

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 11. No. 22.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

## MODERN SCIENCE (XV)

It is reported of the philosopher Aristippus that, when reproved for offering an indignity to philosophy by falling at the feet of Dionysius, the tyrant, to crave a favour, he said it was not his fault if Dionysius's ears were in his feet. Presumably Aristippus got what he wanted. I notice that he didn't take his seat at Dionysius's side and harangue the multitude on the subject of the immense benefits it was about to receive from the institution of a more philosophical tyranny.

Our modern philosophers do not fall at the feet of the tyrant. There is a sense in which it is true that they are the feet of the tyrant. Upon them the tyrant walks. Watch anyone walking, and observe that it is not his head which bears to the left (or to the right) but his feet, and not both feet at once, but the left foot first, whereafter the right is merely natural and accordant and bears neither one way nor the other, but sticks nobly to the path. If there ever was a time when I shared the naive view that scholars were chosen to conduct delicate political missions because of their halos, I have long since abandoned it. The meaning of these unacademic occupations first dawned upon me when it was suggested to me by a brilliant but disgruntled scholar that what really mattered was not intellectual distinction so much as the good fortune to be regarded as the 'good little boy' of particular people. The particular person he depended upon was the late Sir Henry Jones, who was both a professor of Moral Philosophy and a personal friend of Lloyd George. He preached. He propagandised in a fluent Welsh way. Gusto, zest, and a knowledge of Hegel which may, for all I know, have been profound, were his high cards; but usually it was his gusto which carried the day, as when, in a village on the shores of the Kyles of Bute, a gentle Scottish body objected that it seemed to her that the Professor questioned the Divinity of our Lord, Jesus Christ. "Madam," he said, so the story goes, "Madam" (with a strong Welsh accent, and of course gusto) "Far be it from me to question in the slightest degree the deevinitee of *any* man! Oh, no, no, no!" It is evidence; but it is not evidence of the kind which is admitted to whatever court there is that remains uncontaminated for reference of the kind of matters I am proposing.

And so I have constructed a table, which occupies, in my small hand about a square yard of paper. It bears the names of the Universities of England and Scotland and that of the University of Wales, and of the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge. Against these entries are the names of the Vice-Chancellors (who were formerly generally called Principals) and the names of the Masters, Provosts, Principals, Wardens, Presidents, Rectors, of the Colleges. The other entries are, where possible from *Who's Who*, and

concern the education these men have received, their initial successes in academic pursuits, the opinions of them of their fellows (as indicated, for example by their election to a College Fellowship), the past and present academic positions they have held, their known connection with politics and administration, the sources of the distinctions conferred upon them, and the time intervals between the recognisable phases of their careers. But, having done all this, I notice that the record is incomplete, not merely because the distinguished do not write unwisely to *Who's Who*, but because a very large number of the entries disclose that Mr. This or Sir John That had some official task allotted to him many years before he rose to eminence in University circles, and, unless the long succession, under the impact of "the greatest crisis of their history," with which Mr. Vere-Cotton has threatened the Universities, is suddenly broken, there must be large numbers of 'swimmers' who have not (as it were) yet broken surface in the waters of the pool.

Nevertheless, the table is interesting.

(To be continued.)

TUDOR JONES.

## "It's not a sacrifice--"

By B. M. PALMER

I suppose it takes a woman to insult a woman; every member of our sex who troubles to notice her must feel outraged by the egregious remarks of Dr. Edith Summerskill in a letter in *The Times* on January 4—but perhaps not. After all, most housewives feel in their bones that, though far from free in the true sense of the word, their status approaches nearer to freedom than that of any wage earners; and the rest of the insult, *i.e.*, that they are so unbeloved of their spouses as to be considered as unpaid drudges—they can afford to laugh at. However, let us look at the passage in question:—

"I welcome every suggestion which focusses attention on the serf-like status of the working housewife, but I cannot accept the view that £1 per week paid by the State will remove the injustice suffered by a woman who works hard seven days a week and is ignorant of the amount of her husband's wage. The British Institute of Public Opinion has recently revealed that one wife in four is in this position. A State grant, without legislation designed to compel a husband to reveal his wage would improve the economic position of the mean and greedy man who would simply reduce the housekeeping allowance by £1."

And of course, nothing else matters. If you get your wage every week, does it matter whom you sleep with?

Dr. Summerskill\* seems too emotionally undeveloped to

\*In an earlier article, *Civilised Slaves* (*The Social Crediter*, August 14, 1943), the author dealt more completely with Dr. Edith Summerskill's proposals.

grasp that a compulsory wage to the wife does not make a marriage; and that a marriage no longer exists when the parties to the contract begin to quarrel over money matters. There is another name for it. Her proposals simply amount to a bribe to live in sin, under the pretext of "serving the State" on the German model. And as for the British Institute of Public Opinion, who are they? Even if the statistics had any significance, they would in themselves be suspect.

Of course it may possibly be that Dr. Summerskill is denying her own experience. In either case she deserves pity. But the whole question can best be dealt with on the plane of the instincts and the emotions. There are not many present-day writers with the courage to tell the truth of the matter in fiction. Perhaps a scene from John van Druten's *The Distaff Side* will give the right emotional perspective to those whose instincts are not already warped.† It will remain to translate instinct into policy.

#### ACT II, SCENE II.

*Mrs. Millward, a widow of fifty, is talking to her daughter.*

MRS. MILLWARD: You don't love Charles. You begin to make me doubt if you even know what love means. Have you no capacity for caring for anything at all except yourself?

ALEX: I do care for Toby.

MRS. MILLWARD: But not enough to make your life his life?

ALEX: I might as well say he doesn't love me enough to make his life mine. Why not?

MRS. MILLWARD: Because that's not the way things are; because you're a woman.

ALEX: What's that got to do with it?

MRS. MILLWARD: Everything... unless you're of the kind that lives impersonally, like Theresa, and then I think you're... unfulfilled. I think that's what being a woman means.

ALEX: To submerge yourself, and everything you stand for, in a man? To give up everything for him?

MRS. MILLWARD: It isn't giving up. It's an exchange for something much more enriching than anything you could have alone. It's not a sacrifice. It's a fulfillment.

ALEX: And if he dies, what then?

MRS. MILLWARD (*very quietly, after a pause*): Then your life's over.

ALEX (*with a quick, impatient laugh of contemptuous protest*): Oh, really!

MRS. MILLWARD: To all intents and purposes. (*Melting a little*) Darling, I know what I'm talking about.

ALEX: Is your life over?

MRS. MILLWARD: The best of it. Father *was* my life. I couldn't have asked a better.

ALEX: But... but your life's full. You're interested in things. You read. You're fond of music. You like to travel. You've us... Roland and me.

MRS. MILLWARD: Do you need me really? You're grown up. You're ambitious. I hope you'll marry... if not Toby, then someone else. Does Roland need me? He shouldn't any more. No. Life for me... I think for most women... means more than that. It means existing in someone else—for someone else.

ALEX: If you believe that, then you must believe in *subtee*.

MRS. MILLWARD: No, you can't do that. You have to live your life out.

ALEX: Why, if it's over?

MRS. MILLWARD: Because I think there's another kind of life that comes from inside you... after your own life's done.

ALEX: After your married life, you mean?

MRS. MILLWARD: After your own personal life. It comes from what you've made of it, almost like a reflection of it. Without it, you wouldn't be complete. Can you understand that?

ALEX: Yes... If you've the capacity. (*She begins to cry.*) Oh, Mother. (*She puts her arms round Mrs. Millward, crying.*)

The "social problem" so-called of the housewife's status is one that can only be solved by a direct application of the Douglas technique in the light of the Douglas philosophy. But before this can be done women like Mrs. Millward, of whom there are millions, and they should be proud of it, must learn to trust and follow their own instincts. When they do this more completely—there are signs that it is happening and it means the defeat of the whole feminist philosophy—then it will be possible for instincts to be translated into policy and action. Not before.

#### THE GREATEST CARTEL

A *Daily Express* correspondent reported from the United States on January 14:—

"American officials are staid to be planning a world cartel to end all cartels, a form of trading that is distasteful to many Americans.

"According to a Washington report in the *Wall-street Journal* an international board, growing out of the War-time Materials Board, would control raw materials internationally, allocating production and markets, and setting prices.

"Trade itself would be left in private hands. The Board would have powers to cut off materials immediately from any Government suspected of aggressive intent."

#### THE BEVERIDGE PLOT

*An exposure of the network of oppressive restrictions which comprise the Beveridge Plan for 'Social Security.'*

Price: 3d. (postage extra)

From K. R. P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
49 PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL 15.

†Other plays which can be earnestly recommended to Dr. Summerskill are *The Taming of the Shrew* and *The Dominant Sex*, its modern counterpart, one of the best plays of the thirties.

## JAMES GOLDER

It is now possible to add to the news of the death of Mr. James Golder, briefly recorded last week, the information that this unexpected and widely regretted event took place, following a surgical operation at King's College Hospital, London, on January 19.

Born at Jarrow-on-Tyne in 1877, of Scottish parents, he served an apprenticeship in mechanical engineering with Messrs. Clarke, Chapman and Company, Ltd., Engineers, at Gateshead-on-Tyne, and received his technical training at Rutherford College, Newcastle-on-Tyne. He afterwards joined the drawing office staff of Messrs. C. A. Parsons and Co. at Newcastle, about the time when the Parsons Steam Turbine was coming into prominence. Of the design, construction and testing of steam turbines he rapidly acquired a wide knowledge and experience, eventually taking on the supervision of guarantee tests as well as the erection of several of the early installations of turbo-electric generating sets in this country. After two years spent in Messrs. Parsons' service in South Africa, he made several journeys on the continent of Europe as well as in the United States of America for his firm, and finally settled in London about 1907, when he joined the firm of Fraser and Chalmers, Ltd., of Erith, Kent, as a power engineer.

Golder was an ardent admirer of Parsons, whose pupil he was, and had a profound understanding of the principles of mechanism, possibly imbibed from the great inventor, but certainly developed and converted into a personal possession. This showed itself strongly after 1926, when his interest in Social Credit was first aroused, although for some time previously he had been groping for illumination in the conviction that there was something wrong, not with the productive system, harnessed as it was by ever stronger ties to limitless supplies of Solar energy, but with the financial system, which acted as a hindrance to availability. As for thousands of others, Douglas not only confirmed what Golder himself knew, but shed a flood of light on nooks and corners of experience which until then were wholly dark. He compared the whole philosophy of Douglas to a perfect sphere. From every surface point of view, there was only one centre, since the bisection of all arcs intersected there; thus the mathematician, the biologist, the engineer and the economist reached the same conclusion, from whatever angle they started. This grasp of the comprehensiveness of Douglas's view revealed in a vivid and inescapable image was of immense help to beginners struggling with the price calculus and showed many of them that a technical point which focussed so many interests must have implications which demanded more than usual attention. For the past eighteen years Douglas has had no more loyal or ardent supporter than James Golder. In the seeding time which virtually closed with the Buxton address of Major Douglas in 1934, he made many converts, and (subtle tribute to his greatness of character) not least among them are members of his family. Thus a considerable circle held him as a trusted guide, which is, in Social Credit as in mountaineering, a position of special danger to set at naught the advantages of superior mind and character. The incorruptible offer to the corrupt an irresistible temptation. But their best was useless on Golder. Of the details he never spoke to us: he just came and saw

and enquired and departed having made himself clear in his mind. What Newton said of natural things applies to social things. "We are to admit no more causes of natural things than such as are sufficient to explain their appearances." The evidence from five continents mounts up. A year, two years, ten years—the missing piece of the foul jig-saw turns up; but honest Golder did not bring us any pieces: he just stood in the sunlight and it was plain to see where the shadow fell and what cast it. The opposition did not really wake up to attack Social Credit until they had exhausted most of their customary methods (and have they any others?). A Social Credit "Sixth of the World" seemed (possibly to them rather than to us) almost in view. A few bursts from the tail gunner of *The Times*, a bark here and a growl there. But when the attack came it was world-wide and simultaneous, stealthy, mysterious and quiet. There are still some who live it on in their silly, vain, distorted dream. The next attack will be different, for Social Credit has entered into the blood-stream of history and of civilisation.

Golder seemed to know what Bacon meant when he wrote that "God on the first day of creation created light only, giving to that work an entire day, in which no material substance was created. So must we likewise from experience of every kind first endeavour to discover true causes and axioms; and seek for experiments of Light, not for experiments of Fruit." His light had come from Douglas, and he wasn't going to turn his back upon it. Still further (and rarer) the suggestion that Light and Fruit were not the same, though possibly, even probably, related things did not escape him. His adherence continued. Nothing that Douglas wrote but was subjected to patient and thorough scrutiny, and the results of his researches he tried to clothe in his own terms, terms which still had about them the tang of the drawing office (which is a place of ideas as well as of lines, and all things bound back to a purpose, a policy). They were serviceable and, in the main, right.

No one who met Golder during the strain of the years before the war could have failed to be impressed with the instantaneous impression he conveyed of scrupulous care and unflinching, thoroughgoing honesty. And so he has left among his family and among his friends a deep affection, as all men do who have been true in adversity and intrepid. Above all, he acted from his own initiative, thoughtfully, purposefully and with determination. He would not accept a directorship in the Secretariat until he was sure his own private war against the common enemy could not compromise it. It was characteristic of him. He never sought to be given responsibility. He took it, making sure that what he took was his own. On such almost alone the future of the world rests.

T. J.

### SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The Treasurer acknowledges with thanks a donation of £20 to open a Fund to assist the re-establishment of an agency of the Secretariat in London.

No further information will be published concerning this Fund, which is, however, open for contributions from those who may particularly desire to contribute to it.

## 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: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,  
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 11. No. 22. Saturday, February 5, 1944.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"Mr. Coldwell described the organisation of the C.C.F. Party in 1932, which took place in Calgary. [sic] . . .

"'Shortly after the organisation meeting,' Mr. Coldwell said, 'I met a New Zealander in Regina, called Walter Nash, who showed me the programme of the New Zealand Labour Party, and I was amazed to find that almost point for point, and *sometimes even word for word,*'" (Our italics—EDITOR T.S.C.) "'the policy of this party was identical with our newly organised party.'"

—*Edmonton Bulletin, November 23, 1943.*

Waal, waal, waal.

By a further amazing coincidence, it was in 1932 that Social Credit propaganda became a serious threat to both the U.F.A. Government in Alberta and the Coates Government in New Zealand.

The Social Credit Movement in Alberta was, as a name, returned to power in 1935, but as a policy was ineffective for eighteen months after that. Not being a sovereign government, it could be, and was, driven to indirect action. New Zealand is a sovereign government, on paper, and by some still unexplained manoeuvre, the whole weight of the New Zealand Social Credit Movement was thrown behind the New Zealand Socialist Labour Party, with which it has nothing in common. Sir Ernest Otto Niemeyer, sent out to deal with the situation, is credited with the remark, for which we cannot vouch, that there was no cause for anxiety so long as Mr. Walter Nash was supported in the position of Finance Minister. Just why Mr. Nash was in Regina in 1932, and his meteoric rise, are unexplained.

Trades Unionism in Canada, as a direct result of war conditions and the fostering of Trades Unionism by the Mackenzie King Government, has increased its paid membership from 55,000 in 1940 to over 250,000 in December 1943. The Canadian Congress of Labour, the equivalent of the Trades Union Congress—note the use of the word Congress—a highly centralised body, has "decided to regard the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Labour Party) as its medium for political expression." The quotation is from the *Times* of January 22, 1944.

The C.C.F. is the same kind of Labour Party as the London School of Economics, the Bank of "England," and P.E.P. The 250,000 will no doubt be led to the polls accordingly.

If we are right in our supposition that not all the readers of the *New English Weekly* are bitter enemies of Douglas

and Social Credit, there may be some occasion for rejoicing that the journal founded by Orage after his wanderings from the fold has at last shown enough of its hand for anyone with the slightest acquaintance with Social Credit to recognise it. The reader who draws our attention to a paragraph under the heading of *Notes of the Week* in the issue for January 20 says the paper "claims or has claimed to support Social Credit," and asks if the *New English Weekly* is merely stupid or whether it is consciously malignant. What it does claim, quite evidently, is the right to present, under an impudently vulgar caption, a sly travesty of someone else's ideas, in a form so slipshod as to be able (though with some difficulty) to say that an entirely different meaning was intended. The motive of such impertinences is much less important than the fact that no motive whatsoever could possibly justify them. A salesman who says: "This soap is as good as Pear's Soap" is at least giving a free testimonial to Pear's Soap, and is quite honestly admitting that Pear's Soap is something quite separate and distinct from what he is trying to sell under the disadvantage of competition from a genuine article. But a man who says: "This is 'What the Major Ordered'" (sic!) in a headline, when it isn't, and alters it to "This might be . . . almost the Beveridge that Major Douglas ordered" in the text is just past praying for. Whatever Social Crediters were "urging in vain" after the last war, or at any time, it was *not* that goods should be given away to make work whenever a slump threatened, nor that "the Government should go into the market and boldly finance production at the consumer end"; nor would either of these proceedings "if acted upon . . . be an advance in the right direction."

### TRANSFER OF JUDGES

In a letter to the *Times* of January 25, 1944, Mr. Edward F. Iwi said:—

"The Supreme Court of Judicature (Amendment) Bill 1944 if passed into law in its present form will lower the independence, prestige, and dignity of the High Court Judges.

"At present a High Court Judge is free from any suggestion of control by the Executive. On appointment by his Majesty the King a Judge is assigned by him to one of the three Divisions of the High Court, and is only transferred to another Division of the High Court by his Majesty the King under his Royal Sign Manual. (Supreme Court of Judicature (Consolidation) Act 1925, section 4 (3).) Clause 1 (3) of the Bill places the Judges under the direction of the Lord Chancellor, and he is in effect given power by the Bill to exercise those powers of direction which are now exercisable only by his Majesty the King. By clause 1 (4) of the Bill the power of direction would extend to transferring a Judge, already appointed by his Majesty the King to the Chancery Division, against his will, to one of the other Divisions of the High Court. In fact, except as to dismissal, the Lord Chancellor will have the same degree of control over Judges of the High Court (whenever appointed) as he now has over Judges of County Courts.

"Is it necessary, or desirable, that a Bill presented to relieve the congestion in the divorce lists should give to the Lord Chancellor, who is a member of the Executive, rights of direction over the Judiciary which are at the present time exercisable only by his Majesty the King?"

## CANADA AND SOCIAL CREDIT

The following is reproduced from the FINANCIAL TIMES (Montreal) of September 24, 1943:—

### STRANGE BEDFELLOWS THESE

A SPOKESMAN FOR SOCIAL CREDITERS DISCUSSES POSSIBILITIES FOR POLITICAL UNION WITH PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVES.

(Some time ago, TEMPUS, in his weekly column, drew attention to the fact that there was a move on foot for the Social Crediters and the Progressive Conservatives to get together. It was indicated that these two were not as far apart as people think. This prompted L. D. BYRNE, an Alberta Social Crediter, to write the *Financial Times*.

With much of Mr. Byrne's thesis we cannot agree; with the whole principle of Social Credit we violently disagree. Nevertheless, Mr. Byrne's processes of ratiocination are curious, stimulating, and to a degree, original. We give it to you here for what it is worth, still protesting that Mr. Byrne and ourselves are worlds apart:)

Dear TEMPUS,

I was very interested to read your comments in *Inside Ottawa* which I received from a correspondent. This question of the possibility of closer relations being established between the Progressive Conservative Party and the Social Credit movement goes much further than you indicate, and I feel that at this stage these matters should be clarified.

I must make it plain at the outset that, in what I have to say, I am merely expressing my own views and that these are not coloured by any partisan considerations but are inspired by the single purpose of furthering effective action to counter the overwhelming disaster towards which we are drifting rapidly.

The affinity between traditional Conservatism—as distinct from the guise in which it is presented in the field of party politics at the present time—and a correct concept of Social Credit is more fundamental than your article brings out. In order to appreciate this it is necessary to go back to the so-called Tory foundation of Conservatism, its stand for responsible democracy under a monarchy being progressively evolved on the basis of the preservation of those features in the social system which experience had demonstrated were sound, and its opposition to the rising tide of mercantilism, and later industrialism, as the controlling forces in social progress—with the accompanying materialistic philosophy and hypocritical puritanism—involved certain basic principles inseparable from the issues we face to-day.

While considerations of political expediency have, over a period of years, resulted in the Conservative parties of both this country and Great Britain gradually drifting away from those principles and embracing policies which were indistinguishable from Whiggism, nevertheless throughout the years the general body of Conservatives have retained much of the philosophy out of which their movement was born. To the extent they have done so, they are representative of the philosophy traditional to the British people, and inherent in the British concept in all spheres of social life.

Using the terms in their correct sense, the clash between the Cavaliers and Roundheads, Toryism and Whiggism, Conservatism and Marxian Socialism is fundamentally the same

as the clash between democracy and totalitarianism, or Christianity and Paganism — again using those terms accurately.

In every instance mentioned the clash arises from the opposing concepts of the relationship of the individual to the group and the relationship of the individual to the institution. This is absolutely fundamental. It is the focus of the universal conflict and confusion in the world at the present time, and it is an issue upon which there can be no compromise.

On the one hand we have a social and spiritual philosophy which conceives the individual (man) as having an "inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," to borrow the words of the American Declaration of Independence. The emphasis of this philosophy is on the freedom of the individual and the means by which this can be achieved under organised social life. It conceives that society exists for the benefit of its individual members, that the State and its institutions exist to serve its individual citizens. Its basis is the sovereignty of the people—all the people—and the subordination of all its institutions to the will of the people. ("The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath." "He that is greatest among you shall be your servant," etc., etc. The Gospels are rich in the enunciation of the principles involved.)

The form of social organisation which conforms to this philosophy is democracy in its true meaning—not the vague abstraction so dear to the modern academic intellectual. For it must be borne in mind that social organisation—like all organisation—is a science involving certain basic principles.

This social philosophy centred in the freedom of the individual, has been challenged throughout the ages by a diametrically opposite and conflicting philosophy. It conceives that the purpose of life is solely materialistic and attainable only by the subjugation of the many to the direction and domination of "superior beings"—those more clever and cunning than their fellows. This concept found expression in ancient times in priestcraft and tyrannical kingship, until by a natural process it became established as the doctrine of the Supreme State or, in modern terminology, totalitarianism. There is no place for human freedom in this philosophy. The goal of individual endeavour is power. Society exists for the benefit of those who control it. Its basis is the concentration of power in the hands of the ruling group, and the subordination of the individual to his rulers and the institutions they control—be it the State or anything else.

The form of social organisation which will serve this philosophy is dictatorship—the centralisation of power in the hands of the ruling group—resulting in the organisation of society on the principles of the wolf-pack.

The focus of the clash between these two opposing philosophies is Christianity, and it is not without significance that the initial impact of the Christian message should have been directed against Judaism.

The rise of Whiggism and its progress towards the totalitarian concept of society would not have been possible if its supporting philosophy had not been inculcated into the life of the British people. The part played by Jews and Judaism in this process constitutes a factor in history which cannot be ignored. The Judaising of Christianity, the financing of Cromwell, the introduction of Jewish trading customs, the

growth of the Judaic money system of the Rothschilds, the introduction of Ricardian economics, and later the infiltration of the doctrines of Marx and Engels—to mention but a few of the better-known facts—is evidence of the influence of Judaism in the development away from the democratic and Christian philosophy inherent in the British concept of social life, and which was the basis of the Cavalier-Tory-Conservative ideal in their inception.

This brings us to a consideration of certain fundamentals of social organisation. Under democracy, in order that the people shall be sovereign, they must have effective control of policy in both the political and economic spheres. A democracy must be organised to that end. The means by which this is accomplished must enable the people (a) to state the results wanted and (b) to enforce obedience to their will. The mechanism which has been evolved to achieve this is the voting system—in both the political and economic spheres. In the latter the voting mechanism is the monetary system.

Turning to the situation confronting the people of this and every other democratic country, we find a strange state of affairs. Though people have been living under democratic constitutions, in no such country have they enjoyed democracy—"government in accordance with the will of the people,"—*i.e.*, the management of the people's affairs to give them the results they want.

With almost limitless productive resources at their disposal, sufficient to ensure for all the economic security and freedom they wanted, the results obtained have been poverty, general insecurity and a progressive loss of freedom.

Without going into the matter more fully, it must be obvious that the people have not enjoyed democratic sovereignty because their mechanisms of control—their political and economic voting mechanisms—have been ineffective. Therefore the focus of attention must be directed to those mechanisms—*i.e.*, the political system and the monetary system. Particularly when a cursory examination will reveal that the latter is controlled by a private monopoly with the final power of control concentrated in the hands of a small group of German Jews. Thus under democratic constitutions has arisen an international totalitarian social structure controlled by an ingenious system of finance, with the acquisition of money (the supply of which is artificially restricted by

the controllers) as the object of human endeavour, and the principles of the wolf-pack as the motivating force in society. Is it any wonder the world is in a turmoil?

Down through the years Conservatism has endeavoured to stem the onslaught of the forces confronting it by defensive tactics and compromise. On the one hand it has endeavoured to maintain the *status quo* and on the other it sought the help of, and, in return protected, the very forces which were destroying everything it stood for. Step by step it departed from its principles and became the political party identified with reaction, big business and monopoly.

The emergence of Social Credit came at a time when the clash between the two philosophies of democracy and the totalitarian concept was beginning to assume cataclysmic proportions. Fundamentally the emergence of Social Credit was the re-birth of the traditionally British ideals of social life (the principles of which were originally inherent in the Cavalier-Tory-Conservative concepts) suitably adapted to modern conditions and in a scientifically precise form. It not only presented the philosophy in all its purity, but it provided the means for giving effect to that philosophy in both the political and economic spheres.

The situation which now confronts the British people everywhere is centred in a choice between the two philosophies of life as reflected by democracy in its purity, on the one hand, and the doctrine of the Supreme State, on the other. The principles involved are analysed in the enclosed memorandum which I prepared prior to the Winnipeg National Convention of the Conservative Party. That the Convention subsequently endorsed policies which violated every Conservative principle and embraced the more vicious of the tenets of State Socialism might seem incredible on the surface, but when we bear in mind that departures from basic principles are always cumulative in their effect on subsequent actions, it was not surprising that this should have occurred.

From the foregoing it should be plain that no realistic approach to the situation which is developing can ignore:

1. A reform of our political machinery to render the people's sovereignty effective.
2. Financial reform, to provide an effective system of economic democracy.
3. The Jewish question—not in the spirit of anti-Semitism, but as a problem to which a solution must be found in conformity with Christian principles.

The principles inherent in this whole question are absolutely fundamental. There is no possibility of compromise in regard to them. The recognition of this by a sufficiently large organised body would automatically mobilise the support of the overwhelming majority of people behind them. Political labels have become meaningless. Party loyalties are being abandoned under the sheer stress of disillusionment. In fact the "party system" is in disrepute and is rapidly breaking up. Recent elections clearly indicate the trend.

Yours very truly,

L. D. BYRNE.

## ABERHART MANNING

*The memoir of Mr. Aberhart published in the EDMONTON BULLETIN, and that journal's report of Mr. Manning's speech on policy broadcast on his becoming Premier of Alberta.*

With portraits of Mr. Aberhart and Mr. Manning.

Price 9d (Postage extra).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

## THE MODERATION OF BERNARD SHAW

*The Times* on February 1 published a column-long letter by G. B. Shaw in praise of the Vicar of Bray, but on page 2.

## Points from Parliament

*House of Lords: January 25, 1944.*

### TRUSTS

Lord Strabolgi rose to ask His Majesty's Government: whether they will state their policy with regard to trusts, cartels and combines, national and international, in post-war reconstruction; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: ... During the last war, the first World War, the growth of combines, monopolies, trusts and cartels aroused a good deal of anxiety, and my noble friend who sits below me, Lord Addison, who was then Minister of Reconstruction, appointed a committee of investigation to look into the whole question. The Committee reported on the 24th of April, 1919. This was a very remarkable Committee; remarkable in the eminence of its personnel. I have the Report in my hand. The Chairman was Mr. Edward Shortt, who resigned in the following June on becoming Chief Secretary for Ireland, when his place was taken by Mr. Charles McCurdy. Amongst the members of this Committee were two very well-known economists, Mr. J. A. Hobson and the former Mr. Sidney Webb, who was afterwards such an addition to your Lordships' House as Lord Passfield, and a trade union leader of whom we have heard a great deal since, Mr. Ernest Bevin.

The terms of reference were as follows:

"In view of the probable extension of trade organisations and combinations, to consider and report what action, if any, may be necessary to safeguard the public interest."

If your Lordships will permit me I will epitomize the Report. In the main Report the most relevant passage, I think, was as follows:

"In the United Kingdom, combinations operating in restraint of trade are, though not criminal, unlawful if shown to be against public policy, as public policy is understood by the English Courts, where these words are construed in a somewhat narrow and technical sense."

A great deal of evidence was taken from scores of great combinations, cartels and trusts and many other witnesses. In essence, the recommendations were these. First of all, that machinery for the investigation of monopolies should be instituted, similar to that in existence in the United States of America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. Secondly, that the Board of Trade should gather information about the workings of these monopolies. Thirdly, that a tribunal should be established, and that the Board of Trade should recommend State action to remedy grievances established by this tribunal of investigation. There was an addendum to the Report by Mr. Sidney Webb (as he was then), Mr. Ernest Bevin, Mr. Hobson, and another member, in which they recommended that monopolistic enterprises should not remain in private hands.

That was the Report, and I was always interested to know what the Government did about it. In November last, I ventured to ask His Majesty's Government what had happened, and my noble friend Lord Templemore was good enough to tell me that the action taken on the recommendations of this Committee—and here is the mountain in labour giving birth to a mouse—was the Profiteering Act of 1919, a ridiculous measure which many of your Lordships will remember very well, and with which we had a great deal of fun in the House of Commons. It never worked...

.... The international cartel system helped Germany very much indeed in her military preparations before the

present war. The German cartels induced their partners in Britain, America, and other countries, but particularly in Britain and America, to rationalise and restrict production, and in exchange, of course, their partners were given a monopoly in certain markets. The German cartels secured closed markets in their own areas. Then, under the Nazi system, when they became in effect part of the Nazi totalitarian government, they built up their own war potential. Profits did not matter to them; the German Government saw to that. They were able, under this cartel scheme in their closed markets, to build up an enormous war potential, the results of which we saw soon enough. They obtained manufacturing secrets and formulæ from their co-partners in Britain, America, Italy, Japan, and other countries. There was, of course, some reciprocity, but that did not matter, because the cartels in Britain and America were not part of a Government plot to prepare for war...

Now what has happened since the war? The greater part of Europe has been over-run or dominated as in the case of Spain, by Germany, and behind the German army have come the German industrialists and monopoly-financiers, the men who built up and controlled these trusts and cartels. In France, Czechoslovakia, and the Low Countries particularly, and in other countries as well, they have got control of the great key industries, the great heavy industries, the manufacture of electrical equipment, iron and steel, coal mining, and so on. There they are, in virtual control of all Europe's industry. In German-occupied Europe and in countries like Switzerland, Spain, and Sweden, which until recently have not dared to refuse anything on the economic plane, they have got a complete network of industrial, manufacturing and trading control. They have their "hideouts," if I may use that word—their financial hiding places—in Spain, in Switzerland, possibly in Sweden (I do not know about Sweden), and probably in the Argentine and Bolivia.

However the war ends, ... the leaders of German monopoly-finance will try to re-establish contacts with their old friends in Britain and the United States of America. They will have an economic and financial empire of great potential value to offer. There may be political difficulties in unscrambling the omelette of the German-dominated cartels in France and other countries. It will depend a great deal on the nature of the Governments in those countries. I understand that, in France, particularly, the German control of French industry has been most cleverly concealed—nominee shareholders, Quislings, and so on hiding the real power behind the majority shareholders—and they will have a great prize in this almost complete European monopoly of great basic industries. This is not fanciful... On the very eve of the outbreak of this war, spokesmen of the Federation of British Industries were closeted with the leaders of heavy industry in Germany—your Lordships will all remember that, but forgive me for reminding you—to try to come to some such arrangement for partitioning out great portions of the globe for monopoly trading operations...

*House of Commons: January 26, 1944.*

### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS (T.U. OFFICIALS)

*Wing-Commander James (Wellingborough):* The point I wish to raise is a narrow one and concerns the employment on big contracts, on sites under the aegis of the Ministry

of Works, of trade union officials who are being paid not by union funds but indirectly by the Government...

I must quote the basis of my complaint. I wish to quote Supplementary Condition No. 1, which is an addendum to a contract form which a contractor has to sign undertaking this obligation. It is called "Trade Union Representatives on Building Sites Levy on Government Contracts." Paragraph 1 reads as follows:

"For the purpose of maintaining trade union representatives on large Government building sites the contractor shall, on demand, within a calendar month of the day of acceptance of his tender, pay, as a levy into a trust fund (the treasurer of which is an officer of the Ministry of Works), established for the purpose, a sum equal to 0.1 per cent. of the estimated value of the work which is in this case..."

Then follows the amount of the contract. Paragraph 2 says:

"The contractor shall not be released from his obligation to pay the amount of levy demanded if a trade union representative is not allocated to the site."

Paragraph 3 says:

"If a representative is allocated to the site he shall be allowed full access to any part thereof to inspect work in progress, and the contractor shall be required to provide for the representative suitable office accommodation with telephone and transport if warranted by the circumstances of location. Payment of the reasonable cost of the facilities defined is to be admitted as an extra to the contract price."

I, therefore, want to ask these questions, because so far as I know this is an entirely new practice and there is no precedent for a Government Department paying trade union officials direct. I want to ask: who initiated this practice? Am I right in saying that there is no precedent for it? When was it started? Did the contractors ask for it or object to it? How many trade union officials have been, and are being, so employed?

Are they all from one union? How are they selected, and what is the total sum that has so far been collected and what is the total that has been paid out? Next, to whom is this money actually paid? Are these men trades union representatives or Government officials? They must be one or the other. The *Daily Herald* on 7th December last, in a paragraph on this question, wrote as follows:

"These officials are independent and responsible only to the Federation."

That would be a very surprising statement if true, because they are paid by the Government. If they are trades union officials in the ordinary sense of the word, then why should the taxpayer pay their salaries and not their union in the ordinary way?...

*The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works (Mr. Hicks):* ...The scheme has its origin in war-time conditions under which large numbers of men, many of them directed away from their homes, were being employed on numbers of large jobs, the majority of them being in isolated parts of the country. Nearly all our building work has to be taken out to the most remote parts. In these circumstances the difficulties of transport, billeting, canteens, protective clothing, rubber boots and other matters assumed a new importance in the building industry. The conditions were such that relatively small grievances could easily become magnified into matters of major controversy... the scheme was introduced with the full approval of both sides of the industry... [In March 1941] The Minister of Labour and Lord Reith met representatives of the principle federations of employers and operatives in the industries and invited their co-operation in

suggesting means for increasing production. The four federations submitted to the Government a memorandum... [which] included in particular a recommendation that of any site on which there were more than 2,000 men employed, a full-time trade union official should be installed for the purposes of consulting with the management on labour questions. After full consideration the proposal was accepted by the Ministers concerned as a special measure for meeting war-time difficulties only. As such, the scheme has worked remarkably well... The trade unions concerned were both unwilling and unable to bear the cost. In these circumstances, as the appointments were regarded as essential by both sides of the industries for assisting in increased production on the Government building programme, the then Minister of Works and Buildings decided that the cost should be borne by the Government...

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Reconstruction .....	6d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

### ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...8d.	
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
The Beveridge Plot .....	3d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet) .....	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.) .....	1d.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	1d.
The Representative's Job .....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.