

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 26. No. 6.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

Light Leaders of Darkness

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

By E. J. PANKHURST.

(Concluded).

One important aspect of the world economic situation should be touched upon here as it will provide a background for something I shall say later.

The whole world situation has been enormously developed in its industrial arts by technical discoveries and their application to industry and the sciences. But the world's social and political character has developed, not as one would think from the technical discoveries but from the Socialist and Communist propaganda in the schools and universities. The advances that have been made in technical knowledge owe nothing to the social and political ideas. On the contrary, the social and political ideas have been a parasitic influence in the body politic in as much that they have not only batted on the results of technological advances, towards which they have contributed nothing, but have sought by every means in their power to prevent men and women in every walk of life from having access to the benefits of those discoveries except on political terms, which means in effect, Monopoly.

If we consider the course of events since the armistice in 1918 we find definite features of this control. There was the enormous debt repayable in Gold to America, negotiated by Baldwin and Norman. The wholesale restriction of credit in 1920 with its consequent unemployment. The return to the Gold Standard in 1923 by Churchill and his subsequent admission that it was a first class error on his part. The Nationalisation of the Bank of England and other institutions and the present subordination of this country to the policies of the U.S.A. If we add to these factors the disappearance of the British Empire and its dispersal among half educated natives, we have to ask ourselves why this country has fallen so rapidly from a position of world leadership and dignity during two decades. If you believe these things are simply episodes or so called economic laws, the small group of men who arrange these things will succeed eventually in their objective.

In 1906, a copy of a book by a writer named Sergei Nilus was deposited in the British Museum. This book embodied a document known as the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, purported to be minutes of secret meetings of the leaders of World Jewry. These Protocols have been published in several editions and no doubt you have heard or read of them. Although every effort has been made to dispute their authenticity, the fact is that the origin of the documents has never been satisfactorily established. But one remarkable feature should be mentioned. The documents explain a political and social strategy so

pervasive, so accurate in its forecasts of the events taking place before our eyes to-day, that one must conclude that the Protocols are the work of a merciless genius with an extraordinary knowledge of human events and weaknesses in the body politic. Whether the authors were Jews or not, the plans describe methods for achieving dominion over the entire human race. In referring to the Jews in these documents, I impute no essential baseness to the Jews as a race. Many of them are respected members of society and are friends of the Christian brotherhood. Moreover a considerable number do not associate themselves with the policy indicated in the Protocols and would indignantly reject Israel Zangwill's description of the "Goyim" or Gentiles as "drinkers of blood" or the "creatures called Christians." We have to deal with a policy; a policy that is the result of a philosophy. I propose to quote a number of extracts from this document, and at the same time give you extracts from the writings of Weishaupt the Illuminist and other secret or semi-secret societies prevalent at that time and since, so that you may be able to appraise the nature of the philosophy in the respective ideologies.

PROTOCOLS.

He who wants to rule must have recourse to cunning and make-believe.

We must not stop short of bribery, deceit and treachery if these are to serve the achievements of our cause.

We will harness the press and guide it with firm reins. . . . We will also have to obtain control of all other publishing firms.

No one desirous of attacking us with his pen will find a publisher. . . .

We will transform the Universities and reconstruct them according to our plans. The heads will be carefully nominated. . . .

We will appear as though we were the liberators of the working man. . . . We will suggest to him to join our army of Socialists, Anarchists and Communists.

ILLUMINISM, ETC.

Apply yourselves to the art of counterfeit, to hiding and masking yourselves in observing others.

We must take care that our writers be well puffed up and that the reviewers do not depreciate them. If a writer publishes anything . . . which does not accord with our plan we must endeavour to win him over or decry him.

We must preach the warmest concern for humanity, and make the people indifferent to all other relations.

We will regulate by new laws the political life of our subjects as though they were so many parts of a machine.

We will circulate inane, dirty and disgusting literature.

Our Sovereign will be irreproachable.

In place of existing Governments we will place a monster called the Administrative of the Super Government.

We will destroy the family life of the Gentiles. We will also distract them by various kinds of amusements, pastimes, passions, etc.

The peoples of the Christians, bewildered by alcohol, their youths turned crazy by debauchers and the classics which have been instigated by our agents. . . .

The Masonic Lodges . . . unconsciously act as a mask for our purpose. . . .

We have taken good care to discredit the clergy. We must extract the very conception of God from the minds of the Christians.

We will create an universal economic crisis.

We will take no account of the numerous victims who have to be sacrificed in order that we obtain prosperity.

Soon we shall start organising great monopolies.

In the first place must be destroyed the men who are most pernicious to revolutionary

We must try to obtain an influence . . . in the printing houses . . . painting and engraving, etc. . . .

An Illuminated Regent will be one of the most perfect men. He shall be prudent, foreseeing and irreproachable.

It is necessary to establish a universal regime of domination, a form of Government that will spread out over the entire world.

The essential thing is to isolate a man from his family; to make him lose his morale. (H. V. Romaine).

Let us never cease to corrupt . . . Let us popularise vice among the multitude.

It is upon the Lodges that we count to double our ranks. They form, without knowing it, our preparatory novitiate.

It is the corruption of the mass that we have undertaken, the corruption of the clergy and the corruption of the clergy by themselves.

Our final aim is . . . the destruction for ever of Catholicism and even of the Christian idea.

The Association will employ all means and all its power to increase and augment evils and misfortunes which must at last wear out the patience of the people and incite them to an insurrection *en masse*. (Alliance Sociale Democratique).

We must improve and regulate State monopolies, and thereby prepare for the State monopolisation of the foreign trade.

(Lenin).

organisations and whose violent and sudden end most frighten the Government. The main problem for our Government is how to weaken the brain of the people by criticism, how to make it lose its power of reasoning which creates opposition and how to distract the public mind by senseless phraseology.

I think I have now given you at some length all too brief extracts in a survey of the satanic subversive forces at work in or acting upon society. We must also remember that many of these ideas are being actually propagated by institutions or individuals in the sincere conviction that they are doing noble work. Nearly all these institutions are led by or originate with propagandists who invariably are not too fond of work in the general sense, and who usually manage their own affairs worse than anybody else. They rely upon their supporters among writers and speakers to provide them with ready made propaganda. Then by control of the Press, Radio and commercial patronage the particular type of Utopia they envisage is then wildly propagated all of which involve the centralisation of Power and the subjugation of man, such as

The abolition of Private Property.

The classless state.

Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.

The dictatorship of the proletariat.

The breakdown of the Christian Religion.

The breakdown of Marriage.

A standardised education.

The elimination of individual initiative which may endanger the plans.

You will wonder what we must do to prevent the development of a robot race. I would suggest, though it may appear startling at first, that all those institutions and organisations that are so fond of appealing to your "public spirit" and "sacrifice" from individuals whose lives are usually one long sacrifice, should be ignored. Nor should you join the throaty folk who shout **LIBERTY, EQUALITY AND FRATERNITY** or such like abstractions. You have to decide whether you are to be free in a world that is rapidly becoming one huge factory: governed in name only by a proletariat without any property whatever and controlled by Commissars. Ask rather, what are your plans going to do to me? Can I kick your Inspectors out if I don't like them? Can I exercise my inborn right to contract out of your schemes if I don't like them? Do I get my coupons or not if I refuse to make atom bombs for Russian contractors, or warships for the Chinese Communists? It is a safe rule to find out first what your enemy wants you to do then do the opposite as Douglas suggests.

G. K. Chesterton put the question correctly when he wrote in "Heretics":—

"Supposing that a great commotion arises in the street, something, let us say, about a lamp-post which many influential persons want to pull down. A grey clad monk who is the spirit of the Middle Ages, is approached on the matter and begins to say, in the arid manner of the Schoolmen, 'Let us first of all consider, my brethren,

the value of Light. If Light be in itself good—? At this point he is knocked down. All the people make a rush for the lamp post: the lamp post is down in ten minutes and they go about congratulating each other on their unmediaeval practicality. But as things go on they do not work out so easily. Some people have pulled down the lamp post because they wanted electric light: some because they wanted old iron: some because they wanted darkness, because their deeds were evil: some thought it was not much of a lamp post, some too much: some acted because they wanted to smash something: some because they wanted to smash municipal machinery. And there is a war in the night, no man knowing whom he strikes. So, gradually and inevitably, to-day, to-morrow or the next day, there comes back the conviction that the monk was right after all: that all depends on what is the philosophy of Light. Only what might have been discussed under the gas lamp we must now discuss in the dark."

And that, gentlemen, expresses the situation in the world to-day. By means of revolutions, schisms, false education and frustration of the public by subversive means, some of which I have only lightly touched upon to-night, the enemies of the individual are committed to a policy of centralisation everywhere. If they succeed in their objective, individuality will be submerged and controlled as the hunter depends upon his knowledge of the animal's movements for the killing. After all liberty, the sight of grandeur, the inspiration of religion, the spirit of relief from unnatural restrictions if even for a few hours are better than being mechanised 365 days in the year. It is for you to choose. Either we fail to recognise the enemy, though he be masquerading in sheep's clothing with utopian programmes in one hand and a dagger in the other and insist on decentralisation to the utmost of man's capacity, or we will be forced back to the level of helotry, and darkness again prevail in the world. As Noel Paton has put it in his "Spindrift":

And in all ages, since the people shut
with the blank seal of death, the inspired lips
of Socrates—since that yet darker hour
When blood stained Calvary owned their sovereign
power.

And Nature groaned in Earthquake and Eclipse,
Has that fierce voice at some loud babblers' nod
Been lifted in blind rage against the voice of
God.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

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

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

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

Diplomatic Re-Recognition of Spain.

"If it is possible to extract anything good from the course of events of Spain, it can only be by recognising the nature of the conflict, and, in recognising it, to realise that it forms an epitome of the nature and causes of modern war. If General Franco wins, as seems probable, Spain will have a Fascist Dictatorship. If the Spanish Government, so-called, with the aid of men and ammunition from Russia, should reverse the fortunes of war, Spain will have a Communist Dictatorship, so-called. In any case, it will be the individual Spaniard who will have fought, been tortured, and died, and it will be one of two international groups of financiers who will have acquired complete control of Spain. In the case of General Franco, the immediate power behind the throne is the Valentin Jew, Juan March, no doubt in collaboration with a Levantine financial group. The real power behind Moscow is probably, as it always has been, situated in New York—New York not Washington. But Stalin is highly popular in the City of London, and with certain American-Dutch and English Millionaires."—C. H. Douglas, "Sanctions for All," in *The Fig Tree*, December, 1936.

Sir John Balfour,* the first British Ambassador to Spain since 1946, has presented his credentials to General Franco. The reasons for the diplomatic vacuum which has existed between this country and Spain for the last five years are well-known to readers of this journal. The visible centre of opposition to the Franco regime is U.N.O. and behind U.N.O. there stands the "Western" financial oligarchy.

U.N.O., it will be recalled, was founded in Moscow in 1943 and Mr. Churchill's next-in-command, Mr. Anthony Eden, was present. At that moment, the Court of St. James was represented in neutral Spain by Sir Samuel Hoare (now Lord Templewood) who, as head of the British Secret Service Mission to Russia in 1917, had first-hand experience of the workings of the Dark Forces of Judæo-Masonry, (*vide* his *The Fourth Seal*, and especially the chapter called "The Dark Forces").

In Madrid during the war-years (1940-44), Sir Samuel Hoare received several urgent warnings from the head of the State to which he was accredited of the danger of indiscriminately supporting the Soviet regime. General Franco in these warnings foretold the part—Sovietization of Europe that has since come to pass. Sir Samuel Hoare pooch-pooched these warnings and the 'world' press suppressed them.

Exactly a year ago, General Franco gave an interview to a French journalist in Madrid. When the inevitable topic of U.N.O. came up, Franco said that the question of Spain's admission to U.N.O. was an empty one inasmuch as Spain had never expressed the least wish to belong to that organisation. He gave his views on Communism as follows:—

"The threat of Communism lies not so much in its military power or the density of the populations over which it holds sway, as in the procedure employed to widen the breaches left open to its advance in democratic countries. Against these attempts every effort must be made to eliminate causes of weakness by the strengthening of spiritual and moral forces. The best way of meeting the propagandist claims of Communism is by unmasking the negation of all liberty which is characteristic of its system. This is especially notable in (Continued on page 8).

*The British Minister in Moscow during the last years of the war, and British Minister in Washington in the immediate post-war years.

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. 6.

Saturday, April 7, 1951.

From Week to Week

"The uproar in Britain over the naming of an American to command the North Atlantic waves has concealed a clever manoeuvre on the part of the British Defence Chiefs. U.S. Admiral William M. Fechteler, now commander of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, was appointed (by the Defence Ministers of the Allied States) to serve as Commander-in-Chief of the North Atlantic Naval Command, with a rank equal to that of Eisenhower. Immediately, the announcement set off furious protests in the British Parliament, with Winston Churchill's voice leading the tumult. While most of the American foreign correspondents stressed the 'affront to British naval pride' as the reason for the noisy protests, some American observers of the defence problems give quite a different version.

"The storm in the British Parliament—they say—had been stimulated as a 'diversion' to cover up and make easier the naming of a Britisher to a far more important post in the North Atlantic Defence Organisation. No one knew this better than Churchill, it was emphasised, even when he was oratorically complaining that the British had conceded the top land command to Eisenhower, but should not concede the top sea command. Actually, American observers say, there had been a lively fight behind the scenes in the Pentagon over the proposed appointment of a British officer to a post of far greater power than that held by Fechteler. The post is that of Chief of Intelligence of the whole European Army, and General T. S. Airey of the British Army has just been named to fill it.

"To the average civilian this appointment means little. But, for the American military observer with vast experience in Intelligence in joint army operations during the last war, it spells British control of 'the eyes and brains' of the whole strategy of the European defence system. While U.S. officers are scheduled to serve under the British General, the appointment would mean that the British attitude would be decisive in evaluating intelligence, and therefore would shape the whole series of top decisions of Eisenhower's command. It is significant that French military are disturbed about this appointment.

"In short, as our informants say, the British military chiefs did not discourage the 'fuss over Fechteler,' deeming it an excellent trading concession. Under cover of this controversy, the British were able to clinch the far more important post of Intelligence Command. There are, indeed, wheels within wheels in the organization of the projected European Army."

—Frank C. Hanighen in *Human Events* (Washington, D.C.)

So you see, John, even if you are no longer a citizen of a Great Empire, have become merely a scrap of paper in a ballot box, have lost the effective demand inherent in possession of a golden sovereign of your own, and don't know what the hell 'they' will do with you next, you may still cast a (more or less) knowing wink—*i.e.*, boldly inspect the shape of things to come through a democratic blind eye.

Gnostic Heresies

Dean Mansel's Introductory Chapter

Either doctrines, systems of belief, philosophies, are of no importance, in which case the 'ordinary' individual, who, in this instance stands for every individual bent up living his life as completely as possible, would give them as wide a berth as possible, and cease from troubling his head about them, or they are of major importance, and the wise man bent upon exactly the same errand, would give them all the thought and care he can spare from prior obligations attention to which alone makes his life possible, *to the full extent of his individual capacity* but not in excess of it (since this is, in any case, impossible, and the pretention to it is both unprofitable and fraudulent—the fraud being against the individual himself). A bare inspection of our common environment shows, that in all communities, not some only, there are current ideas of varying complexity and coherency, which are the ground from which all actions not of a necessary or instinctive nature grow. The lunatic asylums of the world are the only places where action seems to be divorced from a background of idea, general or particular, or from coherent ideas. This is not to say that there may not exist a delusion of the superproduction of ideas of an order akin to that which attends the superproduction of commodities. However this may be, we agree with the authors of the *Protocols* that ideas are important, and that what happens to them is important also, Social Credit included. It is for this reason that we publish, as 'an exhibit,' Mansel's introduction to his book on the Gnostic Heresies mentioned here last week. Primarily we are concerned with the sources of interference with consistent ideas once currency is given to them. We are well aware that, besides an open, and indubitably a healthy competition for acceptance between divergent ideas, there may be a hidden interference, and it is not *necessary* that the second should be reflected to a significant extent in the first. The tale of the centuries, not only of the Christian centuries, often suggests an 'occult' "hand," which holds all the "cards," from which all the important, and some of the unimportant "cards" proceed, as, when, and where required (not by any 'ordinary' inhabitant), and whither they as often return to be replayed when occasion demands (but not any 'lawful' occasion). We have not proved that this is indeed the case: it is something asserted by observers of great penetration and industry, but obviously open to exploitation by others just as active and just as visible. In the meantime, here is a first instalment of Mansel's chapter:—

The meaning of the term *Gnosis* or *Knowledge*, as applied to a system of philosophy, may be illustrated by the language of Plato towards the end of the fifth book of the Republic, in which he distinguishes between knowledge (*gnosis*) and opinion (*doxa*) as being concerned respectively

with the real (*to on*) and the apparent (*to phainomenon*). When to this distinction is added the further explanation that the objects of sense, the visible things of the world, belong to the class of phenomena and are objects of opinion, while the invisible essence of things, the one as distinguished from the many, is the true reality, discerned not by sense but by intellect, we shall be justified in identifying 'knowledge' with that apprehension of things which penetrates beyond their sensible appearances to their essence and cause, and which differs in name only from that 'wisdom' (*sophia*) which Aristotle tells us is by common consent admitted to consist in a knowledge of First Causes or Principles. In this general sense however, the term *gnosis* has nothing to distinguish it from the ordinary Greek conception of 'philosophy,' and so long as it remains solely within the region of philosophical inquiry and terminology, we do not find it generally employed to designate either philosophy as a whole or any special philosophical system. It is not till after the Christian era that the term comes into use as the distinct designation of a certain form of religious philosophy, emanating in some degree from Christian sources, and influenced by Christian ideas and Christian language. Even in the earlier association of Greek philosophy with a revealed religion, which is manifested in the Græco-Jewish philosophy of Alexandria, though the teaching of Philo may be regarded as embodying the essential constituents of Gnosticism in an entire if undeveloped form we do not find the distinctive name of Gnosis or Gnostic applied to designate the system or its teachers. It is not indeed difficult to detect in Philo the germs of the later Gnosticism, but they are present under other names. The wise man, the perfect man, the philosopher, the contemplative man, are names applied by Philo to those favoured persons who are permitted to attain to a knowledge of divine things, so far as it is attainable by man; the peculiar designations of Gnosis and Gnostic do not appear. In their actual use, if not in their etymological meaning, the terms Gnostic, Gnosis, Gnosticism, as names of a sect of philosophers or the doctrines professed by them, have been employed exclusively with reference to philosophical systems which have distinguished themselves, not merely as ontological speculations, but also as heretical perversions of Christianity. It is necessary therefore to a full explanation of the historical import of the terms that we should pay attention, not merely to the general distinctions between knowledge and opinion, between the real and the apparent, between ontology and phenomenology, but also to the especially Christian feature, the perversion of which distinguishes Gnosticism as a heresy from other forms of speculation, which, however extravagant in their pretensions, however erroneous in their results, however alien from or opposed to the doctrines of the Christian revelation, have never been classified as *heresies*, but only as *philosophies*, heathenish it may be or anti-Christian, but not properly heretical. The feature in question will be found in the idea, common alike to Gnosticism and Christianity, but not shared by that philosophy from which the name and many of the leading ideas of Gnosticism are borrowed—the idea of a Redemption—of a Divine interposition to deliver the world from the dominion of evil and its consequences.

Among the Greek philosophical systems, as the idea of evil holds a very subordinate and insignificant place, so the idea of redemption seems not to be recognised at all. The world and its phenomena are regarded from the most various points of view. It may be as the spontaneous development of some primitive vital force, as in the hylozoism of the early

Ionians; it may be as the momentary collision of opposite forces and the perpetual passing from one state of being to another, as in the system of Heraclitus; it may be as a motionless uniformity, without plurality and without change, as in the theory of the Eleatics; it may be as a continuous development under the influence of an external power, as in the philosophy of Anaxagoras; it may be as the subject of successive cycles, of opposite states alternating with each other, as in the doctrine of Empedocles, and again in that of Plato, and more distinctly still in that of the Stoics. It may be as an organised system in eternal revolution, as in the Peripatetic philosophy; but in all these systems alike, the world, through all its changes or appearances of change, does but exhibit the working of one law or one nature essentially belonging to it, and continuing to act upon it or in it throughout its whole existence; there is no trace of any such conception as that of a new power introduced into the world to deliver it from the law to which it is subject, to exalt it permanently and progressively to a higher and better existence and destiny. This one pervading deficiency, which characterizes the whole current of Greek thought, is strikingly and painfully brought into light in the lines of a great poet of our own country, one who, unhappily an unbeliever in the truths of Christianity, endeavoured to replace what he had rejected by elevating the speculations of Pagan philosophy to the Christian level. The Great Year of the Stoics, the destruction of the old world, the commencement of the new cycle, takes the place of the Christian expectation of the delivery of the creature from the bondage of corruption; but after the triumphant opening of the poem with its exulting description of the regenerated world in its new cycle, the melancholy conclusion tells us too plainly, by the unwilling confession of an advocate, that the vaunted regeneration of philosophy is but an endless repetition of the old evil.

[Here the author quotes the text of five verses of Shelley's *Hellas*].

The distinctive feature which marks Gnosticism in all its schools as a religious heresy, and not as a mere philosophical extravagance, is the presence of this idea of a redemption of the world, and the recognition, in a perverted form of the person and work of Christ as taking part in this redemption. And this indication of a partly Christian source of the system will also throw some light on the origin of the name by which it has been generally designated. Already in the *LXX* translation of the Old Testament, and still more clearly in the Apocryphal Book of Wisdom, the term *gnosis* had been employed to denote a knowledge of the true God or a knowledge especially given by Him; and the same term was employed by the writers of the New Testament for that knowledge of God through Christ which is given by the Gospel. The mission of John the Baptist is prophetically declared by his father as to give *knowledge* of salvation to the Lord's people. St. Paul speaks of his Corinthian converts as enriched by Christ in all utterance and in all *knowledge*; he enumerates among the gifts of the Spirit the word of *knowledge*, he tells them again that God hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the *knowledge* of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. In like manner he speaks of casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the *knowledge* of God; and says that he counts all things but loss for the excellency of the *knowledge* of Christ Jesus. St. Peter, in a like sense, exhorts the disciples to whom he writes to add to their faith virtue, and to virtue *knowledge*, and bids them grow in grace and in the *knowledge*

of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Yet there are manifest indications of the existence, even in apostolic times, of a system of false teaching which had usurped to itself especially the name of *knowledge*. Not to dwell now upon the probable meaning of the disputed passage in the eighth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where the indifference as regards meats offered to idols is spoken of as the *knowledge* that puffeth up, we have at least the unmistakable and emphatic warning of the Apostle to Timothy. [O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vane babblings, and apparitions of science falsely so called:] a passage the point of which in relation to the texts previously quoted is obscured in our Authorised Version by the substitution of the word *science* for *knowledge*.

It is probable therefore, that the adoption of the terms *Gnosis* and *Gnostic*, as special designations of a philosophy and its professors, arose from the language of Christianity, and was intended to distinguish the Gnostic teaching as the rival and the assumed superior of the Christian Church. The former of these terms (*gnosis*), as we have seen, is contemporaneous with the teaching of St. Paul; the latter (*gnostikos*) is of later origin and is said to have been first assumed towards the end of the first or beginning of the second century by the sect of the Ophites, or according to another account by Carpocrates. The distinction between the true and the false knowledge, between the knowledge claimed as the heritage of the Christian Church and the knowledge claimed by the rival systems which gloried in the name, is that which in all ages has distinguished the wisdom which is built on faith and received of God, from that which is built on doubt and invented by man. The knowledge professed by the Christian Church was a knowledge given by divine revelation and accepted in faith; whatever fuller insight into divine things could be attained by study or contemplation was admitted only in so far as it was in accordance with the revealed teaching, and, if not identical with it, at least a legitimate interpretation or explanation of it. The knowledge professed by the Gnostic teachers, on the other hand, was a knowledge designed to subordinate the revelation of Christ to the speculations of human philosophy—a curious inquiry, searching after an apprehension of God, not in what He has revealed of Himself, but in that which He has not revealed—an enquiry which, under the pretence of giving a deeper and more spiritual meaning to the Christian revelation, in fact uprooted its very foundations by making it subservient to theories incompatible with its first principles—theories of human invention, originating in heathen philosophies, and making those philosophies the criterion and end of revelation, instead of regarding revelation as the discovery by God of those truths which human wisdom had desired to see and had not seen. Such is the distinction with which St. Paul combats the Gnostic systems in their germ and infancy. 'As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in Him; rooted and built up in Him, and established in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ. For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' And at the end of the second or beginning of the third century, when the principal Gnostic systems had risen and flourished and were entering on the period of their decay, we find Clement of Alexandria adopting a similar criterion to distinguish between the true Gnostic or perfect Christian and the disciples of the false systems which laid claim to the

name. 'That alone,' he says, 'is the proper and incontestable truth, in which we are instructed by the Son of God. . . . ' That truth which the Greeks profess, though it partake of the same name, is divided from ours, as regards magnitude of knowledge and force of demonstration and divine power, and the like; for we are taught of God, instructed in truly sacred literature by the Son of God.'

'Faith,' he says in the same book, 'is the first element of knowledge, as necessary to the true Gnostic as breathing is to life. As we cannot live without the four elements, neither can we attain to knowledge without faith.' And again; 'That which we possess is the only true demonstration, being supplied by the sacred literature of the Holy Scriptures and by the heaven-taught wisdom, as the Apostle calls it (1 Thess. iv. 9) But that demonstration which begets opinion and not knowledge is human, and is made by rhetorical argument and dialectical syllogisms; whereas the demonstration which is from above produces the faith of knowledge, by the comparison and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, in the soul of those who are desirous of learning.'

(To be concluded).

The Spring Offensive

It is twelve months now since Major Douglas published under the prophetic title "The Ides of March" his definition of our sphere of immediate operations—"the stripping from them (our dictators) the carefully constructed defence of Government immunity" and "to begin the task before us—an examination of the whole validity of House of Commons omnipotence—"

Norie can assess how much of this has been done but perhaps we can sense that Cæsar is just a little uneasy in sight of the ruins and the fruits of omnipotence. The trumpets are rather uncertain. Some of the angels are playing out of tune and out of time with their eyes on the audience rather than upon their scores or the conductor who himself looks an old bird going into a late moult for the remaining feathers no longer dazzle!

In March, 1951, Major Douglas asks "What is Social Credit?" Can it be that the answer in *action* has got round the corner at last? Anyway the diagram he gives can be most usefully studied to make sure that we have all the relevant factors clearly in our minds and in their proper relationship.

Philosophy at the head of the diagram should not worry us now. We have it right and as for teaching it there is only one way, "I will show you my faith by my works." "The more excellent way" can only be learnt and taught in action. Policy—philosophy's child—is again a living thing, varying, adaptable, and incomparably more inspiring than dead party slogans, planks or platforms. It is in this sphere that we look for the leadership of "religious" men. But policy has a bad odour with such. All too few can make that essential distinction between "politics" and "policy." The Catholic Church in the persons of its bishops makes but few representations to governments, notably the education of children and the sanctity of marriage. In the case of the former the "faithful" of three generations ago were sold by the acceptance of "compulsory" and "state-aided" education. It was done in ignorance of the principles and factors involved but what is more to be deplored, the bishops have

learnt nothing since in spite of the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*. Moreover there is a strong suspicion among some of the laity that no priest who knows his stuff, and would be likely to act on it, stands a chance of being raised to the episcopate. But what of the laymen? They too have equally failed in applying the principles of the papal encyclicals in the field of religious education. But take heart. Policy based on a true philosophy has a devastating effect on a misinformed but impartial and unprejudiced mind. If the uncertainty of the omniscient state can be sensed, there is still more evident hesitation with the omniscient priest and layman. And surely this is where we come in.

—PASCO LANGMAID.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 8, 1951.

SUPPLY

Army Estimates, 1951-52

Brigadier Head (Continued):—

My next point is this: What happens when the officer comes out? Pensions I know are a very difficult problem. The gross pension of a major is £475 a year. In the old days he possibly had some private means, he got a little house at Camberley or Cheltenham, and was all right. He is not all right now, he has to find a job, and a major retired is not an easily employable man unless he has some particular skill. I am not arguing necessarily for a higher rate of pension. In the Civil Service a man gets a gratuity when he comes out of a year's pay of the rank in which he served. If one were to give a flat gratuity to everyone who earned a pension of, say, £1,000, it would not cost an immense amount, but it would mean he could buy a house on a mortgage or start a small enterprise, and I believe it would have a big effect on allaying some of these doubts regarding his life at the completion of his service.

There is still the problem of the boy who is thinking of going into the Army. I do not know anything about the propaganda in the public schools—when it was mentioned, one hon. Member mentioned Dartmoor as a recruiting ground, which I thought not very helpful. I have always suspected the propaganda of the War Office since they issued that poster "Join the Army to fit yourself for a better life in the future." We must remember that parents today will go to a great deal of hardship and sacrifice to give their boys a good education. It is becoming increasingly difficult for them, especially if they want to send them to public schools.

Might one not broaden the base of entry to the Army, and also produce a greater attraction to the young boys, by something on the Dartmouth lines as an alternative method of entry? A large number of scholarships would be given, the boys would have a very good education, it would interest and attract the parents, and I believe it might have a big effect in increasing the number entering. . . .

. . . Far too many officers in the Army are now on the staff. Far too little has been done since the war to reduce the number. One of the reasons, much overlooked, for this is the increase in the number of levels in the staff.

Between 1930 and 1939 the staff was arranged on four levels. I am talking about the War Office. There was the

director, a major general; the G1, a full colonel of battalion, quite a chap (I apologise for the slang, but he was very fully qualified and had probably passed the Staff College and commanded a battalion); the G2, a major—about equivalent to the modern G1; and the G3. Four levels, four people to decide things, four desks for the files to go up and down. Since then levels have bred like rabbits. Now there is a director, a major general, director, brigadier, brigadier on the staff, deputy director brigadier, deputy director full colonel, colonel on staff, G1, G2 and G3. That means more levels, more typists, more clerks, more messengers carrying files around, more delays and less responsibility for individual officers. In my opinion, that is one of the main causes for the large number of officers in the War Office.

. . . The total of War Office staff on these levels is today 259 and in 1938 it was 70. That is a very big disparity, even taking into account National Service. This is the case not only at the War Office; it has spread right throughout the staff hierarchy of the Army. In 1940 I was a brigade major of the 20th Guards Brigade, an independent brigade with no division behind it. . . and we had seven officers on our staff. The 5th Infantry Brigade of the Second Division of B.A.O.R., with a division behind it, has 14 officers. The number has doubled in ten years.

. . . Let us take Aldershot division. In 1935 that division normally had 11 officers, but I will be fair and say that when it went on manoeuvres and had three brigades brought in, they went up to 20. It was then considered big. But the Second Division in B.A.O.R.—granted they have additional administrative responsibilities in Germany—has 84. That is a lot too many.

The question has not been properly tackled in my opinion. I could go on. At one command headquarters I have a personal friend, a major-general, General Staff—no names, no pack drill—and he has a B.G.S. (Operations), B.G.S. (A. and Q.), General Staff Officer Class 1 (Operations G.S.O.1 Training), G.S.O.1 (A. and G.S.O.1 Q.). Then there is the G.S.O.2 level and the G.S.O.3 level. Quite a family tree. All he has in his command is a few training establishments and a few odd territorial units. He is an able man, he likes shooting, and he gets a lot of it.

This sort of thing does need tackling. There is a serious shortage of officers, and it must be dealt with. I know there are difficulties, but there are too many levels, too many people checking other people. There is too much supervision and too little delegation of responsibility. It is fantastic in peacetime and especially now. Able men who did a great job in the war are being checked and supervised, and if the House will bear with me for a moment, I should like to give two instances of this kind of thing.

There is a commanding officer I know who is covered with D.S.O.'s—I must not be too explicit otherwise he might get into trouble. He commanded a brigade with great distinction during the war, and is now commanding a battalion in Germany, where he went recently. There is a rule in B.A.O.R. that you can have 10 per cent. of soldiers' wives out there, living in quarters. This particular commanding officer was under the 10 per cent., and had a quarter and a wife he wanted to put into that quarter. Could he put her in? No. He had to refer it to brigade, from where it went to division and eventually to the Rhine Army, round and round the Rhine Army and back again with permission. Why could he not have

put the wife in and issued a quarterly or monthly return that he was keeping under his 10 *per cent.* limit? It is fantastic to think that things are still being referred up and down to goodness knows who. I will read what he wrote to me about another subject; it shows that I am in improper touch with a regular officer:

"Last year, I wanted to move the bar out of my Sergeants' Mess ante-room into a little room alongside to make it just that much less inviting for them to drink too much."

This is a thing which would appeal to the hon. Member for Ealing, North (Mr. J. Hudson), who I notice is not in his place. It was a sensible idea I think. He goes on:

"It had to go through the following channels: (1) Garrison Engineer; (2) D.C.R.E.; (3) S.O.R.E.2; (4) C.R.E.; (5) C.E., Division."

He adds:

"The ruddy thing is moveable, too."

Does it make sense? There is too much of this checking; and it is not only frustrating to individual officers, but it is duplicating work, increasing the number of officers required and causing a big wastage when officers are in short supply.

I would urge the right hon. Gentleman to institute a really searching inquiry into this question of too many levels, too much supervision, and too many officers on the staff. That is part of the answer to overcome this officer shortage. I entreat him not to leave it too late. . . .

RE-RECOGNITION OF SPAIN. (Continued from page 3).

the slavery inflicted on the working classes, for whom the State constitutes the most tyrannical of masters. If we wish to combat Communism we must convert into realities the just social aspirations of the workers."

The first part of this statement has the authentic ring of Christian statemanship and such anti-materialist views alone might account for the scorn with which *El Caudillo* has been regarded by the One-World diplomats at Lake Success and elsewhere. But the latter part of his statement has in it nothing that would offend the ears of the representatives of "democracy." On the contrary, the slightly leftist colour of the passage and the indirect endorsement of the fallacy that by raising the standard of the lower classes you immunise the body politic against the 'Communist' virus may account for the tardy decision that Spain should once more be brought into what our whig historians used to call 'the concert of Europe.'

At any rate, before we accept Franco's anti-communist regime as the true alternative to the anti-Christian regime of Moscow we should remember that the same Valentian Jew, Juan March, who was the chief financier of the Franco fight against the Red Internationalists in the late thirties is still in Spain, still "Franco's best businessman," and still the richest man in the country. Very significant, in this respect, is the complete suppression of the bold speech made in June, 1950, by the Spanish admiral, Don Jesus de Cora y Lira. Addressing the Atenco (cultural centre) in Madrid, the admiral referred to the existence of a "Jewish World policy" and to "a conspiracy of Jews and Freemasons." Jews were a danger to the countries in which they lived, he declared, and were responsible for all wars and revolutions. Those Spaniards who remembered that the name of the 'Russian' Ambassador who from Madrid directed the terror campaign against Spain, was Moses Rosenberg* would certainly have listened with interest, to say the least, to the admiral's considered opinions. But the individual Spaniard who fought

and was tortured, and whose relatives were killed at the order of Moses Rosenberg, Bela Kuhn (the latter appeared both in the 'Hungarian' and the 'Spanish' revolutions) and their friends, have still to gain the freedom to speak and hear spoken the truth about those secret manipulators of 'government' policies which is also taboo in the official world of news in the "democracies."

It has been said that there are only two policies at work in the world to-day: one of centralization and the other of fragmentation of power. How far has *El Caudillo* gone in the direction of freeing the individual Spaniard from these trammals in which he has been tied 'under revolution or threat of more revolution'? Has Franco observed the fate of Hungary whose inter-war Regent postponed indefinitely the recall of the Monarch whose place he held? Does not the exchange of Admiral Horthy for Rakosi, or Rosencrantz, contain a lesson for every power-politician this side of the Iron Curtain? Can they not all draw a moral from the fact that every Continental revolution has begun with the deposition or the murder of a King? B.J.

*Mr. Theo Rogers wrote in his book *Spain: A Tragic Journey*: p. 191: "Following the floods of materials (Russian) including troops and officers, there came to Madrid Mr. Moses Rosenberg, Moscow's Ambassador, and to Barcelona Antoneff Avseenko, ex-officer of the Czar, whose brilliant career is in sharp contrast with the consular office he holds. . . Avseenko is in charge of the Catalan Red Army and Rosenberg was, until January, the Czar of Madrid."

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

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

THE BIG IDEA

Price 2/6 (*Postage extra*)

PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR

Price 2/- (*Postage extra*)

THE "LAND FOR THE (CHOSEN) PEOPLE" RACKET

Price 2/- (*Postage extra*)

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