NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The victory of the Democrats over the Republicans has been followed by the usual explanations of what caused it and what will be the effect of it. One pundit informs the world that Roosevelt won because his policy and plans appealed to a wider range of public opinions than did the programme of his opponents. That is telling us much the same thing as that the majority of American voters preferred Roosevelt. The explanation is superficial—except of course to anyone (if such there be) who thinks that normally the voter votes for what he doesn’t want. As for explanations in general about this or any other electoral victory, they amount simply to what the commentators would like to believe were the causes and what they would like the victors to do with their mandates.

* * *

The Times thinks that the victory reflects a demand for more centralisation. One of its correspondents thinks that the people would like to see more power placed in the hands of the Federal Government, and less left in those of the State Governments. And, logically enough, he thinks that this power should primarily be that of controlling taxation. It will be seen from this that he is confusing popular opinion with the banker’s aspiration. He is assuming that Roosevelt won his victory because his policy has tended in the past to centralise powers in the Federal Government. That may be partly true, but insufficient as it is true the reason is that, to the people, the principle of centralisation seems to be the only means to the beneficial ends which Roosevelt is trying to reach. As students of Social Credit are aware, reconstruction is obtainable without centralisation. But so long as the claims for Social Credit are not recognised above or understood below, it is inevitable that reconstruction will have to be sought in the direction of scaling down sectional demands for increased purchasing-power, whether the “section” be the individual, the corporation, the party, or the differentiated State. Once that grant that aggregate purchasing-power in the United States of America is lacking, then there is nothing else to do but spread it out evenly over all “sections.” The aim must inevitably be to effect an equitable distribution of the shortage. Obviously the final arbiter of equity must be the Federal Authority, and equally obviously that Authority must have the power of imposing its rulings on the whole country. The vehicle of such power is finance, immediately controlled by the constituted political Government as regards taxation, and ultimately controlled by the self-constituted private Government as regards industrial credits.

Growing-Pains in the Social Credit Movement.

On November 6 (last post) we received a typewritten letter signed by Mr. Grace taking exception to the statement that The New English Weekly is controlled in respect of policy or any other matter, by the Chondos Group.* She objects to the word “controlled,” and states that she is the sole proprietor, and exercises the final decision in all questions of policy. She adds that it is her intention to maintain the independence of the journal from control by any movement or organisation.

In her letter she requests us to print a prescribed form of apology, the terms of which are as follows:

“My attention has been called to a statement contained in our last week’s issue, that the Chondos Group controls the policy of the New English Weekly. We are informed and we wish to announce that neither the Chondos Group nor any other Group, or organisation, outside the New English Weekly itself, exercises any control over the policy of the New English Weekly, or any matter in regard to it. The paper is entirely independent, and we apologise sincerely to our readers.

* Cf. footnote to the “Star Man’s Diary” comments on the York Conference, where he states that The New English Weekly is the subscription journal of the Movement.”
The New Age between the present editor and another who was a member of the Chandos Group. The plan was backed by other members of the Advisory Council, who, it afterwards transpired, had wished remarks to be made about the venture. This control over an alternative organ was, however, in the best interests of the Chandos Group. As a result, Mr. Symons was appointed as editor of the Securitised New Age and at its outset the Securitised New Age was reconstituted as a directive organisation. Major Donohue conferred the office of Director of Publications with Mr. Wilcox, upon whose accession the editor resigned his position. Mr. Reynolds resigned his position to the New Age. Interlocking Controls.

Now the term “interlocking,” in its commercial content, involves the imposition of a constraint on not one direction but in cross-directions. If the directories of two companies A and B are interlocked, it is equally open for anyone to say that A controls B or B controls A. Further, if anyone wants to assess the significance of the interlocking arrangement, he concentrates his attention on the directors who are common to both companies, and discovers this much possible about their antecedents and affiliations elsewhere. The other directors matter.

The following is the list of organisations or associations coming within our survey of relationships.

The New Age (1923).
The Chandos Group (1926).
The New Age Weekly (1935).
The Social Credit Weekly (1935).
The Orage Club (1935).
The York Committee (1930).

Now, of all the persons connected with these associations, two names pick themselves out for attention, namely, Mr. Reckitt and Mr. Symons.

Both were on the Committee sponsoring the New Age Guarantee in 1925. Both became members of the Chandos Group when it began in 1926. Both were associated with the proposals of the Chandos Group soon afterwards, for widening the appeal of the Guarantee to “non-churchmen” “not economists only,” but “all life.” Both rejected the editor’s suggestion that “assistance” should be considered as part of the work of the committee, and the editor accepted the proposal.

As for the New Age Weekly, we suppose that the Advisory Committee will not dissent to the statements that the New Age is a paper with a status equivalent to that of other newspapers. Further, their desire to give Mr. Reynolds an extension to the New Age Weekly section of the group must depend on the success of the venture. There is a problem here of the distribution of the papers. If the subscribers agree on the distribution of the papers, then the circulation of the papers is likely to increase. The question is: How can the papers be distributed? We have tried to answer this question in the previous issue.

As for the New Age Weekly, we suppose that the proposees of the New Age Weekly will dissent to the statements that the New Age Weekly is a paper with a status equivalent to that of other newspapers. Further, their desire to give Mr. Reynolds an extension to the New Age Weekly section of the group must depend on the success of the venture. There is a problem here of the distribution of the papers. If the subscribers agree on the distribution of the papers, then the circulation of the papers is likely to increase. The question is: How can the papers be distributed? We have tried to answer this question in the previous issue.

Our only hope, so far as we can see, is that the Liaison Committee and the New Age Guarantee to do their best to develop the circulation of the New Age Weekly, the New Age, and the Social Credit in a way that will be of help to the New Age Weekly. The New Age Weekly is a paper with a status equivalent to that of other newspapers. The question is: How can the papers be distributed? We have tried to answer this question in the previous issue.
Prospects of the Movement.

By E. Earl Parvis.

[Address given at the York Conference.]

Probably the most difficult part of the Social Credit idea to put across is the right to our cultural heritage. The right of everyone to a portion of the total product of industry is not so difficult. Everyone can accept that. It is easier to accept the idea of the yearly dividend paid out by the Federal authority. Everyone accepts the right of little people to be eligible for the estate of a sovereign. It is quite easy to accept the idea of being a member of the brotherhood of man. Everybody is ready for that. Yet, if we are going to pursue the population, it is one of the most tough things to get through the average mind. It may be something that is often given by the idea of leisure, plenty, and security. These three things on which we have based so much of our driving force are quite as much a stimulus as anything else that might have come from the idea of security for the people who are alive today.

We must go back to the old crises which have failed. We have failed in American Social Credit and in the Federal Credit, but the first right we must go for is the right to our cultural heritage. This is one of the most difficult things to get accepted. It is a very difficult subject to be raised. We are going to have to work into the minds of the people that "Rights were made to be sustained." You have got to fight for them.

But, we must all be leaders. Politicians compromise. Our duty is to be in the spearhead of progress. We must all be leaders. Consequently, any organization which is going to be one of the leaders must be one which is prepared to help and not to direct.

The two greatest needs of the leaders in each district are start-up and financing. It will be necessary for everyone to start up. Each leader must first be convinced of the truth of the new idea and then go out and sell it to the people. This is the way to build steady and solid support. No one can be compensated. We exchange Social Credit for the Credit Socialism of the Labour Party and the monetary reformers.
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electorate conscious of their rights and determined to be heard by, and through, their elected representatives.

Modestizing Our Weapons.

In pursuing this aim we must see that we do not try to fight with archaic weapons, and we must modify our approach to reach our audience. We must select the weapons most useful to express the earnestness of all types and classes.

The forces we have marshaled against Scotland with most signal defeat at Flodden at the hands of an inferior force—not from lack of bravery, but because of its archaik organization. The Scots had equipped themselves on a model which was forty years old and which had proved very successful on the Continent. It just so happened that it was unsuited for local conditions, and the forty years was one of those forty years periods which counted.

In the same way we may be too hard, but if our organization is an archaic model and ill-adapted to local conditions, we shall be too weak to withstand the shock of battle. Plans for every region must be carefully thought out and tested, and not merely followed because they have been used by other movements with success in the past.

To Summarize.

To gather together my thoughts—if the Social Credit Movement is going to succeed, then we must all have drive, the drive of a man like Tyndale, who had no special advantages of birth or upbringing (he was born in the same humble county as Mr. Baldwin). Like him we must fight that terrible enemy, the dancer, the noiseless propaganda from the teaching of the whole knowledge on which it is based.

We must realise, as Galileo failed to realise, the resistance we are up against, and make a special study of that: it is where co-operation and fellowship are so essential. A small handbook on resistance and their origins would be very useful to many speakers.

The Uprightness.

If we are to arouse the British people, which is our object, then we must go for what the people believe in their heart of hearts: for Freedom. We have got the two best words, Rights and Freedom. We can preach them, we can draw people with them, and we can make a drive which nothing can resist.

The urge for freedom is deep in every heart, it may be obscured by fear, but it is there. It cannot be repressed, nor can it be stamped out.

It was a love of freedom which kept Scotland independent from England for nearly four hundred years, and the same love of freedom which enabled it to join the British Empire in 1707.

In English, I will take you back to the Declaration of Independence of my own country in 1776. I say, “long live one dominate of a nation.” For we fight, not for riches, nor glory, nor honour, but for the ALONE, which no good man gives up save with his life.

With rights in one hand and freedom in the other, with Social Credit on our faith, I do not think we will lack a following among the British people.

London Social Credit Club.
Blewroot Room, Caxton St., S.W.
NEXT PUBLIC MEETING.
November 13th. 8 p.m. — Looking back and looking forward. By Mr. F. F. Field, author of “The King’s Progeny.”

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.
The Subscription Rates for “The New Age,” to any address in Great Britain or abroad, are 3s. for 12 months; 15s. for 6 months; 7s. 6d. for 3 months.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.
The Chandos Group.

Sir,—In pursuance of your role as self-appointed watchdog over the Social Credit Movement, you have, or may, give publicity to a number of objections in your issue of November 5th which relate directly or indirectly to the Chandos Group, with which I am associated.

I refer you to the article which appeared in the November 5th, which states that the Chandos Group is not in any way connected with the Chandos Group, as defined in the Chandos Group, who are the three members of the Chandos Group who are connected with the paper in any way, whether officially or unofficially.

You say that “the Chandos Group is not in any way connected with the Chandos Group, as defined in the Chandos Group, who are the three members of the Chandos Group who are connected with the paper in any way, whether officially or unofficially.”

You then state that “the Chandos Group is not in any way connected with the Chandos Group, as defined in the Chandos Group, who are the three members of the Chandos Group who are connected with the paper in any way, whether officially or unofficially.”
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Since Mr. Goldsley gratefully mentions the Chandos Conference in connection with your review of the publisher’s announcements, I should like to make it clear that neither the announcement nor the book itself is in any way related to the Chandos Conference—let alone the Chandos Conference. The book is the Chandos Conference, and it is not the Chandos Conference.

The rights to the Chandos Conference are the Chandos Group, and the book is the Chandos Conference. The book is the Chandos Conference, and the Chandos Conference is the book.
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in Economic Democracy in face of the creeping parasitism of a system of organisation devised by expert practitioners of Taxonomy. Accordingly, there is little occasion to fear that the essential economic principles of Social Credit will be obscured by the efforts of the Social Credit Federation. The door is well guarded.

[We do not recall publishing anything reflecting on the opinions of any member of the Vorticist Conference. We take everybody's good intentions for granted. But good intentions are no guarantee of efficient performance. York's indictment of Buxton did not concern the intentions of the Secretariat, but their performance. York has supplied his methods, but not their morals, as is shown by the fact that the Chairman's address contemplated the ultimate possibility of revising co-operation with the Secretariat. So let us start from the postulate that we have now an incorruptible Administration confronted by an incorruptible Opposition. It is so conformed because incorruptibility has been found unattainable in a world with inefficiency in its part. And there is no antecedent reason why the Opposition should prove less efficient than the Administration. It is true that the Opposition benefits by the mistakes of the Administration, and can avoid repeating them; but it does not follow that the Opposition will avoid making other mistakes. The best way of avoiding mistakes is to allow the Movement to assume its original form of free initiative by the exchange of information. The vehicle of such exchange exists in the form of The Social Credit News. In Orage's time The New Age was the only paper to go up to 1931, when Public Welfare (later Credit Power) appeared. In 1929 The New Age, which had been acquired by Major Moore, came under its present editorship, and later in that year Incorporated Credit Power. From 1929 to 1933 The New Age was the equivalent of the "offshoot" of the Movement and constituted all there was of a "central organisation." In 1932 Orage launched The New English Weekly which has run parallel with The New Age until today. In the meantime other journals appeared, notably Prosperity and Progress, conducted by those organs representing the new formations now known respectively as The Petition Council and the Social Credit Party of Great Britain. From 1934 onwards the three organs of the Social Credit Secretariat successively appeared. Mention must also be made of the weekly Social Credit News issued by the London Social Credit Club, and Purpose, issued by Mr. W. T. Symons. That makes nine periodicals appealing variously to different sections of the Movement.

Now the first business of a Social Credit Federation, if we are to have one, is to decide what its attitude is to be towards these journals. They all advocate Social Credit with varying emphases and modes of interpretation and application. From the point of view of the (hypothetical) Federation they are all "in good parts" like the current's egg. It may be that the Federation would issue an organ of its own. That would open the question of which would be the attitude of the new journal to the other periodicals. Would it list and sponsor them? Would it invite their respective editors and contributors to co-operate in running and writing up the Federation's organ? These and other questions which will occur to readers will need careful consideration and upon the answers depends the successful outcome of the new organisation's activities against the common enemy.—Ed.]

ABSTENTION AND CONSUMPTION.

Sir,—Footnote paragraph 3, column 1 of page 3 of last week's New Age.

You say that the present financial system "makes no provision for enabling industry to dispose of the articles which the profiteer investors abstain from consuming." Will not this bring the critics buzzing round your ears? I can hear them saying that the money (profits, etc.) saved by the investors will be paid out to wage and salary earners for producing new capital assets, and these wage-earners will spend it on the articles that the investors have abstained from buying.

Immediately, that is so. Ultimately, the new capital assets will saddle consumers with a liability, the meeting of which will leave industry unable to dispose of articles of the equivalent value to those which the investors abstained from consuming.

Would it, do you think, be advisable—for the benefit of both critics and students—to clear up any possible misunderstanding on this point next week?

C.

USURY AND DEFLATION.

Sir,—As you have twice printed Mr. Coleman's gentle accusation that I give S.C. critics a handle when I said that the bondholder, by re-investing, income, restricts production and decreases credit, perhaps you will allow me to repeat that part of my letter wherein I replied to Mr. Coleman and which you omitted last week.

In the letter I said: If we agree that consumption is the basis of production, then the bondholder, by his abstention from spending, restricts production. He translates his effective demand for real wealth without debt to the creation of capital assets plus debt. His creation of wealth is less than he could have achieved by spending his total income less by precisely the sum (usury) he charges the bondholder for his loan. That is the crux of A + B, and all the time we are talking, etc., debates, are otherwise irrelevant. There is no usury in the price system, which is not a pendulum of fluctuations but a steady flow in the price system, which is not a pendulum of fluctuations but a steady flow. On taxation, I explained in the same letter that taxation does not redistribute wealth, nor mitigate mis-distribution of income, but comes because, even if the poor enjoy social services, they must pay the cost of their food (and ultimately the cost of their jobs), and the result is that the one we see, of taxation, etc., is the state of affairs and not the state of tax. I think public work is not the answer. The taxation is not the reason, neglect of the sick and the sick, etc., are the reasons. The biggest tax is medical expenses and not the taxes at all. The big public works are the medical expenses, not the taxes.

The effect of taxation is beyond argument. It is the crux of private capitalism, and as the future we are bound to have, the only true big business of the nation. As the "slates of homes of England" are bought, the state of affairs is due to the neglect of the sick and the sick, etc., are the reasons. The biggest tax is medical expenses and not the taxes at all. The big public works are the medical expenses, not the taxes.

The effect of taxation is beyond argument. It is the crux of private capitalism, and as the future we are bound to have, the only true big business of the nation. As the "slates of homes of England" are bought, the state of affairs is due to the neglect of the sick and the sick, etc., are the reasons. The biggest tax is medical expenses and not the taxes at all. The big public works are the medical expenses, not the taxes.

Mr. Coleman's point concerning the ratio between the deflation and the time debt, and the fall in value of money, and the fall in value of money, and the fall in value of money, and the fall in value of money, is that the ratio of the bondholder's output is not in the same ratio.

The deflation is due to the fact that the interest charged by the bondholder's output is less than the amount of interest charged by the bondholder's output. The deflation is due to the fact that the interest charged by the bondholder's output is less than the amount of interest charged by the bondholder's output.

There is no usury in the price system, which is not a pendulum of fluctuations but a steady flow. On taxation, I explained in the same letter that taxation does not redistribute wealth, nor mitigate mis-distribution of income, but comes because, even if the poor enjoy social services, they must pay the cost of their food (and ultimately the cost of their work), and the result is that the one we see, of taxation, etc., debates, are otherwise irrelevant. There is no usury in the price system, which is not a pendulum of fluctuations but a steady flow.
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There is no usury in the price system, which is not a pendulum of fluctuations but a steady flow.