

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

ORGAN OF THE NEW AGE SOCIAL CREDIT SOCIETY

No. 2340] NEW SERIES Vol. LXI. No. II. THURSDAY, JULY 15, 1937. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION TO THE SOCIETY 30s.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE	PAGE
ALBERTA	57	
<i>The Albertan</i> on THE NEW AGE— <i>The Farm and Ranch Review</i> on the "Unity" question—the Secretariat and Hargrave—the ineptitude of the Secretariat contrasted against the achievements of independent initiative by various persons and groups—Douglas's recantation of his three fundamental axioms—connection between this event and his earlier attempt to silence THE NEW AGE—the necessity for Douglas to go to Alberta and promote unity for an announced Social Credit plan.		
LITERATURE ON ALBERTA		59
<i>Aberhart and Alberta: The First Phase</i> (Marshall Hattersley).		
PRESS VIEWS IN ALBERTA		59
Editorial comments reprinted from <i>The Albertan</i> and <i>The Farm and Ranch Review</i> .		
ETON AND HARROW. By Arthur Brenton		60
High Society in uniform.		
"THE NEW AGE" AND THE B.P.S.		60
Tribute to THE NEW AGE in <i>The Phrenologist</i> , organ of the British Phrenological Society.		

Alberta.

Elsewhere we print three extracts from leading articles in *Albertan* journals. Numbers 1 and 2 are from *The Albertan* which represents Mr. Aberhart and his Government, and number 3 from *The Farm and Ranch Review*, which, under the Presidency and Editorship of Mr. Charles W. Peterson, speaks independently on behalf of the interests of Canadian farmers. We devoted space to discussing Mr. Petersen's views last week. One of our reasons for doing so is because he always writes with responsibility and sincerity. We like his custom of signing his own name to his editorial articles. The use of the editorial "we" is allowable in a journal for which a known person takes responsibility, but is undesirable in one which is run by a Committee or a Company. Both the journals here named are the property of Limited Companies, which is all the more reason, from the point of view of the public, why their editorial views should not be presented anonymously.

This reflection applies particularly to the two extracts from *The Albertan*. In the first it is resisting an "attack" on itself by Major Douglas, and counter-attacking him. In the second it is combining a defence of Major Douglas with a schoolmasterish correcting of THE NEW AGE's examination-paper. We are reminded of the sudden turn-about-face of the Melbourne *Age* on the occasion of Sir Otto Niemeyer's visit to Australia. Not on account of the new direction of the turned face, but on account of the absence of any explanation why the face has turned. No explanation would have been necessary if *The Albertan* had merely announced that it had decided, in the interests of "unity" in Alberta to bury the hatchet with Major Douglas. But it has chosen to fasten on THE NEW AGE the odium of having insinuated that Major Douglas is (or might be) serving his own personal interests when sending out Messrs. Powell and Byrne. Now, supposing that we had made an unequivocal allegation against him to that effect, we would like to know how it would contribute to "unity" in Alberta for *The Albertan* to broadcast it among its readers. In point of fact what we said on this subject was short and

clear enough to have been quoted verbatim by *The Albertan*. Here it is:—

"The ostensible object of Mr. Powell's visit is to inquire into the situation: but really it is to counter-act the effects of John Hargrave's visit." (June 10, 1937, p. 25.)

"Now, as we stated last week, Mr. G. F. Powell has gone out to Alberta to substitute another objective" [i.e., another objective than that of the Hargrave insurgents]. (June 17, 1937, p. 33.)

The effect of *The Albertan's* article can only be to hamper Major Douglas's present objective by ventilating the idea that the counteraction and substitution we spoke of were prompted by unworthy motives on his part (e.g., jealousy of Hargrave). This places *The Albertan* under suspicion of being more concerned to discredit THE NEW AGE in the eyes of the Social Credit Movement than to accredit and subserve Major Douglas's present policy of promoting unity in Alberta. As we have never offered provocation to *The Albertan*, and have on the other hand often defended Mr. Aberhart against what we considered to be unjust reflections on his good faith and competence, we can only suppose that it has been prompted to say what it has said.

It has not been generally known to readers of THE NEW AGE that members of the Editor's family were well acquainted with Major Douglas some year or so before he discovered Social Credit. This fact—almost too marvelous to be true—taken into conjunction with the Editor's having virtually been Major Douglas's valet for the period 1921-1932, should be sufficient to suggest to *The Albertan* that insofar as the personality of Major Douglas is any guide to his public objectives THE NEW AGE is the authority on the relationship and its probable consequences. For the same reason if any persons think THE NEW AGE to be lacking in that exuberant adulation of Major Douglas that some of his protégées choose to display, let them remember that valets enjoy the privilege of nursing a blind spot for heroes. THE NEW AGE has to pay for that privilege, but the Editor has the consolation residing in the biblical warranty that every valet shall be exalted.

Another observation which we wish to make is this: that THE NEW AGE is written for, and read by, only

that select few who know what construction and emphasis to place upon what is written. If anybody thinks that what we write is obstructive of any given actionist policy, all he has to do about it is to say nothing about it. Nothing that we write reaches the public directly; so leaders trying to mobilise public opinion behind them need not be embarrassed by anything that we say. If they choose to broadcast it, to discredit each other, that is their responsibility. We speak what we think ought to be spoken, and, from what we have just explained, we can claim to be better able to form a sound judgment on major questions of Social Credit policy than any other person in the Movement. More than that, when we speak we do so always with the thought in our mind of the large masses of people who are waiting for the Dividend. We are not posturing as selfless altruists. We need the Dividend for ourselves. We daily mix with and talk to worthy people in worse condition than ourselves. We listen to authentic stories that are painful to hear. And the effect on us of hearing them is to make us infuriated by our impotence to help them here and now in the only way that they can be helped. And it is because we are in that dominant state of mind that we write to hurry on action to get the Dividend. We see before ourselves a prospect of progressively diminishing economic security until the Dividend comes to our rescue. We cannot say that the worries of other people in the collective sense "keep us awake at nights." Our own do; and that is sufficient for the consolation of "others," since peace for us must mean peace for them too.

* * *

This explains our attitude towards Hargrave and the Green Shirt Party. We stated, long before Hargrave went to Alberta, that insofar as action on a centralised national basis was necessary to quicken the coming of Social Credit, Hargrave's policy and system of organisation were more effective than Douglas's. Next to Mr. Aberhart and his organisation, Hargrave has done more to dramatise the Social Credit story in the theatre of world politics than anyone else. In this context we must mention also the achievement of L. D. Byrne (now in Alberta) in hustling the Southampton Chamber of Commerce into issuing a Report which was virtually a Social Credit pamphlet—much to their discomfiture when they realised what they had done! This, let it be noted, was done by him long before the Secretariat came into existence. The achievements of Byrne, Hargrave, and Aberhart underline the dictum that Douglas used to insist on that "the bankers fear nothing so much as private initiative." Byrne fluttered the dovescots of quasi-official commercialism; Hargrave and his men were always pestering the politicians at the House of Commons (and painting the streets green until the Government were forced to make it illegal); Hargrave manoeuvred Montagu Norman into entering into a correspondence with the Green Shirt Executive; and, recently, went over and blew into flame the dying embers of the Social Credit idea in Alberta. And meantime Aberhart had won top place in the bill by his sweeping electoral triumph.

* * *

We are not forgetting the achievements of the London Social Credit Club in regard to the Demonstrations in the Central Hall, Westminster, and in the Albert Hall. But these, like the work done by THE NEW AGE under Orage and Brenton, and by *The New English Weekly*, fall into the different category of educational activity,

although on one occasion THE NEW AGE broke through into the headlines of the British Press by reason of its comments on Lady Astor, America, and the British Fleet which the printers felt unable to pass.

* * *

Now, to set against all these achievements, what have the Secretariat to show? Nothing whatever but emulations of Brer Rabbit in *Uncle Remus* who went about measuring and marking the work of the other animals who were building the mansion, and who got in the way so much that the onlookers thought he was doing all the work. Brer Rabbit acquired the mansion in the end by frightening the other animals out of it. A modern version of the story in terms of Social Credit politics would present Brer Rabbit as taking up a collection from the onlookers. For that is the one activity in which the Secretariat has shown proficiency. Their much vaunted Electoral Campaign was quietly interred by Douglas at the recent private conference in London. And time too; it had been dead so long that it had begun to smell. The Secretariat have handled something like £20,000 (from what sources no-one knows) and yet they have contributed nothing to the dramatisation of Social Credit corresponding to the examples we have given. In one aspect they are like a dog on the football field, chasing joyously among the players, deflecting passes or shots in utter oblivion as to what is going on. In another aspect they are like the Old Man of the Sea on Sinbad's shoulders. Their record is one of timidity, lethargy, and secrecy.

* * *

We do not forget Douglas's tour in Australia and New Zealand in 1933-4; but the initiative, the preparations, and the cost of the tour came from the movements in those Dominions. That is not the same thing as thinking out and accomplishing a quick specific task which, by reason of its dramatic nature, forces the Press to make a story of it. We reminded a hostile correspondent privately this week that Douglas used to insist that "directly you organise a movement in the pyramidal form the bankers can capture it." Conversely he justified the policy of individual initiative and multiform method by pointing out that the Movement thus became a nine-headed Hydra, and presented the bankers with the problem of deciding which head to cut off and even then of stopping a new head growing in its place.

* * *

At Buxton in 1934 Douglas recanted his three fundamental axioms. From insisting on the essentiality of (a) multiformity of method, (b) of making the Price-Flaw the centre of propaganda, and (c) of disregarding the ballot box as an instrument of pressure, he turned round and insisted on the exact opposite. We have recently sent a Memorandum to him, his directors and chief supporters, in which we show reasons for the conclusion that he contemplated this reversal of his attitude before the Secretariat was formed. If this was the case it provides evidence of motive for his trying to get control of THE NEW AGE and to gag the Editor before disclosing his reversed policy. He would know that otherwise THE NEW AGE would repudiate it instantly and forcibly, and in good time to have had this policy kept in the dark about it until the evening when he announced it to the unprepared Conference at Buxton. In the meantime he had gone to Australia and left his colleagues on the Secretariat to get control of THE NEW AGE under threats of cutting off financial support, but without having given

the Editor any hint that he agreed with what they were going to do. At that time they had no authority under the constitution of the Secretariat even to press advice on the Editor, much less present him with an ultimatum. The Editor rightly resisted, and had the right to claim Douglas's support in resisting. Instead of that Douglas condoned their actions when he came back, and subsequently treated the Editor's resistance as a crime to be punished by the enforcement of his abdication.

* * *

We regret having to drag up this history, but, as we are prepared to show at the proper time, the so-called "personal grievances" of the Editor are not to be dismissed as irrelevancies, and the occasions for them contribute significantly to the elucidation of Douglas's hidden reasons for his hidden strategy. We suspect that *The Albertan* is being used by him as a vehicle for an oblique attack on Hargrave, and that THE NEW AGE is chosen as the object because he does not want to give Hargrave any publicity or any chance to make a public statement.

* * *

Referring to the Press comments already mentioned we consider that the most important is Mr. Peterson's point that if unity is the first condition of success Major Douglas ought to appear on the spot to promote it. We will add to this the argument that there should also be an outlined exemplary scheme for Alberta like the Scheme for Scotland. If you examine the latter Scheme you will see that besides embodying Social Credit principles it is full of administrative devices for promoting unity. The Scheme is based on the assumption that *unity has not been achieved* before its introduction, and it is designed to bring about general acceptance by reason of its administrative provisions, under which opposition from any quarter is bought off or frightened off, or various oppositions are played off against each other. If readers will examine the Scheme closely they will see that it is an instrument for *establishing unity and putting in Social Credit at one and the same time*. Some of them may remember what a shock it caused to doctrinaire Social Creditors on that very account—namely that it provided penalties as well as rewards.

* * *

Mr. Peterson's demand that Albertans should have a Scheme for Alberta before them is therefore justified, and it is to be hoped that no time will be lost in producing one. "Give me a fulcrum and I'll move the earth." If the required fulcrum is Unity the people will fashion it more effectively if they are shown the lever in the shape of a Scheme.

Literature on Alberta.

In addition to Douglas's *The Alberta Experiment*, and to Hargrave's forthcoming "Report" (announced last week), there has been published a booklet by C. Marshall Hattersley, entitled *Aberhart and Alberta: The First Phase* (43 pp., price 3d., or 4d. with postage, issued under the auspices of the York Social Credit Conference Liaison Committee at 40, Great Russell-street, London, W.C.1).

Readers who know Mr. Hattersley's earlier works will not need to be told that this one is most carefully compiled and annotated. It is a condensed and yet comprehensive historical survey of events and surrounding circumstances. There is comparatively little comment by the author. He is, on the whole, sympathetic towards Mr. Aberhart. As regards Major Douglas's failure to go to Alberta he suspends judgment in view of the lack of information, but is inclined to ascribe it in some measure to the wide difference of temperament between the two men.

Although this booklet contains matter well worth the attention of political and financial students, it is written in a style which will appeal to the man-in-the-office. Mr. Hattersley tells the story in a clear, connected form, confining himself to essentials and rigorously cutting out frills. In one section he includes what should make his booklet all the more popular, namely, a re-statement of authentic Social-Credit objectives and methods. For the rest, he has no theory of his own to preach, and what he says is dispassionate and likely to heal rather than inflame any antagonisms among those who wish to help shape Alberta's future policy.

Press Views in Alberta.

I.—From *The Albertan*, June 14, 1937.

In his latest book, *The Alberta Experiment*, Major C. H. Douglas takes a short detour from his recital of government affairs for a sarcastic cut at *The Albertan*.

In one paragraph, in which he disposes of this newspaper, the gallant Major indicates enough looseness of both thought and fact, and enough unfairness, to provide a reader of his volume with grave doubts as to the whole book's value.

As touching *The Albertan*, the Major has this to say:

"At this time *The Albertan*, a leading Calgary daily newspaper of Conservative tradition, became the official organ of the Government under somewhat obscure conditions. Its leading articles were in many cases indistinguishable from the publications of the chartered banks. Much of its space was devoted to the exploitation and advertisement of the oil resources of the province."

It was news to *The Albertan*, as it will be news to the Conservative party of the province, to know that this newspaper is of Conservative tradition. If *The Albertan* was ever that in the days of W. M. Davidson, or in the days of the late George M. Bell, then we feel sure the Conservatives failed to notice it, and failed also to give credit now assigned to us by the author of Fig Tree Court.

When the Major speaks of "somewhat obscure conditions" in the purchase of this newspaper by Albertan Publishers, Limited, he leaves his own complaint obscure. This is a joint stock company, incorporated and doing business under the laws of the province of Alberta. We are not different from hundreds of other companies, operating under the same laws, except that we are a daily newspaper and are, therefore, attacked more often and more "obscurely" by gossip mongers.

If the Major has a charge against us he should be more specific. His own vagueness makes the indictment impossible to answer.

As we go through the paragraph we become more groggy.

The Albertan's "leading articles," says the Major, "were indistinguishable from the publications of the chartered banks."

We must duck that one or we will lose the round. We hope it goes over our heads and hits the bankers. It will make them groggy also.

And the last one:
"Much of its space . . . devoted to the exploitation and advertisement of the oil resources of the province."

We duck once more. We give that one to our hard-working oil reporters. They seem to think the people of Alberta are interested in oil development and want to read about it. And we think so too, the Major to the contrary notwithstanding.

There may be people who read this defence of ours against the onslaught of Fig Tree Court (we hope so) who will buy the Major's book now, to see what else he has to say about us.

More shillings from more purchasers should not make the Major angry, but the purchasers, seeking more complaint against *The Albertan* newspaper, will be disappointed. We get just one paragraph, and we have here recited the whole blast.

If "The Alberta Experiment" is supposed to be a contribution to the current history of the province we can only express the hope that there is more straight-line thinking and more accuracy in the balance of the 220-page volume than in the one paragraph devoted to ourselves.

II.—From *The Albertan*, June 26, 1937.

Mr. G. F. Powell explains that the purpose of his mission to Alberta is to help in "blending the genius of Major Douglas with that of Premier William Aberhart."

And that seems to sum up the purpose, as we had understood it, very nicely.

When THE NEW AGE says Powell came here in the interests of Major Douglas it is wrong if it means the Major's personal interests, but right if it means the interest of Social Credit.

For Major Douglas is the founder of a great movement which admittedly still has to be tried. The first democracy in the world to undertake to give it that trial is this province of Alberta, and, naturally, Douglas desires, on the one hand, to help it to succeed, or, on the other, if it fail, to know that failure was through no negligence on his part.

Therefore THE NEW AGE is not wrong when it says that in such a sense Powell is here in Douglas's interest; and not entirely wrong if it says, in the same sense, he is not here in the interest of setting up Social Credit in Alberta.

In sending, first, probably one of his ablest assistants "to blend the genius of Major Douglas with that of Premier Aberhart," Major Douglas has followed a perfectly logical course; Douglas, the founder of the scheme, and Aberhart, than whom no one should be more familiar with local conditions and the difficulties, man-made and others, its introduction may expect locally to encounter.

If success is to be had at all, it seems that here is an alliance that ought to assure it.

We have heard the criticism that the Government is importing "outsiders" to "run" our province. Nothing of the sort. While *The Albertan* would have liked to see a Canadian Social Credit technician, and preferably one from Alberta, supervise the details, we are not discontent to have someone with Mr. Powell's and Mr. Byrne's reputation present.

As for their "running" our province, it is no more true than it would be that the paperhanger or the plumber was "running" our home.

We have heard Senator Griesbach say it is a characteristic of American politicians that they have a strange kind of inferiority complex that prompts them always to fear the European Powers are trying to put something over them. Perhaps some of our Alberta politicians are like that.

III.—From *The Farm and Ranch Review*, July, 1937.

However, it is satisfactory to learn that Major Douglas has now recognised his duty and has finally accepted complete responsibility for the successful introduction of Social Credit in Alberta. Being fully cognisant of the constitutional limitations under which a province labours, he *unhesitatingly declared long ago, that his scheme was quite feasible applied to the provincial unit.* That is very encouraging indeed. He will now have the opportunity, which, as the father of the movement, he will undoubtedly welcome, to give the world a practical demonstration of his economic theories.

There is just one disquieting feature in the situation, namely, Douglas's insistence on "unity" of purpose in the ranks of the Social Credit party before he comes to Canada. I hope sincerely that this condition is not a mere "stall." The party has a large majority in the House. It may be taken for granted that each and every member is irrevocably committed to the Douglas theory. Dissensions arose precisely because Douglas failed to assume the direction of affairs. *He is wanted now to restore and maintain unity* and to compose a feasible working plan, within the constitutional powers of the province, a task which is clearly beyond the capacity of the elected members, according to their own frank admission. Such a plan would be bound to receive unanimous support. What more could he ask?

His recent broad hint that his final plan should not be disclosed to the public for fear of counter moves on the part of financial interests, is not so encouraging. Douglas should know that the major policies of a democracy cannot be conveniently hidden away in the minds of a govern-

ment or its advisers. The public will rightfully demand full knowledge of where we are going.

Major Douglas should at the outset try to divest himself of his notorious suspicion and persecution complexes and might advantageously cultivate a sense of humour. He will not find a "financier" with a false beard lurking behind every bush in Alberta. Here, as elsewhere, these people will no doubt fight to safeguard their legal rights, if they appear to be in danger of being encroached upon, but would hardly dare to enter into dark conspiracies against constituted authority.

The recent revelations at Edmonton are frankly a shock to those who have honestly endeavoured to cultivate the open mind on this involved subject and to defer criticism until some explanatory details of the plan were available. If these details are still to be further postponed, by reason of an utterly senseless apprehension of financier machinations, it will, I fear, try the patience of the intelligent public beyond the breaking point.

Eton v. Harrow.

By Arthur Brenton.

I always manage to put in at least one afternoon at Lord's for the Eton and Harrow match. It stimulates ideas to mix in an assemblage composed of the ruling classes that are, and those that are to come. By "ruling classes" I mean, of course, the rulers of administrative services, not the arbiters of basic policies. It is the job of these rulers to get the people to ask for what the bankers are going to give them, and, when the people don't like what they asked for, to get them to ask for some more of the same thing under another name.

The struggle between the boys in the centre of the field is a working model of the struggle between their elders in the game of politics. For, fundamentally, politics—that is, the politics of administration—is a sport just as cricket is a sport. The light and the dark blues are rivals on the field but associates off it—as is symbolised by the uniformity of their elders' attire, the regulation top hat and morning coat.

I had the whimsical thought, when entering the ground this year, devoid of these insignia of social classification, that at least I should escape through the net of the Public Order Act if the police happened to be instructed to arrest some wearing political uniforms. But the thought had some serious background, for undoubtedly High Society is at present a functional instrument in the hands of High Finance, and is thus a political or super-political influence. This truth is obscured by the recent formal abolition of the party system, since when Parliamentary struggles have declined in their appeal and significance in much the same way as if the two cricket teams at Lord's were each composed of Etonians and Harrovians, whereupon the honours of victory would have no school to go to.

"The New Age" and the B.P.S.

The current number of *Phrenology* pays a tribute to THE NEW AGE for the contribution that it has made to the exposition of this science, citing in particular the series of articles, "Phrenology and Social Dynamics," by John Grimm, and saying that they have brought enquiries to the British Phrenological Society.

Forthcoming Meetings.

LONDON SOCIAL CREDIT CLUB.
Blewcoat Room, Caxton Street, S.W.1.

July 16, 8 p.m. "Social Credit and National Guilds," by "Pontifex," of *New English Weekly*.

WANTED.—Four copies each THE NEW AGE, May 13, 20 and 27. Write G. E. STECHERT & Co., 2, Star Yard, Carey Street, W.C.

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