

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 26. No. 5.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, MARCH 31, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

Edwin John Pankhurst.

As already recorded, we have lost on March 20 by his death at the age of 64, an invaluable Secretary to the Social Credit Secretariat, an undeviating follower of Major Douglas from the first statement of his thesis in *The New Age* and a most excellent companion and staunch friend in "E. J. P." He belonged to the end of an age which is already past and to the beginning of one still unborn, the quality of which, in persons, modes and consequences is yet to become visible. That quality may be more richly and more justly conditioned, but, so far as he is concerned, it can scarcely be better. His quality was his own, and it was high, as high as his unflinching good spirits.

Following closely the development of Major Douglas's strategy from the time of the publication of the first articles on Social Credit, Pankhurst established contact with fellow members of the Post Office Workers' Union, and influenced the course of their discussions. He thus came into contact with our friend Mr. W. Coward of Newcastle-on-Tyne; but they jointly discovered the unregeneracy of the official trade union movement as well as the time-scale of Social Credit, and threw themselves into the wider movement with understanding. With one or two others, Pankhurst was an inspirer of the Liverpool Social Credit Association formed in 1932, its first Honorary Secretary and an indefatigable speaker at its meetings and at many another to which he was invited by organisations outside. Within a few months, the Association had over a hundred members and was receiving deferential attention from business, educational and religious quarters in the city of Liverpool and from a wider area. The stage was set for the Buxton Address, the impact of which was instantaneous, as it was elsewhere. The launching of the Electoral Campaign for the abolition of poverty without increasing taxation in any form or raising prices—*i.e.*, without inflation—drove the point home: men who would have been satisfied to possess in perpetuity an arena for controversy were aghast at the prospect of militancy and did all they could to inhibit it. It was chiefly Pankhurst's steady and sturdy support for the policy of Major Douglas which made it possible to guide the Association almost without a hitch into the troubled waters of the Campaign. The forms collected from Liverpool constituencies exceeded in number those from any comparable area, and, on the basis of these, the Campaign was a success. By this time Pankhurst had exchanged the Secretaryship of the Association for that of Liaison Officer with the Secretariat, and although other hands organised later campaigns until the outbreak of war, he was never idle.

On his release from his life employment, his first desire was to assist us, and he did, giving us until his illness last summer the freedom born of knowledge that while he had his eye on things nothing would go far wrong. The address on other pages was his last.

Ezra Pound.

Aware that a volume of essays on Ezra Pound was competing unsuccessfully for editorial attention, we have lately been pleased to give space to other references to the affairs and opinions of the American poet now suffering an odious detention in the United States. Piecemeal treatment of major topics is not our practice, and therefore we insert this note, not of comment upon Mr. Swabey's article which follows, but of explanation. We stigmatise as *inaccurate* the idea, which only a masterly strategy has prevented from gaining the ground coveted by its advocates, that Social Credit ideas are just one set of possibly correct ideas among many—to adapt a current witticism, that "all ideas are equal, but some more equal than others." We perceive that Mr. Ezra Pound's use of the word *usura* is to anathematise the same sin which we discern in current financial practice, and not by any means a mere illegality without root in Law, which it seems to be for Professor Soddy. Also, no one who believes in disappearing money of the Gesell or any other variety is, in our opinion, a safe companion for a suffering public. But this journal is a journal of policy, not of opinion, and, as such, is entitled to assess the possibility of a policy's becoming effective through any channel. Is Ezra Pound's policy, stripped of adventitiae, akin to ours?—Akin, yes; and convergent rather than parallel. Does the present wave of publicity for it—for which possibly Mr. Eliot's concern for appearances is a good deal responsible—advance it materially?—We should say, no.

The essays to which we have referred are "Ezra Pound: A collection of essays edited by Peter Russell to be presented to Ezra Pound on his sixty-fifth birthday." London. Peter Nevill, 12/6d. net. We quote from Mr. Russell's introduction:—"Pound's interest in economics is assumed by many to be either a crazy pose or an insane obsession. In fact he was writing on general problems of economy in A. R. Orage's *New Age* as far back as 1912, though it was not until his meeting with C. H. Douglas in 1917 that he seems to have given much serious study to the particulars of the subject. As the years went by, Pound became increasingly absorbed

THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By
C. H. DOUGLAS:

PRICE EIGHTPENCE. (Postage 1d.)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LIMITED, LIVERPOOL.

in economics. His *Cantos* treat money as a major historical determinant, and his whole attitude is summed up with

... History that omits economics is mere bunk."

Some of the essays do not convince us that their authors are or were anything in particular. Nevertheless we thank them for convincing us that Ezra Pound is a Poet—by the only way, which is quotation. We often wonder whether Mr. Hawtreay ever repented, or experienced any feeling of discomfort on the ground that he once called Major Douglas a Poet.

The Crime Of Ezra Pound.

By H. SWABEY.

It would not be consistent to write off the fate of Ezra Pound, Doctor of Literature, as the concern of the Americans. For his works are widely read by the British, and his influence is European, so that White Christian culture has, or should have, one of its giants on its conscience. Giants, of course, are not supposed to be popular; they do not fit in the "democratic" fable. But where no boycott is operative (as it is in the case of Major Douglas), and where smears are not possible (as they are in the case of E. Pound), the public has not so forgotten its aristocratic heritage as to despise a genius. Mr. Eliot is popular; General Fuller is studied.

I am sure that the "crime" of Dr. Pound is not any particular view he had, or failed to have, on Christianity. He warned his readers against the irresponsible attitude inseparable from a "welfare" state in the thirties, and laid it down that a man should be responsible for maintaining his children. Yet the bishops today cannot too hastily endorse the programme of the welfare state. Some, but not all, have held firm on the educational question, but few would accept the statement made nearly two centuries ago, that "Christianity is part of the law of England." It would not be too much to say that Dr. Pound has rejected less of Christianity than many of its professors.

White Christian culture, as Douglas Reed calls it, is threatened by the five pointed star. I am not clear what all these points are, but Dr. Pound was no friend of any of those that have been disclosed, and did a bit of disclosing himself. Here, probably, we approach the reason of his detention. I received a letter from Algeria the other day, advertising the "Universal Alliance" for the propagation of the "Universal Religion." On the envelope was the five pointed star, enclosed in a circle, and having a cross in the middle.

Ezra Pound upheld the Law, in its broader aspect, throughout his writings: "In Tacitus, in Homer, 3 orders, in Greece as in Germany" and inveighed against "absolute power . . . in every respect diabolical." The narrower aspect is an American question, but it can hardly be maintained that he gave "comfort and succour" to the enemies of America either in fact or in intention. He has doubtless given offence by shewing who the real enemies of his country are, and the fear that he would continue to do so has led its rulers to apply the muzzle.

The classics were a special concern of Dr. Pound, and his translations come nearest of any to conveying the tone and life of the original. Exact definitions are suspect to those who live by fraud of any kind, and Pound's precision was enough to make any man unpopular. But he went much

further, for he was never satisfied with European culture as he found it, and tried to give it an injection. This consisted of the Chinese classics. "Ta Hio, the Great Learning, newly rendered into the American Language" appeared in London in 1936. Another translation of this together with "The Unwobbling Pivot" appeared in America in 1947 and in India in 1949. Two more of the "Books" remain, the "Analects of Confucius" and the writing of Mencius. The quality of the work may be judged from this brief summary by Pound of Confucian principle:

Metaphysic: Only the most absolute sincerity can effect any change.

Politics: In cutting an axe-handle the model is not far off, in this sense: one holds one axe-handle while chopping the other. Thus one uses men in governing men.

Ethics: The archer, when he misses the bulls-eye, turns and seeks the cause of the error in himself.

Next to the strokes, or ideogram, that indicated Accuracy, Dr. Pound was perhaps fondest of that for "Make it New," which one of the great emperors had inscribed on his bath tub. It consists of a tree and an axe. Renewal is achieved by cutting out the dead wood. Pound had no intention of cutting the tree itself down. He was no revolutionary—what Wyndham Lewis called a "revolutionary simpleton"—in that sense. In fact, he had pleasant memories of pre-deluge Britain:

and the Serpentine will look just the same
and the gulls be as neat on the pond
and the sunken garden unchanged
and God knows what else is left of our London,
my London, your London
and if her green elegance
remains. . . .

It may be part of the count that he was something of a "man of Munich" in that he did not desire a great war and tried to stop it or localise it. But partiality for Britain and for Western culture was shared by such as Sir Barry Domville who has at least been set free.

The hideous part of the procedure is its remorselessness. The suffering of an individual—or of millions of individuals for that matter—does not as such concern the Star powers a tinker's cuss. The affair, it is true, might have been even more ghastly than it was, at Pisa and elsewhere, if it had not been in the hands of the half-converted. America is not wholeheartedly a "U" Power, something has spread there besides the plagues of barbarism and power-mania. Whether generosity and mercy will prevail over these meaner vices is a question the answer to which involves rather more than a few individuals. It involves the remnants of a great civilisation. But then, as Social Crediters know, the individual is the civilisation.

For correct information concerning the Constitution of
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.
Social Crediters and others are invited to apply for
the Statement published in July, 1949 (*postage 1d.*)
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 7, 1951.

Cruisers

Mr. Donner asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty how many cruisers are now in commission.

Mr. Callaghan: I would refer the hon. Member to my noble Friend's Statement Explanatory of the Navy Estimates, 1951-52.

Mr. Donner: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that every time this Question is asked we have fewer cruisers in commission than before, and that with 30 cruisers sold or scrapped, this constitutes re-armament in reverse?

Mr. Callaghan: I would remind the hon. Gentleman that enemy fleets of cruisers have disappeared off the seas. The Navy staff requirements are fully met.

Sir Ronald Ross: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that commerce raiders have not disappeared off the seas? Is it not a fact that we now have less than half the number of cruisers we had in 1939 and less than a quarter we had in 1914? Will the hon. Gentleman see that the cruisers which are half finished are completed quickly?

Mr. Callaghan: I must remind the hon. Gentleman that both the German and Japanese fleets have disappeared.

American Aircraft (Cost)

Mr. Profumo asked the Secretary of State for Air what will be the cost in dollars of replacing with American aircraft those manufactured in Britain and sold to foreign countries during the last four years.

Mr. Crawley: None of the aircraft which we have asked the United States to supply for the R.A.F. under the Mutual Defence Assistance Programme is required to replace British types of aircraft which have been exported to foreign countries. The question of cost does not therefore arise.

Mr. Profumo: Is it not a fact that, whatever the Under-Secretary may now say, we shall have to be given, lent or sold American fighter aircraft equivalent to the number the Government sold to foreign countries before we can really be considered to be increasing our Air Force, which will involve either America or ourselves in a totally unwarranted cost?

Mr. Crawley: There is no relation whatever between the number of aircraft we hope to get from the United States and any number which have been sold to foreign countries. Nor, even if we did replace with later types some of the aircraft already in service, is there any connection between the fighter aircraft we may get from the United States and those we sold two or three years ago.

Mr. Langford-Holt: Does the hon. Gentleman mean to say that if those aircraft had remained in this country his Department would have had no use for them at all?

Festival of Britain (Supplies)

Sir John Mellor asked the Minister of Food to what extent the present shortage of food is due to stockpiling for the Festival of Britain.

Mr. F. Willey: No food is being stockpiled for the

Festival of Britain; and it is misleading to talk about a general shortage of food in this country.

Hon. Members: Oh!

Sir J. Mellor: If a large number of visitors come from overseas to the Festival of Britain, will not everybody in this country go very hungry?

Mr. Willey: I think we should be careful about this matter. We are welcoming these visitors and the House should know—it has previously been pointed out—that less than one-tenth *per cent.* of the ration requirements of the United Kingdom for the Festival period will be required for every million visitors for every week they stay.

Mr. Eden: That may be true, but is it really desirable to advertise in American newspapers that food here is plentiful when everybody knows that that is not true?

Mr. Harrison: Will my hon. Friend arrange to have published in the American newspapers copies of some of the London hotel menus—

Mr. Ellis Smith: The dinners and the wines.

Mr. Harrison: —so that the American people can see that there is plenty of food in this country for visitors?

Mr. Eden: Is not that a reflection on the Government?

Mr. Nicholson: If the hon. Gentleman is right in saying that there is no shortage of food in this country, will he be kind enough to divulge the whereabouts of the meat?

Mr. W. J. Taylor: Was not the Parliamentary Secretary's statement the biggest howler made in this Parliament?

House of Commons: March 8, 1951.

SUPPLY

Army Estimates, 1951-52

Brigadier Head (Carshalton): . . . I read through the Estimates and the right hon. Gentleman's Memorandum with some care, and there are, indeed, an immense number of points on which one could talk until well into tomorrow's debate. I do not intend to do that, but when I read the various pronouncements, I found many subjects—welfare, pay, organisation—hundreds of things on which I should like to comment. It is very easy to get lost in this vast expenditure of money and manpower.

In attempting to find which of these elements was the most important to talk about, I reminded myself—and the whole House will agree with me—that the function of any army is to fight. In order to do that, it must be well trained and organised, but what is most important, the private soldier has to be good. In fact, the private soldiers are always good, and I recall a remark by Field-Marshal Montgomery in Cairo a few days ago when he said that the private soldier bears the heaviest burden in war and it is he who carries us all to victory. That is eternally true, but one other point is that the private soldier must be well led.

However good may be the private soldier, he cannot be better than his officers, and if any hon. Members opposite doubt it, they will find that every private soldier will say, "One cannot put up a good turn with a dud officer." War is a very unpleasant thing, and when bits of metal are flying about—as hon. Members who may never have served in the

(Continued on page 7).

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*

One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: SEFTon Park 435.

Vol, 26. No. 5.

Saturday, March 31, 1951.

From Week to Week

Disregarding as irrelevant anything which the heads of theological colleges of the Church of England may say to the contrary on the subject, our observation most strongly suggests that from, at the latest 1914 to 1938 or perhaps later, Theology as a serious study was discouraged among candidates for Holy Orders. Parishioners "weren't interested" in "these discussions"; they were "driven away" by "that sort of stuff"; what was needed in the Church of England was a set of "good mixers," able (assisted perhaps by actual experience of penurious conditions and lack of personal background) to sympathise with (but not to understand causally) a demand for "social justice." (The redundancy of the qualification is diagnostic: everything ethical is social from its nature).

What proportion of incumbents owe their preparation to such influences can easily be ascertained to the nearest decimal: 1914-1938 is a year short of a quarter of a century, and the effects will long outlive the next decade.

Even if it be true that the ecclesiastical engines have now been put into reverse, as we are assured, nothing more significant need arise than the usual consequences of putting a business "under entirely new management." But we are aware of a desire in some quarters to achieve something better, for the guidance of which we quote what follows:—

"The Naassenes derived their name from the Hebrew word *Naash* . . . which signifies a *serpent*; afterwards they assumed the name of Gnostics, professing that they alone had knowledge of the depths. The veneration of the serpent, from which their appellation as well as that of the Orphite generally is derived, was but the logical development of a theory, the germ of which is common to many of the Gnostic sects. Proceeding on the assumption that the Creator of the world is to be regarded as an evil power, acting in hostility to the supreme God, it follows, as a natural consequence, that the fall of man through disobedience to the command of his Maker must be regarded, not as a transgression against the will of the Supreme God, but as an emancipation from the authority of an evil being. The serpent therefore, who tempted mankind to sin, is no longer their destroyer but their benefactor; he is the symbol of intellect, by whose means the first human pair were raised to the knowledge of the existence of higher beings than their Creator. This conception, consistently carried out, would have resulted in a direct inversion of the

whole teaching of Scripture; in calling evil good, and good evil; in converting Satan into God, and God into Satan. . . ."

This clear passage is from *The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries*, a posthumous work of Henry Longueville Mansel, Dean of St. Paul's and sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford. It was published in 1875 with a sketch of Mansel's work, life and character by the then Earl of Carnarvon in an edition by Dean Lightfoot. The work is important and never more so than today.

The assertion current in Roman Catholic circles that Russian Bolshevism is a Christian heresy we note. As sociologists, not as theologians, we affirm that, with a possible addition from a source which we have not discovered, these "earlier and it might be thought obsolete heresies," "this strange medley," this flotsam and jetsam of shipwrecked "Liberalism" are what chiefly afflicts the thought of our day.

Furnished with a list of Gnostic heresies, our readers may try them out one by one to discover who in the community picks what as his own heretical property.

HIT AND RUN. A scrap of paper torn from a notebook was left at the Victoria Street office lately, marked URGENT, with an "Official" prepaid label ready addressed to the Price Control Department of the Board of Trade pinned to it. It demanded information of Major Douglas's publications since 1943.

Whether it matters we don't know, but, in any case, we should estimate the number of electors who still believe they are ruled by men who know their subject to be higher than 99 per cent.

We are bound to stigmatise as absurd the suggestion that Admiral Fechteler has offered to cox the Cambridge boat in its race against Harvard and Yale

Navy Rations, 1800 A.D.

Writing to a Sunday newspaper, Commander E. A. Angerstein-Burton, R.N. (retired), gives this ration of a naval seaman 250 years ago:—

Weekly—7lb. biscuits, 4lb. beef, 2lb. pork, 2 pints pease, 6ozs. butter, 12ozs. cheese, 1½ fish (sized).

Daily—1 gallon of beer.

NOTE: A standard-sized fish was a cod 24 inches long.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of *annual* subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, Croft House, Denmead, Portsmouth.

Light Leaders of Darkness

(Notes for address to TOC "H": March 9, 1951).

By E. J. PANKHURST.

When your Secretary extended an invitation to me to address you, I was conscious of the fact that through illness, I was unable to meet you last year, so I am grateful for this opportunity to place before you certain views of a world situation so fraught with danger that it is vitally necessary to examine the evidence for the causes of the world revolution that is taking place before our eyes. Just as the lamp you extinguish in your ceremony gives place to darkness, and the darkness in turn is dispelled by the light, so the dark shadows of evil can be overcome, not by bombs and broken hearts and homes but only by a recognition of reality and truth, which must lead to right action.

When in the 1914-1918 war broke out, Sir Edward Grey, as he was then, stated that "the lamps of Europe are going out," and the suspension of the Armistice in 1939 reduced the lights still further. To ascribe the resultant chaos to Hitler, or Prussianism, or the lack of morality in the public, is to ignore certain fundamental ideas and agencies which produce the Hitlers and the Stalins.

Six thousand years ago, a natural crop of barley on the banks of the Upper Nile was the primary factor in the commencement of civilisation—or so it is alleged. From that time, how immense is the chasm between primitive man who trod the forest's silent depths and matched his thoughts against the instincts of the beasts, and the industry of this age when fleets travel sea and air, uniting peoples in one great commercial community. This age of astonishing material progress, this heritage of past centuries of endeavour, should have enabled man to discover himself, to be worthy of understanding trust and hope.

But to-day we see men and women still struggling for a living: irritated beyond endurance by external pressure of politicians and wars: housed often in surroundings that the primitive man would have spurned: burdened with taxation and debt: compelled in an age of potential abundance to work for food more actively than his ancestors: accepting docilely the belief that a week's separation from Public Assistance or bankruptcy is a natural development from an age of scarcity.

What is the nature of the mesmerism at work that has induced the belief that man cannot develop his Individuality as science and invention have developed? The answer to this question, in my opinion lies in agencies at work to-day whose activities in various ways have largely contributed to frustrate the real progress of humanity.

One agent of frustration is the belief fostered by organisations generally believed to be above suspicion and wholly devoted to the service of mankind—religious and educational as well as political—that it is the nature of man to resist the laws devised for his benefit, and that his imperfect nature makes for ever impossible the construction of a social order satisfactory to the majority and just towards the minority. Briefly this is the doctrine that the rules invented by legislators for the guidance of those subject to their ministrations are perfect and only the subjects err. This arises from a radical confusion between "LAW" which *may* be discovered, but which cannot be invented, "LAW" which is inherent in Nature, and LAWS which may and often do, set

aside all experiences of reality and enjoin that cabbages shall grow on golf bunkers, and stability seize upon a community rocked and threatened by every evil device of subversive ingenuity. The ascendancy of Power maniacs and the subordination of every social interest to theirs has far more to do with the present dangerous situation of human society than the just expectations of men and women that a reasonable return shall accrue from their efforts. Society yields a diminishing return to the individual despite the spectacular successes which have attended man's efforts to enhance productivity and lighten labour. After all the primitive man was only the present day gentleman with faculties lying fallow. "There goes a man," said Dr. Boris Sidis, "with three quarters of his brain not used." We can say with Shakespeare, "sure he that made us, looking before and after, gave us not that God-like reason to fust in us unused." With all respect to the Churches, I do not believe that the problems of this world will be solved by "Goodness" alone but by the discovery of reality, its relationship to human problems and the pursuit of beauty.

We recall the addresses of the Archbishops and others to the effect that the last war was attributed to the struggle against evil, which though true, omitted to mention that the evil resides, not in the multitude but in the hearts of about 2,000 men in a world population of 2,000 millions most of whom wish to be left alone to work out their natural destiny.

Now evil I define as the spirit of unmixed hatred against the existing social classes, the spirit that benefits from any widespread disaster, and often assists towards that end. It is the spirit that is to a great extent against all forms of individual initiative, and it is particularly directed against Great Britain whose way of life has been for centuries based on this initiative and individual freedom.

Some time ago there was published in a poem called *The Coming of Lucifer*, the following stanza:—

In all he did: in all he taught
He kept this aim in sight.
To have the deeds of darkness done
disguised in terms of Light.
He spread his poison far and wide
among many a specious sect
and made the *EVIL* seem the *GOOD*
bamboozling God's elect.

There is abundant evidence that the spirit of Lucifer is inseparable from many ideas and movements to-day.

We have to ask ourselves first of all why is it that it is becoming more and more difficult to obtain peace on this earth and to turn man's innate good will into something effective. Why is it that during the last two hundred years at least wars have increased in ferocity and the number of men and women engaged in them increased beyond imagination? What is the reason that enables the earth, the sky and the sea to be conquered, but can abolish poverty only by the imposition of slavery? While science and invention have made marvellous progress to the extent that they have handed to savages, who a few years ago ate their grandmothers, the power to wreck a town, they have also provided our administrators with the power to wreck a world.

The great struggle that Macaulay foresaw is in process at the present time and the features of the greatest consolidated battle in history can now be seen. On the one side

are political caucuses and dictatorships financial supporting, and being supported by the most able institutions, with all power, political, police and military in their hands. On the other side are the millions of people dependent on the work of these institutions for wages and salaries for life itself with no power save of their hands and wills. They are not interested in theories generally, so when war or other disasters come to his door the average man is found deprived of many moral and material things which can only be obtained on ruinous terms. Let us consider a few examples of the confused mental and moral problems with which many of you are no doubt familiar.

The Secretary of the Royal Institution of International Affairs, Dr. Arnold Toynbee, informed his supporters a few years ago that he and others associated with the Institution were working with all their might to undermine the sovereignty of all the national states in the world in the interest of some attraction called International Control. He omitted to mention that the undermining of national sovereignty had its natural corollary in the robbing of the individual of any rights to property, but he was frank enough to declare at the same time that he and his colleagues were denying with their lips what they were doing with their hands. Of course, if a declared Communist expressed publicly similar sentiments, the Press would have the usual headlines, and we would know to who he owed loyalty. Not so very long after Toynbee had spoken Hitler undermined the sovereignty of about thirteen nations in Europe with what result we all know. So when Mr. Churchill announced that we would fight Hitler in the streets and on the beaches, he overlooked the fact that Dr. Toynbee and his fellow conspirators had been provided with comfortable headquarters by the Government at Oxford, to carry on their work of undermining the British Constitution at the expense of the British taxpayer.

I now turn to certain historic influences which have played an important part in the exercise of the dark forces, thus separating humanity from its goal. I do not believe that at this critical period in the world's history it is in the natural order of things that every country, class and individual should exist in a state of tension or horror. A considerable body of opinion exists and agrees that the fundamental cause of most of the world's unrest is the financial system. While I myself agree that the financial system is the all pervasive influence to-day, we must also take a wider view of its activities and its work among men, and before we can obtain any clear idea as to the causes of the trouble we must look not only at Governments but at the men who control Governments.

Frederick the Great came to the throne of Germany in 1740. One of his closest friends was Anarcharsis Clootz, who called himself the personal enemy of Jesus Christ. He was also a Freemason. Frederick in his political Testaments wrote:

"As it has been agreed among men that to cheat our fellow creatures is a base and criminal act, it has been necessary to find a word which might modify the idea: and the word POLICY has been sanctioned to that end. In all probability this word was selected for sovereigns for they cannot really be called rogues or rascals. However that may be, here is what I think of policy, I mean by the word policy that we must always try to dupe other people. . . ."

"This principle being laid down do not be ashamed of making interested alliances from which only yourself can

derive the whole advantage. Do not make the foolish mistake of not breaking them when you believe that your interests require it; above all uphold the following maxim 'That to despoil your neighbours is to deprive them of the means of injuring you.'" (Boston Edition, 1870).

In its shortened form these Testaments are a guide to the principles governing Prussia and Germany from the time of Frederick, through Bismarck to Hitler, and there is a direct link between Marxian Socialism, the large sums donated to Labour politics by German speaking Jews, and the foundation of the London School of Economics by the funds of Sir Ernest Cassel, who, according to his friend Lord Haldane, gave sums to this institution for the purpose of training the bureaucracy for the coming Socialist State.

It is a common belief that the great revolutionary movements began with Rousseau and the French Revolution that he inspired. But he was not the originator of his doctrines for we would have to go back to Mably, to the Utopia of Sir Thomas More and even to Pythagoras and Plato, but we need not consider these matters to-night.

Before Rousseau there were the orders of The Templars in 1250 and their leader Jaques du Molay who rose against the authority of the King of France. In 1312 a number of Templars were arrested and executed after charges of spitting on the crucifix and denying the Christ.

Then came the Grand Chapter of Freemasonry constituted under the Templars and the rise of British Freemasonry, though I must add that the craft Masonry of England was largely a development of the working masons and it remains to-day so far as I know a brotherly association activated by benevolence. In France, however, and generally on the Continent, Grand Orient Freemasonry, with its first Grand Master, the Duc de Chartres, became a centre of political intrigue. It originated the popular slogan, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. This slogan split Masonry into two camps, one retaining the principles of Liberty and Equality, the other founded by a Portuguese Jew, Martinez Pasqually, who introduced the Fraternity principle, and he advocated a form of Gnosticism, or Judaized Christianity.

Then came the Illuminati of Bavaria which came into existence about 1776, under the leadership of Adam Weishaupt, a man who has been described as the profoundest conspirator that ever existed. I must ask you to be patient while I devote a little time to this man's record. Adam Weishaupt was born in 1748. After an early training by the Jesuits he quitted that order and associated himself with the subversive doctrines of the French philosophers and anti-Christian movements. It is said that he was also indoctrinated with Egyptian occultism. Weishaupt declared that civilisation was a mistake. Man, he declared, is fallen from the condition of Liberty and Equality, the State of Pure Nature. Man must divest himself of all the trappings of civilisation and return to a nomadic life, even clothing, food and fixed abodes should be abandoned. Kings and Nobles should be abolished. Religion must be abandoned. Family and national life must cease "so as to make of the human race one happy family." Patriotism or love of country was a vice and must be abolished in favour of a universal society founded on love.

In these words we find the expressions of Internationalism as it is expounded to-day.

Weishaupt to give effect to his teaching founded the

secret society known as the Illuminati. All the members were known by an Alias and their correspondence was done in code signs. Initiation into the higher mysteries was graded and for the purpose the initiator was told to acquire the habit of talking "backward and forward." "One must speak," said Weishaupt, "sometimes in one way, sometimes in another so that our real purpose should remain impenetrable to our inferiors."

By such teaching the Illuminati professed to disapprove of revolution and asserted that world dominion was to be attained by peaceful means. But when the adept was initiated into the grade of Illuminated Major or Scotch Knight he was told the whole secret of the Order:—

"Remember that from the first invitation which we have given you in order to attract you to us we commenced by telling you that in the projects of our Order there did not enter any designs against religion. . . . You remember with what art; with what simulated respect we have spoken to you of Christ and His Gospel. . . . We have had many prejudices to overcome in you before being able to persuade you that the pretended religion of Christ was nothing else but the work of priests of imposture and tyranny. . . . Behold our secret. If in order to destroy all Christianity, all religion, remember that the end justifies the means and that the wise ought to take all the means to do good which the wicked take to do evil. . . ."

But all this was unknown to the novice.

The whole order comprised a system of spying on one another, and all measures taken for the support of the least educated. In 1777 Weishaupt became a Freemason and on the 20th December, 1781 it was decided that the control of the Illuminati and Freemasons should be comprised of (a) the Minervals, (b) the Freemasons and (c) the Mystery class as the highest of all. In 1782 a Congress of Secret Societies took place. What was done at that Congress we will never know but one Freemason, the Comte de Virere, said that "I can only tell you that this is more serious than you think. The conspiracy which is being woven is so well thought out that it will be impossible for the Monarchy and the Church to escape from it."

Reduced to its simplest formula the Aims of the Illuminati were:—

1. Abolition of Monarchy and all ordered Government.
2. Abolition of private profit.
3. Abolition of inheritance.
4. Abolition of Patriotism.
5. Abolition of the family, of marriage and all morality and the institution of communal education of children.
6. Abolition of religion.

The Illuminati were suppressed by the Government of Bavaria in 1786 but many of its adherents were prominent in activities leading to the French Revolution.

For those who desire to follow up the course of events through and after the French Revolution, I recommend a study of Mrs. Nesta Webster's books on this subject.

(To be concluded).

PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from page 3.)

Army will know from air raids—the instinct of the human body is to lie down, and stay down until it stops. But in a war, men have to do very unpleasant things, and the responsibility for showing courage and skill, as well as initiative, under such circumstances, lies on the officer and particularly the junior commanders. The responsibility on those men has greatly increased.

When Marlborough went to war, the brigade was *en masse*, and the commander could almost shout so that everybody heard, but today troops are widely dispersed, and there is far more delegated responsibility. It has increased in a way which would not be recognised by officers of previous times. One has to remember the importance of the company, platoon, and equivalent commanders. If they are not good, we can pour money and men into the Army and it will all be in vain, we should have wasted our manpower, as well as our money, to say nothing of our industrial effort.

Bearing in mind the importance of officers today, I felt some disquiet when I read—and my right hon. Friend the Member for Warwick and Leamington referred to it—that the Minister is still not satisfied with the Regular Officer situation, with the comparative dearth of candidates of high quality for Regular commissions. I make no apology for mentioning that again, because there has been ample time for hon. Members to have forgotten it. The Minister said that the matter was receiving his constant attention, and that he hoped the better pay and conditions of service would help.

In attempting to find the most important single matter in these Estimates, I picked on this questions of officers, and hon. Members will, I hope, agree that it is vitally important to the Army. In fact, the whole of the rest of my speech is confined to this problem. Not only is there this shortage today, but there is practically no Regular reserve of officers. In addition, we have before us the necessity for expansion as and when regular recruiting improves, which it shows signs of doing. The officer shortage today is worse than it looks, because it is a concealed shortage. The right hon. Gentleman has put a stop on officers going out of the Army, but that operates only for about 18 months, and it will cease about the end of this year. If we are not careful, there will then be a further run-out of officers. In addition, since 1945 a large number of good officers have left the Army because they were dissatisfied with pay and conditions. I do not want to go into that matter, because I do not want to make this debate controversial; but I think that the Government were late in putting up the pay.

What is more disquieting about this shortage is that officers are not joining at the youngest age. The entry and exit figures for the Royal Military Academy at Sandhurst for 1950 were: 482 passed out; requirement, more than 600. In the same year, there joined in January, 305, and only 203 in September. So 500 will pass out, and I would say that the requirement is about 700. The requirement must be going up. What the House has to consider seriously is why this is happening. I would point out that the best young men of the country are now being called up for two years. The National Service men are magnificent material. This has in effect turned the Army into a kind of national university. If we handle and train these men badly, that is a rotten introduction to life. If we turn them out well, it is a good introduction to life. I suggest that the influences of that period

will come inevitably, whatever hon. Members may think, largely from the standard of officer.

Why is there this shortage of officers? Some of my remarks may appear reactionary, but we had better face the facts. The first point is that many of the old attractions and amenities of the Army have gone. In the past many officers joined because they liked an open-air life, and they liked sport. There is nothing wrong in that. Many officers enjoyed riding, or falling off horses. The horse has disappeared from the Army. It occasionally makes an ignoble appearance on the men's plates at dinner to vary a monotonous diet. Again, officers joined the Army for comradeship. When a man joined a regiment in, say, the thirties, he stayed in that regiment, whether officer or man, undisturbed. I know that is difficult now, but cross-posting is a big deterrent to recruiting. The Secretary of State for War ought to read an article on this subject in the R.U.S.I. Journal by a very well-known officer. Although it may seem trivial to hon. Members, if a man can be sure of staying with his regiment, that is something immensely important to him.

Also, in the old days, under the Cardwell system, an officer—and this applies to a large extent to other ranks, too—knew where he was. He knew that for half his time he would be at home, and for the other half abroad. Nowadays, he may have an almost indefinite period abroad, with short periods at home. A large proportion of the officers who joined the Army in the old days—and hon. Members opposite may be shocked by this, but let us face the facts as they say, or the future—had private means. They have not now. It may be a good thing or a bad thing, but they have not, and that again is a factor. Lastly, officers are considering what is going to happen to them when they finish. I was very glad to hear the Secretary of State's statement about the prolongation of service; in fact, I had a note on that matter for my speech and have crossed it off, so I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on his psychic power. Nevertheless, it is a big consideration.

What can be done now that many of the attractions and amenities have disappeared, to get officers in and stop their leaving? It is a question of vital importance. I have already mentioned cross-posting, and I now turn to the very vexed question of pay. I know that here I am on very controversial ground, especially since pay has been put up. I say to the hon. Member for Fife, West (Mr. Hamilton) that I cannot agree with his recommendation regarding pay. I do not know whether he had his tongue in his cheek when he said that we should reduce the gap between field-m Marshals and private soldiers, but I would point out that a Member of Parliament today has the equivalent of a gross rate of something like £1,500 a year and the man who works the lift in the House of Commons has about £5 a week. Considering what the hon. Member said, I wonder how he justifies the differentiation in pay. It is hopeless to think one can telescope pay together and be democratic. That is not the way the world works, and it is not the way to get field-m Marshals—or Members of Parliament.

I am not advocating more expenditure on pay, but I am suggesting to the Secretary of State this question: Have we got the emphasis of this enormous lump of money in the right place? We are going to have a mass of material and equipment. Ought we to have a little less of that and put a little more on the essential element, the officer? For unless the officer is good, all that equipment may well be wasted.

I have no quarrel about the bachelor in the Army. He is all right. It is the married officer who is the problem. He has got to educate his children, to live in a quarter outside barracks, and to move his wife about, goodness knows where. I believe the War Office worked out the minimum essential expenditure for the various grades. What the War Office works out as a minimum is not exactly a life of wine, women and song. The sum—I think I am right—for a captain with a wife, one child, and no Government quarter, was about £800 a year. He now receives £790 a year, so if he lives as per War Office he is a tanner a year overdrawn. But it is only fair to say that after four years he gets £820 a year, which leaves £20 a year for wine, women and song.

I am not saying the officer is badly paid; what I am saying is that unless we offer sufficient attraction to get good officers, we are going to waste an awful lot of money and effort. Say there is a war. Our main effort in Germany is the provision of three armoured divisions. This captain we have been talking about may well command a squadron in one of these divisions. The deployment, use and manœuvre of these machines depends more on the squadron-leader than is the case with either aeroplanes or ships. This man has the command of 16 tanks. They cost £30,000 each. Therefore, under his charge is about £500,000 worth of equipment—or put another way, of British industrial effort. It is crazy to pinch and scrape over getting good chaps for the job when that equipment may be wasted if there is a faulty decision or he fails in battle.

(Further extracts from Brigadier Head's speech will be published next week).

On Planning The Earth

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

6/- (Postage extra).

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

THE BIG IDEA

Price 2/6 (Postage extra)

PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR

Price 2/- (Postage extra)

THE "LAND FOR THE (CHOSEN PEOPLE" RACKET

Price 2/- (Postage extra)

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool 2.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton.