

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 3. No. 13.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper  
Postage (home and abroad) 3d.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 9th, 1939.

6d. Weekly.

## WHOSE SERVICE IS PERFECT FREEDOM (XI)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

“Let us now praise Famous Men.”

It is characteristic of the Jewish-Whig conception of the State, that the State should do anything for the individual other than permit him to become able to do everything for himself. I think that this is the simple explanation of the obvious fact that Germany, because of her population at once docile and truculent, has been so invaluable to Jewry. Frankfort was the capital of International Finance until it moved to New York, and the form of State Capitalism which began in Germany, spread to Russia and is struggling desperately to conquer Great Britain and the United States, is coalescing to ensure that it shall become universal either through conquest or Revolution.

For this reason, if for no other, it appears to be of the highest importance to recognise that we are engaged in two wars at one and the same time, and that, to win the external war against the German incarnation of the Will to Power, we must conquer it in our own State and Banking institutions. Any one who is unable to see that “Socialism” is merely Will-to-Power, and that it becomes State Capitalism inevitably (*because universalised individual Capitalism is the complete and only answer to the Will-to-Power*) has not, I think anything of consequence to contribute to an understanding of the present situation.

It is obvious that anonymity is the antithesis of both individualism and responsibility—it is the amorphous, in distinction to the defined responsibility. The first characteristic conferred upon an individual by Christianity is “a Christian name.” A child thus becomes an individual, not merely “a human being” or “one of the Smiths”. And if at some later date, John Smith forges a cheque, we are careful to incarcerate not merely one of the Smiths, but John Smith.

It is equally significant that, as far as possible, every

attack on individual freedom is, like every attack on local and state sovereignty, an anonymous attack, generally in misleading phrases, and fathered on an institution which cannot be made responsible for it. Anonymity is an acknowledgement that an action which is covered by it, would provoke reprisals if the perpetrator were not shielded by superior force.

When the Civil Service was, in fact, as well as by constitution, simply the highly-trained executive of an elected Political Minister, this anonymity was quite possibly, although not necessarily, justified.

But, as Lord Hewart, in his book “The New Despotism” has pointed out with the technical ability arising from lifelong experience, the modern Civil Service is characterised by an administrative lawlessness which is something quite new in British experience. More and more the business of the country is being controlled by irresponsible *Fonctionnaires* sheltering behind some Enabling Act. Each interference increases the mass of “Forms” and involves still greater armies of Office staff. The sheer inability both of individuals and businesses to make any headway against this situation is adduced as justifying still further interference. There is no check upon it whatsoever; no one in Government Service is ever responsible for anything. Apart from the fact that, in general “The Crown (i.e., the Civil Service) can do no wrong” and cannot be sued, no one with any experience pursues a grievance against a Government Department with any hope of redress.

The Policy, as distinct from the Administration, of Great Britain both domestic and Foreign, between 1918 and 1936, has been so suicidal as to pass all possibility of mere stupidity or incompetence. As isolated instances, the shutting down of shipyards so that our building capacity has been reduced by at least 40 per cent., the sale of hundreds of ships to enemies to provide them with steel, the handing over of the Treasury Note to a Bank of “England” controlled from the U.S., the return to the Gold Standard in 1925, against even orthodox protest, the refusal to utilise the artificially engineered slump and unemployment of 1929-1933 to re-arm, and so to forestall a Continental situation, which was even then patent to any informed observer, the transfer of loans made or guaranteed by the Bank of “England” to Germany, to the debit of the Exchange Equalisation Fund, so that the British Taxpayer provided the money to build the German submarines to sink British ships, are unfortunately, far from comprehensive. During this period,

### ON OTHER PAGES

A Catholic Marksman

“According to your Cloth” by Mrs. Palmer.

Painless War Finance ..... by H. R. P.

Alberta: The Wider Front

Chatham House

Mr. Stanley Baldwin ("Honest Stan") was at all material times, Prime Minister, and allegedly in control of Policy.

But of course this cannot have been the case, because when it became impossible any longer to disguise the impending catastrophe, Mr. Baldwin, ("Honest Stan") instead of being impeached and shot, was given an Earldom, and the control of a Fund of £250,000, and put to raising more money for the Jews. We must assume therefore, that Mr. Baldwin had carried on a meritorious, if not very successful, struggle against forces which, discreetly, but with all their might, were working to bring about the situation which they have in fact brought to pass, both in the attack on individual and National liberties.

If neither Parliament, nor even the Prime Minister, is to be held responsible in any realistic sense, for Public Policy, no possible contributory to it is entitled to anonymity. This is far from being a matter of mere vindictiveness. The immunity which accompanies the systematic inroads made upon all those privileges for which the English have fought for centuries, and on which they have, perhaps too lightly, been wont to pride themselves, is simply an invitation to further encroachment. There is a large and growing body in the swollen Bureaucracy which is dazzled by the spectacle, presented by Russia and Germany, in which bureaucrats inherit the Earth, without the disadvantage of any compulsion to be meek. We ought to know all their names, and the names of their friends.

And then, of course, there is Mr. Montagu Norman—Tennyson's Brook\*, as one might describe him. His brother, Mr. Ronald Norman, was at all material times chairman of that curious synagogue, the B.B.C. Mr. Norman is so anonymous that he is better known as Professor Skinner. He tranships on dark nights from one steamer to another,

to put the bloodhounds off the scent.

Mr. Norman feels, and says:

"The higher grows the plum-tree  
The bigger grow the plums  
The more the potter plys his trade  
The stronger grow his thumbs."

You may have noticed the income tax.

His opinion of any lack of cordiality to this brave new world we are entering, was expressed in the words:

"The dogs bark, but the caravan moves on."

I cannot divest myself of the thought that if a young and enthusiastic bloodhound, well trained in the maxim that actions speak louder than words, were to join the pack, it would tend to move the caravan, under its subsequent drivers, more in the direction most of us would like to go.

The essential point is that it has, for many years, been altogether too safe, lucrative, and alluring, "to impugn the sovereignty of the local national states of the world" and more particularly, our own as well as the sovereignty of the individual. Hundreds of mediocre individuals have received preferment out of all proportion to their abilities, merely for professing these opinions, and helping shadowy international organisations to their fruition. The opinions themselves are of much less importance than the fact that they are such an easy passport to worldly success in quarters where there ought to be an ugly word for them.

(To be continued).

(World copyright reserved).

\* "Men may come and men may go, but I go on for ever."

C.S. Douglas

## A Roman Catholic Marksman

In leading political circles, recognition is gaining ground that the present war is different from past wars, since it contains a larger element of latent civil war—that is, that THE enemy is not localised but is distributed among all the belligerents, and even among those who are not yet belligerents.

The enemy of any Nation is a power working for its disintegration. The enemy within all the Nations is the power working for their disintegration. Looked at from the point of view of the individual Nation, such a force clothes itself in a "subversive movement." Assuming even a small degree of soundness in a Nation, it will necessarily appear to those composing that nation as something to be defended with all their strength. This is true 'patriotism'—loyalty to an association implementing a common policy.

Such patriotic force is undermined when the 'subversive' agent is unseen. In such circumstances, the weakness plain to all appears as a weakness inherent in

the national life itself, rather than as something external working to weaken it. Thus the national life loses force, and can only be restored by identification of the subversive agent and demonstration of the effect he has brought about.

It does not matter from what quarter such 'marksman', whose eyes are trained upon the subversive agent may come. Every hit that is scored counts as two for the defence of the Nation. The use of power is secondary to the possession of power; a people which has lost its power of decision is a lost people. *The Social Crediter* has no affiliations, political or religious, but one; and that one is to the administrative instrument which has grown out of the advice given by Major Douglas as to how to implement the policy of social credit. At the heart of social credit policy is FREEDOM, defined as *the power to choose one thing at a time*. Where there is *no power of choice*, nothing can be chosen: where there is power to choose, anything *may be chosen*; things

which, in the main, are good if man is (in the main) good; other things, if otherwise. The vast majority of social crediters are not far from the van of human advancement in saying: "We do not know. We believe. In any case, we cannot make it other than it is." Before all things, it has to be noticed: What man has now he has chosen.

Once, a young priest, a man of ability in whom great trust had been reposed, visited Douglas, to ascertain (why do so few people trouble themselves to ascertain?) what was the PHILOSOPHY behind social credit. Douglas, it is to be presumed, satisfied the inquirer, who, on the point of leaving, is said to have turned back. "We KNOW," he said, that what is called the SIN of this world, is not of much more account than pimples upon a man's face. BUT, WE KNOW TOO THAT BEHIND AND BESIDE ALL THAT IS A DIABOLICAL WICKEDNESS which it will be hard to overcome."

Well, it is said the Devil doesn't like light.

A shedder of light in dark places, if not literally upon the Devil, is T. W.

C. Curd, who wrote, in *The Catholic Times* for December 1st:

"The news of recent weeks," he said, "has been eloquent on the glaring record of the 'planners' who are bringing about by stealth and under the guise of war-necessity what Soviet Russia did more openly.

"... the time has already come when we must take stock of our own position and ask ourselves whether we are fighting the totalitarianism of Nazi Germany only to find ourselves victims of the totalitarianism of the bureaucrats and the 'planners' at home."

"The great advocate of a 'planned industry' on a socialistic scale in this country is the organisation known as 'P.E.P.' (Political and Economic Planning).

*"Its aim is the elimination of the 'small man' and the compulsory amalgamation of industries. As a means to the socialist state this is the first step to Communism, as the Communists themselves have made clear.*

"In a recent issue of P.E.P.'s

magazine it was stated that 'only in war, or under threat of war will a British Government embark on large scale planning.' Well, we have the war, and now we have the planning, which is being called 'control.' It is not without significance that P.E.P. is composed mostly of chain-store interests and civil servants, and under this 'control' we find a host of bureaucrats, 'planning' the nation's industry, food, entertainment, and even movements, with a maximum of cost and a minimum of efficiency. Which is strangely reminiscent of Russia's wonderful 'Five-Year' plan."

The writer blames speakers of the Left Book Club run by Victor Gollancz for the alarmist propaganda for 'deeper trenches'; but

"The campaign of terror is helped by another organisation calling itself the Air Raid Defence League. It is directed by Sir Arthur Salter, M.P., who is also on the council of P.E.P.

"Further persuasion is threatened by Commander King Hall, who in a recent *Sunday Pictorial* article urged that it should be made a 'legal offence' for parents to keep their children in danger

areas. Commander King Hall is also associated with P.E.P.

"The evacuation scheme plus the control and pooling of all sorts of commodities from petrol to prunes has dealt a shattering blow at small businesses in every evacuation area by the loss of much trade and the hampering of what is left.

*"Big Business, that is, the business of the 'planners', with its branches all over the country and its enormous reserves, can look on the present confusion and the plight of the small trader with complacency, knowing that vast numbers of private businesses will never recover from the effects of this planning.*

"Meanwhile, Marks and Spencers are enlarging existing premises or opening new ones in a number of towns. Actively associated with these chain stores is Israel Moses Sieff, of P.E.P."

"'Freedom,' says the posters, 'is in Danger . . . !'"

"It is."

A useful article!

## "... ACCORDING TO YOUR CLOTH"

### The War and Unemployment

By B. M. PALMER

"Why, when the men of a great army have gone out of industry and large numbers of women have taken one form or another of paid national service, should there be 1,430,000 unemployed, 903,000 of them men, nearly 418,000 women, and more than 109,000 boys and girls? Instead of there being more unemployment, should there be any unemployment at all?"

—Leading article in the "Times" of November 27th, 1939.

The "problem" of unemployment has been with us for several decades. The *Times* leader-writer is surprised that war has not "solved" it—yet.

This is because he does not know, or will not admit one fundamental fact. *Unemployment is a sign of progress.*

If the actual measures taken by the Government since September 1st had "solved" the unemployment problem by absorbing the whole of our population into industry, our plight would be a sorry one. It would mean that victory

would be uncertain, perhaps impossible, because we had no reserve of manpower.

The question of employment or unemployment can properly be understood only against a back-ground of peace. It is a fact that primitive people are, on the whole, peaceful. Hobbes' primeval savage whose life was "nasty, solitary and short" never existed. Man has been a social animal from the dawn of consciousness. He has also worked hard, on the whole; and it would be as well to ask ourselves why he worked, or, to put this in modern parlance, why he developed an economic system.

He worked in order to make himself more comfortable, or, once more to translate into the language of economists, "to provide himself with goods and services."

*"The purpose of an economic system is to provide us with goods and services."*

Primitive man has no doubt whatever about the truth of this statement.

He does not work in order to make more work, or in order to improve his own character or the character of those around him. To him *the only object of production is consumption.* He therefore proceeds to invent as many labour-saving devices as possible, from flint arrow-heads, bronze spades and iron ploughshares, down through the ages to the loom, the locomotive, and all the steel miracles of the modern age of power production.

Whenever he succeeds in saving labour, or in producing a better result with less physical effort he knows that he has made progress. Life can henceforth be more comfortable and secure, and he will have more leisure.

These facts are fundamental, and are accepted as such by the social credit movement.

It follows that in a state which is making real economic progress there must be less and less work and more and more goods and services produced.

Primitive man would regard this state of affairs as highly satisfactory. But civilised man has attempted to incorporate into the economic system a fallacy whose consequences are so far-reaching that they bid fair to wreck civilisation as we know it.

This fallacy is, that while the economic system provides us with goods and services it should provide us with work as well, and furthermore, it is only as a reward for working that men shall receive the wages by means of which they can gain access to the goods and services.

Thus,

"The modern economic system as controlled by Finance at one and the same time saves labour, and exalts it into a religion, and a virtue. In consequence it condemns man to perpetual bondage."

—C. H. Douglas.

The state of the world to-day demonstrates plainly that we can't have it both ways. Either some means must be found to distribute the goods and services without making "work" a *sine qua non*, or inventions and discoveries must be strictly forbidden, and primitive methods of production reverted to.

Or stay. There is a third way. There might be war. This, surely, would provide a means of disposing of a vast supply of goods and services. They can be hurled at the enemy.

Without suggesting that the excellent people who write letters and articles on the "unemployment problem" welcomed the war as a means of making work, it is quite easy to perceive they consider the enormous amount of toil and moil such an undertaking will involve to be a blessing in disguise, a compensation for all the discomforts of black-out and rationing, and the horrors and sorrows of mutilation and bereavement. Why else should they say they are longing for the day when there are more jobs than men to do them?

Social crediters have no hesitation in stating that for all practical purposes such a frame of mind, with all its mistaken idealism, does as much harm in the world as the acts of aggression of the most arrant dictator, because it makes possible the conditions in which dictators flourish.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." It does not matter what a man's intentions are.

The scope of this article does not

admit of a discussion of the causes of the present war. The fact is accepted. There are two tasks before us.

(a) To win the war with as little loss of life and discomfort both to the civil and military population as possible.

(b) At the same time to preserve as much of our English heritage, or what we might term our civilisation, as we can.

A surplus of man-power should thus be a matter of self-congratulation to us. But it is quite evident that the orthodox economist would never admit this point. To do so, he would have to abandon the position that one of the purposes of the economic system is to make work, and its corollary that he who does not work, neither shall he eat, or at least, eat only a little, just enough to keep body and soul together.

The "work" fallacy is a two-edged sword. If we persist in penalising those without work, forcing them to live on pittance in slum conditions—(disclosures following on evacuation prove the widespread degradation connected with poverty)—these poverty-stricken creatures will not have the means to buy their due share of the country's production. Thus unemployment will tend to increase still further in the productive trades. Furthermore, if we increase income tax and tell people to save as much as possible in order to "pay for the war", it follows that goods and services must be still further curtailed to meet the shrinking market. Unemployment must increase at a greater rate than the army can take up the surplus labour.

Thus financial poverty, brought about by increased taxation, leads back again to unemployment, and the vicious circle is complete.

We have often been told that we must cut our coat according to our cloth. I should like to lay another picture before you. It seems at the moment that we have plenty of cloth in the shape of surplus man-power, and access to raw materials. It has never been stated that we are short of these. May I suggest that there is something wrong with the pattern which we are following?

When war broke out on September 3rd, we had fifty million people ready to do everything possible to help the Government, an efficient military machine, and perhaps the most highly developed industrial system in the world. The task was to adapt the country to its war-time regime. In three months more confusion and loss of trade

resulted than during the whole of the four years' war.

On every occasion when it has been suggested that better organisation might have resulted in more efficiency, the reply has invariably been that "we cannot afford it."

But are we short of men or materials?

Is the tailor short of cloth to make the coat?

The mentality is one which will ruin the material and present his client with a garment in which he can never be comfortable, simply because he will not admit of a fault in the pattern.

To make the best use of our man-power and material resources it is necessary to adapt the financial system; first, to the end of winning the war as quickly as possible and with as little "sacrifice" as possible, and then, by gradual adjustment, to adapt it to winning the peace.

The lines along which this might be developed were published by Major C. H. Douglas in October last, and brought to the notice of many members of Parliament by individuals among their constituents.

A machine into which one has thrown a monkey-wrench may go on working for a little while, but sooner or later the great wheels will seize up.

The financial machinery of the country will come to a standstill. This is inevitable unless the defect is removed.

There is no question but that its removal is a matter of life and death to everyone of us.

B. M. PALMER.

## Letter to the Editor

Sir,

*The Times*, in leader of November 17th used these words: "certain essential elements emerged clearly and distinctly from the declarations of policy already made by the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary — an allusion, of course, to the indispensable restoration of the racial and national rights destroyed by Hitler . . ."

On the production of proof that Mr. Chamberlain made use of the word *racial* in such a context I will pay the sum of ten shillings to the Social Credit Secretariat. If he did not, how does that word come along just there?

Yours, etc.,  
H. E.

December 2nd, 1939.

## NEWS AND VIEWS

### Mr. MORGENTHAU

Why did Mr. Morgenthau, Jewish Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, make a hush-hush visit to London this last summer, and why did he then visit the Scandinavian capitals in an American warship?

Mr. Herbert Hoover, ex-President of the United States, has issued a proclamation asking "Why this tenderness to Soviet Russia." It was always clear that there was a Raw Deal for Hoover (and 60,000,000 Americans) before the Jew Steal via Roosevelt. Is Mr. Hoover going to tell us about it?

A Price Control Committee has been set up. Price Control is the key of the Economic Situation. The Secretary, who is always the key of a Committee, is Miss Shufield. Pronounced with a lisp.

Mr. Attlee is most anxious that the Government shall state at once that we have no intention of "dismembering" Germany. You notice the fear of any decentralisation? Do Bavaria and Saxony love Prussia? What attack on Finance has the Labour Party ever made, except Centralise (Nationalise) it. Had Germany, after the last war, been resolved into its constituent Provinces, and each of these given control of its own credit, there would be no war now, and Hitler might have been a prosperous Paperhanger. Had the National Debt been distributed to the British Public after the last war instead of the imposition of grinding taxation there would have been no economic slump.

Mr. Eamonn de Valera is a Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholic Church forbids any dealings with Freemasonry. The Headquarters of The Grand Orient Order of Freemasons, probably one of the most dangerous Secret Societies in the world, has been moved from Prague to Dublin. Odd, isn't it?

If you like our Planned Bureaucrats, try our Planned Federal Union.

### SOVIET INVADES FINLAND

The invasion of Finland by Soviet Russia has at least clarified the situation for the ordinary man. One by one the tricks and technique of invasion with

which we have become so familiar in recent years, have been employed by a state which has been consistently held up as a model of propriety for us to copy. The press campaign, the 'frontier incidents', the overdone indignation and sympathy for the Finnish people, the invasion to 'liberate' them and the treaty with the puppet government. There can now be no doubt as to the identity of 'Communism' with 'Fascism' nor as to where the real enemy both of ourselves and the Finnish and the German people lies.

The Finns appear to be putting up a grand fight—and amongst other more forceful 'measures' they have appealed to the League of Nations against Russia's aggression; ironically the President of the Council is M. Maisky, the (Jewish) Soviet Ambassador in London. M. Maisky has found it politic to develop a cold, in spite of his country's strong denial that they have done anything they shouldn't do . . .

### SOVIET'S AIM

The cutting below is taken from a local paper, the *Wolverhampton Express and Star*, whose circulation is 100,000 per day. The Editor has twice had the opportunity of reading *Warn Europe*. News must come from "Reuter" to have any effect apparently.

One wonders just how long "Reuter" has possessed the information which is now published three months after events.

"Russia's aim in coming to a pact with Germany was that Germany should be able to conduct the war as long as possible and exhaust Britain and France, according to a report of a speech by Stalin to the Politburo (the Soviet Inner Cabinet) on August 19th, which has reached the Geneva correspondent of the Havas Agency from an "absolutely trustworthy source."

The speech was made four days before the Russo-German pact was signed.

After weighing the possibilities of an alliance with the Allies, the report says that Stalin advocated a non-aggression pact with Germany, which would make war inevitable while Russia could remain outside the conflict.

He said Germany did not oppose the return of Bessarabia (in Rumania) to Russia, and was willing that Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary should be Soviet spheres of influence.

Stalin is further quoted as saying, "If Germany is vanquished England and France will have sufficient force to occupy Berlin and destroy Germany, and we should be unable to help Germany effectively.

"Our aim, therefore, is that Germany should be able to conduct the war for the longest possible time in order that Britain and France should become so exhausted as no longer be able to crush Germany.

"It follows that while remaining neutral we should help Germany economically with raw materials and foodstuffs but naturally without compromising our own economic position or weakening the strength of our army."

Stalin is also stated to have said that the Soviet must conduct active Communist propaganda in Britain and France especially France, so as to be well prepared for the end of the war.

The general theme of his speech, as disclosed by the report, was that the war must last as long as possible, in order to exhaust the belligerents.—Reuter."

### UNEXPLORED FIELDS OF TAXATION

In commenting on Mr. Keynes's plan for financing the war by compulsory savings, the *Economist* says:

"Mr. Keynes has perhaps been a little quick to assume that there is no remedy other than compulsory saving. There are fields of taxation as yet unexplored. Thoroughgoing rationing of every form of expenditure might make it possible to leave the task to "voluntary" saving. But the one attitude that is inexcusable is to say that there is no need to do anything unpleasant. If so, the unpleasant will happen by itself—and will be all the more unpleasant for that."

But why not explore the not-so-unpleasant methods first? Why not consider the proposals for financing the war put forward by Major Douglas in this journal of October 28th? To whom would their adoption be unpleasant?



## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

### SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Home and abroad, post free: One year 30/-; Six months 15/-;  
Three months 7s. 6d.

VOL. 3. No. 13.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 9th, 1939.

12, LORD STREET,  
LIVERPOOL, 2.

Telephone: Bank 5260.

## Painless War Finance

People who say it is not possible to finance the war without taxation are wrong and probably have forgotten the last war and how that was financed. If they further say that "if we make a tremendous amount of armaments, the money distributed in respect of these will cause prices of ordinary commodities to soar, unless some of the extra money is withdrawn somehow," then they prove themselves victims of the banker's propaganda we have been suffering from in this country for many years. The statements are based on so many fallacies that it will pay to analyse them under three headings.

War Finance is merely ordinary finance stepped up into high gear. The War of 1914-1918 cost approximately £9,000 million, of which a little over £1,000 million came out of current taxes. The rest, viz., £8,000 million was financed by credit. That credit was the nation's own credit and no one else's, despite the fact that the manufactories of credit, the banks, claimed to have "lent" it as their own property. There is only one reason why the present war—and the last one too for all that—should not be wholly financed by credit. That reason is that the effort to *win* this war must of necessity be so great as to necessitate some restriction of normal consumption. In the recent concrete proposals issued by Major Douglas and published in *The Social Crediter* of October 28th, this necessity is recognised by his proposal to collect via taxation not more than 10 per cent. of the money required to finance the war. But it is not the usual tax whereby the taxpayer is deprived of the use of his money for ever. He proposes that as a receipt for the tax there be issued an interest bearing Government Bond. This small compulsory investment is all that is needed to effect the desired restriction in consumption. The proportion of ten per cent is a rough estimate, but is fully

justified by the experience of the last war, for which the figures are quoted above.

Armaments are an essential for the successful prosecution of a war. If prices rose owing to the concentration of manufacturers on production of armaments, that would be a small price to pay for winning a war against the instigators of a murderous system of national oppression and international pillage. Do we want to win this war or not?

Inflation is the bankers' pet bogey and happens to be a phenomenon peculiar to the present licentious and piratical financial system. Its existence under certain conditions is proof of that system's prodigious inefficiency in safeguarding the interests of the people. At present prices may rise for either of two reasons. It can happen that the costs incurred by retailers' rise. Few persons in this war have not been told of an increase in price of some article being due to War Risks Insurance. Although some institution or group of institutions has pocketed the premiums thus collected without having to pay out anything so far, the retailers have been helpless. The other reason for increases in price is what in orthodox jargon is called a scarcity value. In the present system any trader can, if an article becomes naturally or artificially scarce, put up the price to "what the article will fetch." This financial anarchy is held very sacred by the apologists of the present system. Major Douglas's proposals contain a clause whereby any article becoming relatively scarce should be rationed and its consumption *not* restricted by mere price manipulation. In the last war public indignation and this time the threat of it forced the authorities to introduce such rationing for a few selected articles of consumption.

The main fallacy in the objections mentioned at the start of these notes is

the implication that money issued in the beneficial ownership of the State—or people, or nation, or public, etc.—causes inflation and money created out of nothing, as happens to all credit money, and chalked up as owned by the State to the banking fraternity, does not. Propaganda to this effect, mainly in the form of subtle suggestion, has long been widespread. Put plainly, it is nonsense and poisonous nonsense at that. The behaviour of a pound Sterling, whether honestly earned, stolen, or created out of nothing is in all cases the same where it constitutes an addition to the public's money. Similarly the effect is the same whether it is issued with or without the proviso that at some *future* date it is to be repaid. The *after* effects will certainly be very different, because, if the proviso attaches, then the public has not only to perform the work and labour required in manufacturing the armaments that originally called the credit into being, but has to perform the equivalent of that labour all over again in order to "repay" to the financial institution, that originally created it with the stroke of the pen, that same amount of money. In the meantime the public has to labour to find the interest on these fraudulent "loans".

It will therefore be seen that the objections mentioned arise not so much from a failure to grasp Major Douglas's proposals but from an unfortunately common ignorance of how the present financing of war and peace is effected.

H. R. P.

## CIRCULATION DRIVE

This issue of *The Social Crediter* is the second of a series containing articles of special interest to the new reader.

We are anxious that as many new readers as possible should have the opportunity of using this introduction to our views, and to this end we are offering a special monthly trial subscription for 2/6 with a commission of 1/3 to the supporter who introduces the new subscriber.

Further details and special aids to help increase the circulation will be sent post free on application to:

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,  
12 LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

A reader in Newcastle says:

"I am pleased to say that I have found little difficulty in getting people to take out a trial subscription. I bagged five subscriptions in two hours and those in the course of business, and I hope to get many more. I may say that none of the five know much, if anything, about social credit."

Another reader writes:

"I shall be very glad if you will let me have a much larger number of leaflets and order forms . . . we are all busy on the circulation drive, and hope to present some first class results."

## ALBERTA: THE WIDER FRONT

*The great monopoly in this country is the monopoly of big credits. A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men who chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedom.*

\* \* \*

*We have been dreading all along, the time when the combined power of high finance would be greater than the power of the Government.*

\* \* \*

*Some of the biggest men in the United States, in the field of commerce and manufacture, are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it.*

—President Wilson.

The man was not a cynic who defined the Art of Government as the Art of constraining people to do what they would on no account do if they knew what it was they were doing.

There would be no need for art otherwise.

It is only supreme artistry that keeps the many millions of the earth's people to the perpetual task of tightening their belts in sight of abundance produced with less and less effort.

Not by any means the least cunning of this artists' touches is that which paints the attainment of a political objective as a matter of clearly defined and well recognised stages which must necessarily be traversed and (a touch still more cunning!) which past experience has proved to be correct. It should be obvious that there has never been experience of anything but successful practice of the Art of Government as defined above.

When a people is made to take its medicine, something seems to be gained by writing "Victory" on the label on the bottle. The sound of the magic word induces excitement; but no cure has ever been recorded as resulting from this medicine, and craving for this thing, Victory, instead of being allayed, increases.

The recipe is well-known:—

- (1) Concoct a plan
- (2) Propagandise
- (3) Gain Power ("Victory"!)

The sort of mind which falls for this sort of thing must be incredibly naive. The late Lord Bryce once wrote an introduction to two massive volumes on "Democracy and the Organisation of Political Parties," by Ostrogorski. The revelations took his breath away and he could only murmur: "I am myself an optimist, almost a professional optimist, as indeed politics would be intolerable

were not a man grimly resolved to see between the clouds all the blue sky he can."

That is all very well. But what they have done in Alberta is to put some blue in the sky so that even quite honest people can see it, with or without 'grim resolution' to do so. And this has been done while the dreadful power which Woodrow Wilson left unnamed was being all the time dragged out into the open. It is something lasting and something great.

Students of politics recognised that, for the first time in modern history, a Government had been elected *against* the wishes of those financial powers which, for the most part, control all Governments. It was *certain* that the new Government would meet with all the opposition which International Finance and those whose policy it implemented could mobilise. It did.

It must be borne in mind that prominent members of the United Farmers' Party, itself brought into existence by revulsion from the older political parties, had been spreading social credit ideas since the early twenties, and conceived the plan of bringing Finance into the open through the medium of the Federal Parliamentary Committee on Banking and Commerce in 1923, a preliminary to the decennial revision of the Canadian Bank Charter Act.

Major Douglas's evidence before the Committee is historic. The United Farmers, nevertheless, failed to embody the new ideas in either their Provincial or their Federal programmes, and when the slump of 1929 began Mr. Aberhart saw his opportunity and made a bid for power with the offer of \$25 a month for every adult in the Province. The concrete nature of this policy is important: lightly attached to "methods" as it may have been, those methods were a

mere name to the great majority of the electors. They voted for a *result* which they believed to be a reasonable and practicable result.

There is little doubt that the enemy disapproved of Mr. Aberhart's estimate of the wealth of Alberta as contrasted with the fictitious value of bankers' notes and disapproved still more of the suggestion that Alberta's wealth was not theirs but Alberta's. In financial terms the wealth of Alberta is the *real* equivalent of 46,200,000,000 golden sovereigns—not merely bankers' notes!

They appear to have disapproved still more of the First Interim Report presented by Major Douglas as Chief Reconstruction Advisor to the Alberta Government\*, with its shrewd assessment of political realities and its uncompromising strategical outlines. They may have disapproved more of the United Farmers than of Mr. Aberhart. In any case, during the month of Mr. Aberhart's great election victory, Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, "ostensibly for the purpose of a holiday on the Maine Coast, had crossed the Atlantic and for some weeks had been a daily visitor to the newly-formed Bank of Canada. There is little doubt that the situation in Alberta had received close attention, and the policy to be adopted in the case of a social credit victory was laid down at this time if not previously."

While it is by no means a matter of merely academic interest to expose the detailed construction of the traps set for the new Premier of Alberta, their general nature was revealed in conversation by "Mr. Weir, head of the Bankers' Clearing House Association," who "dropped in for a chat last night" [9th

\* Presented May, 1935: the appointment was not a party political appointment; but a Government appointment with all that that implies.

September, 1935] "and I gathered that it has been agreed for a long time that if Aberhart comes in in Alberta their plans would be to separate him from Douglas and urge him bit by bit into co-operation with the banks, and then put in Banking Committees to control the finance of the Province as in Newfoundland."

"—As in Newfoundland!" That is very significant, for in fact "through

the good offices of Mr. Graham Towers of the Bank of Canada," the Relief Controller of the Island of Newfoundland, Mr. Robert J. Magor, was recommended to Mr. Aberhart and *did* devote himself for several months in Edmonton to a reorganisation of a type most appreciated by folk who did *not* live in Alberta.

The stripping of Newfoundland of sovereign rights "while Parliament

slept" is not part of this story though doubtless illustrative of what might have happened to Alberta if Mr. Aberhart had not recovered himself. He *did*.

After months of intrigue and confusion the real nature of the struggle was made clear to the Albertan administrators and their supporters themselves, with consequences which will be described. T. J.

## THE REAL INDIVIDUAL —AND THE UNIT

"Just as there is no true peace in us, so there is no true life in us. When you shift the emphasis from the individual to society, to social relations, you shift it from the vivid springing core of life to a windy, if convenient, abstraction. But this is the snag: it is *difficult* to be a real individual living from your feet up. It needs grit, and pride, and courage and power to endure through to despair; you need to be quick with beauty, and light, and love, and sex; you must see men, not as social units, but as your individual brothers, full of this magic thing called life. And that is difficult. But—it is *easy* to be a socialist, it is easy to cry for ideal justice and go forward as one in the ranks, shedding this difficult thing that is real life upon the imaginary back of the army. You are then like one committed to a great fate. You have the surge of the crowd emotionalism within you. This surge will carry you over the barricades superbly. But when the surge is spent and you are sitting on your backside with a sore head—you are not the Joe Wilson, the individual, an entity with its own eternal right under heaven—you are merely a unit who has got lost, and you scurry around until you regain the obliterating safety of the army, and then the surge of crowd emotionalism again, and once more the barricades, and—so on, until, of course, you reach your own final fatal barricade. But that army has its leaders, must have its leaders, and its leaders must be individualists. Power is sweet. The temptation is strong. And you can always make it look like a beneficent bureaucracy—to an army of units. But you could never on God's earth make it look like a beneficent anything to an army of individualists."

—From "Wild Geese Overhead," by Neil M. Gunn.

## The Head of Moscow's Foreign Office

The Jew, Soloman Abramovitch Dridzo Lozovsky, a former Secretary General to the Profintern, the Syndicalist International, and now a member of the Comintern's executive, has been appointed permanent head of the Moscow Foreign Office, and principal adviser to Molotov.

His chief aim in life, says the *Catholic Times*, as he himself wrote recently in *La Vie Ouvriere*, is the overthrow of the existing order in the great democracies.

Lozovsky is a leading apostle of the Revolution-Through-War doctrine. After Rakovski, he is the member of the ruling clique in Russia with the most intimate knowledge of affairs in France and England. He lived in France before the war, returning to Russia after the October Revolution, and was almost at once sent back to France to organise disorder there.

He was responsible for the split in the C.T.G. (General Confederation of Labour), which took place in 1923, and

was the chief creator of the Moscow directed C.G.T.U.

He is the author of a text-book on the subject which has been published in France under the title "La Greve est un Combat."

He has also worked in Poland, where he is remembered as one active agent among the textile workers at Lodz.

Lozovsky's immediate chief in the Comintern, Manouilski, declared in March, at the Congress of the Russian Communist Party, that

"Communists must support every war that brings nearer the victory of the world proletariat, of which the interests coincide with those of the country of Socialism . . ."

"This war will be the most just, the most holy, that has ever been fought in the history of mankind: a war which will necessarily stir up a whole series of revolutionary outbreaks, within the enemy ranks, and which will break up and demoralise the ranks of imperialism."

## JUDAISED VALUES

For instance, ever since 1655 English life has undoubtedly become more and more Judaised—that is to say, that the people of this country and the life they lead have tended to approach more and more to Jewish standards or to standards under which the Jewish character flourishes.

Would there be any sense in now excluding the ethnic Jew, when his Gentile counterpart, his Gentile pupil and slavish imitator is everywhere enthroned by his side, and in greater numbers than the Jews themselves?

Is there any sense in excluding the creator of a culture if you retain his values?

Modern English life is bristling with evidence of the victory of the Judaised Englishman and of Jewish values . . .

No exclusion of the Jews from the administrative or the cultural life of England, therefore, could be more than a piece of shallow, hysterical patriotism, if it did not contemplate and include the far more fundamental but infinitely more difficult task of freeing the country of its wrong values. And all bodies of Englishmen who seriously wish to recover English civilisation at this stage cannot be regarded as any more than emotional and hysterical flag wavers if they do not see the compelling need of that infinitely difficult task—the task of accompanying any gesture of organised reform by a frontal attack upon the Judaised elements in their kith and kin and their own Judaised values.

—From "Jews, and the Jews in England", by Cobbett.



## THE POLICY OF THE JEWISH RACE (XII)

## THE CONQUEST OF AMERICA

## (a) DISCOVERY.

A conspicuous part in the discovery of America was played by a number of converted Jews [known as Maranos] who surrounded King Ferdinand [himself a quarter-Jew] and Queen Isabella of Spain.

"Louis de Santangel was the farmer of the Royal taxes, and owing to his being a confidant of King Ferdinand of Spain he became chancellor of Aragon; together with a relative, the royal treasurer Gabriel Sanchez, and his friend Juan Cabrero, who was likewise of Jewish stock, Santangel entered energetically into the far-reaching plans of Columbus. He represented to Queen Isabella the advantage that would accrue to the Crown and to Spain from the discovery of the sea-route to India . . . she consented to Columbus' undertaking and since the state treasury was exhausted, was ready to pawn her jewels to procure the necessary funds to fit out his expedition."<sup>2</sup>

The maturing of these plans between the 'converted' Jewish leaders coincide with the preparation for the wholesale expulsion of the Jewish masses from the Spanish kingdoms.

"On March 31st, 1492, the Catholic Monarchs issued a decree to the effect that within four months all Jews and Jewesses were to leave the Kingdom and lands of Spain. On April 30th the decree was publicly announced by the heralds, and on the same day Columbus was ordered to equip a fleet for his voyage to the Indies. On August 2nd, 1492, about 300,000 Jews left Spain to settle wherever they might find a shelter and on the following day the fleet of Columbus set sail. His journal opens with a reference to the coincidence in time of the two events.

"Columbus' first account of his discovery took the form of a letter to his Jewish patron Santangel."<sup>2</sup>

The compilers of the *Encyclopaedia of Jewish Knowledge* were equally struck by this coincidence:

"It appeared to him [the Jew] as an act of providence that a new continent which might afford him a haven of rest and a home of refuge should be discovered at the very time when ungrateful Spain . . . expelled his people from her domain and rendered them homeless and helpless."

For many years before their expulsion the masses of Spanish Jews had lived imprisoned in so-called Judarios (Jew districts) and only their ruling families, who were always financial advisers, royal tax-gatherers or body-physicians, were allowed the full freedom of the country and, as well, the sovereign right to tax and rule their own communities. These were the prevailing conditions for Central European Jewry right up to the middle of the nineteenth century, and for Russo-Polish Jews (where the districts were called Ghettoes) such conditions endured till the World War. The various waves of Jewish immigration (Spanish-Portuguese, Dutch, German and Russian) were, unlike the spontaneous immigration of the Gentiles, merely the shifting of whole Jew districts in

"response to the pressure of persecution, in various forms, which sent the Jews forth, first from their Iberian homes, then from the Germanic lands and lastly from Eastern

Europe and the Orient. Until recently the centre of these converging streams of immigrants was the United States."<sup>2</sup>

## (b) THE UNITING OF THE STATES OF AMERICA.

The first Jews who arrived in New Amsterdam [later New York]

"were received in an unfriendly fashion by Stuyvesant, the Dutch governor of New Amsterdam, who wrote to the directors of the West India Company asking authority for their expulsion. This the directors did not grant . . . 'because of the large amount of capital they have invested in shares in the company'. They directed 'that they [the Jews] shall have permission to sail to and trade in New Netherland, and to remain there'."

The passing of New Netherlands into the hands of the British did not (*Encyclopaedia of Jewish Knowledge*)

"militate against the early Jewish immigrants, for some individuals are recorded as being in the Government's service at a time when no Jew was so employed in England."

Their civil status quickly improved:

"In November, 1727, an act was passed by the General Assembly of New York providing that when the oath of abjuration was to be taken by any of His British Majesty's subjects professing the Jewish religion the word 'upon the oath of a Christian' might be withheld. Three days later an act was passed naturalizing a Daniel da Costa."<sup>2</sup>

Nor was British rule unfavourable to Jews in other parts of the colonies; and the history of the colonization of Georgia affords still another instance of those 'providential coincidences' so frequent in Jewish history:

"On July 7th, 1733, Oglethorpe, its founder and Governor had assembled the colonists, who had arrived one month previously, on the site of the present city of Savannah for the purpose of allotting to each settler his proportion of land. While the colonists were partaking of a public dinner given at the close of the day's proceedings, there came up the Savannah river from London, a vessel containing 40 Jewish families. Their arrival was not expected . . ."<sup>2</sup>

But

"Oglethorpe included the names of half a dozen of them as grantors in a conveyance executed December 21st, 1733, of town lots, gardens and farms."<sup>2</sup>

B. J.

References:

<sup>2</sup> *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*.

## LECTURES AND STUDIES SECTION

Prospectus: Price 3d.

For prospectus of Courses A and B apply to:  
THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, Lectures and Studies  
Section, Social Credit Secretariat, 12, Lord Street,  
Liverpool, 2.

## CHATHAM HOUSE

"In plain terms we have to re-transfer the prestige and the prerogatives of sovereignty from the fifty or sixty fragments of contemporary society to the whole of contemporary society—from the local national states by which sovereignty has been usurped, with disastrous consequences, for half a millenium, to some institution embodying our society as a whole.

"In the world as it is to-day, this institution can hardly be a universal Church. It is more likely to be something like a League of Nations. I will not prophesy. I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands, because to impugn the sovereignty of the local national states of the world is still a heresy for which a statesman or a publicist can be—perhaps not quite burnt at the stake, but certainly ostracised and discredited."

The above extract is from an address given by Arnold Toynbee to a group of Internationalists in Copenhagen in 1931. Professor Arnold Toynbee is a director of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, an organisation for the support of which the Government has recently voted the sum of £35,000.

The Royal Institute of International Affairs was a by-product—and a not unimportant one—of the Peace Conference of Paris in 1919, which, fructifying, also brought forth the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations. The former is the direct, though not the fundamental, cause of the present war; and of a special meeting of the League of Nations, that "device to end war," it is currently said (*Daily Telegraph, December 4th, 1939*) that it 'gives an opportunity for a number of nations to express their views' on the invasion of Finland by Soviet Russia.

At the Peace Conference of 1919 were gathered many distinguished experts with the very highest qualifications, and they set themselves busily to the task of planning the map of Europe according to the Best Principles. Only a minor account seems to have been taken of natural phenomena such as human nature; and the Treaty they produced led so inevitably and logically to War that it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this was a result intended—by someone.

We know that the conference was in part a family affair of the Warburgs, that Paul Warburg attended with the delegation from the United States, and that his brother Max Warburg was there in a similar capacity for the German Government; that Bernard Baruch, the American financier, was one of the American delegation. A member of the firm of J. P. Morgan, the financier Thomas William Lamont, was a representative of the United States Treasury on the American Commission to negotiate peace terms. It is also worthy of note that both Lloyd George and Clemenceau had secretaries of Jewish race.

In the intervals of the business of treaty-making the British experts at work had time to wish for a permanent organisation to keep them in contact, and, coincidentally, the United States felt a similar need at precisely the same time,

as did also Germany.\* The United States and Great Britain had a joint meeting during May, 1919, and it was decided to form an international institute (their minds were working towards centralisation just then) with branches in the United States and Great Britain. The British group at this meeting included Lord Eustace Percy, the Fabian who has roomed with Felix Frankfurter, later Baruch's colleague on Roosevelt's "Brains Trust", as well as Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. J. W. Headlam Morley, afterwards Historical Adviser to the Foreign Office. The first task of this institute was to be to write a history of the Peace Conference, and it was also decided that an annual survey should be made of international affairs.

The proposed institute, however, had not as yet materialised, and there were no funds to finance it.

But providence blessed it early, and in Stephen King Hall's words†:

"At this juncture the work . . . received the first of many munificent and public-spirited financial offers which have maintained it during the past sixteen years. Mr. Thomas W. Lamont generously offered to advance £2,000 to enable the task of writing the history to proceed."

Dr. H. Temperley of Peterhouse was commissioned to start this work, to which contributions were made by members of the British and American delegations.

In 1920, after the peace conference, an organising committee was set up which included Lord Eustace Percy, Geoffrey Dawson and Dr. Temperley. A constitution was prepared and members of the Peace Delegation at Paris and other suitable people were invited to join in founding the institute. The second public spirited financial offer, which enabled this preliminary work to be carried on, was from Sir Abe Bailey.

It was found to be impracticable to start an international association, so separate ones were established in Great Britain (British Institute of Foreign Affairs, later the Royal Institute of International Affairs) and the United States.

There must be a powerful impulse behind an Institution that began in 1920 in two rooms in Horseferry Road with an income of £1,700 and that by 1936 had achieved the dignity of 10, St. James Square (with several adjoining houses) and an income of £30,000; that by 1937-38 had an income of over £35,000, and in 1939 is evacuated to Balliol College, Oxford, and is granted treasury funds to the extent of £35,000.

Chatham House (the building at 10, St. James's Square) was given to the organisation in 1923, two years before Professor Arnold Toynbee became a director. In 1926 the late Sir Otto Beit gave to the Institute £1,000 payable over two years, and this was followed by a gift from the Carnegie Trust (on one of the American Boards of which is Thomas Lamont) of £3,000 for the purchase of books for the extension of the library. At this time also, the Bank of England became a regular subscriber, contributing £200 per annum, and J. D. Rockefeller and P. A. Molteno also

\* Dr. Albrecht Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, attached to the German delegation, later founded the Institut für Auswärtige Politik at Hamburg.

† "Chatham House," by Stephen King Hall.

subscribed heavily.

In 1929 Sir Abe Bailey decided that the time had come to provide £5,000 per annum in perpetuity, and a number of important banks and city firms became subscribers. To-day the list of corporate subscribers includes most of the important banks and also Glyn Mills and Co., Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd., Prudential Assurance Company, Reuters Ltd., N. M. Rothschild and Sons, and J. H. Schroeder and Company. The Rockefeller Foundation has also given £8,000 per annum for the last decade, to finance the extension of research.

Indeed, the finances of the Institute have been blessed by the insouciant providence of a fairytale.

The two fundamental clauses in the constitution of the organisation from the time it was started were:

- (a) That the Institute as such could not offer any opinion on the conduct of public policy.
- (b) That its membership should be confined to British Subjects.

The expression of opinions as a result of research is left to individual members, who must be free to say what they think without prejudicing the organisation as a whole. As, in fact, however much against the legal constitution it is, the opinions of the persons connected with any institution that lie within the field of operation of that institute are by natural association instantly connected with the organisation in the minds of the uninitiated, this enables the full prestige of the organisation to be thrown behind ideas which would never be sponsored officially. Another instance of the divorce of power from responsibility.

Chatham House has invented a method of research peculiarly its own: a method of eliminating, as far as possible, all individual responsibility for the views expressed. Subjects for study are submitted to groups of experts, drafted, redrafted, criticised and examined by an advisory committee, drafted again, sent for criticism to authorities in Great Britain and abroad, reconsidered, by the group redrafted, finally revised and approved—and then published; a fine flower of the higher anonymity, however many names may be attached to it. The reports so produced are conglomerate ones with which probably no single member of the group compiling them entirely agrees. And in scientific work, as in other fields, it is a preliminary guarantee of good faith to know who is sponsoring a given idea.

The Charter of the Institute gives as the first aim and object of the Institute:

“To advance the sciences of international politics, economics and jurisprudence and the study, classification and development of the literature of these subjects.”

Much has been made of the so-called scientific attitude of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Now the essence of ‘scientific method,’ if the phrase any longer possesses a meaning at all, is the inductive approach. It is not the same thing as detachment: it is not the same thing as impersonal examination. More is required, the proof that the thing continues to act in all circumstances according to generalisations based on the detached examination. And that proof is obtained by experiment, according to the results of which the generalisation must stand or fall.

In a rather naive passage in his book, Stephen King Hall announces that “It is only in so far as we study human relations impartially, judicially, and scientifically that we shall arrive at conclusions which can be generally accepted.

That is how science has progressed.” Judgment by results—scientific method—whatever you like to call it, cannot be given as a first consideration of, at any rate, many of the paid staff of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. We cannot take seriously that “scientific” attitude which, starting from the conception of the League of Nations (at least five of the staff of Chatham House have been very closely associated with the League of Nations, three of them paid employees of the central organisations) follow its subsequent career, note its effect and its final break down and then proceed to support the new and revised edition of the League, Federal Union. It is as if the fundamental question is rather “How can we ensure that a centralised institution of this nature exists?” rather than “How can we solve the question of War and Peace?”

Professor Arnold Toynbee and his father-in-law Professor Gilbert Murray are both supporters of Federal Union, and much use is made of their prestige. Can they not judge by results?

With Soviet Russia, one of the great exponents of Federalism, expropriating the small national states on her borders (entirely in the manner of the ‘institution’ referred to by Professor Toynbee at Copenhagen) are we to believe that Federalisation will ensure the peace?

Should there be implicit faith and trust in the judgment of those who so carefully arranged the treaty that has ended in such a catastrophe? It may not have been knavery, but it was at least foolery, and at least five of the gentlemen on the staff of the Royal Institute of International Affairs were present at the Peace Conference (B. H. Sumner, H. J. Paton, A. J. Toynbee, C. K. Webster, R. G. D. Laffan) and it is worth noting that they all served in some intelligence department—either Political, Admiralty or Foreign Office, during the last War. It is also interesting that five of the members of the staff have held professorships or other positions in academic institutions in the United States and Canada. And finally, Professor A. G. B. Fisher, Professor of International Economics, was Professor at Dunedin, New Zealand, and at Western Australia, and economist to the Bank of New South Wales.

Undoubtedly the function which the Royal Institute of Foreign Affairs is filling is a most necessary and vital one, but when the taxpayers subsidise its activities to the extent of £35,000 it is time that the policy of the Institution in its general bearings, implicit as well as explicit, was reconstructed and, if necessary, altered to fit the circumstance of its public service.

The Institute provides information on the basis of which action is taken. A man’s character and opinions are the filter through which information is selected, and are bound to modify the reports presented to Parliament. Parliament is *our* Government. Do we wish it to be influenced by ideas that have already proved disastrous? E. S. E.

For THE TRUTH IN ALBERTA

Read “Today and Tomorrow”

Send your sub. to TODAY AND TOMORROW  
1016-118th Street, Edmonton, Alberta.

Subscriptions \$1.50 a year  
(at the present rate of exchange about 6s.)

You can subscribe by International Money  
Order, obtainable at any Post Office.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday's issue.

Special One Month's Trial Subscription Form

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

Please send THE SOCIAL CREDITER to me for the four weeks commencing

..... for which I enclose 2/6.

Name.....

Address.....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

BELFAST D.S.C. Group. Headquarters: 72, Ann Street, Belfast. Monthly Group Meetings on First Tuesday in each month.

BIRMINGHAM and District. Social Crediters will find friends over tea and light refreshments at Prince's Cafe, Temple Street, on Friday evenings, from 6 p.m., in the King's Room.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Study Group. Enquiries to Hon. Sec., 47, Whalley New Road, Blackburn.

BRADFORD United Democrats. All enquiries welcome; also helpers wanted—apply R. J. Northin, 11, Centre Street, Bradford.

CARDIFF Social Credit Association: Meeting of members and friends at 10, Park Place on Tuesday, 19th December, at 7-30 p.m. prompt.

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER will be obtainable outside the Central Bus Station on Saturday mornings from 7-15 a.m. to 8-45 a.m., until further notice. It is also obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Weekly meetings of social crediters and enquirers will continue, but at varying addresses. Get in touch with the Hon. Secretary, at "Greengates", Hillside Drive, Woolton, Liverpool.

LONDON Liaison Group—Next meeting Saturday, December 16th, at 4 Mecklenburgh Street, W.C.1., from 2-5 p.m. Subject: "The Menace of Federation to Democracy." Enquiries to B. M. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

LONDON Social Crediters: Lunch-time rendezvous. Social crediters will meet friends at The Cocoa Tree Tea Rooms, 21, Palace Street, Westminster (5 minutes Victoria) on Wednesdays from 1-30 to 3 p.m. Basement dining room.

The Social Crediter

If you are not a subscriber to THE SOCIAL CREDITER, send this order without delay.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

Please send THE SOCIAL CREDITER to me

Name .....

Address .....

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-
Six " " 15/-
Three " " 7/6
(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

Name.....

Address.....

TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE, THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT, 12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

I wish to support Social Credit Policy as defined in the terms of association of and pursued by The Social Credit Secretariat under the Advisory Chairmanship of Major C. H. Douglas.

I will, until further notice, contribute

£ : : , { per month, per quarter, per year,

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

I herewith enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the above mentioned funds.

Signature.....

NEWCASTLE D.S.C. Group. Literature, The Social Crediter, or any other information required will be supplied by the Hon. Secretary, Social Credit Group, 10, Warrington Road, Newcastle, 3.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: Weekly meetings every Thursday at 8 p.m., 16, Ursula Grove, Elm Grove, Southsea.

SOUTHAMPTON Group: Secretary C. Daish, 19, Merridale Road, Bitterne, Southampton.

TYNESIDE Social Credit Society invite co-operation to establish a local centre for Social Credit action in all its aspects. Apply W. L. Page, 74-6, High West Street, Gateshead.

WOLVERHAMPTON: Will all social crediters, old and new, keep in contact by writing E. EVANS, 7, Oxbarn Avenue, Bradmore, Wolverhampton.

Miscellaneous Notices.

Rate 1s. a line. Support our Advertisers.

ROOMS OR RESIDENCE, small country house in pleasant rural district, 50 miles NW. London. Replies to c/o "The Social Crediter," 12, Lord St, Liverpool.

Information on International Financiers

We should be very grateful if social crediters who possess any information bearing on the centralisation of power into the hands of the international financiers and their use of it, would send (a) a copy of it; (b) a note of where it occurs or (c) the original document, which would be returned when copied to the Editor of The Social Crediter, 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer, Social Credit Expansion Fund, c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

I enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H. Douglas.

Name .....

Address .....