

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 3. No. 26.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 9, 1940.

6d. Weekly.

WHOSE SERVICE IS PERFECT FREEDOM (XVIII)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Any objective observer of the direction in which Governments, both in Europe and America, are moving must, I think, be convinced that however apparently different their mechanisms, they are consciously or unconsciously moving towards a common end.

Perhaps the nature of this movement can be most easily appreciated if we regard the pressure, which is obviously being placed upon the nations in the direction of the surrender of their privileges to a World State, as being of the same nature as the steady filching away from the individual of the freedom of action and initiative, which he once had, in favour of the Bureaucratic or Police State. To see that the process is both continuous and conscious it is only necessary to recall and to compare the speeches of such politicians as Mr. Baldwin or Mr. Lloyd George with the words of Dr. Arnold Toynbee, to which frequent reference has been made, in regard to the undermining of national sovereignty, and his naive admission that "what we are doing with our hands, we are denying with our lips." Particularly since the Armistice of 1918, the two aspects of this policy, the regimentation of the individual and the internationalisation of governments, have been pursued everywhere, and pursued along parallel lines and to a large extent by identical methods. So long as Germany showed any tendency towards decentralisation, she was exploited by Reparations and demands, any benefit of which, of course, went to the United States financiers together with considerable taxes paid by ourselves to the same recipients. When the idea had been well driven in that only a highly centralised Germany could become powerful enough to throw off external control by war, the power of a centralised Germany was built up by the Bank of England and other international financial sources. In the British Commonwealth the same drive towards centralisation by over-ruling the Australian States through the iniquitous Federal Loan Council and the Canadian Provinces by the finance-dominated Federal Government at Ottawa, was accompanied by punitive taxes upon the individual and the systematic ruin of businesses competing in any way with those deriving their finance from central sources. Thirty-seven new central banks were formed and in most cases these were extra territorial, having all the privileges commonly reserved to the Embassies of a foreign power.

It is a well established feature of this policy which is quite frequently called Socialism, to assume as beyond discussion that the last person capable of judging what is good for him or even what he wants, is the individual

concerned, and the logical extension of this argument is that the State (i.e., a Bureaucracy) is wise and the individual is of no consequence and has no rights. I am thoroughly conscious of the fact that reason has very little to do with the situation at the stage to which it has now arrived, but it is possibly not without value to examine its contemporary results. Clearly if the centralisation of all initiative, power, rights and policy is sound, then the Dictator at the apex of this centralisation should represent the ideal of wisdom, education and, in fact, every other virtue which our civilisation is capable of producing.

Do we really think that Messrs. Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini, to mention only the more obvious of the Dictators, represent the last word in human progress? As M. Stalin was a Georgian peasant, Senior Mussolini a blacksmith, and Herr Hitler a house decorator (all of them much more respectable callings than those to which they have gravitated) are we to assume that the education and opportunities for travel which people have been accustomed to regard as one of the greater privileges of the so-called rich are, in fact, not merely useless but detrimental, since neither Stalin, Mussolini nor Hitler have any of them, and, so far as I am aware, have never been outside their own countries. Is there any sound ground for assuming that the emergence, probably with the conscious and calculated assistance of international finance, of three Dictators of this type almost devoid of any knowledge of countries other than their own, is an accident? I do not think that there is. But there is every reason to suspect that the reply given by Disraeli to a critic of one of his Chancellors of the Exchequer, "My dear fellow, of course he knows nothing about Finance. No Englishman does. That's why I appointed him." is the explanation of the rise of the Dictators, rather than their transcendent abilities, or their desire to represent the best interests of their fellow-countrymen.

I find it difficult to believe that any serious student of

ON OTHER PAGES

Mr. Keynes Advises More

Compulsion by John Mitchell

The Magician's Apprentice ... by Mrs. Palmer

The New World Order by Norman Webb

Planned Electricity by "Engineer"

affairs can accept the proposition that it's just an accident that socialised Italy lost no time in attacking and annexing Abyssinia, socialised Germany took about four years in which to embark on a career of barefaced gangsterism, and socialised Russia marched to the "emancipation," by means of bombs and high explosive, of the poor down-trodden Finns, thus causing Great Britain to pass an Emergency Powers Act, all neatly prepared, centralising all the forces of the community,—and sweeping away the hard-won privileges of centuries of struggle—an Act so outrageous in its provisions that an infuriated House of Commons demanded and obtained the repeal of some of the worst of them. The ostensible excuse for all of these attacks on liberty is the same—economic and political necessity. This economic and political necessity is ascribed by one Dictator to the machinations of the other. First Mussolini and Hitler have to make guns, instead of butter, to keep Europe safe from Stalin, and the British Labour Party demands an alliance with Stalin to keep the world safe from both of them. Then Hitler and Stalin combine to rescue Europe from the British Labour Party. I don't know at the moment who Mussolini is rescuing Europe from, but I do know who is getting the power and the money which is coming from the fantastic taxes being levied in every country whether at war or not.

Any intelligent child of six years can see, however, that if the individuals comprising each of these countries had refused to surrender to "their" Governments and Financial Institutions the civil and economic rights of property and person which belong to free men, Mussolini, Stalin, and Hitler would be minding their own business, and the rest of us might have an opportunity to mind ours.

If there is any hypothesis which will explain the events of the twenty years between 1918 and 1938, other than that

which includes a conscious preparation for the resumption of the War for the still further benefit of those who were the primary beneficiaries of its first phase, I am not familiar with it. Had it been desired to prevent another world war it could have been done by a few simple financial adjustments, by the raising of the standard of living in Germany while preventing the growth of a powerful centralised authority there, by the rapid reduction and abolition of taxation both local and Federal in every country, and by the education of the population of every country into an appreciation of the relationship between employment, production and leisure.

No one is likely to underrate the power and the prevalence of plain stupidity in political affairs. But any one observing the steady and obviously conscious misrepresentation of the facts of economics and political economy, the vicious attacks made upon any professional economist unwilling to "toe the line" so scrupulously followed by Economists of Repute, the determination to retain an unprivileged or even starving section of the population so that it might be used as an excuse for reducing the privileges of that portion of the population representing the advance which man has made over his environment, must agree that stupidity in the ordinary sense is not a sufficient explanation of what has occurred. It is too obvious that a policy of general enslavement, carrying with it bribes, some of considerable value, to politicians and officials who were willing to further it, and penalties for any who would oppose it, has been pursued systematically.

(To be continued).

(World copyright reserved).

C.S. Douglas

CANADIAN NEWS

The prosperity of Alberta under the present government was shown by Hon. Solon E. Low, provincial treasurer, in his speech introducing the budget for the next fiscal year. He quoted figures to show that the public debt, funded and unfunded, at March 31, 1936, was \$158,081,000; at March 31, 1939, it was \$154,994,000, and at December 31, 1939, \$150,408,770. The decrease in the net funded and unfunded debt in the period amounts to \$7,672,229. During the government's term of office, increased taxes had been levied only on corporations.

If the purchase of new passenger motorcars is a dependable index of general prosperity, the people of Alberta were better off last year than those of any Province except Ontario. A new car was bought for every 99 persons, while in Ontario the figure was a new car for every 82 people.

According to a report from the

Minister of Agriculture of the Province, Alberta took second place among the hog-producing Provinces in Canada during the year, and increased production by 25.16 per cent.

Calgary's "Committee of 10,000" is co-operating with Liberals and Conservatives in nominating candidates for the forthcoming elections; all nominees will submerge their party affiliations in their efforts towards defeating Social Credit candidates.

Mr. McKenzie King, broadcasting his first election speech, said:

"The decision is yours. It is not your representatives in parliament who are now being asked to decide on the present and future of this country at a time of war.

"It is you, yourselves, who are not only the masters of parliament, but, as never before, masters of your own fate.

I say to you that never have the Canadian people been called upon to make so serious a decision."

It's time he was taken at his word.

In the issue of March 1, *The Times* acknowledged the probability of Social Credit holding its own in the Federal Elections:

"In Saskatchewan the situation is not yet clear, and it is possible that the opposition parties may combine in some constituencies to unseat Liberal candidates. The exponents of Social Credit, under the banner of "New Democracy," are expected to hold most of the seats in Alberta, although if the Alberta election on March 21 reveals a weakening of Mr. Aberhart's position the Liberals will have a fighting chance of regaining the four seats they lost five years ago."

NEWS AND VIEWS

“SOAK THE RICH” EXPONENTS

No. 1—Mr. Lloyd George

Speciality—“The Land for the People.”

Start—Scratch.

Now owns about 1,000 acres of the best English land, and about the same amount of the best Welsh land, and about quarter of a million in other assets with which to keep it up.

Results:

About one thousand million sterling to the Insurance Companies. The land depopulated, about three million acres out of cultivation, and much of the rest almost ruined.

The people—well, Clarence, aren't we providing another nice war to kill 'em off?

“King Fish” Huey Long, Governor of Louisiana, was shot for “muscling in” on the “soak the rich” racket. You have to be elected to the Lodge, and work your way up.

Socialism

Liberty's dead, so hurrah for equality and fraternity. Let's all live in blocks of flats all alike, with rooms all the same size, inspected three times per day by Inspectors all dressed in the same uniform, and wear standard clothes, and talk like Economists of Repute.

PAYING FOR WAR

The following account was given by the “Belfast Telegraph” of an address given by Mr. William H. Leech at a meeting under the aegis of the Douglas Social Credit Movement (Belfast Group) recently.

Mr. Leech outlined means whereby the war could be financed without raising prices, without lowering the standard of living and without war taxation.

Students of economics, he said, knew that the war would be financed by the banks creating the money necessary and lending it to the Government, who would in turn tax the people to repay it. Banks created money by a book-keeping operation and that was called granting credit. But the people had to pay for the war twice, once when waging it and then when called upon to repay the bankers' loans in taxation. The real cost of the war was simply the amount of human energy expended and goods

consumed, which were all paid for at the time.

Even when rationing was due to an actual shortage of goods and increased production costs, there still need not be any increased prices to the people, if the Government utilised a method advocated by Social Crediters as far back as 1919—the compensated price!

As a matter of fact the Government has attempted to use it, but in an inverted form, for some commodities. Sir John Simon informed them that he is paying £1,000,000 a week to keep down the price of bread, butter, bacon, etc. That is to say that the Government in purchasing these commodities for the people is re-selling them at less than cost—this loss amounted to £1,000,000 a week . . .

The Government were charging up the loss to the people in taxation, whereas Social Credit would cancel the loss immediately, he declared.

Since selling below cost meant keeping down prices, by no stretch of imagination could that be twisted to mean inflation, which was rising prices. Of course the banks liked using the word “inflation” as it invariably called to mind the German inflation of 1923, although they were careful to omit the fact that that inflation was deliberately engineered by the German bankers.

Mr. Leech concluded by saying that the evil of excessive taxation could be cured by giving the Government the necessary powers to control the nation's money supply.

INTERNATIONAL FAMILY

An important force in Norway's foreign politics is the leader of the opposition, Carl Joachim Hambro, Speaker of the *Storting* (Parliament), who has very strongly objected to Britain's interception of the *Altmark*.

Last December, he was the President of the League of Nations Assembly which expelled Russia.

Hambro's family is influential both in Scandinavia and in Britain. Hambro's Bank was founded in 1839 in London by Charles Joachim Hambro, court banker to the three Scandinavian kingdoms.

He was made a Baron by the King of Denmark because he financed the

Danish throne when it was threatened by the revolution of 1848. He later helped to found modern Italy by a loan to Victor Emmanuel II's kingdom of Sardinia.

The Hambros have been responsible for many loans to Norway, Denmark, Finland and Greece, whose royal family is of Danish origin.

Among British members of the family are Charles Jocelyn Hambro, a director of the Bank of England who is at present chief of the Scandinavian section of the British Ministry of Economics; Sir Eric Hambro, Deputy-Governor of the Royal Exchange Assurance Co.; and Captain Angus Hambro, Conservative M.P. for North Dorset. A Danish member of the family was prominent in the recent Economic Conference between England and Denmark.

Before the war, Carl Hambro was bitterly attacked by Nazis in Norway for his Jewish ancestry.

POULTRY FARMERS IN ARMS

Through the shortage of poultry food nearly 600,000 poultrymen are losing their livings: some farms are only getting 10 per cent. of the poultry food they need. In three weeks one farmer got only 21 dozen eggs instead of 300 dozen; he had only food enough to rear 500 laying chicks instead of 1,500.

At a meeting of 300 poultry farmers recently the Chairman suggested that we should import not eggs, but poultry food, from abroad. Six tons of cereals for feeding took the same room as one ton of eggs.

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

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND.)

Mrs. PALMER'S PAGE

THE MAGICIAN'S APPRENTICE

According to an article in *Reynold's News* the army medical services are prepared to deal with expected cases of shell shock.

"To-day, all methods calculated to add to the recovery of war neurosis will be encouraged and applied under the supervision of the Director General of Army Medical Services," said Captain T. Gilbert Oakley, Chief Instructor and Command Lecturer in Mind Training during the last war.

"Patriotism and bravery can be sapped by love of wife and children," said the Captain. "This often sets up 'conflict of mind.'"

During the interview he defined nervous breakdown as a staged reaction to "save the face."

As Major Douglas says, the war would soon be over if fifty selected individuals could be distributed amongst the mine-sweepers of the North Sea, kept there during the freezing gales, and machine-gunned at intervals.

In the same way, if all the experts on "patriotism" and "bravery" could be torn from the bosoms of their families and sent to take part in "mopping up" operations among nests of machine-guns it is quite likely they would know a little more concerning reality.

Some people, of course, can be more easily spared than others.

Possibly no individual does more harm on this planet than the expert with an over-mastering passion for being expert at other people's expense.

In that delightful piece of comedy programme music, "L'Apprenti Sorcier," the magician's apprentice tries his hand at spell-binding during his master's absence. The broomsticks caper about, cats and kittens prophesy, the fire burns blue under the noisome cauldron, while strange and fearful shapes walk by night. What is worst of all, they refuse to obey orders. Confusion grows worse confounded until the master returns to set things right.

But what we are witnessing is not a comedy. It would need the power of a musician greater than the world has yet known to envisage and to express the devastating ruin creeping slowly but surely upon us as a result of the divorce

of power from responsibility.

Psychology may or may not be a science. We are not concerned with the study of its technique. We are only concerned with the use to which it is being put.

If it is being used to thicken the fog caused by the careless use of abstract words, then it is an evil thing.

The Oxford dictionary defines a patriot as one who defends or is zealous for his country's freedom or rights; from *patrios*—of one's fathers. You see how illuminating the root meaning of the word is? Men do not develop "complexes" as a result of defending their fathers, wives or children. That is the real meaning of the word "patriotism." It can have no other. A country's freedom cannot exist apart from the freedom of each man and woman in it.

Thus, while each protagonist passionately believes that the other's victory would mean a fate worse than death for wife and child, there is not likely to be much mental trouble. It comes when doubts arise as to who is the real enemy, and men begin to ask themselves what they are fighting for. Life and death become a mockery. The unconscious determination to escape from this hell is the cause of the nervous breakdown staged to "save the face," to avoid the stigma of cowardice.

But here comes the psychologist. He knows that men can only fight while they believe. He gives them an abstraction to worship, "patriotism." He believes in it himself, of course, or thinks he does.

Our job is to get people to think realistically. Let them be patriotic by all means, provided that they are very clear that it means the material well-being of their fathers, mothers, wives and children. To say the love of wife and child "saps" patriotism is poisonous nonsense.

This is a task for every Social Crediter: to go for the abstract nouns and make them materialise—or else show them up for the frauds they are.

Take Mr. Keynes, who, at the moment, is enjoying one crowded hour of glorious life. He is offering us "Social

Justice" on a plate. As described by *The Times* leader it seems quite a nice ice pudding, though it has been in the refrigerator rather a long time.

"Do have a little Social Justice," says Mr. Keynes, and the editor of *The Times* echoes him. They go down the long lines of the good Fabians, each sitting patiently waiting, napkins round necks and spoons all ready, and ladle some out on to each plate.

The funny thing about abstractions is that if you persist in believing them to be real, they become real; but their reality is something far other than you thought. They behave worse than the sorcerer's broomsticks.

You'll find on your plate a nice little capital levy on your life savings; and plenty of working class control (but who controls the "working class control"?); and iron rations; and family allowances (out of taxation); and a descent towards equality (sorry, my mistake, "advance") greater than any we have made in recent times.

Will you have some more pudding on your plate? What, you don't like your share? Have you never heard of "sacrifice" and "patriotism"?

Hush! Mr. Keynes is about to make a speech. He says, amid loud applause, that he is very sorry he forgot to put any "Social Justice" in the pudding which he made for last Christmas. That oversight has now been remedied, in accordance with the suggestions made by those present.

Various members of the party then execute a song and dance, and the proceedings are brought to a close by a recitation from an eminent leader writer, of which I can only remember the last three lines:

"Through this vale of sin and woe,
Your's the only way to go,
Your's the only Scheme we know—
Mister Keynes."

We will draw the veil over a scene where Self Sacrifice, Patriotism and Social Justice hold complete sway, subduing men's earthly passions to a correct level of respectability.

I'm sorry I can't give a longer account of the proceedings. After a few more years of reading *The Times* leading articles I may do better.

B. M. PALMER.

"THE ECONOMIST" ADMITS . . .

The war of 1914-1918 cost the British Empire £14,000 millions, or an average of £9 millions a day. In the first year expenditure was only about £1 million a day, but in the last year it rose to more than £10 millions a day.

Reckoning on the basis of three years for which this war seems to be scheduled, and taking into account the larger scale of armaments and increases in prices, it is estimated that *this* war will cost us a total of not *less* than £10,000 millions.

Lord Stamp is of the opinion that the total national wealth of Great Britain is about £20,000 millions, a figure which, of course, is likely to be very much underestimated. His estimate was obtained by placing a capital value on all land, property, mines, businesses and even private possessions. At the end of the war, if we allow old ways of finance to continue, we shall be faced with the fact that the National Debt will probably amount to this much—on paper. The only 'orthodox' way of providing this other than by taxation, which is manifestly impossible, is by means of another colossal loan from the United States, a loan which it would be

just as manifestly impossible to repay.

That is the alternative of two impossible slaveries presented to us to-day in the guise of necessity. The fact that invalidates it is that by far the greater part of the National Debt is taken up by the banks, who pay for it with *created* credit, so that, as matters stand, at the end of the war, very nearly all the wealth of the nation would be pledged to the banks (either English or U.S.A.) for the simple service of creating financial credit on the basis of the real credit of the community.

Even *The Economist* realises the staggering effect for the individual of the orthodox methods of financing the war, and in an article on January 27, which begins:

If, then, this article is frankly concerned with the technique by which inflation could be brought about, it is only because the right to do so has been earned by the drastic nature of the suggestion for avoiding inflation that have been outlined in preceding articles . . .

the following passage occurs:

. . . It was suggested last week that for genuine savings, the

Government should offer about 3 per cent. There would be no justification whatever for the payment of so high a rate on created credit. Normally, when a bank creates credit by making an advance on good security, it is performing the necessary and valuable function of turning illiquid wealth into liquid credit, and it is entitled to the going rate of remuneration for that service. But in the circumstances here envisaged it would be the community's credit that would be liquified, and the community, represented by the Exchequer, would be entitled to require that the rate of interest should be no more than the cost of handling the funds—say $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., per annum.

Well, it's got half-way there, anyway.

Whether this process, which is a normal banking method that has been profoundly misused, could justly be called "inflation" depends on the *use* it is put to. The use of created credit for the public instead of for private interests does not automatically mean "inflation." It is a weapon to be used, as is suggested by Major Douglas in his proposals for financing the war published in *The Social Crediter* of October 28, 1939, so that it may be the people that win this war, not the bankers.

TWO PAPERS and LORD SNELL

Lord Snell hoped that the Government would not be tempted to readily fall into this trap of asking the most poorly paid in the community to make any contribution by a reduction in the standard of living.

—"Daily Telegraph," Feb. 29, 1940.

Lord Snell asked why buying should be restricted when we have such a great reserve of wealth-producing power and nearly 1,500,000 unemployed. Instead of stopping the buying of boots and shoes we should set about growing more food and exporting more goods.

—"Daily Express," Feb. 29, 1940.

Social Credit Secretariat

EASTER TOUR

Speakers: Dr. TUDOR JONES.
Mr. JOHN MITCHELL.

Meetings have been arranged at:

BRADFORD on MARCH 27.

Enquiries to R. J. NORTHIN, 11, Centre Street.

STOCKTON-ON-TEES on MARCH 28.

Enquiries to A. E. THOMPSON, Langdale, 5, Dunottar Avenue, Eaglescliffe, County Durham.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE on MARCH 29.

Enquiries to W. A. BARRATT, 10, Warrington Road, Fawdon.

ABERDEEN on APRIL 1.

Enquiries to W. J. SIM, 12, Broad Street.

BIRMINGHAM on APRIL 3.

Enquiries to J. G. MILNE, 78, Baldwin's Lane, Hall Green.

LONDON on APRIL 5.

Enquiries to Mrs. PALMER, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup.
H. DIXON, 28, Chigwell Road, E. 18.

A meeting at Belfast is also being arranged, the date of which will be announced later.

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. 26.

SATURDAY, MARCH 9, 1940.

12, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.

Telephone: Bank 5260.

THE NEW WORLD ORDER

It is significant that that prize picker-over of yesterday's dustbin, Raymond Gram Swing, welcomed with marked appreciation Mr. Chamberlain's quite perfunctory references in his speech in Birmingham on February 24 to the need for a new Political World-Order, and hailed them as the Allies' real war aim. America, Raymond croaked, was delighted, and Mr. Sumner Welles was assured of a good time in London. Splendid!

A thing that strikes one is the remarkable manner in which the Allies' war aims shift and change. One might suppose that modern warfare being the deadly and far-reaching thing it is, no war—at least of the present dimensions—would be embarked on without a very imperative and definite objective. At first it was the integrity of Poland, and then it was the abolition of Hitlerism, and now the truth is revealed (how often have we not been warned by Douglas): it is for the establishment of the New World Order that we are fighting. Even Mr. Chamberlain, whose attitude up till now has always allowed of the possibility that Great Britain was fighting for something not wholly unconnected with the preservation of the British point of view, or at least the interests of her own people—even Mr. Chamberlain is not above implying that an economic bloc between Britain and France is a sound democratic objective, almost worth a world war.

The pass-word then, is "Unity"—the World State. Even if we didn't go to war with that blessed name on our lips, it is everywhere now. It is our war aim; so it behoves us, if somewhat tardily, to find out where it came from and what it is. It comes, of course,

from that quarter where all the modern bright ideas, such as jazz music, the instalment purchase, and the movies originated: the United States. And if it seems strange that Europe should have to go to America, and *after* the event, to find out what she is fighting about, we must remember that we have been kept pretty busy this last year or two re-arming, and that in any case Lord Lothian, our ambassador to Washington, asked America to do our thinking for us—in much the same way one assumes, as a maid-of-all-work slogs away and lets her mistress do the planning!

Is it a wise course, one wonders? For slaves, quite likely; but hardly for those who prize freedom of action. "The price of freedom" said Edmund Burke, "is eternal vigilance." But it is scarcely a job one can delegate. It isn't enough for us in Great Britain that Wall Street should have its "eyes skinned."

So much for its place of origin. Now what exactly is this idea that gets such sympathetic treatment on the part of our statesmen and Labour leaders and the Press, and the B.B.C.? What is the nature of this "unity" we are promised? Is it to be a natural growth? Or have we to-day, perhaps, an example of it in the curious, almost unhealthy unity of the British Press. It is a phenomenon—perhaps *the* phenomenon of the times. Something happens such as, let us say, the political demise of the late Minister for War, and the voice of Fleet Street thunders: "This shall not be!"—just as though someone had pressed a button. The unison is unbroken. The timing exact. Nothing is wanting—except the real opinion of the country.

Is that, I wonder, a sample of the synthetic unity to be aimed at in the New

World Order, in which the Planners propose to relegate all the essential functions of sovereignty on to a political plane above the heads of the individuals composing the State? We are to see—so they tell us—proud and free peoples; but with Foreign affairs removed out of their jurisdiction—an unfettered community; but with credit and currency matters placed beyond the reach even of their criticism—possessing an open forum in the shape of a free Press, strictly censored on all the vital points covered by the above. In short, a great, glorious and free World Democracy, possessing neither a policy, nor a purse, nor a voice of its own!

"Man proposes . . ." and that is actually what the Planners propose; "but God disposes." And I am quite confident that events will never conspire to allow the individual to be led up a garden path of such outrageous design—if it came to the point I don't believe the British character would submit. But without statesmanlike counsels to point out an alternative path, less crazily paved, there is danger of serious trouble, and the flower-beds are going to suffer.

Lincoln said you could fool "some of the people all of the time," and the plight of the so-called proletariat bears witness to the truth of his statement; and "all of the people some of the time," which is proved by the fact that great nations can be got to declare war to effect purposes hidden from them and opposed to their best interests. "But," he added, "you can't fool all of the people all of the time." Well, it would appear to be just exactly that last that is to be tried by Lincoln's own countrymen, just as soon as the states of Europe, or at any rate England and France, are calculated to be sufficiently worn down to say "Oh-kay, Chief" to the man that Wall Street appoints to do the job.

One can see Mr. Sumner Welles in the likeness of the dove on its first excursion from the Ark. Will he, I wonder, return in the traditional manner, to the window in Wall Street from which he set out, with nothing? Or will it be the olive branch? Or possibly the "frozen mitt"? Quite frankly, I hope the last. There are encouraging signs. It is noticeable that the voice of Fleet Street availed nothing in the case of Mr. Hore-Belisha, and that stalwart journal *Truth* went unrebuked for its outspoken articles containing the really astounding list of unsuccessful companies, association

with which had apparently qualified Mr. Belisha for the Secretaryship of the Treasury.

I have dipped into some of the Federal Union literature. There appears to be one stock argument, and all the cry is: Look at the United States. Well, I do look at it, and I am not impressed. I suspect the Unity of those States to be just as spontaneous and free as that of our own free Press. I suspect it of being just as truly a unity of the popular will as our Press is truly the voice of the people—and that is not at all.

Yet it is put forward as the model to be tantalizingly dangled before the supposedly envious eyes of struggling Europe; and it is insisted that we all want to be like the central area of the North American Continent. Why, in Heaven's name, should we? Why should we want this England, that produced Shakespeare and a few others, run like Marks & Spencers? The only advantage that can be advanced—and one that is insistently harped on—is the fact that the states of North America are not actually blowing one another to pieces. The appropriate answer to that is that there must be quite a number of the unhappy wretches among her ten million unemployed—that is the latest figure, via Raymond, who admits there is mounting debt and no openings for youth and an almost complete paralysis of enterprise—there must be numbers of her unemployed who wish their country were at war, inside her boundaries, or outside, or any side, so they might get even the equivalent of the hard-pressed German's ration.

Put forward in that manner and from that quarter to a desperately struggling Europe, the idea is really an impertinence. Man may plan and propose, but if he leaves the individual and his fundamental needs out of his calculations, matters will be disposed of otherwise—however that may be.

NORMAN WEBB.

Insidious Federalism

M. Kadmi Cohen, French Jewish specialist on the Near and Middle East, at a luncheon given in his honour by the members of the Royal Central Asian Society, put forward a "solution" of the various Near Eastern problems—including the Palestine problem—by the establishment of a federation of Near Eastern States, including Turkey.

PLANNED ELECTRICITY

The electric supply industry, like all other industries exists, or should exist, for one purpose only and that is to supply a public want.

That is, production is for consumption.

During the last ten years or so the electric supply industry has been subjected to a large scale PLANNING scheme initiated by the P.E.P. group and administered by the Central Electricity Board. In the early stages of the Board's activities it was soon evident that the primary objective of the "Grid" scheme was the ruthless centralisation of the industry in favour of finance. In short, the industry was to produce a financial result and the public interest was of secondary consideration.

The C.E.B. was invested with dictatorial powers and powerful financial sanctions in order to transform the industry on a common standard frequency of 50 cycles and "increase the efficiency of the generation of electricity."

The Board's original programme included the shutting down (forcibly if necessary) and the scrapping of about 400 power stations and the erection of 60 super-stations for the various areas with the retention of a small number of "selected" stations. These "selected" stations would function as "buffers" for the super-stations which would then always be operating on a fixed and most economical load-factor—thus saving a fraction of a penny on generating costs. No mention was made of the well known fact that generating charges only constituted a very small portion of total electricity costs (prices) to consumers.

Up to the early part of last year this "Grid" scheme was well advanced and it is certain that hundreds of power stations had already been scrapped. Thousands of electrical machines of all types and sizes, many of them in new condition, were destroyed. Although the great majority of these machines could easily have been adapted to run on the new frequency, this was not allowed. The C.E.B.'s financial powers made it possible for them to insert in all contracts for replaced machinery that the old machinery "must not leave the premises in a condition suitable for use again."

The Germans, who were obviously more awake than we in Britain, were at one time busy with a similar national "Grid" scheme, but a year or two ago

they scrapped this on the grounds of increased military vulnerability and reverted to individual self-contained power stations.

It is significant that the modern word "Black Out" originated as the result of National Grid failures, many of which have occurred during the last few years. A notable instance was that of Bradford whose "Grid" station, in 1938, was shut down for one week and 50 factories were laid idle for this period.

During the process of transforming electrical Britain in accordance with somebody's PLAN it was soon discovered that none of the councils or local authorities welcomed this "Grid" scheme and they resorted to various subterfuges in order to retain their own generating plant. They all went by the "Board" and were made to toe the line.

To cite only one of the many—Falkirk. The C.E.B. made three offers to supply electricity to this council, each offer was graded lower than the preceding one. The council replied that they could generate at a much cheaper rate themselves and would not consider the Board's offer. The C.E.B. thereupon informed the council that the subject would be put before an "independent" arbitrator and that the council would be forced to accept his ruling. It was disclosed at the following enquiry that Falkirk were obtaining 20 per cent. of their electricity for "nothing" by utilising the town's refuse disposal plant in conjunction with their power station. However, nothing must be allowed to stand in the way of these PLANNERS and the verdict of the arbitrator was, "He was sorry that Falkirk would have to lose their refuse disposal plant, but the "Grid" had got to work." He therefore ruled that Falkirk should accept the Board's offer to supply them with electricity. With regard to a new disposal plant, he would see what could be arranged later on.

Other local authorities who were kicking against losing their generating rights were told by the C.E.B. that no loans would be granted to them in the future for new or replaced plant, and as there was only one source left open to them to get the money and that was through the rates, they all unwillingly toed the line.

All this huge upheaval was

accomplished during a period of re-
armament and with a three million
unemployment figure, giving unmistak-
able evidence of our huge production
reserves.

During the last year of 1939 the
Board suddenly saw the Red Light and
reversed its policy. Stations which had
not yet been scrapped and shut down
were given permission to continue
generating, and loans were allowed for
new plant extensions. Probably it was
too late? We shall have to wait and
see when the bombing starts.

Millions of pounds have been spent
in transforming the electrical industry:
sabotaging would appear to be the better
word. It is true that many villages and
farms have had supplies of light and

power made available, but at the same
time many have not. There are many
farmers who have applied for light and
power to be installed on their farms,
past the back door of which the main
"Grid" lines are running, but initial
payments have been asked of them which
makes it impossible for this to be done.

The vital point is this: could this
have been achieved without this diabolic-
al centralisation and the consequent
wholesale destruction of plant and
power stations? The answer is, yes,
it could have been done quite easily
because one or two areas *were already*
doing it and were organised on similar
lines to the now existing "Grid" system
—but the money (loans) was not avail-

able for development.

It appears to be unmistakable that
finance has made it a first condition that
the industry should be centralised before
they would finance further development
schemes. This is "progress" through
debt, nationalisation, socialism or
dictatorship, call it what you will, and is
quite common to many of our other
industries of late. As Major Douglas
has pointed out, "behind every action is
a policy, behind every policy is a
philosophy." A policy cannot be
drawn out of a vacuum but only from
living human beings. The ultimate
result of this philosophy is world control
and the complete submergence of
individual freedom.

"ENGINEER."

From Week to Week in Parliament

PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

In the discussion on the Navy
Estimates on February 27 it was stated
that the rate of progress in the ship-
building line was now considerably
greater than in 1918, when 1,348,000
tons of shipping were produced in the
year. After the war of 1914-18 the
output declined considerably, but the
amount by which it has been increased
since the beginning of this war shows
that productive capacity, in this line at
least, has not declined.

In one constituency there are still
500-800 ship-wrights and ship-repairers
unemployed. The "normal" figure is
1,500.

There are still many idle factories in
County Durham and on Tyneside.

PENSIONS

The Old Age and Widows' Pensions
Bill provides for the payment of
supplementary pensions to pensioners by
a central body instead of by the local
authority, and it makes a means test
obligatory. It also reduces the age at
which spinsters and wives of husbands
over 65 receive pensions.

In the debate at the committee stage
of this bill the suggestion of a means
test evoked much opposition, and in the

course of it Mr. McGovern said:

"The difference between the
board and the local authority is that
you can raise a certain amount of
public opinion in regard to what is
done by a local authority, and can
carry on propaganda locally in a way
that cannot be done against the board.
The Minister can always shelter
himself or herself behind the fact that
the decision in these matters lies with
the board. If the board decides to
reduce the standard that is a grave
danger in every way . . .

"I am against this talk of a 5s.
flat rate increase; but if you say a 10s.
flat rate increase I am with you . . ."

It is a pity that Mr. McGovern, with
such sound views on the proper sanctions
to hold over your institutions, lost his
realism over matters of money.

DELAY

In spite of the Government's grimly
determined effort to wage this totalitar-
ian war to the finish there still seem to
be one or two cogs in the governmental
machinery that want oiling. Members
of Parliament asked the respective
ministers last week whether they were
aware that:—

(1) Loaded wagons of coal have been
standing in the colliery sidings for weeks

awaiting removal by railway companies.

(2) Sheep-farmers who had had their
wool commandeered at the outbreak of
war have not yet been paid.

(3) There are numerous cases through-
out the country of delay in paying the
£2 per acre ploughing-up grant, and
owing to shortage of cash thousands of
acres of land will not be seeded this year.

(4) Only two camps of the original
number of 50 promised by the Govern-
ment are occupied.

(5) Deliveries of cotton yarn are slow
and not obtainable in sufficient quantities
while spinning mills continue to be sold
at the instructions of the Cotton Spindles
Board.

NUTS AND BOLTS AND THE WEATHER

Mr. Mort asked the Home Secretary
whether he was aware that Anderson
shelters have been delivered in St.
Thomas, Swansea, for two months, but
cannot be erected owing to the non-
provision of nuts and bolts, and what
steps have been taken to remedy this
state of affairs?

Sir John Anderson: "This has been
due to difficulties experienced in obtain-
ing the necessary supplies from the
manufacturers and to delays in transport
occasioned by the adverse weather
conditions."

Mr. KEYNES ADVISES MORE COMPULSION

By JOHN MITCHELL

A FEW months ago the economist, Mr. Maynard Keynes, contributed three articles to *The Times* advocating compulsory savings. In general, the reception accorded these proposals by the general public was far from cordial. Mr. Keynes therefore, withdrew for a while, and has now come back with the same proposals painted in different colours and published in a pamphlet entitled "How to Pay for the War." The first leader in *The Times* of February 27, 1940, gives a warm welcome to these proposals for compulsory savings and tells us that Mr. Keynes "now prefers to call it deferred pay."

In a preface to his pamphlet he claims that he has "endeavoured to snatch from the exigency of war positive social improvements" and that his "complete scheme now proposed, including universal family allowances in cash, the accumulation of working-class savings under working-class control, a cheap ration of necessaries, and a capital levy (or tax) after the war, embodies an advance towards economic equality greater than any which we have had in recent times." "Economic equality" is a polite name for levelling down Socialism.

Mr. Keynes's proposal is that every unmarried man with an income of 45/- a week and over or married man with 55/- a week or over, should contribute a portion of it on a graduated scale, and that the contribution should be divided into two parts, one of which would be treated as income-tax payment, the other as a savings deposit. In the case of the lowest income groups the whole of the payment would be regarded as a deposit.

The deposit would remain the property of the contributor, and it is suggested that he would be able to use it after the war, "when the presence of additional purchasing power would help to counteract the tendency of a post-war depression."

It is encouraging to have a leading economist and *The Times* admitting that if the consumer had purchasing power *additional* to current wages, salaries and dividends it would help to counteract a post-war depression. Social Crediters have always advocated the distribution of extra purchasing power *additional* to wages, salaries and dividends to enable the products of Agriculture and Industry to be fully distributed; and in the past have been told by *The Times* that it would be dangerous and impracticable.

Now Mr. Keynes's proposals are based on the principle that the only practicable way of financing the war is through savings and taxation to the exclusion of any other source of finance, and he must obviously be aware that the Government only wants money so that it can spend it. It is clear that by the end of the war the Government will have spent all the deposits and other money which it has collected by compulsory and other methods. If it has spent it, it will

not have it. How, therefore, is it going to pay back the savings deposits or deferred pay which *The Times* and Mr. Keynes claim contributors will be able to use after the war? The Government has only two sources of money—the taxpayer and the banks. If the Government after the war taxes the taxpayer to pay him back the deposits he has been compelled to lend, it is merely taking with one hand what it returns with the other, which is ridiculous. Mr. Keynes suggests that repayment can be effected by a capital levy or tax, but this would mean that owners of capital would have to sell or mortgage their property in order to have cash to pay the tax. Only the banks, who can create credit, would be able to be purchasers, so that, in fact, under Mr. Keynes's proposals more private property would pass into the hands of the banks, still further increasing their power. Every taxpayer will be a compulsory depositor, desiring the return of his deposits, so not only will they not be able to be purchasers but will not want to be. Furthermore if they are to be purchasers (assuming it were possible) how would the increase in purchasing power which Mr. Keynes pretends to hope for be brought about? The only honest way by which the Government could obtain money to pay back the taxpayer his deposits would be by compelling the banks to create credit for the purpose and give it to the taxpayer. This is so obvious that both *The Times* and Mr. Keynes must know it. They have let the cat out of the bag, for by these proposals they admit these two cardinal facts:—

- (1) If consumers have purchasing power *additional* to wages, salaries and dividends it will help to counteract a post war depression.
- (2) The only way of finding this additional purchasing power is by the creation and issue of bank credit direct to consumers.

The Times and Mr. Keynes have, unwittingly, admitted the case for a national dividend.

It is pertinent to ask Mr. Keynes (and *The Times*) why they did not advocate this remedy to counteract the depression which afflicted Great Britain from 1930 to the outbreak of war and which aggravated the causes of war. Why was not the national debt, incurred during the last war, returned for the use of taxpayers to increase their purchasing power? Is it admitted that the bulk of this debt is bank credit loaned to the Government, and that the £250 million which taxpayers have been paying on average every year as interest on the national debt, has been paid by the Government to the banks for this costless credit? Again, if Mr. Keynes is honest about his proposals why does he not admit the inevitable implications set out above? And, why does *The Times* say of this proposal: "In its present form

it is the first comprehensive proposal which has been made for financing the war." *The Times* knows that Major Douglas put forward much more practicable proposals for financing the war sometime before Mr. Keynes published his. *The Times* has not even referred to these proposals.

Mr. Keynes professes to be actuated by a fear that wartime expenditure by the Government will cause the public to possess purchasing power in excess of the goods available for consumption, and that the result will be inflation. In the words of *The Times* leader, "... two-thirds of the goods annually consumed are consumed by people with incomes of less than £250 a year. The task which has to be faced is to bring about a reduction of consumption on the part of all except those already on the border-line of privation in the fairest possible way and in the way which will cause least dislocation."

The answer to this is clearly that the Government have already proved that they can prevent inflation by compensating the price to the *retailer* with subsidies to the producer. Major Douglas has proposed an even more practicable preventive of inflation, and one which will eliminate the necessity of the Government controlling marketing as at present. His proposal is that by Government statute the retailer's profit should be an agreed ratio of costs and that if he abides by this the prices of *all* goods to the *consumer* should be compensated with subsidies to the retailer. However much purchasing power the consumer possesses the

adoption of this proposal would make inflation virtually impossible. Prices could not rise above cost plus the agreed profit, and as the prices would be lower by the amount of the "subsidy", the consumers' income would purchase more and the demand for increased wages would be lessened. The morale of the nation would be undermined by the adoption of Mr. Keynes's proposals, whereas the adoption of Major Douglas's proposals would greatly strengthen it. The chairman of the Midland Bank in his annual address on January 27, 1940, said:

"The Government must pay for its supplies, and if taxation and borrowing from the public furnish insufficient means, resort must be had to the creation of new purchasing power by borrowing from the Bank of England and the joint stock banks."

Mr. Keynes, however, proposes that the whole cost of the war should be paid by the taxpayer out of his income. He is to be robbed of part of his income in taxation, and another slice of it he is to be compelled to loan to the Government, upon which he, the taxpayer, is to pay the interest to himself out of further taxation, and the interest in turn is to be subject to the highest rates of taxation (reserved for "unearned" income).

Contrast this absurd suggestion with Major Douglas's proposal, which starts by recognising that it is impracticable and dangerous to attempt to make the taxpayer pay the whole cost of the war out of income and that the war will have to be largely paid for by creations of bank credit, and continues by providing that taxation shall be limited to a certain proportion of the total money required by the Government. His proposal, furthermore, is that the taxpayer should receive an interest-bearing bond in return for the *taxes* which he pays, and that the banks should not be allowed to hold any of these bonds; but that instead the credit which they create should be claimed as the nation's credit and cancelled out of existence as the war-production is delivered to the Government by producers, and not allowed to accumulate as a debt of the nation to the banks.

Mr. Keynes may genuinely believe that his proposals are in the national interest, but that does not excuse him for what they would do—defraud the nation. Far from causing the "positive social improvements" which Mr. Keynes claims they would, they are summed up in the words, SOCIAL SACRIFICE. Somewhere behind the Government the financial dictators of this country have issued the watchword for this war: it is SACRIFICE. Who dictates the economic policy of this country? There is plenty of evidence to show that it is the Bank of England. Consider only a few of the utterances of important men in the past. It is stupidity to ignore them.

"The Governor [of the Bank of England] must be the autocrat who dictates the terms upon which alone the Government can obtain borrowed money."—*Sir Drummond Fraser* (1924), then *Vice-President of the Institute of Bankers*.

Who dictates the policy of the Bank of England? Mr.

"YOU ARE ENTITLED TO A TAX-BOND"

Obtainable from—

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

1/- for 100 (including postage)
2/- for 250 " "
6/- for 1000 " "

The above prices are especially low and are temporary. They will in future be adjusted up or down according to the efficiency of the leaflet in selling the book, "Tax-Bonds or Bondage", and *The Social Crediter*, from the sale of which it is hoped to recover part at least of the cost of printing and distributing the leaflet.

All readers who were sent a proof-copy of this leaflet are asked to note the alterations which have been made.

It would be only fair to take this leaflet into the chief booksellers in your town and tell them how many thousand you are distributing in the town so that they order copies at once and display the book in their window. Do this.

"Tax-Bonds or Bondage and The Answer to Federal Union" will not be published for at least a week. All those who are ordering copies please note.

Montagu Norman is its Governor.

"Mr. Norman regarded American support in returning to gold and maintaining the standard as more important than the sacrifices in debt settlement. The extent of his power well makes him the currency dictator of Europe. The Federal Reserve Board has not ignored his desires in shaping bank-rate policy. Relations between Mr. Norman and Dr. Schacht of the Reichsbank are very intimate." — *"The Wall Street Journal"* of March, 1927.

"In helping to stimulate gold production the South African Authorities might remember that this war is, in one of its minor objectives, a war to make the world safe for the gold standard." — *The City Editor of the "News Chronicle,"* February 24, 1940.

"The interdependence of the money policies of the U.S. and Great Britain, or—not to put too fine a point upon it—the dependence of the latter upon the former, has just been dramatically demonstrated. We are informed that the bank-rate must certainly be raised from 4 to 5 per cent. next Thursday. There is nothing in the present position of British Industry which would in itself call for an increase in the rate . . . The incident seems to show clearly who it is that cracks the whip and obeys the signal." — *Sir Josiah Stamp (now Lord Stamp and director of the Bank of England and Economic Adviser to the Government) in a letter to the "London Times,"* February 3, 1923.

"Nor is the growing importance of American finance in international trade an assuring event. One of the things that can be assumed as a certain consequence of the war is that finance is to hold a more important grip on international industry than hitherto, and that in their own interests communities must protect themselves so far as possible against an imperious international financial trust.

"In any event, it is quite clear that this country will have to watch not only Lombard Street, but Lombard Street and Wall Street.

" . . . For finance can command the sluices of every stream that runs to turn the wheels of industry, and can put fetters upon the feet of every Government that is in existence.

"Those who control finance can paralyse the nation, can make it drunk, can keep it normal. And in all their transactions their own interests are put first. Of course, these interests are involved in the general interest. They cannot flourish in a dead economic state.

"But they fix exchanges, bank rates, capital values, they can tighten or loosen the purse strings of Governments and manufacturers, they control the means upon which the political and industrial state depends for its existence."

—*Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, in "Socialism, Critical and Constructive,"* published in 1924.

"The Prime Minister at his interview with the junior Ministers on Monday, said the proposals which the Government submitted to the Bank of England had to be telephoned to America to see if they could be approved of there." — *Mr. Ernest Thurtle, one of the Labour Government Whips in the "Daily Herald,"* August 27, 1931.

"It was probably the banks alone who could

effectively curb the extravagances of Governments by dealing with them as drastically as with the borrowing, individual spendthrift.

"It was only the banks, who, by limiting supplies, could curb the lavishness of Governments and individuals, and control those doubtful credit schemes now being pressed upon them for acceptance at the instance of Ministers and their Departments.

"Fortunately, the real power was still in the hands of the independent banks, when they liked to combine in the public interest." [sic]. — *Lord Novar at the Centenary Meeting of the Union Bank of Scotland; May, 1930.*

"I want to urge the Chancellor again not to be too frightened of the City of London. Since the War the City of London has been invariably wrong in advising the Government . . . Rapid deflation was a mistake, and it had an injurious effect . . .

"They have been wrong every time . . . Now there is no doubt at all that they are using the whole of their tremendous influence for the purpose of restricting the raising of money for national development. Take the cause of depression throughout the world at the present moment. There is not a man who has examined it who will not tell you that a very large part of it is due to the mishandling of monetary questions on the advice of the money barons.

"These men who have mishandled this monetary question not merely advise what to do, but establish a veto upon every proposal which is made for national development.

"If you go to the City of London, what is their only remedy for depression? Their only remedy is by placing artificial barriers to prevent Plenty from reaching Want."

—*Mr. Lloyd George, in the House of Commons,* February 12, 1931.

This is only a small part of the evidence which shows that the economic policy of Great Britain is dictated by the Bank of England on behalf of a group of international bankers who have their headquarters in New York. When, therefore, we find that Mr. Keynes's proposals are given wide publicity and support by the press without any pressure of public demand, and Major Douglas's proposals are suppressed, it is at once clear that the international bankers control the policy of the press and favour Mr. Keynes's proposals as being in accordance with their interests, while Major Douglas's proposals are against their interests and in the public interest.

It is likewise clear that the only hope any Government has got of resisting the subversive actions of international bankers in face of the unanimous misleading of public opinion by the press, which the bankers will order and at the same time of remaining in office is for the public to initiate its own policy and press it upon the Government. A campaign for tax bonds has been launched. If the public will support this and also press for lower rates and taxes without inflation, they will prevent themselves from being SACRIFICED by the bankers.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Books to Read

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy
(*edition exhausted*)
- Social Credit 3/6
- Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
- The Monopoly of Credit 3/6
- Warning Democracy
(*edition exhausted*)
- The Tragedy of Human Effort ... 6d.
- The Use of Money 6d.
- Approach to Reality 3d.
- Money and the Price System ... 3d.
- Nature of Democracy 2d.
- Social Credit Principles 1d.
- Tyranny 1d.

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster 4d.
- The Nature of Social Credit 4d.
- Debt and Taxation 2d.

ALSO

- The Douglas Manual 5/-
- The Economic Crisis:
Southampton Chamber of
Commerce Report 6d.
- The Bankers of London
by Percy Arnold 4/6
- Economics for Everybody
by Elles Dee 3d.

All from

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

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

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: Enquiries to the Hon. Sec. H. Steggle, 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.

LIVERPOOL

TAX-BONDS ASSOCIATION

Mr. JOHN MITCHELL will speak on "Tax-Bonds or Bondage?" at Sandon Studio, Bluecoat Chambers (School Lane), on TUESDAY, MARCH 19, at 6-30 p.m.

LONDON Liaison Group: 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.

NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association are compiling a register of Social Crediters on the Tyneside. Register now and keep informed of local activities. What are YOU doing? Let us know, we shall be glad of suggestions. Write W. Dunsmore, Hon. Secretary, 27, Lawton Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: Enquiries to 115, Essex Road, Milton; 16, St. Ursula Grove, Southsea; or 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor.

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

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

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.)

Erratum:

In the article "Prussian Heritage", on page 11, the lines 11-12, "ending with the words 'The men that matter do not deal with outsiders'", should have read "the sense of which was that 'The men that matter do not deal with outsiders.'"

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.....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.)