NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The Situation in Alberta:

The official announcement from Edmonton that Mr. Aberhart has terminated Major Douglas’s contract is good news because it is definite. It marks the end of seven months of speculation about whether Major Douglas was going to stay or not. It also serves as a reminder of the inter-tribal wrangle as to what kind of advice Mr. Aberhart has for Douglas to give. There is now no need to discuss the chicken-or-egg conundrum whether the Aberhart’s scheme for Alberta should have been deferred until Aberhart had gained power to operate it, or whether such a scheme should have been worked out and promulgated first as a means of giving point and direction to an Albertan bid for power.

The plan laid by Mr. Aberhart before the electorate, and endorsed by them last August, was justly criticised by Social-Credit students as being technically defective. It provided for the collection of processing-taxes in order to pay the promised Dividend. Since all taxes are ultimately levies on the incomes of consumers, the payment of the Dividend would have been purely a matter of redistribution of income in any degree effective. The Social-Credit Dividend must represent a measure of effective demand in terms of goods and services. The Division of a Dividend must be in terms of additional dollars must go into the consumption market along with additional goods.

The basic principle is that all wealth shall be as accessible as possible and when it becomes physically consumable. When that principle is established there will be no need to convert to the volume of wealth converted to consumption except the physical resources of the community on the one side or their desire to consume them on the other. You can’t convert to your use more than there is to convert. And you won’t convert to your use more than you need to use—that is, of course, if you have the power to decide for yourself what you will do. The problem of consumption hinges on this principle of financial accessibility. A tax denies access: that is what it is imposed for. Whether levied on industry and returned into prices, or levied on citizens and deducted from their incomes, access is denied just like the same. So if a Dividend is to give access it must not be accompanied by taxation.

So the tax law in the Aberhart plan must go. And not only as a matter of technical necessity, but also as a matter of political expediency. Usually, of course, a party which alters its programme after having got a formal endorsement of it, lays itself open to the charge of cheating the electorate. And, as we all know, the electorate is not so easily well justified in most cases. But Mr. Aberhart’s is only too well justified in the case. He has escaped this danger, because the tax law Aberhart has not changed the form of the Dividend, he has not done a connotated a promised benefit to the electorate: on the contrary, it connotated the price of a benefit. Taxation does not confer benefits on a community: at the best it redistributes them, and at the worst it subtracts them. The only beneficiaries of taxation are the banks.

Now, Mr. Aberhart, having got an overwhelming mandate from the electorate for undertaking to sell a Dividend at the price of a tax, has no need to ask them for a mandate to dispense with the tax. He can take it for granted. No one could get up and say that Mr. Aberhart was doing him out of something he wanted—except the bank, who, for that matter, has been doing him a service by keeping prices down. And as the banker, who, for that matter, appears to be committed, and perhaps irrevocably so, to the higher taxes provided for in his Budget. Insofar as this creates discontent among those who voted for his programme, he could, of course, score a debating point by reminding them that at least they had endorsed the principle of taxation as the source of the Dividend—although he would have no answer to the retort that he was raising the tax before (or instead of?) paying the Dividend. Let us hope, however, that there
a mechanism which automatically keeps out of the reach of everybody (themselves included) the benefits denied to those who are in need of them. Their policy has been summed up in two words: Watson Annexation—of life, liberty and culture. Wanton, because it would cost them nothing to reverse the policy; Annexation, because they reduce to nothingness the creative forces of civilization.

The urgent task before all reformers to-day is to concern themselves with the subject of the control of the credit mechanism, with the purpose of educating the public into knowledge of how their despoils come about. Only by giving the public some idea of how the present mechanism is designed to do this, can they get them to realize how easily the bankers in control of it can adapt it to make a new policy, if they choose. We have to show that the power to choose the new policy is in their hands (not in those of statesmen), that there are no technical obstacles to its operation, and that no injustice or hardship (either to them or the rest of the community) can be shown to arise out of its operation. By showing that they have the political power and the technical knowledge to put the system of Government immunity from harm in putting it right, we show that their refusal to do so is not in their own interest.

Such an attack is morally indefensible, no matter on what principles a political system is run. Not even a cursory glance at this could carry the autocratic principle so far as to do just what he fancied to do irrespective of what the people wanted. Much has been done in a long line of popular sentiment (or banalities) which, according to the police authorities, for instance, is not a pretty thing. Dillingers were comfortable then, doing a thing in a uniform—"an attitude, which can be extended, not to embracing anybody implying a uniform, and which, as such, is extended, might be called a common system of moral shrills and tax-collectors, agents to whom things are widely spreading. Dillingers were therefore doing a thing in a uniform—"an attitude, which can be extended, not to embracing anybody implying a uniform, and which, as such, is extended, might be called a common system of moral shrills and tax-collectors, agents to whom things are widely spreading.

Now such an attitude of tolerance is possible in circumstances like these, where the operation of which the people are as well as to the rich, in addition to the fact that the rich and the poor have done the same thing. It is not a thing to be done, but a thing to be done, which is not a thing to be done, and which, as such, is extended, might be called a common system of moral shrills and tax-collectors, agents to whom things are widely spreading.

As the proceeds of taxation, it is obvious that these may eventually come out of the personal incomes of individuals and their aggregate amount on the basis of any given schedule of income cannot be guaranteed unless the incomes are guaranteed. It is why we say just now that Mr. Major's success in winning the first trick—the tax-schedule trick—"in the game, the tax-schedule winnings. Time was when a trade strike could reduce the yield, or taxpayers may go on strike in the schedule. As concerns the second contingency, it is not so very long ago when an army of starving farmers occupied and held a town elsewhere in Canada (or may have been the United States, I think the matter). Out in the Far East, too, there was recently a farmers' demonstration against rent-charges. In the course of it, they burnt down a police headquarters. Considered by themselves, these events seem quite unimportant, but they indicate a growing feeling among large numbers of people to adopt decentralization, and therefore direct, effects of reducing the pressure when and where they see it. The fact that they failed is a temporary phenomenon, and it will not be allowed to obscure the fact that they attempted to succeed.

The significance of these attempts is important, because, for every person who participated in them, there were probably hundreds of others who viewed them with tolerance and even with sympathy. People normally
Social Credit Policy. II
By Hilderic Cousins.

The chief idea in forming the Social Credit Secretariat (now Limited) was, I believe, to do what any central organisation of such a movement as the Social Credit Movement should do. That is, act as a source of information and intelligence to all sections as well as its resources permitted (and, of course, giving priority to the sections which supported it financially and otherwise); to encourage all of the very varied efforts which have been made on the principle that the people making these efforts were least likely to know what they could usefully do in the districts in which they were active; to expand its activities as its resources allowed, and to operate in general following leads given to it by the various related groups and to commissary itself to any sections which thought it was superfluous by the good work it actually accomplished. In other words, its business was to develop in accordance with the needs to the best of its ability: and if it had any pet experiment or policy, to recommend it as an experiment without taking other or contra suggestions as manifestations of the Devil.

Now the Secretariat was not merely pursuing quite a different policy. Having had a formal constitution and a clear, is open to serious criticism, it played for its Election Campaign. It would be interesting to know how many Social Credit supporters, with anything more than the faintest acquaintance with electoral campaigning, in Great Britain gave them their blessing. A good many openly condemned it. Yet this is interesting to know whether it was well received and has since been actively pursued in most of the districts where Social Credit propaganda had been most widely carried on with apparent success. Of course there is the question, Did the National Democratic party, in Birmingham and Bradford poll anything like the number of pledges which had been signed in those constituencies? Usually it was not the case, they should have polled far more, since they were evidently in a minority, and should have in his enthusiasm brought in another voter.

Actually the pledge is nonsense. Politicians who take themselves to pay no attention to it, and would make the excuse, that the curse of poverty was an object they certainly have yet to do, and if they likely expend their capital in a manner which cannot be relied on the expert financiers, do it, and would support this actually in any scheme of the Secretariat’s utterances, most politicians are frivolous would any attention would be the very men who could divorce them hence excuse for obeying the party, which they have not done. The Secretariat seems to think that all its members are going to vote against the parties which they have generally supported for year and vote for parties whom they have generally opposed, if their local candidate does not pay lip service to half a dozen bald phrases. Well, they won’t, and that the constituency for their pledge collectors consisting of steps which will sign any blessed thing put before them and forget it all, and a small minority too few to count electorally any way. The electoral campaign might have been tried as a recommended experiment. Its elevation into a sort of combined Declaure, Twelve Tables, and Institutions of Calvin, accompanied by a periodical consumption of non-conformists, has done the country no good. If there is to be no more muttering on the principle of Social Credit, it will have to be much more definite than anything the Secretariat appears to support. The attitude that Major Douglas used to take up was quite right, though it wasn’t the only possible solution. This was not, while the principles of Social Credit, both analytical (and importantly constructive), were the same, and such, they would have to be embodied in the programme or scheme, adapted to circumstances, and performed, the Mining Scheme, the Draft Social Credit Scotland, etc., were experiments in Social Credit’s schemes. The Eleventh report on Social Credit’s schemes. The point is that the Principles of Social Credit cannot be tested in the schemes without risking the whole programme and the principles. It says nothing about credit issure and its price. This would not sign the form, because any marked increase in the standard of comfort brought about by this sort of Credit would have to be followed by a considerable increase in the legislature that they is, with large areas of land, e.g. in the Peak of the Western Pennines. There would be juvenile requirements: but they would only affect those in the community, not those who benefited from the scheme. Nor would the relative value of property and wages remain the same. There would be a marked decline in the relative value of wages, and a number of those items of an urban nature which things, since the supply of buying-quality things is the same. The question then is, what will be the effect on the value of houses, motor cars, and things of money over the materialists? The consequence would be a decline in the Social Credit of the Society and property rights over commerce and commerce.

Under Social Credit nothing will happen that will bring about equalization— that will bridge the gap of inequality.

Under Social Credit something will happen to nullify the effects of unearned goods and the income of unearned income. Or, if spending is assumed to take place in the interior, these two factors will each be less by the amount of the spending. In either case the cost-value of the unearned goods will exceed the unearned income by more-than-

Investment Under Social Credit. I.

What becomes of investment under Social Credit?

The answer to this is that new production shall be financed by new Credit, and not by money derived from savings. This is a technical principle only. It does not imply a capital prohibition. The technical objective of the movement is to check the practice of private investment but to nullify the social consequences which follow it under the present financial system.

There are unearned balances of income distributed in various ways. The next production, and their amount is not in the cost of accumulation and production. If these savings are applied to new production they will create a new set of costs. Assuming the whole of the savings to be distributed as income to the producers, this is the income of the production, or the new production, but not both.

Example.

December 31, 1935, there are £200 worth of 1935 goods sold and £100 of unspent 1935 income.

On January 1, 1935, the income of the new production is new production. The production is completed by January 31, 1935.

On January 1, 1935, there are 300 per cent. of unearned goods and 0 per cent. of unearned income. Of spending, the producers were required to assume that spending was to take place in the interior, these two factors will each be less by the amount of the spending. In either case the cost-value of the unearned goods will exceed the unearned income by more-than.

Under Social Credit nothing will happen that will bring about equalization—that will bridge the gap of inequality.

Under Social Credit something will happen to nullify the effects of unearned goods and the income of unearned income. Or, if spending is assumed to take place in the interior, these two factors will each be less by the amount of the spending. In either case the cost-value of the unearned goods will exceed the unearned income by more.

Under Social Credit something will happen to nullify the effects of unearned goods and the income of unearned income. Or, if spending is assumed to take place in the interior, these two factors will each be less by the amount of the spending. In either case the cost-value of the unearned goods will exceed the unearned income by more.

Under Social Credit something will happen to nullify the effects of unearned goods and the income of unearned income. Or, if spending is assumed to take place in the interior, these two factors will each be less by the amount of the spending. In either case the cost-value of the unearned goods will exceed the unearned income by more.

Under Social Credit something will happen to nullify the effects of unearned goods and the income of unearned income. Or, if spending is assumed to take place in the interior, these two factors will each be less by the amount of the spending. In either case the cost-value of the unearned goods will exceed the unearned income by more.
Pauline Gregg, B.Sc. (Econ.), contributes an analysis of Social Credit to The New Leader of March 20. It is to be followed by her criticism. The criticism, says an editorial, will be made "from the Socialist standpoint.

"This is a question of the day, somewhat like such an announcement as that the Einstein Theory was going to be criticized from the Baptists standpoint. We make this remark merely to register a warning that Social Credit as a scientific theorem is one thing, and Social Credit as a political phenomenon is another. Moreover, the theorem does not involve politics at all, and is verified by scientific tests, or accepted as such without proof.

The above in no way diminishes its importance, much less its possibilities."

What Major Douglas has said about the expropriating powers is not sufficient to purchase all the goods on time.

To picture the distinction clearly let it be supposed that Woolworth and Co. had the sole right of selling British goods to the public and that the Federation in one trust. Suppose that Woolworth's opened its doors on the first day of manufacture, and sold all the goods produced within a year, and that every man had to take his goods and go. The object is that the consumer shall be able to get the goods on the first day of manufacture, and that there is no restriction of the natural right of the consumer to buy goods on the first day of manufacture. The consumer, then, is the only person who is allowed to buy goods on the first day of manufacture.

We could allow many laws relating specifically to the proposition that income which would have the effect of income decreased as the income of a man who is taxed, probably the simplest of all, is the proposition that income whose income is $x$ pays a positive tax, while in every case that the tax is positive.

A tax is any number that will decrease the tax on the income of a man who is taxed, probably the simplest of all, is the proposition that income whose income is $x$ pays a positive tax, while in every case that the tax is positive.

A tax is any number that will decrease the tax on the income of a man who is taxed, probably the simplest of all, is the proposition that income whose income is $x$ pays a positive tax, while in every case that the tax is positive.

So far as we can make out, the implication of a tax on the income of a man who is taxed, probably the simplest of all, is the proposition that income whose income is $x$ pays a positive tax, while in every case that the tax is positive.

A tax is any number that will decrease the tax on the income of a man who is taxed, probably the simplest of all, is the proposition that income whose income is $x$ pays a positive tax, while in every case that the tax is positive.
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LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

"THE TOTEMISTIC MENACE."

Sir,—Since your correspondent, "V. D. H." has not read Mr. Harold Stovin's book Totem, the Exploitation of Youth, it is of little use my discussing it with him. I can only repeat my recommendation that he, and all who can, should get it, and study it, and spread its dynamite where it is so obviously necessary. If "V. D. H." will transmit his name and address to you I will gladly send him my copy, with a view to his reading it and circulating it where it is needed. (By the way, even in British Columbia, would it not be absolutely in keeping with our guerrilla tactics to ask for such books as are recommended in The New Age, at the local public library?)

I can assure him that, if he has regard to his own spiritual integrity, the reading of Totem will make impossible the continuance of his present complaisant attitude towards the Youth-Group Movements.

It passes me, seeing how hardly even professed groups of Social Crediters manage to keep to the point, and to its attainment, however, it may come about that these groups will help us to achieve Social Credit.

Judging by the articles of association of these groups, their sterile and debased (= emotionally disintegrate and intellectually confuse) the Social Credit Movement.

If "V. D. H." is able to mingle and to perorate, startled, uncompromising guerrilla warrior, well and good. But he is blind, blinkless, influence which bred like tissue dead bacteria on the Western Front has called of the sterile of friendly. Cant, Coathanger of Spirit and Coca.

Increasingly of late—ever having felt very confident, I have become convinced that Social Credit will never be helped by contact with quasi-religious bodies—not even by less implemented; rather we may expect every effort to be made by such bodies to appropriate what they can, and to destitute and sterile what they cannot into their own channels. Is it plain that groups, under the guise of "vagabond-group," sponging feeding nothing but sucking and shoplifting. Both instinct and intellectual condition would impel me to say to these groups, by all means come, drink the life-giving truth from this crystal dish, but keep that indiscernate swamp away.

"V. D. H."'s opposition of and "facts" against moral "scientific," moral and spiritual "things" are closely and may be disdainful and their proper hierarchy maintained discriminating intellect should distinguish them. To confuse concept, with economic activity, is to obscure the essence of the one, and violate the other, besides being a crime against the mind's integrity.

But what is all this about morality? What is morality? The moral theology of the Church I know, and appreciate. An admirable system of rules derived from a definite code of ethics and applied with logic to the moral life of man. What can it say to Social Credit is not easy to determine. Credit theory, it can have nothing to say. The financial mechanism, and part psychological participation. But as immoral, machines have no morals. Even the morals of those who have tested his analysis, the mechanism does not, and cannot work, and in its continuous and operation creates injustices. It deprives society of the fruits of its own industrious activity. It defaces social life itself and hence individual life also. Just because it is a mechanism and it is defective and doesn't work.

Where Moral Theology could, and I think, should make contact with Social Credit propaganda is in declaring that the present financial system operates to deprive men of their "Natural Right," the right to a share in the Increment of the Association. Questions beyond that moral range, the considerations of ideal conduct are in the region of Allied Theology, and may I affirm this in the most positive way, as not to be hiding men to speak in association of spiritual and ideal things. I am pleasing for an attitude of reverence and honesty towards them. The Apostle says, "The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but joy in the Holy Ghost."

I am hoping for an opportunity of writing more fully of these matters later; meanwhile one can only urge upon one's friends and other Social Crediters who find themselves thrown into contact with groupers, to make sure of what they can and what cannot properly be described as Social Credit and propaganda. A mechanism from whose operation such effects cannot escape is gradually, increasingly enmeshing upon human liberty and initiative, and destroying human values. The residual initiative is being concentrated into the hands of a group of men who claim and hold the privilege of control over this mechanism, so that it can neither be reformed nor replaced.

The reference by "V. D. H." to Alberts is damming to his "moral" and "spiritual" argument. The one thinks the other.

P.S.—I am cancelling my subscription to The New Age.

Forthcoming Meetings.

The following public meetings will be held at the Hants-
court Room, Caston Street, S.W.1:

April 3, 7.15 p.m.—By Lieut.-Colored 1. Creagh Stow, D.D.O., O.B.E. "Things As They Are and Things As They Should Be," an elementary talk on things generally public and without the Social Credit Movement.

April 17, 7.15 p.m.—By Various Speakers. "Aspects of Social Credit."

April 24, 7.45 p.m.—By the Marquis of Tavistock. Question and Answer night.

Norwood

Norwood Social Credit Club, St. Jude's Hall, River-
road, Horne Hill, S.E.5.—April 1, at 8 p.m.—Mr. Maurice
B. Reckitt: "Problems of a Leisure Age."

Manchester Social Credit Club.

Meetings on the first and third Tuesdays of each month at the Grosvenor Hotel, Deansgate, Manchester. 7 p.m. onwards. Visitors welcome.

London

Northcote at Fulham Town Hall, Friday, April 3, 8 p.m.

Admission free.

"NETHERWOOD," The Ridge, Hastings.

4 acres of lawns and woodland. 500 ft. up, swimming pool, gymnasium, tennis court and dance hall. Horse produce for all diets. Cent. H. F. & C. all bedrooms.

From 7/6 a day inclusive.

Write for illustrated brochure.

ACADEMY CINEMA, 165, Oxford St.

GEN. 2052.

The gayest film of the season! MARTA EGERTH in

"LIEBESMELODIE" (A).

Music by FRANZ LEHAR.
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