

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 7. No. 18.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 10, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The following cablegram was received in Liverpool at Christmas from Mr. L. D. Byrne:—

"Best wishes, God bless you all."

"By the end of 1942 American production [of aircraft] alone may easily equal that of *Germany and Great Britain together** and it will still go on rising. . . . Military supremacy in the air means economic supremacy afterward. . . ."

—Leading Article, *Saturday Evening Post*, U.S.A.

Most of the new aircraft and engine factories in the U.S. have been built with British money. American Debt payments?

"The only nation since the Crusades that has fought the Battles of other Peoples at her own gigantic loss."

—HERBERT HOOVER in an article in the same issue as above.

No, Clarence, you do *not* get a juicy orange for spotting that Noble Nation.

"We mayn't be doing much to them Japs, Sadie, but hell, we'll teach St. Pierre and Miquelon what democracy means."

Have the "Debts" of Europe to Wall Street in respect to the 1914-1918 phase of this war been forgotten? Wait until we have Federal Union, Clarence, and your Income Tax demand comes in. Of course, you can always try to get Oskosh, Wisconsin, to see why you shouldn't pay.

Mr. Curtin, the Australian Labour Prime Minister, who doesn't think the British Empire is worth troubling about, and the Pacific Ocean is an Australian-American lake, is another curious instance of the affection of Labour politicians for the Financial-Masonic attack on British culture. His Federal Treasurer, Mr. J. B. Chifley, was practically unknown until he appeared on the Australian Royal Commission on Banking and Finance, and submitted a highly orthodox dissenting report to the Main Report. This dissenting report was pure Bank-of-"England" centralisation. Mr. Chifley now ranks immediately after the Prime Minister in the Australian Government.

The creation of four new Socialist peers, we have been told, was "designed to strengthen the Labour Party in the Upper House, where its representation is disproportionate at a time when a Coalition Government is charged with the direction of affairs."

Alongside this statement we would place the comment of the *Jewish Chronicle* of January 2: "Of the four new Labour

peers, Col. Josiah Wedgwood is probably the best known to readers of this journal. His fearless championship, both inside and outside the House of Commons, of Jewish causes and particularly of Jewish rights in Palestine has made his name almost as familiar to Jews as the names of Jewish leaders. Another of the four new lords, Mr. Wedgwood Benn, will also be remembered by many for the sympathetic attitude he has shown to Jewry on many occasions. He was very popular in East London, where the first constituency he represented in Parliament, the St. George's Division, Tower Hamlets, contained a large proportion of Jews. It was from 1906 to 1918 that he was Liberal M.P. for this division, which has since been linked with Whitechapel as one constituency."

AN AUSTRALIAN VIEW OF FEDERAL UNION

In an article *The King, Federal Union and You* published in *The Practical Patriot* of Australia Mr. Arthur Chresby, Director of Political Strategy of the Democratic Federation of Youth, points out the treasonable nature of the proposals for Federal Union. He juxtaposes the words of Professor Arnold Toynbee:—

"... I will not prophesy. I will merely repeat that we are at present working discreetly but with all our might to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local National States of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands. . . ."

and those of the President of the Imperial Conference held in 1911:—

"And, just in proportion as Centralisation was seen to be increasingly absurd, so has disintegration been felt to be increasingly impossible. Whether in the United Kingdom or in any one of the great communities which you represent, we each of us are, and we each of us intend to remain, master in our own household. There is, here at Home and throughout the Dominions, the life-blood of our policy. It is the *articulus stans aut cadentis Imperii*."

Mr. Chresby adds: "The constitutional practice of British Law, as evidenced in the 'Statute of Westminster' is to endeavour to continually de-centralise power and increase the local sovereignty of each member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. The expressed aim of Professor Toynbee and his associates. . . is to destroy completely the British Empire and the British Throne."

In British law the "Sovereignty of Parliament from the legal point of view, is the dominant characteristic of our political institutions," (which Professor Toynbee and his associates admit they are endeavouring to put an end to) and in this connection a passage is quoted from one of the greatest authorities on Constitutional Law, Professor Dicey,* who says:—

"Parliamentary Sovereignty means neither more nor less than this, that 'Parliament' has the right to make or unmake any law whatever; and further that no person or body is recognised by the

*Our italics.

*Introduction to the Study of the Law of Constitution, 1927.

law of England as having a right to override or set aside the legislation of Parliament, and further that this right or power of Parliament extends to every part of the King's dominion."

"Here," says Mr. Chresby, "we come up against the 'Party System' for obviously laws made by 'Party Governments' are the results of 'Party' dictates, controlled by the wishes of those who directly or indirectly through Party Funds or other influences, ensure that laws are passed in their interests which, with few exceptions, are *not* in accord with the wishes of the people."

Dicey also refers to what is termed the King's "Veto." He states:—

"Its existence is undoubted, but the veto has not been exercised for at least two centuries.... The well known words of Burke, however, should always be borne in mind: 'The king's negative to bills,' he says, 'is one of the most undisputed of the royal prerogatives and it extends to all cases whatsoever... it is not the propriety of the exercise which is in question. The exercise itself is wisely forborne. Its repose may be the preservation of its existence; and its existence may be the means of saving the constitution itself, on an occasion worthy of bringing it forth'.... Experience has confirmed the soundness of Burke's doctrine. The existence of this 'negative' has greatly facilitated the development of the present happy relation between England and her self-governing colonies. It has enabled England and her colonial statesmanship to create that combination of Imperial Unity with something coming nearer to colonial independence which may ultimately turn out to be the salvation of the British Empire."

"And Professor Toynbee and 'Federal Unionists,'" Mr. Chresby continues, "admit that they are attempting to wrest all this from the British Empire and centralise it somewhere else under a party government over whom you would not be able to exercise control, because *you* do not exercise control over *your* present representatives, Local Government, State and Federal. If you did, the conditions which 'Federal Unionists' claim necessitate a world Government, would not have arisen."

Of British Imperialism Dicey says:—

"Imperialism... in regard to the British Empire... ought to be used as a term neither of praise nor of blame, but as the name for an ideal which, in-so-far as it is true, is of considerable importance. This idea is that the British Empire is an Institution well worth maintaining; and this not on mere grounds of sentiment but for definite and assignable reasons."

"Upon England and upon every country subject to the King of England the British Empire confers at least two benefits. It secures permanent peace among the inhabitants of the largest of the existing states; it again secures, or it ought to secure, to the whole of this vast community absolute protection against foreign attack... provided England herself stands properly armed. Neither England, in short, nor any of her self-governing Dominions can fail to see that the dissolution of the Empire might take from both the mother country and the most powerful of the Dominions the means necessary for maintaining Liberty and Independence. Loyalty to the Empire typified by Loyalty to the King, is in short a sentiment developed by the whole course of recent history."

"You will now appreciate," Mr. Chresby comments, "the reason that prompts traitors to endeavour to take away from the Empire its armed forces and centralise them under an easily controlled Party Government. Easily controlled by outside interests with the lust for power."

With respect to the laws of a country Dicey states that:—

"The time has come when the fact ought to be generally admitted that the amount of government, that is of coercion, of individuals or classes by the state, which is necessary to the welfare or even the existence of a civilised community, cannot permanently co-exist with the effective belief that deference to public opinion is in all cases the sole or the necessary basis of a democracy."

"The justification of lawlessness is also, in England at any rate, suggested if not caused by the misdirection of party government. The rule of a party cannot be permanently identified with

the authority of the nation or with the dictates of patriotism."

"... Our English executive is, as a general rule, becoming more and more the representative of a party rather than the guide of the country."

"No fair minded man will dispute that the passion for natural independence may transform a government of partisans into a government bent on securing the honour and the safety of the nation. But this fact, though of immense moment, ought not to conceal from us the inherent tendency of the party system to confer upon partisanship authority which ought to be the exclusive property of the nation."

"The English people would gain rather than lose by a check being placed on the constantly increasing power of the party system."

Mr. Chresby continues: "The legislation of this country inevitably affects every individual, and it is to our interest that we should *ensure* that such legislation is of the right type, i.e., that it gives to the people of the country the results which they require from their Parliamentary mechanism."

"In this connection Dicey has an extremely important contribution to make:—

"... Legislation must always aim at the attainment of at least two different ends, which, though of importance, are entirely distinct from one another. One of these ends is the passing or maintaining of good or wise laws, that is, laws which, if carried out, would really promote the happiness or welfare of a given country and, therefore, which are desirable in themselves and are in conformity with the nature of things. That such legislation is a thing desired, no man can dispute....

"... The second of these two different ends is to ensure that no law should be passed or maintained in a given country, e.g., England which is condemned by the public opinion of the English people. A law utterly opposed to the wishes and the feelings entertained by the inhabitants of a country... is a nullity, or in truth no law at all, and even, in cases where, owing to the power of a monarch who enacts a law opposed to the wishes of his subjects such a law can, to a certain extent, be enforced, the evils of the enforcement may far overbalance the good effects of legislation in itself wise."

"The implication arising from the above is, you will agree, that no matter how right a law may be it is wrong if it is imposed upon the people without their consent, as the People are sovereign and Parliament merely exists to make their will prevail. Under any scheme of 'Federal Union' or 'Federal Europe' or 'Trusteeship' without the ability to have adequate control over your parliamentary representative (which you have not yet obtained in a country where your member is much closer to you) you would have any amount of laws passed and enforced upon you, without the consent of the people. Should you endeavour to constitutionally oppose any such laws, the Armed Forces would be brought into action as you have witnessed in other countries in recent years."

The following statement by Professor Dicey can, with equal truth, be applied to the arguments advanced on behalf of the treasonable doctrine of "Unionism":—

"Any great change in the form of the constitution of England, e.g., the substitution of an English Republic for a limited monarchy, might easily affect the loyalty of all British Colonies.... Is it certain that a Federated Union of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales would command in our colonies the respect paid to the present United Kingdom?... The King is what the Imperial Parliament has never been. The typical representative of imperial unity throughout every part of the Empire... The increasing influence of the party system has in England, and still more throughout the British Empire, singularly coincided with the growth of the moral influence exercisable by the Crown. From the accession of Victoria to the present day the moral force at the disposal of the Crown has increased. The plain truth is that the King of England has at the present day two sources of moral authority.... The King, who ever he be, is the only man throughout the British Empire

who stands outside, if not above, the Party System.”

“Federal Unionists,” Mr. Chresby points out, “have mainly come to the fore since the outbreak of war asking the people of the Empire to forswear their loyalty to their King.

“The Party system is the mechanism through which the ‘Unionists’ are working with all speed to achieve their objective, e.g., the overthrow and complete breakup of your Empire and the British Throne. . . .

“There can hardly be a doubt that, despite the many so-called imperfections of the British Empire, you are agreed that it is an institution well worth maintaining. Do you really want to exchange this Empire and our Sovereign King for some doubtful and illegitimate form of World Centralised Government, run by party jackals, controlled by people not elected by the Sovereign people of each country?”

The author concludes by advising his readers to use their Representative Government:—

“You elect representatives in three fields—Local Government, State and Federal Parliament. Write to your Representatives in these three fields, calling their attention to, and instructing each one to take action to have those advocating any form of Unionism, i.e., world centralisation, brought before the Courts and indicted for high treason.”

REVIEW

“A ‘Twentieth Century’ Economic System”

By BEATRICE C. BEST

It is possible without spending time or trouble on an inclusive or meticulous examination of all the points in this Memorandum* to expose its fallacious character, not to say its perverse tendency, by giving attention to one only of its recommendations.

The Memorandum admits a deficiency of purchasing power, and the necessity for making it good. Since the remedy proposed is alone under consideration in this short commentary, the reasons given for the deficiency need not, at the moment, be examined.

The remedy, then, proposed for making good this deficiency is that the necessary “purchasing media . . . should be spent into existence by the State.” The implications contained in these few words—“should be spent into existence by the State” are of a momentous nature, and a clear understanding of them is necessary to reveal their true intent, and their “perverse tendency” alluded to above.

It is almost inconceivable that such a remedy should be advanced by any person or persons claiming to offer, for serious consideration, a ‘Twentieth Century’ Economic System. For if there is one thing more than another that is clear about twentieth century economics, it is that owing to increasing mechanisation, or more properly speaking, the increasingly efficient methods discovered by science for the application of solar energy to industrial production, whether of goods or services, man’s labour is necessarily a diminishing factor in that production. Therefore, although by these methods the possible increase of real wealth is almost limitless, the part of that wealth that can be said to be *earned* by man’s labour is, in respect to the amount produced, a diminishing quantity. This undeniable fact is so obvious

*A *Twentieth Century Economic System*. Economic Reform Club.

that by now it should be regarded as a truism. Yet *A Twentieth Century Economic System* ignores it absolutely. For what does its proposal that this “purchasing media . . . should be spent into existence by the State” imply, if not that the money necessary to make good an—acknowledged—deficiency of purchasing power *must be earned*? But, *in truth*, it cannot, and should not be earned. This ‘over,’ or ‘surplus’ production is not an outcome of the labour of living men, but an “*unearned increment of association*”† due to the efforts of both the hands and brains of men long since dead; of their discoveries and inventions, going back through the ages—to the discovery of the use of fire—to the invention of the wheel. The increase of wealth due to these accumulated discoveries is a communal or national inheritance, it is in the nature of a bequest, committed or entrusted to us, and cannot *in justice* be distributed by means of an earned income, or a wage, but only by way of an unearned income, otherwise a dividend. In short, to distribute this ‘surplus’ production by means of earned incomes—always supposing this could be accomplished in the way outlined by the system—is a method that would reflect neither facts nor reality. Should it be argued that some of this ‘state-spending’ could result in a measure of free social services, then the answer is that those benefitting therefrom would become, not free inheritors, but state dependents, subject to the disabilities consequent thereon. There is a further and perhaps more serious objection to this intention to distribute a ‘surplus’ by the State spending the necessary “purchasing media” into existence. The obvious implication here is that industry, or employment, is to be used *primarily* to distribute “purchasing media.” But the true function of industry and employment is to produce goods and services needed or desired with as little trouble as possible consonant with efficiency. In this process the distribution of incomes, though essential, is secondary and incidental. If, therefore, for whatever reason “purchasing media” is found to be insufficient, it is, nevertheless, most improper that the end and purpose of industry should be misdirected to produce a result unrelated to industry’s true function. In short, to use industry for the purpose of distributing “purchasing media” by creating employment* *constitutes an abuse of function*,‡ and the result of such an attempt would be harmful to the health of the body politic, as an attempt to misdirect bodily function would be to one’s physical health.

Finally, this recommendation as already shown, reflects neither facts nor reality. It is the denial of economic truth, and, on the assumption that it could be made materially efficacious, the effect upon man’s psyche and his spiritual development would be disastrous in the extreme; the more so as its operation would be secret and insidious, and not immediately open and blatant. Man cannot live a healthy or progressive spiritual life unless he lives according to the truth in fact and in reality.

It is the purpose of this brief review to show that by this one recommendation contained in the Memorandum *The Twentieth Century Economic System* fact and reality are falsified and distorted, and therefore the result of its application could be nothing less than fatal to man’s future development, and to the realisation of his true destiny.

*“The reform referred to . . . would also solve the problem of unemployment.” —A *Twentieth Century Economic System*.

†C. H. DOUGLAS.

‡It is also an estimate of man as, *primarily*, a *functionary*, and is a denial of the Christian valuation of man as, *primarily*, a *person*.

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. 7. No. 18.

Saturday, January 10, 1942.

"Twisted by Knaves - - -"

Since Sir Henry Dale gave his presidential address to the Royal Society on December 1, *The Times* has published much correspondence on the relationship between science and politics. As the majority of the writers have small knowledge of real politics—seeming to believe it consists in wordy controversies concerning methods waged by parties committed to hard-and-fast doctrines—it is little wonder that small progress in enlightenment has been made. Sir Henry gave warning of one direction in which he saw some reason to fear. He said:

"If science should become entangled in controversial politics, through the over-eagerness of its advocates to invoke the sanction of science or to claim its potentialities in support of any special political doctrine, the threat to its freedom might become a real danger. If science were allowed to be used as a weapon of political pressure it would be impossible to protect science from the pressure of sectional politics. If that should happen the dangers were beyond dispute."

Perfectly true, of course, but in such an eventuality the dangers to the human race would far outweigh the threat to a body of knowledge. It is not the "freedom of science" with which men are concerned, but with their own freedom. If Sir Henry were not so addicted to the vice of the personification of the abstract (commonly supposed to be the predilection of poets) he would know that there could be no danger to scientific research in a nation of *free men*.

As it is possible that none of the correspondents (with one possible exception) have sufficient grasp of realities to define freedom as the power to choose or reject one thing at a time, many of the letters are concerned with that perversion known as Social Science. In *The Times* of December 22 Dr. Catlin strongly supported Sir John Parsons in his suggestion for the establishment of a social research bureau, seeming to think it might have been set up ten years ago, "but Lord Stamp tended to the opinion that only economics could properly be regarded as a science—an opinion which must be regarded as dubious from whatever angle it be viewed—and as a consequence the project proved abortive." We also regard Lord Stamp's views as dubious, though possibly for different reasons; but we cannot fail to be interested in the extent to which his opinion seems to have had the weight of state edict. It is, however, quite likely that Lord Stamp's veto would merely have been "pro tem"; that as soon as the rule of orthodox international economics had been soundly established as an immutable system beyond the reach even of the votes of citizens (see

The Times's leader of November 17 in which this state of affairs is clearly envisaged) then Lord Stamp would have withdrawn his veto against Social Science.

As far as we are concerned, Social Science is at present merely a study of the most effective ways in which the expert may insult and reduce to impotent nonentities his fellow human beings. Before this can be done they must be led into economic bondage, hence the rustling excitement to be heard in the camps of those who concern themselves with the evacuation schemes, family "allowances" and youth movements.

Reference was made to a possible exception. Dr. Behrens wrote on December 23:—

"Is not this interesting discussion part of the larger problem of the proper use of the expert? We have suffered so much from both the neglect and the abuse of expert guidance that the solution of the problem is a matter of extreme urgency. The man in the street and the politician who professes to represent him are conscious of certain desires; they are unable, as a rule, to decide how or at what cost those desires can be attained. That is where the expert should come in. It is not for the expert, as such, to lay down political objectives, *but to suggest methods and to point out the sacrifices involved.** Possessed of this information, the man in the street or the politician can make up his mind whether he is prepared *to accept the method and to incur the sacrifice.**

"An expert may be also a man in the street or a politician, and a man in the street, or even a politician, may be an expert, just as a chimney sweep may be an expert cook. It is when the two functions are confused or combined that trouble arises."

Readers of these paragraphs might be tempted to think that Dr. Behrens had been reading Douglas and even that he had candidly accepted our point of view. Let them cogitate on the difference which may reside between pointing out "sacrifices" imposed by the natural order and incurring sacrifices arbitrarily fixed by the issuers of credit.

A comment may be borrowed from the letter of Andrew MacLaren, M.P., published in the same column. "Someone has said that if the law of gravitation had challenged a vested interest it would not have been known in England to-day."

Who are the vested interests, in England, now?

B. M. P.

Labour officers, working on behalf of the Government, have shown that "disinclination to work for the tax-collector" is one of the main reasons underlying absenteeism in Britain's war factories.

The Treasury's solution, however (and even that high and mighty institution is the executive, the *servant* of the people) is to order Government Departments owning factories to start an educational campaign among the workers "to show them the folly of their ways."

Some of them, says *The People*, "will be reminded that, but for this war, for which they must help to pay, they would still be getting £3 a week, instead of £10."

Oh blessed, blessed war?

*Our italics.

PRESERVING BRITAIN (I)

By N. F. W.

"...the real line of demarcation in the world is cultural, not economic..." — C. H. DOUGLAS.

It must seem to all of us at times, with the increase and spread of World War No. 2, that the problem tends to become so terrific as to be—we might almost say, mercifully—beyond the individual's mental scope. So that, if at this point we are not to become merely apathetic, we are forced to fall back upon faith, trust in Providence—"faith as a grain of mustard seed."

The sceptic may ask: As a practical frame of mind, where does that differ from apathy? It differs, of course, fundamentally, unless we make the mistake of calling that faith which is in fact resignation. Faith here, and in the right sense of the word, does not mean that we have ceased to apply our minds to the phenomenon of war or to the concrete problems it presents; but rather that we are, quite literally, reduced to regarding it simply, and without intellectual pretensions.

Accepting Douglas's statement above, as I think we must, the war resolves itself into an attack upon what is broadly termed Anglo-Saxon culture, by its cultural opposite, whatever that may be, and faith in that case, to mean anything at all, must mean faith in our own culture, in our own way of life and method of doing things. Short of that it becomes no more than the invocation of the God of war on our side—a convenient precaution equally open to the enemy.

Now if that were all there is to the present situation, I feel pretty certain that centralised military force cannot be prevented from working its will on any other nation possessing less military concentration and a more decentralised and individual view of life. In other words, if there is nothing for democracy and individualism as a philosophy of life to oppose to centralised despotism employing organised physical force, *except* physical force, it is quite certain the totalitarian powers must have the last word, if not in World War No. 2, then in No. 3 or No. 4.

If, however, the issue is cultural in Douglas's sense, which I take to be biological, then what we invoke is not the God of war, but our own particular genius, our national virtue, in the Greek sense of that word. It is like this: when the scope and scale of things get beyond us—and after all the scale of life as a whole is always beyond us—it does not really take a world war of the present dimensions to put it outside our mental grasp. All the war does is to emphasise our very definite intellectual limitations—when the scale of events get too much for us, we have literally nothing upon which to rely but our enlightened experience, really our biological nature, individual and national. If we are to be preserved, if we are to survive, it will be through and because of that, or nothing; and because we have relied on it and put our trust in it.

That is the only sense in which realism can be infused into such words as faith and Providence. Though on the surface it may appear a paradox, it is a fact that for an individual or a race to put whole-hearted reliance in native genius is equivalent to trusting in Providence. It comprehends the two seemingly contradictory parts of the statement

anent trusting in God and keeping your powder dry. To lose faith in experience, in one's past history in other words, is in reality to lose faith also in the future. The two are not discontinuous.

It is obvious, then, that the crisis is at once internal as well as external: all human crises are. In this case, external force of arms directed against our natural defences, and internal forces of argument directed against our cultural defences, to persuade us to abandon them. False logic insidiously suggests that we can only beat the Axis powers by abandoning our decentralised, democratic methods, and adopting the ruthless, totalitarian manner of approach to the problem. It enviously points to the initial successes of the enemy, and wilfully blind to the obvious truth that if the issue really depends on German methods of attack, the Allies may already count themselves beaten, for in the art of centralised control they are inevitably behind, and always will be behind, the German, it emphasises the immediate effectiveness of his total methods.

It argues, in fact, like all tempters, that only by repudiating our genius can we hope to defend it, not recognising the self-evident fact that a culture that is not adequate to its own preservation has no biological justification for survival, as such, and in fact will not survive, no matter what it does, or does not do.

These arguments amount, of course, to the old baseless suggestion that Beelzebub can only be cast out by Beelzebub, which as a theory is the father of all vicious circles of reasoning. Against such intellectual attack there is ultimately no defence, except the individual's native, cultural reaction—the actual biological fact of our national genius, on the abandonment of which is focused all administrative and propagandist pressure.

It is a strange awe-inspiring thing to watch: the curious, awkward inability of Britain to satisfy the cravings of her own fire-eaters, largely of the Labour Party and the International Press, and her Penguin intellectuals; her refusal, or inability, to accept the goose-stepping forms of regimentation; or to be slickly efficient and click the heels smartly to the totalitarian word of command uttered by Lord Hewart's "new despots." Above all her sheer inadequacy to the situation created by the desire for a slap-up spectacle on the part of Transatlantic audiences.

In all this Britain has been sadly wanting so far. Such drama, such spectacle and exploits as there have been, have come mostly from the Axis Powers. As a *show* Britain's defence to date is, it must be admitted, a wash-out. America, however, has it in her own hands now, and can stage her own war show in the way she likes it.

Does it seem strange that all this—this spectacle of performance refusing to answer to intellectual desire; of failure to make centralisation a functioning success; of retreat patiently and brilliantly carried out, varied only by our naval and desert successes,—that this should sum up our cup of satisfaction—a small and humbling one, truly? Yet I think it is so. And the source of that satisfaction must be in fact that in this war, which we have good authority for recognising as purely a war of cultures, Britain, and the British Empire, in spite of intellectual foes within and enemies without, and an international atmosphere reeking with propaganda and twisted logic, is patiently remaining true to herself.

THE WINNIPEG CONVENTION

The following are the Principles and Objectives adopted by the Democratic Monetary Reform Convention held recently at Winnipeg.

Principles of the Association

1. *The British Ideal of Democratic Sovereignty:*

The people in any unit of the Empire shall have sovereign power to determine the management of their own affairs within the sphere of jurisdiction acting in harmonious co-operation with other constitutional units within the British Commonwealth of Nations, both national and imperial.

2. *True Democracy:*

The State with its resources and institutions exists primarily to serve its people and not merely for its own glorification.

3. *Economic Democracy:*

That is to say, Democracy can only function essentially when its people are secure and free from economic Regimentation and coercion.

4. *Government Control of the Monetary System:*

That is to say the people should determine the Monetary policy of Canada through their Federal Government which should at once assume effective control of the issuance and withdrawal of all currency and credit.

5. *Balanced Economy:*

That is to say the purchasing power in the hands of the people should at all times be sufficient to distribute the Goods and Services available for consumption so that the people may always be able to enjoy to the full the fruits of their optimum production.

6. *Social Justice:*

That is to say Social Justice cannot be fully obtained until Purchasing Power is maintained at an adequate level by:—

- (a) Just prices including parity of prices to primary producers,
- (b) Fair wages to workers,
- (c) The direct issue to consumers of purchasing power through public works, social services, pensions, bonuses, or other means as required.

7. *Housing.*

That is to say, the granting of loans for the building of homes for our Canadian People at the cost of financing. Moved by Mr. Hallatt, seconded by Mr. Gillies.

8. *Health Insurance:*

We favour the institution of a National system of non-contributory state health insurance to be financed by the government issues of credit. (Moved by Dr. Cross, seconded by Mr. Manning).

9. *Proper Standard of Living:*

That is to say the people of Canada should enjoy the standard of living commensurate with their orderly develop-

ment of the country's vast resources.

10. *Great Freedoms:*

We believe in and will uphold the great freedoms of religion, speech, literature, individual enterprise, the sanctity of the home and all therein implied.

Objectives of the Association

1. To foster and encourage the universally recognised principles of Christianity in human relationships.

2. To establish in accordance with the highest traditions of the British way of life, responsible and effective democratic government in Canada as the basis of post-war reconstruction, so that the people will gain the results they desire from the management of their own affairs.

3. To oppose and expose any attempts to weaken the democratic sovereignty and the democratic institutions of the people by means of increased centralisation of power.

4. To liberate the country from the yoke of the present financial system and its enslavement of a constitutionally free people.

5. To restore to Parliament effective control over the issue of all Currency and Credit.

6. To obtain the economic security which the vast resources of Canada can provide for her citizens.

7. To abolish unnecessary poverty and privation.

8. To secure freedom from oppressive debt and taxation.

9. To ensure that after the war the men of our victorious fighting forces and all wage-earners, primary producers, and others who are valiantly assisting in the present struggle, shall find a Canada worthy of the sacrifices they are making in defence of freedom, social justice and the preservation of our democratic rights.

10. To provide the people with an effective organisation for obtaining information on matters essential to their welfare and for taking united action to assert their democratic will.

Reprinted from "Today and Tomorrow."

ROOTS OF EVIL

By CUTHBERT REAVELY

Speaking generally, little is heard of secret societies. They are looked upon for the most part as schoolboys regard hooded orders or gangsters—awesome, exciting, but unreal. On the fallacious principle of "honour amongst thieves," malefactors of all descriptions are appraised, not by their relative villainy, but by their degree of picturesqueness, and compose an underworld whose main attraction lies in its remoteness.

Just as burglars are thieves who come to other people's houses, brigands are ruffians who attack foreigners, and gangsters are the scourge of America, so, in popular imagination, secret agents (other than the police) belong primarily to the pages of fiction.

Now and again, one of the hirelings who are paid to point out the wrong things at the right moment will indicate nebulous elements like the "hidden hand," "big business,"

"arms racket" and so on, and it is tacitly understood that these in turn are gallantly being fought by secret services and intelligence departments.

But the public regard all these phases of life, be they in the realm of high finance—a sacred term—or the underworld, which they misidentify with the underdog, in no clearly defined light. They are not interested in misdeeds that are drab and unremunerative. They are disposed to worship from afar schemers in the broader issues as unknown gods, and to applaud the humbler individual when an occasional ray from the lens of publicity brings him into relief comparable in sharpness to some "hero" of stage or screen.

That these widely divided strata of society ever mingle or could unite in a set purpose is unsuspected.

Nevertheless, the more closely we investigate the motivating influences of unsocial and irrational lines of conduct, as manifested either in foreign policy or home affairs, the more evidence we obtain of the actuality of this unholy alliance which disrupts all ordered existence—this strange mingling of the dregs of society with the surface scum to poison the stream of life.

Perhaps it would be as well at this juncture to affirm that such machinations are supremely anti-British in the highest sense of the word 'British' namely the best possible standard for ourselves and a strong, helping hand to assist others to attain that standard.

The three principal Italian secret societies to which Disraeli referred, apart from the Grand Orient of Italy, were the *Teppa*, which functioned in Milan and which gave the Italian language its equivalent of the word "hooligan"; the *Mafia*, active in Sicily, particularly against property, the last to be suppressed (1927); and, most notorious of all, the *Camorra*, whose headquarters and main centre of operations was Naples.

This society did not become publicly known until 1820. Its scope was immense. Travellers were amazed, on tipping a boatman or porter, to see a flashily-dressed, be-ringed individual appear as if from nowhere and receive, with apparent cordiality, half of the humble workman's remuneration.

But, although varying in form, the *Camorra* was introduced into Italy from Spain several centuries earlier, when the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, subject to the sceptre of Spain, were ruled by Viceroy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It enjoyed the protection of princes; high authority often came to its aid, and it was eventually suppressed only with the greatest difficulty just before the first phase of the Great War.

The origin of the word "*camorra*" is obscure—the Spanish word means "a quarrel"—but there is no doubt that the Society was founded on the Spanish terrorist organisation, the *Guarduna* or *Gardugna* (Rapine).

Adam Weishaupt, in the formation of his pernicious Bavarian Illuminati borrowed from every former society to whose secrets he could obtain access. The chain of responsibility and the segregation of sections into watertight compartments, with adherents operating independently and unknown to one another (often, indeed, unconscious of the true purpose of their work), were essentially Cabalistic. Nevertheless, he unquestionably drew freely upon the system of the *Gardugna*. Many characteristics were common to all

these *frères terribles*, but Weishaupt's pose of combing antiquity and the East for inspiration was intended to help him cover up his tracks and preserve the illusion, as far as possible, of novelty. Actually, the West and a much more recent period deserve the discredit for many of his ideas. The Western mind is far subtler than that of the East. An Asiatic may display more ingenuity in devising complex tortures for the body; it takes a European to perfect the refinement of torments for the soul.

I have translated the following notes relating to the *Gardugna* from an Italian version of a narrative of M. de Guenedas in De Fèrèal's *Mysteries of the Inquisition and other Secret Societies of Spain*. In the natural order of things, it would have been vastly developed and extended in scope throughout the three centuries of its operation.

"Under the title of the Brotherhood of Rapine, there existed in Spain, at the end of the year 1417, a secret society, composed of brigands of every kind. This society, perfectly organised, had for its object the direction in chief of every sort of crime on behalf of whomsoever had a vendetta to pursue or resentments to satisfy. It entrusted itself, at nicely adjusted prices and with a guarantee, to deliver dagger thrusts, mortal or not, according to the taste of the thruster, to drown, to beat and to assassinate. Assassination was expensive, and one had to have attained a certain prominence in the world to get it done; but, once undertaken, one could count on its being carried out, because the Brotherhood of the *Gardugna* placed a desperate exactness into executing its commissions, once they were undertaken.

"The Brotherhood of the *Gardugna* was composed of a Grand Master called *hermano mayor* (Brother Superior), who lived at Court, where he often occupied a position of eminence. This Brother Superior issued his orders to the *capatazes* (Provincial Masters); these had them carried out with a zeal and precision which would do honour to more than one public functionary. The main body of the *Gardugna*, which was very numerous, was composed of *guapos* (cut-throats), usually fine swordsmen, hardened assassins, expert bandits, whose courage had been proved by torture and the gallows. In the jargon of the Society, these *guapos* were called *punteadores* ("stickers," dealers of dagger-thrusts). After the *punteadores* came the *floreadores* (skirmishers); these were youths, cunning rogues, the major part of whom had escaped from the convict prisons of Seville, Malaga or Metilla; they were called Aspiring Brothers. Next in order came *los fecelles* (spies), because it was their duty in the Society to breathe into the ear of the Master of the Order whatever they knew of city affairs, into which they introduced themselves by virtue of their hypocritical exterior. The *fecelles* were all canting, old humbugs, who were always seen in church, rosary in hand, at least during the hours of their service to the Head of the *Guardugna* or the Inquisitor; for the major part of these old men combined the duties of informing the Sacred Office with those of spying for the *Gardugna*. The *Gardugna* had also a great number of receivers who were called *coberteras* (covers) from the verb "cubrir" ("to cover," to "hide"), and of boys from ten to fifteen years old, who were distinguished by the name of *chivatos* (roebucks). The *chivatos* were novices of the Order. They had to be *chivatos* for at least one year before meriting the honour of working in the capacity of Apprentices (*postulantes*).

"A *postulante* who had deserved well of the Brotherhood became *guapo* at the end of two years' service. After those

of Master and Grand Master, this was the highest dignity which the Brotherhood conferred. Besides the foregoing, the *Gardugna* counted a number of *serenas* (sirens). These were beautiful, young girls, mostly gipsies. The *serenas* were the odalisques of the dignitaries of the Order. They were those who lured the persons indicated to favourable places for the operations of the *Gardugna*.

"Add to these, guards, clerks, lawyers, monks, canons, bishops and Inquisitors, who were all so many instruments and protectors of the *Gardugna*, of which they so often had need, or which gave them money, and one can form an idea of this Society, which ravaged Spain for more than three centuries."

There follow the Articles of the Constitution, "given at Toledo in the Year of Grace 1420, and the Third after the institution of our honourable [*sic*] Brotherhood."

In 1534, the Grand Master of the *Gardugna* lived at Toledo. A little later, under the reign of Phillip III, he moved to Madrid, where under the name of Rodrigo Calderon, he became Secretary to the King, thanks to the weakness of the Duke of Lerma and the powerful protection of the Jesuit, Francesco de Aliaga, Confessor-General to the King and Grand Inquisitor of Spain from 1618 to 1621.

The persistence with which we are urged to-day not to delve into the past, but to put our trust in modernism, should rouse our suspicions. Tradition spells ruin to anarchy, and there are certain elements to whom the archives of history are as a criminal's dossier. Only by tracing their origin shall we be able surely to identify the ills which have beset us of recent years; only by delving to the roots of evil shall we be able to eradicate the entire system.

Pushed to extremes, the following state may emerge:—

Those who do not subscribe in some degree, wittingly or unwittingly, to the system cannot enter public life or take part freely in the affairs of the nation. Their careers are placed in jeopardy. "Great" men are manufactured artificially through the organs of publicity. The demagogue struts unsilenced and supreme. There no longer exists an open market where merit and integrity alone can succeed in any walk of life. Expression is denied to all who fail to belaud the system. The people are dictated to by a groomed oligarchy, selected and appointed by anonymous forces, whose loyalty has never been proved and whose identity may never be challenged.

To combat any such tendencies, let us resolve:—

(1) To maintain the highest possible standard of personal conduct.

(2) To devote as much time as possible to that mental activity in the cause of right which is the highest form of prayer, and which, gaining through faith true understanding, moves mountains.

(3) To fight the forces of evil wherever they may be met in the manner which seems most fitting to each one of us at the time.

PRAYER

"Let us pray for the people of the United States of America who are going to keep to-morrow as a day of prayer."
— "B".B.C.

WANTED

Back numbers of *The Social Crediter*. Write to: E. Bruley, "Plymstock," Dukes Avenue, Theydon Bois, Essex.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Warning Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
The Use of Money	6d.
"This 'American' Business"	3d. each 12 for 2/-

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold	4/6
Lower Rates (pamphlet)	3d.
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson	6d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report	6d.
Is Britain Betrayed? by John Mitchell	2d. each 12 for 1/6
How Alberta is Fighting Finance	2d. each 12 for 1/6

(All the above postage extra).

Leaflets

Bomb the German People	100 for 1/9
The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell	9d. doz. 50 for 2/6

(The above are post free).

Taxation is Robbery	100 for 3/- 50 for 1/9
---------------------------	---------------------------

(Postage extra).

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

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

Information about Social Credit activities in different regions may be had by writing to the following addresses:

BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.

BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.

BLACKBURN S.C. Association: 168 Shear Brow, Blackburn.

BRADFORD United Democrats: R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.

DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.

LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.

LONDON Liaison Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.

Lunch hour re-unions on the first and third Thursdays of the month at 12-30 p.m., at The Plane Tree Restaurant, Great Russell Street, W. C. 1. Next Meeting January 15.

MIDLAND D.S.C. Group: see Birmingham.

NEWCASTLE and Gateshead S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: 115 Essex Road, Milton, or 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor.

SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.