

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 3. No. 20.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 27th, 1940.

6d. Weekly.

WHOSE SERVICE IS PERFECT FREEDOM (XVI)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

It is already evident that there can be no justification for easy optimism that, in the probable event of a victory of force by the Governments of Great Britain and France, the peoples of those countries are any more likely to win the peace than in 1918. Rather the contrary.

Of course, it is quite easy to blame the politicians. Everyone blames the politicians for the Treaty of Versailles, but the politicians who took part in the Peace Conference know quite well that they were hardly more than rubber stamps on a document moulded by "advisers."

Now, if matters go in the main along the same path as in the last war, which admittedly is improbable, we can guess who will exercise the determining influence. And one quite good indication that these advisers have learnt nothing and forgotten nothing, is the quality of the advice which we see in the ascendant again on economic subjects in wartime.

In a letter to *The Times* of January 12th, 1940, Sir William Beveridge, now Master of University College, Oxford, but formerly of the London School of Economics, states "In the war of 1914-1918, we were able to avoid any appreciable decline in the standard of living, except in respect of leisure, in part by realising our foreign securities, but even more by indefinite borrowing from abroad . . . Those who remember the relative prosperity of the last war, had better forget it."

I am not at the moment concerned with whether we can, or can not, enjoy "relative prosperity" in this war. It is quite beyond discussion that war is simply an extension to the limit of the sabotage which is an increasing feature of the insane system founded on the Mercantilist Theory—that a country grows rich on its exports—the bankers' theory.

All waste or sabotage obviously reduces the wealth which *might* be available, but if no one can get at the wealth which *is* available, unless a large number of "tickets" are distributed during the manufacture of "waste" goods, it is quite possible that the amount of distributed goods may *rise* almost in direct proportion to the volume of waste. That is what happened in the last war. But to return to Sir William Beveridge.

If you or I hold American Railway Stock, and sell it, we are paid in sterling. That sterling does not affect the amount of sterling in existence unless a bank is the purchaser. It is either a purchase of sterling from a foreigner, who has bought it with dollars, or a mere transfer between Britons. If, however, the purchaser is a bank or similar financial institution, its purchase by them increases the total

volume of sterling deposits and causes what Sir William Beveridge would call inflation, but I should not.

Now if this stock is physically taken to the United States and sold by the British Bank, it creates a *dollar* deposit, *in the United States*. Sir William Beveridge's theory, if it means anything at all, means that in the last war such dollar deposits were used to buy consumable goods in the U.S., which goods were imported and used to raise the standard of living in England in war time by purchases with the *sterling* obtained by the sale of the Stock. Or alternatively, that these goods replaced *consumable* goods which would have been produced in England, thus releasing producers for war production.

There is not one single atom of evidence to support this theory. It will, I suppose, be admitted by anyone not in a state of monetary hypnosis, that you can only buy in England what is on sale in England. Similarly, I do not suppose anyone would seriously contend that the import of goods which go to raise the standard of living is *greater* in war-time than in peace-time in spite of Shipping and Exchange control, or that in fact our Foreign Securities were not used to buy munitions.

Therefore, the only meaning which can be given to what Sir William says (if he understands what he says) is that we shall't be allowed to have enough money to buy what *is* produced, unless producers sell at a loss. If the Government wanted the producers' services, they would take them anyway. So that hampering the sale of their product is merely waste.

If the major portion of foreign securities were held by individuals (instead of by banks and insurance companies) and those individuals were allowed to sell them for foreign currency, buy foreign consumable goods with them, and import them free of duty and without restriction, not one of which requirements can be met, then the sale of foreign investments would raise the standard of living of the sellers.

As it is, foreign investments *do* increase our power to buy war material without exporting goods in payment. They

ON OTHER PAGES

WOMEN AND THE FUTURE By L. D. Byrne.
WHY PAY TAXES? Correspondence with an M.P.
TO WORK OR NOT TO WORK? By J. Hyatt.
"OUR GROUP"

are almost completely irrelevant to the standard of living, which is primarily dependent on consumable goods.

Then as regards "indefinite borrowing abroad" (whatever that may mean). It is always stated, and correctly stated, as a reason for not paying the American Debt (a) that we received not money but credits for war materials made in America, and sold to us at exorbitant prices; (b) that we re-lent more to our allies and Russia, than we borrowed. None of our "lendings" was repaid. Was our standard of living increased by borrowing sixpence and lending eightpence, and losing the eightpence? Or by sending enormous quantities of goods to Russia, most of which were wasted?

It is, of course, plain, that what Sir William Beveridge is concerned to prove is that making more money available does not distribute more goods, while increased taxation is good for us. All Economists of Repute are concerned to prove this.

I feel sure that they are all perfectly honest, and that they reach positions of comfort and authority, not by saying what they do not believe, but by being able to believe almost anything, even if all experience contradicts it, and to put their beliefs into such a form that the absurdity of them requires a little more analysis than most readers have the time and inclination to give to them.

During the interval between the war of 1914-18 and its resumption in 1939, I am not aware of a single suggestion or criticism which has proceeded from the London School of Economics, whose endowments were largely provided by the late Sir Ernest Cassel, which would either reflect on the monstrous financial policy of this country during that period, or would assist public opinion in an effort to obtain an improvement in it. On the contrary, a steady stream of special pleading tending to a Bureaucratic Revolution by the crippling of private enterprise of every kind except banking, has accompanied support of the incredible exhortations to "save", "spend", or save and spend at the same time, to raise prices by "reflation", to lower them by "deflation", to

return to a gold standard, as the only hope, to abandon a gold standard because it is obsolete, to reduce employment by rationalisation, to increase it—which have convinced the general public that no one can understand finance, least of all, economists.

If Sir William Beveridge, as, for many years, a representative of that institution, would explain why the war was resumed just in time to avert an economic blizzard of far greater severity than that of 1929, and what is the reason that the United States has consented to peg the sterling-dollar exchange since war was declared on Herr Hitler, while refusing to do so before, he will be serving the British Public far better than by obscuring the patent fact that, while it may be both necessary and desirable during war time to ration or even to prohibit the sale of articles of which there is a demonstrated shortage, it is not necessary, desirable, or effective to do this by monetary taxation, or a rise of prices.

On the contrary, I have no doubt whatever that if Sir William Beveridge's ideas, and those of Sir John Simon, if they are his, are not severely dealt with in the near future, there will be a disquieting and ultimately disastrous growth in the feeling that the freedom we are fighting to defend is the freedom to be exploited without redress both in peace and war.

Sir William Beveridge also makes four "practical" suggestions. Of these, it is only necessary to point out that they assume the uni-lateral expropriation of various interests, familiar to students of London School of Economics political economy. Uni-lateral settlement of differing international interests is allegedly the reason (and a very good reason) why we are at war. It is to be hoped that a protest so thoroughly sound may be raised in the field of home politics, in which it has been increasingly ignored.

(To be continued).

(World copyright reserved).

C.S. Douglas

THE BANK OF ENGLAND, 1839-1940

From the "Manchester Guardian" of December 28, 1839, reprinted by that paper on January 6, 1940.

THE CURRENCY

"A special general meeting of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Manufactures was held at their offices, Town Hall Buildings, King-street, on Thursday last, "to receive a report from the board of directors on the effects of the administration of the Bank of England upon the commercial and manufacturing interests of the country."

"[The report of the meeting, which ran to five and a half columns, contained the lengthy report of the directors on the Bank, the concluding paragraphs of which were:]

"Although it scarcely comes within the scope of their present object, the board will add a reflection upon the

subject of the undue privileges possessed by the Bank of England. That such a power over the property, and, as has been seen, the health, morals, and very lives of the community should be vested in the hands of 26 irresponsible individuals for the exclusive benefit of a body of bank proprietors, must be regarded as one of the most singular anomalies of the present day—that the secret acts of these individuals, veiled as they are even from the eyes of their own constituents, should decide the fortunes of our capitalists, and the fate of our artisans—that upon the error or wisdom of their judgment should depend the happiness or misery of millions—and that against the most capricious exercise of this power, there should be neither appeal nor remedy; that such a state of things should be allowed to exist, must

be regarded as a reproach to the intelligence of the age, and as totally irreconcilable with every principle of public justice.

"If instead of having been handed down to us from our ancestors, it had been proposed in the present day to create a joint stock bank, to be endowed with the powers and privileges enjoyed by the Bank of England, the common sense of the country would have revolted against the attempt to establish so dangerous a monopoly."

It is concluded that an institution of the same sort founded at the time the article was written would have been more suited to the wants of the community. The inefficiency of the Bank is attributed to lack of capital.

The newspaper points out that the report was written before the Bank Charter Act of 1844—but what difference did that make?

NEWS AND VIEWS

DEAD END

"We shall be fighting evil things,"
—Mr. Chamberlain.

On January 9, forty-eight hours after the general public first read about Mr. Hore-Belisha's resignation from the Cabinet, a large advertisement appeared in the *Evening Standard*. The lines displayed read: "We must have Hore-Belisha! We can't lose Hore-Belisha. He must come back to the War Cabinet. Write or wire to your M.P. AT ONCE!"

The announcement was not signed.

A letter addressed to the Advertisement Manager of the *Evening Standard*, asking the identity of the sponsors, brought back a terse note from the editor pointing out that the advertisement had been submitted to the paper by "a reputable and recognised agent."

According to the *World's Press News*, "The advertising had been offered to all national newspapers on Monday evening (January 8) and to the London evening papers on Tuesday morning. It was placed by Erwoods Ltd., who were not in a position to divulge the names of its sponsors.

"The agency told the *Daily Mail*, however, that the displays were being placed on behalf of 'an English business man—not a Jew—who is acting entirely on his own.'"

The advertisement appeared in the *Daily Express* of January 10. All other national newspapers rejected it, but it found its way into the *Yorkshire Evening News* and probably some other provincial papers.

The *Daily Telegraph* attacked the scheme in a leader on January 10:

"Misguided partisanship evoked by the replacement of Mr. Hore-Belisha in the office of Secretary for War has taken a highly mischievous turn.

"This blatant broadside is delivered anonymously; it is deliberately flashed in the face of the public like a high-powered torch in a black-out. It carries no authority; those who have drafted it remain in hiding. The public is entitled to ask who is behind it . . ."

The Newspaper Proprietors' Association was first reported to have advised its members to reject the advertising.

Later this was denied by the Association, which pointed out that the earlier report "casts an implication upon certain members who are alleged to have disregarded a decision of the council."

A letter to the secretary of the Institute of Incorporated Practitioners in Advertising, asking "whether the Profession as a body is countenancing this subversive piece of work and, if not, what steps are likely to be taken?" brought the reply, "I have shown this letter to the President (Sir William Crawford), who instructs me to say that he does not consider that the Institute could usefully take any steps."

A letter of protest to Sir Reginald Blair, M.P., has been formally acknowledged and is "receiving attention."

Meanwhile, the identity of the gentleman who wants Mr. Hore-Belisha so badly that he is willing to spend thousands of pounds in advertising the fact, remains sealed in the breast of Mr. Eric Field, managing director of Erwoods Ltd., of 30, Bouverie Street, E.C.4.

ABUSE OF FREEDOM

In a letter published in *The Times* of January 13 under the title of "Abuse of Freedom" Mr. Raymond Savage, literary, dramatic and film agent, protested against two items of a Paramount News Film, the first on the grounds of common decency, the second on grounds of public policy.

The first was a "fake" film concerning Miss Unity Mitford. "Instead of allowing this miserable affair to sink into oblivion Paramount have seen fit to concoct a film of her return journey from Germany to England, accompanied by a ribald and degrading commentary in verse."

The second item was on the subject of the resignation of Mr. Hore-Belisha:

" . . . there is a standing tradition in this country that condemnation is wrong until the facts are proved. This item begins with the most blatant publicity appeal on behalf of the late War Minister, with close-ups of his visits to various units of the Forces and an extract of him making a speech calculated to look as if he were appealing for himself at the present moment . . ."

"We are fighting for our lives for freedom, and freedom is the most precious asset in the world. Freedom of the Press, freedom of speech, and even more in these days freedom of

the eyes. Freedom, however, can be abused, and I protest that this film is the very worst abomination that the film magnates have ever dared to put upon the screen."

A reply to this in a letter published on January 18, G. T. Cummins, Editor and General Manager of British Paramount News, corrected "some misstatements" of Mr. Savage:

"(1) He says that the Belisha report began "with the most blatant publicity appeal on behalf of the late War Minister . . ." It did not, it began by stating that Mr. Hore-Belisha had resigned, going on to depict one or two incidents in his career at the War Ministry . . . (2) Mr. Savage says that the extract of the Minister making a speech was "calculated to look as though he were appealing for himself at the present moment." Why? This extract came at the end of a short sequence of scenes in the War Office, in which the presence of Lord Gort showed every reasonably attentive movie-goer that they were shot at least before last September."

He concludes:

" . . . I find one aspect of Mr. Savage's letter still more disquieting. It is evidence of the underground attacks, now gathering force, on the freedom of the press . . . To such censorship as there is editors do not object. Those, however, who bear in mind for how many generations our forefathers struggled to win that freedom would be traitors to democracy (for which Britain is fighting) if they relinquished it lightly, under the childish specious pretext that all liberty must be surrendered because we are at war. Thus, when Mr. Savage declares that, "there is a standing tradition in this country that condemnation is wrong until facts are proved," he is not merely talking nonsense, he is condemning more than nine-tenths of the Press, which deplored the removal of an energetic Minister."

Mr. Savage replied.

A footnote to the correspondence was provided (in the issue of January 20) by Guy M. Kindersley (a co-director with Mr. Hore-Belisha in one of his business enterprises):

"Journalism at its best is a noble profession, but when it is entirely prostituted to the profit motive it can be the most contemptible of all trades."

The correspondence continues.

PROFESSOR PSHAW on

THE STATISTICAL FRONT

In former times it was quite a simple matter for almost any fool to decide who was winning a war. If the enemy kept sacking your towns, putting you and your friends to the sword, levying tribute, and so on, you reckoned he was winning, while if your troops were doing that, you were. Nowadays, of course, it is much more complicated, like everything else, and ordinary people cannot be expected to know who is winning a war. It is a matter for expert statisticians.

Take, for instance, the following extract from an article by the *Daily Telegraph* naval correspondent (Jan. 1):

"Taken as percentages of the total number in each case, the Royal Oak represents a loss of 6.66 per cent. of British capital ship strength, while the Graf Spee deprives Germany of 20 per cent."

The first figure should, of course, be 6.66 recurring, or say 6.66667 to 5 decimal figures, which gives a net British Victory Index of $20/6.66667=3$. This would never have been suspected without the help of statistics, as the Royal Oak was several times the tonnage of the Graf Spee.

"The Courageous," the article

continues, "represented about 14 per cent of British aircraft-carrier strength, but Germany possesses no ships at all in this category. The three destroyers amount to 1.3 per cent. of the total number in service; while the Oxley is equal to a little under 2 per cent. of the submarine total."

The entire absence of German aircraft-carriers raises a knotty statistical problem about which the experts are not completely agreed. Some hold that the extent of the British advantage gained by the sinking of the *Courageous*, calculated as for Capital ships, by the ratio of the percentage losses, is equal to $0/14$, i.e., nil; others claim that this is unfair, since as the German number of aircraft-carriers is 0, and they have lost that number, the percentage loss is therefore 100, which gives a victory Index of $100/14=$ approximately 7, thus demonstrating the power of the British Navy in a way quite impossible without statistics. This latter result is, of course, the correct one, as the former is what would be obtained without statistics by any uneducated nitwit, and is therefore useless.

Another valuable use for statistics is the consoling of relatives by showing up losses in their true light as mere insignificant details. Thus, I am sure

that the relatives of the men lost in the three destroyers and the Oxley were immensely relieved when they learnt that these losses did not really matter, being a negligible proportion of our total strength. It will be necessary, I fully expect, to apply this method to the home front in order to maintain civilian morale. Thus, relatives of persons killed in air-raids may look forward to receiving a letter of the following type which should cheer and strengthen them in the continued prosecution of the War:

"Dear Sir or Madam,

I regret to have to state that on the 17th, ult., a civilian, female, aged 72, registered number RMUM 68, was permanently liquidated by a bomb while engaged on active knitting for the Forces. I have ascertained from papers in the deceased's possession that you were related to her in a filial capacity. I beg to state, however, that this loss represents only .0000538 per cent. of our total strength of civilians, female, elderly, capable of knitting socks for the Forces.

I remain,

Your humble obedient servant,

(signed) ALGERNON NUMBSKULL,
(Deputy Regional Controller)."

Enough has been said, I think, to show that we shall never lose the War on the Statistical Front. C. G. D.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE JEWISH RACE

'FRATERNITY'

"When we look into our Lodges and see representatives of the Hebrew nation we should be proud of the link with so old a people, a people who helped to build the great Temple upon which so much of our Masonic legend is based."
—*The Freemason*, September 12th, 1936.

"As I believe Freemasonry originated with the Temple at Jerusalem, so do I believe it very possible that its completed work will be seen there."
—*Brother William Moister, P.D.G.W. 18 degree, in the "Masonic Journal and South African Masonic World", September, 1936.*

The Jews trace their 'friendly societies' back through more than a thousand years:—

"If it be true that 'the origin of the friendly societies is probably in all countries the burial club' . . . Jewish organisations of that nature may be traced back nearly two thousand years. The Hebra Kaddisha, or burial society, was known in its present form early in the fifteenth century, and there were numerous associations resembling it more or less closely."²

These brotherhoods were, in fact, one of the outstanding features of the European Jewish communities, and every Jew was obliged to belong to one or another of them and to pay a certain fee. All the modern fraternal associations and trade unions, which mostly came into being after the middle of the last century when the Gentile administrations were

opened to Jews, had previously been 'tried out' for centuries in the Ghetto. The largest of the thousands of Jewish fraternities now scattered all over the world are to be found in the United States where they

"not only offer pecuniary benefits and cheap insurance but also serve as social centres and have afforded the machinery for national Jewish organisation throughout the United States."

The greatest of them is 'The Independent Order of B'nai B'rith', i.e., the Sons of the Covenant, which has been described as a branch of Freemasonry reserved exclusively for the Jews. It was started in New York by a number of German Jews for the purpose of 'instilling the principles of morality among the followers of the Mosaic faith'; a constitution was adopted for the administration of the affairs of

the order, the supreme authority being placed in a central body or board which was elected annually and was composed of one representative from each lodge. In the early days the order presented to the United States a statue of Liberty, chiseled by one Moses Ezekiel of Cincinnati.

It was at the suggestion of the order that a consul was commissioned to represent the U.S. in Roumania 'in order to influence the Roumanian Government on the question of affording protection to its Jewish subjects'. As there was no provision in the American budget for the maintenance of a consulate in Roumania, the order 'provided the necessary funds'. Towards the close of the century the order co-operated with the other international Jewish organisations over the employment of Roumanian and other Eastern European Jews; and these 'on arriving in New York are distributed among the district lodges'. The order was established in England in 1910, the first lodge being founded in the house of Claude G. Montefiore, a cousin of the Rothschilds. But it remained under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of America and was styled "The first Lodge of England 1,663." It now numbers among its members Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the Zionist leader, (at present touring the United States); Dr. J. H. Hertz (the Chief Rabbi of England); Mr. Neville Laski (till recently President of the Jewish Board of Deputies, the chief Anglo-Jewish representative body), and Mr. Moses Israel Sieff (Zionist, Chairman of P.E.P., and Deputy Chairman of Marks and Spencer).

A past President of the B'nai B'rith, and an honorary officer of the English Zionist Federation, Paul Goodman, has written a pamphlet which is alleged to have been intended for private circulation among members only. He states:

"This effort to unite Jews on the broadest principles of humanity . . . to protect their civil and political rights wherever threatened, has succeeded in creating an organisation of about 600 constituents spread over the whole of the United States of America and in 28 other countries, the most recently established lodges being those in Rio de Janeiro and Mexico City (1934) and in Khartoum (1935). This vast network of Jewish endeavour in the Old and the New worlds, closely linked together in one united body, moved by a common ideal represents the greatest organised force of modern times for the advancement of Jewish interests in the Diaspora [Dispersion]. In its effects, perhaps even more valuable has been the political influence which, on grounds of humanity and justice, the B'nai B'rith has been able to exercise through the diplomatic channels of the United States Government in favour of persecuted Jews in Russia, Roumania, and Germany and elsewhere. In political co-operation with the Alliance Israélite Universelle* the B'nai B'rith has for many decades been recognised as representative of American Jewry . . . B'nai B'rith was instrumental in ultimately securing the abrogation by the United States of the commercial Treaty with Russia owing to its refusal to visé the passports of American Jews visiting that country."

The part played by the late leader of American Jewry, Jacob Henry Schiff, in bringing about this breach with 'Despotic Russia' will be dealt with in a later article.

Mr. Goodman next relates how the B'nai B'rith in Palestine played 'a unique part before Zionism laid the

* The founder of which, Adolphe Crémieux, was Sovereign Grand Councillor of the Supreme Council of the Orient, one of the branches of the 'Craft'.

foundations of the Jewish National Home' and we might perhaps here note that when after the 1914 war the National Home was to be brought into being, the men 'who came to give their minds to the rebuilding of the Jewish Homeland'† were a number of well-known Jewish statesmen and philanthropists, namely Sir Herbert Samuel, Lord Melchett, Leon Blum, Max Warburg, Wasserman, Louis Marshall and Felix Warburg.

The early work of the English B'nai B'rith was, obviously, inspired from the other side of the Atlantic. Mr. Goodman writes:

"In 1912 the B'nai B'rith took up the question of the Tsarist Government's refusal to admit British subjects of the Jewish faith . . . it was felt in London that the British Government, too, might be induced to take effective action. Norman Bentwich was invited to prepare a memorandum on the question . . . this memorandum, entitled "The Russian Government and the British Nationality," was circulated among all Jewish communities, with an appeal for co-operation in obtaining signatures to petitions for representations to members of Parliament, with a view to bringing pressure to bear on the Government in order to obtain a satisfactory interpretation of the regulations concerning the freedom of Jewish travellers in Russia."

However, Sir Edward Grey dismissed the petition. But in smaller matters the organisation was more successful. A scheme was prepared, for instance, for the provision of legal assistance to Jewish immigrants desiring to appeal against their exclusion to the Immigration Boards set up by the Home Office. A B'nai B'rith sub-committee sounded the Home Office authorities to ascertain if facilities could be obtained for securing direct access to the immigrants at the Port of London for the purpose of preparing their appeals.

"On the receipt," continues Mr. Paul Goodman, "of a very sympathetic response, in accord with the intentions of the Home Secretary [Mr. Winston Churchill] the scheme was put into effect."

Since the war, the B'nai B'rith has devoted much time to creating a 'Jewish Defense' against Anti-Semitism, working, in this particular field under the name of 'Anti-Defamation-League' which 'has maintained a close watch on every form of discrimination against Jews or attack on them in print, on the radio and on the screen.'

The Jewish Year Book for 1901—1902 records, besides four Jewish "courts" of the Ancient Order of Forresters and seven Jewish "beacons" of the Order of Ancient Maccabeans, the following fraternities: Ancient Order of Mount Sinai, Grand Order of Israel, Hebrew Order of Druids, The Order of Achi Berith. There are also in England and America

"numerous lodges of Freemasons and other nominally non-Jewish fraternal societies which are composed wholly or mostly of Jews. Many Jews have attained high rank in such bodies such as for instance Max Selanick, who is at present (1903) the highest official of the Knights of Phythias in the State of New York. See Freemasonry."²

B. J.

(to be continued).

† See Herman Bentwich: "England in Palestine."

References:—

² *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*.

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. 20.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 27th, 1940.

12, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.

Telephone: Bank 5260.

"OUR GROUP"

A correspondent writes:—

"Our group dates from 1932 when so many groups were formed. It was a second attempt at Social Credit organisation. Those responsible for the first, which was premature, were the inspirers of the second, which succeeded in attracting attention at once. Its numbers grew to well over a hundred in the first year, and its officers, most of whom were thoroughly conversant with Douglas's books, addressed meetings almost nightly at the invitation of clubs and societies of various kinds. It was soon possible to organise meetings of nearly a thousand people, which the press reported adequately enough while offsetting their influence in little ways known to the professional journalist.

"Then came Major Douglas's call to action in the Buxton address. A 'bus load of group members went to hear it and the reaction within the group was instantaneous. On all sorts of pretexts or none disagreement was introduced; numerically the group was unaffected; it managed to pursue the general lines of policy advocated by Douglas; a re-organisation was effected in accordance with the requirements of this policy and the Electoral Campaign for the abolition of poverty was taken up with enthusiasm.

"Our group at that time covered a large city area, but did not draw its membership equally from all parts of it. The work of the Campaign was correspondingly uneven; but a point was reached where practically every house visited contained someone who knew of the Campaign, approved of it, signed the demand presented and induced others to do so. It is true to say that the Campaign was abandoned with reluctance by many who worked in it.

"The city is 'governed' by two

caucuses with the assistance of a third which has greater social influence than either of its great political rivals. The position reached may be described as one of perpetual deadlock giving rise to the wildest stories of corruption and intrigue never substantiated and rarely brought to the point of public examination. Probably the city offers greater resistance to Whitehall than anywhere else, because of the considerable political power generated in line with the maxim that 'practice makes perfect'. The result from the citizens' point of view is unfavourable; but with this potential source of opposition the closely-knit and, indeed, interlocked, political machines know how to deal. Locally, attack by the electorate has long been regarded as hopeless. Nevertheless, many social crediters and as many who were not social crediters took up the Campaign for Lower Rates with No Decrease in Social Services. It is impossible to say what result might have been gained. The war intervened.

"During the later phases of this development, whether from changes in personnel, the complete absorption of available energy in action, or other causes, the group ceased to meet regularly. 'Contacts' lost sight of it, and only an occasional advertised meeting drew a sufficient audience to pay for itself.

"In the spring of last year, this drift aroused concern in one or two who took steps to awaken a keener sense of responsibility. In June arrangements were made to hold regular weekly meetings, and it is interesting to recall the arguments put forward in favour of this policy. Obviously the international situation was not improving. 'Warn Europe' was the text of the best attended meetings of the preceding weeks. There was a disposition to face the needs of a

world at war, a situation which, it appeared, might give every advantage to the opposition and remove, if possible, every trace of advantage from the realism of the Social Crediter's case. The situation was exhaustively reviewed and two weeks before the outbreak of war meetings began to be held with a definite but many-sided objective: (1) To maintain personal contact and to capitalise as far as possible the increment of association arising from discussion in the hearing of each other of the rapidly developing situation. (2) To become individually *competent* to meet instantly the desire beginning to be displayed on all sides for understanding of the real crisis. (3) The creation, more uniformly, of a wider competency to deal with all matters of Social Credit. (4) To keep in step.

"The outbreak of war suspended the arrangements made for a meeting place and alternative rooms had to be found; but it trebled the attendances and redoubled interest in the situation and the nature of the Social Crediter's task in relation to it. Stragglers began to return. The uncharitable said it was because 'talk' had again become the order of the day. I am convinced that this is not by any means wholly true. Every week comes news of fresh contacts which, even if they do not join in our rather advanced expositions, are important additions to that army which is being marshalled by events and, not, I am convinced, wholly unconsciously, awaits the 'psychological moment'. At the same time a provisional sifting of new material for action (which is keenly awaited) is going on.

"I am afraid I have sent you a rather generalised account of our group. I wonder what is happening to other groups?"

Fighting Hitler in the U.S.

Mr. Duff Cooper, former Secretary of State for War, remarked in an interview before he sailed to the United States for his recent lecturing tour, of his immediate purpose: "I think there is only one thing now."

On his tour he has been advocating a Federated Europe, and early in January he spoke at the United Palestine Appeal Conference in Washington, receiving a tremendous ovation.

One of his audience said "There spoke the heart of England. Israel stands with England in this war as in the last."

WOMEN AND THE FUTURE

Outline of an address to the Second Provincial Conference of the Women's Auxiliaries of the Alberta Social Credit League. (December 13, 1939).

By L. D. BYRNE

I feel sure that the men will forgive me if I proceed to ignore them for the remainder of the afternoon. I believe that I can make the most useful contribution to your deliberations at this Convention if I devote the time at my disposal to thinking aloud on certain aspects of the situation which are of vital and, as each day passes, are becoming of increasing importance—not only to every one of us, but to every individual who is living in these momentous times. The first part of my talk will be devoted to giving you my views—and they are very definite and unqualified views—regarding the important part which women will play in moulding the world of to-morrow.

To any one who has studied the question, it is axiomatic that the future of humanity will be decided, not by the thoughts or actions of the few, but by mass thought and mass action.

If a people have no collective mind, you have a very unhealthy organism. You have a social body without a mind and that is a symptom of lunacy. What we are witnessing in the world to-day is the result of this social lunacy and I think you will agree that the evidence is overwhelming. The absurd economic paradoxes we find on every hand, the utter failure of governments, the stupid and unnecessary conflict within the life of all nations, and so forth, I do not need to elaborate—these should leave no doubt regarding the prevailing social insanity. We have to restore to the social body the collective mind without which society cannot function. That is the essential task which confronts us.

EMOTION AND REASON

Right action in the individual is the product of right thinking. The same applies to a nation. Right mass action is the product of right mass thought. And I use the word "right" in the sense that what works best is right.

Now it is a fact which can be demonstrated, that mass thought and mass action are not the result of reason but rest entirely upon emotion; and that brings me to the question of why I asserted so definitely that the future of humanity rests largely with the women of all nations.

There is a sub-conscious thinking, which enables women to arrive at uncannily right conclusions without the laborious process of reasoning; when men discard reason and depend on emotion, they usually arrive at the wrong conclusion and their actions—or, if you prefer, reactions—are correspondingly wrong. I do not need to emphasise the tremendous importance of this inspiration and direction in his life which Man, the doer, derives from Woman. How different recent history might have been, had Herr Hitler had the benefit of this influence in his life!

If these views commend themselves to you, then I know you will realize the importance of your work in shaping the future through your influence in the life of this Province, and the tremendous responsibility in this respect which rests upon you.

NATURE OF THE WORLD CONFLICT

And now let us turn to the world situation which is confronting us. In the last resort, the conflict which is

taking place on a universal scale is reflected in everything that happens in this country, in this Province and, in fact, in this city. I do not propose to refer specifically to the war which, day by day, is developing with such appalling swiftness and inevitability. Those of us who have thought about these matters knew that the war would come and we had no illusions about the terrific nature of the conflict which would be precipitated. However, those who, in the past, have considered us alarmists and who did not give thought to these matters, are appalled at the developments which are taking place and because they do not realise the issues which are involved, they cannot view the situation in any light other than the surface appearance.

The war is but one phase of a universal conflict between two opposite and mutually irreconcilable philosophies of life, and of social life in particular. As I hope to show you, the clash between these two philosophies is the clash between Christianity and Paganism and all that those two terms imply.

The basis of the Christian social philosophy is "Love thy neighbour as thyself" and a recognition of the sanctity of human personality. The foundation of Christian society is "freedom in association" and on the administrative side of Christian sociology, the teaching is perfectly clear: "He that would be greatest among you, let him also be your servant."

Now if you examine these principles, you will find that they imply the sovereignty of the people exercised with generous tolerance and understanding as between individuals, and the administration and management of a community's affairs by persons who are qualified by virtue of their desire to serve. You will recognise at once that these are the basic principles of Democracy or that form of society under which government and the management of a people's affairs yield them the results and conditions which they want. And I believe it is already clear to you that a Social Credit order and Democracy are synonymous terms—for a Social Credit order envisages a functioning political and economic democracy.

In violent contrast to the social philosophy which is common to the Christian Ethic, Democracy and what we term "Social Credit", we have what I will describe as the social philosophy of Paganism. The basis of this philosophy is the Jungle Law—"might is right"; "the strongest or most cunning must rule"; "the survival of the fittest";—these are familiar phrases which are the product of this concept of human society. The regimentation of the many by the few, rule by force, trickery and coercion, have been the dominant features of this social philosophy in practice down the ages. It is in every single respect the complete inversion of the democratic concept of society. Sovereignty of the people, freedom of the individual, the sanctity of human personality and the brotherhood of man simply have no meaning and cannot exist within this pagan social philosophy. People must be regimented, they must be made to do what is good for them, they must be kept in subjection by force—by, of course, the few individuals or, in some instances, the single individual, who has assumed supreme power. He is the

State and the people merely exist to serve the State. He is the infallible head of the State's institutions and the people must conform to the requirements of those institutions.

In contrast to this, the democratic or Social Credit viewpoint is that the State exists to serve its individual citizens as do the institutions of the State.

WORLD TYRANNY

Totalitarianism is the natural product of the Pagan philosophy and its outcome must be the complete enslavement of mankind to an all-powerful world dictatorship by a handful of men. If this ever materialized, mankind would be forced—and when I say “forced” I mean *forced*—to live under conditions in which their minds would be moulded from childhood, their lives would be regimented from the cradle to the grave, initiative would be destroyed and deliberately crushed, idealism would be treated as a crime, culture would depart from the human race, and people would be conditioned to live as animals of a lower order. I am now talking of what would be the ultimate end. You will realise that men and women will never submit to anything like this, and that any attempt to impose such a universal social system upon the human race would lead to bloodshed and violence on a scale which would almost exterminate mankind.

Yet, what we are witnessing in the world to-day is a deliberate, concerted and fanatical attempt to establish just such a social system and the universal conflict is the product of the clash between the Christian social philosophy and the Pagan social philosophy.

I do not need to point out to this audience that the persons who are responsible for the attempt which is being made to enslave humanity are the persons who have gained control of the international ramifications of the financial system. The financial system is the means which they are using to gain their ends, and it is important only to that extent. It is for this reason that we Social Crediters have focussed, and are focussing, our attack on the financial system because that is the instrument through which those we are fighting retain and exercise their power—while at the same time we are engaged in invoking “the emotion of the ideal” to secure mass action to establish the democratic social system through which alone we can establish a Christian social order.

If I have given you a clear picture in your minds of these two irreconcilable and conflicting social philosophies, and if you realise, as I feel sure you do, that we are witnessing a fight to the finish between the adherents of these two social concepts, you will concur that there can be no compromise in this fight. Every victory for one of the principles identified with the totalitarian or pagan ethic is a defeat for the forces of democracy and Christianity.

SOCIALISM AND TOTALITARIANISM

That brings me to an aspect of this question upon which I want to merely touch. For a long time a great deal of propaganda has been disseminated to persuade people that the conflict of ideas in the world was between Democracy and Socialism on the one hand and Totalitarianism and Fascism on the other. This is far from the truth. A study of the principles of Socialism according to the gospel of Karl Marx, and the philosophy of which they are the product, cannot by any stretch of imagination be identified with democracy. They are the essence of Totalitarianism. Fascism is a product of Guild Socialism. Naziism is National Socialism; and the totalitarian system of reasonably

well-fed slavery that has been established in Russia, is also claimed to be Socialism in action by those operating it—and they should know. In those countries we have Socialism in one form or another in operation. “By their works shall ye know them.” The fact is that the basic principles of Socialism are indistinguishable from the basic principles of Totalitarianism. There is, in fact, no fundamental conflict between Socialism and Totalitarianism in its various forms—whether it is called Fascism, Naziism, Sovietism or anything else. But there is a fundamental conflict between Socialism and Democracy and that is a conflict which is going to assume increasing importance—not only as between country and country, but within all countries. It is no accident that the present alignment of nations is between those that have adopted the totalitarian social system, and those whose peoples have, as an integral part of their character, the democratic ideal. And it is no accident that the British Empire, the bulwark of the forces of democracy, because of the traditional characteristics of its peoples, is being attacked by the powerful forces striving to eliminate that social philosophy from the world. I will let the matter rest there.

Finally, I want to leave with you one more thought. I do not believe that this conflict which is being fought out in the world to-day is merely a conflict on a physical plane. I believe that we are witnessing an age old clash, and the final phase of an age old struggle, between what might be very properly termed the powers of Light on the one hand and the powers of Darkness on the other. It would be perfectly correct to describe the conflict as between Christianity and Anti-Christianity or, if you prefer, Paganism. Each of us is a human instrument through which these conflicting powers are working, and to each of us comes the opportunity to be used on one side or the other in this battle of the ages. That is a responsibility which none of us can escape. On the ultimate outcome of the struggle, there can be no doubt whatever; but in terms of human suffering it is vitally important how quickly the forces of Darkness, led by the Father of Lies, can be overthrown. In this work you and I and all the tens of thousands of men and women throughout the world who have the great privilege of being instruments in this work to establish Christianity as the basis of the social system of the future, can and must give leadership which will invoke the emotional power of entire peoples to this end. In order to do so, we must work as though our lives depend upon it—and I assure you that they do.

AN EFFORT WORTH MAKING

Enclosed in this issue you will find a reprint of an article in leaflet form which is published as an aid for increasing the circulation of the paper.

Parcels of this leaflet, not exceeding 100, will be sent to any reader on application—free of charge on condition that an undertaking is given that all leaflets will be distributed.

These are leaflets worth sending to friends and acquaintances and to local organisations, and can with profit be pushed through the doors of houses in better class streets.

VOLUNTEERS PLEASE

Mrs. PALMER'S PAGE

TO WORK OR NOT TO WORK---

By J. HYATT

"He could not emancipate himself from, nay, it did not even occur to him to feel, the bondage of the ideas in which he had been born and bred."

—Samuel Butler in "Erewhon."

One of the ideas in which we have been born and bred from which it is hardest to free ourselves is that if an individual deliberately avoids work he is both lazy and worthless, and is utterly to be condemned.

We may ourselves understand that the whole growth of civilisation has taken place through man's gradually inventing easier ways of doing things and more comfortable ways of living, but still there is a stigma attached to "saving oneself work." In almost every walk of life and even in many homes, on the approach of the superior being, all the "inferiors" immediately set about being much more busy than they were previously, to show their great virtue and complete immunity from the charge of idleness.

In the "lower classes," however, there is a large section of the community in which these ideas have absolutely no sway, and this is one of the few things at which I have heard grown people expressing awe and amazement. It is quite shocking at first to find that there are people who do not wish to work, and do not mind being seen doing nothing; that they not only expect to receive things "for nothing," but often express downright grievance if they are required to pay a nominal sum for them.

The fact that they are there, and that they are really like this, has become widely known through evacuation. Helpers in the reception areas have come into contact with this attitude of mind en masse, many of them for the first time, and it has shaken some of them considerably. In the face of these women, sitting gossiping round the fire of the local centre, expecting things to drop into their laps, and letting their "under-fives" rush wildly around banging *ad infinitum* ("Oh, 'e's always like that, 'e don't take no notice what I tell 'im") they lose any faith they previously had in human nature and become "planners" in the sense that they cannot help but feel they know what is good for other people. They tremble to think of more purchasing power going hand in hand with such ignorance and lack of responsibility.

Similarly, in industrial districts for

years one has heard (from those in work, and above the level of the pay in question) the condemnation of the system which leads a man to refuse work because he is better, or equally well-off 'on the dole'—"It's all wrong!"—all wrong that he should be able to refuse work, particularly when there are riveters *needed*, as I was told recently is the case on the Tyne.

Up there I was told that if men were free not to work, no work would ever be done again. Definitely it is not democracy which is believed in, but a benevolent dictatorship. (A good 'old Socialist' whom I once challenged on this point said, "Well, you won't find many anarchists like you people!").

It is a question which comes up much more readily at the moment than of recent years, and we can face people with it without seeming unnatural. They are glad to be faced with it—it crystallises the question for them. Do we believe in the individual sufficiently to think he may be free, or do we think he needs to be shackled, or at anyrate kept at work (or sufficiently penniless on the dole not to be harmful) because of his vicious nature?

One remark repeated most often is, "They have no sense of values," another form of which is, "They don't know the value of money." This may or may not be true; their "values" are certainly not the same as those of their critics, but possibly they may in some cases be more realistic.

For the mothers of the "under-fives" in one district of this reception area, there is, fortunately for all concerned, a large house where they can come during the day. There are sixteen mothers and twelve come regularly. The house is very barely furnished, all the furniture having been given, but they have the second floor to themselves, with heating and two bathrooms. Continuous hot water allows them to wash their children's things. They pay ½d. per week, and are expected to take it in turns to keep the place clean. It is swept each day and scrubbed once a week. They take it all absolutely for granted, "And what is more," said my

friend who is in charge of the house, "they get the most extraordinary ideas!" He had received a request that they might have another brush to keep upstairs, to save coming down to the ground floor—"and they use it once a day!"

I repeated this to a most considerate and gentle colleague, reminding her there were two flights of stairs. She immediately said she thought it would do them good to go down and get the brush. I accused her of being a planner, whereupon she said perhaps the point was "Could the house afford to buy the brush?" ("Where's the money to come from?")

We are all tied up with methods and side-tracks for the benefit of other people's souls. These women demanded a result—a brush where they needed it, never mind where it, or the money to buy it, came from. There are plenty of brushes.

The Dean of Canterbury

In a book recently published, the Dean of Canterbury, after explaining that during the last war he studied and worked with Sir Drummond Frazer, Manager of the Union Bank of Manchester, says: "It was at this time, with these new interests, that I came across Major Douglas and the Social Credit Movement, perceiving at once what appeared to me to be the essential correctness of his analysis and its bearing on social problems. If later I have moved on to other solutions, it has been on moral and practical rather than technical grounds, and because a wider horizon had, in the meantime opened up."

In welcoming this public detachment of the Dean from the Social Credit movement, it is only necessary to observe that the "other solutions" to which reference is made are solutions to other problems, distinct from and, in our opinion, incompatible with the problem of securing the free and full development of individuals in society.

T. J.

WHY PAY TAXES?

CORRESPONDENCE WITH AN M.P.

R. A. Pilkington, Esq., M.P.
House of Commons.

29th September, 1939.

Dear Sir,

Upon the outbreak of war Parliament voted £500 million for the prosecution of the war and it became clear immediately, even to persons who did not admit it before, that money is going to be manufactured without limit as long as the war shall last.

Under these circumstances nobody can justify the recently announced savage taxation which will do more to cause dissatisfaction and discontent amongst our people in this national emergency than any other cause.

When are you going to do something for the people you represent?

Yours faithfully,

JOHN M. BRUMMITT.

2nd October, 1939.

Dear Mr. Brummitt,

In the absence of Captain Pilkington I have received your letter of the 29th September. He was very anxious that so far as possible his work should go on as usual in his absence, but I fear that I am hardly competent to answer questions on such abstruse subjects, and probably if I passed your letter on to the Treasury the official answer would hardly be satisfying to you. Though naturally I will do this if you wish.

Perhaps Captain Pilkington's answer would be similar to that he gave you in his letter of the 2nd August about the impracticability of borrowing money for recurring needs. For the rest, the general view seems to be that voiced by Mr. Churchill in his broadcast last night, when he said the Budget, "gigantic in its burdens . . . which would have infuriated everybody a year ago, has been accepted with prompt and stolid resolve . . ."

With regard to your last sentence, asking when he was going to do something for the people Captain Pilkington represents, my only answer is that he is now fighting for them.

Please let me say once more that my job is to do anything I can to retain the link between Captain Pilkington and his constituents, and if there is anything I can do to help I shall be more than happy. I am writing to him weekly telling him of his correspondence, and I shall naturally tell him of your letter.

Yours very truly,

N. WILSON,

Private Secretary to
Captain Richard Pilkington, M.P.

23, St. Stephen's House, S.W.1.

To Captain Pilkington, M.P.

3rd October, 1939.

WHY PAY TAXES?

Dear Sir,

I understand that you are now serving with the colours and that your private secretary is dealing with your correspondence. I have had such a courteous and restrained letter from him that I am encouraged to continue the pressure of the elector upon his representative in the hope that he will be able to initiate action, even by proxy, which will culminate in freeing us all from the serious and unnecessary infringement of our freedom through the agency of the financial system.

The only point which I have tried to make in all my letters is that money is made out of nothing and that there is no limit to the amount which can be made. This is obvious.

The deduction which I make from this is that the Government can obtain money without robbing the people of it, i.e., taxation is unnecessary. All taxation is unnecessary.

I am forced to the conclusion that those persons who inflict the savage taxation which was announced a week ago, cannot be ignorant of what they are doing, and must therefore acquiesce in the policy of impoverishment which is being so effectively enforced.

The press, which is also an agent of the same policy, would have us believe that the public doesn't mind paying the taxes at all, and even likes it. Prominence is given, as you point out, to Mr. Churchill's pronouncement that the gigantic budget has been accepted with prompt and stolid resolve.

Having invited many opinions on the subject I can assure you that we, the people, simply hate being taxed and quite definitely do not accept it, and most certainly want it abated, if not abolished.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, instead of serving the people, has constituted himself an omnipotent and overbearing task-master. He must be brought to see that we are still a sovereign people and it is our place to give orders not to take them.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN M. BRUMMITT.

N. Wilson, Esq.,

Private Secretary to Captain R. Pilkington, M.P.

7th November, 1939.

Dear Sir,

As it seems more than likely that the people of this country are going to lose under the cover of war what little freedom and security they might otherwise enjoy, I am writing to point out that there is an alternative.

It is contained in the marked passage on page 2 of the enclosed copy of *The Social Crediter* for 28th October, 1939.

In the event of Captain Pilkington not being available for the consideration of the proposals made in it, I am

asking you to refer it to the next person most competent to deal with it.

As the preservation of morale on the home front is not less important than on the battle front, I look for an early report upon the proposals.

I shall also be pleased to hear whether Captain Pilkington has had any comment to make upon the miraculous appearance at one fell swoop of the £500 million voted by Parliament for war purposes.

I appreciate your considerate reply to previous letters from me and I do now urge you to attach the greatest importance to these matters. There is nothing of greater importance.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN M. BRUMMITT.

14th November, 1939.

Dear Mr. Brummitt,

Thank you for your further letter. I am making inquiries and will write to you again as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,
N. WILSON,
Private Secretary to
Capt. R. Pilkington, M.P.

1st December, 1939.

Dear Mr. Brummitt,

The official to whom I put your theory regarding money is not able to give what I think you would consider a satisfactory answer.

In short, he considers that if all producers were suddenly relieved of the necessity of covering their costs in the prices at which they sell because of a subsidy on all purchases, the resultant effect would be a terrific slump; and that the basis of Major Douglas's Social Credit scheme is neither rational nor economic.

I understand that although Major Douglas appeared as a witness before the Macmillan Committee and was given every opportunity to explain his views, so little were they substantiated in the opinion of the Committee that they

were not even alluded to in the Report.

Yours very truly,
N. WILSON,
Private Secretary.

About 5th December, 1939.

[Letter written to Miss Wilson stating that an anonymous opinion is always suspect, and asking for name and office of official who pronounced Major Douglas's proposals neither rational nor economic.]

11th December, 1939.

Dear Mr. Brummitt,

Thank you for your further letter. The official in question was in the Treasury, and all such officials always are anonymous.

Yours very truly,
N. WILSON,
Private Secretary.

27th December, 1939.

Dear Mr. Brummitt,

By all means publish the correspondence. By this I mean, for my part, my letters of the 2nd October, 1st December and 11th December that is, if anyone is sufficiently interested to read them.

As regards your remark "this amounts to saying that nobody is ever responsible for actions taken and official opinions given" I am sure you cannot really believe this is really what it amounts to. Surely you should think of Government Departments as corporate bodies not as individuals. However, I despair of our ever reaching agreement about anything—and really I can only refer you to Captain Pilkington's earlier letters and mine of the 2nd October because we don't seem to get any 'forwarder.'

With all good wishes.

Yours very truly,
N. WILSON,
Private Secretary to
Captain R. A. Pilkington, M.P.

Perhaps you will let me know where and when you propose publishing the letters?

TYRANNY

That a Government Department is turning out cottagers in North Wales at a few days' notice, to facilitate its schemes, but without regard to alternative accommodation, was alleged at a meeting of the local authority concerned to-day.

Altogether, more than 100 families, including farmers, are affected. Last Saturday, it was stated, 23 cottagers received registered letters telling them that they must turn out in three or four days, in spite of the fact that there was not a single empty house in the

neighbourhood.

What one member complained about bitterly was not with reference to those cottages which were in the way of railway and road construction, but which were required to house workmen engaged on the contracts.

Even if lodgings were found by these dispossessed families, it was pointed out, they would have nowhere to store their furniture.

The chairman said he was amazed to hear that people were being evicted by a Government department that did

not appear to concern itself whether these people would have a roof to go under elsewhere . . .

Another member said that, in fairness to the Government, all the people living in the area had been told months ago that the whole of the property would be taken over.

The Council resolved to send a telegram to the Government protesting strongly against the eviction of householders at such short notice without provision being made for alternative accommodation.

—"Liverpool Echo," Jan. 18, 1940.

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. Monthly Group Meeting on First Tuesday in each month. Special Open Meeting on Third Tuesday in each month, to which the public is invited. All meetings in the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at 8 p.m. Correspondence to the Hon. Sec., 17, Cregagh Road, Belfast.

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 Association: Weekly meetings every Tuesday evening at 7-30 p.m. at the Friends Meeting House, King Street, Blackburn. All enquiries to 168, Shear Brow, Blackburn.

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

CARDIFF Social Credit Association: Members and friends meet at 10, Park Place on Tuesday, 23rd January at 7-30 p.m. prompt. Enquiries to H. Steggle, Hon. Sec., 73, Romilly Crescent, Cardiff.

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, January 27th, at 4, Mecklenburgh Street, W.C.1. from 2-5 p.m. Subject "Action Now." Tea 3d. 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.)

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.

Have You Noticed?

- Have you noticed that among the best 'pamphlets' are selected issues of The Social Crediter?
• While informing on the vital matters of the day, these back numbers contain other paragraphs which, no longer topical, illuminate the transit of events.
• They reawaken vigilance among those who love liberty.
• Search your files and order from— K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

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

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., at 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.

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.....