that it is all about human rights and the liberation of oppressed peoples.

In actual fact, since its inception the United Nations has done everything in its power to undermine the free countries of the world. It has promoted communism wherever possible; it has uttered promises and lies and then betrayed the peoples. Korea, Hungary, Vietnam, Cambodia, Czechoslovakia, Tibet, Afghanistan, the Congo and Katanga: these are only a few of them. The example of Katanga especially should give South Africa food for thought as to whether to allow the UNO "peace force" to be present at envisaged free elections in SWA/Namibia, as the five leading industrial nations demand.

Let us recapitulate briefly: In the course of the so-called decolonization of Africa the Belgian Congo was to be given its independence in 1960. At once two power blocs were formed in the new nation. On one side there was Patrice Lumumba, "a gin-drinking, pot-smoking communist rowdy whom Khrushchev called a great African leader."⁶⁴ Opposite him was the Moïse Tshombe group, firmly anti-communist and an ardent champion of the free market economy.

When Belgian officers were forced to leave the army and the country under pressure from Lumumba, the army went on a spree of looting, rape and murder. The European inhabitants fled in sheer terror, leaving behind everything that they had worked for over the years. Tshombe asked America for help to keep Lumumba's red hordes in check. But Washington refused to help and told him to apply to the UNO for a solution to the problem. On 14 July 1960 the Security Council of the United Nations resolved to send some troops – with the assent of America and Russia – in support of ... Lumumba!

In his book *Die Herrscher* (p. 169) (English title: *The Fourth Reich of the Rich*) Des Griffin writes:

"In less than a week thousands of UNO soldiers streamed into Central Africa. Belgium withdrew its troops immediately and thus handed over the Congo to the dubious mercies of Lumumba's plundering mob and the 'peace troops' of the UN. These last did little or nothing to help those who really needed help and to restore tranquillity and order. Most of the time they looked on inertly as the country was devastated and got more and more under communist control."

That was no doubt also the intention of the UNO strategists, as is clear from what followed. In this situation of chaos and naked anarchy Moïse Tshombe could see no other way than to break away from the communist-controlled central government and declare the independence of Katanga Province. With Belgian help he restored peace and order, and normality returned to life in Katanga.

In the words of his Minister of the Interior, Katanga should become "a bastion of anti-communism in Africa." His fateful words: "I detest communism, and I shall never change my attitude" must have so enraged the "peace-loving" UN Supreme Command that soon afterwards they attacked Katanga with UN forces.

As Des Griffin writes (p. 170):

"After initial reverses the Katangese troops struck back and foiled greater successes by the 'peace troops'. Frustrated by their failures, the UNO soldiers started a terror campaign against the Katangese civilian population. Murder, arson, rape and looting were the order of the day. Ninety per cent of the houses destroyed by UNO bombs were civilian buildings. Astonishingly, the Katangese held the UNO barbarians in check and staved off capitulation from their new homeland."

Griffin continues: "A year later a 'top secret' memorandum of UNO got into the hands of the American Committee for the Support of the Katanga Freedom Fighters. It contained a detailed plan for a second decisive blow against the anti-communist province. It also said 'As in the past the United States will consider itself bound by UN resolutions to make available the necessary transport aircraft, and later helicopters ... The State Department bases its policies on the UN and will by no means neglect its commitments to the UN.' "

On p. 171 he tells us that "on 29 December 1962 the 'peace' barbarians of the UN, fully equipped with American dollars and war material, attacked freedom-loving Katanga for the second time. A month later, when the invaders stormed its last bulwark, Moïse Tshombe said to his brave troops: 'For the last two-and-a-half years you have twice fought heroically against the enemy. Now their superiority has become overwhelming.' Soon

after the last flickering hope of independence and freedom in the Congo died."

A few more examples of what the use of UN "peace forces" meant in practice should suffice to illustrate the wickedness and hypocrisy of this organization, which had been sold to the world as "the last hope of humanity" and which Pope Paul VI had declared to be the reflection of the Kingdom of God on earth.

When Katanga was attacked in 1961 and American Globemaster transports landed UN troops complete with armoured vehicles and artillery in the heart of Elizabethville, they immediately began to shoot up everything that appeared in front of their muzzles; such as the Lubumbashi Hospital (including doctors, nurses and patients), churches, shops, offices, schools and private houses.

On 12 December 1961 Smith Hempstone, African correspondent to the *Chicago News*, reported from Elizabethville:

"A man pulled up in front of the Grand Hotel Leopold II, where we were staying. 'Look at the work of the American criminals,' sobbed the Belgian driver, 'take a picture, and send it back to Kennedy.' In the back seat, his eyes glazed with shock, sat a wounded African man cradling in his arms the body of his ten year old son. The child's face and belly had been smashed to a jelly by United Nations' mortar fragments."

In his book *The Fearful Master*⁶⁵ G. Edward Griffin writes that 46 civilian doctors of Elizabethville issued a joint report of the United Nations' actions against Katanga, which included the following account of the December 12, 1961 UN bombing of the Shinkolobwe Hospital. The doctors wrote: "The Shinkolobwe Hospital is visibly marked with an enormous red cross on the roof of the administrative pavilion. At about 8 a.m. two aeroplanes of the United Nations flew over the hospital twice at very low altitude. At about 9.30 a.m. the aeroplanes started machine-gunning the market square, then the school, and then the hospital, in which there were about 300 patients and their families. In the maternity section the roof, ceilings, walls, beds, tables and chairs were riddled with bullets.

"A bomb exploded in another pavilion ... the roof, the ceiling, half of the walls and half of the furniture had been blasted and shattered. The blood from the wounded makes the building look like a battlefield. In the maternity ward, four Katangan women who had just given birth, one newly born and a child four years of age, were killed."

One Professor Ernest van den Hague made a personal visit to the Congo to witness at first hand the events and conditions there. Commenting on the United Nations' statement that the only civilians wounded in Katanga were combatants in the resistance, he said: "It is hard to speak, as I did, with a

mother whose husband was killed at home, in her presence, with bayonets by U.N. soldiers. She was in the hospital to help take care of her six-year-old, who was also severely wounded by United Nations' bayonets. A child's bayonet wounds are hardly due to having been suspected of being a mercenary combatant."

If we were to list all the horror-stories about the UN forces in the Congo, Korea and other places they would fill hundreds of pages. The Western mass-media, which in the ordinary way of things gladly seize every opportunity to gratify the sensational appetites of their readers, scarcely breathed a word about such things.

The reasons why the communists enthusiastically supported the UNO from its inception can be found in a brochure printed in September 1945 under the title *The United Nations* and circulated by the communists. It clearly shows what the purpose of the organization was. To anticipate somewhat: its purpose was certainly not the maintenance of peace! The brochure states: "It (the UNO) purports to put an end to wars; but ... as everybody knows, it will be possible to end wars only when the capitalist system is got rid of."

It then goes on to say that there are three main reasons why communists should support the United Nations:

1. The right of veto would protect the USSR against the rest of the world.
2. The UNO would be able to frustrate any co-ordinated foreign policy of the principal Western powers.
3. The UNO is a particularly useful instrument for the breaking-up of non-communist colonial empires.
4. **The UNO would gradually bring about the fusion of all the countries in the world into one single soviet system.**

It would hardly be possible to be more explicit.

Since it is indisputable that it was the Rockefeller clan that donated the plot of ground by the Hudson River for the administrative palace of the "Red World Parliament", and America has been bearing most of its costs ever since the organization has been in existence, we must deduce from that that the goals of international communism and those of high finance and the American governments since 1945 have been identical. In their joint drive for control of the world they both make use of the UNO as an instrument for their covert plans.

The nearer we come to "D-Day", when a regular world government will be declared on behalf of the UNO, the more impudently and openly this covert co-operation between the planners in the background reveals itself. While formerly it was only "the communists" who ostensibly threatened

the liberty of Western or Western-minded countries, the threat now comes quite openly from the UNO and the American State Department.

If a government is successfully "eliminated" – on the grounds of violations of human rights, corruption or what not – it is always the communists who are the beneficiaries of its overthrow. (Take as examples Cuba, Nicaragua, Angola, Mozambique, Rhodesia, the Congo etc.). Iran and the Philippines, whose pro-Western governments were overthrown with the help of the American CIA, may be expected to follow shortly.

The same game is now being played in South Africa and South West Africa ("Namibia"). If it were to go according to the wishes of the conspirators in the UNO, South West Africa would be handed over to the tender mercies of the SWAPO murder gangs, the Moscow-controlled terrorist organization, which the UNO unilaterally and in violation of all democratic rules of the game has declared to be "the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people". With such overwhelming partisanship – combined with an extensive propaganda campaign – in favour of SWAPO, which is already accepted in anticipation as "the future government of Namibia", granted observer status at the UN and supported with huge sums of money from UN funds, in such circumstances it would be a sheer farce to hold free elections under the "protection" of UN forces.

If the South African defence forces were to withdraw to remote camps, as UN resolution 435 provides, but surrounded by hostile UN troops and SWAPO terrorist cadres, the predominantly black voters in the country could easily be intimidated and the electoral process would be easily manipulable. The precedent of Rhodesia, where precisely that happened, should be sufficient warning to South Africa.

For that reason the South African government has long hesitated to put this plan into effect and demanded as a counter-measure the prior withdrawal of the fifty thousand Cubans across the Angolan border, on the assumption that such a legitimate demand could not be acceded to so quickly. The marxist régime in Luanda, which actively supports SWAPO, can in fact only remain in power behind the protection of the Cuban mercenaries.

If meanwhile South Africa has accepted the promises of the Secretary General of the United Nations, Javier Perez de Cuéllar, who has given assurances of a withdrawal of all Cuban troops from Angola and strict neutrality on the part of UNO with regard to SWAPO, in fulfilment of the preconditions for an independent Namibia, we must take it that Pretoria has resigned itself to putting up with a new communist neighbour rather than bearing the financial burden of an incessant war against terrorists.

This political realism on the part of a South African government con-

scious of its military strength might be thought rather curious. The communist ring that would then be closed round South Africa must inevitably have serious geo-strategic disadvantages as a result.

South Africa – and the free world of which it is part – would be well advised not to underestimate this deadly danger from the UNO, whose intention is simply to swallow up one country after another and incorporate it in its totalitarian “new world order”. By 1985 there were no fewer than seventeen UN sub-committees busying themselves with anti-South African programmes. In the years 1984-85 that cost the world body (or rather the Western taxpayers) 41 million dollars.⁶⁶

According to *The South African Observer* of July 1987, the number of anti-apartheid committees and sub-committees has now risen to 120; and their influence on each corner of the earth is perceptible. Moreover, UN funds go direct to such enemies of South Africa as the ANC, a bomb-laying, marxist-dominated terrorist organization that has been granted the status of a legitimate “liberation movement” worthy of support. In addition there are twenty-five international radio stations daily pouring out a stream of propaganda and hatred.

According to *The Citizen* of 8 April 1987, Kurt von Schirnding, the former South African representative at the UN, reported that at least two-thirds of discussion time at the UN is dominated by the South African question. In a talk that he gave he said the UNO had a “publicity department” that cost 142 million rands a year. Ten per cent of it was spent annually on South African “disinformation”.

He went on: “When you consider that these publications, radio programmes and TV video films are translated into all the languages of the United Nations and sent out all over the world – especially to schools and universities everywhere – then we are confronted with the dreadful prospect of a whole new generation growing up with a completely distorted image of South Africa.” –

The aim of the United Nations and the people behind it is world domination, the abolition of sovereignty of individual nations and the creation of a vast centrally controlled commune. To attain that goal the UNO, that “last hope of humanity”, does not hesitate to invade free states directly, if necessary.

Few people still know that as long ago as 1965 a plan of campaign, complete in all details, for an invasion of South Africa was devised. Under the title *Apartheid and United Nations Collective Measures* the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a tax-free American foundation, issued a 170-page document describing in explicit detail the military measures by land, sea and air necessary for an attack on South Africa, after which the

country would be placed in black hands and **come under the “international trustee system” of the United Nations.**

It went into such great detail that even calculations of the probable numbers of dead and wounded on both sides were set forth. According to the *Chicago Tribune* of 24 July 1965 in its review of the report, “altogether 93 000 ground troops with air and sea support would cost 94 537 000 dollars for a thirty-day *blitzkrieg*.”⁶⁷

The Carnegie Foundation report had the entire approval of the then marxist Secretary General of the UN, U Thant. We cannot be certain whether the plan was dropped because it went too far for some of the Western delegates or whether the military planners of the UN suddenly became wary of the fighting strength of the South African forces. At any rate, the fact remains that the possibility of a direct military attack on a sovereign Western state was seriously contemplated. And it must now be obvious to even the most complacent citizen of the West how the UN proposes to “preserve world peace”.

We should also know that the disarmament programme for the super-powers – and subsequently for all the other nations – so assiduously advertised, has as its objective nothing less than the transfer of all the armaments systems in the world to the UN.

In Article 43, Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations we read the basic “treaty law” for the establishment of an “Armed United Nations”:

“All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement, or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.”⁶⁸

The unavoidable logical conclusion to be drawn from Article 43 can only be that the United Nations intends to equip itself with unlimited powers to wage war. The American Major Arch E. Roberts, in his book *Victory Denied* (p. 76) writes: “Article 43 will wipe national boundaries off the map. It will create an irresistible international army. And it will chain the peoples of the world to the wheel of a military juggernaut.”

He continues: “We have now arrived at the concealed objective of the United Nations Charter. Absolute, monolithic world military power ...”

In a comprehensive analysis he cites numerous documents that make it clear that the US State Department is in principle quite prepared to hand over its entire military forces to the United Nations. For the accomplishment of that object there exists a Three-Stage Plan that envisages the disarmament of all countries to a point where “no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened UN Peace Force”.

Thus the American State Department has made it quite clear what the intention is: the creation of a totalitarian world government whose orders will be enforced by an international armed force. According to Roberts, all that is needed now is to carry out an American brainwashing publicity campaign to persuade them that this "law" is in their best interests.

The peoples of the world would have no option but to capitulate to a UN army equipped with American atomic weapons and commanded by a Russian.

The “Managed” Conflicts

The world is divided into three groups of people: a very small group that does the things that happen; a rather bigger group that sees that something is happening; and the great mass that doesn't notice that something has been 'done'.

Dr Nicholas M. Butler, former President of Columbia University

Anybody who compares conditions in South Africa now with those of thirty, forty or more years ago cannot but marvel and ask himself: What on earth has happened since then? And why has so much of it turned out so negatively?

To all outward appearance the country seems a model of peace and tranquillity, and most of its citizens go about their daily business as usual; yet for over three years now there has been a national state of emergency; the police and the army hold themselves more and more in a state of readiness; in several black townships there are repeated outbreaks of violence and terror; and there can be no doubt that discontent and disaffection have spread more and more among the non-white population.

At times acts of violence and insurrection have reached such a pitch that there has even been talk of a “pre-revolutionary phase”. When we consider that the standard of living of the blacks has never been so high as it is now, that they now have many opportunities of school and tertiary education, that the most “discriminating” of the apartheid laws have been abolished and that blacks can now attain very much higher positions in their work than ever before, we might well suppose that the very opposite had taken place.

As I have been assured again and again, only thirty years ago South Africa was an oasis of tranquillity. There was no such thing as terrorism or insurrection and very little crime. The economy was sound, there was a harmony among the different races that must have been unique in all the world.

A black gardener or maid was happy to work for a white household for

a modest wage. Their chances of development were very limited. There were no labour unions, and the strict apartheid laws ensured rigorous order and discipline.

How, then, has the present situation of conflict arisen? Why all this discontent and disaffection among the blacks, now that so much has been done to improve their lot?

As we have learnt from the examples of the French, Russian and other revolutions, national dissensions and revolutions hardly ever break out from within. They do not originate from the People, the “oppressed masses” who suddenly rise, like some mechanism switched on, all over the country, to overthrow a tyrannical government. There may indeed be real discontent and unrest among some sections of a population; but that in itself will not suffice to cause a nation-wide insurrection capable of overthrowing the government. Revolts and revolutions have to be kindled, financed and professionally organized. And that needs more powerful forces outside the country concerned.

Human history does not unroll as most people imagine: as a series of more or less **accidental** events from which conflicts arise, which lead to resolutions, which give rise to fresh conflicts and so on *ad infinitum*. Whoever studies the conflicts of this our tormented twentieth century more closely and follows the arguments of this book must recognize that all its wars, revolutions and upheavals not only have a common origin but also that their effects are directed to a common end.

In short: there are such things as “managed” conflicts that serve a perfectly definite process of development, a pattern of theoretical ideation.

According to the theories of the German philosopher Hegel, the so-called “Hegelian dialectic”, the course of history is determined by conflicts. From that it follows that a pre-planned course of history can be achieved by controlled conflicts. Hegel’s ideas, which were eagerly taken up by Karl Marx, are still part of the standard lore of communist education. Thus, according to this system of thought any group that desires to achieve global domination by means of a world government that it steers can change the course of history as it pleases.

When the Trilateral Commission speaks about “managed conflicts” (as it frequently does in its publications) it means the controlled use of conflicts for objectives set far into the future; and not merely for the purpose of solving some particular problem.

According to Hegel’s dialectics, every state of things – the **thesis** – sooner or later brings about a contradiction, the **antithesis**. The conflict created by both of these forms the **synthesis**. And so the process continues: thesis versus antithesis = synthesis. The synthesis desired by the internationalists of the Trilateral Commission is the New World Order. Obviously that could

not be brought into being without carefully planned controlled conflicts. Individual measures by persons or groups would not be capable of achieving that; therefore the synthesis must be artificially created. The method is quite simple; and it incidentally earns the international bankers high profits by playing the parties concerned off against one another.

That also explains why the bankers supported both the USSR and Hitler's Third Reich; likewise North Korea and North Vietnam against America and so on. Such conflicts bring in vast amounts of money while at the same time driving the countries concerned into the tentacles of a world government.

The first man to expose this background was Professor Antony Sutton, a scientist and former research fellow in the Hoover Institute at Harvard. This chapter will be mainly concerned with the results of his researches, which were published in book form in 1985 under the title *How the Order Creates War and Revolution*.⁶⁹

If we apply hegelian dialectics to the South African conflict model we can easily recognize the feasibility and consistency of the theory. According to Hegel, the **thesis** is our representation of the "old" South Africa: a peaceful country almost completely undisturbed by the great conflicts in the northern hemisphere, with immense potential for economic development, a state with many peoples living together in harmony, constantly advancing to the position of dominant power in Africa, the driving motor of the continent, and steadily rising standards of living for all its peoples.

If this process of development is to be disturbed and interrupted because it does not fit into the notion of a New World Order based upon a totalitarian socialist dependence on a world government, then the antithesis must be found and developed. And since there is no such thing as a society entirely free from defects it is not difficult to find them.

In a multiracial state there can be nothing more easily exploitable than "the race problem". The apartheid policy of race separation, or the peaceful co-existence and co-development of the different races, is therefore turned into the **antithesis**, and it is exaggerated and blackguarded to such a degree that it is not long before the black masses are incited to disaffection and rebellion. A system that was formerly regarded as natural by both blacks and whites, a necessary means of preventing areas of friction, is suddenly turned into the very opposite.

The resistance movements that consequently arise, and are soon infiltrated by communists, are then represented as "national liberation movements" in opposition to a "system of injustice". Then all that is needed is to wait to see which liberation movement "makes its number" most conspicuously and most effectively threatens the system. Then that organization is systematically built up and puffed by the establishment media and large

financial backing and set up as an alternative government. The fact that by now it has become almost entirely communist in composition and the brutal methods of terrorism with which it pursues its apparently attainable goal of power are extensively euphemized or ignored; for is not all this happening for the sake of "liberating the blacks from the tyranny of apartheid"?

Thus the antithesis has been created and become a formidable reality. The thesis (the South African government) now finds itself in conflict with the antithesis (the "liberation movement").

The global planners in the background who have created and promoted the antithesis (the UNO, the Trilaterals, the US State Department etc.) then press the government to negotiate, to open up "dialogue", to offer amnesty to "political" prisoners, and ultimately to accept coalition with the "liberation movement". By means of sanctions, diplomatic pressure, blackmail and worldwide propaganda in favour of the "liberation movement" (the antithesis), in most cases the inevitable result is the desired **synthesis**: a socialist black government in the camp of the One-Worlders.

We know from the examples of other countries what happens next. The controlled media concentrate on fresh victims; countries such as South Korea, Chile, Taiwan and other anti-communist states must be prepared for assimilation into the New World Order.

Meanwhile the new communist black government gets rid of apartheid in its own fashion while it sets about exterminating (Zimbabwe), starving (Ethiopia), or otherwise depriving the other tribes of all influence that might make them dangerous to the ruling clique and their exclusive hegemony. There is then no longer any need for the separation of races; the blacks are "liberated" and the (white) world is satisfied.

Cynical as it may sound, this is nevertheless more the rule than the exception. In that respect the realities of twentieth-century Africa in no wise differ from the barbarous customs of former centuries.

When we examine the conflicts supported by the USA and the international bankers more closely, at first sight we seem to find a picture of total confusion and self-contradiction. Two examples may serve to illustrate that. Let us confine our attention to Africa: to two of the countries next door to South Africa, Mozambique and Angola. Both countries are now communist since the Portuguese colonial power abandoned them.

Mozambique is ruled by FRELIMO, the party of the late dictator Samora Machel, who devastated the country, ruined it economically and gave his people over to death by famine after years of terrorist warfare. South African newspapers and travellers report that the country is sunk into anarchy and chaos; FRELIMO soldiers terrorize the population, and

thousands are compulsorily "re-educated" in the numerous concentration camps.

Although FRELIMO has only a small fraction of the country under its control and nearly eighty per cent is dominated by the Western-oriented RENAMO, the National Resistance Movement of Mozambique, the trilateralist government of the United States does not support RENAMO; it supports the communist FRELIMO.

Under the threat of economic and other retaliatory measures South Africa was warned not to give any help to the anti-communist resistance movement in its struggle for a free Mozambique. Not long ago it looked as though RENAMO had so much got the upper hand that it was only a question of time before the communist régime would be overthrown. What happened then was what can only be construed as a last-minute rescue operation. Britain sent more military instructors to the hard-pressed FRELIMO terrorists to prevent the collapse of the régime. France, Britain, America and other Western countries extended enormous credits. David Rockefeller, head of the Chase Manhattan Bank and *éminence grise* of the Council on Foreign Relations, the secret government of the USA, jetted in to Maputo to take stock of the situation there.

South Africa was "encouraged" to conclude the Nkomati Accord, by which the communist régime was supplied with economic aid to shore it up against collapse. In grateful return the new Chissano government and its ally the USSR accused South Africa of causing the death of Machel in the crash of the Russian-built and Russian-flown presidential aircraft, although an international commission of inquiry had unanimously exonerated South Africa of all guilt and attributed the crash on South African territory to scarcely credible sloppiness and negligence and inattention to flight regulations on the part of the Russian crew. The American government has still not withdrawn its original accusation and displays open partisanship in favour of the communist government of Mozambique.

The situation appears to be entirely different in Angola, where the Western-oriented UNITA resistance movement is supported with supplies of arms against the marxist régime in Luanda. America also demands the withdrawal of the Cuban mercenaries from Angola, without whose help the régime would probably be incapable of survival. In that case South Africa is magnanimously permitted to help UNITA too.

So we have two entirely different pictures: on the one hand a communist régime of terrorists is kept in power at all costs by the international bankers behind the governments; on the other it is a pro-Western movement that is supported. Where is the logic? How are we to understand this contradiction?

Well, the bankers are constantly alert to the danger of allowing the

“enemy”, the red empire that they have built up, to become over-powerful. Therefore they have to perform a political balancing act in which they support now the Western side, now the Eastern. It is necessary for them to play off both sides against one another in such a fashion that they retain control of developments and make them serve the desired ultimate end. At the same time it offers an excellent opportunity to humbug and confuse the population of the world.

The lesson to be learnt from this is that the international conspiracy and the personages who direct it from behind the scenes are neither “right” nor “left”, neither religious nor irreligious. They are all – or none – of these things!

According to the hegelian philosophy the political “right” and the political “left”, thesis and antithesis, are both equally necessary for the forward march of History.

In his book Professor Sutton comes to the conclusion that the present world situation has been deliberately contrived by the élitist forces in the background, and that what we see is the result of conscious manipulation of the forces of both “right” and “left”. He is convinced that the most powerful élite that has ever existed in this world has during the past century or so nurtured both the political “right” and the political “left” expressly for the purpose of creating a new world order.

In *Das Kapital* Marx calls capitalism the thesis and communism the antithesis. According to Professor Sutton, historians, including marxist historians, fail to recognize that this collision between the two opposing forces has never produced a society that is neither purely capitalist nor purely communist but a synthesis formed from both. According to Hegel, this new synthesis must necessarily lead to the equation of the state with God. The individual must necessarily submit to an omnipotent state. George Orwell’s prophetic vision of the future, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, presents an astonishing parallel and makes us suspect that he knew more than he let on to his contemporaries.

To hegelians the function of a parliament or congress is merely “to give the citizen a feeling that his opinions are of some value and to enable a government to take advantage of what would be obvious to the stupidest peasant in his wisdom.”

As Hegel also puts it: “By this interest in subjective liberty and through his own conceit in conformity with a general misconception, individuals can regard themselves as very important and nourish the complacent feeling that they count for something.”

The hegelian doctrine, of which the internationalists propose to make us all the happy beneficiaries in their brave new world, proclaims first and foremost the Divine Right of the State. To Hegel and his followers the state

is God on earth, the individual nothing. He has no rights. His entire morality consists in simply following a leader. To such *illuminati* the state means absolute power. And indeed a self-appointed élite that controlled such a state would in practice be able to act like God on earth.

Professor Sutton points out something that Professor Quigley had already noted in his monumental work *Tragedy and Hope*, viz. that the banker J.P. Morgan made use of both "right" and "left" competing elements for the political manipulation of society to his own advantage.

We are now encountering the same phenomenon in parties of both "right" and "left". It doesn't matter whether the Americans elect Democrats or Republicans: both parties are controlled by the same powerful interest groups. The same with the press. The big newspaper proprietors print both left-wing and right-wing papers under the same roof, as it were, and the reader can have whatever he fancies. They are manipulated both rightward and leftward; but they are given the feeling of reading a sensible paper that in its commentaries speaks their minds for them. They will believe that particular publication without noticing that it is only its style, its mode of expression, that is different – "left" or "right". But their ideas are moulded in exactly the same way.

In that way the phoney war of information between both controlled groups of left and right can be kept up. As Professor Sutton writes, "Books that do not fall within either of these categories can be effectively neutralized because they draw upon themselves the wrath of both right and left. In short, any publication that draws attention to deception of the left/right fiction is ignored ... and the citizens trot along to the ballot-boxes in the belief that they have a 'vote'."

Just as the conflict between Nazi Germany and the USSR was fostered in accordance with hegelian dialectics and financed by the same sources of high finance, resulting in a new synthesis of the two super-powers, the USA and the USSR, the manipulators are now in the process of building up Red China as the antithesis to the USSR.

We have already discussed the part played by the USA in the creation of the communist system in Russia. What is less well known is the fact that during the second world war America helped the Chinese communists to power too so as to have a new arm at their disposal in the dialectical process. The decision to build up Red China militarily and economically was President Nixon's; and it was put into effect by Henry Kissinger (Chase Manhattan) and George Bush (Trilateral Commission).

The whole history of the betrayal of China and the part played by the internationalists cannot be discussed here in any detail. Let us content ourselves with a statement by the American Admiral Cooke before Congress: "... in 1946 General Marshall used the tactic of suspending deliveries

of munitions to quietly disarm the Chinese fighting forces.”⁷⁰

Professor Sutton tells us that the now intensified build-up of Red China is to be planned and carried out mainly by the American Bechtel Corporation. For that purpose the firm of Bechtel China, Inc. was expressly established in 1984 to fulfil the development, construction and engineering contracts with the Chinese government. It is interesting that the recent US Secretary of State, George Pratt Shultz, was formerly President of the firm of Bechtel.

According to Professor Sutton, Bechtel is now performing a function similar to that of Albert Kahn, Inc. of Detroit, which in 1928 worked out the preliminary studies and planning for the first Five-Year Plan in the USSR. “By about the year 2000 communist China will be a super-power, built up by American technology and initiative. It is probably the intention of the Order [synonymous with the American Insider Group: author] to bring that power into existence as a conflict-figure in opposition to the USSR.”

It certainly seems to me that the question is to what extent Moscow is a party to this dialectical provocation and is quietly waiting for China to become an adversary to be taken seriously. And who can foretell whether the Chinese communists will not some day league themselves with Moscow to co-operate in hanging the super-capitalists with the rope they have sold them?

The Secret Rulers

The world is ruled by persons very different from what is supposed by those who cannot look behind the scenes.

Benjamin Disraeli (1804-1881)

About two hundred years ago, under the influence of liberal currents, the political structures of Western civilization began to soften up and change. The result was the so-called democratic forms of government in which (in theory) power was derived "from the people".

Now it is possible to hold different opinions about the pros and cons of democratic forms of government; nevertheless one thing is certain: they created undreamt-of possibilities of influencing and manipulating the bearers of political responsibility, who often had only a few years in office. The gates were thrown wide open to all the avenues of corruption, blackmail, nepotism and blatant power-lust. To many politicians democracy means all too often a chance to line their own pockets during the short time that the levers of power – and the disposal of billions' worth of public funds – are in their hands. They go on jaunts and live high on the hog at the public expense, handing out millions in "development aid" to black despots and corrupt generals, tamely follow whatever trend happens to be in vogue among the masses and give them their bread and circuses until the state treasury is empty. The main thing is to make sure that they get elected again!

There have been influential forces that have zealously promoted these trends. Thus the aristocracy have been impoverished, derided and politically castrated. Kings, emperors and tsars who had the welfare and independence of their peoples at heart were shorn of power, murdered or left as mere figureheads of a state from then on ruled by the irresponsible masses concerned only with their own interests and pleasures.

The advantages of such a system of government to forces that seek political control of states are obvious. A monarch constitutionally enthroned for life and whose succession is determined by his family must necessarily have a far greater interest in the well-being of his country than

an elected representative of the people appointed for only a limited period. Since he does not need to be re-elected he does not need to curry favour of the people but can in fact rule in accordance with the best interests of all. Ostentatious world tours, tax-free allowances and plenipotentiary powers offer no attraction to a ruler blessed from birth with all the worldly possessions to act in a manner contrary to the interests of his own state, as is now all too often the case when elections are an important factor. There is also a widespread – deliberately propagated – but erroneous belief that democratic forms of government would cost the state and the taxpayer less than, say, a ruling monarchy or an imperial house. That is a piece of deliberate mendacity designed to mislead the masses.

The extravagant expense and wasteful luxury with which an elected representative often surrounds himself during his brief tenure of office can easily exceed the official establishment of a monarch permanently installed.

We have now become so accustomed to a democratic form of society that we have come to regard it as a *sine qua non* of all proper government. Thus we forget the experience of history: that every democracy bears within itself the seeds of its own self-destruction. Think only of ancient Greece and the decline of the mighty Roman Empire, whose “democratic” aberrations greatly hastened its collapse.

When we contemplate the present “permissiveness” and cultural degeneracy and profane obsession with material things of the Western nations, led as they are into regions of infinite “progress” by the American bellwether, and the decadence and perversions with which we are surrounded, we cannot but recognize that our civilization also has long sunk below its zenith.

The secret rulers of our era are well aware of the prevailing state of things and how to turn this human decadence to their advantage. For centuries they have closely studied the behaviour of the common man and harnessed his weaknesses in their plans. They drive and manoeuvre the masses like sheep to the slaughter; and in one direction: the end of which only they see clearly before their eyes. With diabolical inspiration and fanatical zeal they pursue their ends from generation to generation. Every means will suit their purpose. They kindle wars and revolutions; their road to power is paved with human lives. Their god is Mammon and Lucifer is his prophet. Anyone who stands in their way is ruthlessly destroyed.

To all outward appearance they are philanthropists, benefactors of mankind generously contributing copious funds in the service of a new and better world. In reality what they propose is to “liberate” mankind from every vestige of freedom that it still possesses. Computers, credit cards and cashless transactions are important components of their strategy to get the masses in their grasp. Their objective is total power and total control over

every living soul on this planet. They are mostly invisible; but they stand behind every government of any significance, manipulating it.

What they are working for is a totalitarian world order, a world government and a monopolistic economic system that they can dominate and control. They propose to attain that end by the power of their money and gold.

This is the cabal of international megabankers, a small coterie of superaffluent family dynasties, the inner circle of high finance. They are the secret owners of the central banks, the men responsible for world Zionism and for communism. Their programme is based on the centuries-old *Illuminati* plans of Adam Weishaupt and the documents that take them still farther, the notorious Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, an ostensibly Jewish master plan for the achievement of world domination, the authenticity of which has of course been vehemently disputed by Zionist organizations.

The public first became aware of the existence of these documents when an extraordinary accident happened in 1785. The story goes that a courier of the *Illuminati* secret society was riding hell-for-leather from Frankfurt to Paris to deliver documents and instructions for the projected French revolution. These documents from the *Illuminati* were addressed to the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of France in Paris.

In Des Griffin's book *Wer regiert die Welt?*⁷¹ (English title: *Descent into slavery?*), which gives these documents in an appendix under the title of *Protocols of World Dictatorship: the New Testament of Satan*, we read what happened next (p. 245): "The courier was struck by lightning. All the papers fell into the hands of the police, who sent them back to the Bavarian government, which ordered a raid on the headquarters of the *Illuminati* in which more documents were seized. It was thus discovered that the conspirators had worldwide objectives. All the carefully documented proofs were sent to the governments of England, Germany, Austria, France, Poland and Russia. For some reason or other, presumably through the influence of *Illuminati* insiders, these governments decided to ignore the warnings. Four years later the French revolution exploded and shook the whole European scene."

While we have no certain proof of the authorship of the later so-called Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, there can none the less be no doubt about the authenticity of the documents themselves. The course of world history up to now, which agrees with astonishing exactitude with these papers, is perfectly unambiguous and allows of no other conclusion. Weishaupt's fundamental ideas keep coming to light in the "Protocols": the destruction of all legitimate governments, religions and nations and the es-

tablishment of a universal despotism to dominate the enslaved masses by terror and force.

The connection of the Protocols with Jewish interest groups had its origin in a book published in 1905 by a certain Professor Sergei Nilus, who was associated with the Foreign Ministry in Moscow. There is a copy of the book in the British Museum in London, with an accession stamp dated 10 August 1906. Curiously enough it was never translated, until suddenly a chapter was translated into English in 1920. Immediately there arose a prodigious uproar, as Douglas Reed tells us in his book, *The Controversy of Zion*,⁷² published in 1978.

That one chapter was published in Britain and America under the title *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. Reed was unable to discover whether that was the superscription of the original version or whether it was added in translation.

He writes (p. 211): "When the Protocols appeared in English the minor point, who was the author of this particular document, was given a false semblance of major importance by the enraged Jewish attack on the document itself. The asseveration of Jewish leadership of the revolutionary conspiracy was not new at all; the reader has seen that Disraeli, Bakunin and many others earlier affirmed it. In this case the allegation about a specific meeting of Jewish leaders of the conspiracy was unsupported and could have been ignored ..."

He goes on: "The response of official Jewry in 1920 ... was aimed, with fury, at the entire **substance** of the Protocols; it did not stop at denying a Jewish plot, but denied that there was any plot, which was demonstrably untrue. The existence of the conspiracy had been recognized and affirmed by a long chain of high authorities, from Edmund Burke, George Washington and Alexander Hamilton to Disraeli, Bakunin and many others ... Moreover, when the Protocols appeared in English conclusive proof had been given by the event in Russia. Thus the nature of the Jewish attack could only strengthen public doubts; it protested much too much."

According to Reed, this attack was a repetition of the one that silenced those earlier leaders of the public demand for investigation and remedy, Robison, Barruel and Morse. Those three men made no imputation of Jewish leadership, and they were defamed solely because they drew public attention to the continuing nature of the conspiracy and to the fact that the French revolution was clearly but its first eruption.

"The attack on the Protocols in the 1920's proved above all else the truth of their contention; it showed that the standing organization for suppressing public discussion of the conspiracy had been perfected in the intervening 120 years. Probably so much money and energy were never before in history expended on the effort to suppress a single document." (p. 212)

As we have seen, the publication of the Protocols in England aroused world-wide interest. That period (1920 and onward) marks the end of the time when Jewish questions could be impartially discussed in public without running the risk of being subjected to an orchestrated campaign of defamation, with accusations of being "anti-semitic", Jew-baiter, nazi, fascist and so on – which are so customary nowadays.

On page 212 Douglas Reed writes: "The initial debate was free and vigorous, but in following years the attack succeeded in imposing the law of *lèse-majesté* in this matter and today hardly any public man or print ventures to mention the Protocols unless to declare them forged or infamous (an act of submission also foretold in them)."

The controversy over the origin of the Protocols has continued undiminished since the 1920's. Subsequent to the so-called "anti-semitism" laws, particularly after the end of the second world war, most governments decided to prohibit publication of the book altogether. Anybody who dared to associate the documents with Jewish interest groups was prosecuted retrospectively. A printer in Munich who reproduced them in 1955 had his business confiscated. The attacks on the book were so violent and the legal processes that often ensued were so costly that few ventured to reprint the Protocols.

That state of affairs has persisted to this day, and indeed it was predicted by the Protocols in 1905: "Through the press we have gained the power to influence while remaining ourselves in the shade ... The principal factor of success in the political field is the secrecy of its undertaking; the word should not agree with the deeds of the diplomat ... We must compel the governments ... to take action in the direction favoured by our widely-conceived plan, already approaching the desired consummation, by what we shall represent as public opinion, secretly prompted by us through the means of that so-called 'Great Power', the press, which, with a few exceptions that may be disregarded, is already entirely in our hands ... We shall deal with the press in the following way: ... we shall saddle and bridle it with a tight curb; we shall do the same also with all productions of the printing-press, for where would be the sense of getting rid of the attacks of the press if we remain targets for pamphlets and books? ... No one shall with impunity lay a finger on the aureole of our government infallibility. **The pretext for stopping any publication will be the alleged plea that it is agitating the public mind without occasion or justification** ... We shall have a sure triumph over our opponents since they will not have at their disposition organs of the press in which they can give full and final expression to their views owing to the aforesaid methods of dealing with the press ..."⁷³

Whoever the inspirers and authors of these documents may have been,

it must be admitted that they were possessed of diabolical cunning. Their master plan for the achievement of world domination is undoubtedly based upon centuries of study of human behaviour, which probably began even before the schemes of Weishaupt and his Illuminati. They can hardly be the product of a single man or even a single group that thought them up and wrote them down. Their knowledge of human weaknesses, which have been scrutinized and assessed with scientifically analytical precision, is made plain on every page of the Protocols with malevolent relish.

The instrument to be used for the destruction of the Christian nation-states and their religion is "the mob". The word is used throughout with searing contempt ... "Men with bad instincts are more in number than the good, and therefore the best results in governing them are attained by violence and terrorization ... The might of a mob is blind, senseless and unreasoning force ever at the mercy of a suggestion from any side."

From this the argument is developed that "an absolute despotism" is necessary to govern "the mob", which is "a savage", and that "our State" will employ "the terror which tends to produce blind submission".

The literal fulfilment of this model state with the collectivization of bolshevik Russia must by now be perfectly obvious to all. The end of the process will be the Superstate, the socialist world state. Meanwhile the peoples of the earth will be governed by "people's representatives", who will smooth the way to the classless "international brotherhood" of all mankind.

The Protocols put it quite plainly: "The administrators whom we shall choose from among the public, with strict regard to their capacities for servile obedience, will not be persons trained in the arts of government, and will therefore easily become pawns in our game in the hands of men of learning and genius who will be **their advisers**, specialists bred and reared from early childhood to rule the affairs of the whole world."

Is not that precisely what has been happening throughout this century, as we can see for ourselves from the media any day of the week? The "art of government" is now placed in the hands of peanut farmers and third-rate movie actors whose main function appears to be to flash their teeth in broad grins and for the rest to leave the business of government to their "advisers". In 1905 these unelected but powerful "advisers" were practically unknown to the public. It was only with the outbreak of the two world wars that they suddenly became well-known personalities, the *éminences grises* behind the heads of state.

That was particularly conspicuous in America in the time of President Wilson and his constant companion "Colonel" House, whom the President called his *alter ego*. House was actually a front man for the international bankers and played a leading part in the creation of the Federal Reserve

System and the adoption of progressive income tax. He was also responsible for the entry of America into the first world war.

Later it was Harry Hopkins who as Roosevelt's "adviser" switched the points for the international clique of conspirators. As the President's "right hand" he made sure that from the middle to the end of the second world war the bankers' red empire was amply supplied with war material to the value of six thousand million dollars to make the final victory of Stalin and his bolshevik gangsters quite certain. The exhausted German armies were continually astonished at the abundance of material that the enemy was still able to put into the field right to the end.

Through the instrumentality of the presidential adviser and the help of Henry Morgenthau junior and his closest collaborator Harry Dexter White the Russians were supplied with extremely scarce uranium, heavy water, large quantities of thin copper wire and many other important materials for the production of atomic bombs.

How great the real power and influence of these "advisers" was, who could act with or without permission from the President, is made clear by Colonel Curtis B. Dall, Roosevelt's son-in-law, in his book *Amerikas Kriegspolitik*⁷⁴ (English title: *FDR, My Exploited Father-in-Law*). According to him, Hopkins sent the Russians planeloads of printing plates and special paper and inks to enable them to print American dollar bills.

Dall tells us (p. 118) that "the plates, which represented an enormous value, were sent to Russia by air from a specially designed plant of considerable size in Great Falls, Montana. There is no point in arguing about the amounts of this 'military money' printed up to now, for it is a political secret reserved for the members of particular circles but withheld from the American citizen. Nor may we raise the question as to how many office-blocks, hotels and valuable goods were acquired from us and in other countries by unknown persons with this 'military money'."

Under Richard Nixon Henry Kissinger was the influential "adviser on national security", a key position that made him the president's most important confidant. As such, and later as Secretary of State, the good Henry scored such convincing "successes" that he was able to survive the Watergate scandal unscathed, while his boss had to go. Amongst other things Kissinger was:

- the principal organizer of the "opening" of Red China, while at the same time secretly intriguing to force Taiwan, one of its founder members, out of the United Nations;
- the driving force behind the appeasement policy towards the USSR, and was responsible for measures that for the first time enabled it to gain tactical military superiority over the USA;
- he was responsible for providing the Russians with the most up-to-date

American technology, and he summarily wiped out their debts to the USA of over eleven thousand million dollars;

- he sent American wheat to Russia at astonishingly favourable credit rates, while the price of bread in America went through the ceiling;
- he negotiated a “peace settlement” with the North Vietnamese that handed them victory on a plate and caused the USA to suffer the first defeat in its history; for which he was rewarded with a share in the Nobel Peace Prize;
- he mediated in the Near Eastern conflict so “skilfully” that his friend the Russian ambassador, Anatoly Dobrynin, was able to comment with satisfaction that in those negotiations Kissinger had represented the Russian side as well as the American;
- he infuriated such old allies of America as Turkey and Greece, thus weakening NATO and enabling the Russians to dominate the whole Mediterranean region;
- he urgently demanded a “policy of reconciliation” with Cuba, a Russian satellite successfully planted in the western hemisphere, which thereupon took advantage of the opportunity to promote a communist revolution in Angola;
- despite powerful opposition from Congress and the public, he induced the USA to give up its supreme authority over the strategically vital Panama Canal and supported the demands of the Panamanian dictator, a client of Moscow;
- he called for a boycott of anti-communist Rhodesia as “a danger to world peace”, with the result that the USA became dependent on Russia for its supplies of chromium ore.

How was it possible that this German Jew, an immigrant from Fürth in Bavaria, who at one time thought of becoming a bookkeeper, could within a few years emerge from academic obscurity to rise to the second most powerful position in the White House? Who enabled this modest professor at Harvard to make the prodigious ascent to the rank of “presidential representative” of the United States?

Like Zbigniew Brzezinski under Carter, Henry Alfred Kissinger owed his career to the influence and membership of the shadow world government, the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), and his loyal connexions with high finance; or, more precisely, the Rockefeller empire.

As a result of the NATO alliance policy and the financial dominance of the dollar, the Western countries are almost entirely dependent on the co-operation and protection of America. Their “presidential advisers” are less

conspicuous and less familiar to the public than in America. They operate much more in the background; nevertheless they also are committed to the same shadow world government, which sets their course for them.

The secret rulers of the world no longer content themselves with economic and financial dominance, which they already wield all over the globe anyway. They want more. Their aphrodisiac is total political power and control over all humanity.

Even if the so-called Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion proved to be of non-Jewish origin, as the Zionists maintain, it must none the less be pointed out that the political Zionism of the state of Israel shows a very close affinity of spirit with the contents of the document.

On page 49 of Manfred Adler's book *Die Söhne der Finsternis – Weltmacht Zionismus*⁷⁵ (*The Sons of Darkness – World Power Zionism*) there is an American press report on a court case between a Zionist and an anti-Zionist Jew which runs as follows: "Most people think that the purpose of the so-called Zionist movement is to create a home in Palestine for Jewish refugees. Not at all. The real purpose of Zionism is the attainment of total world-wide control by a super world government."

Adler writes that the population of Israel is being primed by every form of political and philosophical propaganda, in the press and in the schools, with the "basic creed" of Zionism to set them on the road to that final goal. He recalls the monstrous remark made by Golda Meir, a socialist Zionist and former prime minister of Israel, which was quoted by the press in 1974: "If the American people hands Israel over to Arafat, it will be the end of Israel and the end of the world."

He refers to the "notorious and controversial 'Protocols of the Elders of Zion' ... in which the same spirit is expressed."

He writes: "Thus in the very first Protocol we read that greater success is to be obtained by governing people by force and intimidation than by erudite discussions ... Our right is might ... The end justifies the means. In our plans let us concern ourselves less with what is good and moral than with what is necessary and expedient ... Only force prevails in politics."

According to Adler, "Machiavellian principles of that kind can be found on almost every page of the Protocols. To an equal degree we encounter them at every turn in the Zionist politics of the past decades; they are typically Zionist."

In 1920 Chaim Weizmann (president of the Zionists from 1920 to 1930) used the same sort of apocalyptic vapourings as Golda Meir when he threatened Britain, the protecting power of Palestine, during a speech in Jerusalem: "You can hasten our coming [to Palestine: author] or refuse it. But it will be as well for you to help us, for if you don't we shall turn our con-

structive power into a destructive one that will put the whole world in a ferment.”⁷⁶

The tactical intimidation manoeuvres of the Zionists were directed at the peoples so that they would exert the appropriate pressure on the politicians. They are still doing it to strengthen their imperialistic power politics in the Near East, although they know very well that in making their decisions American politicians are entirely dependent on that three per cent of the American population who dominate “the land of unlimited possibilities”, especially in finance, the press and industry. In the USA as in Britain, South Africa and many other countries persons who are either Zionists themselves or closely associated with them occupy all the centres of power.

According to a report in the *New York Times*, in 1973 Senator J.W. Fulbright declared: “Israel rules the Senate. In my opinion the Senate is far too servile. We should concern ourselves more with the interests of the United States than doing what Israel wants. The great majority of the Senate of the United States – about eighty per cent – is completely aligned to supporting Israel no matter what Israel demands. That has been shown time and again, and that’s what has made the situation so difficult for our Government.”⁷⁷

We can safely assume that the Zionist influence is no less strong in Congress. Anybody who doubts that need only glance at the immediate vicinity of an American President to see who makes the policies there. Manfred Adler gives us the example of the former President Gerald Ford:

Henry Kissinger	Secretary of State and head of the National security Council.
James Schlesinger	Secretary of Defence.
Caspar Weinberger	Head of the H.E.W.
Alan Greenspan	Head of the President’s Economic Advisory Committee.
Ron Nessen	President’s press chief.
L.H. Silberman	Vice-General State Attorney (i.c. Department of Justice until appointment of Edward LEVI).
Don Paarlberg	Chief economist in the Department of Agriculture.
Isaac Fleischman	Head of the US patent office.
Stanley Pottinger	Head of the Civil Rights division of the Department of Justice. In charge of files on all complaints about discrimination in employment.

Leonard Garment	Head of the Department of Jewish Affairs.
Rabbi Morton Kanter	Head of the Youth Development section of the H.E.W.
Harris Friedman	Chief economist of the Federal Home Loans Bank.
Helmut Sonnenfeldt	Attorney in the State Department.
Milton Friedman	Senior speech-writer to the President.
George Bernstein	Director of Federal Insurance.
Mrs Sheila Rabb-Weidenfeld	Mrs Ford's press secretary.
Nelson Rockefeller	Vice-President (of Spanish-Sephardic descent).

This list, says Adler, could be continued with hundreds more names in the executive offices of the vast Federal bureaucracy. How many of the members and officials of the government are Zionists in the strict sense of the word it is impossible to say. At any rate they did not get to their influential posts by accident. Or does anybody seriously believe that Henry Kissinger and James Schlesinger happened to occupy the most important Departments in the USA by pure "accident"? Neither they nor any other responsible officials can afford to pursue anti-Zionist policies. But if they did – which is apparently what Brother Nixon tried to do – then their days in government would be numbered.

It may be appropriate at this point – to anticipate the familiar cries of "anti-semitism" – to explain that we must make a clear distinction between Jews in general and political Zionism. Anybody who equates anti-semitism with anti-Zionism does not know what he is talking about. There are in fact plenty of anti-Zionists among the Jews and Israelis who refuse to associate themselves with them because of the brutal and ruthless power-politics of their Zionist leaders and their terror tactics in the Near East.

And by the same token the catchword "anti-semitism" is just as fatuous when it is used exclusively for anti-Jewish attitudes and opinions, as though the Jews were the only semites.

Let me make this clear: the ordinary Jew is as innocent of the machinations of his Zionist leaders as the German people were innocent of the expulsion and persecution of Jewish fellow-citizens during the Third Reich.

The power of political Zionism now dominates the Western world as completely as communism holds the Eastern world in its clutches. The hypothesis that both movements have a common origin – like two branches of the same tree – and are both used by international high finance to gain total control over all mankind must therefore be given serious consideration. It appears to be the only reasonable explanation of the history of our times.

The Deception of Nations

Today the scene is set for the third act [third world war: author] intended to complete the process. The money-power and the revolutionary-power have been set up and given sham but symbolic shapes ('Capitalism' or 'Communism') and sharply defined citadels ('America' or 'Russia'). Suitably to alarm the mass mind, the picture offered is that of bleak and hopeless enmity and confrontation ... Such is the spectacle publicly staged for the masses. But what if similar men, with a common aim, secretly rule in both camps and propose to achieve their ambition through the clash between those masses? I believe any diligent student of our times will discover that this is the case.

Douglas Reed (*Behind the Scene*)

In this book so far we have had a good deal to say about the background to the present undeclared war against South Africa. Let the reader judge for himself whether the statements made in it constitute a true bill from the facts and events cited; and above all by observing future developments for himself.

For millions of people these realities are hidden by dense clouds of hostile propaganda. "Peter Simple" the brilliant satirist of the London *Daily Telegraph*, calls it "a world filled with lies".

The tragic thing about the onslaught on South Africa is not only the fact that so many worthy people, Christian organizations, clergymen, students and well-meaning housewives' leagues, by taking part in protests, demands for boycotts and mass demonstrations, are not only doing the dirty work for a clique of international conspirators (and thus allowing themselves to be used as Lenin's "useful idiots") but also zealously helping to cut off the very branch that they are sitting on.

South Africa is one of the main pillars of the West. If it were to collapse the countries of Europe, America and other Western allies would have taken a further suicidal step towards dependence on hidden forces whose objective is the destruction of all the democratic nation-states.

The Reds, Greens and trendy lefties of all colours would gladly be given the socialist paradise that they are so assiduously beaver for. But what they do not suspect is that in that consummation devoutly to be wished they themselves, in company with the bourgeoisie whose "values" they so much despise, would also be exploited by the same high-finance monopoly capitalists who rule (and indeed created) the "workers' paradise" in the USSR. And that could hardly be what they have in mind!

So let us be wary of swallowing the specious reasons for the present campaign against South Africa: they are entirely bogus. South Africa is only one of the battlefields of this century in a war that all the Western nations are engaged in. The forces of the world revolution are sapping away surreptitiously from both sides of the Iron Curtain; which is why their activities are so effective and so dangerous.

That is also why Joe Slovo, a colonel in the Russian KGB and leader of the proscribed South African Communist Party (SACP), has such complete freedom of movement in the West; why the terrorists of the African National Congress (ANC) are trained and armed by communist states while being allowed openly to have offices and accommodation in the Western capitals; and why the red carpet is unrolled for Oliver Tambo, leader of the ANC, when he is received with honour by high government officials.

That is why the savage punishment of the fiery "necklace" inflicted by the ANC on innocent blacks in South Africa does not deter the leading newspapers in the Western world from honouring Winnie Mandela (the wife of the imprisoned communist leader Nelson Mandela) as a heroine, although she has publicly expressed her whole-hearted approval of that incredibly atrocious form of murder. ("With our matches and our necklaces we shall liberate this country!")

That is why Archbishop Desmond Tutu, Dr Allan Boesak, Dr Beyers Naudé and other South African clergymen, who make no bones about displaying their sympathies with marxist-terrorist "liberation movements" and preaching sermons under red hammer-and-sickle flags, are hero-worshipped in the West and even honoured (like Tutu) with the Nobel Peace Prize.

These heroes, the darlings of the liberals and the Western press, command little respect within South Africa itself; opinion polls show that they are entirely unknown to most black South Africans. Yet abroad they set themselves up as spokesmen for the "oppressed black masses".

That is why the SWAPO and ANC bombers and mass-murderers are not instantly arrested and extradited in the West, as they would have been in earlier "normal" days, so that they could receive just punishment for their abominable deeds. Instead, they are now made welcome at the UNO and

courted by Western governments, receiving instead of the gallows millions of public money, and the taxpayer who pays for all this is bamboozled into believing that these people actually do represent genuine liberation movements in Southern Africa, and as such are worthy of the sympathy and honour and esteem granted them. On top of this absurdity, the “liberators” are still consulted about the problems of the countries that they profess to represent, although they know them only at second hand, since they have mostly been in voluntary exile for decades.

By contrast, the genuinely liberal and moderate (now retired) President P.W. Botha, who introduced more costly reforms and measures in favour of the blacks than all his predecessors put together (and at the cost of much resentment by his white electorate and loss of their support) is snubbed, denounced and declared *persona non grata* by most of the Western governments; yet he was so popular among the blacks that he could walk about their townships with only a token escort and address them to thunderous applause and singing and dancing.

How many more proofs is it necessary to evince that one and the same programme of world revolution is being put into effect simultaneously from both the Western and the so-called communist worlds? That there is a collaboration on the highest levels? How otherwise is the enormous transfer of Western wealth and Western technology to transform the backward USSR into a first-rate industrial and military power to be explained?

The purpose of the undeclared war against South Africa is thus a subversion of the same sort as took place in Angola, Mozambique and Rhodesia. We must conclude from that that the results of those operations have clearly satisfied the expectations of the men of power on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Is it possible, then, to be so blind as not to recognize co-operation between the “capitalists” and the “communists” in this cynical game of chess?

It is the same everywhere. The West, that is America and Europe, supply money, food, material and equipment. The Russians supply war material, the East Germans set up the intelligence services, the North Koreans provide the instructors, the Israelis the technical personnel, the red Chinese contribute in a great variety of ways, and the Cubans and the Russians provide the troops wherever any stiffening is wanted.

It is not so much the quality of the reporting as the sheer quantity of misreporting that makes it so difficult for the ordinary man – including the ordinary South African – to fit together the few important coherent facts and from them form an intelligible picture that makes it all clear. The art of bamboozling nations has been so highly developed in this century that

hardly anybody knows any longer what to believe or not to believe. In the Eastern bloc they are mesmerized by the "warmongers" in the West, who are credited with the most diabolical intentions; while in the West the politicians make our flesh creep with stories about the sabre-rattling East. But there is a purpose in all this farrago. As we all know, when two parties have a set-to there is often a third party standing by to take advantage of it. Since both parties keep arming more and more heavily, the war-machines run at higher and higher revs on both sides. If some apparent *détente* or disarmament should take place, it is only an opportunity to scrap obsolete weapons or shift the existing ones somewhere else. And then the game continues as before. The third parties looking on with understandable amusement are of course the international bankers who finance the armaments industries on both sides.

How serious the danger of war from the artificially created communist empire really is to the West may be deduced from a word accidentally dropped now and again by the "initiated". For example, in a rare access of diplomatic candour the former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger is said to have uttered these words: "The great powers will never make war on one another; the European socialists are too dumb to see that. The Soviet Union is much too poorly equipped for that."⁷⁸

A remarkable and instructive indication of the true effectiveness of the Russian defences, especially in the air, was provided by the flight of Mathias Rust, the German boy who managed without difficulty to fly his little Cessna five hundred miles over "heavily guarded" Russian territory and land it in Red Square in the very heart of Reagan's "Evil Empire". The embarrassment caused by that incident was not to be purged even by the instant sacking of the air force commanders responsible.

The investigations into the crash of the Russian aircraft on South African territory in which Samora Machel, the dictator of Mozambique, was killed provided further conclusive proof of the primitive and obsolete equipment of a machine that had been judged fit to be placed, together with its Russian crew, at the disposal of the head of a friendly state. Since they flew it as a matter of routine, we can only suppose that it was perfectly typical of the normal quality of Russian engineering and navigation.

Similar evidence has been provided by other crashes elsewhere or by aircraft flown by deserters to America, Taiwan, South Korea and other countries.

Many such facts are concealed from the Western public so as to preserve the myth of communist equality with the far more advanced technological capacities of the West.

The secret rulers on both sides of the Iron Curtain know full well that the fusion of both systems into a single world state can only be brought about

if this artificially created bogey of mutual hostility is sufficiently alarming to frighten the ordinary people of the world into accepting a world government, if only as a *pis aller*, in face of the threat of the dreaded "holocaust".

Now that is not to say that the USSR would not be capable of inflicting appalling damage on the West with the modern weapon systems at its command. What it does mean is that the Russians would never launch a serious attack or start a third world war, because (as Kissinger rightly said) in the long run they would never stand the remotest chance of winning a victory over the far more highly-developed West; it would be tantamount to total self-destruction. Their atomic arsenal is certainly formidable enough to frighten the peoples of the West; just as it is formidable enough to discourage any foolhardy assault on the red empire of the international bankers.

The strengthening of the USSR, then, was one of the principal objectives of the instigators of the second world war. It was for that purpose that Germany had to be defeated and bear the burden of spurious guilt and be condemned to eternal expiation. But the really guilty men – the murderers of Dresden, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Katyn, Bromberg and innumerable other places, the betrayers of Pearl Harbour and Vlassov's army – sat in judgment throughout the farce of the Nuremberg trials, which turned every existing law upside-down.

"The guilty one is not he who starts a war," says Montesquieu, "but he who makes it inevitable."

No previous century in the whole history of mankind has been so deeply stamped with lies and deceit as this the twentieth, which, now that it approaches its end, is to see the birth of a "new world order", of which most of our species has as yet no suspicion. The conspirators have so willed it that this new age should be born of a century of terrible human suffering; a satanic age whose god is the Father of Lies; an age that "deceiveth them that dwell on earth", as 13th Revelations puts it.

Anybody living in South Africa and witnessing the total onslaught on his country is in a position to see more clearly than people elsewhere the co-ordinated nature of the attack by the secret forces on both sides of the Iron Curtain. South Africa having been so dumbstruck by the flood of propaganda that it can (officially at least) make no effective reply, they can afford to take less care to disguise the co-operation between East and West; again, the policy of *rapprochement* or *glasnost* of the Soviet Union has meanwhile proved so successful with the USA that the population of the world is quietly being got ready for amalgamation under a single world government.

In Europe nowadays it is taboo to express frankly anti-communist opinions; anybody who does is damned as a "cold warrior" or some such

mal-pensant. Opinions of that sort do not conform with the projected integration of the two world systems. Thus the financial powers behind the mass-media promote rapprochement and a leftward trend in general just as the Protestant and Catholic churches of the quondam Christian West call for ecumenical "toleration" and "dialogue" with other religions with the intention of creating some great united bogus superchurch in due course.

How co-operation with the USSR and the projected world government will work was explained in the official journal of the American Jewish Committee in New York in 1958: "The international government of the UN is actually a joint international government of the USA and the USSR in one."⁷⁹

In 1967 a radio commentary over "the Voice of America" let another cat out of the bag in its European programme: "In the near future the world will be governed in such a way that the American monopoly will not act in opposition to the Soviet monopoly, but rather there will be an **agreed polarization**. Consequently the USA and the Soviets will work together in secret and screen this activity by means of the UN. In that way the public of the world, which will of course not be in the picture, will be hoodwinked. Thus both the world powers will apparently be working against each other while in fact they are in secret complicity. That is the "new order". **Wars will still be fought, because that is part of the ostensible opposition, but they will be managed** and limited to controllable brush-fires so as never to lead to serious large-scale conflict. But behind the scenes everything will be so arranged that neither of the big boys trespasses on the other's territory. [Cf. the Hungarian rising, the Berlin wall, Afghanistan etc. – author] The real decisions, made in secret session, will be handed out to the servants of the Kremlin and the White House, and their satellites will not know what has been decided until they are confronted with the *faits accomplis*.⁸⁰ [author's emphasis]

Thus the Voice of America in 1967. The game has now got well into the second half; and people are still gazing in petrified terror at this completely sham battle between East and West that purports to threaten them with a titanic war of universal destruction.

François Mauriac, who was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1952, was also referring to this community of purpose when he wrote: "We should be less concerned about what separates the USA and the USSR than about what unites them. Both the super-powers, which regard themselves as enemies, are dragging mankind in the same direction of dehumanization. **At present they are acting in concert by jointly smashing the stable white governments in Africa and handing over the whole of Southern**

Africa to communist-inspired black demagogues.”⁸¹ [author’s emphasis]

What South Africans must realize and the other nations must recognize is simply this: political Zionism and world communism are the driving forces of a world revolution that draws its vital sustenance from international high finance. In the present world of unrest, instability and contrived chaos they both serve high finance by waging incessant war, by destabilization, by the spread of false information, by insurrections and terrorist attacks. That is the nature of the third world war against the West, its peoples, its religion and its culture, which are to be weakened, worn down and destroyed by ever-renewed attacks, by terrorist intimidation and bloody insurgencies. But no battle, no resistance is more infallibly lost than one in which the enemy is unseen and unknown. And a war of resistance has now become a necessity not only to South Africa but to all the peoples of the free world. They must now stand their ground and fight back, or else lose it by default.

No doubt Alexander Solzhenitsyn had the same thought in mind when he said in a talk on the BBC in 1976: “Before I came to the West and had a look round it for a couple of years I simply could not have imagined to what an enormous extent the West is blind to the world situation, and indeed to what an enormous extent the West has become a world without will-power, a world paralysed in the face of the existing danger ... We are all standing on the edge of a great historical cataclysm, a flood that will engulf all civilizations and change whole epochs.”

We hardly need Solzhenitsyn to explain to us that the all-destroying cataclysm is communism, which will give the remaining free nations of the world their death-blow so that the “new world” of the superbankers may be built on their ruins.

It is the destructive power of communism that is to create the necessary conditions for the entry of the new worldwide socialism that the One-World planners are working towards. Only when the viability, the power of resistance and the economic health of the nations have been destroyed will communism have served its purpose and be scrapped at the will of the conspirators and give way to the united socialism of the New World Order.

This wholesale humbugging of nations is now happening in all areas: since the very beginning of this century in schools, universities and theological seminaries the tares of confusion and destruction have been sown, and their shoots have sprung up all over the world. Conditions of anarchy, rebellion against parents and teachers, empty atheist churches – these are all symptoms of a sick society living from day to day, spineless, devoid of morality or ideals or principles.

Mental and psychosomatic illnesses have assumed epidemic dimensions – and are made worse by the pseudo-scientific treatments of the so-called psychiatric “experts”. The perverted thought-processes of a Sigmund Freud are still used at many universities as the basis of a “science” that does more harm than good.

As a result of the falsifications of history by the victor powers young Germans today are presented with a picture of their country that makes patriotism and national loyalty seem misplaced and teaches them to become not Germans but pan-Europeans and citizens of the world. We see the same trends in many other countries. Thus the planned abolition of national sovereignty and the amalgamation of Western Europe – and later with Eastern Europe – will be facilitated.

In anthropology students are inculcated with the marxist doctrine of the equality of all races and all human beings – an equality that does not exist either in mankind or in nature. Some of the fateful consequences of that disastrous doctrine are contempt for ethnic connexions or national fellowship and the great diversity of the human species, resulting in chaos and border wars and separatist movements, often accompanied by murder and terrorist attacks in the fight for their autonomy and “separate development” (apartheid).

Of course, it does not suit the One-World lot to admit it, but the fact of innate differences between peoples is perfectly self-evident not only to anybody who has regular dealings with other races but also to any biologist worth his salt who has the courage to take a stand opposed to the official, politically-motivated version. The secret manipulators are powerful enough to oust from his chair any professor of sufficiently independent mind who dared to teach such unwelcome truths. There are in fact plenty of examples, especially in America, where the political weight of the Establishment usually prevails over the scientific evidence given by reputable professors in legal proceedings.

The subversive material churned out by UNESCO, the branch of the UN concerned with educational affairs, in the form of school text-books and guides as to their content, is now uncritically accepted by most Western countries. The result is a standardization and stultification of thought that will make it easier for the future citizens of the world state to submit to the prospective revolutionary changes in politics, society, the economy and religion.

The systematic destruction of Christianity as a buttress and bearer of our Western civilization is regarded as a prerequisite for the creation of the New World Order, which pursues a policy of *syncretism*, the fusion of all the different religions into one all-embracing world temple.

It is not surprising, therefore, that readiness for “dialogue” has led the

Christian churches in recent years to hobnob more and more not only with Jews, Moslems, Hindus and Buddhists but even with Freemasons and communists. It is not without significance that the present Pope was invited and took part in a syncretistic prayer meeting in Assisi, Italy.

The great Rockefeller foundations in America not only train promising New-World theologians from all over the world at their Union Seminary in New York, where they are imbued with an anti-Christian "God is dead" philosophy; they have also given the world its biggest abortion clinic, which, in association with other such clinics in America, is designed to kill up to eighteen hundred thousand unborn babies a year, as John H. Knowles, a former president of the Rockefeller Foundation, boasted; though in less blunt language.

Who can blame the good Rocky if he takes the Fifth Commandment somewhat less seriously than the advantages of birth and population control?

The Christo-communists from the Rockefeller theological institute now occupying the pulpits of many churches in the West are busy making sure that the fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith is falsified and nullified by political interests, with the result that more and more people are abandoning their churches and turning away from Christianity. But a people robbed of its spiritual values and firm moral foundations and rules of conduct is at the mercy of any voguish ideologies and "trends" and can be driven in any desired direction.

So far South Africa has on the whole been able to escape the most noxious of the Western influences and trends; partly because of its geographical remoteness, but to some extent also because for many years it was spared the demoralizing influences of the "TV culture"; for television was introduced only about fifteen years ago. Since then, however, the country has also been exposed to the corrupting and stultifying effects of mostly American trash and subliminal propaganda. The television and the press unite in selling the public a saccharine and totally bogus American scene of perfect racial harmony, in which token blacks in positions of authority and prestige are obligatory, and ignoring all trace of the real state of affairs well known to anybody who has ever been to New York, Washington or Miami.

Complete race mixing and social integration seems to be the order of the day. The subliminal message constantly whispered is that all would be well if only that were accepted as normal; and then South Africa would once more be admitted into the fold of "decent" nations. But the South Africans are not told why, with a proportion of only twelve per cent of theoretically integrated blacks with equal rights, bloody riots and street-fighting are chronic in America.

The simple-minded descendants of the Boers, most of whom are devout Christians, now find themselves the target of a fierce barrage of hostile propaganda, lies, duplicity and treachery against which they do not know how to defend themselves. They are bemused amid this cloud of misrepresentation; they are troubled more and more with a sense of guilt that has been implanted in them, and as a result they often lurch from one extreme to another.

Thus the principal church in South Africa, the Dutch Reformed Church, recently performed a theological somersault and pronounced apartheid a sin, "since it could not be justified on biblical grounds". It seems not to have occurred to the worthy gentlemen of the Synod that made this heroic decision that they were doing something that the enemies of their country had been trying to bring about for years.

Could they so soon have forgotten that their theological predecessors had been maintaining precisely the opposite for at least a generation; that "separate development" under the will of God was absolutely justifiable by scripture? They believed that God had with excellent reason warned his people of the old Covenant against all mixing, which would lead to their assimilation by aliens. They cited the Testaments both Old and New, with particular emphasis on the words of Jesus: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfil."

Whatever anyone may think of apartheid or separate development – taking it in its proper sense and with due regard to human dignity and the equality of all human beings **before God** – it is certainly more defensible than the œcumenical attempts to achieve an imposed unity with syncretistic prayer meetings of the leaders of our Christian churches with non-Christian or positively anti-Christian communities.

The South Africans, believing in the Bible as they do, should ask the leaders of their churches whether it can be done in accordance with the will of God or the Church of Christ to throw their ancient beliefs overboard merely to satisfy an artificially created "world opinion" or sheepishly follow the lead of other churches whose sermons are marked more by the anti-Christian spirit of the World Council of Churches than that of the Divine *Logos*.

In his book *Truth and Falsehood* C.H. Spurgeon wrote: "A lie travels round the world while Truth is putting on her boots." The white and black citizens of South Africa alike are being subjected to a propaganda assault that endeavours to convince them that they have no option but to give in to "world opinion" and to institute reforms designed and dictated by their enemies.

For many years now they have been bombarded by the UN, "friendly"

Western states, international church organizations and so on with a constant, indefatigable, incessant barrage of accusations, myths and half-truths, and a controlled domestic and foreign press has been beating its breast and preaching at them, filling them with a sense of guilt and trying to manoeuvre them into an inescapable blind alley where they should be compelled to capitulate. South Africa is allowed no alternative; although perfectly good alternatives do in fact exist, and the fault-finders do not accept that their meddlings are an intolerable interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state. From all sides the croaks are heard: "It's inevitable"; "Too little, too late"; "Things have gone too far to be stopped now" and so on and so forth.

Any stick will serve to beat a dog; and every means is used to sap the strength and the will and the morale of the whites. Seditious poison is brewed and disseminated from pulpit and press. Foreign church delegations and "fact-finding" politicians arrive in droves, generously imparting the fruits of their wisdom and learning more in a two-week tour than the people who have lived there for generations, solving problems the complexity of which they can hardly even begin to understand. The Afrikaner himself knows perfectly well that most of the "problems" are caused only by the propaganda barrage and officious meddling by those outsiders. Add to these the Christian and secular groups, the friendship societies and the naïve writers who with the best of intentions call for "reforms" and "anti-apartheid" action – who can do more harm than good.

In Britain, Germany and innumerable other countries seminars and "church days" are held in which the main subject of discussion is South Africa; as if those countries hadn't enough internal and external problems of their own to occupy their attention.

The Organization for African Unity (OAU), which at its annual meetings regularly demonstrates its inability to solve the problems and alleviate the conflicts of even one of its under-developed and poverty-stricken member states, joins in the general chorus of condemnation of a country that they should rather be taking as a model and an example to emulate.

They are all caught up in the tug of a wave of propaganda set in motion by the enemies of South Africa that drowns all reason and common sense in its sweep across the whole world.

Meanwhile the international bankers spare no effort to bring South Africa to its knees. By means of artificially provoked and communist-controlled insurrections and acts of terrorism all over the country they stoke the fires of revolution, working away to wear down the resistance of the whites and try to crush them between the hammer of Moscow and the anvil of New York.

C.
STRATEGY
OF A PLANNED
REVOLUTION

“Psychopolitics” and “Disinformation”

There can be no question of an independent press. Not one of you dares to utter his honest opinion. We are the instruments and vassals of the rich men behind the scenes. We are puppets. Those men pull the strings and we dance. Our time, our talents, our lives and our powers all belong to those men – we are intellectual prostitutes ...

John Swinton, former Chief Editor of the *New York Times*, in a speech at the annual dinner of American Associated Press (1914)

For twenty years we have been constantly hearing the same tale regularly circulating the globe; as a result of its injustices and suppression of human rights South Africa is on the brink of civil war. In those twenty years (quite a long time nowadays) people who are in the habit of using their brains must have wondered why the civil war is so long in starting. The answer is obvious to anybody who realizes that the incessant harping on ostensible occurrences of terror, starvation, oppression, posed scenes and reports exaggerated out of all knowing all have but one purpose: to arouse strong feelings against South Africa.

The latest vogue nowadays is for “civil-rights leaders” in Washington, would-be politicians and parsons and actors to assemble in noisy protest demonstrations outside the South African embassy or get themselves arrested for an hour or two for illegally occupying institutions that deal in Kruger rands. “Church days” are turned into South Africa days. Unsatisfied housewives, “professional” students and liberal crackpots of all shades throw themselves into these fooleries with neurotic passion in an unconscious attempt to conquer their frustrations and inadequacies by a display of self-righteous indignation against a nation that they know only at second hand.

The explanation of their antics is the false information with which they are force-fed by the Establishment media. A succession of falsehoods about South Africa is so constantly repeated that most people come to accept such statements as “things that everybody knows”. No further proof is needed.

In 1984 an American company by the name of Accuracy in Media published an analysis of the reporting of civil rights during the year 1982 in the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times* and the CBS TV network. It found that the *New York Times*, for example, devoted more than half (53 per cent) of its reports on South Africa exclusively to the subjects of "human rights", compared with the USSR with 27 per cent, Nicaragua 18 per cent, Red China 14 per cent, East Germany 9 per cent, Iran and Angola 6 per cent each and Ghana 3 per cent. Three of the most repressive régimes in the world, Albania, North Korea and Cambodia, were scarcely mentioned; and the genocidal activities of Robert Mugabe's Fifth Brigade in Matabeleland (Zimbabwe) were referred to only peripherally as of little interest.⁸³

On 12 January 1985 the *New York Times* published a report by its South African correspondent Alan Cowell under the headline: "Hunger in South Africa – selective". It alleged that apartheid guaranteed starvation for 2,9 million blacks because "legislation consistently withheld the fertile land from the black population" and their subsistence cultivation was being systematically destroyed.

It is futile for the South African ministers responsible to rebut these calumnies and to provide the newspapers with the true facts. The harm is done and the effects of such propaganda on millions of readers cannot be undone.

In connexion with the later expulsion of the *New York Times* correspondent the South African newspaper *The Citizen* printed a letter from an American in New York on 21 January 1987, whose view of the situation I should like to quote in full. It appeared under the heading:

Overseas newsmen – Enemy within SA borders

The government of South Africa is to be commended for the expulsion of the New York Times correspondent, Alan Cowell. The question that needs to be answered is why did it take so long?

It is true that we have a free press in the US – free to twist and distort the news, free to report or not to report, in order to advance the political and social agenda of the enormously wealthy and powerful oligarchy that owns and controls the major national news media in the US – an oligarchy that is solidly Leftist and pro-Marxist.

They use their great power to weaken, demoralize and confuse the United States and to try to destabilize and overthrow anti-Communist nations like South Africa. If a bird should fall from the sky over South Africa, the major US news media would blame the 'racist, oppressive, White minority government of South Africa'!

The great power of the US news media (led by the NY Times and Washington Post) to influence events and to change history should not be underestimated. In any democracy where public opinion is everything, the control of information is the

power to change public opinion and government policy. The Leftist news media have used this power to reverse an election with the overthrow of Pres. Richard Nixon and to lose the war in Vietnam. At this moment they are striving to cripple the Reagan administration and perhaps to repeat the coup d'état of Nixon with Ronald Reagan the victim this time.

The dispatches of Alan Cowell, which are given great prominence by the owners of the NY Times, have done incalculable harm to South Africa. As his tour of duty drew to a close, his stories became more and more outrageous. Even if Mr Cowell wished to be objective, he knows that his future with the NY Times depends on pleasing his bosses. On the basis of the hatchet job he has done on South Africa, Mr Cowell's future with the NY Times is assured.

Correspondents like Mr Cowell and almost every other representative of the American print and broadcast media now in South Africa must be considered as an enemy army operating within your borders. It is folly to continue to let them remain. Their goal is revolution – not evolution. The sooner they follow Mr Cowell out of the country the better it will be for South Africa and the entire Western world."

(George E.R., New York 10475, N.Y.)

This hostile propaganda does not come only from America, as anybody can confirm by listening to the broadcasts to Africa of the BBC, Deutsche Welle and Radio Nederland, to name only a few. One might well suppose that they came from the other side of the Iron Curtain.

Most people will by now have heard about the German reporters who threw handfuls of sweets into rubbish-bins and then photographed the black children scrabbling for them. A few days later the pictures appeared in German and foreign publications under such captions as "Starving black children living on the whites' rubbish". These cases are by no means exceptional.

The following report by a correspondent appeared in *Deutsche Wochenzeitung* no. 50/80 (Box 270, 8200 Rosenheim-Obb.). Let it speak for itself:

THE PAPERS AND SOUTH AFRICA

They are constantly reporting 'racial unrests' – that don't exist. The strife among blacks is stirred up by agents, clergymen and journalists.

Not a day passes but reports appear in the press and TV and radio about 'racial unrest' in South Africa. Yet as any visitor can confirm, tranquillity and order prevail in the country and it is pointless to talk about 'racial unrest'. It is true that here and there among the black South Africans living in the crowded conurbations outside the industrial complexes politically motivated faction-fights occur almost daily, which in the African manner

nearly always result in bloodshed.

In most cases the trouble is caused by young people incited to 'take vengeance' on older people and their families who in some way are involved in local administration or work in some government department. The much-lauded Coloured clergyman Boesak, a close friend of Archbishop Tutu and his champion Beyers Naudé, has himself publicly declared, beneath a red hammer-and-sickle flag, that he will make South Africa 'ungovernable'. In the actual situation of the country that will not happen; but it must be admitted that many Western reporters ... fully support such statements and also incite young blacks to acts of terrorism.

The South African security authorities follow these events with close attention and have now begun to record these developments in picture and sound, particularly with video-cameras. A perusal of such material shows:

- During a police action against rioters in the grounds of the University of the Western Cape in October 1985 one of the Coloureds arrested by the police was helped to escape by two members of a TV team.
- In October a member of a TV crew was given permission to take pictures at a continuation school in Soweto. The principal kept an eye on him and watched him driving to a house nearby, where he concealed himself. Soon afterwards the school was attacked by children. Then the man appeared and filmed the event.
- A South African working with a foreign TV unit informed the police that some TV crews had prior knowledge of certain future events. They set up their apparatus in advance and waited for them to happen, usually the burning of schools and other buildings. Such scenes were engineered entirely for the purposes of the TV reports!
- In the first week of September 1985 parents complained to the police in Soweto that their children had told them they had been paid by a TV crew to burn their text-books so that they could film the scene. The police investigated the matter, and it became clear that if any of the parents or children were called as witnesses in a court case they would probably be killed. Such fears were also expressed by some of the witnesses. They are justified too, when you consider that more than 240 blacks have been brutally murdered, in many cases publicly by black revolutionaries. For that reason the police decided not to continue their investigations.
- At a peaceful demonstration outside the University of Cape Town in September 1985 the demonstrators waited for the arrival of the foreign media. When the cameramen appeared they were greeted with cheers and applause. Then the demonstrators began to sing and rampage; it was obvious that they had just been waiting for the appearance of the TV crew to start. The situation compelled the police to take action,

which gave the cameramen an opportunity to film them. This incident was also filmed from some distance away by a police video unit.

- We were also shown other film material taken by the police video units. In one sequence a TV crew hid behind some cars in the middle of rioters armed with stones and other missiles and waited for the police to arrive. As soon as they did the stone-throwing – and the filming – began.
- It was also evident from some of the video material shown to me that some foreign TV crews were provided with gas-masks to enable them to film the actions of the police against rioters while moving freely among them. In doing so they hampered the police and deliberately aggravated a tense situation.

In the light of such facts it need surprise no one that the government of South Africa – which is also responsible for the safety of the black part of the population – decided to place restrictions on the hitherto complete freedom of movement and reporting of TV crews; for no orderly state on earth can tolerate foreigners stirring up trouble on its soil. In fact it waited far too long before deciding to take that step.” (H.J.R.)

That report is by one observer on the spot.

For years the public all over the world has been systematically fed thousands of snippets of information, some true, some false, some relevant, some irrelevant, some contradictory, some incomprehensible. To the average citizen it seems a meaningless mosaic of unrelated bits and pieces. He shrugs and gives up trying to understand the world situation. He turns instead to the sports broadcasts or reads the juiciest gossip about some divorce or devotes his attention to the photographic representation of female anatomy. His mental withdrawal and failure to understand the present state of the world of course make it infinitely easier for the international wirepullers to steer governments and peoples in the desired direction.

The worldwide onslaught on South Africa may be regarded as a classic model of psychological warfare. People’s thinking is subjected to such powerful influences that their natural attitudes are slowly but surely altered and are no longer their own. They are “got at” emotionally. Constant repetition of emotionally-loaded phrases and images cannot be without effect. When lies are repeated often enough they are ultimately accepted as truths. The man in the street has been subjected to such a degree of brain-washing and mental processing that he is no longer capable of considering things rationally.

Within their enormous KGB state security apparatus the Russians have a special section for "disinformation". Its function is the deliberate dissemination of false reports, misleading information, the spreading of rumours and the collection of compromising material for the purpose of blackmail. The communists are past-masters in all these fields and are adept at turning the Western media to their own account. Since the men behind communism are also the masters of the world press, it is not surprising that the methods of "disinformation" used by the press are very similar.

The importance of the co-operation of the Western mass-media in the planned revolution in Southern Africa (Rhodesia, Namibia, South Africa) was admitted years ago by the present communist president of Mozambique, Joaquim Chissano.

A British newspaper reported:⁸⁴ "Soon after the FRELIMO guerrillas had taken over power from the Portuguese in Mozambique, a German journalist, Lutz Herold, interviewed Samora Machel's deputy, Joaquim Chissano. He asked him what chances the ZAPU/ZANU rebels had against the Rhodesian army. Chissano, who had received his training in revolutionary tactics and propaganda in East Germany, Czechoslovakia and the USSR, replied that the guerrillas by themselves stood little chance of defeating the Rhodesian forces. He added that the ANC [the communist African National Congress; author] by itself had absolutely no chance of beating the South African security forces. 'But,' he said, 'that doesn't matter. **We know that the whites in southern Africa are so influenced by their media that they will give up their position of power.**' " [Author's emphasis]

The South African media play a very important part in softening the South African people. As the American publisher of the *McAlvany Intelligence Advisor*, Donald McAlvany, writes, the South African newspapers, "with the exception of *The Citizen*, are much more left-liberal than the most liberal American newspapers, including *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times*."

They consider every reform as not going nearly far enough. Almost all the English-language papers, and to an increasing extent the Afrikaans papers too, influence their readers in favour of the pro-communist ANC, the extra-parliamentary United Democratic Front (UDF) and the anti-government South African Council of Churches (SACC) and demand the release of Nelson Mandela, a communist who was imprisoned for high treason. They palliate or ignore the communist threat both inside and outside the country and advocate radical reforms and the immediate abolition of all race-separation laws, which would have a particularly advantageous effect on Big Business in South Africa. They take part in discussions and dialogue with terrorist "liberation movements" and de-

mand the cessation of the State of Emergency, regardless of the fact that it was precisely that measure by the government that was so effective in reducing the acts of murder and arson within the black townships and restoring peace and order throughout the country, so that the great peace-loving majority of black and white citizens could go about their lawful occasions.

When clashes occur between the police or army and radical rioters, with hardly any exception the blame is placed on the "brutal provocative acts" of the security forces. Everything possible is done to undermine public confidence in the security organs of the State.

The will to resist of the population in general and the morals of young people in particular are sapped by subversive propaganda, and sex and pornography in papers and magazines. What only about ten years ago used to be one of the most strictly moral societies in the world now sees itself subjected to a veritable invasion of moral depravity, prostitution and obscene advertising. Much of this takes place in breach of the existing laws; but the government is reluctant to take action to "restrict the freedom of the citizen", as the press has conditioned its readers to believe.

Most of the South African press, including the publishers of books and periodicals, belong to the vast Anglo-American business empire, and are therefore controlled by its head, Harry Oppenheimer. He is closely associated with the most important international establishments in the USA, such as the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and the Trilateral Commission, and the European Bilderbergers and the Royal Institute for International Affairs in London. Oppenheimer is a strong supporter of Archbishop Tutu and a leading promoter of the internationalist South Africa Institute of International Affairs.

He sent his top management of Anglo-American to hold discussions with the ANC bombers in Lusaka in Zambia, despite the fact that it was planning the overthrow of the government and had been prohibited in South Africa as a subversive organization. Since other "liberal" representatives of South African Big Business took part in these talks, the terrorists were given far more prestige than they could have wished for. The parallel with Rockefeller's close associations with marxist states is striking, and it demonstrates the preference that multinational concerns have for social systems in which the free market economy is replaced by monopoly capitalism.

The American Professor A. Sutton put it like this: "For unprincipled men with the power to corner the market marxist governments have a whole lot of attractions. They include state-controlled markets without irritating disturbances such as competition in the free-market economy and controlled work forces in which there are no such inconveniences

as wage negotiations, trade unions, strikes and expensive security measures ...”

The radio and television services of the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) are controlled by the government, and until recently the programmes were still moderately conservative, apart from the fact that the Corporation does little to make the South Africans aware of the dangers threatening them from both outside and inside. Meanwhile “liberal” forces within the SABC have gained the upper hand, and it is now preparing the population step by step for total racial integration and “power-sharing” with the black majority. Plans are being made for the privatization of the SABC. All else being equal, it is now probable that the Oppenheimer interests will acquire the majority of shares, so that ultimately the press, TV and periodicals in South Africa would be under his control. This concentration of mass-media power in the hands of “liberals” is typical of the whole Western world nowadays.

The demoralization of the South African people is one of the main objectives of the psychological war against the country. It is intended to break the nation’s will to resist by undermining its faith in itself, its institutions and its government. It is done by holding up to South Africans a false picture of reality. The security forces are represented as defenders of an immoral system that deserves condemnation rather than defence, and young people are urged to refuse military service, and thus weaken their country.

As Lenin said: “The highest art of war is to avoid military engagements altogether and defeat the enemy by destroying his moral principles, his religion, his culture and his traditions. When a country has been demoralized in that way it can be taken over without a single shot being fired.”

In 450 B.C. the Chinese philosopher Sun Tsu taught: “Undermine everything that serves the life of your opponent. Undermine his respectability and at the right moment expose him to public disgrace. Enlist the help of the meanest and most abominable persons. Spread strife and discord among the citizens of the enemy country. Goad young people against their elders. Disrupt the activities of the government by all means possible. Hold all your enemy’s traditions and gods in contempt. Send loose women among them to complete the work of destruction ...”

According to those principles a war is conducted eighty per cent psychologically and only twenty per cent militarily. The object is to convince the people of the country that its existing form of society is incompatible with a happy and stable life and economic prosperity. By contrast, the enemy’s system is represented as being far more morally defensible and infinitely more acceptable by the people and the world in general. Only that system

could ensure a lasting peace, harmony within the country and with the world outside and economic progress.

Once the majority of the population allows itself to be mentally manipulated in this way it is hardly necessary to wage military operations; the country has already half capitulated.

One of the first steps in psychological warfare consists in the isolation of the enemy country, both physically and psychically. It is made out to be the pariah of the world. (In America efforts are being made to get South Africa officially declared a "terrorist state".) The country is excluded from all international committees and sports organizations. Trade boycotts and restrictions on travel are imposed. Tourists, sportsmen and businessmen are put under such pressure by their governments and "the media" that they hardly dare to visit the country. Newspapers and television present distorted images of reality: exaggerated stories of a state of civil war, terrorism, murder and violence calculated to frighten off anybody thinking of going there. Famous sporting figures and stars who are not intimidated by all this are "black-listed", reprisals are taken against them, and on their return they are boycotted by many countries. Through fear of the media in their own country and the concomitant adverse effects on their career and earning power many of them are induced to jabber the stereotyped claptrap expected of them, although in fact the impressions that they had formed of the pariah state and its inhabitants were entirely different.

Yet there are dauntless exceptions, such as the young American TV actor Jan Michael Vincent, who recently visited South Africa and had the courage to say openly what he really thought.

On 12/10/1987 the *Pretoria News*, which is critical of the government, carried the following report on his visit:

AIRWOLF STAR THINKS WE'RE A HAPPY BUNCH

American TV star Jan Michael Vincent is returning home with the belief that South Africans are happy in spite of apartheid.

Vincent, who plays Stringfellow Hawk in the action series Airwolf, was in Durban at the weekend promoting a chain store. He said he saw only happy and cheerful South Africans wherever he went. He said that when he returned to the US he intended meeting President Ronald Reagan and telling him what he saw in South Africa.

'As soon as I get back to America, I will seek an audience with President Reagan to tell him exactly how I feel about South Africa.' He said he was aware people were 'compartmentalised' into their own racial group areas, but believed each group

preferred to live with their own. He said he had not seen healthier, more beautiful children than those he had seen in this country. He said he visited only one black township, and everyone was happy.

Of course such observations do not fit into the picture of South Africa that foreigners are supposed to see. The terror of public opinion or "world opinion" has now reached such proportions that it is no longer possible for anybody in public life to express an honest view of South Africa and its social system. On the evening TV news the South Africans are regularly offered the astonishing spectacle of visitors occupying important positions in political, ecclesiastical or commercial life – whether conservative or evangelical or liberal makes no difference – all starting with the same line of patter that "of course" they are against apartheid and deplore the present social system, before going on to answer the neutral questions that follow.

Another important objective of psychological warfare consists in presenting an entirely false picture of the system of government of the country concerned so that it appears to exploit and oppress the majority of its population and act in a manner contrary to their interests. Everything possible is done to restrict contacts with the country to the minimum so as not to spoil the carefully composed distortion.

Mental isolation is even more important than physical isolation. The white population of South Africa must be made to feel like lepers, outcasts from the world community, for living in and with and by an abominably unjust system that enables them to prosper at the expense of the "oppressed". If they want to regain the goodwill of the world, they are told, they must do something about dismantling that system.

The Afrikaners are incessantly assured in subtle ways by the mass-media that never before had the blacks been so horribly oppressed and ill-treated as by them, and that South Africa is ruled by "the worst régime since Nazi Germany".

These emotion-laden expressions, which in fact stand the truth on its head, and by constant repetition come to be swallowed as self-evident axioms by a gullible world public, with the result that even South African businessmen and sportsmen and tourists abroad often fall victim to this psychic barrage. Like exchange students, theologians and professional people who undergo some part of their training abroad, they more often than not return as mouthpieces for the enemies of their country without being aware of it.

The sense of guilt implanted in them is skilfully used by the establishment media to spread it into every corner of the country. Well-known personalities in sport, the churches and business, who from sheer simplicity or a positive marxist inclination spread their corrosive bane, are the

darlings of the controlled press both at home and abroad. Hardly a day passes but their sage observations and appeals to their own people for "more justice" and "reconciliation" and "reforms" are reported in some newspaper or other.

Thus a national guilt complex is fabricated which, together with the isolation of the country, is intended to lead eventually to the surrender of the whites and the handing over of power to a radical socialist black "majority".

Every effort is made to persuade the whites: For God's sake chuck it! There's no point in holding out against the communists, the Americans, the UN, the ANC and all the rest. An ANC government is inevitable. Negotiate an acceptable peace while you're still in a position of strength.

The true realities of the South African problem are discerned only by a rare few. Most people, both here and elsewhere, conceive the conflicts as exclusively racial in character: Get rid of apartheid and all your problems will vanish ... This misinterpretation is deliberately fostered. In actual fact racial antagonisms are made use of only for the purpose of replacing a "capitalist" social system by a marxist-socialist system; as we shall see in the next chapter.

Whatever evolutionary reforms may be made, whatever justice and equality of opportunity may be instituted within the obdurate South African social system – and indeed are necessary – they will do nothing to ward off the onslaught against the country!

The battle for South Africa – it is necessary to keep stressing this – has global strategic objectives; it has absolutely nothing to do with apartheid, human rights or discrimination by colour.

The machinery of propaganda and the psychological strategies of the KGB make use of the same channels and vehicles of "disinformation" and calumny so readily available in the West.

Those include Russian support of the so-called "front-line" states and "liberation movements" being represented as altruistic and stabilizing factors. Any counter-reaction by the West or defensive measures taken by the South African armed forces are consistently characterized as "injustice" and "aggression".

The Russian version of South African politics is one of unnatural contrast and conflict between South Africa and the black African states. Its dominant position and its mere existence as a white entity in Africa are decried as a "system of injustice with no legitimate rights".

To isolate South Africa still further Russian radio broadcasts and publications concentrate on mustering black Africa, particularly the "front-line" states, and Western Europe against South Africa.

Touching a highly sensitive nerve, they falsely represent South Africa as

a colonial survival from a past era that has attained its position of power by exploitation and oppression of the black population. In Europe Russian psycho-propaganda endeavours to represent South Africa as heir and successor to Hitler's Germany by equating its form of society with the National Socialism of the Third Reich. A well-known South African bishop who makes no secret of his "red" sympathies even went so far as to imply that the aim of the South African government was a "final solution of the black question" – whatever he meant by that.

The UN promotes this association of ideas wherever possible. Thus a few years ago the Cuban delegate, Oramas Oliva, made a speech before the UN in which he said: "We do not wish to strain the patience of the members by quoting word for word what that stupid but dangerous apostle of Hitler, Herr Pieter Botha, [former S.A. State President: author] said ..."

That this was a coordinated strategy is obvious from the fact that similar statements were suddenly made everywhere. Thus J. Makatini, a member of the prohibited underground communist movement the ANC said: "The architects and present upholders of apartheid derived and still derive their inspiration and examples ... from the Hitler régime."

One Mr Clark, a former chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, stated that "the South African apostles of that prophet [Hitler], particularly Malan, Verwoerd, Vorster and now Botha, have never concealed their admiration and support for National Socialism ..."

Even the official documents of the UN suddenly adopted this line: "This cowardly and criminal act of aggression against Lesotho [i.e. a South African attack on ANC terrorist positions; author] and the massacre of civilians reflect the crimes of National Socialism."⁸⁵

The intention is perfectly clear. If South Africa can be forced into the rôle of Nazi Germany, then apartheid can be condemned as being the same kind of crime against humanity as the National Socialism of the Third Reich is now condemned by the world.

In addition to the attacks by the establishment media both at home and abroad there is a spate of publications of all sorts in South Africa itself that creates a revolutionary climate and sometimes assumes dangerous dimensions. These "alternative media" are largely financed from abroad; often by church organizations in Germany, Switzerland and Scandinavia, whose missionary zeal, it must be said, does little for the cause of Christian unity and love of one's neighbour.

Their influence, whether overt or covert, on the black masses through marxist propaganda and "liberation theology" must bear its share of responsibility for the outbreaks of violence and revolutionary unrest in the

black townships. Black leaders who wished to restore peace in their locality and had perforce to co-operate with the security organizations were denounced in the media, while radical agitators were often represented as heroes. Bodies and individuals who did not steer the revolutionary course laid down by the ANC were vilified and branded as collaborators. A careful selection of news and photographic material flattering to radical-left organizations endeavoured to set them in a favourable light. On the pretext of objective reporting and normal journalistic practices these publications were vehicles of subtle propaganda and helped to create the revolutionary climate in the country.

The special connections of the media with revolutionary activities could hardly have been made more obvious than in the trial, years ago, of Braam Fischer, a former leader of a communist underground movement in South Africa that had close relations with Moscow. He had cheerfully admitted: "Our press has done marvellous work." By that he did not mean *Pravda* or *The Morning Star* but the South African mass media belonging to both chains, the Argus Group and South African Associated Newspapers.

There can be no doubt that revolutionary groups in South Africa are able to command favourable treatment in the media, particularly those of the "alternative press". In 1985 the ANC had stated that the "democratic media" in South Africa must be developed parallel to the armed struggle to mobilize the masses.⁸⁶

Scarcely anything has done more harm to the image of South Africa in the world than the propagandistic, distorted and one-sided reporting in its own media, which is eagerly snapped up abroad and only needs to be reprinted.

In the *Aida Parker Newsletter* no. 49 of 29 January 1985 the writer published some readers' letters under the heading *The Truth Is South Africa's Strongest Defence* which well express the mood and dissatisfaction within the population:

"There is a desperate need for a more enlightened public, for an educative programme to 'de-brainwash' people. You are not going to get that through the SA editions of Pravda and Izvestia South. One of the more unattractive aspects of SA journalism is the manner in which it has been enlisted to assist in the global campaign against this country. I know of no other country in the world where the attacks, notably on the SADF and security forces, are so unrestrained as virtually to border on treason." (Lawyer from Natal)

"An alarming aspect is that certain of the country's newspapers have for quite a few years now carried out what has all the earmarks of a calculated campaign of denigration of the SADF and particularly the Security Police, wherever possible insinuating a basic moral depravity. Wittingly, semi-wittingly or unwittingly, all

possible is done to undermine public trust and faith in the security forces. Let that be achieved and the radicals can then operate more freely against us, in this country and abroad." **(Citizen Force officer)**

"One of the least admirable traits of the liberal White South African, including many opinion-forming Afrikaners, is this continuous whining mea culpa, mea culpa. Such selfdenigration would be sensible and understandable in a country which had clearly failed. Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola, Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia, all would be well justified in wearing the sackcloth, in acknowledging guilt. But this thirst for self-accusation among so many in SA is incomprehensible. The problem is that SA's self-esteem has been almost mortally wounded by a powerful alliance within the country's own borders: the news media, radical churchmen, NUSAS [National Union of SA students; author], the Black Sash, the arts, literature, theatre, trade unions, all ready and willing to parade at any time in denunciation of their own country. Combined, they do everything possible to poison and confuse public opinion, to erode public support for the White community, the free enterprise system, for the army and police." **(A Natal doctor)**

"At a time when the full force of the international propaganda machine is being used against us, it is quite inappropriate that we host people like ..., previously not granted a visa for many years but now dusted down and trotted out as part of the campaign to diminish or destroy the SA economy. Local activists are steadily getting bolder, more out of hand. For once, it might not be a bad idea to follow the example of our arch-enemy, the USSR. We should place a straightforward law on the statute books, making it an indictable offence punishable by five years' detention (or more) for deliberate slander against the State, with a view to assisting in the overthrow of that State." **(A Pretoria Lawyer)**

"Behind the pinkish smokescreen, it should be obvious to all that certain interests, representing international capital, want SA totally discredited, discredited completely and for good – buried, whatever the human cost. A serious complication factor is that most of our own media are simply not on our side. SA is incomparable stronger and better than it is portrayed but the heat is stepping up because the real truth about Black Africa is now emerging, while the Soviet-supported ANC/ SACP onslaught has never really got off the ground. SA must be destroyed now, or soon it may be too late." **(Former police officer)**

"Should one impose certain restrictions on an adversary press? In certain circumstances, yes. Freedom of speech is a luxury you can afford when living in isolation and a state of tranquillity. Once you are surrounded by enemies who leave no doubt about their ultimate aim, and in the process use their interpretation of free

speech to subvert the nation, certain restraints are justified.” (*University of Cape Town academic*)

Many blacks clearly accept that South Africans are all in the same canoe and must paddle hard together to avoid going over the waterfall. **A black businessman from Sebokeng** takes offence at the demand for sanctions by the South African archbishop Tutu and writes:

“Intoxicated with his own importance Bishop Tutu, spending far more time outside SA than inside it, is engaged in a Devil’s Dialogue. The rules of common sense indicate that what we need is a flood of information pamphlets to our people who mostly know little of the real facts about sanctions and boycotts. Bishop Tutu’s photograph should be large and sharp, with the caption: ‘This man wants to take away your job, your security, your home, the food from your children. He wants to destroy your future and your children’s future. This man eats with the Queen of Holland. He doesn’t want you to eat at all.’ ”

Another black South African, **“Pro-Peace” from Soshanguve** writes in a letter to the SA newspaper *The Citizen* (12.10.1987):

“During the past three years, I have, as a concerned citizen, been following the media and news about the necklacing method used by the ‘comrades’ in killing ‘spies’ and ‘collaborators’. It has been a horrible and shocking experience to us all nationally, and even internationally. So far 1023 have been killed by this barbarous method.

Without any doubt, this method was used to terrorize the many law-abiding citizens in the Black townships. Recently, Oliver Tambo (leader of the ANC; author) announced that necklacing must stop. But it took him and his organization a very long time indeed to say so. They must have been pressurized into their new stance. Their main aim of striking terror into the people was not realized as many people condemned and denounced this barbaric method. The ANC also has been recently losing credibility and sympathy in most Western countries. One should now wonder what method will they now apply because they do justify the execution of police ‘collaborators’ and spies. Perhaps a ‘better’ less barbaric method will be used! My advice to them all is that negotiations pave the way for a better understanding between nations, than dictatorial and barbaric methods. All those barbaric and horrible killings were really a waste and loss for mankind. What a shame! God forgive us all.”

A housewife from Port Edward wrote: (*The Citizen*, 20.9.89)

“My heart goes out to the mothers of all our policemen who must lie awake at night worrying about their sons. It seems to me that our Security Forces are in a no-win position. If unruly mobs get out of hand, they are blamed for not taking strong action. When they do take action to control the rioters and protect us from these

hysterical lunatics, they are harshly criticized, not only in our own country but world-wide.

A few years ago I experienced a 'rent-a-crowd' crazy mob of black teenagers brought in to Braamfontein by the busload, to be passed off as Wits students, and this was a very frightening experience. Our brave young policemen, after warning this crowd again and again not to come into the streets, were forced to stop them and control them and protect us, and they charged this sea of stick-wielding, stone-throwing rioters.

Of course, the baton-charging policemen were very well filmed by a well-positioned group of foreign TV newsmen, whom, incidentally, I had witnessed a few days before, in the very same spot, placing their cameras and practising for this riot, so that they could film our police in the worst possible positions for their lying overseas newscasts. I am sick and tired of hearing daily of yet another death of a brave young policeman. Very strong action must be taken against the ANC terrorists, who appear to be taking control of our land and are very well organized by Tutu, Boesak and the like, who are obviously on the payroll of their Marxist bosses. My heartfelt thanks and appreciation to our police and Security Forces who are doing their utmost to control the violence in our land. God help us all if they were not there!" (Mrs. Pat F., Port Edward)

When the government imposed severer restrictions on the daily papers and the "alternative media" as part of the emergency legislation to contain the rioting and chaos in many black locations, partly at the urging of both blacks and whites; the said media having continued to print revolutionary propaganda despite the prior warnings of the minister responsible, with the result that some were suspended, there was a great outcry from the press all over the country. Together with the liberal media in other countries they accused the government of unjustified dictatorial measures caused by such neurotic obsessions as the "total communist onslaught", and the abolition of "freedom of the press" by which the citizens were deprived of "the right to information" and "the voice of the oppressed" had been silenced by undemocratic means.

Most people, however, heaved a sigh of relief and marvelled at the patience of a government that had so long put up with the provocations of a controlled press that endangered the state.

Moreover, the press in South Africa still has the same right as before to criticize the government and other bodies to its heart's content so long as it refrains from revolutionary propaganda dangerous to the security of the state and incitement to conflict between classes or races. In doing so the government is merely taking the same line as many other countries in the Western world in which the demands of security take precedence over unrestricted freedom of the press.

The psychological war against South Africa, last but not least, has a strong impact in the economic sphere. A weakening or total collapse of the economy of the country would be the simplest means of forcing the government to capitulate. The bloody revolution so often conjured up, especially in the foreign media, for South Africa, the prospect of a marxist takeover and concomitant nationalization of industrial firms, together with pressure from their home governments and "the world public" to turn their backs on the apartheid state has induced dozens of large firms to sell off their South African affiliations and withdraw. The result was that financially powerful South African interest groups have been able to buy up the local offshoots of such multinationals as Coca Cola, IBM, Ford, General Motors, Kodak and Barclays Bank for a song.

Although that may temporarily lead to a weakening of the existing economic capacity, in the long run it nevertheless means a strengthening of the country, since the profits will remain at home and the technological training of local experts will be promoted.

The withdrawal and sale of mostly American firms in South Africa is usually based on the argument that they will no longer have any part in the apartheid policy and leave in protest. In fact the canting hypocrites have for many years been drawing enormous capital and profits from the apartheid state and its black labour forces without the slightest scruple. Now that the apartheid laws are being extensively abolished and better social conditions for the workers are being instituted, and higher taxes have to be paid to finance the process of assimilation – as a result of which profits would of course be reduced – they are retreating under the pretext of moral indignation.

Actually their financial withdrawal is only a piece of show-business; for most of them continue to make considerable profits from lucrative technological exchanges and licensing agreements from the plant that they have sold.

In *Diagnosen* 3/86 the American James P. Tucker Jr wrote: "The key to the disinformation campaign by the establishment lies in the omission of facts and the distortion of events. If the Americans had complete information and balanced reports they would be angry; all the hysterical demonstrations against apartheid would immediately stop, and the phoney liberals who are destroying the interests of America would be so ridiculed that they would disappear."

The South Africans ought to know that there is no such thing as a hostile "world opinion" or "world community". They are based on an artificial fabric created by the media, a web spun out of the imagination. But what makes such a figment so dangerous is the fact that it has become a soothing

illusion to many liberal intellectuals in the West, a bogus creed that they hang on to with stubborn tenacity; for if they were to recognize the great campaign of lies for the monstrous things that it is it would be unendurable.

The enemies of South Africa are not the millions of members of any "world community" but a little clique of wirepullers who control the psycho-campaigns and "disinformations" to create a "world opinion" and regulate the course of the world in accordance with their wishes.

Exploiting the Racial Problems

We must always bear in mind that the existing racial tensions are our party's most powerful weapon. By constantly drumming it into the heads of the coloured races that they have been oppressed by the Whites for centuries, we can win them for the communist party programme.

**Israel Cohen, a communist functionary, in his book
A Race Programme for the Twentieth Century (1912)**

There can seldom have been an ideology that has had such a pernicious influence on the human species as the fallacious marxist doctrine of the equality of all men. According to that doctrine human beings are distinguishable from one another only by their membership of a particular social class, religion or state of affluence. Apart from that, regardless of whatever race or nation they belong to, they are all naturally equal and possessed of the same capabilities, talents and potentialities. If they all grew up under the same conditions, with equal opportunities in education and training, they would all be capable of the same mental development of the highest order.

However absurd and contrary to all human experience that doctrine may appear to anyone capable of thinking clearly, it was adopted in principle by the UN and entered into the statute-books of several multiracial states, including Britain and America. The notion is now championed with fanatical zeal by marxists, communists, socialists, liberals and many politicizing churchmen who are not prepared to admit that wherever equal opportunities exist, unequal abilities are perfectly obvious.

What is true of the individual is no less true of races or peoples. It is foolish and contrary to all reason to attempt to force people of different races and cultures into a common mould. Nor is it possible by doctrinaire methods to "standardize" them or make them homogeneous. There are genetic and other differences that are simply too great to be bridged over by artificial human interference or legislation.

It is the natural tendency of all human beings – of all animals – to consort with their own kind; it is an unalterable fact of life observed all over the world wherever different cultures and races live together. The marxist objective of forcing all mankind down to the lowest common level through

racial mixing – to bring about the perfect Marxist Man of the future – has concealed political motives the demoralizing effects of which, particularly in America and Britain, are all too apparent nowadays.

Hatred, envy, discontent, social instability, captiousness and high crime rates are the consequences of an integral political order that takes no account of the national and racial differences that exist. Wherever natural antagonisms and hereditary racial differences are treated as if they did not exist, and – ostensibly – there are equal opportunities for all, ideas and expectations are raised that cannot be realized. The frustrations caused by a sense of “denial” and one’s own inadequacy – despite legislated equality of opportunity – necessarily lead to feelings of inferiority, a tendency to “let yourself go” and to a general moral decline in a society in which only the “smart”, the industrious and the talented can achieve success and recognition.

Dissatisfaction and hatred of superiors explode with ever-increasing frequency in outbursts of violence against “society”, its police and security organizations. The sense of inferiority is compensated for with insolence and threatening behaviour.

How else are we to explain the race riots in such “liberal” countries as England and America, with all their equality laws and care and social welfare programmes for the black or other ethnic elements of their populations?

If we make a perfectly detached and factual examination of the realities of America, where blacks and whites have been living together for centuries, the dry statistics demonstrate that there can be no question of assimilation. In the face of all the liberal dogmas the figures published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in its *Uniform Crime Report* in 1963 and a report by the Department of Labour in 1965, *The Negro Family: the Case for National Action*, tell a very different story.

They tell us that on the average the American negro produces eight times as many illegitimate children per head of population, six times as many feeble-minded adults, and commits nine times as many robberies with violence, seven times as many rapes and ten times as many murders as white men.⁸⁷

Conversely the US negroes produce only a sixth per caput of persons with an IQ of over 130, i.e. in the “gifted” category.⁸⁸

A comparison with England gives similar results. Between 1945 and 1960 the government allowed in about a million immigrants. Although those million, mostly negroes from Jamaica, constitute less than two per cent of the British population, they now produce over seventy-five per cent of all homeless children, who have to be

admitted to British orphanages. Most of them are illegitimate and of negroid stock.⁸⁹

These figures are necessary to show what it leads to if unequal races have to live together. To uprooted people alienated from their own culture and way of life, it almost always means social decline, distress and despair; it is almost a form of genocide.

Legally prescribed equality between unequals inevitably gives rise to tensions and disharmonies; for it flouts divinely-ordained realities. Inequality is one of the unalterable realities of this world. Men cannot be **both** free **and** equal; for free men would not be equal, and equal men would not be free. But it is precisely in the multiplicity and variety of all forms of life that we perceive the blessing and the wisdom of a creation in which talents and abilities are unequally distributed and ought to complement one another.

In the different peoples of South Africa their marked differences in abilities are particularly evident. Some are distinguished by their preference for husbandry and tillage; others are skilful craftsmen, painters and builders of huts. Others again are noted for their carpet-weaving, and their products are exported to many countries. Some tribes are warlike and tend more to the hunting life of their ancestors, and their special talents in that sphere earn them considerable respect. But there is one thing that all the black peoples of South Africa have in common: they are infinitely superior to the white man, within their own cultural contexts, in the natural environment and in their ability to survive in the wild African bush.

More than once my safety has depended on the skill of my black companion, who after travelling by cross-country vehicle for hours through the bush at night, in which every shrub looks exactly like every other, could not only spot a multitude of wild animals and point them out but could also find the way back to the farm with the ease and accuracy of a sleepwalker.

Their physical constitution and manner of life enable a native to drink the foul water of some sluggish river with crocodiles and hippopotamuses wallowing in it and so contaminated with germs and parasites that no white European could risk even bathing in it without getting bilharzia and a whole range of other tropical diseases.

Their courtesy to one another, their wise customs and practices, their respect for the old and their love and solicitude not only for their own children but for all their kin are exemplary, and vastly superior to the moral standards of the white consumer society of our day. There is therefore no justification for arrogant presumptions of superiority to other races in all their diversity and cultural differences.

But if all these peoples were to be lumped together with Indians and Coloureds and whites into a completely integrated unitary state, it would

not only give rise to dangerous racial tensions, it would also be a grave injustice to black peoples, uprooted and robbed of their own cultures.

The policy of *apartheid* or separate development was developed to prevent just that.

If the white Afrikaner has hitherto refused to share the responsibilities of government with his black compatriots, it is not merely out of malicious hostile "racism" but from sheer experience and the judgment acquired over centuries of the abilities of his black compatriots. That may well be "discrimination", but it is perfectly understandable to anybody who knows how the black African states in general are governed and administered. Incompetence, corruption, prodigality, one-party despotisms: these are the rule, not the exception.

Of course the black man has his own abilities, his own strengths and spheres appropriate to his particular culture; but he is by no means as fit to run a modern industrial state like South Africa, far less to assume sole power of government, merely by virtue of his overwhelming majority of votes as the white "European", whose culture and civilization have a history of thousands of years and offer a better guarantee of progress and the maintenance of a stable and ordered polity.

These are simple facts that must be stated, even at the risk of being maligned as a "racist". If it is racist to observe and respect the capacities or lack of capacities of different peoples and to act in accordance with them, then such "racism" is nothing more than common sense and a proper understanding of humanity.

S.E.D. Brown wrote in *The South African Observer* of September 1978: "By racist we correctly denote a person who is devoted to his own race, who stands up for the self-respect of his own race and prefers to live in a community of his own people in accordance with his own culture and way of life. In all that there is no trace of hostility to any other race. Millions of people of all races, in fact the majority of human beings, are by that definition racists."⁹⁰

It is significant that, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the words "racist" or "racism" do not appear in any dictionaries printed before 1960. The words did not exist; they must therefore be artificial neologisms, created for a quite definite political purpose. We may assume with a probability bordering on certainty that they were put into circulation by the appropriate specialists of the KGB propaganda department or some equivalent branch of the UN.

They are now among the most frequently used pejoratives for anybody who has the audacity to raise objections to an unrestricted immigration policy and the swamping of his own people by foreigners of different races. Anybody who is not prepared to accept that worldwide miscegenation is

good for humanity in general or to any people in particular and is imprudent enough even to allude to the ethnic characteristics and differences that so obviously exist must put up with being accused of the most abominable crime of "racism". Since the offender has no defence – there is no such thing as an official definition – he is automatically condemned out of hand without trial.

"In America and Europe nowadays everything may be publicly called in question," writes Heinrich Jordis Lohausen in his *Entscheidung im Süden – der Umweg über die Dritte Welt* (*Decision in the South – the Detour through the Third World*); "everything may be publicly debunked: any constituted ideal, any genius, any élite, any tradition, any law, any truth, any belief; but not one thing: the alleged equality of human beings. Everything else can be argued about, but not that. That alone is taboo.

"Driven by their bad conscience – extermination of the Redskins, enslavement of the Negroes, the Opium War, persecutions of the Jews, massacres in India, massacres in the Sudan and so on – some nations nowadays are throwing out the baby with the bathwater. The only equality is that of the inalienable right to live of human beings, not that of human beings themselves. There is nothing equal about them but their inequality. They were different in essence even before they trod this earth in flesh and blood. The capacities of one are not those of another; and conversely. And just as their abilities are different, so also are their stages of development and their capacity to govern themselves in freedom under present conditions. Individuals, like races and peoples, are not interchangeable; and that uninterchangeability is at the same time their wealth and that of all mankind."⁹¹

In South Africa the various races have been living together in a state of harmony unique in this world. Everybody knew where he belonged and what his rights and duties were. Separate living areas enabled each people to maintain its own language, culture and manner of life and created the conditions for peaceful development in which each people could be happy after its own fashion.

If the policy of separate development or apartheid also entailed disadvantages and limitations, the advantages nonetheless by far outweighed the disadvantages. It was a political experiment that was closely watched abroad and showed every prospect of serving as a model for other multiracial countries.

To the international conspirators who were working for a raceless, mongrelized world community such a policy was from its inception as irritating as a piece of grit in the eye. It completely contradicted their notion of removing national boundaries, the merging and mixing of all races and

their dogma of the equality of all men and women. It wasn't harmony and peaceful progress that they wanted but "chaos and old night" and the decline and fall of nations.

The South African race policy, its respect for people of other races, its laws for the maintenance of the purity of its own white people and its readiness to guarantee the national independence of other peoples, had therefore to be denigrated and destroyed by all possible means. A propaganda assault of such intensity against a sovereign state was quite unprecedented; and it clearly indicates the danger to their plans that the conspirators recognized in a successful policy of "separate development".

From the very beginning they saw quite clearly that the abolition of national boundaries and homogeneous ethnic groups for the purpose of achieving a world community of mixed race could only be realized if they managed to manipulate the governments of the world under their control into allowing unrestricted immigration by all races to all countries.

We can now clearly see the results of this policy in many countries in Europe and beyond. Even in such homogeneous countries as those of Scandinavia there has been such an influx of foreign races that it has led to acts of violence and radical anti-government demonstrations.

It appears to be the same in non-European countries; and it confirms the suspicion that there is a coordinated worldwide plan behind it. An Australian reader wrote as follows to the South African *The Citizen* (20.11.87):

"I enclose a copy of a letter that I sent to the Australian newspapers on October 27, 1987, re SA Airways. I felt quite angry that our socialist government would thus exercise its power while on things like capital punishment, or Asian immigration, which too, are sore points and which nine out of 10 Australians feel strongly about, are brushed aside arrogantly. Needless to say, it was not published. This country was a good country when in 1963 I arrived here from Wales. It had a 'White Australia' policy which was a good policy, but now, because of communists, religious cranks, etc. Australia is going to the dogs. Sydney is full of Asians, Orientals, Pacific Islanders who almost in living memory were all cannibals – the Pacific Islanders I mean – not the Asians and Orientals.

Coloured people are given priority in jobs in Australia. I could tell you one case where a Negro from Burundi, Central Africa, was given a job before an Englishman. Eight months after he started, as a boilermaker/welder, he got the boot. His welding was the work of an amateur.

Crime in Australia is as bad as Chicago in USA. The streets of Sydney are not safe to walk in after dark. Travel on suburban trains after dark is also a big risk. Murders, rapes, drugs, corruption in police departments, is rife. Drunkenness is very prevalent, even in the workforce ... Despite high unemployment here, so called

Vietnamese refugees, Indians and what have you, are being given priority over Whites.” (Ron L., Sydney, Australia)

A degenerate world community with no affiliations to any particular ethnic group and with no roots in any particular national unit is the goal of the *Illuminati*, who would be on top of this amorphous heap; while themselves, of course, taking care to remain pure and unadulterated.

At the beginning of this century there were loud demands in America for the creation of a separate federal state for the Negroes. In 1912 a communist writer, Israel Cohen, wrote a book under the title: *A Racial Programme for the Twentieth Century*, in which he set forth a cunning scheme to stir up discontent and racial hostility among the blacks as part of an effort to propagate racial integration and mixed marriages. For example: “We must recognize that the most effective weapon of our party is racial tension. By drumming it into the heads of the blacks that they have been oppressed for centuries we can mould them according to the programme of the communist party. In our propaganda we must particularly make use of the notions of colonialism and imperialism. While we raise the black minority against the whites, we must endeavour to inculcate a guilt complex among the whites with regard to their exploitation of the negroes. We will help the negroes to attain leading positions in all areas of life – in all the professions and in the world of sport and entertainment. With that prestige it will be possible for the negroes to marry whites and set in motion a process that will deliver America over to our cause.”⁹²

Who can doubt that the same objectives are now being pursued in South Africa? The conspirators are perfectly well aware that racial integration, followed by mixed marriages and mongrelization, have been crucial elements in the decline and fall of other states and other civilizations. Their schedule is a long-term plan, and it is being put into effect step by step from generation to generation.

For many years now it has incessantly been drummed into the blacks in South Africa that they have been oppressed and exploited by the whites, that they have a right to demand more and more from them and that the country really belongs to the blacks. No wonder, then, that the result is race-riots and insurrections. Discontent is systematically fanned by communist agents, marxist churchmen, socialists, liberals and extra-parliamentary groups. The UN, the World Council of Churches, the press and hundreds of foreign anti-apartheid organizations who make it their business to “raise the blacks against the whites”, as the marxist theoretician Cohen proposes in his guide.

Actually the marxists are anything but negrophiles. Anybody who thinks that they are not “racists” should read *Karl Marx – the Racist* by

Nathaniel Weyl. This quotation should suffice: "Publicly and for political reasons Marx and Engels purported to be friends of the Negroes. Privately, however, they were anti-black racists of the worst sort. They despised the whole black race; and they regularly equated them with animals and idiots. In their private correspondence they constantly used the designation 'nigger'."

According to Marx, the blacks of Africa were "insignificant" and "irrelevant", and compared with such progressive people as the Russians they were "far behind".

We cannot blame the simple-minded blacks for not seeing that they are only being used in this mephistophelian game to destroy South Africa, and with it their own welfare. They would be the chief sufferers if the foreign wire-pullers were to succeed in provoking a bloody racial conflict in South Africa. They would have no chance of winning any trial of strength against the whites, especially against the forces of law and order.

The black leaders in South Africa are well aware of that. The Zulu Chief, Mangosuthu Buthelezi, leader of the biggest tribe, seven million strong, warned his people against any suicidal conflict with the whites. He has long understood that powerful foreign forces can achieve far more through diplomatic threats and pressures and economic action than his Zulu warriors ever could.

He expects those forces to prevail sooner or later and the government to throw up the sponge or be compelled to make such concessions as would enable him, through the numerical preponderance of his people, to take over the reins of government.

Buthelezi sets himself up as a Christian preaching a future democratic order in which blacks and whites would have equal rights; and by so doing he has won the sympathies of many whites. He could well afford such a "democracy" with free elections after the Western model; for he knows that he would then automatically be elected head of state.

A Zulu (and the same is true of all the other African tribes) would never elect anybody from outside his own people; therefore, from then on, because of the voting majority of the Zulus, South Africa would be ruled exclusively by the Zulus instead of the whites. It would be no more and no less a "democracy" than it is now.

But what Buthelezi has apparently not grasped is the fact that the external forces working for the overthrow of the present government are not in the least interested in a democratic state under his leadership. At most he might be allowed to set up a transitional government, like that of Muzorewa's transitional government in Rhodesia, until the United Na-

tions, with American, British and German support, had established "the only authentic representatives of the South African population", the communist-controlled ANC, securely in Pretoria.

The South African government is fully aware of all this; and it finds itself on the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand it has to defend itself against the attacks on the country under white rule, and with little help from the black South African leaders, who see those attacks as an easy way to their own seizure of power. On the other, it needs the co-operation of the black leaders to go ahead with its programme of reform and "power-sharing" with the blacks. So far many of the blacks prompted from outside have declared themselves for "all or nothing". Only when they realize that the whites are prepared neither to step down nor to capitulate to the onslaught will they be prepared to co-operate with their white compatriots in contriving some federal or confederal system of government – supposing they even want to be given their independence.

The more convincingly the Afrikaners demonstrate their strength and resolution, the sooner the blacks will be prepared to support them. Weakness does not pay anywhere in Africa; only the strong can command respect and recognition.

Meanwhile the secret rulers are working away to block this peaceful evolutionary road by all means in their power. It is a race against time, a scoop-the-pool game to be won by whoever can hold out longest. Any concession by South Africa, any humanitarian gesture by the government, such as the release of communist agitators, talks with the ANC or premature lifting of the state of emergency, would be construed as weakness by the black leaders and the enemies of South Africa, and the immediate response would be fresh demands.

Only if the government refuses to bow to foreign "reform proposals" and demands and threats and concentrates on what is best for South Africa and its many-layered population will it find solutions in co-operation with its indigenous blacks that will be acceptable to all.

Total racial integration by the abrogation of all existing segregation laws (schools, residential areas etc.), as demanded by "liberal" businessmen (for reasons of profit) and the leftist press, would certainly not lead to peaceful change and harmonious coexistence in the future. The following example of integrated American schools – with blacks numbering only twelve per cent of the population – may serve as a foretaste of what South African pupils and teachers could encounter.

In its issue of 9.10.1979 the Viennese *Europa-Korrespondenz* wrote:

"American schools: – According to reports from New York the seeds of violence are sprouting in American schools. Assaults, thefts, rapes, bodily

harm to teachers and pupils and even murders have become a shocking component of the daily routine. In a study of American schools the New York Teachers' Association designated 115 of the 950 schools in the largest city in the USA as 'unsafe'. In this surge of violence sixty thousand school-teachers are assaulted and injured annually in the USA. According to the same study, since 1972 the number of rapes in classrooms has increased by 40 per cent and other physical assaults by 70 per cent.

"Last quarter a sixteen-year-old schoolgirl took a rifle 'for fun' and opened fire on a school, killing the rector and wounding eight pupils and a policeman. In New Haven a pupil held up a shop in the school buildings and shot a woman teacher. In Los Angeles pupils who were dissatisfied with their marks attacked their teacher and set fire to her hair ..."⁹³

On 11.9.75 the *Rheinische Post* of Düsseldorf reported on the racial integration policy in American schools and its chaotic consequences: "Washington: The new school year in the USA is opening under an ominous star. After the summer holidays of over three months the doors of their schools are shut on more than two million American children, because their teachers are on strike. The racial integration of schools passed by a constitutional amendment by the Supreme Court once more led to bitter demonstrations and bloody clashes between its supporters and opponents. Tensions in the classroom itself are so serious that pupils are required to pass through an electronic screen before entering the school building to search them for weapons ..."⁹⁴

In *Die Absteiger – Planet der Sklaven?* (English title: *Descent into Slavery?*) Des Griffin writes (p.345):

"In the world of today there are powerful forces at work that seek to get rid of all racial separation, to lead us into complete fusion of races and into a world government ruled by the Illuminati."

That this is not just a fantasy dreamed up by a few cranky individuals is evident from a statement made by Dr G. Brock Chisholm, a prominent member of the World Health Organization, who would certainly not have said it without the approval of his department: "What people must practise everywhere is ... genetic mixing, so that one race in one world under one government may be created." (USA magazine 12.8.55)⁹⁵

In his book *Praktischer Idealismus* Count Coudenhove-Kalergi (1894-1972), the first and long-standing president of the Pan-Europe Union (founded in 1923), wrote as follows: "The man of the future will be a mongrel. For Pan-Europa I would wish a Eurasian-Negroid future race to bring about a multiplicity of personalities. The leaders will be appointed by the Jews, since a kindly Providence has given Europe a new aristocracy of intellectuals in the Jews."

Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, Ph.D., himself a "Eurasian" halfbreed and former husband of the Jewish actress Ida Roland, was a professor of history in New York, secretary-general of the European Parliamentary Union, a recipient of the Charlemagne Prize from the City of Aachen, a freeman of the University of Frankfurt am Main, a recipient in 1954 of the great Federal Cross of Merit of the German Federal Republic, Chevalier of the Légion d'Honneur and a member of the Humanitas Lodge of Freemasons in Vienna.

Yet the good Count, who attained so many high honours, knew quite well what disastrous effects miscegenation would have on many races and individuals. In the same book he wrote (pp 20-21):

"... The result is that half-castes often combine a want of character and self-restraint, weakness of will and treachery with objectivity, versatility, mental alertness, freedom from prejudice and breadth of horizon. Half-castes always differentiate themselves from their parents and grandparents; each generation is a variation from the previous ones, either in the direction of evolution or degeneration."⁹⁶

In a lecture a man of mixed blood expressed a degree of grief and suffering that should give food for thought:

"To pretend that racial mixing is progressive is sheer nonsense. The opposite is true: is it the idea of race that is progressive, the raising of a stock above previously existing standards. And it is the same with sorely-tried humanity. Is it human to bring sick people into the world? People of mixed race are sick, torn inside, often troubled by physical or mental afflictions. A whole series of investigations has been done on that. Do you call that human? Humane? Wherever there is legislation against racial mixing, as in Israel and South Africa, it can't be called inhumane. It's sheer common sense. It shows a sense of responsibility. It's meant for irresponsible parents; even if it gets in the way of their happiness, it has the happiness of posterity – whole generations – at heart.

"Once at some church 'working group' they were knocking South Africa, the usual stuff, how inhumane and horrible the whole policy of apartheid was. Then a man of mixed blood who had been listening quietly to all this got up and asked whether they had actually talked to a coloured man. Silence. Then he went on: 'Well, I'm one myself. And I've suffered because of it. Not that I'm ill-treated – that's hardly ever happened. People have always treated me with understanding and sympathy. But the main thing is that I'm split inside myself. I don't know where I belong. Do I belong in black Africa, or do I belong here? I don't fit in anywhere. Here I have to keep taking vitamin C just to stay alive. This isn't my tradition or my culture either. And I wouldn't fit into black Africa – the life would be far too primitive for me. I can't feel at home anywhere in the world. And my

parents are responsible for that. I blame them, most emphatically, for getting married. It would have been sensible to have laws against mixed marriages here too; then I'd never have been brought into the world.'

The speaker continued:

"That was the feeling of an actual half-caste. If we are against miscegenation, it's for the humanest principles. In any case, even if general mixing were to happen racial tensions wouldn't disappear, and there would still be no real equality. In Brazil there is no (legal) impediment to mixed marriages, but there is racial stratification just the same. People there take their place in the social order according to the lightness of their skin. The idea seems pretty unfair to us, but it seems sensible to them. And every mother wants her child to marry somebody with a lighter skin. Free-for-all mixing solves no problems. When we advocate racial purity we aren't turning the wheel backwards, we're turning it forwards; for we're in conformity with nature."⁹⁷

In *Die Neue Zeit* H.A. Konrad-Trautheim writes about people of mixed race as follows:

"The half-caste is a mixture or cross of different racial valencies: Germanic, Hebraic, Negroid, Mongolian etc. Individual racial features are fused in him; and they do not produce a homogeneous person but remain separately autonomous alongside one another, strain apart and fight against one another for dominance, get in one another's way and produce a person who is capable of swallowing any lie, muddled, excitable, discordant, aimless, disorganized. He hates and opposes everything of value. Therefore he will support any form of democracy."⁹⁸

The former world heavyweight champion Cassius Clay ("Muhammed Ali") said: "If I lived in Alabama I'd vote for Governor Wallace, because he doesn't mix whites and blacks. I won't vote for anybody who says 'I like negroes,' and I wouldn't vote for a man like Sammy Davis (half negro and half Jew) either. He married a white woman. People should marry their own kind. Elijah Mohammed (the founder of Islam) said that dogs should keep with dogs, fishes with fishes, insects with insects and whites with whites. That's what nature and the law of God command, and it says so in the Bible too, that you Christians revere so much." (*Deutsche Kommentare*, Buenos Aires)⁹⁹

The internationalists are fully aware of the importance of the disintegration of races through miscegenation in their efforts to bring about their One World. If it did not come about, then the continuing cultural separateness of the different national groups would keep them conscious of their distinct uniqueness. Their love of freedom and independence would break out in revolt against the masters of the One World.

Instead of denouncing such general miscegenation and warning their people of its ill effects, not only on biological grounds but on social and ethical grounds, governments and churches zealously preach the gospel of racial integration and denounce all resistance to it as reactionary and callous. That attitude, whether they know it or not, is the direct result of an organized, co-ordinated and powerfully funded campaign against all races, but particularly the white man, who must be stripped of all the racial springs of action that have made him dominant over so many centuries. The people who are now spreading the gospel of racial integration in South Africa and all over the world have of course no intention of allowing their own blood to be contaminated by that of any other race. They will keep their line pure at all costs, and all over the world they practise the most rigorous segregation with regard to marriage, education and business.

"They glitter behind closed doors, among their own kind," as Frederic Morton puts it in his biography of the Rothschilds. (*The Rothschilds*, p. 19) ¹⁰⁰

They are planning to run a single world community as a kind of super-race herding a population reduced to the undifferentiated mass of a vast stupid flock of sheep.

The incessant bombardment of the whites in South Africa with catch-words like "racist" and "the racist régime in Pretoria", "apartheid state" and what not is subtly calculated to induce them to root out their natural self-awareness as a race and to submit to general integration. Under constant pressure from the press both at home and abroad and partly brainwashed and softened up by regular exposure to trashy "integrated" American movies and TV programmes in which – in flat contradiction to all American reality – negroes are the heroes or represented as persons exercising authority over complacent whites, they are humbugged with an image of utopian fantasy that bears no relation to the real world. Black South Africans, whose various peoples have if anything an even stronger sense of race than the whites, and rarely mix or marry outside their own tribe, have now taken up the parrot-squawks of denunciation of the "racist Boers".

The black racism that has erupted all over Africa, and has frequently resulted in the mass murder of Indians and other black tribes, by no means prevents the sanctimonious heads of such states from accusing South Africa before every authoritative body in the world of the worst conceivable racism, although compared with the rest of Africa it is practised there in the mildest of forms.

Among all these canting moralizers one observes with particular admiration the Indian government, of all people, averting their gaze from their own iniquitous caste system (apartheid?) and its own Untouchables to demand "swift and tough measures" against South Africa because of its apartheid laws. (*The Citizen*, 9.1.1987)

On a visit to Zimbabwe, which the marxist head of government Robert Mugabe had in a few years reduced from the prosperous flourishing Rhodesia to beggary, the Canadian prime minister Brian Mulroney at a banquet in his honour declared, in a voice vibrant with total conviction: "Apartheid is based on the premise that human beings are born unequal because of the colour of their skin. Any system founded on that concept is condemned to failure, because it is false through and through. It is simply a question of When." Whereupon the former terrorist leader Mugabe, under whose command a genocidal campaign is being waged against the Matabele tribe in his own country and who is in the process of turning it into a one-party dictatorship, replied no less unctuously: "Our policy of nonracialism, democracy and social justice for all is regarded (by Pretoria) as anathema, because it constitutes a threat to the wicked system of apartheid." (*The Citizen*, 28.1.1987)

The Danish ambassador to Tanzania, in an address before an audience of students, went so far as to declare that Denmark regarded apartheid in South Africa as "a threat to world peace" (*The Citizen*, 23.2.87), so swallowing the UN propaganda line holus-bolus.

And indeed in marxist terminology he was saying precisely the right thing; for the peace-loving communists automatically define anybody who refuses to submit tamely under the communist yoke of the One-World planners as a warmonger and a threat to world peace. To the people working for a mongrel world with no national states under an atheistic, authoritarian world government, the South African system of apartheid is indeed a very bad example that others must not be encouraged to imitate.

The "separate development" of peoples in South Africa and the marxist Utopia of equality of all are the opposite poles of two conceptions of the world, the success or failure of which will be decided by history. Despite the prodigious efforts of propaganda by influential circles to damn race separation and represent it as wicked racism, there are still plenty of people capable of seeing through all the hocus-pocus. But they are only a shrinking minority; for inexplicable reasons the South African government makes no attempt to counter the worldwide propaganda assault with an equal campaign of information. The millions that it would cost would be only a drop in the bucket of the vast sums spent now on defence and the circumvention of sanctions and trade boycotts.

Readers who derive their information mainly from one-sided reports on South Africa might find it interesting to hear opinions from other sources once in a while. Here is a letter from England to the editor of *The Citizen* (1.10.1987):

"In England we are just starting to understand the benefits of apartheid within South Africa. Parents want their White children taught at schools where they are

not a minority and which practises our English culture.

There is a growing fear here in England, that the Blacks and Coloureds are beginning to take the Whites over, and forcing their culture upon us. People are falsely led to believe that mixing of the races is good for us. In fact, the majority are afraid to say what they truly think for fear of being labelled a racist.

If we are to have racial harmony with all the different Black and Coloured races within our society, we must have more, not less, apartheid. Most people when they look to South Africa, agree with all your policies concerning the apartheid issue. Do not feel guilty about it, we in the West envy you." (Philip W., England)

A reader from Massachusetts, USA, writes: (*The Citizen*, Jan. 87)

"An article in the *Boston Globe* of October 20 stated that the new Moderator of the Dutch Reformed Church (in South Africa) claims that apartheid cannot be scripturally justified, that it causes harm, and is therefore a sin. That is akin to saying that men's preference for pretty women cannot be scripturally justified, that it harms the ugly women, and is therefore a sin.

From Boston it appears that apartheid has kept South Africa from being a shambles like the rest of the continent and has thus caused a lot more good than harm ... There is no doubt that apartheid is psychologically justified. Since God created the natural law, of which the human mind and human nature are a part, apartheid must therefore be morally justified ...

South Africa recognises racial conflict explicitly by formal apartheid. The US recognises it covertly by tacit apartheid. It is probably true that almost all the Whites who oppose apartheid in the US live in White areas. That hypocrisy is not unusual in the country of Thomas Jefferson, who wrote that all men are created equal but owned slaves all his life.

The conflict between the acceptable (beautiful) and the unacceptable (ugly) can only result in separation for both or subjugation for one – either distance or disaster. The new leadership of the Dutch Reformed Church has apparently chosen disaster. Choosing disaster is a sin." (Charles Z., Hyde Park, USA)

The same correspondent wrote in another letter to *The Citizen* (27.3.1987):

"... The 'race' problem is a culture problem and a beauty problem, singly or together causing a reciprocal rejection problem. The only practical remedy is separation. When Blacks moved into Mattapan, for instance, the Jews moved out. Mattapan is now all Black. Apartheid is a psychological necessity, and therefore a social necessity, and therefore a moral necessity ...

An association of those who live conflicting lives is not a community but an arena. Different is inherently separate, as the tacit apartheid of Boston, Chicago and other American cities attests. Most Americans live in all-White areas where they never observe differences. They are convinced of the dogma and intend to force it

upon South Africa. This is what the US arrogantly did in Vietnam ... American policy for South Africa will be what it was for the city of Huế: 'We had to destroy the city in order to save it'.

South Africa should beware the treacherous power which rushed to save Bolshevism in World War Two, destabilised Lebanon, betrayed Cuba, murdered the Catholic president of Vietnam, and now wants to bring 'justice' to South Africa. Trust yourselves alone ..." (Charles Z., Hyde Park, USA)

The following is the private opinion of a Catholic priest who bravely puts his point of view in opposition to the official attitude of his church: (*The Citizen*, 17.3.88)

"In the church press and in the news media the words 'apartheid', 'racism', 'heresy' are bandied about like tennis balls or should I say like brickbats. To argue about it ... without having a clear definition or concept is a futile exercise. Apartheid, as the word says, is separateness, separate in language, separate in culture, separate in history and development. Apartheid in this sense is as old as mankind itself since Babel divided and separated them. In fact, separateness rules the entire universe; it dominates the world of plant and animal life as well as human history.

Such is the will of the Creator God.

Apartheid, racism in its odious sense is the undue glorification of one's own nation coupled with contempt and oppression of other races and nations. To say ... that there exists no pure race, therefore 'race is but a fiction', is crooked logic and ridiculous. To be proud of one's race and nation is perfectly right and normal; what is objectionable is the self-glorification of the one and the contempt and the belittling of the other. That would be evil 'racism'. Mr. v.E. denies that the Bible speaks of apartheid and differentiation of races and nations. The Bible condemns miscegenation. In the Bible God demands that the Israelites keep apart from the surrounding nations; Egyptians, Assyrians, Philistines etc.

In the book of Ezra chapter 10/3, men who had married foreign women were ordered to dismiss these wives with the children. See also Chapter 9/1. The hullabaloo about 'apartheid' is mostly based on muddled thinking and ignorance of the Bible and history." (Rev. F.M., Malelane)

South Africa is constantly being exhorted to grant "reforms" to its black fellow-citizens. The press, church organizations and foreign governments urge the country to ever more concessions. The following reader's letter expresses the view of many South Africans (*The Citizen*, 16.4.1987):

"In all sincerity I appeal to the State President to re-think about reform. This threadbare word 'reform' is going to be the demise of the South African nation. Since the winds of change, the curse of Africa, started blowing we have been a divided nation. Mankind against mankind which is now enveloping the Republic of South

Africa. Before reform was forced on the Government by outside opinion, threats, boycotts etc, which we should have rejected outright as a total interference in a truly democratic country.

Before reform stirred the nation we were truly an independent nation, proud of our heritage and love for our wonderful country. The different ethnic races were happy and respected as humans. Immigration to our country was increasing, employment, development, investment, contact with the rest of the world was accepted unequivocally, no anti-this or anti-that, a word unheard of. The Springbok, our sporting emblem, being swallowed up by nations wanting to compete against us. Our health departments from locust control to veterinary services were welcomed in Africa; crime too was never as high as it is today. Tourists and investors flooded our country. Then suddenly, we were awakened to the 'new reform', forced upon the government which is going to be the downfall of this nation." (J.G.K., Lynnwood)

The South Africans' understanding of the policy of apartheid is naturally quite different from that of a misinformed world population, as the following letter shows (*The Citizen*, 16.4.1987):

"What is this apartheid that South Africa is constantly exhorted to 'get rid of'? It is not based on race hatred, but on the God-given differences between peoples. It is not a barrier to achievement, as many highly placed people (including a certain Archbishop) must acknowledge.

Since most of the Black peoples practise apartheid amongst themselves, why is it a sin for White peoples to advocate it? Apartheid is simply the best guarantee of human rights ever devised by man and there are plenty in Africa who wish that they had some. If ethnic homelands are not acceptable to the West, why are Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland acceptable? Merely because they were created by the British a hundred years ago?

In all the prattle about human rights, the one right that is never mentioned is the right to life. I have seen no commitment by either the Zulus or the Xhosas to submit peacefully to a government dominated by the other. If the Xhosa-dominated ANC is foisted on South Africa, as the West seems bent on, how will a civil war be avoided? Do the Koreans or Cubans have enough troops to occupy the country? It seems that the Blacks will realise too late that apartheid was the best guarantee of human rights they ever had." (Peter D., Alberton)

To the unprejudiced reader it will by now have become apparent that "apartheid" in South Africa is rather different from what has been drummed into him for years. The evil forces behind this campaign are pursuing two main ends.

In South Africa the blacks are to be stirred up to fight a race war against the whites to bring down the government; and in the rest of the world the

word "apartheid" will be given such an emotion-rousing ring that nobody will dare to oppose worldwide racial mixing for fear of being branded as a "racist" or accused of being "a sympathizer with the apartheid system". Thus all resistance will be nipped in the bud.

The method is the same as with the catchwords "anti-semite" and "nazi", with which every criticism of Jews and every patriotic Nationalist will immediately be brought to silence.

The greatest mistake that South Africa made was not to reply immediately to the attacks on its policy of separate development with a worldwide information campaign to refute them. Now it is too late, and the government has allowed itself to be manœuvred into a position of weakness in which its only recourse is to initiate a number of extremely risky "reforms", whose success or miscarriage will be judged by history.

The Rôle of the “Liberation Movements”

We members of the Communist Party are the most advanced revolutionaries in modern history ... The enemy must be completely smashed and rooted out of the earth before the communist world can be made a reality.

**Nelson Mandela, former leader of the
African National Congress (ANC)**

The more the problems of South Africa are blown up by the media, the louder clamour the voices of those exhorting the government to sit down at the negotiating table with the “liberation movements”. Although there are a number of perfectly legal opposition groups in South Africa who espouse the cause of the blacks and their rights by peaceful means, the militant African National Congress (ANC) – of all things – is made out to be “the sole legitimate representative of the black population of South Africa”.

For years the ANC has been elevated to the status of a noble liberation movement whose altruistic goal is liberty and justice for all and the establishment of a new democratic system in South Africa. The acts of violence and terrorism committed by this organization are condoned by a gullible world public as the desperate moves of an idealistic group of black nationalists who can no longer find any other means of escape from oppression by the “iniquitous apartheid system”.

Their former leader Nelson Mandela, sentenced to life imprisonment, is represented as a martyr bearing the cross of liberation on behalf of his black compatriots. He would certainly have received The Nobel Peace Prize in 1987 if Archbishop Tutu had not pre-empted that dubious distinction a few years earlier.

The present leaders of the ANC are received by important members of Western governments as though they were a respectable pro-Western government-in-exile ardently longed for by the black masses of South Africa and on that account worthy of support by the West.

In many capital cities ANC personnel are allowed to maintain their own offices and command posts from whence they can plan their subversive

programmes against South Africa under the aegis of the host governments. There is no lack of funds for them; enjoying as they do the benevolent support of the World Council of Churches, the UN and many Western governments.

Well: who are these heroes of the South African "struggle for liberation"; and what in fact are the aims of the ANC?

The ANC was founded in 1912 with the declared intention of achieving "democratic rights for the African people by peaceful means". That is how Bartholomeus Hlapane defined his organization to the delegates of the commission of enquiry led by the American Senator Jeremiah Denton investigating terrorism in southern Africa in 1982.

Hlapane, who as a former member of the Executive Committee of the South African Communist Party and the ANC made some very scathing comments on the real aims of the organization, was therefore shot dead along with his wife in their house in Soweto on 16 December 1983.

At first there was in fact a loose association of nationalistic movements working for civic equality and political rights. Communists played no part in the South African National Natives' Congress, as the organization was called at its foundation, for at that time communism in South Africa was exclusively white.

In 1921, with the help of Moscow, they founded the Communist Party of South Africa (CPSA) in Cape Town and immediately began to put out feelers towards the Natives' Congress. Their objective was the creation of a "united liberation front" with the aid of the black masses and under the leadership of the Communist Party.

At first the ANC showed no particular sympathies with bolshevism and the Moscow party-liners; but about the mid-twenties that attitude gradually changed. In his report to the annual conference of the ANC in 1927 Gumede, president of the ANC, had some very kind words for the communists: "Of all the political parties the communist party is the only one that honestly and sincerely fights for the oppressed".¹⁰¹

Whereupon Gumede was promptly confirmed in office for a further three years. At the same time a trade union official who had been thrown out of the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union for refusing to break with the Communist Party, E.J. Khaile, was elected Secretary General of the African National Congress.

Up to about the mid-forties the ANC led a sort of shadowy existence, with various pro- and anti-communists in-fighting for power within the organization. The breakthrough for the communists only came in 1946, when they and the ANC persuaded seventy thousand black miners to strike. The president of the African Mineworkers' Union was a communist,

J.B. Marks, who had been a member of the management committee of the ANC since 1945; and from then on the CPSA and the ANC increasingly coordinated their activities.

As the Party sheet *The African Communist* no. 87, 4th quarter 1981 observed, "The ideological breakthrough was made by the militant leader of the ANC Youth League, run by men such as Tambo [President in exile of the ANC; author], Sisulu and Mandela and supported by leading communists in the ANC leadership, like Kotane and Mofutsanyane."

The National Party, which had won the General Election in 1948, was nevertheless firmly resolved to put a stop to these communist activities in South Africa. In 1950 Parliament passed the Suppression of Communism Act, which prohibited communist activities of all kinds. Thereupon the communists continued their activities underground.

From 1949 to 1952 the ANC endeavoured to mobilize all blacks in one mass movement and to amalgamate with the Indian and Coloured opposition groups. On 26 June 1955 they held a "Peoples' Congress" in Kliptown, near Johannesburg, at which were present the South African Indian Congress (SAIC), the South African Coloured People's Congress (SACPC) and the white communists' Congress of Democrats (COD). The Congress of South African Trade Unions (SACTU) was there too. All five members of the Congress Alliance were more or less communist-controlled.

As Henning von L  wis of Menar wrote: "The COD and SACTU were specially created to take part in this rigged game. Among the fifteen members of the first executive committee there were at least nine communists. The president of the organization, Abram Fischer, was a communist."¹⁰²

As time passed more and more communists managed to get on to the Central Executive of the ANC, the controlling body within the Alliance. The position of SACTU was no less clear. It later joined the communist World Federation of Trade Unions.¹⁰³

Other communist front organizations that joined the Congress Alliance were the Federation of South African Women (FSAW) and the South African Peace Council (SAPC). The "Freedom Charter" drawn up at Kliptown was declared to be the official programme of the Congress Alliance, and it is still taken as the signpost to "the democratic future" of South Africa.

Bartholomeus Hlapane, who was later murdered in Soweto, stated to the American commission of enquiry: "I discovered that the document [the Freedom Charter] had been drawn up by Joe Slovo on the instructions of the Central Committee, before being definitely accepted by the Communist Party."

Joe Slovo, a white Jew of Baltic origin, is president of the prohibited

SACP, a member of the National Executive Committee of the ANC, a colonel in the KGB and until recently a member of the top staff of the military wing of the ANC.

In 1960 there was a split in the ANC, which meanwhile was almost entirely dominated by the SACP. The radical socialist Robert Sobukwe considered that the ANC was not militant enough and that it bore too deep a stamp of white communism. He wanted a sharp confrontation with white South Africa, and in 1959 he founded the Pan-African Congress (PAC). He then exhorted the black masses to break the pass laws that allowed them to live only in places where they had accommodation and work. He urged them to burn their passes and “demonstrate” outside police stations.

“In one such action, at Sharpeville in 1960, 69 demonstrators were killed. Sharpeville became a synonym for oppression of the blacks in South Africa – and a showpiece for the one-eyed international anti-apartheid lobby. The fact that the leader of the PAC, Robert Sobukwe, was the key figure in the Sharpeville disaster, as Erich Wiedemann, editor of *‘Spiegel’* stresses, was carefully ignored,” as Henning von L  wis of Menar wrote in his publication, *Der Afrikanische Nationalkongress (ANC) – Moskaus Speerspitze gegen S  dafrika (Deutsche Afrika-Stiftung, Heft 40)*.

The “massacre” of Sharpeville from then on became the turning-point in anti-South African agitation. The leftist South African press and foreign correspondents wasted no time in looking for the underlying causes of the disaster. The press reports sent to the world outside showed Sharpeville in a light that left no room for doubt about who were chiefly responsible: a brutal police force that fired on inoffensive unarmed blacks while they were making a peaceful demonstration against unjust pass laws; trigger-happy sadists who were happy to take advantage of the opportunity to kill as many blacks as possible.

Thus legends are born and misinformation spread in defiance of all truth. What actually happened and how the tragic events came about nearly thirty years ago that brought the world to a state of united hostility to South Africa are explained by the South African freelance journalist Aida Parker in *The Aida Parker Newsletter* no. 49 of 29 January 1985.

To put the events in their proper perspective, she writes, it is necessary to go back in time a little, to Cato Manor, on the outskirts of a normally sunny, sleepy Durban. It is the 25th of January 1960, barely two months before the main drama of Sharpeville. On that day nine policemen, four whites and five blacks, were to lose their lives in gruesome circumstances.

The story of Cato Manor was told by a man who was present: Gert Smit, at the time a police sergeant stationed in Cato Manor. In those days it was a place that most people would have preferred to give a wide berth to: a hot-

bed of crime, filth and infectious diseases, a ramshackle black slum with thousands of tumbledown hovels spread over a number of Indian farms. The situation was exacerbated by smouldering racial tensions between blacks and Indians, who were accused of exploitation. Numerous shebeens, illegal drinking-dens selling rotgut, completed the infernal mixture.

It was the job of the police to keep the tensions in the location under control, to prevent crime and to get rid of the shebeens. The 25th of January was a Saturday. A huge crowd of blacks had come into Cato Manor from outside to drink and spend the weekend with friends and relations.

It was standard procedure for the police, a twelve-man patrol, to get out at certain points in the township and return to the police truck with any prisoners that they might have picked up. That night the ill-fated patrol was commanded by Sergeant Winterboer, a man who later committed suicide in Pretoria. Winterboer set down his squad and arranged to pick them up at the Benoni No. 1 warehouse.

The patrol-leader was a white constable called Joubert. The squad made a few arrests, and then found themselves surrounded by a drunken unruly mob who demanded the release of the prisoners. In the circumstances it would no doubt have been best to let them go on some pretext or other; but Joubert, who had put in only eighteen months' service, underestimated the danger now threatening his party. Even when the women in the crowd began to set up their shrill ululations with which they traditionally incite their men to battle Joubert's reply was stubborn: "These prisoners will be released only over my dead body."

At that point one of the black policemen accidentally trod on a woman's foot. She set up a howl – and her screams had a chain reaction. In a minute the patrol was surrounded by a howling mob that kept growing as more and more drunken blacks poured out of the surrounding shanties and attacked the police with knobkerries, pangas and pointed weapons.

Amidst the hellish din of the crowd howling "Kill the cops! Kill the cops!" the patrol fell back and fought their way to the Benoni No. 1 warehouse in the hope that Sergeant Winterboer would be waiting for them there with the police truck. They managed to barricade themselves inside a tumbledown tin shack, where they were exposed to a hail of stones from the surrounding mob.

While all this was happening Sergeant Winterboer turned up, saw what was going on, panicked, and instead of opening fire rushed back to the station for reinforcements. In his absence the showers of brickbats continued, together with the ululations of the women and the cries of "Kill the cops!" Constable Joubert made a desperate attempt to break out and ran to an avocado tree nearby and tried to climb it. He was seized and hacked to pieces with long pangas and horribly mutilated. (Only a month later nine

blacks drinking beer under the very same tree were struck and killed by a flash of lightning.)

The white constables Kriel and Rademan and a black constable called Dlodla also managed to escape from the beleaguered shack. Kriel fought for his life with his bare fists and ran nearly a kilometre before he too was hacked to pieces. Rademan, who had reached safety, heard Kriel's screams and went back to help him. He likewise was hacked to pieces. The black constable Dlodla tried to help Rademan; and he suffered the same fate.

So also with four other black policemen. The body of a white constable, Gert Rheeder, was later pulled out from under a heap of stones and laid on a police truck along with the other dead. When they got back to the police station the commander, Major Jerry van der Merwe, solemnly saluted the dead. Then an Indian constable noticed one of Rheeder's fingers moving. His head and body were so mutilated, a mere mass of bleeding flesh, that his parents could not recognize him. Rheeder survived, but he was a physical and mental wreck for ever after.

That, then, is the story of Cato Manor on 25 January 1960. It was ignored by most of the foreign press, passed over in silence. But when only two months later, on 21 March 1960, the police at Sharpeville were faced with a similar mob estimated at from ten to twenty thousand, the events of Cato Manor were still very fresh in their memory; they had cause enough to be in fear for their lives. As at Cato Manor, only ordinary uniformed constables were on duty, with no special training in the handling of mass demonstrations. One of them had only been in the service for a month.

Tension began to gather round the police station on the Sunday evening of 20 March. Throughout the night groups of armed blacks had continually to be driven off by the police with truncheons. On Monday morning the police found themselves confronted by a huge jeering and menacing crowd. Teargas proved ineffectual, and the police had to make several more baton charges against the agitators.

According to the report by P.M. O'Brien, the judge who conducted the enquiry, by about noon a crowd of about nineteen thousand blacks had assembled, whose attitude was "insulting, menacing and provocative". It was at 13h35 that the fatal events took place. The crowd had repeatedly attempted to charge the police barricades. An attempt by the police to seize one of the ringleaders failed. What then ensued was far from being a calculated massacre by the police but rather a panic-stricken reaction by young policemen who were unprepared for a situation of that kind. Many of them had been on continuous duty for twenty-four hours. The tension had reached its climax. The commanding officer, Colonel Pienaar, ordered his men to load but not to fire until they received the order. The tumult outside was so loud that instructions could be heard only a short distance

away. According to witnesses examined later, the officers repeatedly warned their men not to use their firearms, while they continually tried to come to terms with the ringleaders of the crowd.

Then it happened. Suddenly an infernal din broke out: howls of "Cato Manor! Cato Manor!" and the crowd surged forward. The gates were torn down. A police officer of high rank was flung to the ground. Stones rained down on the police, and shots or sharp orders were heard from the crowd. The police opened fire. There were 69 killed and 180 wounded.

That was the end of a demonstration by "peaceful black citizens"; and Robert Sobukwe, the communist agitator of the PAC, had coldly taken it into his political calculations. The pass laws served only as a pretext to force a confrontation with the white security forces.

He had succeeded in that. Since Sharpeville South Africa, in the eyes of the rest of the world, has been a criminal in the dock. From then on every action by the white forces of order was regarded as a crime committed by the ruling whites, with the result that communist-contrived provocations by black revolutionaries have increased. The government replied with drastic measures. In April 1960 they banned the PAC and the ANC. Both organizations went underground. The ANC became still more closely linked to the SACP, and together in 1961 they formed *Umkhonto we Sizwe*, the Spear of the Nation, the armed branch of the ANC.

Joint decisions were taken by the combined supreme command of both organizations on the planning and execution of acts of sabotage. Three representatives of the SACP and the ANC respectively belong to it: the SACP – Lionel Bernstein, Ahmed Kathrada and Govan Mbeki; the ANC – Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu and Raymond Mhlaba.

"Supplied with money and arms from Moscow, in the years 1962 and 1963 they committed 192 acts of sabotage and diversion."¹⁰⁴

In 1962 the South African security forces managed to arrest Nelson Mandela. A year later, on 11 July 1963, they picked up all the CP headquarters personnel at Lilliesleaf Farm in Rivonia, just outside Johannesburg: the leadership cadre of *Umkhonto we Sizwe*, Sisulu, Kathrada, Mbeki, Bernstein, Mhlaba, Dennis Goldberg and Arthur Goldreich.

Numerous secret papers fell into the hands of the police, including handwritten notes by Mandela and a plan of "Operation Mayibuye".

"This plan envisaged the following two stages: a partisan movement combined with massive subversive activity and to organize and further infiltrate trained fighters on the sea and air routes who would join the partisans and the armed people."¹⁰⁵

The police raid on Rivonia was a severe blow to the ANC and the SACP. Eight of their leaders were sentenced to life imprisonment, including Nelson Mandela. During his trial he admitted that he had played a leading

part in the planning of acts of violence. He also defended the active co-operation between the ANC and the SACP and pointed out that such communist leaders as J.B. Marks, Moses Kotane and Albert Nzula had also been members of the National Executive of the ANC.

Henning von Löwis of Menar wrote: "The Rivonia trial made it clear how deeply the Communist Party had infiltrated the ANC. At the same time it was made plain to the South Africans what aims the communists were pursuing and what methods they were using: the South African government was to be violently overthrown. The communists intended to seize power either on their own or in combination with other forces. As in Cuba and South Vietnam sabotage and guerrilla operations would clear the way for a power takeover, create fear and panic among the whites and mistrust of the government, and convince the blacks that powerful forces would be working for their liberation. On the mobilization of the masses there would be a *coup d'état*, carried out by South Africans trained abroad and supported by troops of foreign powers. That was to be the course of Operation Mayibuye."¹⁰⁶

After the Rivonia trial, the ANC structures having been effectively smashed by the South African forces, the remaining leaders of the ANC, PAC and SACP groups shifted their bases abroad. In the next few years the ANC endeavoured to consolidate its position. With the active support of the UN, the USSR and its allies, and several Western governments and organizations, they gradually succeeded in regaining still greater international recognition as the South African "liberation movement".

In 1974 the UN formally declared the ANC "the authentic representatives of the overwhelming majority of the peoples of South Africa". As in the case of SWAPO in South West Africa/Namibia, the UN with its one-sided pronouncements was not interested in letting itself be guided by such boring things as popular plebiscites; only by the expediency of yet another new government within the fold of their socialist New World Order.

In addition to political and moral support for the ANC, the UN also channelled material aid to it to the extent of over twenty million dollars in 1984. It also received huge subventions from the USSR and its allies and satellites and front organizations such as the World Peace Council. With all that help it was able to resume its armed struggle. Acts of deliberate terrorism with explosive devices in the big towns in South Africa, such as the car-bomb explosion in Pretoria in 1983, in which nineteen persons of all races were killed and many others mutilated, were still to be directed mainly at government employees.

At the Second Consultative Conference in Kabwe, Zambia, in June 1985, the president of the ANC, Oliver Tambo, confirmed the policy of his

organization as "the indiscriminate use of violence" for the attainment of their objectives. The conference was described as a Council of War, and the leaders announced that "in future" no distinction would be made between civilian and government targets with regard to acts of sabotage. In Tambo's words: "In an intensified confrontation, in an escalating conflict, all distinctions between 'soft' and 'hard' targets must disappear."¹⁰⁷

His words were soon turned into deeds. A series of road-mine explosions in rural areas, in which most of the victims were black farm-workers, and a bomb explosion in a busy shopping centre in Amanzimtoti, Natal, just before Christmas 1985, killed four persons, including a four-year-old girl. More wanton bomb attacks took place in several other towns.

In Europe and America the ANC is readily represented as a pro-Western liberation movement with the praiseworthy goal of getting rid of apartheid and the establishment of more human rights. On German TV the communist ANC terrorist Nelson Mandela, sentenced to life imprisonment, is sometimes actually referred to as "the South African opposition politician", whose release is now "demanded" by Federal Chancellor Kohl, Prime Minister Thatcher and other Western governments. According to a piece in the London *Sunday Express*, the release of Mandela is the price that Pretoria would have to pay if they hoped for a visit by Mrs Thatcher; as had been intimated in British diplomatic circles. "[Mrs Thatcher] believes that the release of this man, who has been languishing in gaol for over twenty years, would have a moderating influence and avert the threat of a bloody conflict." (*The Citizen*, 11.1.1988)

This absurd statement turns the realities of South Africa completely upside-down. Perhaps the best answer by South Africa would be to suggest the release of the Bader-Meinhof gang, the IRA terrorists or the Red Army Faction, so that they first could "exercise their moderating influence" in Germany and Britain.

To the credit of the South African government, it has made no such ridiculous proposals.

The close interrelation between the ANC and the SACP was confirmed by Bartholomeus Hlapane before the Denton Commission of Enquiry: "It is a standing rule that members of the SACP must also belong to mass organizations like the ANC and SACTU. The idea was of course to infiltrate apparently reactionary members into each organization to undermine the leadership and eventually take over control of the organization."

The connexion between the ANC and the SACP developed into a firm alliance. In June 1958 the National Executive Committee of the ANC consisted, as proposed at the Second Consultative Council in Zambia, of thirty

persons, of whom at least twenty-three were either known communists or active supporters of the Communist Party.

But, it may be said, there are seven members of the leadership of the ANC who are not communists. How is it that those people have not been eased out long ago, if the organization is entirely communist?

To understand that it is necessary to understand the revolutionary strategy jointly adopted by the SACP, the ANC and the USSR. According to soviet revolutionary theory "national liberation movements" play a central part in all the Third-World countries. In such countries there can be no direct road to the final phase without some transitional stage. They must first pass through the preparatory phase of "national liberation". In this preliminary phase as broad a national front as possible must be created, which will consist of all the "progressive elements" –liberals, churchmen, students, academics and workers, which will be under the leadership of an "advance guard". In the case of South Africa this advance guard during the "national liberation" phase will consist of the ANC. Their common basis is Joe Slovo's Freedom Charter.

When "national liberation" has been achieved, rallying the masses behind it, the second phase of the revolution will begin, with the workers as the advance guard; that is, the SACP. It is only during that phase that the "useful idiots", the liberals and naïve democratic elements of the previous national front, are given the push and a "people's democracy", i.e. a communist state, is set up.

Obviously the SACP believes in this two-phase theory of revolution. In *The African Communist* no. 87, 4th quarter 1981, the Party openly admits that its primary objective is "to fulfil the aims of the national democratic revolution, or, to put it more precisely, to achieve national liberation for all the oppressed blacks and to destroy the economic and political power of the existing ruling class."

In confirmation of this programme it adds: "The Communist Party guarantees its unreserved support for the Freedom Charter."

The strategic objective is "to destroy the system of capitalistic exploitation in South Africa and replace it by a socialist system in which ownership and the means of production will be socialized and the economy organized so as to serve the interests of the entire people."

In its own publications the ANC has prescribed exactly the same double-phased revolution. The first phase is "liberation under the banner of the Freedom Charter". The second is the establishment of a "people's democracy" with the emphasis on the "majority of the people", i.e. the proletariat or "working class". That is made perfectly clear in *Sechaba*, an ANC publication printed in East Germany (September 1985):

"We in the ANC know that a national (liberation) struggle and a socialist

struggle are not one and the same. Nor do they belong in the same historical period. They both belong to two distinctly separate categories of the revolution."

In the same issue the ANC lets the cat clean out of the bag:

"We mustn't get intoxicated with our love of socialism. The people of South Africa must be made to understand the bitter truth simply, clearly and directly; the main content of the present phase of our revolution is the national liberation of the black people. It is simply impossible for South Africa to achieve the socialist victory unless the national liberation of the blacks is achieved."

The tactic of the proposed two-phase revolution in South Africa is not just some new theory. It has already been put successfully into practice in several countries.

In Vietnam, for example, there was a National Front, the FLN, some of whose leaders were non-communists. There were also other democratic forces, such as academics, Buddhists, Catholics and students, who got mixed up in anti-government agitations. But as soon as the "national liberation" was achieved, the "advance guard" took over the leading rôle and got rid of the former elements of the democratic front. Many of them found themselves back in "re-education" camps. Others fled. Many were killed.

It was the same in Cuba. There was a broad national front, the so-called 26th of July Movement, which included many democrats who had resisted the Batista régime. In the early stages of the revolution Fidel Castro promised his liberal friends that he would lead the country to true democracy with free elections. But as soon as he was in power he locked up or banished or put to death many of his former non-communist comrades in arms.

Likewise in Nicaragua after the "National Liberation Front" had overthrown the Somoza régime. Again it was the advance party, in this case the communist Sandinistas, who seized power and eliminated their erstwhile democratic and liberal fellow-fighters.

In *The African Communist* no. 87, 4th quarter 1981, Sol Dubula explains why it was the ANC and not the SACP that had taken over the leadership in the liberation alliance during the first phase of the revolution: "If the real leadership of the democratic revolution requires a strengthening of the national movement as the main mass organization, then that is precisely how the Party foresaw it in its leadership and advance guard rôle in its truest (and not just its ordinary) sense."

Thus the S.A. Communist Party openly admits its leading rôle in the ANC. The fact that the ANC is far from being an authentic liberation movement with the welfare of the blacks at heart becomes clear when we

examine the nature and the weapons of its "liberation struggle" and the statements of the organization more closely.

The equipment used by the ANC includes road mines, limpet mines, bombs, explosives, hand-grenades and AK 47 rifles. In warfare of that sort, in which mines and car bombs are used, there can be no selection of victims. Innocent civilians, and indeed mostly black pedestrians, therefore constitute the majority of victims. Since the ANC offensive is not directed primarily at the armed security forces but rather at the intimidation of the population in general, it forfeits all claim to any such designation as "liberation movement" or "partisan fighters", as the mass media of the world attempt to convince their audience. The ANC is nothing but a communist terror organization that considers any means legitimate in its endeavour to gain power for itself and to sovietize South Africa. The blacks in South Africa serve merely as cannon-fodder for the unscrupulous aims of the terrorists, and if there were a power takeover, as in neighbouring Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Angola, they would be the principal sufferers.

Here are some of the terrorist acts committed by the African National Congress since 1976:

- 12 mine explosions; 30 others were rendered harmless by the security forces.
- 113 hand-grenades were used in attacks; 1 273 others were discovered by the security forces.
- 115 limpet mines exploded; 409 others rendered harmless.
- 7 bombs exploded; 87 others rendered harmless.
- The security forces seized 85 other explosive devices in ANC caches.
- From April 1984 to April 1985, 60 acts of terrorism were committed by the ANC; from April 1985 to April 1986, 193, some of them from Zimbabwe, Zambia and Botswana.
- Since 1976, 43 blacks and 35 whites have been murdered by ANC terrorists in South Africa.¹⁰⁸

There can be no doubt that the ANC is a link in the chain of the international terror network controlled from Moscow and supported and financed by powerful interest groups in the West. Despite skilful efforts by the international media and the demonstrable mendacity of Western church organizations and certain government circles in representing the ANC as brave guerrilla-fighters engaged in a just cause, it is not always possible to square the brutal murders and acts of terrorism and the statements of the organization itself with these fraudulent shifts.

Thus, for example, "Radio Freedom", the voice of the ANC in Africa,

broadcast incitements to mass murder in May 1986: "Let us take up our weapons, ... our 'necklaces', our grenades, our machine-guns, our AK 47s, our limpet-mines and everything we can get hold of; let us fight the 'vigilantes' [i.e. anti-communist black opposition groups; author] the so-called 'fathers', together with the apartheid régime, together with the police and the army."

Earlier, in January 1985, Radio Freedom had noted with satisfaction some of the goals that had been achieved: "Puppets [i.e. members of freely elected black local councils; author] have been killed, their houses burnt down, many have been forced to resign from office."

In October 1985 the transmitter sent out the following report from Zimbabwe: "The strategy of burning traitors [i.e. 'necklacing'; author] has evidently paid well."

In the same month Tim Ngubane, speaking for the ANC at California State University, said quite blatantly: "We will make the death of a collaborator so grotesque that nobody will ever dare to co-operate with the authorities again."

In May 1985 the National Executive Committee of the ANC, broadcasting over its transmitter in Addis Ababa, called for the murder of black civil servants: "Out watchwords must be: Unite in mass actions ... confrontation of the enemy on all fronts ... making the country ungovernable – the police and soldiers must be ambushed ... for the purpose of taking their weapons from them. Our people must make bombs and incendiary bombs at home from locally available materials. We must buy weapons whenever possible. When our people are armed in that way they must seek out collaborators and enemy agents and settle accounts with them. Collaborators working in local councils, informers, policemen, Special Branch men, members of the army, all of them living among us must be killed. The Popular Front must support the armed struggle and attack the enemy on the economic front, carry out acts of sabotage against firms and industries by which the government gets rich ..."¹⁰⁹ etc., etc.

After a meeting with Oliver Tambo, president of the ANC, a member of the British Cabinet, Mrs Lynda Chalker, Minister for African Affairs, said of this terror organization remote-controlled from Moscow that it "didn't advocate violence any more than anybody else."¹⁰⁹

Here is a sample of the fare dished up to unsuspecting German Christians by the External Office of the Evangelical Church of Germany (EKD) (from an EKD project group *Publicity Work in SA Questions*): "The ANC is very popular among the black people ... the resistance by the ANC cannot simply be condemned as terrorism ... It must be embittering to the members and leaders of the ANC to be compared indiscriminately to certain terrorist groups ... So far it has shown circumspection in the great majority of its

actions and taken care to cause as little harm as possible to the life and limb of innocent people ..."¹¹⁰

UCANEWS, the information sheet of United Christian Action in South Africa, wrote in its issue no. 20/85 of 6.11.85: "Meanwhile the ANC, like all 'liberation movements' controlled by Moscow, commits murders, mostly among the civilian population. 'Our watchword now is: A corpse a day!' – that was the message broadcast over the official transmitter of the ANC, 'Radio Freedom', from Tanzania on 4.7.85."

The terrorist organization demonstrated its "circumspection" in another dastardly attack in a Durban shopping-centre two days before Christmas 1985 by blowing up a rubbish-bin amid a crowd of shoppers. Five persons, two of them children, were killed; over fifty suffered grievous injuries.¹¹¹

On 13 April 1986 Winnie Mandela, wife of the imprisoned ANC communist Nelson Mandela, shocked the whole world by saying: "... With our matchboxes and our necklaces we shall liberate this country."

That did not prevent Willy Brandt, President of the Socialist International and former Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, from receiving the good lady at dinner in the residence of the German ambassador in Pretoria two days later.

Mrs Mandela is already being represented to the readers of newspapers in the Western world as future "first lady" and "mother of the nation". How the liberation of the blacks in South Africa in the manner of Mrs Mandela and the ANC will be effected is evident from the "necklace" treatment, by which more than six hundred innocent blacks have departed this life:

1. The victim's hands are hacked off so that he cannot defend himself. In the most merciful cases his hands are tied with barbed wire.
2. An old car tyre is pulled over his shoulders and soaked in petrol or diesel oil. Diesel is preferred, because it burns longer and sticks to the skin better.
3. The fuel is set alight with matches. If the victim's hands have not been chopped off, he is forced to light his "necklace" himself.
4. The fuel ignites the tyre, which quickly reaches a temperature of 400-500 degrees C.
5. The burning tyre gives off dense clouds of smoke, producing carbonic gases at a temperature of 300 degrees. Breathed in, they destroy the tracheal and lung tissues.
6. The melting rubber runs down his neck and body and burns deep into his flesh. By now it is impossible to extinguish the fire. Water is useless. The victim is a blazing corpse.
7. It can take twenty minutes for the victim to die. While he is writhing and screaming in agony, Mrs Mandela's fellow-liberationists stand looking on, laughing and jeering. Members of the victim's family sometimes try

to help the poor blazing creature. But the perpetrators – who include children and striplings – know that by now nothing can be done. The molten rubber seethes like boiling tar and cannot be got off the burnt flesh.¹¹²

In the curious words of a German prelate: “By its ambiguous attitude the Evangelical Church is contributing to the prejudiced notion that the liberation movements in southern Africa are evil.”

(Bishop Martin Kruse, President of the Council of the EKD, at 21st Convention of the Evangelical Church in Düsseldorf, 5-9 June 1985; *Idea* 24/85, p. 15)¹¹³

In an interview with the Russian news agency TASS the “future first lady” said that the Soviet Union was the true ally of all oppressed peoples, and she expressed her gratitude for its fraternal solidarity with the salutation: “The Soviet Union makes our dreams come true!”

Another dream that came true was a Volkswagen bus given to her by the government of the Federal Republic of Germany – for her “social activities and welfare projects”. (*proTEST* no. 4/5, August 1986)

The bishops at the South African Catholic Bishops’ Conference also expressed an opinion of the “patriots” of the ANC. In their view the murder of “collaborators with apartheid” was not a criminal but merely a political act. In an appeal to the State President the Catholic bishops demanded the suspension of the death sentence passed on the murderers of Kuzwayo Jacob Dhlamini, the elected black mayor of Lekoa.

UCANEWS no. 24/87 of 9.12.87 wrote: “On 3 September 1984 the condemned men set fire to Mayor Dhlamini’s house and when he managed to escape from the burning building they overpowered him and stoned him. Finally they poured petrol over the still living victim and burnt him alive. The presiding judge described the deed as ‘horrible, mediaeval, barbarous’. Yet the weekly *New Nation*, the mouthpiece of the Catholic Bishops’ Conference, hailed thirty-two criminals, including ANC terrorists and the murderers of Dhlamini, as ‘patriots’ to whom the status of prisoners of war should be granted.”

The horror that the murder gangs of the ANC aroused all over the world with their savage method of killing compelled the leaders to request the members of the organization not to use the “necklace” in future. It might otherwise cause difficulties and interruptions in the copious flow of money from the Western treasuries which they would have been most reluctant to forgo. We may assume that their friends in the Russian KGB advised their black brethren to adopt some more humane method of dispatch that would be easier on the more squeamish digestions of the Western governments and church organizations.

At this point I should like to say a word or two about a person who is inseparably bound up with the ANC and who is already enveloped in the nimbus of a future Head of the South African state. I refer to Nelson Mandela, the former head of the ANC. Twenty-seven years ago he was sentenced to life imprisonment for sabotage and high treason. The government has hinted at the possibility of releasing him if he should abjure violence in future and renounce all communist agitation. But Mandela is not prepared to do that.

According to a report by the Evangelical Press Service (epd), Mandela commands "the overwhelming support of all black South Africans". (epd No. 6/85, p. 3)¹⁴ Yet the facts do not bear that out, to judge by the findings of a black newspaper, *The Sowetan*. Some time ago the paper waged a signature campaign for the release of Mandela among seventeen million South African blacks. The total result was six hundred thousand signatures, or 3.5 per cent of the black population.

Vox Africana no. 30, June 1987, reports on another poll taken in Soweto, with its millions of black inhabitants: "At the time of the white parliamentary elections in South Africa a large-scale 'alternative' parliamentary election was held in Soweto. For months *The Sowetan*, the paper with the largest circulation produced by blacks, for the purposes of this mock-election, asked all blacks to name up to ten of their favourite personalities to whom they would like to entrust the conduct of state affairs in a democratic South Africa. At regular intervals the paper reminded its readers of the campaign, which was expected to be a powerful demonstration of the black masses for the leadership of their choice. The results were made known on 7 May 1987. They were remarkably meagre. In an acid commentary *The Sowetan* observed that the interest of its readers in this exercise in democracy had been 'not exactly overwhelming'. Actually the 'alternative' election had called a myth in question. Nelson Mandela, regarded in certain circles as the most prominent prisoner of all time, the almost universal symbol of the black fight for freedom, whom even Archbishop Tutu, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, called his Leader, got precisely 838 votes from his black compatriots in South Africa."

On that occasion United Christian Action, an umbrella body of conservative Christian movements, interviewed Mr B. Moulton, the business manager of *The Sowetan*: "Our election appeal is in fact a severe disappointment. It showed the total apathy of our readers to politics. We had specially programmed our computer so as to be able to have the voting results professionally analysed. Now we can evaluate the fifteen hundred voting papers sent in by hand. Moreover we found that in the votes for Mandela there were whole bundles obviously by one and the same person signed with different names. A lot of the entries came from the same street in

Soweto. We assume that certain action groups are hiding behind the votes for Mandela." (*UCANEWS* 5.5.87)

All the to-do about Mandela – in London the City Council recently unveiled a statue of Mandela on the Thames embankment – is a remarkable triumph for the "disinformation" policy of the USSR and its Western accomplices.

Since it was becoming increasingly difficult for the ANC terrorists in exile under the leadership of their president Oliver Tambo to keep their murder gangs in South Africa under control and not lose their power of influence, they looked for some legal representation inside the country.

On 20 August 1983, on the initiative of the Rev. Allan Boesak, president of the World Federation of Reformed Churches, the United Democratic Front (UDF) was founded. Its purpose was the creation of a "unitary, democratic and non-racist South Africa"; any use of force or violence for the attainment of political ends was renounced. Moreover it discountenanced all formal or personal association with the prohibited ANC and SACP.

The attitude thus struck for outward show, the "democratic" in its designation and the inclusion of numerous non-political figures from the community and church organizations enabled the UDF to pass in the eyes of the world as a non-violent civil-rights movement and therefore as a legitimate opposition to the South African government.

In fact, however, the UDF was founded solely for the purpose of slipping in through the reform programme initiated by the Botha government that many blacks found very encouraging. That development was of course by no means compatible with the intentions of the revolution-minded leaders of the ANC, who certainly had no interest in an evolutionary improvement of conditions in South Africa: "It cannot be sufficiently emphasized that in a national liberation struggle it is not a matter of winning a place within the existing order. Still less can the step-by-step extension of political rights to the majority of the people be the goal of any such struggle," as *Isizwe*, the official organ of the UDF, wrote in November 1985 (p. 11).

Unlike many foreign critics of South Africa, the indigenous communists knew very well that the reforms initiated by President Botha were far from being merely cosmetic in nature and that they might therefore have an inhibitory effect on the revolution. The UDF was therefore created as a legal successor to the banned ANC, not only as an act of ideological self-preservation but also because it offered the communists their last chance of strangling the reform policy by force.

It is certainly no accident that after years of peaceful change the violent unrests in South Africa broke out precisely from the moment that the UDF went into action. Anybody who still had any illusions about the true

character of the UDF at its inception could hardly have had any doubts remaining about its real purposes and objectives after the election of its office-bearers: Archie Gumede, Albertina Sisulu and Oscar Mpetha – all former members of the ANC and long-service activists – were the first three national presidents of the UDF to be elected. The fact that Nelson Mandela, former president of the ANC, and all the ANC terrorists who had been given life-sentences along with him for high treason were adopted as patron saints of the organization seems just as logical as the fact that the present leadership cadre of the UDF comprises over ninety per cent of former members of the ANC, the SACP and other prohibited revolutionary organizations.

Thus what was postulated by the ANC organ *Dawn* in August 1983 with regard to the creation of the UDF has become a practical reality: "The National Liberation Alliance led by the ANC will only be able to steer the UDF if we have our own underground structures inside the UDF. These structures must operate skilfully, set the right guidelines for the UDF and above all give a clear indication of the tasks of the Front"

According to its own statements the UDF, controlled as it is in that manner, now comprises about 850 organizations and associations with a total membership of about two-and-a-half million. Its sustained (and even increased) personal connexions with the South African communists accentuate the character of the UDF as a camouflage organization for the ANC and the SACP. And that again casts a very curious light on the father of the UDF, the churchman and champion of civil rights, the Reverend Dr Allan Boesak.

The UDF has adopted the tactics of the communists as its own, and adapted them according to the changing circumstances of South Africa. Just as it was twenty years ago, it is still the declared intention of the revolutionaries to make the country ungovernable, to get rid of the system of apartheid by force and ultimately to overthrow the government of the whites. For that purpose the ANC-UDF alliance counts essentially on the following weapons:

International Activities

As has become perfectly clear during recent years, the UDF campaign of agitation is not confined to South Africa; it also includes the direct mobilization of "world opinion" against Pretoria in the hope of isolating South Africa by that means from the "civilized" world and so bringing about the fall of the government. The international mass media have an essential part to play in the process; they are regularly supplied with "information" and

with their sensational TV reporting they have done much to precipitate and aggravate the troubles in South Africa. It is significant that the rioting in the black townships has greatly abated since TV crews were forbidden to enter them. The second international brigade more than useful to the UDF in its campaign consists of "committed" parsons and certain church organizations. It is certainly not accidental that the head offices of both the UDF and the South African Council of Churches (SACC) share the same address in Johannesburg. How well the collaboration works is demonstrated by the activities of the two patron saints of the UDF, Allan Boesak and Desmond Tutu; the international boycott campaign against South Africa and consequently the destitution of thousands of unemployed blacks is largely due to the indefatigable efforts of these two sky-pilots.

School Boycotts

One of the most important members of the ANC-UDF alliance is the stone-throwing mob of fanatical youths and children, who have no idea what they are doing and most of whom have not seen the inside of a school for years.

Here again there are large sections of the UDF and affiliated bodies, revolutionary student societies, "committed" teachers and parsons who are the real driving force behind them. So churches are regularly turned into centres of assembly and agitation and usually serve as the starting-points for bloody "children's crusades" in which non-revolutionary-minded teachers and pupils are harried and terrorized. On the pretext that education for blacks is inferior schools are systematically wrecked and textbooks and equipment burnt. Those who refuse to co-operate with them or dare to oppose them are lucky if nothing worse happens to them than a severe beating; most are killed in savage fashion.

But these children and adolescents on the rampage serve only as cannon-fodder for the people responsible. If a child should happen to be killed by the security forces amid all this orgy of violence, they are provided with splendid material for the international press, and once again South Africa can be pilloried for the brutality of its police.

"People's Education"

Meanwhile, as a result of a new policy of the ANC summarized by the slogan "Back to the schools!" the UDF is now challenging the government to hand over the black schools to the organization. For it is only in that

way that one of the elementary needs of the people, "people's education", can be achieved, according to the ANC publication *Upfront*, for again part of a general political development is the "take-over of power by the people".

Strikes and Work Stoppages

The fact that revolutions cannot be accomplished by bloodthirsty adolescent fire-raisers alone has by now begun to filter through even to the communist circles of the ANC-UDF. Consequently great efforts are now being made to mobilize the workers in the cause of the revolution.

The creation of the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) in November 1985, with its pro-communist leanings and its close connexions with the UDF was a move in that direction. At present the political function of the black trade unions as a tool of the UDF is limited by the continuing economic recession and the increasing unemployment that it causes. Moreover, despite COSATU the various black trade unions are severely split up, with the result that – so far – the decisive political thrust cannot be implemented in accordance with the plans of the UDF.

Consumer and Rent Boycotts

Years ago the ANC had been constantly calling for the mass boycotting of white shops and the public transport services and refusal to pay rent. The UDF has also held true to this tradition, for it realizes that the consumer boycott is one of the most effective weapons by which the black residential areas can be made ungovernable. By refusing to continue paying rents to the municipal authorities they would deprive them of their most vital necessity, the administration would collapse and be taken over forcibly by UDF-controlled cadres of activists and "street committees". Thieves, house-breakers and other criminal elements would gang up with one another to take advantage of the summons to boycott to assault and plunder with impunity those blacks who did not toe the line.

Intimidation and Murder

The road to the "liberation" of South Africa is now strewn with the corpses of the victims of the murderous revolutionaries who, encouraged by the international boycott movement, propose to wage a "cleansing civil war" so as to be able to build a communist state on the ruins. By the

“necklace” and other horrors they will try to isolate those blacks who are willing to accept reforms and co-operate with the whites, so that from the outside it will look as though the black people living in the townships were firmly united behind the “liberation movement” led by the ANC-UDF revolutionaries.

In accordance with Lenin’s catchphrase “Terror is just another means of persuasion”, the scenario of intimidation as staged by the UDF gangs always follows the same pattern: for example, if the inhabitants of a township do not comply with a consumer boycott of white shops, the young activists fall upon their black fellow-citizens with unimaginable brutality. They are beaten up, their purchases confiscated or destroyed, and they are forced to eat soap or drink cooking-oil. In one case the white owner of a shoe shop received a pair of his shoes by post with the feet of the black woman who had bought them from him still in them.

Black civil servants, members of local councils and policemen, even low-grade employees, teachers and petty traders who have laboriously built up a decent livelihood, become targets for the terror gangs of the ANC-UDF alliance, as “profiteers of the system”. Hundreds of families have been living in fear of attack and physical violence. Their children cannot be allowed out in the street, because they would be beaten up without mercy, and their houses and shops are a constant invitation for the arsonists. Often – usually as a result of some capricious denunciation – they are subjected to outright manhunts in which the victim is either beaten or stoned to death, hacked to pieces with matchets or murdered by the notorious “necklace” method.

Meanwhile Oliver Tambo, president-in-exile of the ANC, rides in triumph all over the world, hailed as the future head of state of South Africa; a country that he has not set foot in for nearly thirty years; and is received by senior members of government in London, Paris, Bonn, Washington, Wellington and Canberra. Allan Boesak, the founder and patron saint of the UDF, is invited as guest of honour to the church convention in Frankfurt to deliver the principal address.

While the ANC-UDF terror gangs continue their cowardly assaults to intimidate the black people of South Africa, members of government, church organizations and media of the West humbug their people and incite hatred against South Africa. For example, the External Office of the German Evangelical Church (EKD) issued a declaration by its Council that the UDF was a “non-violent protest movement” the members of which are being arrested because of “questionable special (apartheid) laws”.¹¹⁵

Nevertheless it is only as a result of the use of South African army and police units and the introduction of the state of emergency that the reign of terror of the ANC-UDF gangs in the black townships was brought to an end

and lawlessness contained, so that the great mass of peaceful black citizens can once more go about their business in reasonable safety.

When black South Africans beat, stone and burn other black South Africans to death, it is not merely condoned by the ANC-UDF and their foreign aiders and abettors but exploited as positive propaganda. The world shall be roused to anger – not over the brutal murderers in the townships; its righteous wrath is directed against the government that has done all in its power to prevent the atrocities! The conspirators may well hope that the system will ultimately collapse under the combined assault from within and without, when they will be able to build “a new Jerusalem out of the ashes of Pretoria”, as Dr Boesak so poetically put it to the assembled Evangelicals in Frankfurt.

The Rôle of the Churches

The evil committed by human beings is never more carefully and thoroughly done than from religious conviction.

Blaise Pascal (1623 - 1662), French theologian and philosopher

Ever since the *illuminato* Mordechai Marx Levy, alias Karl Marx, at the behest of and with the financial support of the house of Rothschild, turned socialism into an ideology with his books *Das Kapital* and *The Communist Manifesto*, the Christian religion in particular has come under attack by evil forces that seek its destruction.

True to the precepts of Weishaupt, the followers of Karl Marx and later Lenin set about putting into effect their plan to make such a brutal assault on all religion as to drive it clean out of people's heads. But it was more easily said than done. Believers, especially Christians, proved to be an unexpected obstacle in the road to atheist world revolution.

We are all familiar with the tragic beginnings of communist rule. The churches were either shut up or destroyed. Of the forty-six thousand churches in Russia there were four thousand left in 1940, and in the first thirty years of bolshevist rule forty-eight million human beings were "liquidated", forty thousand of them priests and leading members of religious groups. Despite the cruellest persecutions, from Stalin, Khrushchev and their successors down to the present day, they discovered that Christianity could not be extinguished; on the contrary: the numbers of believers underground kept growing. The promise of Jesus, that the gates of hell should not prevail against his church, proved to be stronger.

Thereupon the communists changed their tactics. In addition to the direct attack from outside, they infiltrated churches and theological seminaries with students who were really agents of the KGB. They corrupted the clergy or took over their functions themselves. Obstinate priests were terrorized, locked up in madhouses, sentenced to long terms of imprisonment or exposed to public disgrace. Parents who had their children baptized were accused of endangering the mental health of their

children. Fathers lost their jobs and the children were barred from higher education.

A few churches were left unmolested, to be used as a show-window for the purposes of propaganda. Since there are only a few churches still open, they are always well attended. Tourists and some Western church leaders then go about spreading stories of full churches and freedom of religion – they’ve seen it with their own eyes.

In the West the communists use different tactics. Since they cannot make a direct attack on the churches, the tried and true method of infiltration is the only one open to them. They know that they have a vast potential in the unbelievers and the lukewarm Christians and liberals inside and outside the churches.

In 1938 Georgi Dimitrov, the leader of the Bulgarian communists, put it in this way: “Let our friends do the work. We must always remember that one sympathizer is worth more than a dozen militant communists. One university professor who isn’t a party member but stands up for the interests of the Soviet Union is worth more than a hundred party members. One well-known writer or one retired general is worth more than five hundred nonentities who have just enough sense not to get beaten up by the police. A writer who isn’t a member of the Party but defends the Soviet Union and the trade union boss who isn’t one of us but stands up for the soviet international policy is worth more than a thousand party workers. Those who aren’t party members or known communists have greater freedom of action. Our friends must confuse the enemy for us. They must export our principles and mobilize campaigns in our support against people who don’t think as we do and whom we can’t get at. We must use most especially ambitious politicians who need help, men who know that we communists can smooth their path and give them publicity and help them in other ways. Men like that would sell their souls to the devil; and we buy souls.”

Thus we see that the communists use liberals, “useful idiots”, as Lenin called them, to advance the goals of communism in the West.

Universities and the press are the main instruments by which they can spread ideological poison. But their easiest prey are “modern”, “liberal” parsons and theologians, men who have lost their faith and their vocation, for whom God is dead and the Bible far from infallible. These are the easiest victims of a new gospel whispered in their ear by the marxists.

They are to be found everywhere in the world nowadays. Wittingly or unwittingly they work for the destruction of Christianity; for they have been taken in by the Utopia of an ideology that promises man the Kingdom of God on earth. It is liberal theologians of that kind who now sit at the controls of nearly every church organization and distribute their members’

money. Since they are patronized by secret forces they advance to high positions of influence and esteem.

Their main task, as they see it, is the liberalization and softening-up of all dogmatic structures in the church. By recruiting and training mostly leftist ministers they succeed in watering down the Christian message and interpret it in new ways. The emphasis is shifted from the vertical – pointing to God – to the horizontal, compassionate-humanist, plane. By the distortion and denial of cardinal precepts of the Bible and over-emphasis on social and ethical questions they gradually weaken and falsify the Christian doctrine; and the result is confusion among believers and emptying churches.

The communists know only too well that the decay in belief in the churches can best be achieved not from below upward but from the top down. Theologians who want to build their Kingdom of God on earth in concert with the marxists cannot help mixing marxist jargon with their religious pronouncements. And so the fundamental, irreconcilable opposition between marxism and Christianity is blurred.

The over-emphasis on social – and political – aspects inevitably leads to a garbling of biblical utterances and a perversion of the Bible into a revolutionary handbook. Thus, for example, Jesus's missionary command to spread the Gospel is interpreted as a call to "dialogue" with communism, the spiritual salvation of mankind suddenly means political liberation, and justice (before God) means "reconciliation" with human beings. The Good News of the Gospel is thus gradually transformed into a social-humanist ideology that can be taken over by atheistic communists, pagan cults and any other religion in the world.

This universal heretical trend appears to have the blessing of the World Council of Churches in Geneva, for the WCC – more a worldly than a spiritual body – has long been demanding joint sessions and prayer jamborees with Buddhists, Muslims, Jews, Animists, Hindus, Taoists and all sorts of other sects and conventicles.

In the United States it was the member churches of the WCC that helped to get the Americans driven out of Vietnam, so that the whole country fell into the hands of the communists. And now liberal theologians and churchmen are using the same tactics in Africa; and the WCC spends most of the money that it collects in the West not by any means on the dissemination of the saving message of the Gospel but on aid and comfort to marxist murder gangs in southern Africa and everywhere else in the world, preparing the way of the antichrist, making his paths straight.

Indirectly the attack on the "white" positions in Africa had begun in 1961. In that year the Orthodox Church of Russia was accepted as a member of the World Council of Churches. It was in that same year that President Kennedy

– as though accidentally – ended the “cold war” and began the new era of “peaceful co-existence”. That meant that from then on the West recognized the communist dictatorship as a “democratic system” on a par with the Western parliamentary systems.

The Russian Orthodox Church had been a member of the Oecumenical Council of Churches for barely ten years when politicization began to set in in Geneva. It was soon clear to all and sundry that the “Christian” brethren from the east were less interested in spreading the Gospel than in expanding the soviet hegemony.

When in 1970 they pushed through the Programme to Combat Racism of the WCC and fumigated it with Christian incense, the KGB officers active in the Church Centre had scored their first striking success. It had long been the goal of the soviet planners to exchange the anti-communist bastions in southern Africa for régimes subordinate to Moscow so as to gain control over the strategic Cape route and the mineral wealth of the subcontinent.

Their direct drive by supporting terrorist cadres with arms and ideological propaganda had not produced the desired results. But now with the aid of the Programme to Combat Racism of the WCC their efforts were sealed with the blessing of the churches. The terrorists constantly working for the overthrow of the white governments not only received an unexpected moral boost and sanctification of their bloody deeds, they were soon able to dip their hands into the stream of Western money raised by the churches in the form of “humanitarian aid”. In view of so much active moral support on the part of a world organization of churches, many “progressive” Western governments and – of course – the UNO were swift to follow suit and dig deep into their pockets to stump up their share for the noble cause.

The Swedish government, which had already been contributing an annual subsidy of 150 000 dollars, now raised it to four million dollars. The Lutheran World Federation went out of its way to support the decision of the WCC and in the following year (1971) handed over a sum of 35 000 dollars to the FRELIMO “freedom fighters” in Mozambique.

That same year the British Council of Churches also associated itself with the WCC decision to support the “freedom struggle” in southern Africa; likewise the Presbyterian Church of America, the National Church Council of America, the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands, the All Africa Church Conference and the Christian Peace Conference.

How greatly the Evangelical Church of Germany (EKD) esteems the work of the WCC is shown by the fact that its contributions exceed those of the highest share of any other members by several million. But that is understandable. The president of the External Office of the EKD, Dr Heinz-Joachim Held, is also the chairman of the Central Committee of the WCC.

In *Diagnosen* (October 1984, p.42) Norbert Homuth wrote: “The EKD

with 2,2 million DM is paying the highest share of all the members of the WCC. For years the church has been arguing that none of the church funds had been used for the support of terrorism in South Africa, and at a meeting of the Central Committee of the WCC in January 1979 it was stipulated that the support for terrorists should not come from general church funds, but only from donations for clearly identified projects. The chairman of the External Office of the EKD gave his word of honour for that. Thus the public was deceived for years, until in November 1982 it came out that in the year 1982 at least the Oecumenical Council had handed over money to the terrorists that had been earmarked for world missionary tasks and evangelization and had come from the Evangelische Missionswerk; thus church funds and Free Church funds."

We must add that they were far from fussy in their choice of organizations on whom to pour their golden shower. Those that received the most favourable consideration seemed to be mainly those with an anti-Western slant, who had distinguished themselves as enemies of the "capitalist" free-market economy and were subservient to the advance of atheism. In short: the organizations regarded as most worthy of support were and still are those that serve the interests of Moscow.

How successful the efforts of the USSR and the WCC have been is demonstrated by the fact that Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique are now under marxist rule.

Reviewing a few facts that illustrate this development, Homuth wrote: "From 1970 to 1979 alone the WCC gave away 3 063 545 dollars. Of that 65 per cent went exclusively to marxist terrorists in southern Africa. In 1978 the 'Patriotic Front' in Rhodesia, which was trying to overthrow the white pro-Western government, was given a sum of 85 000 dollars by the WCC. At the same time this Patriotic Front is financed by Cuba and the Soviet Union. Even before the WCC announced its donation for 'humanitarian aid', the Patriotic Front had killed 207 white and 1712 black civilians, not counting the 296 civilians mangled by terrorist mines. The WCC rejected all criticism from all sides and announced with pride that it had given another handout of over 125 000 dollars to marxist SWAPO (Namibia). Altogether SWAPO had received 823 000 dollars from the WCC by 1982. In Angola the Russian-supported MPLA received 78 000 dollars, marxist FRELIMO in Mozambique 120 000 dollars. In 1978 thirty-five foreign missionaries and their children were murdered in Rhodesia by the terrorists financed by the WCC. Soon afterwards they shot down an unarmed civilian aircraft and killed all those who had survived the crash; and two members of the Salvation Army were also killed by the terrorists. Because of that the Salvation Army left the WCC."¹¹⁶

The last and strongest bastion against communist domination in south-

ern Africa and the principal objective of the USSR is the Republic of South Africa and South West Africa (Namibia). It is on these two countries that the joint attack by all those forces that intend to neo-colonialize Africa and use it as a springboard for its New World Order is concentrated.

The fact that such agreement of objectives exists between international communism, the UNO and the WCC should surprise nobody who is aware of the pronouncements of one of the leading theologians of the EKD and the WCC, Professor Jürgen Moltman: "... The churches should therefore make special efforts to get rid of national sovereignty and promote the development of the United Nations and a world government."¹¹⁷

A report by the WCC admits quite openly that the support of terrorists in South Africa is intended "apart from compassion to enable the WCC to have a say in the new distribution of power."

Among whom the power is to be newly distributed, if all goes according to the wishes of the WCC, can be seen from its donations. Since 1970 mostly marxist "liberation movements" have received 7,5 million dollars in annual instalments "for the fight against racial injustice" and to give assistance to the "racially oppressed".

The payments from the WCC Special Fund for the Programme to combat Racism (PCR) for 1987 were as follows:¹¹⁸

Donations by the WCC to "liberation movements" (in US dollars)

African National Congress (ANC)	110 000
Pan-African Congress of Azania (PAC)	35 000
South West African People's Organization (SWAPO)	115 000
South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU)	10 000
	<hr/>
	270 000
	<hr/>

Donations to "Support Groups":

Japanese Anti-Apartheid Committee	5 000
New Zealand Hart Aotearoa	2 000
Deutsche Anti-Apartheid Bewegung	6 000
Mouvement Anti-Apartheid Français	6 000
Western European Parliamentarians for Measures against Apartheid	10 000
English Namibia Communications Centre	4 000
Welsh Anti-Apartheid Movement	3 000
US-Southern Africa Program, American Friends Service Committee	4 000

(Oecumenical Press Service, 1 - 7 Nov. 87)

The objectives of the recipients “must not deviate from the general goals of the World Council of Churches”, as the WCC stipulated. That can only mean that a marxist-communist, atheist order of society is in general agreement with the goals and intentions of the World Council of Churches. Since the donations are made “with no control over the manner of their use”, there is nothing to stop the money from being spent on weapons, bombs, or Mrs Mandela’s famous tyres, petrol and matches.

The extraordinary activities of the Oecumenical Council of Churches become more comprehensible when we know the parties most interested in its foundation. It was the National Church Council of the USA (NCC) that served as a model for a World Council. This body, financed by large contributions, particularly from the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations, had got so firmly into the clutches of the American *illuminati* that by 1936 the US naval intelligence services had classified it as one of the most dangerous and subversive organizations in the country. *The Readers’ Digest* wrote that it is still being seriously accused by state commissions of enquiry of having been infiltrated by marxists.

A few years ago this National Council of American Churches caused a great to-do by appearing as co-plaintiff in a court action in Rhode Island against a public performance of the Christmas story. No, dear reader; you have not misread that. The US Council of Churches actually took out a writ against a children’s representation of the birth of Jesus.

In his book *Vorsicht, Ökumene!*¹¹⁹ (*Beware of the Oikouménē*) Norbert Homuth writes: “Just as the *illuminati* served the National Council of Churches of the USA, the same took place on the world level by the foundation of the Oecumenical Council in Geneva. It is one of the tactics of the Freemasons to try out something on a regional level before putting it into practice worldwide. One of the most powerful wirepullers in that business was Rockefeller. He is a high-degree Freemason. Rockefeller not only funded the UN building [should read: UN site; author] in New York, he also financed the establishment of the World Council of Churches in Geneva. To the question as to what extent the Oecumenical Council was connected with Rockefeller’s Council of Foreign Relations the reply came from Geneva: ‘The Rockefeller Foundation contributed substantial sums to make possible the creation of our Oecumenical Council. Four founda-

tions contributed altogether 1,2 million dollars for the building of the Oecumenical Centre.' "

In 1954 still more money came from Rockefeller, over 125 000 dollars, and in 1958 Rockefeller gave another two million dollars for the establishment of a training fund for theologians in Geneva.

As Homuth writes: "The same Rockefeller who financed an abortion centre for over ten thousand abortions a year in New York also financed the sex-guru Bhagwan, the Club of Rome and the World Council of Churches in Geneva. They all serve the same ends."

It was certainly no accident that both the UNO and the World Council of Churches were founded shortly after the end of the second world war and financed from the same sources. It was the legal adviser to the Rockefeller family and later US Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who was appointed chairman of the Commission for International Relations of the WCC in Geneva. His job was to integrate and co-ordinate the work of the WCC with that of the UNO.

"Dulles also ensured that a WCC office was opened in New York. Through this office in New York pass all communications to the UNO-UNESCO, in which 'God-is-dead' and communist-inclined theologians are mass-produced. This theological seminary stands under the aegis of Rockefeller and his hidden influence," says Homuth.

A few years ago Frau Dorothee Sölle, of all people, was the only German theologian to be invited to report to the WCC conference in Vancouver; whereupon a storm of indignation broke out from the Christian press in Germany. Why? Since 1975 Frau Sölle had been a professor at Rockefeller's Union Theological Seminary.¹²⁰

Of the two million dollars contributed by Rockefeller for the training fund for theologians E. Fey writes in his *Geschichte der ökumenischen Bewegung* (*History of the Oecumenical Movement*): "The financial means of this fund and the services of the collaborators were used so cleverly that they led to a radical change in theological training."¹²¹

According to Homuth, the creation of a fund for Christian literature and music in 1964 was a logical sequel to that. Millions of dollars of *illuminati* money must have flowed into the creation of "Christian" rock music alone.

The upper ranks of the oecumenical movement are entirely occupied by high-degree Freemasons, says Homuth. That is also true of the UNO and the other large world organizations. The Catholic Church, which had always been deeply hostile to the Freemasons, officially approved them in its new *Codex juris canonici* of 1983. As Homuth wrote in *Diagnosen* 10/84, "Pope John XXIII introduced the oecumenical-charismatic process into the Catho-

lic Church, so that now the Vatican is populated by a whole army of Freemasons."

The fact that it is not otherwise in the Protestant churches can be deduced from a paper issued by the EKD, quoted by Homuth. The official responsible for sectarian questions wrote to him: "A general objection to the membership of Freemasonry by Evangelical Christians cannot be raised. The rumour that a Freemason cannot be a Christian or a Christian a Freemason is in the eyes of the Christian church a breach of the Eighth Commandment."

Thus one brick is added to another to build the pyramid of the *illuminati*. While the UNO is the incarnation of the future world state, the Oecumenical Council in Geneva foreshadows the emerging anti-Christian world church. Its magazine, with the significant title of *One World*, leaves no room for doubt that the interests of the World Council of Churches in Geneva are identical with the *novus ordo saeculorum* of the UNO. Both organizations are the political instruments of influential forces that are changing the world and intend to enslave humanity under a totalitarian marxist world government and a pseudo world church. The WCC long since made it clear that it was not concerned with an *oikouméné* of the Christian churches alone.

Ever since the World Conference of Churches in Geneva in 1966 it has been obvious that its aspirations go far beyond that to an *oikouméné* of all religions, sects and cults. It is no longer a question of the unity of Christians but of the unity of all human beings in the liberal-freemason sense.

At the fourth plenary session in Upsala, Sweden, in 1968 they were already talking about a widening of the notion of unity: "The church makes bold to speak of itself as the symbol of the future unity of all mankind."¹²²

A few more examples may serve to illustrate that. In March 1970 an oecumenical congress was held at Holiday Beach at which not only representatives of Christian churches were present, but also those of Islam, Buddhism and Hinduism. The organizers were the WCC in Geneva.

In 1974 the Catholic Cardinal Suenens acted as host to a "world conference of religions" in Louvain, Belgium. For that he received a prize from the Templeton Foundation, a Freemason institution that consists of representatives of the six world religions.

In the spring of 1982, an Islamic-Christian "dialogue" was held in Colombo, Sri Lanka. The result was a decision by the Islamic World Congress and the World Council of Churches to form a Standing Common Committee.

The former Secretary General of the WCC, the marxist Philip Potter, made an introductory speech at a meeting in Bossey Castle in 1980 in which he said: "The Charismatic Movement is a connecting link. It can help the

World Council of Churches to attain the goal that it has set itself, which is the integration of all human beings all over the earth."

Thus the goal towards which the World Council of Churches is heading is clear. Obedient to the old Freemasons' notion of a world brotherhood, it is working for an integrated world with an integrated church in which atheists, communists, Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, Moonies, Scientologists and swamis of all sorts and colours can caper to their hearts' content.

If, in spite of many attempts to suppress it, they cannot altogether root out the sense of religion that is innate in all human beings, then they will at least contain it within the confines of a universal pseudo-church and use it for the purposes of power politics, so it seems.

In his book *Die Protestantischen Kirchen im Sog des Kommunismus*¹²³ (*The Protestant Churches in the Wake of Communism*) Dr Beat C. Bäschlin writes: "The destructive elements that were able to usurp control over Protestantism so extensively are pursuing a twofold strategy. Absurd demands are made in the name of Jesus Christ. The intention is, **on the one hand**, to discredit the churches and shake the faith of believers or otherwise put them off; **on the other hand**, they intend to take over the ecclesiastical apparatus and its funds for the ends of communist policy and the advance of atheism. These two strategies reinforce one another.

"For the more the Protestant churches allow themselves to be used in the war of extermination against Christianity, the more untrustworthy they become. And the more untrustworthy they become, the more successful is the effort to weaken the Christian religion in the West also and hasten its demise."

The destruction of the repute and "credibility" of the churches is thus one of the long-term objectives of soviet policy in the Western countries. The flood of defections from the churches by members disgusted by the support of communist terrorist groups by the churches is noted with satisfaction by the KGB men operating in Geneva. It is a victory in their war against religion in general and the Christian churches of the West in particular.

Despite the departure of something like two million members of the Evangelical churches in West Germany since 1965, the upper ranks of the EKD (and the nearly 300 member churches of the WCC) saw no good cause to condemn the atheistic ethos and soviet policy of the Oecumenical Council, far less renounce their membership. "On the contrary," said Bishop Lohse, then chairman of The Council of the EKD in 1983, "there is no alternative to the oecumenical organization of the WCC; the EKD is determined rather to strengthen its solidarity with the WCC."¹²⁴

The German-speaking Christians in South Africa and Namibia, who

stand in a "partnership relation" with the EKD through their church organizations (in 1987 the existing agreements were replaced by a "provisional arrangement") got a good taste of that solidarity. By means of financial subventions and the despatch of predominantly trendy-lefty parsons to South Africa and Namibia, the EKD exercised a decisive influence on the policy of the German churches there. They also, together with the Lutheran World Federation, bear a substantial share of the costs of a theological training centre in Natal. That of course gives them a decisive say in the selection of the teachers into whose hands the young aspirants to holy orders are confided.

So it is all still in the (EKD) family; and the German communities that had been hoping to dispense with the "imported" and EKD-trained ministers in future and train their own ministers bound to the Scriptures and the Creed had congratulated themselves too soon.

The fact that the German head of the Faculty of Theology had signed the notorious KAIROS document, which is full of the spirit of marxism and calls for the violent overthrow of the South African government, hardly helped to pour oil on the troubled waters of the resentful German Christians in South Africa. The Lutherans still loyal to their church in South Africa see themselves exposed by this "partnership relation" to increasing political pressure from their church leaders who, in total contempt for their rights, require them not only to condemn the policies of the country that they are living in but also to force them into "greater Christian unity" with their black fellow-citizens in an integrated church in which the proportion of whites would be less than five per cent.

And the fact that this unity between black and white Christians has always been interpreted purely spiritually in the biblical sense means little to the church politicians who exert the pressure; for the unity that they are interested in is quite a different kind: the unity of organized power-politics.

Although the EKD is unable to fuse together all seventeen of the autonomous regional churches in the Federal Republic of Germany into one single church, they nevertheless demand the structural integration of all the black and white Lutheran churches in southern Africa. They cannot manage it even in Germany, where, in contrast to the multiplicity of races in South Africa and Namibia, there is complete uniformity of race, nation, language and colour.

Predictably, most German-speaking Lutherans have (so far) declined to comply with these pious injunctions. They are perfectly well aware of the political intentions behind them and of the fact that as a minority they would be deprived of all right to self-determination and their characteristic German culture as a religious community, which they had built up for over a century and nurtured with love, would be endangered.

The descendants of many German missionaries who with great self-sacrifice and privations carried the Gospel to the blacks and dedicated their lives to the task must now put up with being reviled as "racists" because they are not prepared to accept the political programme of the WCC championed by the EKD. German-speaking communities are to be humbugged by their synodal representatives with religiously camouflaged statements and financial aid – as a sort of Fifth Column of the EKD – into co-operation in radical "changes in the structures of the private as well as the public domain" of the country.¹²⁵

This can only be understood as connected to the radical forces both at home and abroad working for the overthrow of the present system of government. In its overt support of the communist terrorist groups by the WCC, to which the EKD contributes a third of the running costs every year, the possibility of a successful "structural change" being brought about is plain for all to see.

On whose side the ecclesiastical structure-changers stand was made clear to an astonished German church community in Pretoria recently, when the visiting specialist on South Africa in the External Office of the EKD told them that the church had many friends in South Africa, "but unfortunately many of them are in gaol".

At that moment a light was switched on for many Germans in Pretoria. With the uneasy feeling of having been left in the lurch by an opportunistic church leadership and being ministered to by a bunch of EKD pastors whose vocation is regarded as politically suspect, many members of congregations have been fighting for years for a total dissolution of the link with the EKD.

They accuse the churches of the Federal Republic, both Catholic and Protestant, of the greatest guilt in the collapse of general morals, legal concepts, the destruction of the family, the horrible number of abortions, and all the other phenomena of degeneracy that are now the norm in Germany.

Many of the foreign Germans in South Africa, who number about 120 000, and the far greater mass of South Africans of German descent, therefore, have developed a sound mistrust of the activities and intentions of the Federal German church organizations, which on the pretext of trying to help, interfere in South African affairs but cannot keep their own house in order.

Their officially tolerated homosexual ministers, their support of atheistic terrorist movements and the many anti-South African agitators in German pulpits give many German-speaking South Africans grave doubts as to whether the ecclesiastical influences emanating from Germany are really in the interests of their congregations and their

black fellow-Christians and likely to be conducive to peaceful development in South Africa.

The dangerous part played also by the local churches in South Africa may be judged by anybody who has followed the train of events in the successful revolutions in Nicaragua and other troubled countries. Even in the communist seizures of power in Rhodesia, Mozambique and Angola the churches did a good deal of the preliminary spadework.

A young black woman from South Africa, a former member of the African National Congress (ANC), shocked Americans recently by her admission that she had been incited to take part in acts of murder and arson in the townships mainly by South African church leaders. Salamina Borephe was one of several witnesses who testified before a study committee of the Republican Party in Washington. Miss Borephe, who had become a Christian since breaking with the ANC, spoke of the sleepless nights and nightmares that had tormented her ever since. She said that in 1975 she had attended the Congress of South African Students (COSAS), at which she was told that it was a branch of the ANC. The student members of COSAS were taught how to make Molotov cocktails, and "parsons told us how good communism was. They promised us a better education in other countries; and that's why I joined the organization."

"The anglican priests taught us that communists were black people from Central Africa. Leaders like Samora Machel, Robert Mugabe and Joshua Nkomo were spoken of as heroes who would liberate us ... We were imbued with a powerful hatred of the whites, particularly the Afrikaners."

An anglican priest and another clergyman (whom she named) were the ringleaders of the "opposition movement". "They told us that the local councillors must die, because they paid no attention to the people. There was a lot of confusion, and some people who went to work were beaten up, others were killed, some burnt to death."

On Sunday 2 September they had held a meeting in the Catholic church of Evanton and Sharpeville. "By half past five on Monday morning we were on our feet and throwing stones at cars and buses." She described how a black councillor was seized by "the boys" and burnt to death with a petrol bomb. Another was hacked to death with pangas as he was coming out of his house.

"They always referred to the Bible to explain why we should murder the local councillors", she said. "They said that Mandela was like Moses, and he had been sent to set us free. We were also urged to kill policemen, and some members of COSAS had got hold of firearms for that purpose". The organizations also used children and adolescents from twelve to eighteen. "We were told to burn down the schools,

because the communists would come and build better schools for the blacks." (*The Citizen*, 29.6.87)

These are the words of a former member of the ANC.

But many other clergymen and churches fanned the flames in South Africa. In its publication *ucaNews* 11/86, United Christian Action, an umbrella organization of several Christian associations, wrote:¹²⁶

"Catholic Bishops in South Africa Smooth the Path to Marxism.

"On 16.5.86 the general secretary of the South African Bishops' Conference, Father Smangalis Mkhathshwa, was arrested for illegal possession of arms and ammunition. This event shows only the tip of an iceberg, for under the leadership of Archbishop Denis Hurley the South African Bishops' Conference has become a tool of marxist revolutionaries. United Christian Action substantiates this by the following examples:

"The Episcopal 'Namibia Report': On 1.6.82 the South African Catholic Bishops published a situation report on Namibia ... in which the Christian intentions and overwhelming support among the blacks of the terror movement SWAPO were arrested. Even the official party programme openly proclaiming atheism, marxism and leninism did not offend the bishops; as they argued on page 27 of the Namibia Report, that was only intended to 'keep the Warsaw Pact countries in the mood to continue supplying them with arms.'

"Propaganda for the marxist ANC: Archbishop Denis Hurley played a key role in the propaganda campaign financed by the Catholic charitable relief organization Misereor against South Africa in Germany in 1983. Misereor, which is lavishly funded by unsuspecting Catholics in good faith, represented the terror organization the ANC as 'the natural expression of the African desire for liberation'. (Interview with Archbishop Hurley, Misereor provincial magazine, South Africa, 1983, p. 21).

"Class struggle in Catholic school-books: The Education Section of the Bishops' Conference in 1983 published a study course for school children in which the leaders of the black homelands were depicted as puppets of the South African government who were merely continuing the oppression of the masses. Black policemen, soldiers and councillors and Coloured and Indian parliamentary representatives were abused as 'collaborators' who betrayed their people from a craving for power and prestige. The Catholic study course is illustrated with pictures of black children raising their fists and expressing their hatred in the caption: 'We won't work for the whites any more! Europeans get out! We won't pay any more taxes! Schools are useless! The chiefs are oppressing us! Give us land! We'll never allow the Christians to rule us!' (*Signposts*, 1/83)

“Publication of the pro-marxist New Nation: With a grant of over DM 250 000 from the charity funds of Misereor and Missio, two German Catholic relief bodies for famine and sickness all over the world, in 1985 the South African Catholic bishops started a periodical called *The New Nation*. In issue no. 10/86 of 22.6.86 the paper glorified the marxist ‘comrades’ who by that time had murdered over five hundred black people who had no revolutionary inclinations with burning car tyres.

“Hand in hand with the ANC against national defence: On 13.4.86 Archbishop Hurley led a five-man delegation to the ANC headquarters in Lusaka, Zambia. Excerpt from the communiqué issued by the bishops and the ANC: ‘The black majority knows from experience that the South African police and army are instruments of oppression ... The Conference therefore acknowledges the importance of the campaign to end conscription in South Africa.’ (Citizen 17.4.86). The episcopal magazine *The New Nation* also commented on the South African commando action against ANC bases on 19.6.86. According to issue no. 10/86 the objective was not the ANC but the economic independence of South Africa’s neighbours. ‘The military want to cause as much chaos as possible. They are afraid that the successful development of a multiracial socialist state in Zimbabwe or Mozambique will show up the absurdity of apartheid capitalism.’

“Other activities: The Catholic Bishops’ Conference in South Africa has acknowledged its support for the marxist Kairos document; it has repeatedly demanded the withdrawal of the police and army from the black townships in South Africa while ignoring the threat to peace-loving inhabitants by radicals; on several occasions Archbishop Hurley has perverted the Holy Mass by offering petrol bombs and firearms as sacrificial objects, ostensibly to strengthen the oppressed in their struggle for liberation.

“The Catholic bishops of South Africa are not interested in the opinions of the members of their flocks – according to surveys more than 95 per cent of Catholics in the country are opposed to any kind of sanctions against South Africa – yet their shepherds call for punitive economic measures. The Catholic organization TFP (Tradition, Family, Private Property) collected over ten thousand signatures against them. Another group that calls itself Concerned Catholics submitted a note of protest against the ‘socialist activities’ of the bishops to the Vatican. At a three-day conference in Durban on 20.11.85, attended by eighty senior black church leaders, a motion of censure was carried against the activities of Archbishop Hurley. In an interview with *The Sunday Times* a leading black theologian said: ‘The general feeling at our conference was that we are fed up with the white Messiahs who set themselves up abroad as martyrs for the black cause.’ (*Sunday Times* 1.12.85) Black priests then withdrew their support for Bishop Hurley’s

newly-founded organization Christians for Justice and Peace, and the project collapsed.

"Yet the Archbishop is obviously confident that the Bishops' Conference does not need the support of the ordinary member of the congregation any more. Foreign donations for the revolutionary activities of the bishops more than make up for the growing abstention. In 1984 the Bishops' Conference received DM 750 000 from abroad, mostly from Germany. A year later donations from abroad passed the two-million mark, which does not include the DM 250 000 for *The New Nation* Pastoral Project from Misereor and Missio. The Vicar General of Cape Town, Father Reginald Cawcutt, commented thus on the jibbing at the Bishops' Conference: 'The bishops are the leaders of the Catholic Church and need not necessarily ask the community which road to take.' (*Citizen*, 30.4.86)" (End of report)

Another curious part is that played by the South African Council of Churches (SACC), which, like all the other national church councils worldwide, supports the interests and aims of the WCC. Its activities are therefore comparable to those of the WCC.

When these activities threatened to go beyond the score, in 1981 the government instructed a judicial commission of inquiry to examine the development, activities, aims and finances of the SACC. After nearly two-and-a-half years the Eloff Commission, as it was called, submitted its 451-page report to parliament in Cape Town on 15.2.1984. It shocked the nation.

It stated that the SACC was waging "a political war of liberation in fraternal association" with the marxist terror organisation the African National Congress (ANC) and other militant organizations. The chief characteristic of the activities of the SACC was the fact that it would opt for a revolutionary rather than an evolutionary process to bring about change in South Africa. In the planning of its activities, therefore, it identified itself more and more with the so-called liberation struggle. It had embarked upon a programme of "reinterpretation" of the Christian faith so as to be able to justify its active participation in politics. With its own version of "liberation theology" the SACC was attempting to indoctrinate and politicize the churches associated with it and the blacks in the country, while the whites were to be subjected to a "change of consciousness" to prepare them for a revolutionary change in the existing structures.

According to the Eloff Report Bishop Tutu, the then secretary general of the SACC, frankly admitted to waging "a massive psychological war against the country and to a strategy of resistance and the promotion of the political fight for liberation. That included such tactics as, on the international level, persuading governments and organizations to bring political, economic and diplomatic pressure to bear on South Africa. Within the

country itself the SACC associated itself with "a large-scale campaign of civil disobedience", a disinvestment campaign and vociferous support for young men who refused to do their national military service.

He incessantly prophesied the impending violent uprising and declared his solidarity with all who came in conflict with the government, whether they were striking teachers, militant black power movements or radical black trade unions.

Although the SACC was unable to enlist the support of the churches in South Africa – only 1,2 per cent of its total budget was received from member churches – it had no difficulty in getting plenty of money for its programmes from churches, governments and other organizations abroad.

According to the Eloff Report, most of that money came from Germany, and mainly from the EKD. The SACC proposed to use "underground groups" in its civil disobedience campaigns; for that had proved very successful when used by the marxist guerrilla fighters in Latin America. The leaders of the communist Sandinista government in Nicaragua now frankly admit that it would not have been possible for them to take over power in the country without the support of the Catholic "base communities", the church underground groups.

With regard to the links between the SACC and the ANC the commission found that after consultations with the ANC and other "liberation movements" in Lusaka the SACC had passed a resolution "to enhance its credibility with the liberation movements". The SACC justified the use of violence by the terrorists with skilful theological formulations and thus gave them its express approval.

There was, however, nothing theological about the recent pronouncement of the former secretary general of the SACC, Dr Beyers Naudé: "Stone-throwing and the burning of cars and houses and the killing of collaborators occasionally" could not unconditionally be regarded as "violence".¹²⁷

The Eloff Report also states that Bishop Tutu had had personal contacts with Oliver Tambo and other banned leaders of the ANC and evidently had very accurate information about activities planned by the ANC. Mr John Rees, another former secretary general of the SACC, had likewise had personal meetings with them. Most of the payments made from the Dependents' Conference Fund went to former members of the ANC and PAC, another communist underground organization. Yet another secretary general of the body that later became the SACC, the Council of Churches of South Africa, the Revd A.W. Blaxall, had earlier been convicted of having taken part in ANC activities.

According to the report, Bishop Tutu's official statements are calculated to improve the "image" of the ANC and make it more "respectable". Thus

Tutu described Oliver Tambo as "a person of Christian convictions and sincerity in his endeavours for peace, justice and democracy in South Africa" – the man who was responsible for the bomb explosion in Pretoria in 1983 that killed nineteen people and inflicted crippling and disfiguring injuries on over two hundred others, including black and white women and children.

He called Nelson Mandela, a communist who was sentenced to life imprisonment for high treason for his terrorist activities, his leader, and spoke warmly of him as the future South African head of state. Tutu, now the Archbishop of Cape Town and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, who nonetheless boasts of being "no pacifist", predicts that the use of force in the fight for liberation will be unavoidable. In that case he could see nothing wrong with actively supporting the fight himself. He hardly ever uttered a word in condemnation of revolutionary violence, because in his eyes the use of force was justified if the South African government did not change its course very soon.

The Red Bishop, who declares himself a socialist and a hater of capitalism (*Sunday Times*, 29.12.85), appears to take a very odd view of Scripture when he can make such public pronouncements as these:

"Some people think there was something funny about the birth of Jesus ... Maybe he was an illegitimate child." (*Cape Times*, 24.10.80)

"When justice prevails over injustice, as in [marxist] Zimbabwe, that shows that the Kingdom has already arrived." (*Ecumenews* 11, 1980)

"I thank God that I am black. At the Last Judgment the whites will have much to answer for." (*Argus*, 19.3.84)

"A young fellow with a stone in his hand can do far more than I can with a dozen sermons." (*Daily Telegraph*, London, Nov. 1984)

"Every Christian must be a revolutionary. Jesus was a revolutionary. I am a revolutionary, if by that you mean somebody who wants to change things completely." (*Rapport*, 20.4.86)

"As far as I'm concerned the West can go to hell." (*Cape Times*, 23.7.86)

Many Christians in South Africa are afraid that His Grace himself is already headed in that direction, and so many people have deserted the Anglican church that it now finds itself in sore financial straits.

Of the Asingeni Relief Fund of the SACC the Eloff Report says that it was originally established as an aid fund for those involved in the rioting in 1976, including the defence costs of persons charged before a court. The judge who conducted the investigation drew attention to the nature of the offences with which most of the accused were charged: possession of explosive substances, presence at prohibited gatherings, public violence, attempted arson, housebreaking, malicious damage to

property, riotous assemblies, stone-throwing, robbery, assault, attacks on police stations and administrative buildings, and sabotage.

After these disturbances had abated Bishop Tutu, the then secretary general of the SACC, considered it opportune to use the fund in future for the purpose of "liberating the oppressed". Thus the Asingeni fund now became an effective instrument to promote the political aims of the SACC.

The Eloff Commission then takes note of a man who seems to have been the real "master-mind" behind the programmes and campaigns of the SACC: Dr Wolfram Kistner, the son of a German pastor and former director of the Justice and Reconciliation section of the SACC.

One of the main stumbling-blocks in the way to realization of his programme of action for a radical change in South African society was the existence of a theology that distinguished between spiritual and worldly matters. He therefore made it his task to convince the leaders of the member churches of the SACC that theology was indeed concerned with worldly realities and phenomena and that the church should investigate socio-political problems. In his opinion "the theology of the member churches had to be adapted" to the so-called "social gospel" or "liberation theology" and to a new definition of Christian ethics in which the old notions of sin and guilt would be identified afresh.

How important the co-operation and support of the churches in South Africa have become to the aims of the communist terrorist movements is clear from statements made by Oliver Tambo, president of the African National Congress (ANC), on various occasions. For example:

"I hope ... the church in South Africa will really be in the front rank of the advance ..."

"The church must play an active part in informing the Christian community of the necessity of the liberation struggle."

We also hear similar strains from SWAPO: "The churches must declare themselves for the liberation movements or else they are taking sides with the oppressors ..."

Likewise the Pan-African Congress (PAC): "The churches have an essential rôle to play in consciousness-raising."

Then there is the plain statement by the ANC in its monthly *Sechaba*: "The most important strategic goal in our struggle is the forcible take-over of power from the hands of the white minority régime by the joint revolutionary forces of the black majority and all the other democratic forces in the country."

If we were to assume that the SACC and the churches in South Africa are aware of the true character and ungodly ends of these marxist "liberation movements" we might think that there would be unbridgeable differences

between them. Yet the commission of inquiry pointed out that there was the closest possible co-operation between the ANC, PAC and SWAPO on the one hand and the WCC and many other oecumenical bodies on the other.

Thus, for example, at a joint session of the WCC with representatives of the ANC, SWAPO, PAC and the SACC were present, the subject of *The Church and the Liberation of Southern Africa* was discussed. In its recommendations the following proposal was adopted: "The conference fully approves the demands of these liberation movements and wishes to declare its unconditional support in their fight against imperialism, colonialism, racism and minority-settler rule. Moreover the conference declares its respect for the African liberation movements and those groups which are taking up the cause of the total liberation of the African continent. We therefore call upon all the churches, particularly those in Southern Africa, to take practical steps to support the freedom struggle ..."

At another meeting in May 1982 the PAC expressly thanked the WCC and its various organs for their moral and financial support in previous years and expressed the hope that it would be continued. Since then conferences between representatives of the churches and the communist "liberation movements" have been held regularly. With regard to the civil disobedience campaign, in a BBC interview Bishop Tutu said: "... laws that seem unjust to us ... should not be obeyed; and then a disobedience process is set in motion on a large scale in which nearly all the laws of the legislation are disregarded, until this country becomes practically ungovernable."

What rôle had been designed for sincere Christian believers may be gathered from the words of Dr Kistner: "In view of the diminishing tolerance level of the authorities an increase in pressure emphasis should be placed on assisting Christians in preparing in underground activity on non-violent resistance ..."

As the Eloff Report says, in the course of its "massive psychological campaign" against the existing power structure of the country the SACC more and more realized the importance of effective propaganda. Programmes were therefore designed to alter the mental attitudes of the whites. Special efforts would be made to exploit opinion-forming institutions, such as the mass media, for those purposes. They realized that a well-directed propaganda effort would be absolutely necessary not only to "arouse and inform" the clergy but also on the level of the parishes and the local pastors to enlist the necessary support for the "programme of change".

Constant defamation of the South African government was regarded as a fundamental element of this strategy; likewise the refusal to recognize the positive improvements that had been undertaken in many areas. Mendacious statements, such as that the blacks in South Africa were in a condition

of "permanent slavery", the South African system was comparable to the Nazi régime in Germany, and so on.

To improve the somewhat damaged image of the SACC with its meddling in politics, the question was frequently raised as to the expediency of bringing out some prominent church leaders [of the EKD] from Germany so that they could testify to their sympathy and solidarity with the SACC. But Dr Kistner suggested that it would be better to await the right moment; for example, if the Eloff Commission should reach conclusions that would compel the government to hamstring the SACC in its political activities.

The strategists of the SACC were at all times aware of the fact that they could always count on the full support of the WCC, the UNO, the Lutheran World Federation and the EKD. That explains the arrogance and self-confidence with which they behaved both at home and abroad.

As for the finances of the SACC, the commission found that between 1975 and 1981 it received over seventeen million rands in donations from abroad. Nearly nine million, or 52 per cent, came from West Germany alone, followed by ten per cent from the WCC. By far the largest proportion of the money from Germany came from the EKD and the churches in communication with it; altogether about eight million rands. The EKD not only supports the SACC as its principal contributor, practically keeping it alive; it also pays the salaries and retirement pension contributions of its mastermind, Dr Wolfram Kistner, and the former secretary general of the SACC, Dr Beyers Naudé, two gentlemen who "demand the removal of the South African government and the take-over of power by 'the people' under the leadership of the ANC."¹²⁸

In its search for more rich uncles to pay for its revolutionary activities in South Africa the SACC had some very precise notions, it seems. In addition to secret transfers of money from the UN Trust Fund (UNTFSA) channelled through the WCC they looked for still more copious fountains.

They canvassed not only foreign governments and church organizations, but also such leftist bodies as the International University Exchange Fund (IUEF). That organization gave direct financial assistance to the African National Congress, which they regarded as the leader of the national liberation movement in South Africa, also to PAC and SWAPO, as "the only legitimate liberation movement in Namibia". The activities of the IUEF [a front organization financed by the CIA; author] included programmes for the training of specialists for "the future liberated countries of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa". The IUEF was a body particularly hostile to South Africa, with the clearly stated intention of destroying the existing order by a revolutionary *coup*.

The then secretary general of the SACC, Bishop Tutu, was compelled to admit before the judicial commission of inquiry that he had twice person-

ally addressed the organization at its headquarters in Geneva and that money had been sent to South Africa by a detour through the WCC to disguise its real origin and enable them to give out to the South African public that it was "church funds".

These are only a few points from the official report of the Eloff Commission. They speak for themselves.

When one considers that the SACC, as an offshoot of its parent WCC in South Africa, contrary to its own claims represents only a small minority of the Christians there and that over 97 per cent of its budget of millions comes from abroad – more than half of it from the EKD – then it must be clear to all that a curious game is being played.

More and more blatantly the constant pressure of the EKD to manoeuvre the German churches in South Africa into the fold of the SACC becomes apparent. Against the background that I have described such attempts by no means allay suspicions about the real intentions of the organization. They raise the question whether South Africa and its German churches would not be wiser to withdraw completely from the sphere of influence of the organization, send the imported pastors and teachers packing and rely entirely on their own financial resources and those of their adopted South African home.

The irreligious activities of the SACC are by no means an exceptional case; and they are not confined to South Africa. For example, the government of Singapore recently ordered the dissolution of the Christian Conference of Asia, the regional headquarters of the WCC there. In a statement by the Foreign Minister the Council was accused of using Singapore as a theatre for pro-communist "liberation movements" all over Asia. Five foreign leaders of the supposedly religious body were given two weeks to get out of the country.

It also came out that members of the Christian Conference of Asia were behind a "Christian-marxist" conspiracy to overthrow the government in 1987 and that they also had close connexions with the radical opposition in South Korea. The WCC and other organizations associated with it were also accused of having paid millions of dollars to the National Democratic Front in the Philippines, the political arm of the guerrillas of the New People's Army.

A laudable exception was the National Church Council of Indonesia, which withdrew from the WCC recently "because it had supported the pro-Soviet liberation movement in the whole region".

These are ominous examples that South Africa should take careful note of. A country of such a Christian character as South Africa, whose churches are full every Sunday, whose government and parliament open every

session with prayer, where grace is still said at table and evening Bible-readings are not uncommon, and the pastors still command the undisputed respect of their flocks, – such a nation is particularly vulnerable through its churches and clergymen.

The enemies of South Africa have long been aware of that. By infiltrating the church leadership, subtle brainwashing of the clergy and training at christo-marxist seminars; they are attempting to undermine the churches, gradually convert them to a new, humanistic gospel and subject the unsuspecting believers to a process of political “re-education” almost unnoticed.

How is it possible (many will ask) that so many clergymen and church leaders nowadays preach a political “gospel”, support militant atheist terrorists and have fallen into the pit of marxist ideology so easily?

Perhaps that question is best answered by the Scriptures themselves, which give clear warning of the seduction of the faithful in our time. But let us listen to the voice of a man who anathematizes marxism and its adherents from his own excruciating experience in these words:

“Never before has the world seen a godlessness that has been so organized, militarized and evil through and through as that of marxism. Within the philosophical system of Marx and Lenin hatred of God is the main driving force and the heart of their psychology, even more fundamental than their political and economic pretexs. This militant atheism is not a mere fringe phenomenon of communist policy, not a mere side-effect, but its central pivot. To achieve its diabolical aims communism needs control over a humanity that lives without religious faith and national consciousness. Both these intentions are openly admitted by the communists and no less openly put into practice.”

Thus Alexander Solzhenitsyn in 1983; a man who had good cause to know what he was talking about.

The attack on South Africa is not confined to its strategic minerals and control of the Cape route. It is at the same time a satanic, eschatological attack on one of the last strong bastions of Christianity still standing in the way of the marxist New World Order and its universal pseudo-church.

The Rôle of the U.S.A.

The appalling thing in the revolution is not the tumult but the design. Through all the fire and smoke we perceive the evidence of a calculating organisation. The managers remain studiously concealed and masked but there is no doubt about their presence from the first.

Lord Acton (1834 - 1902)

For many years South African observers have been following the influences of the USA on the political developments in their country with increasing dismay. The interference of American organizations and government departments in the internal affairs of South Africa has reached such proportions that it amounts to a deliberate destabilization campaign that, but for energetic counter-measures by the South African government, would plunge it into economic chaos and revolutionary violence. If it were to continue unhindered, such a development would undoubtedly lead to a communist take-over of power by the African National Congress.

After examination of the available facts there can be no doubt whatever that that is the actual intention of influential circles within the American government.

However shocking that statement may seem to many of my readers, nevertheless the events themselves permit no other interpretation. The partly overt, partly carefully concealed, programme of action of the dominant Western super-power against South Africa is unequivocal; it speaks a language that it is impossible to misunderstand.

In their efforts to drive a mostly unsuspecting mankind into the socialist New World Order during this century, the American State Department, run as it is by the men of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilaterals, makes use of every conceivable means to attain its goal. In recent years one anti-communist country after another has fallen victim to this perfidious plan. Iran, Rhodesia and the Philippines are only three examples of such revolutionary upheavals in which Anglo-American machinations have played a decisive part.

The once flourishing pro-Western country Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) is far advanced along the road to a one-party marxist-leninist dictatorship, for the creation of which British and American duplicity and diplomatic intrigues did the necessary spadework.

The fall of the Shah in Iran, which was contrived by the American CIA, opened the way to the transitional régime of the Ayatollah. The abduction of Ferdinand Marcos, President of the Philippines, by high-ranking American officers into exile in Hawaii, enabled the big international bankers to install one of their confederates, Corazon Aquino, in his place.

After the death of Khomeini in Iran, the communists are well positioned to seize power. In the Philippines the bankers can be equally confident of success, since both Mrs Aquino and the strong communist opposition are working for the New World Order. The unaccommodating nationalist Marcos was slandered – like the Shah – in the usual tried and tested fashion, accused of corruption, oppression and what-have-you, and driven into exile by suborned officers.

The pattern is the same everywhere. First of all they extend vast amounts of credit to the target country, underwritten of course by the American taxpayers. Very often the credits far exceed the ability of the country to repay them. In other cases, where the government is more circumspect, such as that of South Africa, by tampering with the economy they destroy the currency and force the government to keep devaluing it. By that means the repayments are increased in proportion to the devaluation and delivers the country into the hands of the bankers. On top of that the USA makes the country dependent on it through programmes of “aid” and military assistance.

When at last the country can no longer meet its repayment obligations, more stringent new conditions are dictated for the advance of further loans by the bankers, the IMF or the World Bank, with the result that the people are plunged into poverty, and riots, lootings and mass demonstrations against the government ensue.

In the case of South Africa, which as the economically strongest country in the whole continent had always punctiliously met its financial obligations, the repayment debt doubled almost overnight because of the drastic devaluation forced on the rand. Not long afterwards the trap was sprung, when Rockefeller’s Chase Manhattan and other big banks without warning demanded the immediate repayment of all short-term loans – ostensibly out of concern over the revolutionary political situation in South Africa; which of course had been created by the intrigues of the bankers and the CFR clique themselves.

If the necessary government actions lead to hardships and austerity within the population discontent, riots and upheavals often ensue; and that

is the signal for the American auxiliaries in Russia, China, Cuba and elsewhere to arm and train resistance groups and “liberation movements” and with their help to throw the country into confusion. The American politicians – and their confederates elsewhere in the West – with the support of the controlled mass-media then drench their citizens with a flood of cock-and-bull stories about the frightful oppressions, tortures and contempt for human rights that the “oppressed” people have to endure from their government.

The government is denounced, accused of corruption and branded as an illegitimate régime that does not represent the majority of the people. The anti-communist government, which had hitherto been a staunch ally of the West, is accused of discrimination, exploitation and religious and political oppression, and exhorted to free all “political” prisoners, abdicate or form a new coalition government along with the (communist-controlled) opposition movements. With the help of the mass-media, support from the churches and world-wide diplomatic recognition the terrorist resistance movements are given honourable status and transformed into respectable national liberation movements.

If the demands made on the government are refused, all financial and military aid is withdrawn by the West, sanctions and boycotts are imposed, punitive economic measures are threatened or put into effect and American and foreign firms are compelled to withdraw. Every conceivable opposition group in the country is provided with lavish subventions from tax-free American foundations. If the national leaders of the target country are not prepared to resign office they might well expect to be assassinated. As a result of the sustained blackmailing pressure that they are exposed to they are often prevailed upon to introduce “reforms” dictated by the enemies of their country or to release communist subversives from prison and set up a coalition with them. To appease the foreign countries the supposed “representatives of the people” are granted an arbitrary number of seats in parliament and free elections are promised for some future date.

By means of murder, intimidation, the moral support of the media and enormous funds supplied by the liberal establishments, the radical elements usually soon manage to take over the government. The “free elections” are quietly dropped and the communists set about the mass murder, judicial or otherwise, of all “enemies of the people”. Yet another country has thus been “liberated” and is forthwith subsidized with huge credits, deliveries of aid and military training programmes.

This infamous game, particularly since the second world war, has been played by every president of the USA, always with the active backing of whatever British government happens to be in power at the time. This

fraternal collaboration has driven one country after another into the clutches of the internationalist CFR planners.

Against this background let us consider the demands made on the South African government by the “conservative” President Reagan in 1986:

- Release of all “political” prisoners;
- Participation of Nelson Mandela, the former leader of the ANC, in the political process;
- Legalization of the (communist) ANC and other radical organizations;
- The beginning of “dialogue” between these organizations and the government.

On 29.9.86 Reagan said: “We all know that a solution to the problems in South Africa can only be found after the lifting of the state of emergency.”¹²⁹

If by “solution to the problems” the President meant handing over power to the communists, he was certainly right. Otherwise his statement is in flat opposition to any realistic peaceful development in South Africa; and it certainly does not correspond with the wishes of the vast majority of either blacks or whites.

Since the declaration of the state of emergency the number of murders committed by communist gangs on blacks has fallen by 62 per cent. The ANC has publicly admitted that its introduction was a severe blow to its military wing. The state of emergency has led to a widespread normalization and stabilization, particularly within the black communities that had previously been at the mercy of the ANC-UDF arsonist gangs.

The introduction of comprehensive economic sanctions, the cessation of all deliveries of arms and military equipment and the refusal of all credits to South Africa was “compensated” for by the US State Department in the form of munificent gifts to the communist neighbours of South Africa. Angola received two hundred million dollars’ worth of aid, Zimbabwe 375 million and Mozambique a hundred million.

While the American State Department under George Shultz (a member of the CFR) and his understrapper Chester Crocker and *his* understrapper Frank Wisner were doing everything in their power to destabilize South Africa, it simultaneously blocked all humanitarian and military aid to the pro-Western resistance movements UNITA and RENAMO in communist-ruled Angola and Mozambique. (The decision with regard to UNITA was later rescinded on the intervention of President Reagan).

The British Prime Minister Mrs Thatcher is also at great pains to “get rid of apartheid”, by which is meant getting rid of the present white government. She does of course oppose economic measures against South Africa, because she regards it as “an illusion” that apartheid can be ended by destroying the South African economy “from outside”. But she said in an

interview that Great Britain would use a whole lot of other "positive and practical measures" that would lead to the same result:

"We shall spend an additional twenty million pounds in the next five years to instruct and train blacks in South Africa.

"We are helping the front-line states to reduce their dependence on South Africa by making over a thousand million dollars (!) available to them. That will be used to improve their own transport routes and harbours. We are giving aid in the form of military training in Zimbabwe and Mozambique to strengthen their defensive capacities. We are putting quite considerable sums of money, about 35 million pounds, at the disposal of Mozambique to help to solve their problems." (*The Citizen*, 14.1.88)

The question of why the British taxpayers should be compelled to support communist régimes in far-distant Africa Mrs Thatcher wisely leaves open. Strangely enough, no journalist appears to have thought of asking it. The corrupt régimes of those countries that came to power by murder and violence, that were never elected by the people, in whose countries starvation, misery, persecution and despair are more conspicuous than "human rights" since the communists took over, are not even grateful for these generous capitalist handouts. They almost invariably vote against their Western benefactors in the UNO; biting the hand that feeds them is an old communist tradition.

Anybody in South Africa who still believes (as some newspapers say) that the British government is "the only true friend that this country has", since Britain has plenty of well-considered self-interested reasons for opposing sanctions against South Africa, fails to understand that there are no friendships in politics, only power-political motives. It is now as it was before the outbreak of the Boer War. The sell-out of Rhodesia to the communist dictator Mugabe by the Thatcher government should serve as an example and a warning. The Anglo-American One-World planners may be marching along different roads (which helps to confuse the masses), but they are united in their common goal "to get rid of apartheid".

Forces within the American State Department gave the advance of communism a further boost when on 28.1.87 the terrorist leader Oliver Tambo (ANC) was received by US Secretary of State George Shultz soon after being hailed as a hero by the American press. Tambo was enthusiastically described as "the only unifying force in black South Africa" when he was presented to a hundred journalists in the National Press Club in Washington.

Michael Armacost, a high ranking official of the State Department, assessed the meeting between Tambo and Shultz as follows: "The purpose of the meeting is to promote dialogue between the South African government and the legitimate voice of the blacks."¹³⁰

UcaNews, the press release of United Christian Action in South Africa, wrote in 1987 (No. 5/87): "US State Secretary and African specialist of the White House, Dr Chester Crocker, on 22.6.86 in the US ABC TV programme: 'The ANC feels itself committed to democracy and a whole series of other ideals that I believe all Americans could agree with.'

"ANC terrorists Crocker called 'freedom fighters'. Within the ANC there was 'a wide range of opinions'; it was necessary to isolate the communist elements and strengthen the moderates."

UcaNews continues: "The ANC treated these vapourings with the utmost contempt, which was evidently not taken seriously in Washington. The ANC radio station, Radio Freedom, announced on 11.5.86: 'There are no non-communist leaders in the ANC'."

The US magazine *The New American* ironically commented (2.3.87, p.11): "But it is these non-existent non-communist leaders that the US State Department thinks it has discovered. It wants to support this non-existent element within the ANC to prevent the real communist leaders of the ANC from establishing a marxist dictatorship in South Africa."

UcaNews goes on: "To many observers a reason for still greater uneasiness is the money that the American government is investing annually in its vision of 'post-apartheid' South Africa. During last year alone, according to conservative estimates about a hundred million dollars was spent on 'the biggest human-rights program in the world' (James Montgomery of the State Department, in *The New American* 2.3.87).

"Professor Carl Noeffke of the Rand Afrikaans University in Johannesburg describes the aims of the US administration as follows: 'In the view of the Reagan administration a 'post-apartheid' South Africa means a black majority. With its expanded aid programmes the US government is hoping to induce in the future black leaders of South Africa an attitude friendly to the USA... '

"For example, 1,7 million dollars was earmarked for exchange programmes for South Africans 'who must actively co-operate in ending apartheid'. A conference of political leaders from South Africa and the so-called frontline states received 161 720 dollars. 'Refugees from South Africa and Namibia' received over two million dollars in grants for study in the USA. (For the most part these 'refugees' are members of the ANC-SACP alliance). Millions of dollars flow into the coffers of alternative education projects such as the SACHED organization ..., opposition groups like the Black Sash, activists of the United Democratic Front, the SACC etc. Many of these 160 or so projects are frankly pro-ANC oriented.

"This programme is described by Douglas Holladay, head of the South Africa Working Group in the US State Department, as follows: 'The Reagan administration wants to do for the black majority in South Africa what

Pretoria isn't doing – put the tools in their hands to take over the government and lead a flourishing, progressive and free-enterprise democracy.' (*Business Day* 22.4.86)

"And Dr Chester Crocker on 9.4.86: 'These programmes will help to train a new generation of black South Africans who will play a great rôle in shaping the future of the country.'

"On 5.2.87 the US government earmarked 93 million dollars for the marxist governments of the so-called frontline states, ostensibly to lessen their dependence on South Africa. Marxist governments often receive fulsome praise from Washington, such as that of President Dos Santos in Angola (which is kept in power by 35 000 Cubans). According to Edward J. Fox of the State Department: 'US businesses are economically active in Angola because by the unanimous judgment of business people in America, Western Europe and Japan it's a good place to do business in. (*The Star*, 26.1.87)" (End of quote by ucaNews)

Which all confirms the preference of the super-capitalists for monopoly communist-capitalist economic relations.

Howard Phillips, President of the American Conservative Caucus with millions of members, probably hit the nail on the head when he said publicly what many Americans must be thinking privately. He said that the meeting between the American Secretary of State Shultz and Oliver Tambo was "a frightening message to the heads of African states: **an indication that the USA and the USSR were in alliance and that they supported the exchange of the present anti-communist government in South Africa for a marxist-leninist cadre group that has dedicated itself to armed revolution and soviet objectives.**" [Author 's emphasis]

"The ANC" (says Phillips) "approved the Russian occupation of Afghanistan, allies itself with the PLO and condemns American foreign policy practically everywhere. ANC president Tambo described Cuba as a model of an ideal democracy and was awarded the Ho Chi Minh Peace Prize by the soviet puppet régime in Angola. It is incredible that Michael Armacost, the US Secretary of State for Political Affairs, could describe the ANC as 'the legitimate voice of the blacks of South Africa' ... It is bad enough to support a terrorist régime in Iran; but it is far worse to try to bring another terrorist group to power in such a strategically important country as South Africa."¹³¹

Although American firms are perfectly happy to trade with every country on earth, whether with governments of the extreme left or the extreme right, Russia, Red China or South Korea, they appear to be seized with the most delicate moral scruples only when it comes to South Africa. Willard A. Butcher, president of Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank and

the man who triggered off the flight of capital from South Africa, declared that his attempt to starve out South Africa financially was bound up with his "moral abhorrence of apartheid". Yet it seems something of an inconsistency in Mr Butcher's moral sensibilities that his abhorrence should be so narrowly limited to apartheid while he finds nothing to dislike about the mass murders and persecutions and slave-labour camps in the Gulags in the USSR and other countries with which his bank does brisk business; easily swallowing a camel while gagging at a Nat ...

In contrast with other foreign firms and the normal practice of American concerns outside their mother country, in South Africa the offshoots of American multinationals set themselves on a course of direct confrontation with the government. According to a report by the Institute for American Studies at the Rand Afrikaans University in 1987, the influential black American Baptist preacher Leon H. Sullivan drew up a four-part programme for American firms in South Africa in 1977 with which they all had to comply or else expose their parent firms to boycotts and vilification campaigns by pressure-groups at home.

The subscribers to the Sullivan Rules were naturally thrust farther and farther into the arena of internal South African politics. The controversial parson is now calling with menaces for total sanctions against South Africa if steps are not taken immediately to abolish everything that he considers "racially discriminating." He even goes so far as to exhort American firms in South Africa to disobey the existing laws.

Professor Carl Noeffke, director of the Institute for American Studies, describes the latest Sullivan Report as "political dynamite" (*The Citizen*, 13.5.87). In 1986, he said, the American Chamber of Commerce was still resisting the proposal that it should encourage its members to support a programme of civil disobedience. "However, from this report it is clear that many American companies are, in fact, supporting a demand by the Reverend Leon Sullivan to openly challenge the policies of the South African government."

"It is interesting to note", he says, "that South Africa is the only country where this is happening." Even the brutal oppression of Afghanistan, as a result of which an estimated one-and-a-half million people lost their lives, did not prevent the United States from continuing to trade with the Russians. "If one reads this latest report on the Sullivan programme, it becomes evident why the business world failed to stop the sanctions campaign against South Africa. Instead of challenging the assault on the principles of free enterprise ... [they] sided with the forces calling for sanctions against South Africa... This is a dangerous development."

The perfidious part played by America in the destabilization of South Africa was first exposed by the South African journalist Aida Parker in her

series "The Secret US War against South Africa" in *The Citizen*, the South African daily that was subsidized by the government until 1978. The hysterical campaign against *The Citizen* that followed the publication of the series and resulted in the closure of the State Information Bureau and the end of Miss Parker's employment with *The Citizen*, was undoubtedly staged by agents of South African high finance who could not have been at all pleased at the revelation of such compromising details.

The Citizen is now in private hands and controlled by one of the two press giants in South Africa associated with the Oppenheimer group. The accuracy of the details of the secret American plan for South Africa leads us to conclude that the source was either the South African or some foreign intelligence service that had an interest in leaking the material. At any rate the report served to disillusion even those who until then had assumed that the communists in the Kremlin and the American State Department were pursuing different goals.

The report gives detailed, authentic, documented proofs of a perfidious American plan to destabilize South Africa and overthrow its government. For example, Miss Parker demonstrates in full detail that the Ford Foundation had supplied reading-rooms in Soweto and other black townships with books about radical "black power" movements and the French Revolution, that it and other foundations had raised over a million dollars for the legal defence of terrorists in South Africa and that most of the money had been channelled through the World Council of Churches, although it originated from the Rockefellers. These outrageous revelations were smothered by the establishment press in South Africa under a cloak of silence – in itself a testimony to their truth that they could not have demonstrated more clearly.

The government of Chile, which is also on the liquidation list of the One-World planners of the American State Department and their invisible backers, printed 75 000 copies of the report and distributed them among all the officers of the armed forces as a warning.

For obvious reasons I can quote only a few extracts from its 76 pages. South African readers will understand exactly from developments up to now to what extent the American attack on their country has been successful, to what extent it has been frustrated and what they might still have to expect as time goes on.

The American plan of operations, which was begun under the Carter administration, envisages three simultaneous programmes:

- A large-scale campaign to form and mobilize anti-South African opinion among the American and other populations;
- Foreign governments will be put under pressure by American embassies to withdraw or reduce their investments in South Africa.

- Agencies of the American government will attempt to destabilize South Africa by giving enormous amounts of aid to “liberation movements”, black resistance groups and black leaders in opposition.

The activities of the American State Department leave no room for doubt about what the intention is: the replacement of pro-Western white rule in South Africa by a black “majority rule”; and it matters not a jot whether the new government is pro- or anti-marxist. The official warcry is anti-apartheid; but in reality the objective is the incorporation of South Africa in the socialist New World Order in which human rights will exist only on paper, if at all.

As Miss Parker says, there is sufficient reason to assume that the US embassy in Botswana next door is receiving vast sums of money which are placed by the State Department and the CIA at the disposal of South African dissident groups. Regular visitors to the embassy include leading members of the Black People’s Convention, the South African Students’ Organization and the Soweto Students’ Representative Council. These and other persons – many of them banned activists – have in that way access to large sums to finance their subversive monkey business.

For years the CIA has been building up a wide network of opposition groups in South Africa and giving them financial support. It has infiltrated political, cultural, academic, labour, church and social institutions and used them improperly to further its ends of polarizing black and white and destroying the existing order. In recent years it has been secretly supporting the Black Community Programme, the Union of Black Journalists and the National Youth Organization.

None of these organizations that I have mentioned is aware of the influence of the CIA or the true source of its funds; in fact, they firmly deny any connexion with America. Many black activists travel all over the globe at the expense of the CIA without suspecting that they are mere pawns on the board pushed forward to risk their life and liberty for the furtherance of the disguised ends of a foreign power, one of which is to checkmate the South African government.

In all these cases the money is channelled deviously through secret CIA conduits. They include the African Bureau, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the Africa-America Institute, the International University Exchange Fund, the Congress for Cultural Freedom and various other front organizations. The American government pays for the defence in nearly every treason and sabotage trial, and here again the money is piped through the American Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. The report makes it clear that the funds for such purposes are unlimited. Thus, for example,

340 500 rands was made available for the SASO trial in 1976. Of that a legal firm in London paid 21 500 rands, the South African Council of Churches paid 98 000 rands and the Africa-America Institute 221 000 rands.

Great pains are taken to conceal the CIA connexion. Neither the accused nor the defence are ever informed of the source of the money, although there is hardly a political trial in the country in which the CIA is not implicated. Practically every judicial proceeding is attended by a senior member of the diplomatic staff. There is also ample evidence that black radicals receive financial support from US agents and that they endeavour to stir up feelings of hatred against the whites and the government.

CIA funds were also used to spirit the leaders of the bloody disturbances in Soweto across the border, where many of them were given terrorist training. The CIA paid for whole charter flights of Rhodesian and South African fugitives to Zambia, Tanzania and other countries to enable them to escape from impending legal action against them. The USA offers millions of dollars worth of grants to black South African students to be trained at American universities for "future leadership rôles" in the South African government. In certain cases grants are awarded only on the recommendation of a "recognized liberation movement".

According to the report, several agencies of the US government are constantly engaged on "vulnerability and feasibility" studies to seek out weak points in white South Africa and thereby employ any means of inflicting damage on the country.

There is also a secret section of the CIA that collaborates with sociologists, psychologists, historians and "specialists in the media" in carrying out research studies on South Africa. This section concentrates on "reachable targets" such as South African students, intellectuals, academics, journalists, church leaders, missionaries and so on. They are enlisted in the destabilization activities without knowing in whose service they are employed.

Then there was the master plan called Group Action to destroy the South African economy. An analyst said that the plan was "so competently prepared that it makes your blood go cold". From then on it was used as a basis for anti-South African activities at a thousand American universities and thousands of church, community and working groups. Group Action is the work of the American Friends' Service Committee.

The plan purports to offer the first steps towards "a complete withdrawal of American firms from South Africa". The document describes how sympathizers, radicals and activists can be used on a local, provincial or national level to "strangle" the South African government financially and economically.

It describes in full detail the methods that should be used:

1. The preparation, support and promotion of trade and sport boycotts.
2. The preparation, support and promotion of attacks on banks and other financial institutions that do business with South Africa.
3. How to stop the sale of Kruger-rands in America.
4. How to act against firms, especially multinational, with branches in South Africa.

In 1977, when Aida Parker first revealed this plan, the activities described were no more than theoretical possibilities. Now, twelve years later, they have become living realities; and the accuracy of the report is confirmed.

The results of this American campaign for more "human rights", the "abolition of apartheid" and so on are a weakened, though not destroyed, economy, tens of thousands of mostly black unemployed, poverty and unrest in the black townships, a state of emergency and the beginnings of an "imported" polarization between blacks and whites such as was formerly regarded as a purely American phenomenon.

So what is behind this American Friends' Service Committee (AFSC) that devised and developed the plan?

Miss Parker tells us that the organization was established in 1917 as a kind of welfare body of the American Quaker sect. At any rate they soon got mixed up with communists and World Government enthusiasts. Later their sympathies with the African "liberation movements" became more and more evident. The American Committee on Africa, the Defence and Aid Fund for Africa and the International Women's League for Peace and Freedom are kindred bodies. In 1954 an American committee of inquiry found that the AFSC was supporting the American Students' Union, a communist front organization; also the League for the Refusal of War Service, the Brotherhood of Reconciliation, the Independent Communist Workers' League and so on and so forth.

After all that one might well suppose that the AFSC was dependent on purely communist sources of cash; well, that would be an absurdly mistaken assumption. Again it is the by now familiar story of the big capitalist foundations: in this particular case Ford, which put 1,34 million tax-free dollars at the disposal of the AFSC.

Is it necessary now to mention that the principal source of financial support for the AFSC is the Rockefeller Foundation?

The activities and recommendations of this body include exhorting the Americans to place the security functions of their country under a world authority, refusal to undergo military service and making bitter attacks on

anti-communists. They champion "social revolutions" all over the world; and in particular – naturally – South Africa.

In 1953 the chairman of a Congressional committee of inquiry, Norman Dodd, asked Rowan Gaither, the president of the Ford Foundation, why it gave such huge amounts to anti-American groups. The plain answer was: **"We operate within the framework of a directive from the White House to change life in the United States to such an extent that it will be easy to become amalgamated with that of the Soviet Union."**¹³²

The American media did not, as one might have expected, seize upon this extraordinary exposure of the Foundation and the rest of the conspiracy as a Trojan Horse; instead the press attacked the chairman of the committee of inquiry for having the presumption to ask such impertinent questions and discover such important information.

Let us now take a look at another of the 74 organizations that support the Group Action attack on South Africa: the American Committee on Africa (ACOA). In 1977 it had about twenty thousand members, who included such figures as Congresswoman Bella Abzug, the trade-union leader Victor Reuther, the actor Sidney Poitier and the writer James Baldwin.

The ACOA is the mother-organization of all secular, marxist anti-South African groups in the United States. Ever since its foundation it has been in the forefront of political and financial support of African "liberation movements". It built up the Defence and Aid Fund for Africa (USA), mobilized well-known sportsmen and show-business personalities in the boycott campaigns and initiated "action programmes" and mass demonstrations. The ACOA played a leading part in the disinvestment campaign. It was chiefly responsible for the church-backed boycott of the American firms ITT, Motorola, IBM and Control Data. Paul Irish, an office-bearer in ACOA, took part in the formation of a coalition to prevent the import of any more coal from South Africa. ACOA was behind the juridical proposal to prohibit the advertisement of post vacancies by South African firms in American newspapers. In 1977 ACOA organized and financed a poster competition with the title "Apartheid kills", offering a first prize of five hundred dollars for the best poster that most dramatically brought it home to people that "apartheid means murder, injustice and oppression".

ACOA is behind the "Stop the sale of Krugerrands" campaign, which calls the purchase of the coins "an investment in oppression".

A whole series of other similar activities could still be listed; but let us here confine ourselves to the question of how these expensive exercises are financed. In 1977 Aida Parker asked: What is the position of the US

government to all this, and does it attempt to restrict these destabilization activities by the ACOA and other anti-South African organizations?

The answer is that it is by no means easy to trace the labyrinthine ramifications of what payments are made to whom in South Africa. But it can be stated with certainty that the ACOA receives official remittances from the Africa Fund. That fund was established as a "charitable and educational" institution to make it possible to transfer taxfree money to the ACOA for its own use. The Africa Fund in turn is regularly and lavishly supported by the Samuel Rubin Foundation and the Norman Foundation, which are both known to be CIA intermediaries. Like the Africa Fund they are both taxfree.

But when a fund or a foundation is declared taxfree that in itself means that it has the support of the government. No government would allow any such body to operate taxfree unless it were acting in a manner approved by the government. It may therefore be taken as read that the destabilization activities of the ACOA and the rest have the approval of Washington.

At that time big British, German, French and Swiss banks were reporting that they were being placed under increasing pressure from America not to extend any further credits to South Africa and to reduce trade with it. A London banker said: "The present [American] pressure goes far beyond mere harassment. The Carter Administration gives every indication of wishing to precipitate a major decline in South Africa by punitive economic sabotage."

The policy was consistently applied by the Reagan government under the name of "constructive engagement". The rhetoric changed, but the intentions were still the same; although many South Africans were taken in.

The American government is pumping a million dollars a year into the militant South African trade unions, which at the same time receive huge amounts from other countries. (*The Citizen*, 10.4.87).

Pro-marxist groups in Britain and Germany clamour for boycotts of South African fruit. Naïve members of women's church associations allow themselves to be harnessed to the American bandwagon with shrill cries of "Don't buy apartheid fruit!" In their myopic or ideological antipathy these Christian (?) ladies are helping to take the bread from the mouths of thousands of black plantation workers and their families.

Aida Parker goes on to describe how one of the richest and most powerful American establishment organizations, which has at its disposal vast government and State Department funds, is used as a wedge to split and bring down "the white minority régime in South Africa".

It is the African-American Institute (AAI), a body at the service of the

internationalists of the State Department, the CIA and the White House hierarchy.

The activities of this organization included, for example, a five-day conference in Maseru, Lesotho, which it arranged, and to which 116 delegates were invited, some of them the most inveterate enemies of South Africa. The principal part of the conference consisted in working out methods of "getting rid of apartheid" and bringing down "the white minority régime" – and whether by peaceful means or by force.

Among the number of the delegates were representatives of the banned ANC, the New York head of foreign relations of the banned PAC, David Sebelo, the American senator Dick Clark, the coloured American Congressman Charles Diggs and the viciously anti-South African brigadier from Nigeria, Joseph Garba.

It is less well known that between 1962 and 1977 the AAI spent about twenty million dollars on black "training programmes". Large amounts of that money went to "refugees" and members of "recognized liberation movements". Many of them returned "trained" and promptly took part in organized acts of violence in South Africa. It was an open secret, says Aida Parker, that in programmes of that sort there were close connexions between the AAI and the "dirty tricks" specialists of the CIA. The AAI is also known to keep in close touch with radical American negro leaders, banned ANC and PAC terrorists and white South Africans in exile.

The AAI also runs the South African Student Program on behalf of the State Department, founded in 1962 with the help of the CIA for the purpose of making a contribution to "the coming revolution" by training exiles for "the post-revolutionary government" in South Africa. The AAI has also assumed the congenial task of wet-nursing visiting black South Africans as guests of the State Department.

It plans their routes, arranges cocktail parties and – above all – selects the people that they meet. Evidently the Institute distinguishes between black and white South Africans, even if they are all students, for whites are usually looked after by other organizations and meet other people.

Although the AAI has been working for a radical change in South Africa for nearly thirty years now, it is hardly ever mentioned in the South African press. Yet there must have been some inkling of what it was up to as early as 1967, when it held a two-day conference in New York in conjunction with the University of Syracuse.

There were 58 persons at that "working session", and they represented an excellent cross-section of the opponents that the still unsuspecting South Africans would have to deal with. There were representatives of the United Nations and various European and African governments, members of American government departments and African "liberation movements"

such as Mr Edwin Khabelo of the ANC, Mr Testus Muundjina of the South West African National Union, Mr Sam Nujoma of SWAPO, Mr John Simons of the World University Service and – last but not least – Mr Harvey Hall of the Ford Foundation.

We get a pretty good idea of the approach of the AAI to its educative function by reading the report issued at the end of the meeting. “It is of vital importance to provide education and training for refugees from Southern Africa ... because they are symbols of the struggle against racism and for the majority rule in their countries, and because they will be needed in the fight for freedom and in the subsequent process of nation building. The objectives of such training should be ... to prepare students to participate effectively in the struggle for freedom ... Scholarships for training should be awarded where possible to students affiliated with a liberation movement. Refugee students at US institutions should be helped to maintain contact with their liberation movement, to preserve their sense of commitment to their cause. Whatever steps are taken to solve short-term problems, there is only one ultimate solution to the overall problem: that is the overthrow of minority régimes in Southern Africa and the liberation of the Southern tier of the continent.”

Although this was a public document, not a single South African newspaper seems to have bothered to mention it. Nor apparently were any questions asked of the State Department which was supporting the organization to the tune of such large sums of money. Most South Africans had no idea of what was brewing, and their government cloaked itself in silence.

The arrogance and presumption of this meddling in the internal affairs of another nation by government-backed American organisations becomes startling when we read the statement made by William R. Cotter, then president of the AAI, before the House Committee for Foreign Affairs: “For me the litmus test is simple. When reviewing a US activity, we should ask: can it lead to changes in South Africa which will result, as immediately as possible, in ending apartheid and minority rule in that country? I personally am in complete accord with those who call for the strongest measures by the US to accelerate the process of change within South Africa. Nor would I automatically rule out violence as an instrument for obtaining the rights of the non-White majority.”

Mr Cotter also advocated the withdrawal of American firms: “... when revolution comes to South Africa we will not be drawn into the conflict on the wrong side because of our economic ties with the present régime. We would then be free to support revolutionary change in a direct and effective manner.”

According to some South African lawyers who have read this passage, the president of the AAI is blatantly telling an American legislative body that in his opinion a revolution in South Africa would be legitimate and that it was a laudable act to support terrorist groups. Again no comment appeared in the South African press on Mr Cotter's frank declaration, nor were any questions asked of the State Department.

We could continue ad infinitum and ad nauseam to quote details of the American plans, both secret and overt, to subvert a sovereign Western country. But I think enough has been said to show my readers, both South African and other, who are ultimately behind the insurrections in South Africa, the revolutionary onslaught, the opinion terror and the economic problems.

Are not these the very forces responsible for the defensive measures that the South African government has been compelled to adopt and with which it is now reproached? The declaration of the state of emergency, the restrictions on freedom of the press, the exclusion of foreign journalists and TV crews, the temporary restrictions on news, the arrest of ringleaders and trouble-makers, the strengthening of the police and military control in the disturbed black areas – all these are the consequences of a co-ordinated attack from both east and west on a country singled out for destruction on the pretext of "apartheid" so as to be able to put the whole continent of Africa in the hands of the socialist One-World planners.

The real instigators of the defensive measures in South Africa are meanwhile infuriated by the fact that a small country should have the audacity to defend itself. They demand with menaces, blackmail and economic sanctions – in close collaboration with their trilateral fellow-conspirators in Europe and Japan – the immediate cessation of all defensive measures and the unconditional release of all the communist subversives and terrorists who are dignified by the name of political prisoners. They have persuaded "world opinion" to accept their lies and distorted images of the truth and become more and more brazen and blatant in their ostensible campaigns for "justice and democracy" in South Africa.

When the South African government released the veteran ANC communist Govan Mbeki not long ago, to the joy of the subversives and the dismay of most of the whites, the US State Official Dr Chester Crocker expressed himself as "highly delighted" at the release of a man who had been sentenced to life imprisonment for high treason. Charles Redman, a spokesman for the State Department, said the United States "was particularly pleased that his release was unconditional". By that he evidently meant the disavowal of the previous condition laid down by the govern-

ment that prisoners like Mbeki should clearly renounce the use of violence before their release could be considered.

The British government also welcomed the release of Mbeki "with all its heart": "The British government hopes that the release of Mr Mbeki will soon be followed by that of the other prisoners. Their release would encourage those in South Africa who are hoping for a change through peaceful dialogue." (*The Citizen*, 7.11.87)

Yet at a press conference organized by the South African Bureau of Information in Port Elizabeth Mbeki bluntly stated on 5.11.87: "I am now as before a member of the ANC and the South African Communist Party and I am a convinced marxist." He took advantage of the occasion to exhort the young people of the country to "continue the fight".¹³³

I should perhaps at this point remind the reader that Mbeki and the top leadership of the ANC were arrested at Lilliesleaf Farm in Rivonia on 11 July 1963 for being in possession of comprehensive plans for the overthrow of the Verwoerd government. For their proposed sabotage campaign the terrorists had been expecting 210 000 hand-grenades, 48 000 anti-personnel mines, 144 tons of ammonium nitrate, 22 tons of aluminium powder, 15 tons of black powder and 1 500 time detonators from the USSR.

At the time, one of the South African newspapers most severely critical of the government, the *Rand Daily Mail*, commented on the trial of Mbeki and his fellow-conspirators: "Even the opposition agreed with the Prime Minister that the success of the accused would have meant a communist-oriented government in South Africa and the loss of every liberty for all population groups."

The editor of the *Mail* commented in the same issue that the judgments delivered by the presiding Judge De Wet had been wise and fair. "These men were convicted of sabotage on a large scale; they were planning armed revolution ... The death sentence would have been justified." (RDM 17.6.64)¹³⁴

Predictably, the release of Mbeki was immediately followed by demands for the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and the other convicted subversives. One should assume that the South African government will think twice about that, since it has its hands full as it is trying to cope with the present mass *démarches* and demonstrations organized by the Mass Democratic Movement, the UDF and other ANC front organisations. But if they were to yield to the pressures from abroad and release Mandela unconditionally and without restriction, it might strike the spark of revolution that the conspirators are hoping for.

If the internationalists in the US State Department and their dogsbodies

in other Western governments are demanding the abolition of apartheid and "dialogue" between the South African government and black leaders, it has really nothing to do with human rights and a peaceful evolutionary development in this country. They want conflict, they want the overthrow of white government and a "Red Azania" that they, as the agents of high finance, can control and exploit just like the other African colonies of the big bankers.

D. POSTSCRIPT

Conclusions

*Von guten Mächten wunderbar
geborgen,
erwarten wir getrost, was
kommen mag.
Gott ist mit uns am Abend
und am Morgen
und ganz gewiß an jedem
neuen Tag.*

*Protected by God's mighty
wall,
we need not fear what may
befall.
As long before, so still
today,
His hand is over us
always.*

Dietrich Bonhoeffer

By the time I had got to this point in my manuscript I was more and more assailed by doubts of ever finding a publisher abroad who would be prepared to publish a book on South Africa that presents the problems of this country from a point of view that is generally withheld from the ordinary citizen.

Surely "everybody knows" what's wrong with South Africa? Was there anybody at all who could conceive of another side to South Africa and be prepared to read and think about it?

My thoughts ran round in circles. South Africa had become far too much a universal stereotype and had been far too long exposed to a barrage of one-sided propaganda for the "truth" about it, as presented by the mass media everywhere, to be doubted. I had no illusions about that ...

I could already hear the controversy that the book would arouse, the pros and cons about the "conspiracy theory", the arguments about apartheid and the furious attacks from the left.

It had been difficult to be just to all sides. Many subjects would really have needed far greater clarification. It had not always been possible to avoid making wholesale judgments, because it was not a question of details but of a "general line". Of course I did not confuse the American State Department with the American people. I did not suppose that the press consisted exclusively of lying journalists. My criticisms of the churches are

not directed at the individual minister but at the hierarchies and the wolves in sheep's clothing who make wrongful use of their position.

As a German immigrant I could not keep silence over the wicked slanders and orchestrated campaigns of falsehoods against a country that had become a well-loved home to me and to many others like me – especially when those attacks were made by German politicians, church leaders and journalists who really ought rather to have been concerning themselves with the condition of their own doorsteps.

I also knew that “the secret forces in the background” could have no interest in the appearance of this book and its revelations. Would they obstruct its sale or even get it prohibited?

There were several possibilities: The simplest and commonest way to treat a “troublesome” book is simply to ignore it: kill it stone dead with silence, treat it as if it didn't exist. No press reviews, no advertisements, no reference of any kind.

Another treatment could be to drag the book through the dirt, make it ridiculous and dismiss its contents as moonshine. Who would buy a book that got an unrelievedly bad press?

Lastly there is the ancient weapon, defamation of the author. “No case – abuse the plaintiff's attorney”. He can be blackguarded as a communist or a nazi, a racist or an anti-semiter, extremist, intolerant, hidebound, a stooge, a lackey of the apartheid régime or a government hack, or any other terms of endearment that may lie at hand.

Very well; be it so. That cannot change the facts compiled in this book, which I have been collecting for over fifteen years. And the conclusion that my studies of many separate pieces and many inconsistencies and the findings of other writers led to was that all these things added up to the picture of a universal political intrigue that only a few people could see through. And although it has not been possible within practicable limits to exhaust every single theme – each chapter could have been expanded into a book – nevertheless I hope that it will have made any reader who has hitherto looked at South Africa only through the stock black-and-white spectacles provided by the establishment media realize that there is a good deal more to it than that.

One thing I can be fairly sure of: after reading this book, dear reader, the world will not seem quite the same to you as it did before. What seemed obscure or confused should now be clear; what seemed inconsistent should now make sense; what seemed illogical now becomes perfectly logical. The events that unfold in days to come will be comprehensible so long as you check them against the background depicted in this book.

The one-sided attack on South Africa by the world press, the striking absence of criticism of the communist sphere of power, the fragmentation

and financial exploitation of Germany, the central power in Europe, by the victorious powers, the surreptitious co-operation between the World Council of Churches and the UNO, the support of marxist régimes and "liberation movements" by democratic Western governments, the increasing politicization of the churches, the advance of atheism, the subliminal attacks on the white race and the Christian religion – all these and far more make comprehensible sense only if we recognize the events as components of a deliberate conspiracy in both the East and the West, unsuspected by most people and steered towards a common goal. To attain that goal it is necessary to conceal the true intentions as long as possible. Meanwhile the points are being switched; and once the train of history that carries us all has passed over them the fact will have been accomplished, with no hope of return.

The South Africans must clearly understand that for many years now, their country has been in a state of undeclared war. While they are staring fascinated at the communist bogey in the East they fail to see the far deadlier enemy in the West. They do not see that they are caught between the pincers of East and West in a co-ordinated attack organized by America, backed by European governments and executed by communist forces.

Ultimately it makes no odds to the initiates of the New World Order whether South Africa is subjugated by their Eastern auxiliaries or capitulates in the face of the UN-led attacks from the West. The power-groups behind the UNO, the State Department and the Kremlin have all the same end in view: a centrally controlled socialist world government with a monopolistic economic system run by them.

Since politics are more than ever before subordinate to economics, and the greatest part of all money, gold and basic industry in the world are in the hands of the two thousand-odd members of the Council on Foreign Relations and the organizations associated with it, that is where the real centre of power is situated. The present economic and monetary interdependence of states, and therefore their increasing vulnerability in isolation, is one reason why so many countries have submitted to the "New International Economic Order". Many see in a global socialistic redistribution the only way out of the debt crisis that they have been manoeuvred into by the bankers. The beggar nations of the Third World, which for many years have been reduced and condemned to almost total dependence on Western handouts, even see advantages to them in the New World Order. It seems not to worry their rulers that they will then no longer be heads of sovereign states but at best governors of provinces.

But the peoples of the world have not yet begun to suspect where they are all heading for. They seldom or never read anything about the secret plans

of the politicians; and if they do it is only as an occasional inconspicuous column-inch in the press that few would even notice.

Here are two examples to illustrate what I mean – the only two that I have been able to find. On 2.8.85 *The Citizen* printed the following report that occupied forty by forty millimetres, or one column-inch:

“CALL ON WCC

“Buenos Aires: Argentina’s President Raul Alfonsin called yesterday for a new economic order and urged the World Council of Churches (WCC) to take the message to the powerful nations of the North.” (Sapa – Reuter)

What the WCC has to do with the New Economic Order (synonym for New World Order) will puzzle only those who think that the WCC represents mainly church interests.

About two years later, on 1.4.87, the paper printed the following report, again in one column-inch:

“NEW ORDER

“Kinshasa: Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu and Zaïre President Mobutu Sese Seko have called on developing nations to join together to convince developed nations of the need for a New World Economic Order.” (Sapa – AP)

Thus we see that the politicians in three such disparate countries as Argentina, Romania and Zaïre support the New World Order. We can deduce from that that all the governments in the world are involved in it. Why, then, if it is such a good thing, does the man in the street everywhere hear nothing or next to nothing about it?

The reasons are quite obvious. The loss of sovereign national statehood, with its own freedom of decision, and the subordination of the peoples under the authority of a foreign world government within a socialist-marxist economic system would never be freely accepted. The goal can only be achieved by guile and deception of the masses.

But most of the supposedly democratic leaders of nations nowadays act in accordance with the principle of *après moi le déluge*. The advancement of their own ignoble careers is far more important to them than the long-term good of the people; so they make hay while the sun shines.

Of course, there are also forces in South Africa dedicated to the plans of the One-Worlders. They exert a strong influence on the government and it is largely because of them that this once peaceful and stable country has in

recent years been shaken by civil disturbances as never before in its history of over three centuries. The causes have not been internal stresses and grievances, apartheid, violations of human rights and what not, as "the media" continually hammer into everybody's head, but rather a skilfully organized manipulation of the black masses.

As long as the different peoples in South Africa were living politically, culturally and geographically "apart" (i.e. separated), harmony and peace prevailed. A steady evolutionary development under the umbrella of an experienced white government was ensuring progress and advancement for all the peoples within the cohesion of the state.

Just as the division of Europe into national states was in accordance with the will of its peoples and brought order and progress to the whole continent, so had the South African version, *apartheid* or separate development, exercised an undeniably positive influence on the development of its multinational communities. The result of that policy, as we saw in Chapter 1, was the rise of a continental super-power that gave its many-layered population by far the highest standard of living in all Africa.

I know very well that the present progressive abolition of many obsolete apartheid laws is necessary and overdue. They are paternalistic survivals from a vanished age that have lost their original purpose, and they do indeed injure the human dignity of individuals beyond necessity. But that does not mean that the solution to the problems of South Africa is to be found in the total integration of its races and a new attitude of *laissez-faire* that would surrender the ordering and stabilizing function of the government to the caprice of the mob.

Destruction of the main pillars of cultural and racial differences, as for example in separate schools and residential areas, would cause considerable frictions, and because of the disparity in numbers any attempt at integration would have disastrous consequences. Standards of living would decline, emigration would increase. Lawlessness and racial tensions would become more and more widespread, and the possibility of a strong white "backlash" could not be ruled out, with the chaos and anarchy that that would bring ... All these things could well follow from a policy of a government that allowed itself to be driven too far into a corner by pressure from outside.

That is also true of "reforms". As long as they are carried out from inner impulses in the interests of **all** the inhabitants of the country, they signify progress and a general improvement in living conditions. But if they are made only to "appease" external pressure-groups, foreign governments and internal radicals, then they are no longer reforms but artificial measures towards a socialist redistribution that will not make the poor richer but the "rich" poorer. Inequality cannot be turned into equality by legislation.

There is no doubt whatever that there is still much to be done to root out anomalies and injustices in South Africa. But that is true of every country on earth: of the European countries with their chronic "immigrant" and "gast-arbeiter" problems, as well as of America with its slums and "coloured" discontents. But if there is a country in Africa that despite all its shortcomings and deficiencies has made unexampled progress towards the welfare and prosperity of its peoples of all colours, that country is South Africa.

What impudent hypocrisy it must seem to the blacks in South Africa when they hear corrupt and murderous dictators in the rest of Africa together with their communist friends in the UN clamouring for reforms and human rights that they take good care to withhold from their own oppressed and starving peoples living in conditions that simply cannot be compared to South Africa.

The steadily rising standard of education of the blacks in South Africa enables them more and more to see that America and its allies are not in the least concerned with the well-being of the black population when they impose sanctions and economic boycotts and withdraw their industrial subsidiaries. They see more and more clearly through the political duplicity of the Western powers that, on the pretext of trying to "help the oppressed", actually take their jobs from them, cripple the economy and sow hatred and strife.

It is high time for the people of the world to sit up and take notice of what is going on here. They ought to call their mass media, their churchmen and their politicians to account if they continue to support, in the name of democracy and freedom, communist murder gangs, mislead their own people and under threat of punitive action demand reforms in countries like South Africa whose internal political affairs are none of their business and which they are neither able nor fit to judge.

The conspirators fear nothing more than premature exposure of their plans. The longer they can suppress the truth, the nearer they come to their goal. It is up to all of us – including South Africa – to stop them in their tracks. It is still not too late.

Whither South Africa?

A society that does not defend itself is doomed. A system that remains passive in the face of attack deserves to go under. Those unwilling to defend freedom will become unfree. To stand idly by is to commit suicide.

Brian Crozier (*Strategy of Survival*, 1978)

The prevailing opinion among foreign observers of the South African scene is that the country is on the verge of a bloody revolution and that it appears to be only a question of time until the last vestiges of white hegemony in Africa vanish, either by force or by the processes of negotiation.

They point to the examples of the former colonies such as Angola, Mozambique and Rhodesia, in which white rule apparently succumbed to the increasing pressures of black nationalism.

"Africa for the Africans!" cry the ignorant parrots in the West. "Uhuru!" howl the Africans; "Liberation at any price!" If you follow the foreign press and the sensational TV news in the evening, you do indeed get the impression that the days of the whites in South Africa are numbered. Apparently nothing can stop the triumphant march of the blacks.

Is it really so? Or is it not just wishful thinking on the part of liberal intellectuals and red ideologues? Is South Africa really on the eve of a black revolution that could overthrow the government and forcibly wrench the power out of the hands of the whites?

To be able to answer these questions we must first carefully and coolly examine the facts and conditions as they exist at present in South Africa. According to public opinion polls carried out by reputable research institutes employing black interviewers, there is no such thing as a classical revolutionary climate in the country. One questionnaire established that only twenty per cent of the blacks asked regarded their relations with the whites as "poor". A survey of urban blacks, who are usually more radical-minded than most, by the Bergstraesser Institute showed that only one in four thought that peaceful change was no longer the most effective means of improving the position of the blacks.

It is a fact that every visitor to this country is astonished to find that relations between blacks and whites are distinctly harmonious. Whatever their colour, they are both Africans. Both were born and bred on this continent, both have got accustomed to one another and have learnt to understand the mental processes of one another. In contrast to the widespread antipathy of European peoples to foreign immigrants, *gastarbeiter* and what not, black, white and brown South Africans regard themselves as natural compatriots whose birth and right of habitation is not in question.

The vast majority of the black population of South Africa took no part in the riots and disturbances of recent years. What is not generally realized abroad is the fact that the troubles were mostly caused by power struggles between rival black groups, often exploited by criminal elements. The "insurgencies" were directed less at the whites than at black fellow-citizens, which is moreover proved by the fact that they were entirely confined to the black locations. When white – and black – police acted in defence of law-abiding citizens, there were scenes that were readily interpreted abroad as a state of civil war between blacks and whites.

There are other important circumstances that in my opinion rule out a violent revolution in South Africa. No attempt at revolution has ever succeeded unless all or most of the following preconditions were fulfilled:

- Weakness in a normally strong and stable government, often associated with a military defeat.
- The emergence of an alternative (black) leadership class from the people (in a homogeneous society, which does not exist in South Africa).
- An unstable military leadership in which parts at least sympathize with the (black) alternative élite.
- Secure bases inside or outside the country.
- Serious dissatisfaction and smouldering hatred against a tyrannical government.
- Widespread corruption, splintering of parties and lack of will to lead in the ruling élite.
- Powerful financial and organizational support from foreign powers.

None of these points except the last applies with any certainty to South Africa. A well-known expert on revolutionary warfare, Professor Calvin Woodward of the University of New Brunswick, Canada, came to the conclusion some time ago: "There are no signs of a revolutionary climate in South Africa. Nor is it possible to speak with any certainty of widespread discontent. The rulers radiate strength and confidence,

and the use of force ... has not essentially increased over the years. In short, South Africa was and is a politically stable state."¹³⁵

Although this statement was made before the disturbances a few years ago, it nevertheless remains essentially true. Of course that does not mean that there are no attempts being made to bring about a revolutionary subversion in South Africa. We all know that the ANC and its allies are still working to stir up a nation-wide rising to overthrow the government. After all, that is why the ANC-UDF-SACP alliance fills the townships with violence and terror, to get their inhabitants under their control.

The problem that the radical leaders are confronted with is precisely that the great majority of the blacks have no desire for a revolution; no doubt because they are aware of the consequences of "successful" revolutions in the neighbour countries, from which there now stream hordes of starving and desperate refugees across the borders into South Africa. Besides, the strength and loyalty of the security forces of the white establishment make any prospects of a violent convulsion very unrealistic.

In contrast with the former Rhodesia, with a ratio of seventeen blacks to one white – yet it managed to fight on undefeated for thirteen years – the ratio in South Africa is more like four to one.

There is another important difference: South Africa was never a colony unjustly annexed by the Boers. They feel no sense of guilt, nor do they feel under any moral obligation to hand over their country to a black population merely because it has since grown into the majority. The white Afrikaners have no wish to domineer over the blacks. They have given them as much autonomy as possible within their own areas and left the tribal structures and the authority of their chiefs as intact as possible. But it is precisely because the Boers do not wish to rule the blacks that they have no intention of themselves being ruled by the blacks.

Therefore the government is searching for some constitutional pattern by which full black self-determination can be achieved without seriously endangering their own autonomy, which they obtained only in 1948 after nearly a century of struggle against the British Empire.

Several constitutional models have been scientifically studied on behalf of the government for the purpose of devising one in which minorities have adequate protection; from the Swiss cantonal system and the Belgian model to the Moravian Settlement in the Danube Monarchy; all so far apparently failing to offer a convincing solution to the problems of South Africa.

There is no doubt whatever that the South African government is firmly resolved to devise some form of constitution that will satisfy both the need of security for the whites and the demands of the blacks for general suffrage. A federal structure is also under discussion, in which a constitutional court

would prevent the creation of a dictatorship even if the majority were to want one.

The white electorate, which has given the ruling National Party a mandate to introduce necessary reforms and peaceful social change, is now deeply split over the correctness of the course adopted. Instead of appreciation of their willingness to share power with the blacks, they see violent disturbances, increasing pressure from abroad, punitive economic measures and demands that they should completely hand over power to a "black majority" that does not exist, since it consists of disparate tribes and peoples.

The readiness of the whites to accept some form of power-sharing has, as might have been expected, been interpreted as weakness both at home and abroad. Radical black leaders, the communist "liberation movements" and the internationalists in the State Department immediately increased the pressure on the government and added fuel to the flames. They hope to bring about the collapse of the government by means of economic sanctions, trade boycotts and the support of militant black opposition groups.

The greater the willingness of the Boers to accept reform, the stronger grew the pressure. Many Afrikaners simply cannot grasp this apparent paradox and are now demanding a return to the undivided power policy of former years. If the National Party fails to come up very soon with a constitutional model that will guarantee the whites a secure future in freedom and autonomy and restores the whole country to stability and order, then it will have to reckon on being replaced by the Conservative Party, the parliamentary opposition. They are demanding a return to the old undiluted policy of "separate development" as the only possible way to peaceful co-existence of the different peoples of South Africa. They propose a state formed by a territorial division according to ethnic affiliation, which would give all communities the right to political self-determination and provide a basis on which none would predominate. The Conservatives regard any kind of "power-sharing" as a sure road to chaos in which the whites would finish up ruled by the blacks.

In this situation it is of little importance which party has the most convincing arguments. What does matter is that the Afrikaner is not prepared to give up his political autonomy, for which he fought so long and hard. Any political and social change, however, can succeed only with the consent of the whites. They are prepared to make concessions, but only as long as their own security and the future of their children remain safeguarded. The rapid growth of the Conservative opposition party and the nationalist right-wing *Afrikaanse Weerstandsbeweging* (Afrikaner Resistance Movement), which wants a separate white "volksstaat" inside South

Africa, is a clear warning to the government not to try to go too far with their reform policies.

The South African armed forces, military leadership and civil and military intelligence services are as good as the best in the world. The high morale of its soldiers and the tough will to resist of the Afrikaner people are far more marked than anywhere in Europe or America. The South Africans are still free from the bacillus of defeatism and reluctance to fight as shown by post-Vietnam America and Britain with its never-ending conflict in Northern Ireland.

No attack from outside, even by a combined force of African states, would stand the slightest chance of success. The total mobilizable armed force in South Africa, including paramilitary units, consists of nearly half a million well-trained men, is rated the sixth strongest in the world. They are tough, battle-trying and very strongly motivated. They would now be an incomparably more formidable opponent than they were during the Boer War, when they inflicted such heavy losses on the British army.

The very up-to-date South African armaments industry, which was created only in 1977 as a result of the UN arms embargo, very soon not only made the country independent of supplies from abroad but also one of the ten biggest exporters in the world. Its weapons systems are now exported to many countries.

A former CiC of the Nato forces in Northern Europe, the British General Sir Walter Walker, writes in his book *The Nex Domino* (Covenant, 1980, p. 336):

"South Africa's conventional capability is so superior that its conventional military deterrent is more than equal both in a regional and continental context. In terms of conventional warfare it would be a tremendous undertaking even for a superpower such as the U.S. or the U.S.S.R. to invade South Africa."

General Walker continues: (p. 332) "... South Africa has an abundance of men of character and resolve. They will fight to the last man against the enemy from within and from without. While I am in no position to judge the calibre of their politicians I am, however, qualified to judge the quality of leadership in the higher echelons of their Armed Forces and the Army in particular. I doubt if such strong men, high leadership and sheer professionalism can be matched by any other country in the world today."

General Sir Walter leaves his readers in no doubt that the South African military leaders would not hesitate to use tactical nuclear weapons against strong concentrations of enemy troops if they were no longer able to defend themselves by conventional means. Nor is there any doubt in either Wash-

ington or Moscow that South Africa is capable of making nuclear weapons at very short order, and perhaps already possesses them.

Thus the danger to the country is not so much the likelihood of a military confrontation from outside as of a weakening and a sell-out from within, the destruction of the moral character of its young people and the gradual undermining and "liberalization" of its political, spiritual and cultural institutions. Meanwhile both the carrot and the whip are being used to induce the whites to surrender step by step and accept "power-sharing" with the blacks.

How that power-sharing will look in practice and why such an experiment should succeed in the multinational state of South Africa when it has been such a dismal failure everywhere in Africa and elsewhere, the government has so far left unanswered. It is to be hoped that it does succeed in devising a constitution that will enable both blacks and whites to find a peaceful way to the future, together but in separate autonomies. Otherwise there are only two possibilities: either white rule or black.

Sharing power would be an absurdity, an unstable condition that would soon lead to new power-struggles and power entirely in the hands of the strongest group. We must assume that the government of South Africa is fully aware of the dangerous nature of the balancing-act that it is attempting to perform with its programme of reforms. It is certainly unlikely to allow itself to be taken in by any such diplomatic manoeuvres as those that led to the Lancaster House Agreements by which the erstwhile Rhodesia was taken for a ride by America and the British Foreign Office. The then British Foreign Minister, Lord Carrington, who switched the points that sent the communist dictator Mugabe to power, was later elected Secretary General of NATO (!)

To sum up: Neither sanctions nor boycotts could cripple the South African economy – the strongest on the continent – severely enough to cause a total collapse; an overt military attack on the country must be regarded as highly improbable for the foreseeable future, since it would entail incalculable risks for any attacker; a violent overthrow by revolutionary forces inside and outside the country has no prospects of success; a total isolation of South Africa is not feasible; and more and more people are becoming aware of the insidious invasion by the New World planners and the plot against South Africa.

Furthermore the problems in the rest of the world keep worsening, which must inevitably lead to some reduction in the international political pressures on South Africa. A worldwide depression, a collapse of the dollar, huge-scale bankruptcies caused by repayment failures of the "debt bomb", mass unemployment and monetary collapses in the big industrial

nations linked with the decline of the dollar, which would have calamitous effects all over the world, – all these contingencies in the years to come must be taken into account.

Because of its geographical isolation, its wealth of minerals and an almost self-sufficient economy, South Africa is in the enviable position of being far more able to weather the coming storm than the countries in the northern hemisphere, the Eastern bloc or the poverty-stricken countries of the Third World; provided that there is enough time left to it to solve its internal problems and find a way into the future that will ensure justice for all its peoples.

If the white South Africans can retain the goodwill of their compatriots of other colours; if they succeed in developing a form of state that will give all its peoples political self-determination; if they can mobilize the spiritual and moral strengths of both blacks and whites in their common defence, so as to make a stand and say “thus far and no farther” to foreign meddlings in their own affairs; if their politicians retain the will and the resolution to stop the advance of the New Agers in its tracks; – then South Africa could be in the van of a counter-revolution that so many people all over the world are waiting and longing for.

There are some encouraging signs, especially in America, of a great spiritual reawakening. More and more people are beginning to recognize the dangers of a godless, materialistic New Age that is bent on destroying all the old orders so as to build their totalitarian New World on the ruins of the Christian West and the ashes of the white race.

But if South Africa allows itself to be deceived; if it fails to recognise the dangers of the liberal *Zeitgeist* and accepts its decadent materialistic conception of the world; if it allows itself to be forced by its enemies to make more and more concessions and submits to an impossible “power-sharing”; if its government succumbs to the present mania for “equality” and attempts to force the peoples of South Africa into the melting-pot of a democratic unitary state; – then the country will sink into African chaos and old night; and there will be no future for it.

The tragic conclusion to such a development (unlikely though it may seem at the moment) could be one of the following end phases: either a military intervention by the UNO with the help of the great powers and the installation of the African National Congress, a *coup d'état* by the South African military and the establishment of a military government, or a rebellion by the Afrikaners and their secession to found a separate Boer republic.

Warning to Europe

The evil in the world does not live through those who do evil but through those who tolerate evil.

Edmund Burke, 1729 - 1797

The French military writer Ferdinand Miksche prophesied that the existence of Europe was directly linked to events in southern Africa. If it were to fall into the hands of communists, the Europeans would have good cause to fear economic strangulation.

It has always been the hope of the USSR to see the red flag waving over Cape Town. As long as 1928 the Communist International pointed to the road to South Africa: "Our aim should be to turn the African National Congress into a national revolutionary fighting organization against the white bourgeoisie and the British imperialists on the basis of the trade unions, peasants' organizations, etc. in which the leading rôle of the workers and the Communist Party must be systematically developed in this organization."¹³⁶

The first phase in the long march to power was the adoption of the ANC and its incorporation in the socialist world revolution. For the second stage many "useful idiots" were enlisted: churchmen, liberals and socialists, who could not see what was afoot in South Africa. The controlled mass-media saw to the rest by softening up the country with a constant barrage of propaganda in readiness for the final charge and driving it into world-political isolation and economic ruin.

A whole army of Eastern agents who had been training for their task for decades was dispatched to South Africa. One of them, Commodore Dieter Gerhardt, the senior naval officer in Simonstown, had kept the Russians informed for over twenty years about modern Western weapons systems and the South African "ear to the world", the communications centre at Silvermine in the Cape.

The gains to the Russians and the planners of the New World Order would indeed have been great. The incorporation of South Africa in the Russian sphere of influence would deprive the NATO pact states of a very

important position geographically and militarily. The strategic situation of South Africa, its well-equipped harbours and repairing docks, its well-constructed airfields and its dense network of road, rail and information communications make it an almost ideal base for sea and air operations in the southern parts of the Indian and Atlantic oceans. In the age of huge tankers the Cape route has become the most important link between the Arab oil states and the NATO countries. Moreover, seventy per cent of the strategic raw materials needed by Western Europe and over a quarter of its food imports are carried round the Cape.

Whoever rules South Africa can at any time turn off the tap on European and to a lesser degree on American industry. The withdrawal of important South African minerals would cripple the defensive capacity of the free world and bring whole arms industries to a standstill. In short, Europe would be at the mercy of a hostile super-power that could hamstring its national economies and its defensive capacity at will.

The net result of this situation is obvious. The battle for South Africa is actually a battle for control of the rich industrial nations of Western Europe. Its ultimate goal is the incorporation of America in the socialist world republic of the super-bankers.

For nearly a century now this has been the signposted road of a world revolution planned, financed and steered by high finance with the assistance of their communist henchmen. Their intention is to make the free world entirely dependent on communist régimes for its vital supplies and in that way bend it to the purposes of the New World Order. There would then be nothing for the West but to accept the world government of the future.

The American historian Otto Scott, who knows South Africa well, warned his countrymen in these words:

"I'm worried because, in all the noise that's being raised about South Africa, I'm not sure the average American realizes that our survival as a nation and a people relies on maintaining good relations and especially trade with South Africa. Without South Africa, we will have to do without a military establishment, without an oil refining industry, without a chemical industry, without being able to make any new planes, tanks or ships, without being able to make any more of our own steel, without being able to maintain our electrical industry, our medical industry, or our transportation industry."¹³⁷

Now do you understand why South Africa must at all costs be isolated and detached from its natural allies? Can there be any other plausible reason for bombarding a foreign country in far-away Africa with a tremendous propaganda barrage of hatred, for decades, at inconceivable expense,

for the sake of a few million well-nourished blacks from whom the right to vote has been withheld, while hardly anybody bothers about the most brutal oppression and almost total absence of "human rights" all over the rest of Africa and the peoples of the communist bloc? As Mark Antony said: I pause for a reply.

But there is still more to it. South Africa is the domino that is to knock over first Africa, then Europe, then finally the USA.

As Otto Scott puts it in his *The Other End of the Lifeboat*: "What I suggest to you today is that South Africa is the key to not only all Africa south of the Sahara, but to the survival of the United States. To blockade South Africa, to cut off its mineral flow to the West, would cripple Europe and America alike. It would mean the control of the world will fall into the hands that rule the Kremlin. Make no mistake about it; this is a real crises."¹³⁷

The plans of the One-World conspirators are by now far advanced. The dream of a Rockefeller, of a Communist International and their liberal fellow-travellers could reach fruition in a few years. Powerful forces in the UNO, the State Department, worldwide Freemasonry, the World Council of Churches and its national church councils, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Bilderbergers, the Trilateral Commission, the New Age movement and innumerable other bodies are working away for the creation of a world government that will ostensibly unite humanity and ensure everlasting peace on earth.

But the reality will look different; radically different. A world government would have to apply dictatorial measures to keep "the mob" (i.e. the ordinary people of the world like you and me) under control. The national consciousness of peoples, their traditional scales of values, their notions of honour, their racial distinctiveness and their religious, moral and cultural characteristics cannot simply be switched off. But they could not be allowed to exist within an egalitarian, totalitarian and atheistic world system. For that reason a world government could exist only within a system of brutal coercion, which in turn could only be kept in being by means of draconian laws, police terror and the repression of all individual liberties.

For seventy years now a third of the population of the world has been subjected to the system of Soviet communism. It was created expressly for that purpose; and it is now preparing to seize control of the world on behalf of the super-bankers. To make possible this fusion with the West it is necessary to assimilate both systems to one another ("White House directive," see page 203) that the populations of both East and West will quite happily accept it. The replacement of the Old Guard in the Kremlin by westernized, smiling, "charming" personalities is a part of that strategy; just as are Gorbachev's *perestroika* reforms and the temporary replacement

of the brutal communist system of coercion by a socialist-democratic form of government such as exist in the countries of Western Europe.

From the fusion of Western and Eastern Europe with the Soviet Union the Socialist One World Order will be launched; and then the union of America, Japan and the rest of the world will follow.

But let us take warning! An authoritarian world government will not be able to sustain the former "democratic" liberties.

After a few years of socialist peace there would begin a "consolidation phase" in which millions of "undesirable elements", including whole national and racial groups, would be scientifically eliminated. Never before in the history of mankind, in none of its many and bloody wars have so many human beings been killed as it would be necessary to kill to establish and maintain the socialist New World Order.

Anybody who doubts that should be reminded of the communist take-over of power in only two countries: Cambodia and Vietnam. The whole extent of the terror was not reported by the media. In the initial phase millions of people were massacred, millions were forced into slave labour and millions were shut up in "re-education" camps. What happened there on a national scale would happen in a worldwide "purge"; for it would be the only way possible for the rulers to hold "the mob" in check. By then they would no longer need to take any notice of the – no longer existent – free Western democratic world on the co-operation of which they had formerly been dependent.

As in the USSR and its satellite states, a world government could hold on to power only through ruthless terror and an ironclad, brutal police apparatus.

I know these are horrifying ideas; and I would far rather leave them unspoken. Yet they are bitter realities that we must look at firmly and steadily if we are to keep our freedom. The plan to construct a world dictatorship does really exist. It is not a fantasy. The sequence of the course of history up to now is proof of it and confirms the content of the "Protocols of World Dictatorship", which we have discussed elsewhere.

The *Novus Ordo Saeculorum*, the New World of the Antichrist, could enter its final phase with the fall of South Africa; the lever with which the rest of the free world will be lifted off its hinges.

This book has endeavoured to make it clear that the secret forces of the world conspiracy emanate from the West. Their headquarters are in New York. The communists are only their stooges, entirely dependent on their masters. If enough people can be made to understand these facts, then much will have been gained. So please don't just chuck this book back in the bookcase and leave it to gather dust there. Pass it on, or order more copies, so that as many people as possible can be warned of the approaching

danger. In your own interests help South Africa to keep within the free world. Put pressure on your politicians to stop the sanctions and propaganda campaigns. At meetings and discussions fight for a free South Africa. Provide information. Write letters to your newspapers. If you can, come to this country and form your own personal impressions at first hand. You will soon find that things are quite different here from what you supposed and that you have been misled by your churches, your politicians and your mass media.

With the background knowledge that you now possess, you have become a formidable opponent of all those who are working for a New World Order, whether out of naivety or evil intent, who threaten not only South Africa but also your own freedom with extreme danger. Do not let it get to the point where South Africa falls victim to the red world revolution. It would be the beginning of the end of the free world.

Perhaps you are old enough to remember the fate of Hungary. On 23 October 1956 tens of thousands of peaceful demonstrators streamed on to the streets of Budapest demanding the end of soviet rule and the restoration of their own democratic government with free elections. The Russian reprisals were swift and brutal. The Russian tanks battered down all resistance without mercy. The Western governments did not stir a finger. On 4 November the last cry for help from Hungary was heard over Radio Free Budapest: "Peoples of the world, hear our cry! Help us ... Don't forget, this savage attack by bolshevism won't stop here. **You could be the next victim!** Save us! SOS, SOS, SOS ..."

A little while later the voice continued: "Peoples of the civilized world, in the name of freedom and solidarity we beseech you to help us. Our ship is sinking. The lights are going out. The shadows are getting thicker from hour to hour. Hear our cry ... God be with you – and with us."

At that point the voice broke off. No help arrived. Thousands of Hungarian men, women and children were murdered. Hungary was forced back under the communist yoke.

Don't be misled by the present events in Eastern Europe. The "free world" is shrinking more and more. SWA/Namibia has just fallen prey to marxist SWAPO. South Africa must not be the next victim. This is a big and strong country, but nevertheless it needs your support. Help it to ward off the danger that threatens it and stop the advance of the world dictatorship. Otherwise our warning to you is likely to be not the Hungarian cry: "You **could** be the next victim" but "You **will** be the next victim!"

E. APPENDIX

To: Ambassador of the United Kingdom
H.E. Mr P.H. Moberly, C.H.G.
Embassy of the United Kingdom
Hill Street/Pretorius Street
PRETORIA

International Immigrant
Committee of South Africa
P.O. Box 856
VANDERBIJLPARK
1900
26th October 1985

SOLIDARITY WITH SOUTH AFRICA

We, nationals and immigrants from Austria, Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Spain, Switzerland, United States, Yugoslavia and refugees from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Russia and former Rhodesia, now working and living in South Africa, have today, the 26th October 1985, assembled to declare our Solidarity with this Republic against superpower intervention on this sub-continent, against economic warfare, political destabilisation and against internationally sponsored terrorism.

In South Africa we all have found work and a warmhearted reception from all communities and those of us who are refugees have also found freedom from Communist dictatorship and oppression.

We who live here know that what is taking place is one of the most dishonest, most vicious and most dangerous propaganda campaigns ever witnessed.

Unfortunately, it could also be one of the most effective.

We appeal to our Embassies to set the record straight and most particularly urge that the Embassies themselves do not become accessories to the campaign of distortion, defamation and sometime total misrepresentation directed against South Africa.

We urge these Embassies to provide their Parliaments with unbiased and balanced information about the realities of the South African situation.

As newcomers we appreciate the complexities of the South African situation and we urge you to reflect these in your reports to your home Governments.

Rather than ostracising South Africa, concerned foreign governments should do their utmost to contribute to an equitable solution to the many problems and difficulties facing South Africa, and refrain from joining the USSR in investing in subversion and civil war.

Bishop Tutu's claim that South African Blacks would welcome a Soviet occupation is manifestly absurd. From all over Africa almost 2 million Black people have voted for South Africa with their feet, seeking opportunities here that they no longer enjoy at home, trying to escape the miseries, internecine warfare, brutalities,

oppression and famine that, tragically, have become almost the norm in Africa today.

Any continued destabilisation of South Africa victimises these millions of helpless Black refugees.

It is in the self-interest of overseas nations not to assist directly or indirectly any revolutionary forces whose ultimate target is, indeed, not South Africa but, through the destruction of South Africa, the destruction of the Free World.

For the International Immigrant Committee of South Africa.

Dr F. FEICHTINGER

Statement by the State President of South Africa, P.W. Botha, on 29 July 1986, on the occasion of the visit of the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe.

During the past few days the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, representing the European Community as well as the British Prime Minister, visited Southern Africa.

I also received messages from President Reagan and others in connection with our discussions.

The South African Government is always prepared to receive prominent representatives of other governments and to discuss with them matters of common concern.

We are also willing to provide information about our country, because we have nothing to hide.

It has been stated by Sir Geoffrey that "the South African Government holds the key to a solution" and that "a leap of imagination" is now needed from the South African Government.

We fully realise that we do hold the key, and we also realise that with that key we can open the door to peaceful co-existence in multi-cultural countries worldwide. But there are elements which obstruct us in using this key.

In this regard I posed a number of questions to Sir Geoffrey, relating to key issues, not only in contemporary South African politics, but in a host of other countries as well.

If we can reach agreement on these questions, and their answers, I believe that we have the key to the solution, and that we shall be able jointly to help in solving these problems worldwide through a combined leap of imagination.

THE QUESTIONS ARE:

1. Would the European Community, the British Government and others agree to link punitive action against South Africa with similar action against all countries where any form of differentiation between racial and ethnic groups exists?
2. Would they agree to the condemnation of all governmental systems which do not accord with their ideal for a "truly democratic and non-racial" state, while at the same time setting the same time-scale for the solution of all these problems in all these different countries?
3. Would they agree to launch an international campaign to solve simul-

taneously the problems of all countries that are experiencing internal conflict as a result of racial, ethnic or religious tensions?

4. Would they agree to link the question of the quest for ethnic national states in South Africa, with similar questions relating to, among others, the Sikhs, the Tamils, the Gurkhas, the Aborigines, the Maoris, the Northern American Indians and the Basques, to name only a few?
5. Would they agree to seeking a common approach to so-called "political prisoners" in countries all over the world, including persons such as Mr Andrei Sakharof and Mr Patrick Magee?

If one relates the historical facts underlying these questions to the South African situation, it would only be reasonable to expect of the members of the international community, given their own experiences and those of others, to appreciate that we have committed ourselves to something which has often proved impossible, or which has, at the very least, taken centuries to achieve elsewhere.

Yet, instead of encouragement and co-operation we find that Western democracies and totalitarian states alike are neither prepared to acknowledge the sincerity of our efforts nor to grant us the opportunity to achieve our goals.

We are a developing country that has achieved much to be proud of and when sound advice is given to us in a spirit of goodwill, we welcome the opportunity to discuss and test it.

We prefer to have normal relations with other civilised states, but we cannot allow uncalled for direct interference in our internal affairs, which could only lead to confusion and deterioration of relations, both within and outside our country.

During the discussions with Sir Geoffrey I availed myself of the opportunity to provide him with information on the vast and comprehensive programme of reform carried out in South Africa. I also explained to him to what extent the BLS countries in particular, as well as other neighbouring states in Southern Africa are dependent on South Africa.

I mentioned the fact that more than a million foreign workers find refuge in South Africa, because there is no hope for them in their own countries.

Furthermore, I explained to him to what extent these neighbouring countries are dependent on the continuance of our Customs Union and that without it, their economic position will become hopeless.

In our discussions I also referred to the political, economic and social reform programmes that we carried out during the past number of years in the fields of constitutional law, sport, labour, influx control, property rights for Blacks, education and business.

I particularly drew his attention to the fact that as a result of sound health policies, the life expectancy and infant mortality rate in South Africa was better than in most other African countries.

I also told him that the world at large should take a greater interest in the real redevelopment of Southern African States, because we prefer to have prosperous neighbours.

But during our discussions it was quite clear to me that Sir Geoffrey, as the representative of the twelve nations, was not interested in these positive policy matters. He came to South Africa mainly to bring pressure to bear on us to release Mr Mandela unconditionally and to unban the ANC.

I consequently told him candidly that I would be ready to let Mr Mandela be released the moment he is prepared to abandon violence, thereby making it possible to have proper discussions with him in circumstances of peace.

I also told him that as far as the ANC is concerned, there can be no talks with them as long as they are under Communist control, and that the unbanning of the ANC can only take place if they abandon violence and take part in peaceful processes in South Africa.

I drew his attention to the cruel murders perpetrated against innocent people and the intimidation of Black people by Blacks under the leadership of the ANC and their allies.

I impressed on Sir Geoffrey the necessity that South Africa should be left in peace: that there are enough authentic and representative leaders in this country with whom we can iron out our future dispensation; that we are making headway; and that the reaction to our proposal about the National Council is so overwhelming that I am optimistic that we will make the necessary progress.

In the past we have taken the initiative to develop South Africa and to make it a safe haven for millions of its citizens, and a beacon of hope for the troubled nations around us. We shall continue to do so and we shall continue to invite reasonable people and leaders to co-operate with us, as many of them are already doing.

In pursuance of internal co-operation and communication between the peoples of South Africa, we shall continue with dialogue and negotiation with peace-loving leaders of all our communities, as we have done in the past.

We are resolutely committed to dialogue, as part of our efforts to broaden democracy in our country, and it is our aspiration to continue with dialogue in our search for a common destiny for all the peoples of South Africa.

However, we believe that dialogue should not inevitably have the

end result of jeopardizing the self-determination of the groups and communities in our multi-cultural country, but that it must be an instrument of hope, peace and freedom for all.

I told Sir Geoffrey that I looked upon his recent speech in the House of Commons as nothing but a threat against our country.

In connection with sanctions and threats of sanctions I informed him as follows:

"It is our impression that the European Community is threatening us with sanctions *inter alia* because some of our neighbouring countries have urged the members of the Community to do so. I would in turn urge you to suggest to those states that it is incumbent on them to set an example by themselves, initiating comprehensive sanctions against South Africa.

"They should have the courage of their convictions instead of continuing to enjoy the considerable benefits of close association with South Africa, while leaving it to others to pay the price of sanctions.

"The prosperity and welfare of the Southern African region should be a matter of concern to the whole of the free world, not only to the region as such.

"I derive no satisfaction at all from the knowledge that sanctions will hurt our neighbours in the region even more than they will hurt South Africa.

"I stand ready therefore to meet other Southern African leaders, as well as leaders of the European Community, for the purpose of jointly identifying and addressing the problems that afflict us and others in the region, in seeking solutions.

"I would not see such an assembly as in any way replacing or detracting from the internal reform process to which my Government is committed and which will continue until our goals are reached.

"A joint meeting of this nature thus strikes me as potentially more productive than the present practice of promoting hostility and alienation."

Let there be no question about it: I can never commit suicide by accepting threats and prescriptions from outside forces and hand South Africa over to Communist forces in disguise.

I hope this hysterical outcry of certain Western countries against South Africa will soon pass, but if sanctions are applied without taking note of all our endeavours to build this country and to develop it, then we shall have no alternative but to preserve our national interest.

In the past, comprehensive military sanctions were instituted against our country. We succeeded in overcoming them and now we are exporting some of the best weapons in the world.

Oil sanctions were applied against us. The steps we took also put us in a position to overcome that problem.

I don't believe in sanctions. If this world is to become a better place to live in, nations must learn to deal with each other in a more just, responsible and civilised way. But if we are forced until our backs are against the wall, we shall have no alternative but to stand up in self-respect and say to the world: You won't force South Africans to commit national suicide.

Leave South Africa to the South Africans and with God's help our country can go forward in faith.

SOURCES

1. S.E.D. Brown in *The South African Observer* no. 4/87, p.15 (P.O. Box 2401, 0001 Pretoria)
2. Quoted from *Wer regiert die Welt?* Verlag Diagnosen, Untere Burghalde 51, D-7250 Leonberg
3. Ivor Benson, *Behind the News*, (Jan. 86) 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, England, CO10 GTD
4. Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope – A History of the World in our Time*, (1966, MacMillan, N.Y.)
5. Ivor Benson, *Behind the Scene*, p. 2 (1976, Dolphin Press Pty Ltd, P.O. Box 332, 3600 Pinetown, South Africa)
6. *Diagnosen* no. 1/86, p. 26 (for address see 2.)
7. *Diagnosen* no. 11/86, p. 46 (for address see 2.)
8. *Vox Africana* no. 29, p. 8 (P.O. Box 17007, 8061 Cape Town, South Africa)
9. *South Africa, International Bone of Contention* (1979, Maskew Miller Ltd. Cape Town, South Africa)
10. *Understanding Revolution in South Africa*, p. 36 (1983, Juta & Co Ltd, Johannesburg, South Africa)
11. *Die Afrikaner*, 11.2.87, quoted in *Vox Africana* no. 29 4/87
12. *South Africa, International Bone of Contention* (see 9.)
13. Profile, Black Socio-Economic Development (1986, Bureau for Information, Pretoria)
14. Bulletin, Vol. 26, 4/86, p. 56 (Africa Institute of South Africa, P.O. Box 630, 0001 Pretoria)
15. Bulletin, Vol. 26, 4/86, p. 3 (Africa Institute of South Africa, supplement "Economic Interdependence in Southern Africa" (see 14.)
16. Bulletin, Vol. 26, 4/86, p. 4 (see 14.)
17. Bulletin, Vol. 27, 4/86, p. 4 (see 14.)
18. *South Africa, International Bone of Contention* (see 9.)
19. *ibid.*
20. *Africa Insight*, Vol. 13, no. 1/83, p. 25 (Africa Institute of South Africa) (see 14.)
21. *Pretoria News* 15.10.80, quoted in *Africa Insight*, Vol. 13, 1/83, p. 26 (see 14.)
22. *Vox Africana*, no. 28, 12/86, p. 7 (see 8.)
23. *Africa Insight*, Vol. 13, no. 1/83, p. 26 (see 14.)
24. Bulletin, Vol. 25, no. 5/85, p. 59 (see 14.)
25. *Vox Africana*, no. 27, 7/86, p. 8 (see 8.)


26. *Southern African Facts Sheet*, no. 54, Dec. 83 (Southern African Editorial Services, P.O. Box 781303, 2146 Sandton, South Africa)
27. *Signposts*, Vol. 6, no. 2/87 (P.O. Box 26148, 0007 Arcadia, Pretoria)
28. *Die unchristliche Kampagne von Misereor gegen Südafrika*, p. 72, quoted from *Deutschland* magazine no. 3/83 (Verlag Claus Peter Clausen, D-4780 Lippstadt, Postfach 1327)
29. *Southern African Facts Sheet*, no. 54, Dec. 83 (see 26.)
30. Quoted from *The Citizen* 2.4.87
31. *Sowetan*, quoted from *S.A. Digest* no. 6/87
32. *Mining Survey* no. 3/4 1983 (Chamber of Mines of South Africa, P.O. Box 809, Johannesburg 2000)
33. *The Aida Parker Newsletter* no. 45/1984 p. 4 (P.O. Box 91059, Auckland Park, Johannesburg 2006)
34. Reader's letter to *The Citizen* Feb./March 1987
35. *The Aida Parker Newsletter* no. 48/1985 p. 8 (see 33.)
36. *South African Panorama* no. 170 Feb. 1987, p. 20 (Bureau for Information, 228 Church Street, Pretoria 0002)
37. Ivor Benson: *The Battle for South Africa*, p. 3 (1979, Dolphin Press Pty Ltd, P.O. Box 3145, Durban, South Africa)
38. *Südafrika informiert*, Heft Nr. 12/83 (Information Service of the South African Embassy, Auf der Hostert 3, D-5300 Bonn)
39. *Diagnosen* no. 12/1986 p. 49 (see 2.)
40. *Southern African Facts Sheet* no. 50, Aug. 1983 (see 26)
41. *Vox Africana* no. 30, June 1987 (see 8.)
42. *Welt am Sonntag*, special edition May/June 1986
43. Antony C. Sutton: *The War on Gold* (1977, Valiant Publishers, Pty Ltd. P.O. Box 78236, Sandton 2146, South Africa)
44. Quoted from *Pretoria News* 22.6.87
45. *Die unchristliche Kampagne von Misereor gegen Südafrika*, p. 29 (see 28.)
46. Heinrich Jordis Lohausen in *Entscheidung im Süden – der Umweg über die Dritte Welt*, quoted from *Nation Europa* Heft 1/2, Jan./Feb. 1986 (Postfach 2554, D-8630 Coburg)
47. Eustace Mullins: *Die Bankierschwörung* (1980, Verlag für ganzheitliche Forschung/Verlag für biologische Sicherheit, D-2251 Wobbenbüll)
48. Gary Allen: *Die Insider*, p. 48 (1974, Verlag für angewandte Philosophie, Wiesbaden)
49. *ibid.* p. 48
50. Arch E. Roberts: *Victory Denied* (1966, Howes at Oak Publishing, Fort Collins, Colo. 80521, USA)
51. Gary Allen: *Die Insider*, p. 68 (see 48.)
52. *ibid.* p. 93
53. *ibid.* p. 93

54. Carroll Quigley: *Tragedy and Hope – A History of the World in our Time*, p. 950 (see 4.)
55. *Die militärische Ausdehnung des Sowjet-Systems – Die Erde im Belagerungszustand*, a study by Eduard Platzoeder, P.O. Box 57, Haenertsburg 0730, South Africa
56. *The Aida Parker Newsletter* (Pty) Ltd, P.O. Box 91059 Auckland Park, Johannesburg 2006
57. Memo-Press no. 4/85, published by Emil Rahm, CH-8215 Hallau
58. Des Griffin: *Wer regiert die Welt?* p. 222 (1984, Verlag Diagnosen, Leonberg)
59. Aida Parker: *Secret US War against South Africa*, p. 68 (1977, SA Today (Pty) Ltd, Nedbank East City, 120 End Street, Johannesburg 2001)
60. Gary Allen: *Die Insider*, p. 127 (see 48.)
61. *Diagnosen* no. 2/86, p. 30 (see 2.)
62. Des Griffin, *Die Herrscher*, p. 165 (1980, C.O.D.E. Verlagsanstalt, FL-9490 Vaduz/Lichtenstein)
63. Arch E. Roberts in *Victory Denied*, p. 36, and Gary Allen in *Say No To the New World Order*, p. 49
64. Des Griffin: *Die Herrscher*, p. 168 (see 62.)
65. *South African Opinion*, Sept. 1978, p.67
66. *Psychological Strategies*, Publication no. 21 (Institute for Strategic Studies, University of Pretoria)
67. Arch E. Roberts: *Victory Denied*, p. 64 (see 50.)
68. *ibid.* p. 76
69. Antony C. Sutton: *How the Order Creates War and Revolution* (Veritas Publishing Co. (Pty) Ltd, P.O. Box 20, Bullsbrook, Western Australia 6084)
70. *ibid.* p. 77
71. Des Griffin: *Wer regiert die Welt?* (1984, Verlag Diagnosen) (see 2.)
72. Douglas Reed: *The Controversy of Zion* (1978, Dolphin Press) (see 37.)
73. *ibid.* pp 213/214
74. Curtis B. Dall: *Amerikas Kriegspolitik* (1975, Grabert-Verlag, Postfach 1308, D-7400 Tübingen)
75. Manfred Adler: *Die Söhne der Finsternis – Part 2: Weltmacht Zionismus* (1975, Miriam-Verlag Josef Künzli, D-7893 Jestetten)
76. *ibid.* pp 11/12
77. *ibid.* p. 13
78. S.E.D. Brown in *Diagnosen* no. 6/84 p. 10 (see 2.)
79. S.E.D. Brown in *Diagnosen* no. 7/86 p. 53 (see 2.)
80. *ibid.* p. 53
81. *ibid.* p. 53

82. Gary Allen: *The Rockefeller File* (1976, '76 Press, P.O. Box 2686, Seal Beach, Calif. 90740, USA)
83. *The Aida Parker Newsletter* no. 49, 29.1.85 (see 33.)
84. *The Aida Parker Newsletter* no. 46, 4.12.84 (see 33.)
85. J.A. du Plessis: *Soviet Psychological Strategies regarding South Africa*, Publication no. 21 (Institute for Strategic Studies, University of Pretoria)
86. Quoted from *The Citizen* 19.8.87
87. Carleton Putnam: *Race and Reality*, p. 46 (1980, Howard Allen Printing, P.O. Box 76, Cape Canaveral, Fl. 32920, USA)
88. Andrey Shuey: *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, 2nd edition 1966, New York (quoted from *Race and Reality*, p. 46 (see 87.))
89. Carleton Putnam: *Race and Reality*, p. 47 (see 87.)
90. Des Griffin: *Die Absteiger – Planet der Sklaven*, p. 346 (1981, C.O.D.E.-Verlagsanstalt, 9490 Vaduz/Lichtenstein)
91. Heinrich Jordis Lohausen: *Entscheidung im Süden – der Umweg über die Dritte Welt*, p. 48/49 (quoted from *Nation Europa*, Heft 1/2 1986) (see 46.)
92. Des Griffin: *Die Absteiger – Planet der Sklaven*, p. 342 (see 90.)
93. *Warum Völkervermischung?*, p. 35/36 (Hugin-Gesellschaft für Politisch-Philosophische Studien e.V., D-5802 Wetter 4, Postfach 13)
94. *ibid.* p. 35
95. Des Griffin: *Die Absteiger – Planet der Sklaven*, p. 343 (see 90)
96. *Warum Völkervermischung?* p. 17 (see 93.)
97. J. Rieger, in an article in *Nordische Zukunft* no. 3/4 1978, Gesamtdeutsche Arbeitsgemeinschaft, Albrecht Müller, Tresckowstr. 52, 2000 Hamburg 19 (quoted from *Warum Völkervermischung?*, p. 9/10) (see 93.)
98. *Warum Völkervermischung?* p. 10 (see 93)
99. *Unabhängige Nachrichten*, Feb. 1976, p. 9, 4630 Bochum 4, Postfach 400215 (quoted from *Warum Völkervermischung?* p. 11) (see 93.)
100. Des Griffin: *Die Absteiger – Planet der Sklaven*, p. 344 (see 90.)
101. Henning von Löwis of Menar: *Der Afrikanische Nationalkongress (ANC) – Moskaus Speerspitze gegen Südafrika*, p. 3 (1987, Schriftenreihe, Heft 40, Deutsche Afrika-Stiftung, Heussallee 40, D-5300 Bonn 1)
102. *ibid.* p. 7
103. Chris Vermaak: *The Red Trap* (Johannesburg 1966, pp. 27 ff.) (quoted from *Der Afrikanische Nationalkongress (ANC)* Heft 40, p. 8) (see 101.)
104. *Der bewaffnete Kampf der Völker Afrikas für Freiheit und Unabhängigkeit*, pub. Institut für Militärgeschichte des Ministeriums für Verteidigung der UdSSR/Afrika-Institut der Akademie der Wissenschaften der UdSSR, Berlin (DDR) 1981, p. 317 (quoted from *Der Afrikanische Nationalkongress (ANC)*, Heft 40, p. 10 (see 101.))

105. *ibid.* p. 11
106. *ibid.* p. 11
107. *Talking with the ANC*, 1986, Bureau for Information, Private Bag X745, Pretoria 0001
108. D.J. Louis Nel, former South African Deputy Minister of Information, at an international press conference on 21 May 1986 (quoted from *Talking with the ANC*, p. 22) (see 107.)
109. *The Aida Parker Newsletter* (85/1986) special German issue by the Hilfskomitee Südliches Afrika e.V., D-8630 Coburg, Postfach 851
110. UcaNEWS 20/85, press release by United Christian Action, P.O. Box 35737, Menlo Park 0102, South Africa
111. UcaNEWS 1/86 of 1.1.1986 (see 110.)
112. *The Aida Parker Newsletter* (85/1986) special German issue by the Hilfskomitee Südliches Afrika e.V. (see 109.)
113. UcaNEWS 10/85 of 19.6.85, p. 2 (see 110.)
114. *ibid.* p. 2
115. UcaNEWS 20/85 of 6.11.85, p. 1 (see 110.)
116. Norbert Homuth, in *Diagnosen* no. 10/84, pp. 42/43 (see 2.)
117. J.D. Vorster: *Christianity Under Communist Attack*, pp 5/6, (Christian League of Southern Africa, Pretoria)
118. D. Scarborough: *Gospel Defence League*, Nov. 1987 (P.O. Box 17007, Regent Road, Cape Town 8061)
119. Norbert Homuth: *Vorsicht Ökumene!* (Selbstverlag, Postfach 810408, D-8500 Nürnberg 81) quoted from *Diagnosen* no. 10, Oct. 1984
120. *ibid.* p. 44
121. *ibid.* p. 44
122. *ibid.* p. 47
123. Beat Christoph Bäschlin: *Die protestantischen Kirchen im Sog des Kommunismus* (Selvapiana-Verlag, CH-6652 Tegna)
124. *ibid.* pp. 30/31
125. P.J. Kauffenstein: *proTEST* no. 3/4 1985, p. 5, Information Service of *Kreuz im Süden*, P.O. Box 3254, Kenmare 1745, South Africa
126. UcaNEWS 11/86 of 21.5.86 (see 110.)
127. Kairos Document pp 11/12, quoted from *Vox Africana* no. 30, June 1987 (see 8.)
128. P.G. Kauffenstein: *proTEST* no. 5/1987, p. 14 (see 125.)
129. UcaNEWS 5/87 of 4.3.87, p.1 (see 110)
130. *ibid.* p. 2
131. *The Aida Parker Newsletter* no. 99 of 11.2.87, p. 8 (see 56.)
132. *Code* no. 3/88, p. 29 (Verlag Diagnosen) (see 2.)
133. UcaNEWS 21/87 of 9/11/87 (see 110.)
134. *ibid.*

135. *South Africa: Prospects for Revolution*, p. 4 (special report from Martin Springs's South African Newsletter)
136. *The South African Question*: resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the Communist International in the year 1928 (quoted in Deutsche Afrika-Stiftung, Heft Nr. 40, p. 40)
137. Gary Allen: *Say NO to the New World Order*, p. 174 (1987, Concord Press, Seal Beach, Calif., USA)



VARAMA PUBLISHERS
P O BOX 17200
GROENKLOOF
0027 PRETORIA
SOUTH AFRICA

We shall shortly be issuing a fortnightly newsletter edited by Klaus D. Vaqué which will keep you up to date on the confidential backgrounds and developments in church, politics and economics.

If you would like to receive a free copy of this information service *with no obligation*, please send us your name and address on this card.

NAME:

ADDRESS:

.....

.....POSTAL CODE:.....

We shall shortly be issuing a fortnightly newsletter edited by Klaus D. Vaqué which will keep you up to date on the confidential backgrounds and developments in church, politics and economics.


If you would like to receive a free copy of this information service *with no obligation*, please send us your name and address on this card.

NAME:

ADDRESS:

.....

.....POSTAL CODE:.....




VARAMA PUBLISHERS
P O BOX 17200
GROENKLOOF
0027 PRETORIA
SOUTH AFRICA

The turbulent events of recent years, the one-sided reporting and the concerted worldwide onslaught on South Africa have aroused the suspicion in an increasing number of people that there must be some mysterious forces at work here that are steering the course of events and are responsible for the unrests and widespread confusion. In bewilderment it is not only many South Africans who are asking: **WHAT** does all this mean, and **WHO** is behind it?

This book attempts to make it clear that the history of South Africa towards the end of the twentieth century shows all the marks of a continuation of the betrayal and conspiratorial machinations of an international power group, which was responsible for the outbreak of the Anglo-Boer War in 1899. The book reveals what forces and manipulators lurk behind the total onslaught against South Africa. It explains what aims and objectives are linked with the overthrow of "white South Africa", throws light on the vital global-strategic rôle of the country and unmasks the conspiracy that has stamped its impress on the whole course of this century and is directed to the achievement of a so-called "New World Order" and the establishment of a totalitarian World Government.

The author has not hesitated to tackle controversial subjects. He describes "apartheid" and "racism" from the point of view of a German immigrant in the light of South African realities and presents a picture of South Africa such as has seldom if ever before been shown.

THE PLOT AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA discloses what the Media conceal, explains connections and backgrounds that are taboo elsewhere and proves beyond any doubt that the campaign directed against the Republic of South Africa has little to do with "apartheid" and black civil rights, but much to do with the concealed aims of power-mad interest groups.



Klaus Dieter Vaqué was born in Kolberg in the eastern German province of Pomerania in 1940. At the end of the war he fled with his mother and sister to the west. Studied and trained in Hamburg at the Higher Commercial College for the foreign trade and international banking business. Lived in Denmark for 16 years. Built up his own successful firms in Sweden, Norway and Denmark. In 1977 emigrated with his family to South Africa. There he soon became involved in the vortex of political turmoil. In addition to his business activities he interested himself in Church matters. Though a "newcomer" he was quickly elected an elder to the Church Council of the largest German-speaking Evangelical-Lutheran congregation in the country. Co-founder of several conservative-Christian organizations and for two years chairman of one such society. As a result of many years' study of the backgrounds to world politics, Klaus Vaqué endeavours to draw the attention of his fellow men to the imperilled future.

ISBN 0-620-14537-4