

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."
ORGAN OF THE NEW AGE SOCIAL CREDIT SOCIETY

No. 2367] NEW SERIES Vol. LXII. No. 12. THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1938. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION TO THE SOCIETY 30s.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
SOCIAL CREDIT PROSPECTS	53	BOOKS TO READ. By "Pakeha"	57
Mr. Gorham Munson on the subject of Social Credit prospects in America—the Social Credit Movement as a guerilla force.		SOCIAL CREDIT IN POLITICS	58
ALL SOUND AND FUHRER	55	Extracts from Major Douglas's speeches.	
Hitler's New-Year statement analysed.		CORRESPONDENCE	58
COMMON SENSE. By "The Preacher"	56	N. R. Temperley; "Norman Conquest"; S. R.; J. A. Franklin; J. A. F.; Hilda E. Cole; Arnold McGowan; L. G. Ackland-Doyle; "One of the Old Guard"; J. S. Helmont; H. Saunders; T. Coulson.	
MAKING IT PLAIN. By F. G.	57		

Social Credit Prospects.

Mr. Gorham Munson contributes to *The New English Weekly* of January 13 an account of how Social Credit has been getting on in the United States. He prefaces this account with a swift survey of activities in England, Australia, New Zealand, and, of course, Alberta. Of these activities generally he remarks that there is a scarcity of "data of practical experience" on which movements in different parts of the world can assess the value of each other's principles and methods. Alluding to the English electoral campaign as an example, he says, that "we in America know virtually nothing" of its "efficacy," "cost," or "actual results." He continues:

"Were we to make a serious effort to apply the Electoral Campaign, we would have to send a commission to England to study it at first hand, much as John L. Lewis and his lieutenants went to France to learn the new technique of the stay-in or sit-down strike, and probably in any case this should be done. The point is that it is impossible to generate in patrons the desire to finance such a commission without a clearer picture of the conditions to be satisfied in launching an Electoral Campaign, the canvassing upon needed, the value of the pledges, and the effects upon politicians."

"It will be said that publicity should not be given to the inner workings of our campaigns, and that is true after a certain point. Nevertheless, we are not an underground revolutionary movement with the police hunting us; and the Socialists, who often had to work illegally, did produce an abundant critical literature for the training of their organisers and agitators."

Passing on from these reflections, Mr. Munson describes the American movement's strength and circumstances in these words: "Young, small, inexperienced, poorly equipped, very modestly financed." Yet, he declares:—

" . . . despite these handicaps it has led the world in achieving the focal point of an actually introduced national Bill—for Mr. Goldsborough has brought in Bills at every session of Congress since 1935."

This Bill*, Mr. Munson points out, was "the first piece of Social Credit legislation anywhere in the world to . . ."

be brought into a national legislature." He then describes the diverse reactions of Social Creditors to certain features of the Bill, and points out that discussions were bound to be inconclusive because "neither side had any precedent in Social Credit history" to invoke—"no pool of Social Credit political experience to draw upon"; and, thus, "the arguments on both sides were improvised." It was, however, agreed that the Bill ought to be viewed as an educational, not a practical, political instrument, having regard to the weakness of its Social-Credit backers. Mr. Munson estimates that the American movement in 1935 did not number more than 500 Social Creditors, with perhaps 2,000 passive assentors; and states that the movement's magazine, *New Democracy*, had a distribution of 1,450 copies. Since its formation in 1932 its average revenue (and expenditure) has been not more than the equivalent of £2,000 per annum. Is the success of the American movement, he asks, due to conceiving and executing an astute plan? He answers: "Partly plan, partly confused endeavour, partly luck."

Well, this answer may serve to explain the progress of Social Credit generally, that is, the various kinds of successes achieved on different sectors of the world-front; but we should say that the success in America, i.e., the introduction of the Goldsborough Bill, was not the result of astute concerted planning, or confused endeavours, or luck, but was the result of Mr. Goldsborough's personal initiative, enterprise and courage. If there was any luck about the event, it lay in the circumstance that Mr. Goldsborough was on the spot at the right time, and possessed the attributes required for taking action. Mr. Goldsborough appears to be the rare type of believer who says: "Lord, here am I; send me"—in contradistinction to that numerous class of believers whose cry is: "Lord, here am I; send him."

This "send-him" evasion of personal responsibility—this principle of *reliance on others*—is as great a blight on the movement as the bankers' principle of *sacrifice for others* is on the condition of the people as a whole. To invent jobs for other people to do is as vicious as to cut down one man's rations for other people to eat. It is the bankers' ramp upside down. And the proof of the ramp is the observed fact that in the first case the other people don't do the jobs prescribed for them, and, in the second case, the other people don't get the rations renounced for them.

There is a story about a public-school cricket team who played a team of village yokels. One of the latter, a hefty blacksmith, knocked up his hundred in forty minutes, and even then only got out because he was thirsty. After the match, the school captain congratulated

* It is a striking coincidence that the original Bill was introduced on the same day on which Aberhart triumphed at the polls, namely August 22, 1935.]

lated him. "A jolly decent knock, my man; who was your coach?" The blacksmith asked what a coach was. Upon being told it was a teacher, he said: "Oh, it was me feyther." "Ah; and what was his system?" asked the other. "System?"—"Yes: what did he tell you to do?"—"Oh, is that it? Well, he always used to say to me: 'Lad, when tha seest t' ba', clout it'—and I b— well does!" Mr. Goldsborough seems to have been similarly coached. When he saw the ball he clouted it. To see, and to seize, an opportunity was, for him, an instantaneous act. Yes, and a good policy, too; for even a mishit, if it is a proper clout, is more likely to drop over the boundary for 6 than to drop into a fieldsman's hands for 0.

Without discussing the merits of the Goldsborough Bill either as a technical or political instrument, its introduction has this underlying value, namely that it does link up a desirable economic objective with monetary policy, and in such a way as registers the fact that the remedy for the economic deadlock lies in monetary policy and nowhere else. The Bill provides a focal point for stray energies, and thus contributes towards obviating what Mr. Munson describes as "confused endeavours."

Surveying the movement as a whole, it can only act on the guerilla principle. The chief cause of weakness in the movement resides in the inability or unwillingness of so many of its members to recognise this fact. Yet all the evidence of our experience points that way. Mr. Munson provides some of it in his survey. He shows us a picture of the movements in England, America, Australia, New Zealand and Alberta all doing different things. Furthermore, as will have been seen, he observes that these movements do not know what each other is achieving. Information is not distributed through any centre, nor is it elicited by any one movement from any other. Thus, three years after Buxton he does not know how the Buxton policy has been working, and, apparently, is waiting to know before he (or the American movement) decides whether that policy is suitable for adoption in America. Well, all this (and much more that could be adduced) amounts to proof that the Social Credit movements all over the world are acting on the guerilla principle. Acting on that principle inevitably means acting as if there were no centralised directive General Staff. And even if the General Staff ceased to assume direction, and became merely a clearing house for information based on guerilla successes or failures, the value of this information would be very little, because the circumstances of any guerilla *coup* are, in the nature of the case, bound to be unique, and therefore afford no precedent or guidance to guerilla bodies elsewhere. As the sailor said about Invergordon when someone jocularly said: "Better luck next time," after hearing the inside story, "No" (said the sailor) "it will never happen again—I mean, *not in the same way*."

And if Mr. Munson will reflect on why the American movement have waited more than three years to inquire into the results of the Buxton policy, he may reach the conclusion that they did not really want to get the information, and that the reason was that something told them that England's experience was unlikely to be applicable to America, even if encouraging. There was no idea of disparaging guidance from London, nor of resisting the idea of being guided by a General Staff: it was simply that they instinctively felt that they were one of a number of guerilla forces, to which, each and all, a General Staff was a superfluity and maybe an embarrassment.

The national guerilla forces of the world movement are each subdivided into guerilla bands, and—if you like to analyse further—these bands into individuals. Whatever the size of the unit you consider, it exercises its own attractions and repulsions. Sometimes they collaborate, sometimes not. It depends on external circumstance. For example, the Abdication crisis brought together THE NEW AGE, the London Social Credit Club, the Green Shirts, and the Secre-

tariat. But when this crisis was over (or shall we say, went underground?) these bodies reverted to their independent policies. This episode, by the way, is a reminder that the Secretariat represents only one among the several guerilla bodies constituting the English guerilla force. Its electoral campaign to blockade Parliament failed because such an objective was only within the reach (even theoretically) of a properly constituted army with full complements of all ranks down to the lowest—especially the lowest. It was not a guerilla proposition; and, as already said, the world movement, let alone the English movement, is not, and will not become, anything more than a guerilla force. Considered as a potential army, however well led and disciplined, it lacks the resources necessary to oppose Mr. the bankers' army, namely money and personnel. Mr. Munson has given us the measure of the American movement's strength in these terms; and the English movement's strength is something of the same order, its membership probably being not more than 1,000 Social Creditors, and 5,000 "passive assentors," and its monetary revenue (and expenditure) say £5,000 per annum. These figures would have to be multiplied by a thousand at least before we began to talk of a Social Credit army.

Now, these facts are the reverse of discouraging if faced up to. If we realise our weakness we shall realise our strength. It has been through our forgetting our weakness that we have lost strength, or at any rate have failed to use it as effectively as we used to do. Our achievements up to Buxton were of the order of a miracle considering the apparent foolishness of our proposition, the paucity of our personnel and equipment, and the gigantic power of the monopolistic institutions whose supersession or regeneration we demanded. In fact it was pardonable that in view of this progression that we (or many of us) thought that the days of educational agitation were over and that we could beat our instruments of war into instruments of negotiation with a discomfited enemy. The Buxton Conference was virtually a disarmament conference. We had won the battle for Social Credit, and all we had to do was to appoint a body of negotiators to go to Versailles. We damped down our educational agitation; and to-day the bankers are embarking on educational agitation against us, hinting that we dropped ours because we began to doubt the truths we had proclaimed. This mistake must be repaired. Let us have our official negotiators by all means, but let us renew our fighting on the old guerilla lines, for unless we do we shall be frittering away powers of negotiation.

There is evidence that financial difficulties will compel the movement to revert to the pre-Buxton policy. (December 11-18) when THE NEW AGE flew its signal of distress, so did *The New English Weekly* and the Secretariat. The Secretariat, however, unlike these two journals, stated in their appeal that their revenue had not fallen but that their expenditure was increasing. We are inclined to the view that expenditure ought not to be increased, but rather reduced—and reduced wholly under the "B" category, i.e., "payments to other organisations." The English movement spends far too much on printing. There is, for instance, a glut of journalistic matter. And if the outside public are not absorbing their proportion, the deficit must be made good by the movement, or, if not (or not wholly) then there will have to be retrenchments under the "A" category—a course which the spirit of the Social Credit Order surely forbids.

NOTICE.

Listen! Keep the date Friday, March 25, 1938, open for a Dinner. Particulars will be announced later.

All Sound and Führer.

"The peace that you wish . . . is also the aim of my work . . ."

"Germany is striving . . . to give the German people the happiness of a brotherly and united community by smoothing away the apparent social and economic contrasts which threaten the inner unity of the nation, to strengthen those who are economically weaker through joyfully offered help and to promote all healthy and good movements for increasing the material as well as the spiritual well-being of the entire people."—(Herr Hitler at his official New Year reception in Berlin on January 11, 1938.)

Q.—What is the aim of the German Government?

A.—To give happiness to the German people.

Q.—In what will this happiness consist?

A.—In brotherliness and unity.

Q.—How will you bring this about?

A.—By smoothing away the apparent social and economic contrasts which —

Q.—One moment, please. That word "apparent," does it not mean that the things denoted by it do not exist, but only seem to exist?

A.—That is so.

Q.—Then the social and economic contrasts that you refer to are not real contrasts? What I mean is, these "contrasts" are really all grey in tone, and only seem as if they were divided into blacks and whites?

A.—That is logically involved, I admit.

Q.—Then, how do you smooth away what does not really stick out?

A.—Well, if the people are deceived by appearances

Q.—You undeceive them—is that it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You will explain that these apparent contrasts are not contrasts at all?

A.—Well, I —

Q.—Take instances of contrast: "The rich man in his castle, the poor man at his gate"—rank and wealth in the midst of obscurity and poverty. Are these contrasts real or imaginary?

A.—Of course they are real as contrasts, because they are antithetical.

Q.—But the antithesis is only apparent? There is no real unlikeness between rich and poor or high and low?

A.—Oh, the unlikeness is real, but the people misunderstand its significance. That is what threatens the inner unity of the nation.

Q.—You mean that although the contrasts are real you will smooth away the notion that they are real.

A.—I'm afraid I don't quite understand—

Q.—Yes, I'm afraid the matter is a bit involved. It is that word "apparent" that is bothering both of us. Wouldn't it be better if you dropped it, and simply said that you would smooth away the contrasts?

A.—Yes, but I cannot smooth away these contrasts without altering the things that stand in contrast.

Q.—You mean without taking from the rich and giving to the poor—and elevating the lowly to the same equality?

A.—Yes; for that would be pandering to the revenge complex which characterises the Communist movement, besides which, my attempt to do this would destroy the inner unity of —

Q.—One moment, again. What is "inner" unity?

A.—Well, unity has more than one dimension—in fact, several dimensions.

Q.—Quite. But which dimension do you intend to identify by the word "inner"? Would you say "upper" unity—the unity of the governing caste?

A.—Well, there must be unity in leadership.

Q.—I do not contest that: I only want to know what your policy is. Now, agreed that there must be this inner or upper unity, I see your point that real contrasts must not be smoothed away. Next, I see that if you do not smooth them away you have to pretend that they do not exist, so as to establish the outer or wider

unity of the "entire people" to whom you refer in your peroration.

A.—Yes, I think you have seen part of my problem.

Q.—In other words, your problem is to preserve contrasting inequalities by teaching the people that the contrasts are not real but only apparent.

A.—Well, I certainly think that they can be, and should be, taught to see that wealth and rank are not everything.

Q.—Ah! Now you're talking ilke a pedigree Democrat. "Almost thou persuadest me" to be a Fascist. I think you ought to have the Church in on this proposition. The clergy are great boys at proving that anything which isn't everything is nothing.

A.—Well, we are looking after that, but we are going to form a Church of our own.

Q.—Ah, like the B.B.C.?

A.—Yes, but more so.

Q.—Well, don't forget the rest of the hymn I quoted just now about the rich man in his castle: you remember the later lines:—

"God made them high and lowly

"And ordered their estate.

Yes; put the responsibility for contrasts on the Deity, and then you save yourself the task of pretending to people that they are not real contrasts. Admit the reality, but say that it must be tolerated because it has been ordained.

A.—Thanks. I will consider this proposition.

Q.—I see that you are striving "to strengthen those who are economically weaker through joyfully-offered help." I take this to mean that the man-at-the-gate is to get a few more scraps off the plate of the man-in-the-castle?

A.—That is my hope: it can be done.

Q.—Provided that the man-in-the-castle offers this help with joy. What I mean is, does he have to feel joyful about parting with—?

A.—Well, I should hope he would be ashamed to object.

Q.—Yes, but if he did object, or didn't feel joyful, would you refrain from transferring the scraps?

A.—Well, I should have to proceed slowly and circumspectly, because I must not disturb the "inner unity" that we have been—

Q.—Ah, you would wait until the man-in-the-castle got the feeling that he would like to part up—?

A.—Yes, but I should try to persuade him in that direction.

Q.—I see. I suppose that this is what you mean when you talk about increasing the "spiritual well-being" of the—well, not "entire people," but, let us say, the castle-people?

A.—Yes, I should teach them, if I could, that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

Q.—Well, you could do that; but have you considered that if you preached this doctrine to the man-in-the-castle, he would preach it to the man-at-the-gate?

A.—Yes. And that is why I speak of the "spiritual well-being," not of one class, but of the "entire people." The doctrine has a universal application, or none at all. Nicht wahr?

Q.—Oh, I see that. But what bothers me is that you say you want to increase "the material, as well as the spiritual, well-being of the entire people." Two questions arise in my mind. How do you improve the material condition of the entire people? And if you do this, how do you promote the spiritual well-being of the entire people at the same time?

A.—I did not specifically undertake to improve material conditions. My words were: "To promote all healthy and good movements for" doing this—that is to say, movements attempting to do this in the right way.

Q.—Ah; such as the distribution of new credits as personal incomes and measures to regulate prices?

A.—Oh no; I mean morally regenerative movements.

Q.—And you think these can do the trick?

A.—One can only hope so.

Q.—In that case, I suppose you hope that, by persuading the entire people to seek the spiritual blessedness of renouncing material benefits, you will put them in the way of receiving them?

A.—I have faith that if they seek the things of the spirit first, all the things of the flesh will be added unto them—at least, all that are good for them.

Q.—Good for their spirit, or their flesh?

A.—That I cannot say. God moves in a mysterious

Q.—And you are the Steward of His mysteries?

A.—Excuse my modesty; but I prefer to leave the answer to Posterity.

Common Sense.

NOUS they call it in the North of England, from the Greek word meaning "mind," and, says the dictionary, "The reason; the highest intellect; God regarded as the World Reason."

Savvy is slang for the same thing, from the Spanish *saber*, to know. It means mental grasp, understanding, nous, common sense—"horse"-sense. You'll hear it in the barrack-room, especially—"Ach, he's got no savvy!" Or, very often, as a question—"Savvy?"—meaning, "D'you get

Gumption is another word for shrewdness, common sense, or nous, and the English people have always prided themselves upon having a good deal of it. I remember an old Westmorland woman calling out to her daughter—"Hast naw nowse, lass—bangin' t'mats against wind, so as dust blows back through t'door?"

It is this nous, this reason, this highest intellect, that is the one thing, and the only thing, that can save us all from the Stamping Stupidity of the Left-Right Conflict. The only thing that can solve the tragic absurdity of Poverty in the midst of Abundance. The only thing that can put an end to War. The only thing that can "de-mob" the Mass, and release the Individual from Herd Regimentation.

Common Sense is common to everyone; everyone has it in this or that degree. It is not a matter of book learning. It is a matter of using it to get what we want. And that means that, as a people, we must know for certain exactly what we do want. We must use our common sense in order to know that.

So we proclaim the Resurrection of the Living, which is the Religion of Common Sense in action. Those who know by means of common sense what they want will be drawn to act together as a Corps of Volunteers under the Banner of Common Sense. They are the Vanguard of the Army of Common Sense—and they are here, now, proclaiming a common sense objective. That objective is—LIFE, before there this day life and good, and death and evil . . . therefore choose life—"That they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.")

Those who, here and now, use their common sense and fight for Life—the Common Objective—are thereby quickened and alive. Those who, having common sense, do not use it, but let it die out within them—overcome by Mass Apathy—though they number many millions—cannot hold back from the Resurrection that is to quicken them also. This is the social chemistry of the "Quick" and the "Dead."

The use of common sense depends upon Imagination. If, therefore, you wish to keep people from using their common sense, the great thing is to weaken their powers of imagination.

When people say "It's too good to be true," when they hear it stated that Incomes-for-All based upon production is a practical, common sense solution to the social-economic problem of to-day, it shows that their imagination is weak. It has been weakened by propaganda absorbed from Press, radio, and cinema. They cannot imagine that they could free themselves from Work-Wage Slavery. And because

they cannot imagine this change to be possible, they cannot bring Common Sense into play and demand it.

Kill Imagination, you kill Common Sense.

Kill Common Sense . . . and what is the result?

Exactly what you would expect: a mad world, my masters!—poverty amidst plenty—class war, sex war, age war—psychological war within the individual—and, finally, the Mass Slaughter of World War. In a word: *idiocy*.

Do away with common sense, and what do you expect?

Now, whether you know it or not, you are either on the side of *Idiocy*, or you are on the side of *Common Sense*. So there is a war on here, eh? There is, indeed! And no one can escape it.

Would a Maggot starve because the Apple was Too Big? The common-sense answer is—NO!

We preach the Gospel of Common Sense, we proclaim the Resurrection of the Living "Dead," the Revelation of Common Sense, the formation of the Committees of Common Sense—here, to-day, now in the British Isles—and Common Sense Action through the Party of Common Sense in which "party politics" are forgotten; in which the people of these islands stand solidly, as one man, for one Common-Sense Objective: ECONOMIC SECURITY AND FREEDOM.

For common sense gives short shrift to intellectual cynicism. Intellectual cynicism is the sure sign of that "living death" that overtakes the life-wearied idea-sippers and cult-tasters.

"I must live!" says the hungry man looking for food. "Why?" says the intellectual cynic (who, please note, has had a good breakfast), and smiles his clever smile.

But life runs past him, without bothering to answer the stupid-clever question. The hungry man—if he has common sense—buys, begs, or steals a loaf of bread. Because he must live—and no one knows why. In fact, the question does not arise until the belly has food in it; and if it arises then it is as futile (common sense tells us) as the asking of another question to which no one in the whole world has the answer: "Why is Space—Time—Matter?"

"Find Out," answers Common Sense, "if you want to; but you won't find out by asking the question."

It is at this point that Common Sense (the will-to-keep-alive) has all the Philosophical Systems beaten. First things first, says Common Sense, and those first things, so far as human life on this planet is concerned, are the Three Essentials:

FOOD, WARMTH, SHELTER.

We must have these things first, and enough to give us all plenty of time (leisure) from work-wage slavery, if there is to be any Culture worth having.

So the common sense concern with material things leads to culture, and there is no other road. The "kitchen-middens" of prehistoric man lead to the modern laboratory, and all the results of intricate intellectual activity in every sphere of art, science, and philosophical speculation.

Our concern, then, in applying common sense to the economic problem—our determination to introduce the Economics of Common Sense—is, in reality, directed towards the Release of Culture, by means of the release of the individual from economic enslavement to an out-of-date Money System.

We may see at what an early date the words "common sense" are embedded in the English tongue, and how deep-rooted they are in what we, as a community, feel and think, when we read the following lines from *Piers Plowman* (written between 1360 and 1400):—

"Then came Common Sense
and made clerks and learned men
That Common Sense and knighthood
and the king together
Should see that the people
might gain a living."

Here we find Common Sense personified, just as in the early Morality Plays we find the Vices and Virtues personified. "Then came Common Sense"—not just as a name for blockheaded-ignorance-set-in-a-rut that our lickspittle politicians and journalists extol in what they call the "man-

in-the-street," but Common Sense with a clearly defined purpose. "Then came Common Sense" in order to "see that the people might gain a living."

There you have the plain, matter-of-fact meaning that we attach to the words "common sense." It is not common sense that the people should be unable to "gain a living." And yet we have so-called economists to-day who will argue the hindleg off a donkey, with their statistical claptrap and their mean-hearted industry, to prove that there is no real Poverty—and no real Plenty (not even "potential plenty"). Sir Joshua Stamp-on-Plenty is but one of them. But, as regards this vital question, there is more common sense to be found in Rowton House than in the lecture hall at the London School of Economics.

It is not knowledge that is lacking in the men who set themselves up to explain what is the matter, and how to put it right. They are fuddled with Facts and addled with Figures, more especially with percentages that anyone can play ducks-and-drakes with to suit his own line of saletalk. As against all this trash, I have only to look in the gutter to see the old woman selling matches. . . . None of their Facts seem to fit that frail, little, old, bent-up figure clad in black rags, for by their everlasting Economic Studies they have "statisticalised" her right out of existence! And they do that, either by working out a rigmarole about Trade Cycles, and so forth, or by printing a Table of Commodity Prices. But, believe me, the old woman is still there—in the gutter, miserable, cold, hungry, poverty-stricken.

"Mother wit" is another expression we have. Mother wit is natural or native wit (wisdom) or intelligence: the same thing as nous, gumption, savvy, common sense. It sounds a homely, commonplace sort of thing—mother wit—and yet it is the one thing that has given us all we have. For if "Necessity is the mother of invention," mother wit is the womb of the inventive faculty. There would be no machines to-day if primitive man had not had the mother lean upon, to strike with, to throw as a spear, to bend as a bow. To-day, thanks to that mother wit, we "lean upon" the intricate machinery of the Power Age.

But, unless we, as a community, again use that mother wit—which is nothing more than Common Sense—we shall be driven by economic causes into the shambles of Mass Slaughter in which our form of civilisation will become a heap of rusting wreckage, and the chance of establishing an Age of Leisure, so painfully and so nearly achieved, will be gone: plunged into a New Dark Age of confusion, scarcity, and brutality.

Such a slip back can be stopped—but only by the use of Common Sense.

We say, without fear of contradiction from the majority of our fellow-countrymen, that the only "shirted movement" that showed Common Sense was, and still is, the Green Shirts.

THE PREACHER.

Books to Read.

Leading a life of busy idleness I have plenty of time for my miscellaneous and indirect reading. I keep a notebook in which to jot down the titles of books I have had from the library, together with what I think about them. Here are a few jottings from that notebook which you may find just as useful as wading through long-winded "reviews," if not more so.

In their bearing on the African native question three recent books are well worth reading.

White African. Autobiography of Professor Leaky of pre-one of his native languages. Born in the country, he speaks Kikuyu as well as English.

Out of Africa, by Karen Blixen, a Swedish aristocrat who struggled for years on a coffee farm in Kenya and who knows how to write.

Black Hamlet, by Dr. Wulf Sachs. This treats in humane honesty of the impact of modern industrialism on native life and character. Grim enough, but well worth reading.

When you need a change from *homo sapiens* there is a treat for you in *Speak to the Earth*, by Miss de Watville, a Swiss woman who wanted to see elephants close and takes you delightfully with her to do so.

Getting back from Africa to what is now a much more savage Continent, we come to a pair of books which, together, give a more or less stereoscopic view of Fascinazism.

The Fascists, by E. B. Ashton, an American who is satisfied that both the Germans and Italians have the sort of government they have always liked, and more or less always had, and who is quite pessimistic as to the future. *The House That Hitler Built*, by J. H. Roberts, the very learned Professor of Modern History at Sydney, who seems well acquainted with Germany from within. He notes the increasing difficulty "of whipping up the dying love of sacrifice for the peace time war," but reckons that Germany is getting back rapidly to the old army-junker rule.

Nearer home there is Mr. O'Brien's anthology, *Short Stories of 1937*, which I had for Christmas time. On the whole fifty-eight that I then read I can only faintly recall two. "The Water of Sturricorri" and "The Surgeon and the Nun," both American. A pitifully poor miscellaneous collection.

Going east by way of the Red Sea there are two first-class books of real adventure. So good are they that the fact that this admirable French sailorman was engaged in smuggling evil drugs through our lines in Egypt does not worry you a bit. They are *Hashish* and *Sea Adventure*, by de Montfrier.

Further east still there are books on China. If you have not read those by Pearl Buck it is time you did. They are almost beyond praise.

Then there are two very light and entertaining books by Dr. Gervais. *A French Surgeon in China* and *Madam Flowery Sentiment*, which should amuse you.

In contrast with these last two is a book which merits much more space than I can give it.

Red Star Over China, an outline history of the Communist movement there—its repeated fight against what seemed overwhelming odds—its final extraordinary exodus into the far N.W. corner of China by a wonderful march of six thousand terrible miles where it outwitted, outfought, and out-suffered its larger and much better equipped enemy. Then there is the kidnapping of Kaishek by the northern army there is the combination arranged between all parties against and the combination arranged between all parties against Japan. As Gordon found years ago, the Chinese, if they trust their leader and believe in their cause, are as good soldiers as any in the world, but we are left wondering whether the wonderful pluck and public spirit aroused by the Communist hope could ever be canalised to a lasting State on Communistic lines, or whether such an attempt would again only end in a Stalin. Edgar Snow is the first outsider to have actually lived with the leaders and men of the Chinese Red Army, and speaks with authority.

PAKEHA.

Making It Plain.

Scene: A Green Shirt Open Air Meeting.
Heckler.—Can you define Social Credit shortly?
G.S.—Can you define the principles governing a wireless set or a motor-bike shortly?

Heckler.—What's that got to do with it?
G.S.—Definitions of technical matters involve technical language, but I'll do my best. I should define Social Credit as the monetisation of the real wealth and increment of association for the benefit of the general community.

Heckler.—You've said a mouthful—but it doesn't help.
G.S.—Just what I expected. You are not used to those words. Tell me, you look like a War hero, where are your medals?

Heckler.—What the hell has that got to do with you? Voice from the crowd.—Get on with it, Joe! Why don't you tell him your medals are up the spout, same as those belonging to the rest of us?

G.S.—Exactly what I expected. Now those medals represent real wealth. By taking them to Uncle's you have monetised them. That is, you have got what Uncle thinks they are worth in hard cash. In other words, you have monetised the real wealth of the medals. In exactly the same way, the Bankers are the Uncles of the business community. They lend money on the security of the fields, factories, workshops, and plant of the community, to enable the industrialists to pay their way until they are able to market their goods and get their money back in prices from the general community upon which they depend.

The real wealth of the producers to produce, without which although it is not mentioned in the deeds, is the mental and physical ability of the producers to produce. This ability, like the very real wealth would be valueless. This ability, like the fields, factories, workshops, and plant, belongs to the individuals. The Banks merely produce a ticket system, which they call "money," in exchange for which they not only get a legal claim over real wealth, but also insist upon the repayment of any money they create and issue as loans to them out of the prices of the goods produced.

Heckler.—What do you mean by the increment of association?

G.S.—We mean by the increment of association the obvious fact that ten men working together on a job can produce more than ten men working separately. In a simple case, we may suppose that one man working alone might produce one unit of goods. Ten men working in co-operation might easily produce as much again, or—say—twenty units of goods. To whom does the twenty units belong? Obviously, in the case under review, each man ought to get two units of goods. But in a complicated system like that of modern industry it is not a question of the simple co-operation of the physical energies of man, but all that we know as civilisations—scientific education and progress, and marvellous machinery, and machinery which produces machinery with less and less need for human labour. This is the productive system which has brought us within sight of the Age of Plenty. To whom, therefore, should the vast increment of association be distributed, after the producers have drawn a reasonable subsistence than to the community in general?

We contend that the goods and services representing this increment of association, i.e., the surplus goods and services produced over and above those which the producers need to consume that they may go on producing, shall be monetised and distributed to the community. To enable this to be done, we contend that it is necessary to set up a National Credit Office, the duty of which will be to measure production against consumption, to monetise the value of production and consumption, and to distribute the surplus equally to every man, woman, and child in the community by means of a National Dividend. Only in this way can the increment of association rightly become the possession of the community. Only in this way can the community enter into its inheritance and the standard of living be so raised as to enable the community to live at the ever-increasing standard of life which they are entitled to do in view of the ever-increasing productivity of the system.

Voice from the crowd.—When do we get that National Dividend?
F. G.

Social Credit in Politics.

EXTRACTS FROM DOUGLAS, 1928-31.

There are two hypotheses as to the method by which changes of so far reaching a character as those we have been discussing might come about, one of which may be described as the evolutionary method, and the second as revolutionary. For my own part I am inclined to believe in the probability of a combination of the two.

A small impetus from a body of men who know what to do and how to do it, may make the difference between yet one more retreat into the Dark Ages, or the emergence into the full light of day of such splendour as we can at present only envisage dimly.—(NEW AGE, Aug. 8, 1928.)

In respect of any undertaking centralisation is the way to do it.—(NEW AGE, Aug. 30, 1928.)

The state of mind which is the result of an environment cause is itself the greatest barrier to the removal of the morbid stimulus from which it arises. That is why civilisation seems only salvable by shock, or by a Saviour.—(NEW AGE, Oct. 4, 1928.)

It has to be remembered that antecedent to the actual constructive work on any great project a great deal of hard work, and perhaps the hardest work of all, has to be done. The minds of the public have to be prepared, they have to be educated to see the desirability of the proposed work, plans have to be drawn, and a staff of workmen has to be marshalled in readiness for the concrete effort.

It has always been my personal opinion that the force on which we had to rely was not principally propaganda, but rather the awakening of public opinion, once it had been given the lead, to the explanation of the facts of the everyday world.

I should not be honest if I gave it as my opinion that such a radical reform as we desire is at all likely to take place so long as the credit and banking system remains under the control of the individuals who are now in possession of it.

The forces of reaction undoubtedly will not retreat and be finally defeated without striking many a shrewd blow.—(NEW AGE, March 28, 1929.)

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

PRICE-INCOME SHORTAGE

Sir,—Various criticisms of my demonstration of the price-income shortage, when considered in conjunction with letters in your supplement, show possible weak spots in the presentation of my argument.

I do not want to step forward in my progress towards the logical proof of Major Douglas's "pons asinorum" without establishing each proposition beyond question.

Firstly, I may not have illustrated sufficiently clearly my explanation of the permanent income-shortage of L pounds per week due to the repayment of weekly loan L before the cost of distributing L as income appears on the price-tickets of goods and services actually on the market.

I have therefore prepared a tabular statement comparing week by week for seventeen weeks the minimum solvent costs, loans made, loans repaid, incomes distributed, and weekly deficiency. Owing to difficulties in the way of printing such a table here, I must ask your readers who are interested in finding the logical cause and solution of "Poverty in the midst of Plenty," to make their own table in the form suggested below. I start, as I have done before, from our zero taking-off ground. (See my first letter, November 4.) I start from a simple self-liquidating system where R equals L, that is, total of retail prices equals total of incomes distributed. I am considering only loans and new money without interest. I postulate loans as repayable in four weeks (token figures), and incomes distributed appear as costs on the market in ten weeks. (Ten weeks is a better illustration than the eight weeks of my letter on November 4.)

It will be observed that for four weeks incomes exceed costs by L, and therefore the excess of 4L is built up, and may be reserved to absorb a deficiency of 4L and no more, in four later weeks. From week five to weekly payments being no deficiency, the costs due to weekly loan. After the balanced by the incomes due to the weekly loan. After tenth week the costs will exceed income by L per week, and this is absorbed by the earlier excess, for four weeks. After the fourteenth week and for ever the added deficiency will be L per week.

Guide to drawing out the table: Make six volumes headed thus: Date; Loans made; Loans repaid; Incomes; with one Deficiency. Fill in the vertical "date" column, with one of these items on each line: To-day; 1st week; 2nd week; 3rd week; etc. . . . ending with 17th week. Write in the "loans made" column opposite those items: 0; L1; L2; L3; L4; etc. . . . to L17, which will be opposite 17th week. Write in the "loans repaid" column: 0; 0; 0; 0; 0 (five times). At the 5th week: L1; L2; L3; etc. . . . at the 17th week: L13; L14; L15; L16; L17. Write in the "incomes" column: I + L17; I + L16; I + L15; etc. . . . At the 17th week: I + L17; I + L16; I + L15; etc. . . . At the 17th week: R + L1; R + L2; R + L3; etc. . . . At the 17th week: R + L7 + L1; R + L8 + L2; etc. . . . At the 17th week: R + L13 + L7. Write in the "deficiency" column: "none"; excess L; excess L; etc. . . . at the 5th week: "none"; none, etc. . . . at the 11th week: "deficiency L" etc. . . . still none, etc. . . . at the 11th week: "deficiency L"; and so L for ever.

To complete the table, add a note at the end of the 10th week: "To complete the table, add a note at the end of the 10th week: week: "repayment starts." After 14th week: "The excess of 4L has now been absorbed by the four weeks' deficiency." After the 17th week: "Deficiency continues to be added at the rate of L per week for ever and ever."

The deficiency, or lack of purchasing power, is due to the too early repayment of loans before money can fairly be collected from the community to cover repayment. There is nothing immoral about withdrawing loans quickly, but the resulting shortage must be taken care of, in our economic system, or it will crash. Douglas's proposals will effect this.

The deficiency described above is, of course, independent and additional to that described in my earlier letters as due to saving-for-reinvestment, or that due to pumping new money into the system through industry. Nor have I touched on the subject of "interest." These causes of shortage are superimposed in practice, but need not be superimposed in our brains.

A second point I want to clarify: Letters in the debating supplement show that everyone does not agree with me that the amount of loans made to, and expended by industry, must normally (assuming solvency), appear some day as a cost on the price ticket of something. This disagreement does not destroy my argument, which is, so far, qualitative not quantitative. Everyone must agree that X% of loans must appear in costs at some time. Therefore X% of L must represent the inevitable weekly shortages. Our estimate of X is the only point on which we differ. Some writers imply that X is the amount spent on progressing consumable

goods, the remainder being the amount spent on making "capital" goods. In my opinion, there is no distinction of that sort, but a distinction of quite another sort. I would be glad to be allowed space to prove this in your pages in due course.

N. R. TEMPERLEY.

January 12, 1938.

"CANCELLATION" SEQUENCE.

Sir,—Your correspondent, "Not Quite Convinced," writing in your issue of the 13th inst., would appear to be concerned about the cancellation of credits and the piling up of cash within a Social Credit Economy. One hesitates to use his own expression of "mug" as applied to one whose thinking is confused and illogical.

Presumably he does agree with the Douglas Analysis, that within the community at present there is not and cannot be sufficient purchasing power in the form of tokens, currency and bank credit to equate the real wealth available. And, presumably, he understands that at present there is cancellation and the piling up of credits and of debts.

If that be so, surely there is no difficulty in visualising a state of affairs in which there will be available within the community just sufficient purchasing power—in the form of tokens, currency and bank credit—to equate the real wealth, and cancellation in the same way as now. There will under such new regime be also some piling up of credits in the form of savings as now, but no piling up of debts, seeing that new purchasing power will not come into existence —as now—as a debt to its creators. Under such a state of affairs it may well be that "Not Quite Convinced" would add to his savings until he realised that there wasn't much point to it and that money is only made to be spent.

Purchasing power is cancelled, so far as the consumer is concerned, when a purchase is effected and money changes hands, so far as the retailer is concerned when he pays his wholesaler's account, so far as the wholesaler is concerned when he pays the manufacturer, and so far as the manufacturer is concerned when he repays his credit advance through the bank to the issuing authority, the National Credit Office, or equivalent.

Purchasing power is simply a series of book entries and tokens, currency or cheques are merely detachable loose-leaf entries; the tokens, cash, and notes being available for issue again when they have performed their functions in circulating and returned again to the issuing authority.

"NORMAN CONQUEST."

Sir,—It will be interesting to see whether Social Credit technical students can give a short and clear explanation on the point raised by "Not Quite Convinced" in your last issue.

S. R.

AN EXPLANATION.

I hope later to give Mr. Coleman's letter in the Debating Section (January 13) the close attention it merits. I hasten now only to confirm his belief that I would not consciously misrepresent him. Upon reflection, however, I hope he will see that I really did not do so. His full statement* was there for all to see; I merely quoted that part I was then denying and which itself denied what I was saying.

The case I was presenting was that consumers are all the time receiving payments sufficient in themselves to meet all capital charges. Only the first part of Mr. Coleman's sentence was denied this. The latter part (starting at "unless") was therefore irrelevant at that stage. I agree that consideration of it is "vital to a proper understanding of the self-liquidation problem" which Social Credit propounds. But to see why critics deny that any such problem in reality exists it is equally vital to obtain a proper understanding of banking and the nature of debt, subjects which Mr. Coleman is eager to skip.

I must add that he himself unintentionally misinterprets years. I said that £1 a week collected and hoarded over two years does not cause a deficiency. I was simply and correctly pointing out that the money has not disappeared; it is merely spent not being used. Mr. Coleman's point that pleasure to spend money (and so to create income) has no support to his real argument which should demonstrate the Douglas deficiency—that money is simply not there at all to be spent, not just being hoarded.

J. A. FRANKLIN.

*Charges against consumers will continue to be made in respect of capital goods unbalanced by any payments to consumers unless the industrial system is expanding and getting into debt at an ever increasing rate

A FAKED QUOTATION.

Sir,—Regarding the quotation you print (on page 46 of last week's issue), which is attributed to an American

bankers' magazine of 1924, the following appeared in the Canadian Leader-Post recently:—

"The main trouble about the quotation is that it never appeared in the U.S. Bankers' Magazine at any time or place, and it never appeared in any bankers' magazine that anybody can discover. Exhaustive researches have failed to trace the quotation to its source. The Leader-Post once took a notion to find out where it may have come from and the best it could get was that the quotation had appeared in a radical weekly in Idaho in 1893 or 1894. But when further inquiry was made it was discovered that the paper had not been published for about forty years. The quotation is evidently a fake, but truth has never been able to catch up with it."

J. A. F.

PARTY POLITICS.

Sir,—I read in the paper called "Social Credit" (2d.) that: "Party Politics is not Democracy. It is a mechanism of frustration financed by the Money Power."

As I understand it, Mr. Aberhart formed a political party called "The Social Credit Party of Alberta," put up S.C. candidates in the ordinary way, preached the main plank in the Party platform ("25 dollars a month basic dividend") far and wide, and won the general election of 1935 on orthodox lines, using the existing voting system. Is it on orthodox lines, using the existing voting system? A mechanism suggested that Mr. Aberhart's party was "a mechanism of frustration financed by the Money Power"?

Supposing the "Money Power" did actually finance the Aberhart party as a "mechanism of frustration," is it not a fact that, between them, Douglas and Hargrave succeeded in manipulating the Alberta situation in such a way as to turn the "mechanism of frustration" into a weapon for the release of real democratic action against the Money Power itself? It does look as though the only place in the world in which Social Credit has a chance to get to grips with the enemy is in the Province of Alberta, and that this opportunity was brought about, in the first place, by means of "Party Politics," in spite of the fact that P.P. is "not of Democracy." I think this fact should make us reconsider the whole question of the use that might be made of "the mechanism of frustration." If Aberhart can use it to get governmental power in Alberta, and if Social Credit men can't be done elsewhere? I believe what we need are some more Aberharts.

HILDA E. COLE.

ABDICATION PROBLEM.

Sir,—The following facts may be of use to your correspondent, G. S. Wood, in formulating the main point in the abdication problem raised in his letter of January 13:— "The King occupies the throne under the Act of Settlement, 1700, whereby, in default of issue of Princess Anne of Denmark and H.M. William III., as provided by the Bill of Rights, the Princess Sophia, Electress and Duchess Dowager of Hanover, daughter of James I., was to be the next in succession to the throne of England and the late Queen of Bohemia and daughter of England and the heirs of her body, being Protestants." It is established that "the Sovereign cannot be, or marry, a Roman Catholic." "The Sovereign cannot be, or marry, a Sovereign cannot do. There are several other things that a Sovereign cannot do. For example, he cannot "make, unmake, or suspend Acts of Parliament; levy or suspend taxation; prevent impeach-

ments." (J. J. Clarke.) "Since the King can do no wrong, he can do neither right nor wrong. He must not be praised or blamed, nor must his name, or personal wishes be brought into political controversy." (Lowell.) This means that "if the King has done a wrong act he can neither legally nor constitutionally be held responsible for it." (Clarke.)

Moreover, we find that: "The power and jurisdiction of Parliament is so transcendent and absolute that it cannot be confined, either for causes or persons, within any bounds." (Sir E. Coke.) All legal authorities agree that: "The King reigns but does not govern."

We may recall the words of Bracton, the foremost jurist of his time, in commenting on the dangerous state of affairs then existing (civil war: the Battle of Lewes): "If the King were without a bridle,—that is, the law—his subjects ought to put a bridle on him." Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, had the "bridle" ready, and in the winter of 1265 the House of Commons, as distinguished from the Lords, was originated. That was the "bridle."

That the House of Commons has, in its turn, had the "bridle" of Finance, the Hidden Government, put upon it, can hardly be doubted by any serious student of history.

ARNOLD MCGOWAN.

Sir,—It seems perfectly clear that if Edward VIII. had replied to the "ultimatum," as formulated by Mr. G. S. Wood, by saying: "I will not give up this woman, nor will

I abdicate: I am determined to reign as King, and marry this woman, and she shall be Queen," he would have split the country into two warring factions: the Kings' Party and the Constitutional Party. For a day or two we were very near that in December, 1936. Without a Press and deprived of the use of the radio, it is doubtful whether the King and the King's Party could have done anything worth doing. The Bankers' "Constitutional" Party would have dominated—as, indeed, they did. Had Edward said "No" to the "ultimatum," there was nothing for it but a *coup d'état* carried out immediately by the King's Party. If successful, it would have meant a semi-Fascist regime with the King at the head of it. It is doubtful, from a Social Credit point of view, whether that would have done any good. From any point of view Edward was probably right in declining to take the risk.

E. D.

Sir,—I am very glad G. S. Wood has raised this question of the Abdication. I do not believe Parliament, Prime Minister, Cabinet, or anyone else, has the constitutional or legal power to bring the kind of pressure that was brought to bear upon Edward VIII. because he wished to marry a woman who had divorced her first husband, and was about to divorce her second. By all means, let us hear what those versed in constitutional law have to say.

L. G. ACKLAND-DOYLE.

TIN-PAN ALLEY?

Sir,—With K.M.J. I also deplore the infantilisms that have reduced the morale of the S.C. movement and brought it into disrepute amongst thinking people. It seems incredible that men like Brenton, Hargrave, Hattersley, and a good many others one could name—all "Old Guard" Social Credit fighters—should be deliberately set upon and turned into "opposition." But I also deplore K.M.J.'s attitude when he suggests that he might "curl up and hibernate" until these childishnesses have been outgrown or pushed out of the picture by force of circumstance. We shan't get any forrader by going "dormouse." What is needed is information. For instance, although I have read all that was published, I cannot for the life of me make out, even now, why Douglas fell out with Brenton and THE NEW AGE. It is all very well to say, "the whole thing is fatuous enough without explanations," but that is not likely to get us very far. I, for one, would welcome an authoritative "explanation" of the above-mentioned crosspatch-puzzle. I am not signing this letter for reasons that will be obvious to you, Sir, but I enclose my card.

ONE OF THE OLD GUARD.

Sir,—K.M.J. makes a great mistake in writing as he does about the differences of Social Credit actionists. Turning away in disgust only makes matters worse. You might just as well say that the differences that have arisen between Stalin and Trotsky are just "tin-pan alley." There were people who said the same sort of thing about the dialectical warfare, schisms, and often snarlingly vicious argumentations that took place between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks; they thought it was just squabbling. Superficially always jump to that kind of conclusion. As in other matters, that actionist policy is right that *works*, and these conflicts are inevitable and become more intense the moment you leave the theoretical sphere and attempt to put ideas into action. The only way of escaping them is to "follow the example of the dormouse," and go to sleep, which is what K.M.J. contemplates. But those men who have the ability to shape events always take the utmost trouble to keep their minds wide awake in order to understand the pattern of these conflicts, no matter how intricate, and to manipulate them. They are practical psychologists. "Chance has no more part in psychology than it has in physics. Every thought which flits through the mind, however casual or irrelevant it may seem to be, is the only thought which can possibly result from the various mental processes which preceded it." (Bernard Hart, M.D., *The Psychology of Insanity*, page 60.)

Even the conflicts of children squabbling in "tin-pan alley" do not arise by chance, and are deeply significant in the social-economic life of the community. If we intend to do anything at all about Social Credit, we must not be intellectual sluggards. We must come to understand how the conflict-patterns arise within the movement, and what effect they are having at each given moment.

J. S. HELMONT.

MAN'S BODY IN CESSPOOL.

Sir,—The following letter appeared in *The Times* for January 13.

Sir,—More than a month ago a young farm labourer named Robert John Burgess, aged twenty-nine, living at the village of Bredgar, near Sittingbourne, bade his wife and two children good-bye and left home to go to his

work. He lived in a block of cottages known as Chantry Cottages, and when a few steps from his threshold he disappeared into a well. Apparently, caused by heavy rains, there had been a subsidence in this well, leaving only a thin crust of earth on the surface. Burgess stepped on this, the crust gave way beneath his weight, and he fell into a 200 ft. well that used to serve a monastic college here.

From that day to the present time the body of the poor fellow is still at the bottom of this disused well, which for some years now has been utilised as a cesspool. Consultations and correspondence have since been going on between the coroner, the police authorities, the county council, the Home Office, and the Ministry of Health, but no one will authorise the sanction of the expenditure that will be entailed by the setting up of machinery to raise the dead man's body from its loathsome tomb and give it a Christian burial.

The young widow is still suffering from the shock of her husband's tragic death, and everybody in Bredgar is indignant at the unaccountable delay, which amounts to a scandal, in finding some way out of the difficulty. Is there no authority, Government or county, which can put an end to this dreadful state of affairs?

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
Robert J. G. Bennett.

Just imagine it!—"no one will authorise the sanction of the expenditure." Truth at the bottom of a well.

H. SAUNDERS.

ACTION IN ALBERTA.

Sir,—The American magazine, *Dynamic America*, for January, contains a review by Mr. Gorham Munson of Mr. Hattersley's booklet, *Aberhart and Alberta: The First Phase*, in which the following passage occurs:

"Aberhart would not take advice until he was in danger of being kicked out by his own party; and the blunders he made during 'the first phase' are unforgivable. Both Major Douglas and John Hargrave, London Social-Credit extremist who visited Alberta, came to form shrewd appraisals of Aberhart. Occupying the middle ground between Douglas, with his 'sanctions-plan,' and Hargrave, with his 'dividend-plan,' are Social-Credit writers like Mr. Hattersley, who exhibit this movement's political thinking at its feeblest, a mixture of naive good will, bourgeois vision, and wishful politics."

I am not concerned with this opinion about Mr. Hattersley's "political thinking," but there seems to be some misunderstanding here about the two "plans." This is that Douglas advocates a "sanctions-plus-dividend-plan," that Douglas advocates a "sanctions-plus-dividend-plan," not the same thing as that stated by Mr. Munson.

When discussing matters with Mr. Munson's Planning Committee on the occasion of its first meeting on December 19, 1936, Hargrave said: "You ought to place financial penalties upon any banking institution that fails to co-operate with the Government, and still heavier ones if there is any kind of pressure brought to bear by these institutions upon any citizen or association of citizens in Alberta—or any threat of such pressure, as in this case." (*Alberta Report*, page 10.) It is clear from many other passages in the Report that Hargrave was, and I suppose still is, in favour of the application of "sanctions," or "penalties," simultaneously with the issue of the "basic dividend."

I am not attempting to argue whether this is a correct line of action. I only want to get the position clear; for if we are to understand what has happened, and what is now happening, in Alberta, we must be as accurate as possible in defining such vital divergences in strategy and tactics.

T. COULSON.

Letters Received.

Letters for the Debating Section have been received from Gladys F. Bing and S. Rudd.

Correspondents should note that our acknowledgment of receipt of their letters is not necessarily a guarantee of publication, but is an assurance that what they say is receiving attention.

Forthcoming Meetings.

LONDON SOCIAL CREDIT CLUB.
Blewcoat Room, Caxton-street, S.W.

January 21, 8 p.m. "£5 Monthly for All for Life," in addition to wages and salaries, with a lower cost of living," by Mr. Brame Hillyard.

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 12-14, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, E.C.4, England, and printed for him by THE ARCTS PRESS LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London, E.C.4, England (Telephone Central 3701).