

THE
REVOLUTION BETRAYED
EZRA POUND

THE revolution. that has been betrayed is, basically, "our" American Revolution of 1776, not in its local and particular phases, and certainly not as an wholly unnecessary split of the English RACE.

That revolution has been quite clearly betrayed by the generations of Dan Websters, Riddles, Morgans, Baruchs, camouflage's of all shades, Trotskys, Wallaces, Perkinses, the two shoals ,of Roosevelt's advisers, organisms like Morgenthau, steeped from the cradle in usurious preconceptions, the pinch-penny *aryio-kikes*.

This term I insist on. The Semitic poison is in the Semite tempered by Semitic instability, by the Semite's wobble from one excess to another.

This instability snakes him a peril to static and paralytically-minded races. But in all Roosevelt's hideous, dangerous and subversive entourage it has been the Jew, M. Ezekiel, who has toddled first toward the economy of "ABUNDANCE" in his *2,500 Dollars a Year*.

This book is unpleasant, it is as evasive as any Semitic writing can be, it dodges the real money problem. It is Jew compromise, it has all the J. Simonic desire for a smooth deal and general quiet, BUT it is better than Wallace and Perkins. And any reasonable objective anti-Semite will admit also that the facts wherewith Mordecai Ezekiel is trying to compromise emerge from the report of a committee headed by the sporting Jew, Loeb (Mr. Hemingway's cock-shy).

If you believe that a whole race should be punished for the sin of some of its members, I admit that the expulsion of the two million Jews in New York would not be an excessive punishment for the harm done by Jewish finance to the English race in America.

Whatever comrade Wyndham Lewis may have said about Jews governing England rather well, Jews do NOT govern America in a satisfactory manner, but the Jew financier is not our worst evil.

A race may possibly be held responsible for its worst individuals. The Jewish race has not for ages taken the responsibility for the enforcement of its own law. In the Gospel story, whether you take it as fact or as illustrative fiction, the execution of Jesus was achieved by passing the buck. The law enforcement was up to the Romans. If a man is going to be anti-Semite, let him be objectively anti-Semite. Let him gather as many facts as he can, and not blink them.

The Jew has brought anti-Semitism on himself by
LACK OF ORGANISATION,
by refusal to undertake responsibility.

If the Jew wishes to live in a neighbourly world among ENLIGHTENED peoples, he must undertake the discipline of the less pleasing breakers of Jewish law. So far as I know, he has for 2,000 years been quite unwilling to do this. No other race asks to have a country run for it, or conquered for it, at least, not in the Occident. If Brahmins do, they deserve the name "dirty niggers," and so, perhaps, do some Chinese epigons, non-Confucians.

Roosevelt's cabinet has two diseases. New York usury, which is linked up with all the usury in London and thence to Basel, and the sewers of Paris.

The "dozen economists" whom the *N.Y. Tribune* listed in November, 1937, as advising Roosevelt to end the slump, deserve no human pity for the advice they gave, whether it were given from brute ignorance or sheer malice.

"Bolster Public Confidence". etc. These men had the chance to tackle the problem of equating the public purchasing power to available needed goods, and failed to take it, and they are as little worth compassion as Neimeyer, Baruch, or any son-in-law of incorporate usury.

Look upon this and on that !
That century, was the betrayer of words. It befouled every luminous idea of the century before it.

LIBERTY, which meant the right to do what does NOT injure others, was dressed up as the right to bleed others.

EQUALITY in Jefferson's mouth meant that men had the same rights at law; that no man was born with an insurmountable handicap. It had a flavour of Burns' "a man's a man for a' that," but it did not, in Jefferson's time, mean even universal suffrage.

Suffrage could be a reward of merit. It wasn't defined as strictly as party membership, but it was not cast upon swine unawares. Before these sanities could be bitched and defiled it was necessary for the usurers' horde to betray the very means of communication.

LIBERTY is impossible without order, and order comes of organisation.

An agricultural nation, such as Jefferson's mostly was, did not immediately need a guild organisation as the medieval cities had needed it and evolved it. No system is fool proof and tithing proof. Evolve a perfect social mechanism and put it into action, and the sons of hell will start chiselling; leeches will start sucking blood and vermin will infect corners left unattended.

The extent to which the kept Press has befuddled the Anglo Saxon reader in England and the U.S. is apparent in a letter that came yesterday and is now on my desk, from a man by no means an imbecile. I quote it to show what can be:

"In his latest book Christopher Hollis says that Mussolini has given Italy a decent money system by taking from the private bankers the power to create money or credit arbitrarily with a fountain pen. He implies that the government controls and causes the issue of money there. Reluctant to take his word alone for such a revolutionary reform in national economy, which must be fought tooth and nail by the bankers, I am asking you if such is the case. If so, Italy should be a place to go."

This is dated November, 1937, i.e., two years after the Italian bank reform. The facts are there, but the young man has been so conditioned by the

capitalist press that he just can't believe 'em without personal word from a friend.

The Russian revolution was the END of a cycle. It continued the XIX century betrayal of words, it used hoax verbiage, as in "dictatorship of the proletariat," to mean dictatorship of a few people, etc. The Bolshies won't even now define words. They do not want revolution. At least none whom I have encountered in print, or in days when they asked for replies, do. They won't take up the fight for clear terms, for the clear definition of meanings, so that however much one may have disliked some things they were out to destroy, one simply cannot continue to stand still, anchored with them.

We can't, or at least I can't, at the present moment, get any clear information from Russia as to what Stalin means monetarily. No one even claims that he, Stalin, knows. At least I have not seen any such claim, and his opponent, Mr. Bronstein (Trotsky), is no clearer. Hence the pink intelligentsia.

They do NOT go in for defining words. They do NOT go in for collecting information. They do not seek to report on actual events in this peninsula, such as Rossoni's acts and clear statements.

"In the mass of grain there is, further, a political reason: Bread should be guaranteed to every Italian, without absurd jumps of price, without immoral speculations". Rossoni admits that this is not a new economy, or rather his words are "we do not achieve a new economy. We HAVE, however, quite definitely got ON from carrot-before-the-nose-ism" ("Pursuit" of happiness).

In one sense this is more or less a return to the mine fields system admired by Mencius. On the negative side it does not DIRECTLY equate money to a mass of consumable goods. But, on the other hand, it is effective, because every honest control of price for the public, and the public good, affects the purchasing power of such money as is in existence.

Two years ago an Italian, as well known as Rossoni or perhaps better known, but not in the Cabinet, wrote to me: "*The two diseases of modern society are the legalisation of usury via the banks, and the legalisation of theft in the limited liability company laws.*"

It was a private letter, and I had never quite known, whether I was free to quote it. I now feel quite free to do so, as such an idea is no longer imprudent. Whether the letter was originally a private opinion or an indication of what was about to be public at a suitable time, the root idea has gone into action IN ITALY.

You can measure the Fascist course by degrees

1/. In the Consegna, anno XII: "*discipline the economic forces and equate them to the needs of the nation.*"

2/. The Milan speech the following autumn: "*production solved, economists prodded on by the State should solve problems of distribution.*"

3/. Autarchy. C. H. Douglas' doctrine. Analogy with Jefferson's policy. The bases of sound economics have been the same for millennia. Certainly a nation can NOT properly and honestly pay a dividend until it has that which to divide.

To keep praise in true measure, the anti-democrat must admit that the U.S. Constitution gives the U.S. Government full right to control its own currency. It is nothing but Rooseveltian slobber and Baruchian bunkum to puff up balloons about constitutionality. The U.S. Congress, were it honest and supposing it to contain a few dozen men among its hundreds of apes, COULD tomorrow fix the purchasing power of the dollar at one bushel or whatever of wheat, at six pounds of best beef steak, at two yards of serge or four pounds of wool of a certain grade, or whatever were found just, after proper survey of national resources.

No one but a liar or a man jockeying for personal political advantage can seek to obscure this. In the U.S. it is NOT a defect of the Government's

verbal instrument but a root rottenness of will or a sheer bestial ignorance that impedes these reforms.

If such reform be Fascism, it must be Jacksonian Fascism.

Any country needs some form of order. The Spanish American war, when we kids (kids of my type) were being drilled, introduced a jargon about open order. It may be that the ultimate isles and the American continent demand an OPEN order, not adapted to Europe as continent. But at any rate let us try to see what is, and what has been, and let us try to keep these realities separate from what Milords Bunkum and Wunkum tell us, and have us told in their papers.

The discipline of troops in open formation differs from that of the troops under Braddock, who tried to fight Indians back before 1776. I apologise for military comparisons if it be manners for me to do so. But I should like to make my point somehow. I should like to establish a true demarcation for the words "liberty," "order," "responsibility," "shiftiness."

Mussolini's recent statement that "Capital is at the service of the State," is the answer to Adam Smith's sentence: "Men of the same trade never meet together without a conspiracy against the general public".

The damnable thing about the kept Press, and hired pseudo-economists is that they never light up the real greatness of the writers whom they profess to admire, and to whom they attribute their deleterious theories.

That sentence of Smith's was real.

The XIXth century never faced it. It needed a hundred years and the blacksmith's son from Romagna to find its answer and balance.

Hence various *corporazioni*, or high central guild organisations, including the *corporazione* of "*Foresight and Credit.*" Credit proclaimed to be as the life blood.

The rest of this article is applied to answering miscellaneous statements of honest writers. Someone must try to correlate current thought, just try to eliminate certain misunderstandings, even if they don't all belong to the same part of the subject.

As footnote in answer to the letter enquiring about Italy creating her own money. Italy creates her own money, but credit is a natural human product. So long as any one man trusts any other, no state can ever TOTALLY prevent small patches of individual credit springing up as the grass, by nature, beneficent and fraternal.

Italy has NO state-olatry. The phrase "*worship of the state*" has been coined in ignorance, and for the purpose of propaganda.

You can get it straight from the fountain head. The state in Italy is not here to suppress individual initiative, but to prevent abuses and to find a just measure when contending interests that have not in them sufficient sense to find their own solution.

If I did not believe that Fascism in Italy meant the fullest development and the maximum field of individual liberty *compatible* with a sane social order I should be as anti-Fascist as the pink-tea boys and French pseudo-literati, who don't yet know that something has started in Italy. One is permitted to believe in liberty through order. You are much more likely to get it with decent traffic regulations than via chicken-headedness or *disinvoltura*, as of the hero who managed to shoot his own camel during a camel charge.

I am as worried now by lack of transmission of economic and political news, or say of news re the state of economic thought, as I used, 25 years ago, to be about the lack of real news about books. There was, then, no place where one could conveniently know what was being written abroad. A serious anti-Fascist would today want to know what he was up against, and whether his pet hates corresponded to any extent with objective reality.

"*There is*" says Karl Whiter, in the October issue of *Civiltà Fascista*, "*an anti-fascism in the democratic world which is just position and bad faith; there is also an anti-fascism ignorant and in good faith.*"

I recommend that article of Winter's, and what he has to say about the left as a constructive element in totalitarian countries. Beniamino de Ritis also contributes to that issue of "C.F." with an article on the disappearance of hostility between North and South in the U.S.A., an article which might lead one to think of the possibilities of a new and healed Europe.

Naturally, if you issue credit or money or even special kinds of money in excess of available WANTED goods you will have an inflation, that is, a disease, which defeats the aim of the issue, UNLESS you have government price fixing, as demanded by Douglas and OPERATIVE in Italy to-day.

Devaluation is cheating and, moreover, it is a drastic reduction of the amount of purchasing power at large. The man who chooses the time of a devaluation can always rook someone else. Even if his intention be decent, he tempts and almost forces speculation by crooks and by hard-pressed men struggling to live in the wallow of merchantilism and hell of a mercantilist-usury milieu.

A SLAVE is one who waits for someone to free him.



EZRA POUND

A man with passionate views, who although the greatest poet the United States ever produced, was persecuted and imprisoned in his own country.