

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"But the fact is that British industrialists have become indistinguishable from British Socialists. Both believe in organising industry, both believe in protecting it when organised, either from foreigners or from native newcomers."—*The Economist*.

In fact, all three, (inclusive of *The Economist*) know everything about industry except what it is for.

"We say that the principle of limited government is outmoded in our industrial age and must be abandoned or drastically modified. This alibi is a natural outgrowth of the delusion that in our industrial society we can get rid of individual responsibility without losing anything of real value. Obviously many Americans no longer consider liberty as a quality of real value, in comparison with something called security.

"In the name of efficiency and apparent economic security, we have gradually been turning too many of our individual responsibilities over to giant corporations. The present trend towards government centralisation and government monopoly is a natural outgrowth of the same delusion that in our industrial society we can get rid of our individual responsibility without losing anything of much value.

"Political liberalism in an industrial age works only when there is exchange of responsibilities, not when the emphasis is on the elimination of responsibilities.

"Our political devaluation is revealed in this decline of individual responsibility, both in private economic affairs and official government affairs. Hence the folly of proposing government monopoly as a cure for private monopoly. And hence also the folly of proposing that official government guarantee a 'floor under economic security.'"—Lewis O. Anderson in *Human Events*, U.S.A.

We do not think (and in this we suspect that we share the view of the inner circles of the Church of Rome) that what is called "revealed religion" is comprehensive, and if this is so, there must be a "good" occultism. But we are increasingly convinced, on the other hand, that the world is reeling under the Forces of Evil, linked with mundane politics and industry; that facts are distorted, emotions stimulated, from something which seems to be correctly described as Antichrist. It may be (we do not know) that as in the filthy ceremonies of Voodooism a blood sacrifice on the largest scale was a prerequisite to this atmosphere of Satanic illusion; and that this was provided by the two Greatest Wars; but the constant reiteration of the idea that the present trend, plainly identifiable with spiritual entropy, is "inevitable," when every aspect of it is false, retrograde and evil, can be of service only to Satan.

From *Western Civilisation since 1660*, by Tschan, Grimm, and Squires. J. B. Lippincott Company, 1945.

p. 1073 footnote 15:—

"A curious result of the continuing agitation against the 'democratic-Cæsarism' of Napoleon, even after these initial reforms, may be mentioned. In 1864 a Parisian lawyer named Maurice Joly published an essay in political theory entitled 'A Dialogue in Hell Between Machiavelli and Montesquieu.' It was a thinly veiled attack on the despotism of Napoleon III. In 1905, Serge Nilus, a half-mad priest of the Greek Orthodox Church, published in Russia a plagiarised version of Joly's essay in which the alleged menace of the Jews was everywhere substituted for the alleged menace of Napoleon III. The last chapter of Nilus's book contained the notorious *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. In numerous translations this anti-Semitic diatribe, historically baseless, has passed around the world since 1905, and has been involved in every anti-Jewish movement since that date. At a well-known trial in Berne, Switzerland, beginning in October, 1934, the facts as contained in this footnote were irrefutably demonstrated." [Quite incorrect. Joly (real name Joel) never wrote anything which would suggest ability to originate the Protocols. He is stated to have committed suicide—Editor, *T.S.C.*]

"In so far as the majority (sic.) of the French people were concerned, Napoleon III earnestly sought to stimulate the general prosperity and well-being. Dictatorships in their early years often are able to achieve much along such lines, and that of the Second Empire was no exception. True, Napoleon III was aided by fortuitous circumstances. The enormous gold discoveries in California and in Australia between 1848 and 1852 had given a filip to apparent prosperity the world over. Until 1857 there was, in fact, a general economic 'boom' in western Europe analogous to that prevailing in the United States before 1929. The effects of this upswing in the business cycle were clearly perceptible in France. The emperor probably only dimly perceived the causes, but like most political figures, he was willing to take credit for the results.

"Numerous innovations intended to create economic well-being were introduced into France during the Second Empire. Among these, for example, were such economic devices as the corporate form of business enterprise; investment banking as typified by the *Crédit Mobilier* in 1852; and in the same year land-mortgage banking as represented by the *Crédit Foncier*."

The above is probably the work of J. Duane Squires, of Colby Junior College, Waterville, Maine.

A Question for Candidates

If you believe in the Secret Ballot, why refuse its protection to M.P.'s in Parliament against Party Boss intimidation? If you do not, will you press for all voting, in and out of Parliament, to be open, recorded and responsible? The subject is made financially responsible at Common Law for the natural consequences of his acts. Why not for his votes?

“La Belle Pamela”

The following are some references to Freemasonry in *La Belle Pamela* (Lady Edward Fitzgerald) by Lucy Ellis and Joseph Turquan: Herbert Jenkins Limited, St. James's, London, S.W.1, 1924:—

CHAPTER II. PAMELA IN ENGLAND.

“... The history of certain families, of certain personages, is at times so intimately linked up with that of a country, that it becomes the actual history of that country. . . . Affiliated to a secret society of which the prince (the Duc de Chartres) has become the highest dignitary and she herself the instrument, [the Comtesse de Genlis] uses her influence over him to collect into one party of active political opposition the crowd of men of theory and passion, of philosophers and dreamers born from the writings of J. J. Rousseau^(*), that of the malcontents whom the long reign of the *Bien-Aimé* had created a little everywhere, and that of the ambitious which is of every time.

This secret society or freemasonry, which comprehended already a number of Protestants forming a political rather than a religious party, many Jews and foreigners, and was later on to include many more, led this party and was of singular aid in making the Revolution. For one should not imagine that these great movements of the people are spontaneous; they are organised rather than make themselves.

The Duc de Chartres, the Comtesse de Genlis above all, appear at first only to be secondary personages because their action is exerted in the shade; but when one knows both it and its consequences, this secret action shows them in the foreground. Since it is for the realisation of ambitions, as little avowed as her illicit double maternity, that Mme. de Genlis, seconded later on by men of talent or semi-talent, works to make of the Duc de Chartres a standard and then to raise it against the standard of the King. She knew that in England the first prince of the blood must needs be the head of a party in opposition: in all countries, by the same token, is not the younger branch always a seed-bed of fault-finders, pretenders and usurpers? The collaboration of her creatures, with whom she had peopled the Palais-Royal, and that of Freemasonry, would, as she thought, assure the realisation of her personal projects.

We cannot enter here into the details of the subterranean action of a sect whose essential object was the destruction of things created by the ancient French monarchy; we will content ourselves with recalling to our readers that, since 1771, the Duc de Chartres, in succession to the Duc d'Antin and to Louis de Bourbon, Comte de Clermont, had become Grand-Master of Freemasonry in France. Hurt pride had caused an estrangement, which might and should have been avoided, between him and the Court. With an eye to the future, Mme. de Genlis sought in no way to lead him back there. With incredible audacity, when one remembers the old-time prestige of royalty, she made out that she had some-

(*) And also through other influences. The Duc de Croy wrote in his *Journal*: “The fashionable philosophy which was always spreading religious toleration, cosmopolitanism which diminishes or annihilates patriotism, turn everything to indolent tranquillity.”

These words might apply to more recent times; they prove that patriotism, contrary to certain opinions, existed before the Revolution. They show also that “cosmopolitanism” or internationalism is no new thing, but a simple engine of war launched by our enemies by means of their secret agents when they want to “diminish or annihilate patriotism” in France, so as to deprive her of her principle moral force.

thing to complain of in the Queen's treatment of her. . . . Mme. de Genlis showed herself cruelly mortified by [the Queen's] recall to etiquette. But who knows whether she had not hoped to provoke it in order to have a grievance against the sovereign, to still further estrange the Duc de Chartres from the Court, and to form by the aid of Lauzun . . . a primary kernel of opposition? (Note: “Mme. de Genlis excited his animosity against the Queen and, however much she may deny it, she certainly roused and maintained him in political intrigue.”—Lord Holland *Recollections of the Courts of France*.)

Thus in some years, these two, both on the margin of society and of the Court, found themselves, more or less secretly, at the head of the enemies of Versailles. They grouped the principals at the Palais-Royal, and thus was formed the party called the *Orléans* faction.

To neglect no means of arriving at his ends, the Duc de Chartres, in 1773, had made his wife become affiliated to Freemasonry. Mme. de Genlis entered shortly after the Duchess, if, indeed, she did not precede her; she was not ignorant of the deep political designs of that society when she created in the year 1773, either by her own initiative or because it was prescribed to her, an *Order of Perseverance*. It was to comprehend, says Bachaumont, only “lords and ladies of quality.” (*Memoires secrets pour servir a l'histoire de la République des Lettres: mémoires dits de Bachaumont*.) p. 103. Garnier Frères, publishers). As Bachaumont does not let us ignore that this project was conceived at the Palais-Royal and that, at a preliminary meeting, Mme. de Genlis made “a very fine speech,” it is not rash to believe that the *Order of Perseverance* was but a branch of the lodge *Candour* to which Mme. de Genlis belonged, and that she had the mission or the personal desire of introducing by this means, into mundane and Court circles, principles or theories which were to sap the existing political order and break down the ancient, worm-eaten edifice of the French monarchy. Freemasonry in no way disdained admitting into its ranks the aristocracy of the country, quite the reverse, and the latter responded in flocks to its advances. But later on, certain perspicacious minds, such as the Comte de Virieu, perceiving whither its doctrines led, retired from it, leaving only the simple, the needy, the “climbers,” the malcontents and the black sheep of the flock.

No matter, Freemasonry made marvellous instruments of them to serve her ends. As for Mme. de Genlis, she had adhered, like many others, less to serve it than to be served by it. For she seems to have already conceived her plan, a plan unheard-of, unbelievable, extravagant—look back on that period—and which does not appear to have been suspected by the historians of the Revolution: to push the Duc de Chartres, whom she dominates and who does nothing without her assent or order, into separating from the Court, rising against it, getting the King deposed (by means of a small revolution easy to provoke by distributing wine and money through the ring-leaders kept at the Palais-Royal), then to make the Kingdom into a constitutional monarchy and place her lover on the throne of France.

. . . Amid the turmoils which precede and bring about the fall of outworn dynasties is generally concealed a feminine hand which, behind the curtain, moves and directs the actors. For in politics, as in everything, one must always take count of women and not overlook with scorn the small, hidden and sometimes decisive causes which determine the greatest crises of the lives of nations. Behind the Duc de

Chartres, when not at his side (as we shall see her on October 6, 1789), does one not always find Mme. de Genlis? One may affirm that she was at the base, that she was the base even of the Revolution. She believes she leads all, because she sees that her personal interest, which she discloses to no one, is blended with that of the lodge which dominates the Palais-Royal, but is it not she, on the contrary, who is led, without knowing it, by men as mute as regards their ends as she is on hers and whose instrument she has become?

... She had judged rightly: the prince will not abandon her for this caprice, and she will always remain the first, in his mind as in his heart. A slave to certain peculiarities or habits, bound to her by political interest and by their two little girls, the Duc de Chartres with his want of initiative, was in need of being led and of having things decided for him; he could not dispense with the tutelage of Mme. de Genlis.

... From long previously—it is Chamfort who has confided this to Marmontel (*)—the Revolution was prepared and it was in the Palais-Royal that the preparation took place. But the social body was vitiated, a large abscess had by degrees been formed in it which was ripe and near to bursting. . . . In the unlocking of the Revolution, Mme. de Genlis . . . played her part; but she was soon to learn that it is an easier matter to unchain the passions of the populace than to direct them; stronger hands than hers will wrest from her this Revolution, hatched by her and of which she had thought to make her chattel, and will frustrate the benefits she had hoped to derive from it; *sic vos non vobis*. . . .

Meanwhile, she cheats the Duchesse de Chartres, she cheats her accomplices, she cheats the public, she cheats everyone, as she will cheat her biographers and the historians of the future, hoping to cheat history.

(*) "Excellent as a builder, you are worthless, Marmontel, for destruction. It seems to me that things are going further than the nation understands and much further than it demands."

"Good," replied he, "does the nation know what it wishes? It shall be made to wish and to say what it has never thought of. . . . The nation is a large herd which only dreams of pasture and which, with good dogs, the shepherds may lead where they will. (a) Difficulties are foreseen, and means are calculated. . . . One has, to impose this, that particular class which has nothing to lose by a change, and thinks to see everything to gain. To work it up, one has the most powerful motives, want and hunger, money, rumours of terror and alarm. . . . All that is necessary to the Revolution, all that is useful to it, is just. That is the great principle."

"It is perhaps that of the Duc d'Orleans," replied I, "but I see only him for leader of the people in insurrection, and I have not, I must avow, a high opinion of his courage."

"You are right," said he to me, "and Mirabeau, who knows him well, says that to count on him would be building in the sand. But he has shown that he is popular, he bears a name which carries weight, he has millions to spend, he detests the King, he detests the Queen, even more, and if courage is lacking to him, he shall be given it. . . ." (Marmontel: *Memoires*, Vol. II, p. 294-300).

It was not courage that was lacking to the Duc d'Orleans, but the spirit of initiative and decision as well as character. He was too supine to be leader of a party, and his courage was of the passive kind. As for his hatred of the Queen, it was Mme. de Genlis who had inspired him with it to make him "advance."

(b) "Human nature is born silly and is led by knaves, that is the rule." It was Benjamin Constant who said that: if he were still alive, would behold a different opinion? Barere and Vadere had no higher idea of the Paris populace, in their eyes it was a vile herd, a collection of imbeciles; with a straw, one could lead that set of boobies." (Le conventionnel Vilate, *Cause Secrète de la*

CHAPTER III. 1779 TO 1782.

... But did this notion of becoming "governor" of the children of the Duc de Chartres really originate with Mme. de Genlis? Had it not been breathed to her, if not imposed by someone of those mysterious societies to which they were one and the other affiliated? For one must not forget that she was Grand Mistress of the masonic lodge *Candour*, one of those rare androgynous lodges whose title, applied to Mme. de Genlis, makes us smile, as much as we do at that of the lodge *Equality* to which belonged the first prince of the blood, Grand-Master also of Freemasonry in France.

However that may be, the thought had arisen of directing the intelligence and education of the children of the Duc de Chartres in a manner totally opposed to the traditions of the old French monarchy: must one not, before the projected Revolution was accomplished, inculcate in them the revolutionary spirit?

... She was to turn the education of the princes and princess of Orleans towards the philosophic ideas which were leading everything at the Palais-Royal. . . . (Note: The Duc de Chartres, having lost his father on November 18, 1785, had taken, according to the tradition of his house, the title of Duc d'Orleans).

... That demolition [of the Bastille] was on the revolutionary programme which was being organised by certain secret societies working on public opinion in France ever since the Reformation. Calling to mind the words of Cardinal de Retz, that "nations are weary some time before they are aware of it," certain German influences, interested in weakening France, sought to persuade the inhabitants of that country that they were unhappy. Little by little these influences fermented their brains and easily altered into a spirit of revolt that carping spirit which is as rooted in Frenchmen as was their love for their King. When the moment came, all was ready. "An unfrocked Jesuit, Weiss-haupt, an obscure professor of Ingolstadt, had achieved," says Costa de Beauregard, "the unification of all the German secret societies by imposing on them the all-powerful organisation of the Jesuits." A French gentleman, the Comte de Virieu, was among others who, generous-hearted, led by illusions and dazzled by mirages, had become affiliated to illuminated freemasonry. In Germany, that secret society was ruled by the Crown Prince of Prussia, the Duke of Brunswick, the Prince of Hesse, etc., as in France it comprised the Duc and Duchesse de Chartres, the Duchess de Bourbon, the Princesse de Lamballe. . . . Convoled to the famous congress of Illuminism in 1782 at Wilhelmsbad, Virieu returned from it terrified. "The conspiracy which is being wrought," he avowed with sorrow and without being willing to say more, "is so well woven that it will be impossible for the monarchy or the Church to escape it." The affair of the necklace was the first torpedo. Charged by Cagliostro, and fired by the Prince de Rohan, Cardinal-Bishop of Strasburg and Grand Almoner of France, it had burst on the goal, giving a shock to the monarchy which left the latter tottering like an ancient tower, ready to fall at the next stroke of the ram.

That scandalous affair, an invention in every detail, was followed up by the still more scandalous acquittal of the Cardinal, due to the same influences. Royal power, which

(Continued on page 7).

Revolution. At a later time, when party spirit idealises the past and will only see the poetry of a legend, these words astonish people; they are, nevertheless, the truth. . . .

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. 23. No. 23. Saturday, February 4, 1950.

"Ballot Box Has Divine Authority"

Signed in bold letters, "SEEKER," the following appeared prominently in a panel in the middle of the leader page of the *Sale and Stretford Guardian* for January 27, headed in black letters **BALLOT BOX HAS DIVINE AUTHORITY**:—(N.B. *The Sale and Stretford Guardian* published on January 6 a letter quoted by us on January 14 urging the restoration of the Open Ballot. In the interval, the date of the general election has been announced, but no reply to the letter has appeared.)

A preacher in St. Paul's Cathedral recently had something to say about the coming election which merits careful consideration.

"Everyone who bears authority among us," he said, "is answerable to God. However he may have been appointed to his office—whether by election, nomination, intrigue, or chance—he is answerable for the conduct of it before the judgment seat of God."

The private citizen too, at all times, but perhaps especially at election time, is in the same position. We cannot persuade ourselves that because we are only one voter in a constituency of 50,000 our thought and decision are of no account. Nor can we present as an alibi to our conscience that we are only one in a total population of 50,000,000. We are answerable to God because *all authority—even the authority of the ballot box—belongs to Him.*

The Church does not take sides in political controversy. Her policy was stated with admirable lucidity by the Lambeth Conference, which declared that "The Church is the champion of Man against all that cheapens and degrades him" and the Christian will bear this in mind as he prepares—exercising his authority under the supreme authority of God—to record his vote.

Sir Stafford Cripps preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on January 9. The brief report in *The Times* next day did not contain any such reference as the above, and the words, with their ambiguous ascription of "authority," may not have been his. The blasphemous doctrine enunciated in the heading and repeated in the comment seems to be completely unconnected with the quoted paragraph. Dismissing the literal interpretation of the commentator's words as meaningless, the derivative meaning is the crudest possible expression of the doctrine of *vox populi, vox Dei*, a doctrine repudiated even in the Anglican addition to the Lord's Prayer. What happens if you make a Cabinet Minister (elected "by chance" or otherwise) answerable *only* to God, and then let him abolish God, which, we understand is within the competency of "Sovereign" Parliament?

"Inevitable" is a Satanic Word

A correspondent in Australia points out how different an approach from that of Lord Horder's "fly-paper"

Fellowship in England is possible. He encloses a cutting from the *Sydney Morning Herald* for January 18, reporting a speech by Sir Earle Page, Federal Health Minister, at the first of a series of conferences with the Federal Executive of the B.M.A., the Pharmaceutical Guild and the friendly societies.

"It is fundamentally wrong," he is reported to have said, "to throw the whole responsibility of private medical and hospital services on the Government," and added that the Government would provide every incentive for individual and community effort and would subsidise both. "Those who help themselves will receive the greatest help from the Government." He said their immediate aim was to restore the autonomy of hospital managements on the spot, and they would discuss methods whereby that could be accomplished. The making of doctors virtually Government employees must lead to waste and inefficiency.

"Can we reverse this trend? The hospitals were never better conducted than when they were fully controlled by local committees . . . The best antidote to laxity in administration is the cultivation of local pride and the stimulation of local effort."

Action in Australia

In the recent Australian Elections, all Candidates in a certain Constituency were asked:—

What political action are you prepared to take, if elected, in respect of the following: That Regulations made under any Act shall cease to be valid after an interval of three months unless such regulations have been debated and sanctioned by Parliament?

The candidate, since elected, replied:

I believe there has been considerable drift in the authority of our Elected Parliaments by the use by Ministerial action having the force of law and without the sanction of Parliament. I think your suggestion of a time limit of three months is excellent.

According to the *Sydney Herald* for November 30, the Governor-General, Mr. W. J. McKell, "has received a petition from Queensland asking that proceedings be taken against a Communist Party candidate in Queensland at the forthcoming Federal election for alleged sedition.

"Mr. A. Chresby, of Charleville, Queensland, a Country Party organiser, in the Maranoa electorate, forwarded the petition to Mr. McKell last week.

"The petition has been handed to Mr. McKell's constitutional advisers for examination."

"The Middle Class Vote"

"A very valuable recent study of the middle classes brings out very clearly what a much more serious thing it is for a man to find he has only one employer, in proportion as his stock-in-trade is a specialised proficiency which it has taken him many years to acquire. It used to be the great attraction of professions like medicine that once a man had acquired the degrees he would always have a wide choice of what he would do. The man who became a colliery manager or a mining engineer knew that there would always be concerns competing for his abilities. Today more and more professional men have to face the danger that there will come to be only one organisation in a position to employ them in this country, and that, if they get wrong with the relevant Department, or National Board, it will be decisive against their career."—*The Tablet.*

"I Went and Hid Thy Talent in the Earth"

By HEWLETT EDWARDS

*Martin of Patteshull, Dean of St. Pauls: William of Raleigh, Bishop of Winchester: Henry of Bracton, Archdeacon of Exeter Cathedral.** These and those around them (1154-1272) were the formulators of Common Law, unique and of England. Continuing over generations this formulation did not consist merely in the redrafting of something which existed, or the devising of something new. Such men were not isolated intellectuals detached from their own time and generation, but were the outcome of age-long Christendom. First, what they had behind them in their great work was Christian tradition and its interpretation in Canon Law: second, immemorial custom, slowly acquiring the weight of law: and third, natural law which, as Stephen Langton said, is binding on Princes and Bishops alike, there being no escape from it. Around them was present change, in the gradual acceptance elsewhere of Roman Law, with its compact organisation and its tendency towards abstractionism. Custom slowly generated the principles of Common Law; with Canon Law as a natural bridge connecting legal ideas with interpretation of the New Testament and theology based upon it. The synthesis of these varying strands of thought and practice embodied the structure of the Constitution; a synthesis consonant with growth, for the technique was in the heart of life and day to day affairs, dealing with problems as they arose; each decision constituting another link to take the stress which caused the problem to arise, much as the budding of new leaves requires a greater strength to carry them, which is supplied by growth. Magna Carta itself was a case, and that decision a precedent, not a completion.

This continuity of growth received articulation in the Year Books; "a matchless record of the dealings of the King's Courts with free men and women of England and of their relations with one another as this appeared in evidence before the Court."

From out this practice of the principles of Christian philosophy England became a society of free and responsible men and women, living in a free and responsible community. As part of the same process emerged the solution of the primary problem of society: the disposition of power. Christian theology converged with the nature of reality in the trinitarian constitution; the three Estates of the Realm. The King—"the fountain of honour and justice"—was executive as to the power entrusted to him by his subjects the Commons, and Lords Temporal. Authority was represented by The Lords Spiritual; the Lord Chancellor, invariably a Churchman, was recognised as "the King's Conscience." So far as humanity has yet experienced, it is this balance between Authority, Power, and the Executive which alone can stand against relapse, by human frailty, into pagan totalitarianism.

A clear distinction was drawn between matters mundane dealt with by the King's Courts and those spiritual which fell to the Courts Christian. Among the latter was usury, "the taking from a borrower of a payment solely for the use of money lent to him to be applied by him in the normal way as a means of exchange." This was prohibited. In this sphere Church law was met by enactment in the King's Court concerning the "just price." Whereas Roman law sanctioned the idea that each man had the right to out-

reach others as far as he could, a Statute of Edward III clearly envisaged the conception that price should be reasonably related to cost. The wrong use of money was recognised as a source of corruption, and these measures had a profound effect upon the whole range of economic life, embodying the injunction "whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also unto them."

This age of Chivalry, and of the Builders of Cathedrals and of the Constitution had its darker side—departures from the conditions of its growth. Throughout there was in the life of those days a certain clarity which has been lost. A man knew where he stood and the mark at which he aimed. His responsibilities were clear, he needed none to tell him when he was evading them; he knew what freedom was and when he lost it. Well understood provisions protected him where he was weakest, and for the rest he was able and willing to fend for himself. Out of constitutional practice the serf emerged a free man.

After five . . . six . . . seven hundred years many words of tribute are still paid the British Constitution; but here already, in the nineteenth century, is a curious note for reverence to assume:—

Lord Peel in an address (1848)*:—

"I do earnestly trust—I have that confidence in the good sense of the working classes of this country—that they will believe no false delusions of the compulsory sharing of profits; no emnity directed against capital, no extinction of competition among individuals, no overpowering of private enterprise at the public expense, can possibly be for the benefit of the working classes, or have any other ultimate result than involving them in ruin."

And Baron Bramwell, in binding over a number of men who had been convicted of illegal activities during the London Tailors strike in 1867:—

"Everyone knows that the total aggregate of happiness of mankind is increased by every man being left to the unbiassed, unfettered determination of his own will and judgment as to how he will employ his industry and other means of getting on in the world. You must know it . . . But strange to say, you men are trying to legislate for yourselves in a contrary direction: for instead of furthering that freedom of labour . . . and of capital which the law has endeavoured to secure, you are endeavouring to put restraints upon them. . . ."

Although engaged in the endeavour to create confidence, neither Peel nor Bramwell could conceal his perplexity. In propounding a thesis which is implicit in the Constitution they were evidently baffled by the resistance offered and quite unable to translate this into its own realistic comment upon constitutional practice. It was a curious position to 'bind over' men not to seek bondage; to force them to be free. These eminent Victorians were not entirely unaware of the movement of the ground beneath their feet, presage of the landslide of today. But neither they nor others seem to have been able to regard this problem in the wider perspective in which it now seems so clear that there were two possibilities: either the provision by the Constitution of a framework in which responsible men could move freely was 'wrong' and ultimately foredoomed to disaster, or the framework within which

*Much factual information has been derived from *Christian Philosophy in the Common Law*, by Richard O'Sullivan, K.C., to whom acknowledgements are made.

*Quotations from *The Age of Equipoise* by W. L. Burn in the October issue of *The Nineteenth Century*.

men were neither responsible nor free had in fact become inadequate. It is the tragedy of recent history that, almost without argument, the former alternative was accepted; for the process which we now experience consists in the removal of responsibility and freedom in order—so we are instructed—to be responsible and free.

Little imagination is required to show that the constitution no longer provides that comprehensive refuge from interference in which alone the integration of a free society can take place. In the 12th and 13th centuries the Constitution was a living, growing thing. Suppose that growth to have continued in the singleminded search for all-embracing truth, not only by divines but expressed in Everyman's activities and in successive decisions of the Courts Christian and of the King's Courts; each problem illumined by instructed integrity and each a step to further understanding. It is an illumination to imagine men of that ancient integrity, penetration and tenacity faced by the problems of the turn of the eighteenth century. What would they not have accomplished, backed by that unity of purpose so long since vanished? Adherence to and development of the 'just price' and the ban on usury would long before have resulted in a money system fit to meet and use the impact of the industrial revolution. Finance, instead of adding its headlong momentum to the pursuit of material things, would have turned to fulfil the spiritual aspect of material changes. For the release which is implicit in the advancement of the industrial arts is also of the spirit (otherwise 'progress' is not merely senseless but fatally destructive) which, so enlarged, would without effort have overcome the flood of alien and materialistic philosophies. Had the Constitution proceeded on its course inviolate, we of this generation might well have echoed Shakespeare: "Come the three corners of the world . . . and we shall shock them!"

It did not happen so. During the early years of the sixteenth century Sir Thomas More (Speaker of the House of Commons and later Chancellor) was recognised as the incarnation of English law and Equity, and of the Christian theology and philosophy which animated the Common Law. His execution by Henry VIII in 1535 marked the beginning of the dismemberment of that for which he stood. The Year Books came to an end, as to which Edward Burke made comment "To put an end to the Reports is to put an end to the law of England." The study of Canon Law was prohibited and Roman civil law was instituted. The Constitution thus breached the enemy marched in, *The Prince*, by Machiavelli (The 'Protocols' of that era) being made current generally and in the religious houses, by Thomas Cromwell, Vicar General to the King. The doctrine of the Supremacy of Kings (Cranmer 1540) undermined the threefold balance. The foundations of the Constitution were deep and sound and its downfall lasted over generations. But "since the Whig revolutions of 1644 and 1688, and the foundation of the Bank of England under characteristically false auspices in 1694, the Constitution has been insidiously sapped by the Dark Forces which knew its strength, and the obstacle which it offered to treachery."* In the eighteenth century *Blackstone* could write that "Parliament hath sovereign and uncontrolled authority in making, conforming, expounding and repealing laws; this being the place where that despotic power, which must in all governments reside somewhere, is entrusted by the Constitution of these Kingdoms. . . ." From their inception no political Party has contested this process; all have accelerated and accepted its

advance. "We have now only the mere shell of the Constitution, Single Chamber Government . . . to which the next step is the secular materialistic State, the final embodiment of power without responsibility."*

"I went and hid thy talent in the earth." Bad enough. Worse still to allow perversion to destroy it.

The disintegration of the Constitution has proceeded at various rates in various spheres but no aspect has escaped attention. Provisions against known dangers in the use of money were abandoned. In 1571 a Statute provided that no penalty should attach to usurious transactions if the rate of interest did not exceed ten *per cent*. In the 17th century Cromwell reinstated the Jews as moneylenders in London. In 1854 came the repeal of all usury laws (one of the removed 'restraints' referred to by Bramwell). This was due to the influence of Bentham whose *Defence of Usury* became "one of the sacred books of the economists." Marriage and the family have been subjected to influences and regarding individuals no more need be said than that the free men and women of England have become *insured persons*. Volumes would be required to record other, and in particular more recent infringements of the Constitution.

Throughout all there have been times and there still are times when the spirit of England shows forth for what it is; but in spite of, and not in concert with the political structure within which it is now imprisoned.

Deeper than history, the Constitution has profound relationship to doctrine: the Doctrine of the Incarnation. "At bottom, what we have to make up our minds upon is whether human political action is subject to the same kind, or some kind, of compulsion to be 'right' as we accept in doing a multiplication sum, and if so, whether the Christian Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, is the living incarnation of that 'right'-ness. . . . It must be insisted that Christianity is either something inherent in the very warp and woof of the universe, or it is just a set of interesting opinions, largely discredited, and thus doubtfully on a par with many other sets of opinions, and having neither more nor less claim to consideration."†

This brief review will suffice to indicate that the Constitution contemplated by the Victorians or that now being elaborated by present politicians is distinguishably at variance with that for which Sir Thomas More died rather than surrender. It is evident that neither Lord Peel nor Judge Bramwell appreciated this, or that their perplexities would have dissolved in the return to authentic constitutional practice; no easy task in their day, and the hundred years which have since elapsed have been devoted to little else than the cultivation of further disintegration.

Real understanding comes first; upon that the problem resolves itself into the restoration of the functions we have allowed to decay. No surface measures on conventional lines will have the least effect, and any others will, at first sight, be condemned as impracticable; but the reason for taking action is not because it is easy but because it is contributory towards its purpose.

It would be small exaggeration to say that what has *not* been said here carries the major weight, in consideration of the appropriate focus of action. The deterioration of ideas (as well as of words) must be taken for granted. By the 'Welfare State' *freedom* has been transmuted into irre-

*C. H. Douglas in *Realistic Constitutionalism*.

*C. H. Douglas in *Realistic Constitutionalism*.

†C. H. Douglas in *The Realistic Position of the Church of England*.

sponsibility. But in reality freedom, though distinguishable, is inseparable from *responsibility* and from that which is at once the progenitor and product of both—*integrity*. If responsibility is attained, freedom will be there too. In this sense it may be useful to think of the approach to this problem as being couched in terms of responsibility. *The Lords* are responsible for the safe keeping of the Common Law—then make it so, together with the removal of restrictions upon it and the establishment of the principle that legislation by the House of Commons impinging upon it is *ultra vires*. *The Parties* have assumed responsibility for the propounding of policy—then make it so, with the proviso that their proposals (including cost) are put in a form which the electors will understand. *Electors* are responsible for choosing policy—then make it so, being sure that they understand the proposals put before them and that each (by having his vote recorded with those who agree) will secure the results of his choice.

This line of action clearly impinges on the restoration of the Constitution—the incarnation of the Talent which is the especial endowment of the British people.

“LA BELLE PAMELA” (continued from page 3)

was already giving way, confined itself to sending the prelate to the Bastille.

As for his seductor, the charlatan Cagliostro, he took refuge in London to escape the just wrath of the monarchist party, and published from thence, as says M. Costa de Beauregard “that famous letter announcing the destruction of the Bastille and of the monarchy, and in which he predicted the advent of a prince who would abolish *lettres de cachet* who would convoke the States-General and establish the cult of Reason.”(*)

CHAPTER VI. BEFORE THE REVOLUTION.

... The grand words Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, which were being at that time stamped on every wall in Paris, will not fail in their appeal to [Lord Edward Fitzgerald's] imagination. Already the opposition party in England was hailing with enthusiasm the dawn of that revolution, and we must remember that the head of that opposition was Charles James Fox, a very charming man of remarkable intelligence, who was first cousin to Lord Edward and had great influence over him. . . .

CHAPTER VII. THE BIRTH OF THE REVOLUTION.

... Mme. de Sillery's (formerly de Genlis) political ambitions seem to have been actively exercised in these latter years, during which an occult power spread abroad rumours of great events which were shortly to overturn everything.

(*) Talking of Cagliostro: “He is the greatest of men, wrote the Cardinal to Mme. de la Motte; Cagliostro is God himself.” And when behind the screen this improvised god evoked the vision of the Queen of France, “the perjured priest embraced the hands of his seductor . . . and crawled at his feet . . .” The rest is known. The duping of the Cardinal, Mme. de La Motte's knavery and the Queen's innocence were strikingly shown in the evidence, though something of the calumny remained. Virieu rushed to the minister Breteuil: “If I,” said he, “were to be sent to the Bastille for it, I must ask you whether you are aware of what is passing on in the masonic lodges, and if you have taken measures to guard against the dangers which may result therefrom?” But that was giving the alarm to those who cared neither to see nor to hear . . . “Oh! be at your ease, Sir,” was the reply, “you shall not be sent to the Bastille, nor will the freemasons disturb the State.” At the very time that the minister was giving Virieu these proud assurances . . . “the parliament had been almost entirely brought over . . . a scandalous acquitment took place.” (Marquis Costa de Beauregard, *loc cit.*, pp. 43-48).

All knew that the social state needed modification. Generous sentiments were at the base of the dreamed-of reforms; an exalted desire for innovation, the hope of an era of happiness, were favourable to the revolutionary plans. At first was envisaged only a regeneration of the monarchical power by establishing political rule of the nature of that in England. A constitution analogous to that seemed a panacea to all evils. It was only later on that they thought of changing the person of the monarch. The project of that was formed by the *Illuminati* at the masonic congress in 1782, and we know that freemasonry directed all things at the Palais-Royal. It was there that the riots were conceived, from thence emanated that occult power which Sylvain Bailly called “the invisible motor.” “Some day,” wrote he, “will be known and shown up that spirit of evil who was the sleeping partner.” The highest in the aristocracy the Noailles, La Fayette, Ségurs, Lauzuns, Narbonnes and Montmorencys (these two latter impelled by their friend Mme. de Staël, who was no doubt more seriously affiliated to the secret societies than the Duchesse de Bourbon and the Princesse de Lamballe), were in the vanguard. Then came the parliament, always malcontents, seconded by some prelates and many priests; then lawyers, attorneys, notaries, tax-collectors and clerks of all the administrations. . . . All those formed the framework of the Revolution, which, on summing it up, was, more or less, the work of everybody, though the riots and popular risings were always led by foreigners. . . .

... Mme. de Sillery (de Genlis) supported the movement in secret, and openly, showed herself not unfavourable to it. . . . Rocking in the bark of her illusions, she does not see the tidal wave advancing which will sweep away everything. Who indeed does see it?

... Mme. Vigée-Lebrun, an artist of the middle class, might have had wider views than those held by the Court; the account she gives shows, however, that she was much scandalised at seeing, as she imagined, the ideal, fairy-like Pamela (daughter of Mme. de Genlis) parading with complaisant ease in the midst of this unclean rabble, so improperly called *the people*: the word has since taken on a higher meaning than it then had, when one qualified as *the people*, vile blackguards who were at the orders of anyone who would pay them. . . .

CHAPTER X. MARRIAGE OF LORD EDWARD AND PAMELA.

... Though we cannot swear that the Masonic Lodge to which Lord Edward (Fitzgerald) was affiliated was one of those eight or ten English and Irish Lodges which had accepted the doctrines of Illuminism, we know that in 1792 there were at least six or seven revolutionary societies in England which were in correspondence with the Jacobin Club; for at the end of September, an address of congratulation was sent to Paris by the members of the following societies: London Constitutional Society; Reformation Society of Manchester; Revolution Society of Norwich; Constitutional Whigs; Independents and Friends of the People. (*)

Lord Edward's frame of mind with regard to affairs in France had not passed unnoticed by his family . . . Miss Emily Ogilvie, the Duchess of Leinster's youngest daughter . . . makes a sensible criticism of the Utopian turn their brother's

(*) *The Friends of the People* were undoubtedly a Masonic Society, for Samuel Rogers the poet, himself a fervent revolutionary, mentions attending one of their meetings “at Freemasons Hall.”

ideas have taken: "He is *mad* about French affairs, the levelling principle, and indeed seems entirely engrossed by these subjects. . . . One must not say the *mob* before him. but *the people*, and he has put out of all Mama's books *Privèlège du Roi* . . ."

We see . . . to what a pitch Lord Edward's imagination has risen; he finds even the events of the Revolution so attractive that he is off to Paris. He has a Masonic mission to fulfil and is in raptures, for it gives him an opportunity of inspecting the Revolution at close quarters. . . .

Mme. de Sillery and her pupils left Paris . . . on November 25. . . the first halt . . . being at the Chateau de Raincy, the property of the Duc d'Orleans. . . . The Duc d'Orleans went there also with M. de Sillery, and in the course of the day arrived young General Egalité and Cæsar du Crest, come in all haste from their posts with the Northern Army to serve as escort to the ladies on their journey into Belgium. We have every reason to think that Lord Edward also came to the Chateau, under the pretext of making his respectful adieus to the Duc d'Orleans, for, as we have seen by Canning's letter, . . . Lord Edward's presence in Paris was not due to mere curiosity but, as the English Government suspected, he was an emissary from that lodge of Illuminated Freemasons which was called the *Constitutional Society of the Friends of Freedom* (*).

"As a member of a secret society, Lord Edward took care in writing to his mother, not to say anything which might lead her to guess the political object of his journey to Paris . . . but there is no doubt whatever that Lord Edward, being an emissary of a masonic revolutionary society, went at once on his arrival in Paris to see the Duc d'Orleans, the official chief of the Jacobin party, as much a sect as a party), and, for some months still, Grand Master of French Freemasonry. (*) Note: "In the latter months of 1792, the Jacobins fearing that reactionary movement might develop among those of their members who had remained faithful to the King, closed many of the lodges; it was however only on February 22 (1793) that Philippe-Egalité gave in his resignation as Grand Master, saying 'that he thought there should no longer be any mystery or any secret assembly in a Republic.' From that time, the *Grand Orient* and the diverse masonic powers ceased to function." (N. Deschamps, *les Sociétés secrètes*).

CHAPTER XI.

" . . . Even before his marriage [to Pamela, daughter of Mme. de Genlis and the Duc d'Orleans] Lord Edward was in connection, as we saw in Paris in 1792, with certain societies of Masonic origin which, in England, Scotland and

(*) We do not know to what rank Lord Edward had attained in Freemasonry: his brother, the Duke of Leinster, had been three times Grand-Master of Freemasonry in Ireland, as well as once in England. In this year, 1792, the Grand-Master of the Irish Masons was Lord Donoughmore, the Prince of Wales being Grand-Master in England. The heads of Freemasonry in both countries disapproved and discouraged as much as possible the political and revolutionary tone which certain of the Lodges had arrogated to themselves. They tried later on to repress it, as the following quotation shows: " . . . Many Masonic Lodges in this country (Ireland) having taken upon themselves the discussion of political and religious subjects, on Thursday 3rd of January, 1793, at the meeting of the Grand Lodge of Ireland—the following admonition was resolved . . . that it is utterly inconsistent with the fundamental principles . . . of Free-Masons to permit discussions or publication of political or religious subjects because these above all others are known to arouse the worst passions of men. . . ." (*Sentimental and Masonic Magazine*, March, 1793).

Ireland, had accepted the subversive doctrines of Illuminism; (Note: According to Barruel, a man called *Zimmerman* brought over several English Masonic Lodges to Illuminism. He was succeeded by Doctor *Ibeken* (so-called), who had success in Ireland as well as in England. We read in a pamphlet, published in 1798 by the translator of the Abbe Barruel's great work, that 'this masonic association in Ireland bore first the name of *Irish Brotherhood*, when it was formed in June 1791; later on it took that of *United Irishmen*. It was affiliated to the *Jacobin Club* in Paris, to the *Revolution Society* in England and to the *Committee of Reform* in Scotland. Dublin, Belfast and Newry became the headquarters of the new conspiracy . . . negotiations were begun with France . . ." (*Application of Barruel's Memoires of Jacobinism to the Secret Societies of Ireland and Great Britain*, by Hon. R. C. Clifford).

" . . . he does not, however, seem to have worked much for them in 1794-5, doing his best rather to obtain by constitutional means the change he desired to see in the laws of Ireland. . . .

"In May 1795, Wolf Tone, one of the leaders of the United Irishmen, went to America, probably to confer with M. de Talleyrand there on details of a project the latter had prepared three years previously for sending a French expedition to Ireland as allies of the *oppressed* patriots of that country.

"The famous letter from Talleyrand to the minister Lebrun may be remembered suggesting to him the idea of making England and Ireland into two Republics in order that their interests might coincide with those of France; giving him all details concerning the regular troops in England, Scotland and Ireland, and the number of 'registered patriots' in those countries on whose help the invaders might count.

"The Ministry in England were warned of the plan by the publication of the letter after Lebrun's death, for, as is known, Pitt passed the Aliens Bill without delay in order to disembarass himself of M. Talleyrand's presence in England, and the latter, as a result of the Act, had to embark in February 1794, for the United States. He travelled there from town to town, busying himself in strengthening the outposts of Illuminism which had already been planted in that Republic. Did he succeed? That is doubtful, for according to Lord Holland he did not appear very satisfied with his sojourn in America. We do not know whether it was by Talleyrand's advice that Tone subsequently went to Paris, but . . . in the spring of 1796 it was decided that two other delegates should be sent, one of these being Lord Edward Fitzgerald, the other Arthur O'Connor, also a member of the Irish Parliament, a very gifted young man with whom Edward had lately become intimate, and who, as appears from his speeches, seems to have been of superior rank among the *Illuminati*."

CHAPTER XIII. THE IRISH INSURRECTION.

" . . . Castlereagh was, . . . in ignorance that Fitzgerald and O'Connor were by no means the real leaders of the movement, but only the tools of that sinister society of the *Illuminati* which had already succeeded in making a Revolution elsewhere. Caught in the meshes of that terrible society, it was impossible for them to disengage themselves, even had they wished to do so. . . ."