The Social Credit Secretariat

In former years The Social Credit Secretariat employed as many as four paid assistants. Assistance at this level is well beyond present resources. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that without adequate attention to routine our whole effectiveness at this critical time has or will become stultified. This fact has been brought prominently to light by two circumstances, one favourable and one unfavourable. To our observant and interested eye, there has occurred a loosening of the minds of the abler elements of the community. The unfavourable factor, however, is the increasing pressure on the Belfast office, operating as it does with no paid assistant to Mr. L. A. Lyons.

Here we would remind Social Crediters of the relevant sentences in our Statement of Constitution authorised by Major Douglas. This statement should be read and re-read by everyone. The sentences are:

“For the avoidance of some at least of the difficulties incidental to interaction between the general public and a community of persons within it, as much as possible of the routine work of the Secretariat (i.e., matters of business, etc.) as well as all contractual obligations is handled, on a contractual basis, by a Company, KRP Publications, Ltd., formed by Social Crediters and incorporated under the Companies Act, 1929, on April 17, 1939. The primary function of the Company is that of a publishing business, as its name implies. The property, THE SOCIAL CREDITER, is in its ownership; but control of the policy of the paper is in the hands of the Secretariat in the persons of the Company Directorate. So far as possible, the remuneration of the Company for services rendered to the Secretariat is an annual sum estimated to be the equivalent of the remuneration of one relatively junior person employed by the Company. The Directors are unpaid, and in this as in other respects the rule is absolute that no financial benefit to any individual shall arise from the exploitation of his services to the general body of Social Crediters. (The just source of financial support for such activities as those of Social Crediters should be the National Dividend, for an account of which the reader is referred, if necessary, to Social Credit literature. Political agitation—at least as a profession—would disappear from a properly constituted political society. Technical instruction and research, as well as the enrichment of society by the spread of original ideas, e.g., science and literature and the fine arts, are not envisaged under this heading.)”

The subsidy necessary to keep The Social Crediter in existence now already exhausts the resources of the Secretariat. It has been decided that we should take steps to provide Mr. Lyons with paid assistance in Belfast. The Secretariat’s resources must therefore be augmented, and it becomes necessary to invite Social Crediters to assist in this direction.

The nature of this urgent requirement presupposes continuity of the support necessary to meet it. Through The Social Crediter and by other means, the Director of Revenue will be issuing a further statement very shortly on which it is hoped all Social Crediters will act to meet this organisational necessity.

William Lourival Bardsley

We learn with deep regret of the death, suddenly on January 2nd, of Mr. W. L. Bardsley, Secretary of the Social Credit Secretariat Limited, from 1933 until 1938.

One of the very few to attain to a comprehensive understanding of Douglas’s economic proposals, Mr. Bardsley was educated at Winchester and Oriel College, Oxford, his University Education being interrupted in 1918-19 by service as an officer in the Grenadier Guards. His later career, before and after his stay in the Secretariat, was in business. During the Second World War, however, serving in the Royal Army Ordnance Corps, he was posted as a Staff Captain in the Department of Director of Projectile Development, Ministry of Supply, rising to the rank of Lt. Colonel.

Mr. Bardsley leaves a wife and son to whom our deep sympathy is extended.
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From Week to Week

In a letter to the Daily Telegraph (November 20, 1959) Mr. Cyril Osborne, M.P., quotes figures of income as published by Her Majesty’s Statistical Office relating to National Income and Expenditure Accounts.

The point which Mr. Osborne is concerned to make is that the number of those who over a ten year period have moved from a ‘low’ to a ‘higher’ income bracket. The figures he gives are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of income after tax</th>
<th>1949 thousand</th>
<th>1958 thousand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£ million</td>
<td>£ million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-250</td>
<td>13,040</td>
<td>5,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-500</td>
<td>10,140</td>
<td>8,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-1,000</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>7,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,000</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-4,000</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-6,000</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in the ten years covered the purchasing power of income has decreased to about one third of its earlier value, so that the income ranges restated in terms of current purchasing power are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
<th>1949 thousand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-83</td>
<td>13,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-166</td>
<td>10,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166-250</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-333</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333-666</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666-1,332</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,332-2,000</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1949 there were 10,140,000 getting from £250-£500; in terms of corrected purchasing power, in 1958 there were 4,715,000 receiving incomes in the range of £250-£666, while those receiving incomes in excess of £2,000 had fallen from 89,100 to 900.

With so broad a classification of income groups these figures may not be accurate, but the trend they indicate is the opposite of what Mr. Osborne supposes from the unadjusted figures.

A second table quoted by Mr. Osborne is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of income</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after tax</td>
<td>£ million</td>
<td>£ million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-250</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-500</td>
<td>3,529</td>
<td>3,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-750</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>4,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-1,000</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,000</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-4,000</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-6,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these figures it may be determined that the total income in excess of £2,000 per head of those receiving such incomes is £161.2 million, and that the number of those receiving incomes below £2,000 is 25,955,000, so that if the excess above £2,000 were distributed to those receiving incomes below £2,000, it would amount only to £6.4s. per head per annum.

Total incomes after tax are: 1949 £7,930 million, and 1958 £14,220 million, but converting the latter figure in terms of its relative purchasing power we get the total of £3,740 million—less than half the 1949 figure.

According to Mr. Osborne, Labour is today neither Methodist nor Marxist, and so lost the election. It may be so. But progressive taxation is a Marxist policy, proclaimed as such in the Manifesto. Doubtless that is why the ‘Conservatives’ won.

Labour and Conservative alike appear to be quite unable to conceive economics in any other terms than monetary and this, as much as anything else, must be why the greatest despoliation of a population in history has passed practically unnoticed.

The real basis of what the Marxists call the exploitation of the working class is the concentration of production on non-consumer goods, and production for export in excess of imports. The latter process as we have pointed out before alone has lost to the British thousands of millions of pounds' worth of goods, and the loss is to be accelerated in a mad competition with the U.S.S.R. under the guise of ‘co-existence’. The Communists, however, whose exploitation of the working class is quite calculated and objective, know what they are doing, and it is very much to be doubted that they will export in excess of imports. That we are idiotic enough to do so they explain as one of the ‘contradictions’ of ‘Capitalism’ which will bring about its downfall, at which time they are ready to step in and gather up our dispersed riches.

The whole business is a good deal more explosive than the hydrogen bomb, which no doubt accounts for Mr. Krushchev’s exuberance.

The ostentatious wealth of the extinct private Capitalists was never a matter of serious economic consequence. The huge bulk of their profits was invested in the expansion of
industry, in which, however, an ever-increasing number of individuals became shareholders. Pending expropriation of these by nationalisation, deliberate inflation is being used to counteract the potential independence of the masses which diffused share-holding would otherwise confer, so that monopoly exploitation can proceed to its logical end of global slavery.

---

**National Finance**

"Two opposing philosophies with respect to public finance exist in high government circles, to-day. The first, which may be called the *traditional* view, is that a continuously unbalanced budget and a rapidly rising public debt imperil the financial stability of the nation. The second, or: *new*" (emphasis in original) "conception is that a huge public debt is a national asset rather than a liability, and that continuous deficit spending is essential to the economic prosperity of the nation. According to this view, the conception of a balanced budget belongs to the category of obsolete economic dogma, the fallacy of which has been clearly demonstrated in recent years."


"It is equally obvious that so long as this demand for a balanced national budget is conceived, there can be no economic security, since it involves continuous application to the financial authorities for permission to live."

—*The Monopoly of Credit* (p. 59) by C. H. Douglas; published 1931.

"The great bulk of the loan (National Debt) represents purchases by large industrial and financial undertakings, who obtained the money to buy by means of the creation and appropriation of credits at the expense of the community, through the agency of industrial accounting and bank finance."


---

**Concentricity**

Shareholders of Kemsley Newspapers which was recently bought by Canadian Roy Thomson for £11,250,000, have voted to change the name to Thomson Newspapers Ltd. Mr. Thomson, chairman of the company since August, presided over a meeting, which lasted less than 10 minutes yesterday, of fewer than 20 shareholders.

The company has been known as Kemsley Newspapers since 1943. Before that it was Allied Newspapers.

It produces three national Sunday papers, four provincial mornings, seven provincial evenings, and a number of weeklies.

Mr. Thomson now controls about 70 newspapers in addition to his U.S. and Canadian interests.


Who controls Mr. Thomson?

---

**The Monopoly of Credit**

The third revised edition of 1951 of *The Monopoly of Credit* by Major C. H. Douglas was reissued in 1958. The comments we made in 1951 bear repetition.

*The Monopoly of Credit* is a major work of Social Credit. It was chosen for reissue from a list of possible works of like calibre by Douglas because it is the work which is, before others, the technical manual of Social Credit, and, as such, is the one which should be brought, though not exclusively, to the attention of anyone who may desire to be informed at first hand of Major Douglas's analysis of the present financial-economic system, its effects and the means available to correct them.

It is the standard literary instrument for the correct information of the public concerning the technical aspects of Social Credit, and, as such, its availability and continuous distribution is a primary concern of the Social Credit Secretariat. How can this be secured?

In general, it is not a policy of choice that Social Crediters themselves should absorb the total literary output of Social Crediters, or even a great proportion of it. Our objective is to reach those members of the public who are able and willing to profit by Social Credit ideas. But extensive experience has shown that unusual obstacles are placed in the way of our reaching this objective. The organisation of the sale of even the most trivial and evanescent work is highly elaborated, beyond our means to imitate, and, in addition, it is controlled, we are satisfied, at every point—production, distribution, advertising, criticism. Beneath the avalanche of printed matter which effects nothing whatsoever to the true advantage of mankind, but definitely the reverse, it is calculated that any reparative agency will be buried and obliterated.

Nevertheless the ever-continuing attacks on Social Credit, dishonest in form and probably in intention, are proof that incomplete reliance is reposed in this calculation, and that all the time Major Douglas's ideas are spreading. Every assistance must be given to an extension of this process. Accessibility of important sources is the key to the achievement of this end. Every reader of *The Social Crediter* should have in his own possession at least one copy of *The Monopoly of Credit*, and it should be his constant practice, as an integral part of his work for Social Credit, to urge the purchase (not the borrowing; though that has its place) of copies by every member of the public who shows any sign of genuinely seeking information on the critical question of our generation. No public library is properly serving the community if it does not possess a copy freely obtainable by its readers. No book list is complete which does not give accurate information of its authorship and place of publication. In all of these directions, our readers can do something to increase the distribution of *The Monopoly of Credit*, and to overcome the psychological resistance to Social Credit ideas.

---

**Renewal of Subscriptions**

Regular readers of *The Social Crediter* are reminded that prompt renewal of subscriptions will greatly assist the Belfast office.
CRystALLIZATION

Events since they were written have brought out or emphasised the meaning in numerous of the notes under the heading “From Week to Week,” written or inspired by the late C. H. Douglas and published in these pages during the second phase of the World War. Of the near infinity of political commentators, Douglas alone penetrated to the very heart of world politics, and not only exposed the cause of our malady, but progressively elaborated the cure.

The cause is still operative, the cure untried. What Douglas had to say then is applicable to our present situation which is continuous with our previous situation, and for those of our readers to whom access to earlier volumes of T.S.C. is difficult, and for other reasons, we propose to re-publish a further selection of his notes.

The date of original publication is given in brackets after each note.

It must be clear to anyone who will give the matter unprejudiced consideration, that the outstanding danger of the post-war period is genuine and widespread ignorance of the reality which can be attached to political words and phrases. It is not so much, for instance, a question whether “public ownership” of this, that, or the other, is desirable. The real problem resides in the unquestionable fact that large numbers of people, in the face of overwhelming evidence on every side, and in every country, cannot grasp the simple idea that there is no such thing as public ownership—there is either ownership, or there isn’t. The very words themselves are incompatible.

When there isn’t, as, for instance, in the army, you devastate the countryside almost as much, on manoeuvres and for practice, as though you were a hostile invader. “Public” authorities are doing it now. It is quite a mistake to suppose that this is sheer vice and wastefulness. It is simply that the age-long instinct for preservation which goes with the personal attachment of a human individual for things both animate and inanimate, which is the essence of the property idea, has been lost.

(December 14, 1943.)

It is precisely this essential unreality which makes it as certain as anything mundane can be certain, that these grandiose Conferences which punctuate this still phoney war must fail. The chief actors do not dispose of the matters which, perhaps, they imagine that they control. The constantly recurring atmosphere of catastrophe is the political counterpart of the geysers which are excited to activity by rolling stones down their craters. No one in his senses can suppose that the human individuals who compose the British armed forces will sit down calmly, after doing by far the greater part of the fighting and suffering the greatest losses outside Russia, and allow themselves to be disposed of by three or four men, much as though they were a herd of prize cattle.

(December 14, 1943.)

No doubt as the outcome of the predominantly abstract nature of our so-called educational system, social and political values are reversed. There is no more reactionary and atavistic animal on earth than the Fabian Socialist, but he is convinced that he is the vanguard of progress rather than a nuisance with an urge to push people about without being well kicked. His ideas are ages old, but dressed up in new names, just as Stalin is a Russian Czar of the period before Catherine, but with the tools of Western mechanism to help him. The Socialist-bureaucratic state has a more pronounced class bias than any so-called bourgeois community, for the simple and all sufficient reason that, in contrast to a bureaucracy, success in a genuine capitalist society depends less on functional popularity than on neighbourly relationship. Our first socialist exhibit, the Post Office, is a sufficient demonstration. Your average post office clerk doesn’t care two straws whether you like his way of giving you a book of stamps, or not—if you don’t, it’s just too bad, isn’t it? But observe his manner when a First Division Inspector from King Edward Building drops in. You don’t encourage your grocer to tell you that he’s only serving you because he isn’t sure whether you’ve a pull somewhere.

We are rapidly descending into a more rigid power organisation than has existed in Western countries in historic times, and the sinister feature of the situation is that reactionary and predatory tyrannies are represented as peace-loving torch-bearers of progress.

(December 14, 1943.)

It is important to keep quite clearly before the widest public possible that the carefully fostered idea that Communism and Fascism are enemies is simply propaganda emanating from the financial backers of both of them. Communism is more favoured just now, because it appears to go down better with the inexperienced.

This is not, of course, to say that the rank and file of both parties are not bitterly hostile to each other, just as the rank and file of Liberals and Tories were bitterly hostile to each other in mid-Victorian politics. It merely means that the rank and file of both parties will be allowed to fight each other as long as it pleases them, for the amusement of a select body of the spectators.

(January 1, 1944.)

Promotion in the Middle Ages

“There is very little evidence to show that our forefathers” (in the Middle Ages—Ed.) “in the middle ranks of life, desired to set any impassable boundary between class and class. The great barons would probably at any period have shown disinclination to admit new men on terms of equality to their own order; but this disinclination was overcome by the policy of promoting useful servants, and the country knight was always regarded as a member of the noble class, and his position was continually strengthened by inter-marriage with the baronage. The city magnate again formed a link between the country squire and the tradesman and the yeoman and in position and blood were close akin. Even the vilest might by learning a craft set his foot on the ladder of promotion; but the most certain way to rise was furnished by education, and by the law of the land ‘every man or woman of what state or condition that he be, shall be free to set their son or daughter to take learning at any school that pleaseth them within the realm’.”
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