

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 27. No. 2.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

Gnostic Teaching Contemporary with the Apostles

[To the extent of this topic we resume the publication of extracts from Dean Mansel's book*. The chapter is his fourth Lecture entitled, *Notices of Gnosticism in the New Testament.*]

On the mention of Gnostic teachers contemporaneous with the Apostles and alluded to in the New Testament, we are naturally disposed in the first instance to turn to the account given in the Acts of the Apostles concerning Simon Magus, who by general consent, at least of the early authorities, has been selected as the father and first representative of the Gnostic heresies. Yet with the exception of the expression 'the great Power of God,' which we shall have occasion to consider hereafter, the narrative of the Acts throws no light on the peculiar character of Simon's teaching, the particulars of which must chiefly be gathered from later and uninspired authorities. The earliest distinct indications of a Gnostic teaching contemporary with the Apostles is to be found in the Epistles of St. Paul; chiefly, as might naturally be expected, in those addressed to churches, or persons presiding over churches, in Asia, one of the early centres of the Gnostic teaching; to which must be added those addressed to the city of Corinth, whose commercial activity and constant intercourse with other centres of civilisation rendered it easily accessible to the influences of Asiatic and Alexandrian teaching. In fact the two Epistles to the Corinthians are the earliest in point of time of the Apostolic writings in which we can with any probability recognise an allusion to the germs of a teaching which afterwards developed itself in the Gnostic schools. Here we have the earliest instance of the use of the word *gnosis* in a depreciatory sense, [*knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth*†], and the occasion on which these words are used is such as to warrant us with some probability in interpreting the term in the same technical and peculiar sense in which it was afterwards so constantly employed. The question to which the words relate is the lawfulness of eating meats which had been offered to idols; and we have evidence that the lawfulness of partaking of these sacrifices was distinctly maintained, not merely by the later Gnostics, but by their precursor Simon Magus, who, under the pretence of superior knowledge, indulged in this respect in the utmost license of practice, maintaining that to those who knew the truth idolatry was a thing wholly indifferent, and that whether they partook of the heathen sacrifices or not was a thing of no consequence in the sight of God. The context of the passage seems to support this interpretation. The words of the next verse, [*And if any man think that he knoweth*

any thing, he knoweth nothing, yet as he ought to know. But if any man love God, the same is known of him.], read like a direct rebuke of that pretension to a perfect knowledge of God and divine things which forms the basis of the whole Gnostic teaching; to which it may be added that Irenæus, who wrote at a time when the Gnostic systems were still in existence, and who entitled his work, 'The Detection and Overthrow of Knowledge falsely so called,' expressly cites these words of St. Paul as having reference to the Gnostic doctrine. 'On this account,' he says, 'Paul declared that knowledge puffeth up but charity edifieth; not as blaming the true knowledge of God, for then he must first have accused himself; but because he knew that certain men, elated by the pretence of knowledge, were falling away from the love of God, and while deeming themselves to be perfect, imagined an imperfect creator of the world.' We may infer also from other passages in these Epistles that among the opponents of St. Paul in the Corinthian Church were some who endeavoured to disparage the authority of the Apostle on the ground of their own superior *knowledge*; and when we find St. Paul, in writing to this church, both vindicating his own claim to knowledge so far as such a claim could be justly made by man, [*But though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge*]*, and at the same time reminding his readers that all human knowledge is but in part, and shall vanish away when that which is perfect is come, these words acquire a fuller significance if we recognise in the Corinthian opponents of the Apostle's authority the precursors of those Ebionite Gnostics who at a later period calumniated him as an apostate from the Law.

It is not improbable that Gnostic doctrines are at least partially and indirectly combated, along with other errors of a similar character, in the Apostle's elaborate and triumphant argument for the resurrection of the body in the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle. It is true that this article of the Christian faith was so entirely opposed to all the schools of heathen philosophy (as may be seen from St. Paul's dispute on the same topic with the Epicureans and the Stoics at Athens) that it is difficult to select any one school of heathen thought as peculiarly or especially referred to. But we shall see a little later how the peculiarly Gnostic form of this error appears in the teaching of St. Paul's subsequent opponents. Hymenæus and Philetus; and we may reserve what has to be said on this point till we come to speak of the Epistle in which their heresy is mentioned.

Passing over the very doubtful allusions to Gnosticism which some have supposed to exist in the Epistle to the Romans, we come next in order to the letters addressed to the two Asiatic churches of Ephesus and Colossæ. Here we are in one of the chief centres of Gnostic influences, both as regards philosophical teaching and practical addiction to magic arts and enchantments; and here, accordingly, we find allusions to the Gnostic teaching more frequent and more

*See *The Social Creditor*, July 14, p. 6 (note).

†1 Cor. viii. 1.

*2 Cor. xi. 6.

distinct. When the Apostle prays that his Ephesian converts may know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge . . . we are reminded of that contrast between knowledge and love, on which he had previously insisted in his advice to the Corinthians; and when he adds 'that ye may be filled with all the fulness of God' . . . we are at least conscious of the use of the current term in Gnostic phraseology, though the verse does not, taken by itself, necessarily imply an allusion to Gnostic theories. But when in two other passages of the same Epistle we find the Church spoken of as the body of Christ, 'the fulness [to *pleroma*] of Him that filleth all in all,' and when the Christian is spoken of as coming 'unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ,' though the word in all these passages is used in a different sense from that in which it held so conspicuous a place in the Gnostic teaching, we are tempted at first sight to assent to the surmise that the choice of this term may have been dictated by a desire to turn the minds of his readers from the false to the true use of it, to remind them that the true Pleroma, the place of those united with God, was not in that mystic region of spirits where the Gnostics placed it, nor to be attained to, as they asserted, by knowledge only; that the body of Christian believers was the true Pleroma of God—the place which God fills with His presence; and that the bond of union which raised man to it was not knowledge, but love. And this surmise is perhaps confirmed by the words which follow the last of these passages, and which seem distinctly to point to a false teaching which it is designed to correct: 'That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of man, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.' The interpretation however of these passages must be admitted to be very doubtful; and it is at least an open question whether the use of the term [*pleroma*] was suggested to St. Paul by the Gnostic writers, or borrowed by them from the New Testament.

The Epistle to the Colossians, which was written at the same time with that to the Ephesians, contains however more distinct indications of the existence of Gnostic errors among those to whom it was addressed. The false teaching which the Apostle denounces in this Epistle seems to have manifested itself in the form of a combination of Judaism with Gnosticism, such as was afterwards more fully developed in the teaching of Cerinthus; though the tradition which brings Cerinthus himself into personal collision with St. Paul will hardly bear the test of chronology.

The characteristics of this teaching may be easily gathered from evidence furnished by the language of the Epistle. First; it pretended, under the plausible name of *philosophy*, to be in possession of a higher knowledge of spiritual things than could be obtained through the simple preaching of the Gospel. Secondly; it adopted the common tenet of all the Gnostic sects, that of a distinction between the supreme God and the Demiurgus or creator of the world. Thirdly; by virtue of its pretended insight into the spiritual world, it taught a theory of its own concerning the various orders of angels and the worship to be paid to them. And fourthly; in connection with these theories, it enjoined and adopted the practice of a rigid asceticism, extending and exaggerating the ceremonial prohibitions of the Jewish law, and probably connecting them with a philosophical theory concerning the evil nature of matter.

(To be continued).

Words Over Korea

"How long will the cease-fire talks between Soviet puppet emissaries and American officers go on? After a month of wrangling, with no cease-fire or real truce in sight, this question is forcing its way to the top of the forum of American public opinion. Since the fighting still goes on, with its dismal weekly casualty toll, mothers and fathers want acutely and agonizingly to know—when?"

"We sought out a very anonymous expert on the Far East—one of those civil servants whose advice on China and Korea was disregarded when he tried to prevent the present mess; and who sits in a remote Government bureau trying to find some hope in the dispatches, as he seeks to square headlines with his background knowledge of the Far East for the past quarter-century. His reply was, as follows:

"These talks might run many months, maybe a year. You seem surprised? Well, I want to remind you that this is an old game of the Chinese Communists. It's a matter of history. They carried on quite a number of cease-fire talks with Chiang Kai-shek, and some of them lasted a very long time. For instance, one of these parleys commenced in February, 1944 and did not end until May, 1945. These particular talks were held in Chungking and Sian, for approximately sixteen months.

"As a matter of fact, this protracted negotiation followed a short period of all-out warfare which in turn had been preceded by a previous cease-fire negotiation. The latter lasted several months and ended only in November, 1943. During the talks, intermittent, although not all-out, war went on. Why did the Reds string out these parleys? Simply in order to build up their forces for another assault on Nationalist China. In my opinion, the Reds are pursuing the same strategy today in Kaesong. And if they do come to an agreement soon, they will certainly violate it."
—(Frank C. Hanighen in *Not Merely Gossip*).

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: July 24, 1951.

Education

(continued from last week).

Mr. Pickthorn (Carlton).

Defeatism comes into the consciousness through one thing almost more than by any other method—and I am not being at all funny when I say that in my judgment one of the main reasons why France has not been so great a country, especially militarily, of recent years, as she once was—though I hope and pray she soon will be again—I am not being at all funny, nor in my judgment exaggerating, when I say that a large part of that has been examination worry because they have been in this matter a generation or so ahead of us—if that is the word to use, in progress in this matter; almost every French family is doomed to frightful worry as to whether little Toto or little Jojo is going to get over the next hurdle.

The wretched child goes through its childhood continually hag ridden with this horrible obsession, that perhaps it will ruin the whole family. I beg hon. Gentlemen when they are talking about equality of opportunity to consider the very great intellectual and logical difficulties. It is easy for me to contemplate without envy the superiority and comparative wealth of right hon. Gentlemen opposite, so long

as I know it is due to an accident of birth, but if I knew that all their manifest superiorities over me were wholly due to merit, I might find it beginning to be a little difficult to bear.

They talk about children who do not get into the most fashionable type of school being resentfully conscious of inferiority to other children. But the more we make everything turn on school competition—that must be by way of examination of one sort or another however we change the name of examination—and the more we make that the only test, the more we run the risk of resentment.

Do not think I am talking against equality of opportunity. Nobody could believe in it more firmly than I do or owe more to it than I do. All my life, since 13 years of age, I have lived however fraudulently, on examination successes; and I am not boasting, I think I have had more opportunity than anybody here, I do not think anybody has tried harder than I have to help children of all ages from 13 upwards to scholarships. Do not think I am running down equality of opportunity, but it wants a lot of thinking about.

I think there ought to be equality of opportunity in the sense that every child ought equally to have opportunity and we ought to try to see that that is so. But I do not think we can give every child an equal chunk of opportunity as one might give them an equal quantity of milk or an equal 2½ ounces of cheese, or whatever it might be. I do not believe it is possible to do that, and in that connection I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider something which I am going to say now. . . .

It is perfectly plain that we cannot have equality of opportunity in the sense that every child shall have an equally large opportunity of doing equally well in both senses of doing well unless we can have equally good teachers, and plenty of them, say, one per 20 children in every school. That is a most frightening thought, because it makes almost all the arguments I have heard, from both sides of the Committee, in the last 15 or 16 years about what is the purpose of public education logically and intellectually disreputable.

There are a few figures in this connection which we ought to think about. I apologise to the hon. Gentleman if they are wrong. These figures I hastily picked up where I could and I will, of course, take his word for it if he tells me they are wrong. I am told that in the last few years there has been among teachers in training a decrease of from 66 to 55 per cent. in the number of those who got firsts or seconds in honours in the universities. That looks a bit as if the tendency were going the wrong way. If we are to keep the present percentage of 77 per cent. of graduate grammar school teachers and are to get an average of one teacher to every 20 pupils in secondary schools then, I am told, we shall need another 10,000 graduate teachers before 1960. I am also told that that means that the graduate teachers in training at any one time ought to be something over 3,000 and that one-third or rather more of that lot ought to be mathematicians or scientists, and that more than 70 per cent. of the whole lot ought to have got firsts or seconds in honours.

I ask the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen to put this question to themselves. Suppose that budget in teacher manpower which I have just very roughly indicated is to be achieved in 1960, from where shall we get the intelligent chaps whom we want to be stockbrokers, average adjusters, and all the rest of it? Where are they to come from? It is

usual to ride off at that moment and to say, "So you see we want a lot more universities and university graduates." But we are not going to get those very quickly, and it is pure assumption that if we got them, we should get graduates as good as we ever got before.

We cannot increase the undergraduate population, at the brain and character level to which we are used, unless we increase the don population in the same proportion, and whether there are enough people to be got for either purpose, without a very disadvantageous weakening of other professions is a great question. I do not know the answer to this, but it is a great question, and I hope that I have put it accurately and fairly. . . .

I come now to three points of controversy, . . . First, adult education. I wish people would not say, I am afraid that my hon. and admired and indeed revered Friend the Member for Harrow, East (Mr. Ian Harvey) said it, that education goes on from cradle to grave. If one means by education all the formative and well-tending things that happen to one when one uses the word education that is what it means, but then education is useless to me. I wish people would not say that.

How much of adult education is education in the honest sense? I was happening to lunch with somebody who knew a great deal about this. I asked whether it would be a wild exaggeration to say that 90 per cent., more or less, of education had a strong party-political tinge. He said it would be a wild exaggeration. I said, "Seventy per cent.?" He said, "I think that would be an exaggeration." I said, "Fifty per cent.?" He said, "You would be quite safe at 50 per cent." I think one would and the Parliamentary Secretary, who laughs, knows perfectly well one would, none better. We get these continual complacent speeches about adult education. It is a very difficult thing to go into it and everybody who knows anything about it considers it is high time we had a deep look into that.

I notice that the Blue Book had an amusing phrase—I do not think it was intended to be amusing. . . . It is about the bodies that manage adult education. The Blue Book says they are

". . . (technically known as 'responsible bodies') . . ."

That means they have no responsibility at all. Nobody really inquires into exactly what they are doing, and nobody knows. To the things about which I am being offensive, add U.N.E.S.C.O. We are long overdue for some real explanation of what U.N.E.S.C.O. has done. All the Blue Book tells is about a desert being made to blossom like the rose somewhere, but nothing at all about education.

The next thing is comprehensive schools. I was delighted to hear that the Minister was interested in them without any political inference. It may be the prejudice for comprehensive schools had nothing political in it. That moves the hon. Member for Aberavon (Mr. Cove) a long way from his party, but if he will read the party pamphlet about it he will see that there is a lot in it that is political. It does make the Blue Book look rather curious. Still more, the party pamphlet says that we hope that the result of the comprehensive schools will be that the private enterprise schools will cease to exist. I am not quoting quite fairly, but I am being hurried, and I think I am not being very unfair. Since we are none of us interested in this

(continued on page 8).

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, Tele-
 phones: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephones: SEFTON Park 435.

Vol. 27. No. 2.

Saturday, September 8, 1951.

From Week to Week

HYDRO-ELECTRICITY in ITALY: "The Po Valley, with its virgilian landscape of poplars, mulberry trees, wheat, flax, and millet . . . The first irrigation works in the Po valley are believed to have been built by the Etruscans, and the Romans, the Benedictines, the Communes, the princes of the Renaissance, even Leonardo da Vinci himself, took a hand in the work. . . . The expansion of hydro-electric capacity is . . . vitally needed in Italian industry" [our emphasis].—(*The Times*, August 15.)

Readers who recognise the truth of this assertion and its relevancy (only accepting the last absurd confusion between life and 'industry') will also recognise how radical must be the reorientation of individual outlook on society before the engines impelling us to destruction are braked or reversed.

• • •

The Social Crediter, while it still seems the least confused voice, is no longer the only one offering wise counsel. Witness *The Scotsman*, which, on the same day as the impressive article on Power from the Alps, printed three leading articles in succession. The last should, as always, be first. Article (1) patted the backs of the organisers of the British Association meeting in Edinburgh for their success and the Duke of Edinburgh for his bearing and devotion to duty. Article (2), which is spoilt by a blithe disregard for realism concerning the meaning of *in-come* when preceded by the adjective 'national,' nevertheless deserves quoting:—"Whereas before the outbreak of the First World War the cost of the social services per head of the population was approximately £1 6s. by last year this had increased to over £23 14s. At the earlier date expenditure on social services accounted for less than 3 per cent. of the national income, but by 1950 the proportion had risen to 10.7 per cent. Total expenditure publicly borne amounted to £1162 million, of which the National Health Service accounted for over 35 per cent. . . because of full employment, the accumulated surplus of the National Insurance Fund steadily rose in the post-war years to about £1160 million and . . . the Government took advantage of this to reduce the Exchequer contributions."

All this means, of course, is that the community 'paid for' its social services to the tune of £2322 million pounds worth of work. Why this should be so neatly balanced into two halves, £1160 million filched from wages *qua* insurance against unemployment, and £1162 million filched from wages, salaries and dividends, *qua* 'taxation' does not appear to attract the curiosity of *The Scotsman* (though staffed by taxpayers who are also 'workers'). Notice that the Government did not "take advantage" of the situation to pay the £1160 million back to the people who had overpaid it. They

only took a little less next time. Or did they? Until people (and accountants among them) understand that accountancy as practised is merely an incorrigible persistence in telling the King that the answer to his question, How many beans make five?, is 'five' (a solution he rightly rejected), our public 'accounts' will not be accounts. Beans don't make figures. If they make anything they make more beans. The distance from Liverpool to Manchester isn't 10,337 miles because a cyclometer-reading at the end of that journey is 10,337.

In any case, the answer to the question of Sir Alexander Gray, How far can the process continue? would seem to be obvious—until all the population is working all the time regardless of what they are doing or why. And, of course, regardless of consequences.

Article (3) of the sequence promises better things:—

"SOMEONE has observed, rather impatiently, that it is rather a pity that there is not a British Association for the Retardment of Science. . . Science has undoubtedly done a great deal to make us more comfortable, but there is no doubt at all that it has not made us less fretful or less discontented.

"Science, unfortunately, seems to increase the complexity of life, and to pose more problems than it solves. ['Make us more comfortable']. Perhaps the trouble is that we treat science far too seriously. . . Scientists . . . form a kind of hieratic caste in the brave new world. We do not remind ourselves enough that scientists, *sub specie aeternitatis*, are very nearly as ignorant as the rest of us. Compared with the *terra incognita* which they have still to explore the extent of their knowledge is pitiful. They haven't the faintest conception of how this ridiculous little globe began or to what destination it is headed, although they can tell us a lot about its history, its speed, its historical phases, and its relationship with other lumps of matter. They can't tell us why we are here, and they know infinitely less about us than a motor mechanic knows about the internal combustion engine. The number of things they haven't found out far exceeds the number of things they have found out. They can't, if it comes to the point, even tell us how to eliminate such a trivial irritation as the common cold. We all like scientists and admire them, we are all willing to profit from their discoveries, but it would do us all a power of good to remind ourselves that they, like us, have still got an enormous amount to learn."

But are we willing to profit by their discoveries?

The Social Credit Secretariat

NOTICE

Letters on Secretariat business which would normally be addressed to the Social Credit Secretariat or to Dr. Tudor Jones personally should be addressed as indicated below until October 1:—

Mr. Hewlett Edwards,
 Nether End,
 Austrey,
 Atherstone,
 Warwickshire.

The Russians, the Bolsheviks and the U.S.A.

Some of the developments attendant upon the arrival of M. Alexander Kerensky in American-occupied Germany, from New York, have been reported in newspapers in a manner likely to confuse the public in two different ways. It seems desirable, therefore, to supplement the note "The U.S.A. State Department and the Free Russia Movement," which was issued by the undersigned in April.

Alexander Feodorovitch Kerensky.

In the previous note some particulars were given of the manner in which persons who had every appearance of representing the State Department of the U.S.A., in their ostensible attempts to form an anti-Soviet front from among Russian exiles, had invoked the help of Trotskyists, Mensheviks, disgruntled Bolsheviks and other Marxists, whom they had found in small groups in centres such as Paris and New York. It was reported that these politicians, when addressing the exiles, had advanced policies for the future of Russia which were essentially socialistic and Marxist and which the Russians had rejected out of hand. It was also mentioned that, following upon this failure, a new scheme to the same end had been initiated in New York and Washington.

Unless it is correct to assume that the persons promoting these activities are phenomenally ignorant of Russian conditions and of the general Russian point of view, it must be that they have one of two aims: (a) to discredit the possibility of creating an active Russian movement as a means of Restoring Russia to the comity of nations, or (b) to ensure that, if the present international tension culminates in a large-scale war, then that war will be fought to a finish—the finish being *the establishment in Russia by so-called anti-Communist Powers of a new regime which would be indistinguishable from the existing regime.*

The leading and most responsible group of Russian exiles has two major aims for liberated Russia: peasant-proprietorship and, for industry,—to use its own words—"forms of relationship between entrepreneurs and workers in which both sides find themselves in conditions of social justice, creative interest and a worthy economic existence." These aims conform to the natural and moral law, which is the only sure basis of social order. It is not surprising that they have turned out to be exactly what is wanted by the great mass of new exiles from Russia, who have experienced Marxism in actual practice. These aims have been condemned by the State Department's agents as being excessively "to the Right."

M. Kerensky's intervention at this stage does not call for an account here of what he did as leader of the Social Revolutionary party which brought about the fall of the Russian monarchy. Suffice it to say that he is famous, especially in Russia, as the politician who "let in the Bolsheviks." For this reason, he is wholly discredited, not to say detested. It is not possible to believe that he will achieve what is said to be the purpose of his visit to Germany, but his arrival there naturally gives rise to speculation. *Why did the U.S.A. authorities give M. Kerensky facilities for proceeding to Germany?* If given official backing, his activities there may well prove a cause of discord, or, what is worse, give rise to grave suspicion among the Russian people as to the real intentions of the Western Powers. If

the present writer were entitled to give advice to Americans, he would urge that M. Kerensky be invited and helped to return quickly to the United States and to stay there quietly in his private place of residence.

It is perhaps not inappropriate to observe at this point that a canvass of opinion among the Russian exiles discloses a marked inclination to favour a restoration of the monarchy. Most of the exiles were born after the revolution, but they say that they know from their elders about the general prosperity which prevailed in Czarist times—as was in fact the case during the earlier years of this century, although propagandists would have us believe otherwise. The Russian Monarchist Organisation has a great number of adherents. It is unwilling to press the issue of monarchy at the present juncture, but it proclaims its assurance that "the people of Russia, having obtained the opportunity of freely expressing their desires, will show themselves in favour of that regime under which there reigned in Russia law and truth, faith and faithfulness." For the same reasons, The Grand Duke Vladimir, the young head of the Romanov dynasty, now refrains from advancing his own cause. It should be said, however, that His Imperial Highness is a strong believer in a land-owning peasantry and in true freedom for industrial workers. As stated in a previous note, there is no Russian party which stands for a restoration of large-scale landed estates. It is the Bolsheviks and other Marxists, and certainly not the monarchists, who are opposed to a free peasantry in a country which is predominantly agricultural.

Ukrainian Separatism.

Press reports from Germany indicate that M. Kerensky's reception by the Russians there has been far from cordial. But press correspondents in Germany are not necessarily familiar with Russian affairs. The same may be said of those who write the headlines and sub-headings, of English newspapers. For example, in connection with M. Kerensky's activities, a well-known press agency has reported an announcement by "Ukrainian resistance leaders" to the effect that "they will not co-operate with Russian anti-Communists," giving as its authority the words of a person of no political consequence who has, at the best, a negligible following. In one section of the press such a report concerning Ukrainians has appeared under the heading: "Will not work with Russians—Anti-Reds are split."

Such displays of ignorance are now so frequent as to be dangerously misleading.

The history of what is called the "Ukrainian anti-Russian separatist movement" is linked to the history of foreign interference in Russian affairs. *Ukrainians are Russians.* The Dukes of Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine, became Dukes of Moscow and eventually Emperors of All the Russias. In a somewhat similar way, with Alfred the Great and his son, Edward the Elder, the Saxon kings of Wessex became the kings of a united England or, as they were designated, the Kings of the English. It is as absurd to suggest that Ukrainians, otherwise the Little Russians, are a non-Russian people who fell under Russian rule as it would be to say that the people of the English counties of Devon or Somerset are not English, but under English domination, or that the people of New England, who are not Americans, are subjected to the U.S.A.

The Ukrainian question, in so far as there is one today,

has its roots in the unfortunate absence of physical features suitable as natural frontiers between Russia and other East-European countries and in the virtual impossibility of aligning those frontiers satisfactorily in conformity to racial divisions. There was, and is, a considerable population of Ukrainian stock in Galicia, and towards the end of the nineteenth century the Austro-Hungarian General Staff adopted a policy of fostering a Ukrainian separatist movement in Russia for their own ends and against Russia's. The Ukrainians who led this movement were almost all from Galicia, rather than from Russia. After the 1914-1918 war, Galicia became a part of Poland, and Germany became the patron of the movement, again for its own ends. The movement became more noticeable when it received German backing because by then Bolshevism had been established in Russia. Ukrainians generally who were domiciled in the United States and Canada gave it support to an extent which would have been quite unthinkable if the central authority in Russia had not been one of Bolshevist oppressors.

German backing of the Ukrainian movement proved unprofitable. When the German armies entered Russia, in 1941, they were welcomed as liberators by the Russian people from the Baltic to the Black Sea. When it was realised that they were would-be conquerors, they were similarly opposed.

The Russian people, notwithstanding their detestation of Soviet rule, are exceedingly patriotic. They can be relied upon to resent very bitterly any attempt by foreigners to dismember their own native land. This is not unknown to the Soviet rulers. The "Ukrainian movement," such as it is, is divided into numerous competing groups, of which some, like other separatist movements, are subsidised by the Bolsheviks M.V.D. If a foreign Power were now to support Ukrainian separatism, in the hope of embarrassing the Soviet regime, it would in fact be *playing straight into the hands of the Red dictators*. For every self-seeking adherent gained, hundreds of patriotic Russians might be turned into enemies.

As for the Ukrainians of Galicia, responsible Russians recognise that they are now a separate and distinct people after having been for many centuries under non-Russian influences. They are mostly Uniat Catholics; and, as matters now stand, their future is part of the future of Poland.

The Russian leaders desire the friendship of a free and independent Poland. On the other hand, the leaders of the Polish exiles and their numerous sympathisers now show signs of realising that the liberation of Poland cannot be achieved without the liberation of Russia. Indeed, the liberation of all Europe and of the whole world can be brought about only by uprooting Bolshevism from the soil whence it draws sustenance. This cannot be done without the Russian help which Russians are so eager to give. But it calls also for an intelligent appreciation of the truth and complete abandonment of "isms" and "ideologies," such as those associated with M. Kerensky's name, which, if not derived direct from Marxism itself, are certainly out of the same stable.

The U.S.A. State Department and the Free Russia Movement

Representatives in Europe of the U.S.A. State Department have often stated of late, without asking that their words be treated as confidential, that the organisation and

support of a Russian anti-Soviet movement is essential if the present dangers are to be overcome. They have also said that the diplomatic representatives of other countries are of like mind. It might be supposed, therefore, that the State Department is engaged in some activity to this end.

Outwardly, the State Department appears to be doing nothing itself but to have delegated the matter to a non-official body. This procedure can be readily understood in view of the full diplomatic relations subsisting between the Presidents of the U.S.A. and of the U.S.S.R.. The person who seems far more active in this respect than any other American is a Mr. Spencer Williams. He is said to have been at one time connected with an official Committee for Political Warfare, but he now causes it to be understood that he represents the Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the Soviet Union, which was brought into being at Munich by the International Rescue Committee, which is an organisation led by a David Martin, a member, or former member, of the Communist party of the U.S.A. It should be noted, however, that accredited State Department officials do not repudiate Spencer Williams if his name is mentioned to them as being one of themselves.

First Move.

During the summer of 1950, Spencer Williams convened meetings in Munich of Russian exiles, who were constituted into a committee for the purpose of organising a general congress of Russians to be held in the same place later in the year. This committee was making good progress when Spencer Williams announced that his support was withdrawn because the views of its members were too much "to the Right." In consequence, the general congress was abandoned.

The grounds for Spencer Williams' complaint could only be that the members of the committee were not Marxists of some variety. Among Russians there still survive a few persons who might be called reactionary because they are interested chiefly in the recovery of their former estates; but they are of no account as a political factor, and none was a member of the committee or present at its meetings. The political aims of the important organisations of Russian exiles are based upon peasant proprietorship—the ownership of land by its actual cultivators—and an industrial system providing for solidarity and harmony between employers and employed, in the manner of the old Christian guild system.

Second Move. *Marxism from U.S.A. frustrated by Russians.*

Spencer Williams' next move was to arrange two conferences at Füssen, near Munich, in January, 1951. One, which was called a conference of "scientific workers," was attended by 152 persons, of whom 45 were non-Russians brought from the U.S.A. or elsewhere. The other was attended by representatives of four groups of a more general character. In order that the outcome may be understood, some further reference to Russian exiles' associations is necessary.

A very large majority of the Russians now in exile is comprised of those who have left the Soviet Union since the outbreak of its war with Germany, in 1941; and a majority of these, in turn, consists of men who were soldiers in the Red army but succeeded in evading the repatriation provided for by the Yalta Agreement. The actual organisations of Russian exiles, however, were mostly founded much earlier by those who had previously escaped from the Soviet Union.

These organisations, generally speaking, are opposed before all else to the Soviet régime and to all forms of Marxism. At the same time, there are, in New York and Paris, a few small groups, of no real consequence, consisting of Social Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and other people having similar views who helped to pave the way for the Bolshevik revolution and afterwards found it desirable to leave Russia in great haste. The members of these groups are mostly elderly and wholly discredited people who are unrepresentative of any widely-held political opinion; and their small numbers, who could meet comfortably round a table, are to no small extent made up of people who certainly are not Russian by race or creed, even if they were ever technically of Russian or Soviet nationality. These little groups have been joined by Trotskyists and other such Marxists who say that they do not approve of all that Stalin has done. There are no grounds for supposing that there are no Soviet agents among them. It must also be borne in mind that Mensheviks, and others too, are Marxists who differed from the Bolsheviks only because they believed that Communism ought to be introduced by gradual, or Fabian, methods.

Spencer Williams saw to it that the representatives of these small minority groups should be in a position to dominate the proceedings at Füssen, which developed into efforts to persuade those present to accept a Marxist, but ostensibly anti-Stalin, policy. Indeed, Spencer Williams announced that, if there were no agreement to promote such a policy as the basis of a Free Russian Organisation, he would be able to procure for it very substantial support from the Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the Soviet Union. The members of one group, who had expressed dissent, were told by him that, if they relinquished their objections, he would procure for them personally, from the same source, liberal financial support, to be paid monthly. Nevertheless, the Russians present objected strongly to the Marxist arguments, those most recently from the Soviet Union being notably hostile, and the Füssen meetings therefore failed to achieve any result.

Another Move.

Spencer Williams's Marxist plans having been frustrated by Russians, including ex-soldiers of the Red Army, he declared that he would have to proceed independently of any exiles' organisation in selecting the leaders of the new movement; and, in spite of what really happened, State Department representatives now complain that Russians cannot be induced to agree among themselves.

Further developments show the persistence of Marxist influence. There has been for some time in the U.S.A. a group, comprised chiefly of journalists, called the Committee of the Friends of Free Russia. Significantly, its name has been changed to the Committee of Friends of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R. It now receives substantial support from a David Dubinsky, head of the very wealthy Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, who is notorious in well-informed American quarters for his manipulation of elections in Marxist interests. There is good reason to believe that it is at the instigation of this committee that Mr. Edward (?) Barrat, of the Psychological Warfare section of the State Department, and Mr. Charles Bohlen, attache to Dean Acheson for Russian Affairs, have agreed to the despatch to Europe of a mission to inquire into the political views of the Russians now outside the Soviet sphere. The personnel of this mission have been provided by the Institute of Sociology of Harvard University. The head is Professor Bauer, the other chief members being George

Fisher, a Trotskyist, and Frederick Wile, a Marxist, both of Harvard. 1,000 Russians are to be questioned, their selection being in the hands of these Marxists. Thus, it appears that the real purpose of the mission is to present a report showing that a substantial number of the Russian exiles are Marxists, or near-Marxist. That would be the exact opposite of the truth, as the general Russian detestation of Marxism, in any shape or form, is so great as to be almost indescribable. *Where this may lead.*

The State Department and those who seem to be its agents are following a very dangerous course. If there should be set up a bogus Free Russia organisation under crypto-Marxist leadership, its leaders might succeed in deluding for a time a number of young Russian exiles who are totally inexperienced politically but anxious to return to their homes. In that case, the plan, if it did not fail at the outset, might prove initially a partial success of a most undesirable sort. *It could not command the enthusiasm or sustained support of the Russian masses in the Soviet Union or of the men now serving in the Red Army.* Otherwise, the activities now in progress may end quite quickly by bringing into discredit the whole project of creating a Russian anti-Soviet front. But competent strategists and students of foreign affairs believe that there is but little hope of ending the Soviet menace without enlisting the support of the Russian people themselves. With a close examination of the military and economic factors, this becomes so clearly evident that it is probably for this very reason that Communists and their friends have thought it necessary to anticipate genuine moves by their own wrecking schemes.

The activities of the State Department of the U.S.A. are not a direct concern of the British people—who, even if this were not so, are unable to control them. In consequence, the developments described here can be met only by the resolute and intelligent action of His Majesty's Government, which ought to be urged with greater insistence than has been shown hitherto. There is no time to be lost. The proper moves must be made before the American Marxists' plans can be brought to fruition, not to mention those of the Soviet Government itself. The liberation of Russia is one of Great Britain's foremost needs. No one has so much as hinted at an alternative policy for dealing with Soviet aggression, actual or forthcoming, or for re-establishing Great Britain's economic and political equilibrium. Moreover, the liberation of Russia is a duty to all mankind.

ARTHUR ROGERS.

Grand Orient

FREEMASONRY UNMASKED

by MGR. GEORGE E. DILLON, D.D.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

5/-

On Planning The Earth

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

6/- (Postage extra).

PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from page 3.)

matter politically, I would ask hon. Members whether they are sure that the comprehensive school is desirable from the equalitarian point of view. . . . is there not a risk that the comprehensive school may not get headmasters really as keen and excited about "modern" education as the headmasters of modern schools are? I may be mistaken in this, but I assure the Committee that I am not being hypocritical. One of my objections, though not the major objection, to the comprehensive schools is that I think they may definitely be against the interests of the modern schools, and against their hope to be classed in the public mind along with the grammar schools. . . .

Hydro-Electric Schemes, North Wales

Mr. Vosper asked the Minister of Local Government and Planning if he has yet received a report from the National Parks Commission on the investigations of their Sub-committee into the proposed hydro-electric schemes in North Wales; and whether their report will be published.

Mr. Lindgren: My right hon. Friend has received a copy of the representations which the Commission have made to his right hon. Friend the Minister of Fuel and Power. No doubt the Commission will include these representations in their annual report.

So It Goes On

"When the military overrode the State Department opposition and achieved a deal with Spain, the general opinion here was that the State would swallow its disappointment and collaborate in making Spain a real military bastion of defence. Like many other general opinions, this one has now proved faulty, although the real news has not yet reached the public prints.

"Dean Acheson—who in 1946, together with the Red Dean of Canterbury, led a Communist-inspired rally against Franco Spain in Madison Square Gardens—is not so easily converted. We learn from unimpeachable sources that, on the morrow of Admiral Sherman's agreement with Franco, Acheson sent his aides to the Defence Department. Their 'line' ran, as follows:

"Yes, we must make Spain a bastion of our defence. But, military aid cannot prove successful without economic aid—to raise the standards of living of the people. That's our province. We propose that a State and E.C.A. mission go to Madrid to examine and supervise thoroughly all economic aid expended in Spain.

"This proposal, we hear, has aroused angry opposition—and apprehension—in the Pentagon. The Pentagon people fear that the State Department would utilize such a mission to create confusion, if not chaos, in Spain; by withholding funds from one faction and tendering them to a rival, thus playing one against another. State Department agents—still trying to overthrow Franco—would upset all the Defence Department's plans for a stable Spain, certainly a prime necessity for construction and operation of our bases there.

"It might be added that these Pentagon fears are seeping into committees on Capitol Hill which are examining requests for foreign aid. The reaction of Congressmen is, 'Let the generals and admirals supervise any money for Spain.'—(Frank C. Hanighen in *Not Merely Gossip*).

Abolition?

"Slavery is likely to be abolished by the war, the power of chattel slavery destroyed. This I and my European friends are in favour of. For slavery is but the owning of labour and carries with it the care of the labourer, while the modern European plan is capital control of labour by controlling wages; this can be done by controlling money. The great debt which capitalists will see to it is made out of the war must be used as a measure to control the volume of money. To accomplish this, bonds must be used as a banking basis. It will not do to allow the 'Greenback' as it is called, to circulate as money for any length of time. We cannot control them. But we can control the bonds, and through them the bank issue."—(From the *Hazard Circular*, issued in America, 1862).

The Idea Spreads

"The logic of the situation, it seems to us, was all wrong. One of the machines ought to have been called in to debate the logic of the social services and to save Sir Alexander a great deal of time and energy. Alternatively, both Sir Alexander and a machine might have simultaneously debated the problem, thus giving an additional sporting interest to one of the facets of *étatisme*.

"Not being a convinced cybernetician, we very much doubt the aptitude of these miracle machines. We suspect that it is true that *nihil est in machina quod non prius in machina*. In other words, one can only extract from the machine what one has previously fed into it. It is true that the machines seem to go through the equivalent of scratching their noses and frowning their brows, but this may only be a piece of showmanship put on to conceal the poverty of their ratiocination."—"A Scotsman's Log" in *The Scotsman*.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas; —

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(Reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	6/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England.....	8d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.