

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 26. No. 21.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 21, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

There is But One Freemasonry by "ANON"

"All the Lodges are bound in solidarity one with another and Masonry is one."

One frequently hears it said when referring to the subject of freemasonry in general, "Of course English freemasonry is free from the political and subversive side which infects Grand Orient and Continental freemasonry; it is religious, charitable and non-political."

Many promoters of this false doctrine are often quite innocent about the fallacy they are propounding. They are just as useful in their propaganda postulating the innocence of the English brand of freemasonry as the "knowers," *i.e.*, the wire pullers within the citadel.

Apropos of this inner circle of "knowers," let me quote a foreign writer on the subject. His reference has never been contradicted as far as we know. He says in the *Tuif Talmudiste*, "In London there are two Jewish Lodges, 'B'nai Brith' and 'B'nai Achai,' which hold all the strings of the revolutionary elements in the Christian Lodges, *i.e.*, the English Lodges. Juda forms the head of the Lodge; and the Christian Lodges are nothing but marionettes mobilised for Juda without their knowledge." (See also the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, with regard to the use to be made of freemasonry).

Before giving you certain facts with regard to the internationalism of freemasonry as shewn by its own advocates, let me give you the text of an illuminating letter (quoted in Ludendorff's *Vernichtung die Freimaurer-ei durch enthüllung ihrer Geheimnissen*).

This letter is to be seen in a certain library, and has been read by the author. It is of course not the original, but its tone convinces any impartial reader that it is genuine, as it would be almost impossible for any "profane" person to invent its contents.

It is "The letter of a freemason to a member of the Royal Family published in 1881," signed by Bradlaugh and Annie Besant, the one an atheist and a freemason, and the other an occultist and a co-mason. The letter is addressed to H.R.H. Albert Edward Prince of Wales. It says. . . . "I write to you not as an English Prince, but as a brother Master Mason. My sponsor was Simon Bernard, yours I hear, was the King of Sweden.

"I write to you as a fellow Master Mason, as to one on an equality to myself, so long as you are true to your masonic pledge, less than myself whenever you forget it. As a freemason you are bound to encourage freethought. *Freemasonry is freethought* [what about the Christian postulator? *note by copier*] are you a freethinker? freemasonry is democracy, are you a democrat? You are now a freemason, excommunicated by the Pope. Come with me to-day, and I

will shew you *even in this country*, lodges where brethren work day and night to break through conventional fetters, where they toil hourly to break down imperial and princely shams, where as a prince they would scorn you. Go to Joseph Mazzini [our "refugee" guest for so long: *note by copier*] and he will tell you of lodges where for fifty years Poles and Italians have kept the sparks of liberty alive. . . . Read Brother Cremieux's (founder of Alliance Israelite Universelle. *Copier's Note*) recent declaration. . . .

"In England at this moment we freemasons are very near forgetting the use of a Queen. Get Odo Russell to ask Mastai Ferrati to tell you that in the lodges are the enemies of the falling churches, and the most earnest inculcators of republican earnestness. . . . Masons will tell you how their teachings helped to pulverize crowns.

"You have joined yourself to the Freemasons at the right moment, for true freemasonry is about to be more powerful than Royalty." Yet Freemasonry is not political, but only charitable and religious! How many crowns have fallen owing to the subterranean activities noted so cynically by the writer of this astonishing letter? Bradlaugh goes on:—

"Brother before you die, you will hear cries for a republic in England unless you make yourself worth your money to the nation. . . . disband your standing armies and there will be a lease of power for you! My knowledge of the mystic branch [occult, *i.e.*, the agency which was at the back of the anti-Imperial Freemasonic conspiracy in Russia's revolution in 1917. *Copier's note*] has been gained among republicans of all nations." [The Toledo and Arles Protocols of 1489 and 1583, shew how this was deliberately planned by the Jews to gain influence in the counsels of the nations.]

"Instead of going with some noble German glutton," continues this polite and respectful freemason to his future Sovereign, "to a paltry casino, read Europe's history for 40 years before '93, and then, Sweden's and Germany's Master Masons, speaking from their graves, shall tell you how their teachings helped to pulverize crowns and coronets."

Then follows this sinister paragraph in view of the Spanish civil war ended in 1939:—"Freemasonry has in Iberia (Spain) a grand mission, (1936) an arduous task. In Italy where our Brother Garibaldi is the Grand Master [1881] today they dream of a Government without a Monarch" [fulfilled 1949]. This frank freemason then proceeds with these brazen but enlightening confidences to his future Sovereign:—

"In Europe the republic of united Germany is not so far away, but that the Grandchildren of living Prussian and Austrian subjects may read with wonderment the value that foolish Englishmen put upon petty German princes." All this he knew because he was a freemason and his revelations are confirmed by other freemasons of various nationalities, but generally of the Jewish persuasion; thus Disraeli, "The

world is governed by very different persons from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes."

Melchett, a Jew, said in 1928, "If I had told you in 1913 that the Austrian Arch Duke would be killed, and that out of all that followed . . . the establishment of a national home for the Jews, *etc.* . . ." Where did he get this knowledge from? Now comes a reference to part of a ridiculous and degrading ceremony of initiation of a freemason:—

"Mere badge wearers who lift their legs awkwardly over the coffin in which the truth lies buried, never know the Grand secret, or work for its discovery" *etc.*, *i.e.* the outer ring of 'green' freemasons. . . ."

With regard to Bradlaugh's reference to the "Mystic" part of freemasonic knowledge it is interesting to remember the following by an occult author. "All secret societies, religious or militant, which have appeared in the West, Templars, Rosicrucians, Martinists, or FREEMASONS, are connected with the Kabbalah, and teach its theories."

Stephen Morin, a Jew, is reputed to have established the political Masonic Scottish Rite (33rd).

Now you may say. . . . "All very well, but this is all theory and there is no evidence that it has been put into practice; how could it be anyway?" When you have read the following quotation you cannot any more plead thus:—

"No Plutocratic Peace but a democratic victory," published by the Monetary Education Bureau in U.S.A. in 1919, contains a letter from Ernest Sneyd saying:— "In winter of 1872-73, I went to America, authorised to secure if I could, the passage of a Bill demonetising silver,* as it was to the interest of those I represented, the governors of the Bank of England to have it done. I took with me 100,000 pounds sterling with instructions that if that was not sufficient to accomplish the object, to draw another £100,000, or as much as was necessary. I saw the committees of the House and Senate, and paid the money, and stayed in America until I knew the measure was safe. Your people will not know the far reaching extent of that measure, but they will in after years."

In the same publication is a letter from James Buell, official representative of the bankers' association. It says, "It is advisable that you do all in your power to sustain such prominent and weekly newspapers as will oppose the issuing of paper money, and that you will also withhold patronage of favours from all applicants who are not willing to oppose the Government issue of money. Let the Government issue the coin, and the banks issue the paper money, for then we can better protect each other.† To repeal the law creating National bank notes, or to restore to circulation the government issue of money, will be to provide the people with money, and will therefore seriously affect your individual interest as a banker and lender. See your Congressman, and engage him to support our interests, that we may control legislation."

Then there is Horace Greely who says, "We are careful to conceal the ugly fact that by our iniquitous monetary system we have nationalised a system of oppression more refined but none the less cruel than the old system of chattel slavery."

Now if it is possible to buy a Government's assent to so iniquitous a proposition as is here revealed, it is surely easy

for those who are willing to subordinate means to ends in so criminal a manner, to implement by like methods the political ends proposed (and compassed since 1881 as we know by historical facts within our knowledge) and proclaimed in the letter of Bradlaugh to H.R.H. The Prince of Wales, (later King Edward VII). Think this over, you who are "innocent" freemasons, and who repeat the tag handed out to you "Freemasonry is charitable and non-political," for the benefit of those who are smelling a rat.

In the B'nai Brith 1st Lodge of England (all-Jewish Masonry) in 1929, the following resolution was adopted. . . . "That the council of the Lodge should investigate the present restrictions which debar the children of naturalised British subjects from entering the Civil Service, and should report to the Lodge the steps that it (The Council) proposed to take in the matter." This impertinent interference with the laws of England is by an alien body accepting our hospitality in order to abuse it, it is evidence enough of the interference politically of lodges alien or other in England.

Ponder the following items you proclaimers of the isolation of English Masonry, 1929. "Mr. Dowson was also a member of the Anglo Argentine Lodge London"

Tchechoslovakia's two obediences, The National Grand Lodge and Grand Lodge "Lesuing zu den drei Ringen," are recognised by the Grand Lodge of England, and the Grand Orient of France, also the Grand Lodge of France among others. (*Revue Internationale des Sociétés Secrètes*, November 1st, 1938).

"The Grand Lodge of Bolivia became recognised by the Grand Lodge of England in September 1934." *Fascist*, May 1935.

1936. "The Lodge Italia met for the installation of the Ven Cerruti. The ceremony took place in the presence of Bros. Lord Cornwallis, Grand Master Provincial of Kent, Turime and Hessenberg of the Deutschland Lodge, Colberg of the American Lodge, and Mazzini. Lord Cornwallis hoped that the masonic principles would again reign in Italy. Brother Nicholls declared that the day which would see the whole world become Masonic, the League of Nations would become a superfluity. Now we know from the horse's mouth what we have always postulated, that the League of Nations was a Freemasonic institution.

1932. "An Irish Lodge is formed in England (at Farnborough) a deputation of English Grand Lodge officers attended, and Grand Lodge of Scotland also sent a deputation." "There are already five lodges under the Grand Lodge of England in Palestine, one in Constantinople and one in Greece."

Small wonder there is unrest in Palestine, where no doubt terrorists and Jews use them for their subversive propaganda.

The Stuarts' Restoration was largely engineered through the Masonic Lodges, used by the Jews to foster it. Though at the time the Lodges were Guild Lodges of Masons, real workers, the Jewish interests concerned with restoring Charles II. used them as camouflage for their meetings (See reference to Joseph Morin).

"Masonry in India" introduced by Alexander Burns, a nephew of the poet, and a Scottish Mason. (*Unrest in India*).

Membership in masonry is often a necessary preliminary to obtain membership of eccentric bodies, such as for instance Rosicruciana in Anglia, Antient Masonry, *etc.* Masonry pro-

*Not only political writers generally but the *Protocols* are misleading concerning the technique of finance.—Editor, *T.S.C.*

† See previous footnote.—Editor, *T.S.C.*

vides the trying-out ground for these exotic bodies, which are perhaps more dangerous in their activities than masonry itself.

The following quotation from *World Revolution of the Red Prophets*, by Herman dem Deutschen, Berlin, 1923, is interesting evidence of the Oneness of Freemasonry, denials of interlocking on the part of English Freemasonry notwithstanding,

Page 33 of the above pamphlet refers to Press notice of Vorwarts, (No. 107, March 4, 1927) saying . . . "The English Grand Lodge has said that individual lodges are free to allow ex-enemy nationals to become members of their Lodge." Further on the page 33 it states that Prince Max of Baden, (who seems to have played the same rôle in pre-war Germany as the Duc D'Orléans did in the French Revolution in 1789) is reputed to have been a member of an English Lodge, and Bethmann Hollweg to have been a member of an Italian Lodge."

It is quite possible for "outer ring" masons to believe quite genuinely what they are told about the non-political or other attributes of English Freemasonry. They would not know that they are of the outer ring, and that they are as useful in that position as some of the inner circle, who decide where they shall stay. As these "innocents" spread the glad tidings of non-political and pro-religious basis of English Freemasonry their unconscious function is to disarm would-be members who might object that freemasonry is universal and therefore supremely political and anti-religious, instancing the French Revolution as having been brought about by their agents, and whose slogan was "Egalité, Liberté, Fraternité"! As the rôle played by Freemasonry in that upheaval comes to be generally known, fear animates those who would hide its origin, and we get the silly tag "English freemasonry has nothing to do with Continental or Grand Orient freemasonry."

But we also get the following refutation of that fallacious postulate. Thus, "Pilger Lodge, No. 236, the senior of the two German speaking Lodges under the Grand Lodge of England, celebrated its 150th anniversary on Thursday [1929]. Among those present it mentions the late Lord Ampthill, and representatives of all other Anglo-Foreign Lodges in London"! *The Daily Telegraph*, December 4, 1929.

"The Board of General Purposes of the United Grand Lodge of English Freemasonry" has drawn up a statement of the basic principles on which it could be invited to recognise any Grand Lodge applying for recognition by the English jurisdiction.

As a result of the enquiries undertaken by the President of the Board (Sir Alfred Robbins) during his mission to South America [in 1927?], undertaken at the direction of the Grand Master, and of the negotiations which succeeded it, there has been a renewal of the mutual representative relationships between the United Grand Lodge of England and the Grand Orient of Brazil for the first time for many years.

"Further the Grand Orient of Uruguay has now formally ratified the suggested agreement signed at Montevideo in April, 1927." *The Daily Telegraph*, August 30, 1929.

"The Grand Lodge of Bolivia became recognised by the Grand Lodge of England in September, 1934." *Fascist*, May, 1935.

"Freemasonry though divided into national associations,

in virtue of the identity of their principles and their ultimate goal, are bound together in solidarity over the whole surface of the globe." From the official "Constitution" of the (ex) Grand Orient of Italy for the year 1889 (quoted in *World Service*, December 15, 1937.)

"At the Grand Orient of France (December 22, 1936) a member of the Lodge Locarno said that . . . 'From the point of view of the exterior we go hand-in-hand with our brothers of the Scottish Rite of Great Britain and Ireland. We have obtained from them that they will undertake common action with us against international fascism which enables us to come to the help of our freemasonic brethren in Spain in a very discreet, but very efficacious manner.'" (*Gringoire*, December 25, 1936—Compare Bradlaugh's reference to the future of Iberia).

The Bro. Groussier had asked if "One could not approach the Grand Lodge of England which seemed to be aware of the international possibilities of Freemasonry." *Revue Internationale des Société Secrètes*, December 1, 1936, quoting *A M I Bulletin* No. 46, July-September, 1933, page 331.

These quotations shew quite definitely that the "separateness" of English freemasonry is nothing but a fiction, put about for the benefit of "innocent" freemasons.

After reading the above quotations if anyone still protests that English freemasonry has nothing to do with any other freemasonry, then that person is either *non compos*, or wilfully deceives others.

If not actually by the front door (as seems indicated by *The Daily Telegraph* report of August 30, 1929) then by the back door, as indicated by the *Discreet* quotation by Gringoire of December 25, 1936.

Disraeli and Rathenau, Bradlaugh, Wronski, and probably many others have given away the rôle of secret societies, and the part they played internationally in revolutions, unrest and strikes, etc. Let us follow Continental governments at least in this, and ban all secret societies in this our "dear, dear Land!"

Freemasonry was banned in Italy 1925, Czecho-Slovakia 1938, Poland 1938, Germany 1933, Portugal 1935, Hungary 1919, Turkey 1937, Roumania 1937, Brazil 1937. Russia banned freemasonry in 1822, but it went underground and of course under the present bloody regime it has resumed its sway. Spain since 1939 has probably banned freemasonry. Ten countries in all.

From *The Freemason* January, 13, 1935: "It is stated that there is reason to believe that German masonry remains a considerable political force, as it was before the war." [Now revived]. Compare with regard to the admission the item in previous column re Pilger Lodge and on page 2 re Italia Lodge and the late Lord Ampthill's statement on October 26, 1934, with regard to the renaissance of masonry in Italy. Said the late pro Grand Master of Grand Lodge of England: "England has become the sanctuary for those who will some day revive the Freemasonry which has been so nearly exterminated in some parts of the Continent of Europe and is so gravely threatened in others. The members of Pilger Lodge and Deutschland Lodge are keeping alive the flame of the torch which will some day revive the light of Freemasonry in Germany."

(continued on page 6).

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. 21.

Saturday, July 21, 1951.

From Week to Week

Eidos, a quarterly art journal which has been noticed in these pages, has ceased publication after three (not quite) -quarterly issues and internal evidence of fierce dissension. With Bernard Ashmole, Sir Leigh Ashton and John Rothenstein under W.P. Gibson on its editorial advisory committee, and magnificently produced, it could hardly be classed as small beer. Art must be important (as the distinctively human activity besides the religious it is the only thing that is important, once subsistence is assured, even a bare subsistence). Certainly it receives major attention from the enemy; but does not know its enemy. Like politics, art should be something which can be taken for granted and neither argued nor fought about. But these things are not yet. The enemy of *Eidos* (the idea, the form of thought) is, our readers may have guessed, the Big Idea. We trust that this much community of perception may bring comfort to some defeated person who is unknown to us.

Is it not queer how easily some people understand the PHI-ratio and not the A + B Theorem? But do they?

If there weren't a split in the 'Conservative' Party, the Beaverbrook newspapers would probably soon manufacture one. And what of this one in particular? We don't think Lord Salisbury is a winner. Nor has *The Daily Telegraph* a small fraction of the moral force of *The Morning Post* which it swallowed up in times gone by. If everyone but the Labour Party is playing to lose the electoral stakes, the outcome is assured. It may yet come to "keep them in and give them Hell!" But we do wish the hell were a little more like what it was painted before the abolition of H.S.M. the Devil.

In Italy, doubtless, Fascist is synonymous with Black-shirt; but, if we draw the right inferences from a *Scotsman* article concerning the post-mortem examination held by the Communists on the Italian elections, a larger territory than Italy is envisaged by those who said and repeated that 'at present' Fascism does not represent a danger (to the Communists). One might ask, Does anything? Black instead of red Fascism is not the thing which so inflames the passions of (among others) a Churchill, and black and red Fascism may well come together without our being much the wiser concerning the identity of the real force of opposition to either. At one time anti-fascist-communist leanings were merely boost for ballot-box democracy. Everyone is looking for a swirl or

eddy in the current of entropy for encouragement in our darkness. In the nature of things, that cannot avail.

The week's straws in the wind include (1) a certain intensification (if a chance reaction here and there can be accorded significant intensity) in the baiting of Mr. Charles Morgan for his recent outburst against 'switch-control' and (2) a lapse by a writer to *Human Events* into 'Newspeak,' the language described by the late George Orwell in his fantasy, "1984." Is it seven years since "1984"? The book is just beginning to be spoken of in quarters more exclusively devoted to the Third Programme. There used to a legend about every cell in the body's being renewed every seven years. Perhaps 'they've had it'? George Morgenstern's "1985" deals with South Pacific—"Australia, New Zealand, that Outfit. One of these mutual defense things. Somebody attacks us, New Zealand saves us. Somebody attacks New Zealand, we save her. Collective security." Police action. Casualties in Newspeak become CAZ. But we can't make out "sneal oreview." Perhaps it has something to do with television. Or perhaps it's a misprint. Does it matter. There is too much printed.

Identity Cards

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*,

Dear Sir,

At the present time, I think there is only one way to attack the Ration Book, Identity Card and Census Form issue, *i.e.*, to bracket them together, and hold them up to public detestation, as did the four officers of the British Housewives' League. It was a wet day. One Member of the House has since said, "Magna Carta was signed in the rain."

We are not so foolish as to imagine we have done any more than brighten the climate of public opinion. These things are *at present* in the realm of allegory, if I may be permitted to allude to the admirable article in your last week's issue. But we are appealing to the *spirit* of Magna Carta.

The Liberal Party have isolated the identity card, the least important of the "three bars to the prison" and have allowed the issue to be lost in the sands of Orders in Council. They are simply hoping to get another plank for their Party Platform.

Lord Reading, I understand, is also championing a demand for the abolition of Identity Cards, although he knows very well that they are so bound up with the Health Service, as to be issued by the Minister of Health. But we are learning that we must attack men, not institutions.

Need any more be said?

Yours sincerely,

B. M. PALMER,
 Editor, *Housewives Today*.

July 9, 1951.

Grand Orient
FREEMASONRY UNMASKED
 by MGR. GEORGE E. DILLON, D.D.
 From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD. 5/-

Politics at Oxford

We have pleasure in reproducing from THE ISIS of May 30, 1951, the following article by Mr. John Stewart, which is said to exemplify "the saner undergraduate reaction to contemporary politics."

THE POLITICAL CLUBS—CHANGE OR DIE?

In the strange, frustrated world of Oxford politics crisis-time has arrived. For the past few years the clubs have prospered and lived well. Crowded meetings and large memberships have combined to give the Oxford political clubs a pleasing sense of their own importance. Now, that time has passed. A cabinet minister may count himself lucky if he attracts an audience of fifty. A membership above a thousand has become a wild dream of the past, and most of the clubs are engaged in a pitiful struggle to maintain financial solvency.

To the casual onlooker it may seem that nothing is changed. The boards outside the J.C.R. are still covered with notices of political meetings. College secretaries still bang persistently on one's door. But the clubs themselves are beginning to realise that a crisis is upon them. Falling membership, empty meetings, bank overdrafts and bankrupt magazines are symptoms that cannot be ignored. The clubs have turned to the conventional solutions. Social activities have been increased. 'Bigger names' have been obtained. 'Interesting' speakers have been asked down. And yet the membership continues to fall.

It is only beginning to dawn on the political clubs that Oxford is no longer interested in their type of politics. Oxford politics is centred on current political controversy. This is inevitable so long as the clubs regard their main function as the holding of meetings for their party leaders. Oxford politics is content to reflect the party controversies of the national scene. In the same way the apathy in Oxford is merely a reflection of the wider apathy in the country. As Oxford is tired of the politics served up by its clubs, so is the country tired of the politics served up by its parties.

The apathy is due to the political bankruptcy of our parties. Political controversy has a vital function. It should focus attention on the vital issues and stimulate opinion upon them. The issues upon which the parties battle today are trivial. Nothing is more painful or more ridiculous than to see party leaders trying to divide where there is no division. At the same time, real divisions are ignored and vital issues are ignored or discussed hesitantly within the parties. Even the Bevan episode has failed to stir up full public controversy on the issues involved. The country has drifted into policies of rearmament without discussion, while the parties have spent three years in full battle over iron and steel.

An effective party system leads naturally to the discussion of vital issues. In that lies the main justification and the main duty of the political party. But gradually, as the inertia of office has crept over the Labour Party, the field of political controversy has been narrowed. Unconsciously assumptions have been made and asserted by politicians of all parties. These assumptions control and limit political activity. They are easy to detect. They occur in almost every political speech as it gradually worms its way over the same old ground to the same old conclusions.

First come the assumptions based on self-satisfaction with our democracy. They indicate a belief that democracy is an institution represented by the ballot-box, rather than a way

of life to be aimed at, if never achieved. To the politician making his hack speech, it never seems to occur that something more might be done to bring the Government closer to the people.

Then we have the assumptions of politicians that their political ideals are easily obtainable within the present administrative machine. Yet nothing has been more striking in the last five years than the way the ideals of the Labour Party have been down in the routine of administrative detail.

Politicians have gradually come to believe that most basic industrial problems are problems of organisation. The problems of human relations have become unimportant.

Again, there are the continually recurring assumptions about supreme aims. The supreme aim until recently was full employment; now one suspects it is rearmament. But are there such things as supreme aims in politics? Are there not rather a complex of aims? Unless this is so, the whole pattern of political values becomes distorted by the desire to achieve the supreme aims.

These and many other assumptions run through every politician's speech, of whatever party he may belong to. It is right that members of each party should have assumptions in common. What is dangerous for the health of our political life is the number of assumptions common to all the main parties. The area of controversy has been narrowed, vital issues are assumed out of existence and attention concentrated on petty ones. This is the situation in the country to-day and this is the situation the Oxford political clubs are content passively to accept.

But if the clubs are to survive, they must abandon this passive acceptance. They must challenge these assumptions. They must discuss the real issue. To do this they must alter their way of life. Discussion must take the place of the hack politician. Let them encourage speakers from within the club, industrialists and trade unionists from outside. Let them above all eschew the petty controversies of present-day politics. Only by radical reorganisation can the clubs hope to survive.

JOHN STEWART.

Fred Anderson, M.L.A.

We regret to record the death at the age of 73 of Fred Anderson, who was, from 1935 to 1947, a member of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Alberta. Born near Madras, India, he was educated at Haileybury College and returned to India after serving three years in the Bank of England, an experience described as 'a passing show.' He then went to Burma and to the interior of Siam, where he was engaged in logging operations in the teakwood trade; but contracting malaria, like many Britishers, he returned home, emigrated to Canada and spent the rest of his life there excepting for the period of the 1914-18 war, for which he enlisted in the 28 Battalion of Saskatchewan, being discharged with the rank of Major.. Politics, as ordinarily understood, disgusted him, but he was a loyal adherent of Social Credit and for a time liaison officer of the Alberta Government.

Correction

"Precluding" in the first line of George Meredith's verse, quoted on page 1, *T.S.C.*, July 7, should, of course, have been "preluding."

(Continued from page 3).

The members of the Italia Lodge are preserving a tradition which may be some day joyously revived by their fellow countrymen in Italy." (Quoted in *Free Press*, October, 1936). If English Masonry is non-political why does the Grand Lodge officially welcome the exiles?

Qui conduit l'Europe à la guerre? page 9, published in 1936, *Les Documents Nouveaux*:—

"Freemasonry meets in groups under the name of Lodges. When these work the first three degrees they take that name. The 18th degree (Rose Croix) are called Chapters."

Co-masonry is of the 18th degree. Annie Besant was 18th and 33rd, i.e. a co-Mason, and a Scottish Rite member.

Metropolitan Chapter 1597 has the six pointed star on its paper.

Albert Hess, P.Z. Ezra signed the Convocation of this Chapter in 1918. Hess is not an English name, and this convocation took place before the end of the war!

The Earl of Donoughmore 33rd i.e. Scottish Rite, was Most puissant Sovereign Grand Commander of the Connaught Chapter. A summons dated April 2, 1916, to attend an emergency meeting of the above Chapter is signed by C. C. Adams 30th degree.

"Societas Rosicruciana in Anglia." Wynn Westcott, M.B. P.M. 2076; P.Z. 329; P.G.D.

"Candidates for admission [to the above Order] must be Master Masons holding the certificate of a recognised Grand Lodge. There are Colleges in London, York, Newcastle, Berlin, Melbourne and British India."

"The aim of the Society . . . to facilitate the system of philosophy founded upon the Kabbalah and the doctrines of Hermes Trismegistus, which was inculcated by the original Fratres Rosæ Crucis of Germany A.D. 1450."

The Grand Orient of Italy's Grand Master was Garibaldi. See in connection with this Bradlaugh's admission re revolutionary activities of the Lodges in England and his reference to Garibaldi. Garibaldi whom Liberals and others to this day speak of with bated breath as the great liberator!

The Grand Lodge of Russia was established and Yelagu was appointed its Grand Master by the Grand Lodge of England in 1772.

Dr. Werdt, a Freemason, says:

"Every grade is composed of Knowers and Non-Knowers. The latter are useful links in the big chain of our holy Order. The knowers are few, those who know the secrets of the Orders, not the degree not the Lodge official.

"The visible head is not always the real head of the Order. If one wishes to classify broadly freemasons there are only two sections, The knowers and the non-knowers." Quoted from Ludendorff's *Krieghetze und Volkermorden*, page 53.

On Planning The Earth

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

6/- (Postage extra).

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: 2 July, 1951.

New Clause—(Settlement for Benefit of Children)

. . . Mr. I. J. Pitman (Bath): I beg to move, "That the Clause be read a Second time."

. . . The purpose of this Clause is virtually to repeal the mischief of a Clause in the 1936 Finance Bill. Under the law which has existed since 1936, the Financial Secretary can properly provide for his dependent grandmother. He can maintain her and, if he likes, arrange for her instruction in sucking eggs, or anything else she likes. Anyhow, he is not limited and he can provide for both her maintenance and her education.

But if he wishes to make a settlement in favour of his son to send him to Winchester, he is not in the same position as he is with regard to his grandmother. He will have to add back the income spent on the education and maintenance of his son and declare it and pay tax on it as part of his own income. It is true that one can do the same thing under the existing law if one does it for a nephew. If provision is made for the education and maintenance of a nephew through a settlement of this kind, then neither the father of the nephew nor oneself need regard that income as their own income. It is treated as the income of the child.

Therefore, it is only the parent who is penalised, and it seems to me that this House would always wish the sense of responsibility of parents for their children to be developed to the maximum extent. One of the unfortunate effects of the present law is that it tends to have parents seeking to detach from themselves and to attach to grandparents or uncles the financial responsibility for at any rate educating and possibly maintaining, their children, because it costs a grandparent or uncle or aunt so much less to do it for a nephew or grandchild than it costs a father to do it for his son or daughter. I am sure the House will feel that is essentially wrong.

The real trouble, however, is that in 1936 it was possible to do this in respect not only of education but also of food and clothes—the normal necessities of life. The purpose of this Clause is to put back only the education, not food and clothes. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the late Neville Chamberlain, introduced the 1936 Finance Bill, he made it quite clear that the educational side was thoroughly praiseworthy. These are his words:

"I rather went out of my way to say that, although quite recently they were developing into a new form in which tax avoidance was the principal object, there were many, many cases that I knew in which they had been entered into, not from that motive at all, but from different motives which in themselves were perfectly proper and even praiseworthy."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 20th May, 1936; Vol. 312, c. 1257-1258.]

May I say that, particularly because of the effect of subsection (2) of this new Clause which confines the purpose of the settlement entirely to education and does not cover in the slightest the loaf of bread or the piece of clothing, this Clause is wholly praiseworthy. It will mean, of course, that boarding schools will have to supply accounts to the parents separating fees and text books from maintenance, but I understand that presents no difficulty. . . .

. . . This will also inevitably help the independent schools which, I think we would claim, have been the great

pioneers of education and of the very greatest service to the State and to the community. The great advantage which they enjoy is the supreme flexibility which enables them to try out and to develop new lines of educational thought. As I have said, I was asked by the Minister of Education to be a governor at just such a school. Having sat at its meetings, I know of the difficulties which those schools at present face and how greatly they would be relieved by such an arrangement as is made possible by the Clause.

Finally, I come to my constituency interest. We have in Bath the Admiralty, with its civil servants and its serving officers, who are very mobile. For a high-ranking, mobile civil servant or naval officer, a boarding school is an essential necessity if he is to carry out his duties and see that his children are properly cared for. The local authorities in Bath and elsewhere in Somerset—the same applies, in Plymouth and Devonport, under the Devon County Council—are inundated by applications for assistance under the Butler Act; but they just cannot carry it out, because they have to carry on local rates what is in effect a national problem. If only these men were allowed to obtain reduction of the total of the income on which they pay tax by the amount which they spend on the education of their children, this would go a very long way to solving what is a very peculiar and local difficulty.

Mr. Hollis (Devizes): . . . My hon. Friend referred to the Royal Commission on Population. As hon. Members know, the general conclusion of that Commission was that the total population of the country was not very far—not as far as some people thought—below the reproduction rate; but on the other hand there was a serious deficiency in the birth rate of children of the best educated people. As also a considerable volume of biological evidence was put before the Commission to show that by and large ability was hereditary, there was at any rate the distinct possibility that, since the population in general was remaining roughly stable and the best educated and most intelligent people were having the fewest children, therefore the general level of intelligence of the population must be falling. I remember that I put that point when we debated a similar Clause last year and the Financial Secretary made what seemed to me somewhat comic answer. He said: "We on this side of the House do not accept that argument for an instant."

It is not a question whether the Financial Secretary or hon. Members opposite admit it. It is a question of whether it is a biological truth or whether it is not, and not whether it is or is not voted for. I am reminded a little of Harriet Martineau. People came with great excitement one day to Thomas Carlyle and said, "Harriet Martineau has accepted the universe." Carlyle said, "By gad, she'd better." It is the laws of the universe with which we are at the moment concerned rather than the laws which the House sees fit to pass, and the Financial Secretary had better accept them—by gad he'd better. There is a serious reason to think that unless some drastic policy is pursued in order to induce the best educated people to have a large number of children, there will be a decline in the average level of the intelligence of the population.

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Douglas Jay): Although I have no more prejudice against the fathers of children than the hon. Members who have just spoken I do not think it will surprise the hon. Member for Bath

(Mr. Pitman) if I tell him that we see overwhelming objections to this new Clause.

. . . In the first place, even if our objective was to assist Income Taxpayers to finance the education of their children at independent schools, this would seem a rather peculiar way of doing it. The Clause would give such a relief in the case of those taxpayers who had resorted to a particular legal device, but not to other taxpayers who might have an equal number of children at the same schools. Surely, if we did wish to give help of that kind, it would at least be better to do it by giving an allowance for any expenditure on education rather than for expenditure through this particular device.

Secondly, even that, I think, would be open to the serious taxation objection that allowances under the Income Tax have always been granted in virtue of the existence of a dependent, or child as such, and not in virtue of some particular form of expenditure in which the taxpayer chooses or does not choose to indulge in connection with a dependent or child.

Thus, when we examine this proposal we are forced to the conclusion that it is better to give such a relief, if we wish to give it, by a larger children's allowance under the Income Tax than by an allowance confined to expenditure of education. But I think we are still bound to ask whether, supposing one has £10 million to spare—and this new Clause would cost about £10 million—it is really desirable, if it is to be spent on education, to spend that £10 million on tax relief for those who are educating their children at private fee-paying schools, or whether it should not be spent on some section or other of the general education system of the country.

It could be argued that such a sum would be better spent on raising school teachers' salaries, or in building more schools, or in giving a larger subsidy for school meals, the price of which we have recently had to raise largely as a measure of economy. My view is that we could not give first priority to tax relief to the Surtax and Income Tax paying class, and if we put the arguments together there is an overwhelming objection to this proposed new Clause.

Viscount Hinchingbrooke (Dorset, South): I confess to some interest in this Clause, having six children who are at present dependent upon me. I think the arguments adduced by the Financial Secretary are quite fantastic. He rejected the Clause on three grounds; on the ground of tax avoidance, on the ground that it was a particular legal device and on the ground of cost.

What if it is a piece of tax avoidance? I cannot see why parents in these days of high taxation should not be entitled to take advantage of tax avoidance rules and legislation, provided Parliament has passed it, and that is what we are trying to get done by this new Clause. The fact that Mr. Neville Chamberlain turned this down in 1936 has no relevance to the situation at present. Taxation was then very much less than it is now, and the people for whom this Clause is designed to operate are now in a position of being right up against it in connection with all their sources of income.

University professors, professional classes with incomes ranging from £1,000 to £3,000 or £4,000 are finding their circumstances today such that they simply cannot afford to maintain any kind of standard for themselves or their families as they could in the olden days, and the cost of their children's

education is prohibitive. Many families are finding it necessary to avoid sending their children to the school where they themselves received their education; or if they are able to send them to the same school, they are having to do it by the expenditure of their savings, a situation that has never been known before. . . .

Mr. Joynson-Hicks (Chichester): . . . I, in concert with my hon. Friends, declare a triple interest in this. The first interest I declare is that of a taxpayer, which nobody else has declared, because I believe that it is to the taxpayer's interest that this new Clause should be passed, and I shall show the hon. Gentleman presently why that is so. Secondly, I am also interested as a parent. Thirdly, I am interested as a governor of schools. We know full well in those private schools the immense difficulties which parents are having at the present time to be able to afford to send, and continue to send, their children to those schools. In fact, I have started to try to work out what it would cost a parent with three children—and even in these days that does not seem to me to be an excessive number—for whom he is entirely responsible, for the payment of their maintenance and education out of his earned income. I reckon that in order to keep and maintain three children simultaneously at school at the present time he would have to earn a sum of approximately £6,000 to £6,500 a year. That shows that it is clearly quite impossible, and that at the present time education in private or independent schools is being financed out of savings—a situation which cannot continue.

It will mean that one by one, and then ten by ten, score by score and hundred by hundred these private schools will drop out, and then the whole responsibility for the education which has hitherto been carried on by the private and independent schools will be thrown back on the Government. That is why I say that the Financial Secretary does not appear to have begun to visualise the seriousness of this problem—the problem which we are seeking to attempt to deal with in a very limited measure by this new Clause.

Again, if that is to be the case, as my hon. Friend the Member for Devizes (Mr. Hollis) has pointed out, that is quite impossible of fulfilment at the present time; if there were no independent schools, the Government could not begin to tackle the problem of how to enforce the educational laws in regard to children who are at present going to independent schools.

Secondly, when the Financial Secretary says he estimates that this would cost the Treasury £10 million, I wonder what he estimates it would cost the Treasury if these children did all have to be educated at the expense of the taxpayer. It would certainly cost them an exceedingly substantial sum of money. The hon. Gentleman has indicated no basis whatsoever for his estimate of £10 million, and I cannot conceive how he arrives at that figure. I shall not be so bold as to attempt to estimate what would be the additional cost to the taxpayer if the independent schools do have to close down and, in consequence thereof, the education of these remaining children has to take place at the expense of the taxpayer.

Another aspect of the matter which the Financial Secretary seemed to me to avoid entirely was in the actual element of tax avoidance, where he skirted the issue—I think we can say he evaded the issue rather than avoided it. The very weight of taxation and the problem upon the taxpayer is, of itself, forcing him into the avoidance of tax liability; a per-

fectly proper and legitimate thing for him to do, in so arranging his affairs that they do not attract incidence to tax. But it is that very fact, the weight of taxation and the expense in which he is involved, which is forcing him into the tax avoidance position, and what we are suggesting by this new Clause is that, by a very meagre simplification of the law he shall be given a legitimate way out of that—a way recognised and approved by Parliament—whereby he can gain the benefit, in effect, of educating his children out of gross income instead of having to do it out of net income.

I will not detain the House with any further arguments upon this, because I believe that we have got and made, self-evidently, an overwhelming case. The final basis of the whole argument is the argument of logic. It really is ridiculous that a man can befriend and educate his nephew, or a cousin, or a stranger, or whomsoever he likes except his own child out of his gross income. He has not got the right and privilege of fulfilling his duty of educating his own child with the same advantages that he has the right and privilege but not the duty, of educating somebody else's child. It really is a most ridiculous position into which the Government have forced the parent at the present time. By this new Clause we are specifically limiting the concession—if so be it can be called a concession—which is being given to the taxpayer to the question of education alone, and not to the question of maintenance, which was the basis of the allegation of avoidance raised by Mr. Neville Chamberlain. For those reasons, I again urge and press the Government to deal with this matter fairly and sensibly and to accept, if not this actual Clause at least the spirit which it contains.

(Further extracts from this debate will appear next week.)

Agene in Bread

The following is from *The Scotsman* of July 7:—

48 Manor Place, Edinburgh,

June 30, 1951.

SIR,—The Scottish Soil and Health Society supports Mrs. Pattullo and the Housewives' Association in this matter of agene poisoning of bread. Agene has been proved to be poisonous to some of the higher animals, and the Medical Research Council has condemned its continued use.

Why does the flour trade continue to use it?

The reason is that the commercial white flour has had most of the protein extracted from it—and sold to feed poultry and pigs. The remaining flour has not enough binding material to help the dough to stand up and make an open texture bread. Agene stiffens the flour, besides bleaching it. That is all.

The true remedy is to leave the nutritious proteins in the flour, along with the valuable minerals and vitamins that go with it. This means 95 per cent. whole wheat or more; in other words wholemeal bread, on which our forefathers lived and thrived. Any other solution, such as substituting addage (another poison) for agene spells continued National ill-health.

—I am &c.,

ROBERT L. STUART, Vice-Chairman.
Scottish Soil and Health Society.
A. GUTHRIE BADENOCH, Member of
Council.