

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 6. No. 3.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

“WHERESOEVER THE CARCASE IS---” (II)

By C. H. Douglas

It is, I think, important to keep in mind this fact that Socialism is simply a system of Legalism, because it is not a British product, and all Legal Systems must be based on some particular conception of Society and must aim at realising or perpetuating that conception. Socialism is “German,” in the same sense that the Rothschilds (*Red-shields*) are “German,” or that the Reformation was “German,” or that Kuhn, Loeb, or the Warburgs are “American.” It is, and has been always, primarily a theory for export, and in the country of its nativity, has been, and is, kept severely in its place which is to crush independence. The hey-day of “German” Socialism was in the day of Bismarck, who said of it “We march separately, but we fight together.”

The downfall of Russia in 1917 was consummated by the introduction, in a special train from Germany, of Lenin and Trotsky. Freemasonry, financial and moral corruption, and Socialism, accompanied by a horde of petty bureaucrats, have brought about the downfall of France; and the strong tendency of the better elements of French society, in all classes, to Anglophobia is the result of the widespread conviction that the British Government is now merely the tool of the same Dark Forces.

The situation we have to consider, therefore, is simply this. Two quite distinct influences have been at work for at least two hundred years. On the one hand, we have had the material progress of the industrial arts, which, as most people know, has been easily sufficient, considered by itself, to raise every member of the British public, by the use of power, to a position of economic independence, while at the same time reducing the necessity for economic labour to a small fraction of that available. Almost contemporaneously with this, we have witnessed a systematic expansion of Legalism, of which Socialism is an increasing part, which ignores and in fact systematically attacks and distorts this

situation. And the nett result is insecurity, more labour-hours, poverty, and war.

While it is probable that a majority of those who are interested understand how this situation has been brought about, it may be desirable to recall that the *physical* causes have been: Export of production, either unpaid for, inadequately paid for, or paid for in raw material only useful in the production of further material for export. The objective of this has been exchange manipulation. Grossly unbalanced production—too many machines, too few comforts. Sabotage: Artificial trade booms and slumps, with the breakup of plant and organisation.

Large-scale “Rackets” such as the Grid Electricity Scheme, which was an imitation of, and inspired from the same source as the Utilities racket in the U.S. Hundreds of millions of pounds worth of magnificent machinery and plant was consciously and unnecessarily broken up in connection with this scheme alone. All of these were rendered possible by subtle propaganda which treated money as wealth, and only employment paid for by money as being the production of wealth.

The *political* cause was the determination to maintain the monopoly of credit and to buttress that monopoly by Law. The most vital result of this was that purchasing-power was, and is, inadequate to buy the goods produced at the prices at which the price system requires that they should be sold, so that a majority of production has to be given away to an enemy, while the purchasing power involved in its production is used to make up the deficit in respect of the remainder. At the same time, the controlled Press hypnotises the public to demand universal employment. Of course, nothing could be more favourable to the temporary re-establishment of this system than the present holocaust of sabotage and free gifts to the enemy if the world is still foolish enough to agree.

We are now perhaps in a somewhat better position to proceed with our examination of the apparently contradictory attractions of Socialism, *if we realise that it is simply more Law, an extension of exactly the process which has stultified the progress of the industrial arts. There is no more prospect of producing a tolerable state of Society by passing more Laws, and imposing more sanctions, than there is of repairing a motor car suffering from a choked carburettor by devising a fresh tax upon it.* The world is suffering from a fantastic and unnecessary

Major Douglas's Books

Attention is drawn to the fact that *Social Credit* and *The Monopoly of Credit*, recently unobtainable through enemy action, are now obtainable. For other works see list on p. 12.

book of Regulations, every additional one of which, while apparently beneficial at the moment, exacerbates the disease.

There are thus two aspects of Socialism, attracting very different supporters. There is the aspect which attracts Messrs. Winant, Harriman, and their like, with Mr. Benjamin Cohen, the Incarnation of Law, joyously assisting. These people see in Socialism, quite correctly, a line of thought which can only lead to the concentration of power in their hands, power they are determined to maintain and extend, just as Stalin and Hitler have power which the Czar and the Kaiser never had. The aspect which attracts the rank and file of Socialists is in the main something much more subtle, I think.

Passing over the fairly obvious influence of the revenge complex on the part of the under-privileged (who have for the most part been kept in that position by the millionaire "Socialists" in order to be used as a disintegrating force) and the attraction offered by petty bureaucracy to lovers of power without responsibility, I believe that one definite delusion accounts for more Socialists than any other single cause. It is the delusion of the supremacy of the intellect, with the derivative that an order is the same thing as its execution.

Now, anyone with reasonably wide experience of life and affairs knows that the intellect has very definite limits. "The Professor" is recognised as a legitimate butt for mild humour, not so much on account of his knowledge, as for the lack of any ability to use it in his daily life.

We recognise that what is lacking, is something we call judgement, or (very misdescriptively) "common" sense, and that this faculty, so rare that when it is combined with intellect it can almost command its own price, is an ability to check constantly and almost automatically, theory and ideas, against experience. It is exactly the lack of this faculty which is conspicuous in Socialist circles, which by common consent draw their support largely from the influence of well-meaning elementary school-teachers. The modern State-controlled school is the perfect model of bureaucracy, designed primarily for control by the Government rather than for any genuinely educational objective. There is no standard of output, except "Si monumentum requiris circumspecte." Once again, it is evidence of the magnificent material of the British people that a large and increasing proportion of these teachers are revolting against this tendency. But a good deal of harm has been done.

Now to this type of mind, the fact that you can multiply x by itself five times, for instance, and the result is called x^5 is not merely proof of a fifth dimension, it is ground for a political world of five dimensions. Or to put the matter another way, "the Government" can order golf-club secretaries to grow asparagus in bunkers. Therefore asparagus will grow in bunkers. This confusion between Aristotelian and Baconian thinking is one of the most valuable tools of arch intrigue.

At this point, it may be desirable to dispel the idea, if it exists, that international financiers spend their time hatching out, e.g. Socialism.

To paraphrase a well known example from the theory of Chance and Probability, if ten monkeys tapped ten typewriters long enough, they would be bound, eventually, to write Karl Marx's "Das Kapital," as well as everything else, even if they didn't understand it. But that would not mean that it would be broadcast weekly with variations

by the B.B.C, commented upon by the "Woof," sponsored by the "Daily Poursuivant," modified for use in schools and Churches by the London School of Economics, and hailed on the outbreak of war as the Blue Print of the New Order. It is control of *distribution* upon which international financiers rely to stultify *production*, either of goods or of ideas.

What happens is that a comprehensive watch is kept on proposals of every kind and from every source, which have the smallest bearing on major issues. As an instance of the rapidity and efficiency with which this intelligence service acts, I might perhaps cite the fact that in less than three weeks from the publication of what might be called the first article on the relation between Finance, Centralisation and World Hegemony, which appeared in the *English Review* in 1918, an important member of the Rothschild family had sounded an alarm in appropriate quarters about it. If a proposal is dangerous to financial and high political interests, the press is closed to it. On the other hand if it is an attack on any interest *other* than these, and particularly if it is buttressed by "moral" argument, it is subterraneously assisted, since the destruction of these interests does not mean that they cease to exist—it merely means that they are transferred to international Finance. It is hardly too much to say, at this time, that if a policy of social reform is not attacked in the Press, or refused reasonable publicity it is certain to contain, hidden in it, a conspiracy against the plain man. The torrent of abuse, misrepresentation, downright lying and calumny, which has been directed against Social Credit, more particularly in Canada and Australia, is probably the highest compliment to its potential effectiveness which could be offered by the world's mischief makers.

(To be continued).

(All rights reserved).

C.H. Douglas

Write to your M.P. and say that this Government has no mandate to modify the social and economic systems, and that he should oppose all reconstruction policies which depart from pre-war principles until the electorate has an opportunity to pronounce an opinion upon them in peace time conditions.—C.H.D.

NOTICE

The following announcement is made in view of enquiries received, particularly from overseas:—

(1) All organisations accepting the strategical advice of Major Douglas may be accorded affiliation to the Social Credit Secretariat.

(2) The following are some of the organisations which do *not* accept Major Douglas's advice concerning political strategy and some of them may mis-represent his economic views:—

- (a) The Social Credit Co-ordinating Committee.
- (b) The American Social Credit Movement (Gorham Munson, Secretary).
- (c) The Social Credit Party ("Greenshirts").
- (d) The Economic Reform Club.
- (e) The Political Science Group.

PARLIAMENT

PUBLICITY USEFUL TO THE ENEMY: AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION

March 11, 1941

SUPPLY: AIR ESTIMATES (44 columns)

Mr. Garro Jones (Aberdeen North)
 . . . I wish to mention a matter, of some delicacy perhaps from a political and secret service point of view, namely, the publication in technical journals of facts and opinions of operational value to the enemy. Our enemies, Germany, Italy and Japan, have drawn an effective black-out against all printed and other facts which might convey information to us. Yet we permit to our own technical journals what is, to me, a most inexplicable freedom to publish almost any kind of fact and opinion about operational tactics, about progress in training and production especially in the United States and the Dominions, and, most important of all, about technical information. . . .
 . . . high officers in the Royal Air Force, whose names the House will not expect me to divulge, and eminent technicians associated with the Royal Air Force, were extremely perturbed about the amount of information which was being conveyed to the enemy through the freedom given to our technical journals to publish information of this kind. I therefore took the matter up privately with the Under-Secretary of State for Air. . . For example, there was a detailed analysis of the defects of German incendiary bombs and the reasons why they have failed, pointing out how those defects could be remedied. Information which has been collected as a result of an enormous amount of research by all the resources of a skilful technical Press was placed in the hands of the Germans within a few weeks. Obviously that is a matter which ought not to be allowed to be published. Then there were reports of production figures carefully culled from American and other sources all over the world tabulated in these journals and presented on a platter to Goering or whoever is the head of the German intelligence service.

Then there was an indication of the types of German fighters and bombers destroyed in this country, and the addresses of Air Ministry contractors were published.

. . . Let me give an example—I think it is a matter to which attention might be properly drawn—in connection with an issue of the "Aeroplane" this month. I heard the right hon. Gentleman, the Secretary of State for Air, say that the development of flying at great height, as everyone who is associated with this problem knows, is a development which is proving of ever-increasing importance. This week, in this technical journal, there is an article which shows that they have had access to the most detailed scientific tests made at the Royal Aircraft establishment on the question of the supply of fuel to aircraft engines at great heights. I will read the preamble to this article, because I want

THE RAMP.

The National Savings Campaign, with its wholly admirable energy and persistence, is going badly off the rails. . . Most of its propaganda lays emphasis merely on the total of money subscribed. *War Weapons Weeks are already leading to the subscription of newly created credit by local branches of the banks—a clear contravention of the principle.*
 —from *The Economist* March 22, 1941.

right hon. and hon. Members to judge for themselves whether they think such information ought to be allowed to be published:

"The article which follows reports the result of comparative tests of a Junkers JV 211D motor and a Rolls-Royce Merlin X."

Hon. Members know that the Rolls-Royce Merlin motor is the engine which powers our Whitleys and other most modern aircraft.

"We mentioned the test briefly in last week's issue of 'The Aeroplane,' and stated summarily that its result was to show greater supercharger efficiency and slightly better consumption rates for the Merlin, but since the article tends to present these facts in answer to the popular belief that certain German aeroplanes have a slight advantage in height, we feel it desirable to suggest here that the Daimler Benz DB601E might have

been chosen with greater effect for the test as a motor of better rating at height."

The reason for any disparity in output between British and German aircraft at height is a point which the German technicians would be most delighted to have settled; yet here we have the result of Government experiments, carried out at the Royal Aircraft establishment with all the detailed scientific drawings, published over three pages, made available for cable direct to neutral countries, and through them to our enemies to assist them in their experiments along these vital lines. A few weeks ago minute descriptions were given, covering many planes, of everything that has been ascertained in this country about the towing and operating load-carrying liners. That was published in the "Aeroplane."

One of the journals concerned obtains high-quality paper to publish about 100 pages per week packed with information of the greatest value to the enemy or hindrance to ourselves. Some of it I am sorry to say, is of a political character. For example, there is a strong bias in this journal against all American aircraft production. I think I can claim that I was one of the first to press the Air Ministry to utilise the aircraft production of Canada and the United States. From the beginning these journals have made the most bitter comments against aircraft produced in the United States, and have opposed with all their influence—and it is not small—the placing of orders in the United States. I am of the opinion that that is a matter which ought to receive the attention of the Air Ministry, because quite obviously they are partly acting in the interests of those from whom they obtain their advertising revenue. . . .

. . . To my amazement, sandwiched in an article a few weeks ago, was a statement that all our gold had been exported to the United States. Whether that is true or not, I do not know, but if that had appeared in a British daily newspaper, I venture to say that it would not have been allowed. . . .

It is not only in Britain that this difficulty occurs. I am not saying it is an easy problem to solve. There are American aviation journals. In this

country we do not publish damage that has been done to aircraft factories and aerodromes, but, owing to facilities granted to American newspaper correspondents, American journals are able to publish in the most minute detail damage that has been done to military objectives in this country. . . . I want to ask the Air Minister whether he will not consider setting up some small committee of two or three Members of the House to investigate this matter and to reinforce such submissions as it might be found necessary to make to the War Cabinet if such powers as they already possess are found to be insufficient. . . .

NECESSITY FOR RESEARCH

(36½ columns)

Mr. Hamilton Kerr (Oldham): I beg to move, to leave out from the word "That," to the end of the Question, and to add instead thereof:

"this House, realising that the quality of our pilots, aircraft and equipment, opposed to the great numbers of the enemy, has been the main cause of our success in the air war, urges His Majesty's Government to mobilise all the means of research at its disposal so that we may retain this all-important advantage of quality in the struggle which lies ahead of us."

Dr. A. V. Hill (Cambridge University): . . . There was a research organisation analogous to that of the Ministry of Supply in the Committee on the Scientific Survey of Air Defence, the so-called Tizard Committee founded in 1935. That, in co-operation with the Director of Scientific Research and the Air Staff, through those critical years between then and now has done work of the very greatest and most vital importance. It had the advantage of frequent discussion with the officers commanding in different Commands, with the Air Staff and with the officers concerned with research and development. There was, therefore, very close touch with that Committee between the scientific people inside the Air Ministry and the scientists outside. There was also the closest touch between science and research on the one hand and the operational people on the other. The success is due largely to the chairman of the Committee. . . . The Committee to which I am referring just grew up, unlike that in the Ministry of Supply, which was planned from the start. It had little status and authority. It worked rather by good will and friendly co-operation. When the Ministry of Aircraft produc-

tion was formed it was found that the Committee no longer existed. Sir Henry Tizard himself, the chairman of the Committee, after a successful mission to America which has resulted in the co-operation of which we now read in the newspapers and the presence here of the President of Harvard, succeeded Sir Wilfred Freeman as Air Member for Research and Development, but without any authority, as he was not a member of the Air Council on which his predecessor had been. . . .

Mr. Austin Hopkinson (Mossley): I think the House will agree with me that this is likely to be a very useful Debate. The point raised by the hon. Member for Cambridge University (Dr. Hill) is one that we and the Government should consider. . . . Other hon. Members have pointed out some of the difficulties. The hon. Member who spoke last referred particularly to the break-up of the scientific committee on air defence, but he did not give the reason. In order to avoid controversy, I will not mention names: I will only tell the House that the break-up of that committee was totally unnecessary, and that it was due to the interference of a certain person, who shall be nameless, but who made the conditions under which the committee had to work absolutely impossible. I leave it at that. This is an opportunity for the Air Ministry to reconsider its position in the matter. As has been pointed out by the last speaker, there is the closest connection between air research and actual operations. It is highly probable that new tactical schemes of value may originate from quite junior commissioned officers of the Air Force, and that they will be unable, owing to lack of scientific and technical knowledge, to judge whether the schemes are practicable or not. It is necessary, therefore, that there should be the very closest liaison between actual operational squadrons, and their officers, and scientists and technicians who are capable of judging such matters. On the other hand, any research department must also have the closest liaison with actual technical developments.

The House and the Government have to consider whether we are likely to get better results by making the gap between research and development, or between research and actual operations. My submission is that, on the whole, it is better, as research has to be, as it were, in close touch with one, and in less close touch with the other, that there

should be close touch with operations, and less close touch with development. When we get on to technical questions, as apart from scientific questions, one wants a completely different sort of brain to tackle them. That has become evident already in the working of the Directorate of Research and Development at the Ministry of Aircraft Production. May I give examples, and may I say, in presuming to address the House on this subject, that I have had some forty years' experience in invention and development of new devices? I want to put it in non-technical and non-scientific language to Members of the House. I have found in my experience that the technical side of development of any device of one sort or another depends ultimately upon scientific research. In ordinary commercial engineering we are usually unable to get the best scientists in the scientific world and have to be content with what I may term cheap scientists. But we who are technicians pure and simple, and concerned with the actual production of mechanical devices, are, generally speaking, totally unable to deal with scientific research even in the branch of engineering in which we are engaged.

The important thing about Sir Henry Tizard, which makes him of supreme value to the country at the present time, is that he is almost unique in his flair for appreciating on the one side operational requirements, and on the other side purely technical considerations. I think, with the last speaker, that it would be a disaster if we did not employ a man of unique qualities such as are possessed by Sir Henry Tizard. He has found it—and I make no bones about the matter—quite impossible to work at the Ministry of Aircraft Production. . . . It seems to me that at the earliest moment, particularly now that the disturbing element to which I have hinted already is out of the way at the Air Ministry, he should be able to develop his unique qualities under very much more suitable conditions. It is notorious that he has also, in addition to the capacity of understanding all technical and scientific problems, a great flair for being able to get the best out of junior officers. I believe that is due to the fact that he has had Air Force experience himself. I ask the Secretary of State for Air to consider this point very seriously. . . .

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Aircraft Production (Colonel Llewellyn): I think my hon. Friend the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. A. V. Hill) was under a misapprehension. I have seen two letters that have passed between Sir Henry Tizard and my noble Friend. Sir Henry has not resigned, and if the hon. Member for Cambridge University will look at the letters, I think he will come to the same conclusion. Sir Henry Tizard is, I regret to say, ill. He is certainly not sulking in his tent. He wrote that he thought as he could not come back for two months he ought to put his resignation in the hands of my Noble Friend. My Noble Friend wrote a letter saying that we hoped to see him back, and encouraging him to come back. Sir Henry then wrote another letter saying that he would think the matter over and he hoped he would be able to come back. My Noble Friend wrote a second letter wishing Sir Henry a speedy return both to health and to his duties.

Mr. Mander: Is it not the case that four other distinguished persons in the sphere of production on similar kind of work either have resigned or are so dissatisfied with the present situation that they are thinking of doing so?

Colonel Llewellyn: I know that there are rumours. There has been a resignation of one person holding a high position in the Ministry, and rumours have got about. . . .

Mr. Hamilton Kerr: I beg to ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Captain Balfour: . . . I come to the main point of his [Mr. Garro Jones's] speech—a point which interested us very much. It was whether we are giving information of value to the enemy in the publication of technical journals. He was good enough to say—as was the case—that last autumn I investigated this matter, as well as specific examples which he brought to my notice. He was also good enough to say that he did not think that I had power to deal with the matter properly, and that he was not entirely satisfied with the result of my investigation. We had better examine, first, what powers we have. If he asks, "Can you stop articles appearing in the technical Press?" my reply is, "No, we have not the power to stop articles appearing in the technical Press, as long as the Government retain, as a matter of policy, the principle of voluntary

ensorship." . . . we are satisfied that so far nothing substantial has recently been published which would be of any value to the enemy. The hon. Gentleman quoted two or three specific instances from a whole score that he brought to me. . . . the case which he said was the worst, that of why incendiary bombs, or what we call the oil bomb, failed and what their defects were, was a bad case. But this occurred on 20th September last. It was after that date that we went into this particular question, and as a result, the editors of all the technical papers in the country were called to a conference at the Ministry of Information at the end of October or the beginning of November last. Since then very few errors have occurred. The hon. Gentleman quoted this week's "Aeroplane," and he has quoted to me the case of an article dealing with a comparison between the Merlin X engine, and the German Juno.

This article—and the House would wish to have this assurance I know, and so would my hon. Friend—was not published without reference to the Air Ministry, so we must accept the responsibility. It is not the Editor who can be blamed for the publication, we agreed that it should be published, and I will tell the House why. There were very good reasons for allowing it. The Germans have captured a Merlin X intact, and they know its performance and its structure, and, of course, they know the performance of their own aircraft. There has been much criticism in many quarters of this country of our policy of using carburettors instead of injection mechanism. This article showed clearly the advantages of the carburettor over the injection mechanism under certain conditions, and we felt it right that the country and the technical people in general should have that particular knowledge. . . . let us remember that, in a democracy, security must be weighed against the morale of the population, and our policy is to tell the people all we can rather than follow the German line of silence and the consequent breeding of suspicion. . . .

The final point put by the hon. Member was that the "Aeroplane" showed bias against United States products and orders placed in the United States. I, like him, deplore these articles, and from that point of view we have made representations to the paper as regards editorial policy, and, indeed, there have been complaints from the

United States newspapers about this periodical's attitude. It is unwarranted and contrary to our experience, but so long as we have liberty of expression and wish to take advantage of this fact in our national life, I believe we must also face the disadvantages. . . .

THE PRESS BAN ON PARLIAMENT

Compiled and edited by
JOHN MITCHELL

(includes as a separate section:
What 'Capital Levy' Means to You
by C. H. DOUGLAS)

PRICE 1/6 net.

(Postage on single copies 2½d. extra.)

from—

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

POOR MR. PRIESTLEY

Mr. Priestley feels bereft
Of the chorus of the "left"
In the comic opera fight
He's conducting with the "right,"
Playing on his fuddled fiddle
Somewhere in the muddled middle.

— EXCALIBUR.

EXIT FOR MEDICAL STUDENTS

Given the will, learning to qualify as a doctor is no harder than (a) designing bomb-sights or (b) running a kitchen properly, tasks which are often well-performed in the present admittedly difficult circumstances.

Mr. Maxton has asked the Minister of Health what are the advantages of shipping medical students across the Atlantic when our own medical schools are not fully utilised.

Anticipating the harvest of official research, two consequences of shipping medical students to America, whether 'advantages' or not, would be:

(1) To afford an exit door for some young people (?) now resident here, whether Jewish or not.

(2) To inoculate a serviceable number of potential propagandists for service on return.

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.

Editorial Office:

4, ACREFIELD ROAD,
WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL.
Telephone: Gateacre 1561.

Vol. 6. No. 3.

Business Office:

12, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.
Telephone: Bank 5260.

Saturday, March 29, 1941.

WAR FOR JUDAISM

Two passages in *The Jewish Chronicle* of March 21 are worthy of consideration side by side. One is a note on the middle page associating Mr. Churchill with President Roosevelt and both with Judaism or 'Judaism's daughter faiths.' The other is part of an anonymous 'Sermon for the Week' explaining the sacrificial nature of the 'truths of Judaism' which are 'the battle-ground of the war.' It is stated that 'all the great religious creeds' are 'the battle-ground of the war' as well as the 'truths of Judaism'; but the view is clear that these are the 'daughter faiths.'

The recommendation to read the passages together is ours (not *The Jewish Chronicle's*). That newspaper's objective is to show that a 'Jewish war' and a 'Christian war' are the same thing—namely Jewish, and this is easier of attainment if (1) one cannot distinguish between the Jewish and Christian philosophies and (2) one is left unprovided with any concrete illustration of the policy arising from either. The sermon writer provides condition (2) and thus assists the reader in regard to condition (1).

We are quite as convinced as is *The Jewish Chronicle* that 'the truths of Judaism' are the battle-ground of the war; but just as *The Jewish Chronicle* sees no reason to distinguish between these 'truths' and what may, without great confusion, be designated 'Christian truths,' so we see no reason to regard them as specifically anti-Nazi. They aren't. They are merely anti-anti-Semitic-Nazi. The newspaper makes use of this phrase (Anti-Semitic Nazis). To be anti-Semitic is, in its understanding, to be anti-religious. (There is only the 'mother' religion—Judaism;

and all other faiths serviceable to it are its 'daughters.')

During the past week we have been told in an unexpected quarter that there is *some* good in Nazism. The suggestion may be conceded on the assumption that there is *some* good in everything. What we are much more sure about is that there is a whole Hell of bad about it: namely the presumption of its leaders to know what the 'world order' *ought* to be and their determination to exploit every vice and every virtue known among men to *make* it what it *ought* to be. This is the essence of Hitlerism. It is also the essence of Judaism.

The surprise recorded by the gentlemen who said

How odd
Of God
To choose
The Jews

appears to have its counterpart among the Jews themselves whenever the claim is made to independent authorship of their productions. It wasn't in the least odd of Hitler to fail to recognise the source of his inspiration: it was singularly adroit, and it may well be that later generations will adjust the perspective and give honour where honour is due even in respect to this particular.

But, to return to Mr. Churchill: the '*Chronicle*' "seems to catch an echo" of his use of the stirring words of Judas the Macabee in Mr. Roosevelt's promise that "the British people would rather die as free men than live as slaves."

"What is more remarkable," the commentator goes on, "is that for his peroration . . . the President, like the

Premier, went straight to Jewish writings. . . . It is no mere accident, this recourse of the two leaders of the Democracies to the Bible.

"They reflect a potent truth—the saturation of the national character of Britain and America with Biblical ethics. They point to another no less potent truth—the fact that the democratic ideals of justice and liberty for which the democracies are struggling are the truths proclaimed by the Jewish teaching and by that of Judaism's daughter faiths."

At this point a glance at the mother faith. Its 'witnesses' are looking forward to the Passover "the great Festival of Freedom." "Freedom can only be celebrated in purity." "The Abode of Civilised Democracy" has been defiled. What can cleanse it?

"Only a blood-red sacrifice, a flaming holocaust, a lurid pyre such as the world had never witnessed before. The lordly cedar among men and the humble hyssop would be destroyed together. Ashes, tragic ashes, of war's destruction would be scattered over the fair earth. And then?—would that cleanse us? . . .

" . . . Disaster is not in itself a cleansing influence, and least of all the disaster of war. That was our fatal error in the last war. *We kindled the conflagration; we made our sacrifice; ashes of ruination were strewn everywhere.* But they did not purify. Let us learn the lesson this time.

"We need the 'living waters' of God's Word, of Bible Religion, of Hebrew Prophetic Teaching, in order to interpret our calamity and to extract the 'sweet from the fierce'; in order to reconstruct on the ruins of our past mistakes the edifice of a better world and nobler life. *It is the Old (and so often rejected) Order of Hebraism, with its social justice, international equity, sensitive humanity, and spiritual idealism, which makes the God-Idea the focal point of human life, that will give us the only New Order worthy of the name.*"

"A dark yet mighty faith, a power as wide

"As is the world it wasted"

wrote Shelley. The world will have to take care to reject it again—and finally—and soon!

T. J.

Sudden Opposition to The Interim Programme in Alberta

This article by *SPITFIRE* appeared in *Today and Tomorrow* of February 20, 1941, as one of that author's regular commentaries entitled *Social Credit Patrol*.

For the time being those stout champions of the people's rights and the welfare of the Province, the Chambers of Commerce and the Boards of Trade, have turned their attention from expounding the great benefits of financial domination under the Sirois recommendations and the need for the centralisation of power by Ottawa controlling all provincial expenditures, to organising opposition against the Treasury Branches.

W. H. McLaws, Calgary lawyer, speaking to that city's Board of Trade Council is reported as having told them that the old stand by *ultra vires* should be invoked to declare the Treasury Branches illegal, and as having called upon merchants and manufacturers to boycott the Interim Programme.

Edmonton Chamber of Commerce is reported to have sent out a questionnaire to its members to ascertain who has signed up to co-operate. (Oh, no! Of course the banks don't want to know this. Why should they?) This is said to be a preliminary to calling a meeting of Chamber of Commerce members to discuss the situation. (Ah! yes—of course, of course.)

"Spontaneous"

And later on, no doubt, meetings of other Boards of Trade will be called—quite spontaneously, don't you know—to bring to the attention of their members what a dangerous and wicked thing the Interim Programme is proving for them. Such extravagance—so futile—tut! tut! and so...so...well dammit such a nuisance. (Sh-h! never mind for whom.)

And away in the East the mouth-pieces of the financial interests are coughing and spluttering with indignation about the development of the Interim Programme which was announced recently—a development carried out in obedience to the mandate given to the Government at the last election.

Is it not curious that, though the Treasury Branches system has been in operation in Alberta for over two years, there has been no excitement about it

until the new features were announced? Then, all of a sudden, there is terrific activity. Attacks appear in the press. Lawyers spring forward to declare the Treasury Branches illegal. (Funny that the House of Commons Committee on Banking and Commerce did not take this view after hearing Mr. Low's evidence.) Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade get busy to organise opposition against them.

And what is all the excitement about? The new features being introduced are quite simple and straight forward.

In future non-negotiable vouchers of a different design will be used to transfer "trade claims" instead of "voucher balances" on the books of Treasury Branches. And trade claims on goods and services only—and not claims on money. By this simple procedure it will be possible to expand internal production and consumption to the extent that trade claims pass from the accounts of consumers to the accounts of retail merchants for Alberta Trade Marked goods. Because, in turn, retail merchants can re-stock with Alberta Trade Marked goods by passing on the trade claims recorded in their accounts of wholesalers and manufacturers. From the manufacturers trade claims can pass to the accounts of wage earners and primary producers who, in turn, as consumers, can use them for securing goods from retailers—and so on.

Developing Alberta

It will be clear that these trade claims are nothing more than a book-keeping record in the Treasury Branches of transactions involving an exchange of goods and services for goods and services between those voluntarily co-operating under the Interim Programme. It is just a convenient system of barter or exchange.

The use of trade claims will be effective to the extent that Alberta citizens entering into voluntary association can produce and exchange for their own use the goods and services they want.

This will not interfere with the operation of the bank-controlled monetary system. It will operate merely as an auxiliary to that system. Moreover to the extent it conserves the use of money, it will release dollars for the war effort in accordance with the policy of war finance being used by the Federal Government and besides, the development of Provincial resources can be directed so as to provide further aid to the national war effort.

As a result of internal expansion inter-provincial trade will be stimulated—and, be it noted, in case the ramshackle monetary system cannot stand up to the terrific strain being imposed upon it by war conditions, it will provide the people of Alberta with a safeguard against the terrible consequences of even a partial collapse of the monetary structure.

New Features

In short the new features being introduced into the operation of the Treasury Branches hold out possibilities of much greater advantages than could be achieved before. As it is, during the past two years it has been demonstrated that, by means of a consumer's bonus based on Alberta made goods, it is possible to stimulate a demand for Alberta products, thereby expanding Alberta industries, increasing Alberta pay-rolls and providing new opportunities for creative employment for Albertans. That has been PROVED. It is no longer a theory. And the expansion of the Interim Programme will have an even greater beneficial effect on the provincial economy.

Then why all the excitement and sudden opposition from these spokesmen for the financial interests? They plead that the Treasury Branches are COSTING the people of Alberta a large sum. But that is nonsense.

Actually the operation cost of the Treasury Branches is but a fraction of the cost to the people of maintaining banks and providing profits for those institutions. Why has there been no complaint about this from the sources

who are showing so much anxiety regarding the 'cost' of Treasury Branches?

Again, the improved conditions in the province since the Treasury Branches system has been introduced have been reflected in increased Government revenue in excess of the cost of operating the Treasury Branches. Thus without any increase in taxation on the general public, the people have obtained the benefit of the Treasury Branches and Marketing Board services—and have benefitted in terms of increased business, increased employment and increased purchasing power.

But, say the critics, if the cost of the Treasury Branches was cut out, it

would be possible for the Government to decrease taxation. Such foolishness! If the Treasury Branches services were discontinued, then obviously the demand for Alberta-made goods would fall, employment would decrease, payrolls would decrease and Government revenue would shrink.

Surely those who advise the Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade are not so stupid that they cannot understand such elementary facts.

Then, why, oh! why this sudden panic about, and opposition to, the Interim Programme?

Well—the new features being introduced WILL make the people of Al-

berta a little more independent of the financial institutions—provided they take full advantage of the facilities which will be at their disposal. Yes, sir, it will do that. Can it be then that the banks are determined to retain their stranglehold on the lives of the people and resent the development of the Interim Programme as a challenge to their dictatorship?

We shall see. All this yelling in the press, Chamber of Commerce stuff and threats of *ultra vires* are tactics which have become quite familiar to the people. They know from whence it all emanates. And the more of it they see, the fewer illusions they have as to the real purpose behind it.

THE WORLD OVER

PREMIER HEPBURN 'TAKES SPACE'

The forces are lining-up against the interests in Canada. In Australia there is corresponding progress which Canadian news should assist.

"Finance and communications are concentric." The English public, though showing increasing suspicion flavoured by contempt is still dough in the hands of the press. It has little idea of the extent to which vital information is withheld and less of the pressure of suggestion upon what the press manipulators are pleased to call the 'public mind'—it isn't the *public* mind but a mask painted by a private hand to disguise the public mind from itself.

One way of mitigating the evil of the press is persistent publication. The money power does not bear the cost, which is an added drain on the private purse. This is a disadvantage. Nevertheless it is the method adopted by Premier Hepburn, who on January 31 took nearly a page and a half of advertising space in *The Northern News* (Kirkland Lake, Ontario) to explain by actual quotations from Official Reports of the Sirois Conference that

"THESE ARE THE FACTS."

At the same time, the Ontario Premier told a dinner meeting of the young men's section of the Toronto Board of Trade that the government had to spend money on newspaper advertisements "to give the citizens the true

facts of the conference."

Mr. Hepburn said he thought of going on the air with an explanation of Ontario's stand at the conference but decided against it after Col. George A. Drew, leader of the Ontario opposition had been refused the right to hire radio time to discuss the report and "I thought it would have been improper of me to seek the same privilege."

Mr. Hepburn said he also had thought of issuing a public statement.

"I thought the public statement I issued the other day on monetary reform an important one," Mr. Hepburn said. "It was not a lengthy statement . . . yet the Canadian Press deliberately cut the statement so that you could hardly recognize it."

[*The Northern News*, which printed both the advertisement and Mr. Hepburn's comment, dissents at this point, asserting that "The Canadian Press carried in summary form an 850-word story" on the statement.]

Mr. Hepburn said that Finance Minister Ilsley "who has control of propaganda," issued a statement in reply and that it was run in full.

Speaking of what he termed the difficulty of getting an accurate account of what happens into a newspaper, Mr. Hepburn said that although there were 42 reporters in the gallery at the Ottawa conference the Canadian Press reported that "we walked out." The Canadian

Broadcasting Corporation, he said, broadcast throughout Canada that "we walked out and I had to protest the next day."

["The erroneous report mentioned by Mr. Hepburn was not carried by the Canadian Press" is the comment of the newspaper.]

"There was nothing farther from the truth than that the Ontario delegation walked out," Mr. Hepburn said, "We were there at the end singing God save the King—and I don't mean Mackenzie King."

Mr. Aberhart and the *Toronto Globe and Mail* have also crossed swords on the subject of misrepresentation.

There are some good points in a speech made by Mr. T. D. Pattullo, premier of British Columbia, on February 19.

"The fact of the matter is that there are powerful influences in the east who would like to see centralisation of authority. They believe that the provinces should be curbed in their expenditures and a permanent check placed upon their activities. These influences found expression through the department of finance and, according to the Prime Minister of Canada, it was the influence of the department of finance which persuaded the Govern-

ment of Canada reluctantly to call the recent Conference." Incidentally, this disposes of the suggestion that the provinces staged an "interference with the war effort." Finance staged it; but meant it to be the 'other way up'—a control, not a liberation of potential aid.

Mr. Pattullo, like Mr. Hepburn and Mr. Aberhart, has "gone for" the press. He charges the *Winnipeg Free*

Press with "bespattering the records."

"Do as I say, don't do as I do" has its counterpart in 'Listen to what I say; and don't watch what I do.' Mr. Baldwin was a past-master at the game—perhaps he still is. Mr. Mackenzie King says:—

"Financial provision can be made and will be made for whatever it is physically possible for us to produce or to procure *in the way of war services,*

supplies and materials." It is a moot point whether the phraseology or the qualification is the more significant of Social Credit progress in Canada.

In Australia the desperate edict of the Menzies Government to stifle criticism of the financial system has already resulted in a further awakening throughout the community.

ECONOMICS IN VACUO

A Review of *An Outline of Money* by Geoffrey Crowther, Editor of *The Economist*. (Thomas Nelson: 10s.)

Reading a book of this kind produces a suspicion in the mind that it consists mainly of a "learned" discourse on the movements of marionettes without the presence of a manipulator of the strings being even suspected. Many pages are devoted, as is usual in such works, to the Trade Cycle, without any reference to or understanding of the *forces* involved. Similarly foreign Exchange is dealt with at length and the plain fact that this exchange is manipulated in the most flagrant way to suit the ends of the Money Power and usually at the expense of whole nations is not put bluntly; but is given pseudo-scientific names and is explained, described and generally theorised over, till it no longer looks the plain fact it is, but more like a cross between a miracle and an abstract mathematical problem.

While marvelling at the author's capacity to write in such a way, the reader is intensely irritated. The whole discussion on money takes place in a kind of mental vacuum. Money is presented in a grand financial isolation, without any bearing on or reference to the goods and services that give it its value, and that it represents. The impression left is a description of the smoke-screen instead of an examination of what lies behind, a pretence that the shadow is the reality. It is clear that in the author's mind the money system is paramount and nothing else really matters. The lip service to the contrary in the last few lines of the book does not alter the tenor of the rest or the curious outlook that is so grandly divorced from all matters mundane.

Judging by the evidence there is also a conscious effort made in certain parts of the book to confuse the reader's mind on the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from undeniable facts. For

instance, this is most marked when discussing the creation of money by the banks out of next to nothing in the form of financial credit, and the "lending" of this credit.

There probably is not a page in the whole book on which the Social Crediter can not find something to criticise, supplement or deny. Nowhere in the book is there so much as a hint that the monetary system is used as an important tool in the art of government, to force the people to do what they don't want to do, instead of its being an instrument to facilitate the achievement of their legitimate aspirations. In one place the author admits that he does not believe that there exists a secret caucus that controls the banks for its own ends. The circumstantial evidence that such an organisation exists is overwhelming and his failure or refusal to even look at the evidence does not increase one's confidence in the book.

It is therefore not surprising that speaking of the gold standard he writes (p. 268) "it was never invented but, Topsy-like 'just grown'" In his short historical revue of money (p. 17) he omits what is probably the main reason for gold becoming the basis of money, namely the superstitious belief of old that gold was the blood of the gods. Further (p. 183) when after the U.S.A. boom of 1922-29 the bankers contracted credit, because the people of the U.S.A. were getting too prosperous and independent, and so brought about the biggest crash slump in history, this disaster is called a "consequence" of the boom.

It therefore comes as a surprise when (p. 191) we read: "The task of conducting monetary policy naturally falls to the Central Bank, which occupies the strategical position in the whole struc-

ture." This is a damning statement and quite true; but in the circumstances somewhat naive.

The facts of the gold standard are presented as rules of a kind of card game, which outlook is no doubt that of the manipulators. No effort is made to show how idiotic these conventional limitations are and how criminally stupid is a system that can be put out of gear by a panic based on justified but purely financial fears and considerations (p. 68-72).

In discussing the creation of money he goes to great length to explain the limitations imposed on banks when creating money. He does not explain that these limitations are quite artificial and have no connection with pragmatic limitations of production or consumption. The author writes (p. 47): "Nearly every loan made by a bank is secured upon some form of valuable security. Even if it is granted without security, the earning capacity of the borrower is a form of wealth. Thus the bank does not 'create' money out of thin air; it transmutes other forms of wealth into money." Well! well! what an argument! First of all, money is't wealth, it only represents wealth. Secondly after all is said, the banks still create money out of nothing. Thirdly, if it is accepted that the banks by this argument don't create money but "transmute" other people's wealth into money, why do the banks lend it, instead of giving it to the person whose wealth it is? Fourthly, if I obtain an advance from a bank on the security of my house, do the banks transmute the bricks and mortar of that house into money? Fifthly... on second thought, that will do. Well! well!

After having given the foregoing piece of logic some of its due, it is with

great expectations that one comes to the subdivision in chapter V headed *Fallacies* (p. 160). Needless to say, Major Douglas's writings have the place of honour. The first paragraph contains a number of incorrect and misleading statements about Major Douglas's contentions: "These theorists consequently argue that there is a continuous tendency in the monetary system for the expenditure of the community to be less than the cost of producing the goods and services that are available for sale."

"All money that is saved [is] entirely lost to the fund of purchasing power."

Such and other statements are attributed to Major Douglas, who in fact has never propounded anything of the sort.

"He [i.e. Douglas] apparently holds that the 'gap' in the circular flow of money and expenditure is sometimes as large as 90 per cent; that is, of all the money paid out by industry, only 10 per cent. ever gets into the hands of consumers. . . ."

Such gross misquotation has to be seen to be believed. Major Douglas has certainly pointed out instances where in a particular business the wages, salaries, and other personal payments to consumers amount to only about 10 per cent. of the cost of the product; but nowhere has he generalised this percentage as applicable to industry as a whole, nor has he made the assertion attributed to him. Anyone with knowledge of highly mechanised

businesses knows of such cases and to dismiss this *fact* as nonsensical, as Mr. Crowther does (p. 161), even after the misquotation, must reflect on the author. In passing, it may be mentioned that the statistics for industry as a whole are unobtainable despite the glut of statistics that prove nothing, as at least one University in this country that searched for them can vouch.

It is typical of orthodox economic writers to misquote Douglas, or rather not to quote him at all but to put forward an alleged paraphrase that has little or nothing in common with his contentions. This habit is so persistent and so invariable that it can scarcely be a coincidence.

For the benefit of those not conversant with Social Credit technics, it can be pointed out here, that the purchasing power of the nation is never as much as the costs of the product *in the same period of time*. It may be greater than the costs of *consumable* goods produced, as it is no doubt at the present time, thanks to vast production of capital and unwanted (war materials) and unconsumable goods. Regarding Mr. Crowther's point about savings, if invested, there is a double circuit through industry. In other words, two or more lots of costs amounting to the sum "saved" are created: but the money can act as purchasing power only once. What the author attributes to Douglas is a very different proposition.

This author, like most orthodox economic writers, appears incapable of

grasping that the problem is dynamic and not static. The 'gap' is not between two sums, but between two rates of flow. i.e. the flow of purchasing power and the flow of costs and that in consequence time is a vital factor. Probably all money issued acts as purchasing power some time or other, but this is quite irrelevant to the theorem. Apparently few people have the gift of grasping the difference between, say, two distances and two speeds. This unfortunate shortcoming no doubt accounts for the curious fact that no one has ever attempted to disprove the simple mathematical presentation of what has come to be known as the "A plus B theorem" and printed in the last edition of Major Douglas's *Monopoly of Credit*. It may of course be quite beyond the grasp of the London School of Economics and such like.

In the Appendix to the book there is a reprint of Mr. Crowther's "disproof" of A plus B, first published in 1934. He chooses an example—it seems to be a bakery that might have existed in the Middle Ages—in which there are no "B" payments in the period he takes. From this he generalises that therefore "B" payments do not exist anywhere.

Then he considers some "B" payments and in his argument ignores the time factor. In this way he comes to the same conclusion as in his first example. A review of this book in *Truth* mentions that the appendix is not the least valuable part of the book. This judgement seems to be a grave reflection on the rest. H. R. P.

ALMOST COMPLETE SUCCESS—?

By B. M. PALMER

They are going to be very kind to us: I think that is quite plain now. I listened carefully to Mr. Ernest Bevin's speech. The solicitude expressed for the workers was greater than, I think, has ever before been expressed by a public man—but after all Mr. Ernest Bevin stands at the peak of victory—he has won his suit, the conscription of labour, and can afford to be generous—The young women can scarcely feel that there is any compulsion in the affair at all. Just think what we are getting—general extension and improvement of welfare arrangements; travelling and settling in allowances; arrangements made for billeting; hostels being built, subsidised travel, part payment for the care of children. There seems no limit to what is being done for us, though

there is every limit to what we can do for ourselves.

Yes, the lion tamers are kind. "It is all done by kindness, you know." The whip will not be used unless absolutely necessary, at the moment it is only cracked occasionally. As *The Times* says, "the industrial registration which he announced for next month are preliminaries to other measures should they be necessary."

As the old shipyards workers go to the Labour Exchange to register will they remember how they were driven out of the docks in 1933—34; how hundreds of our ships were broken up in the depression; how those of their friends who were lucky and could pay the fare went off to U.S.A. some of our best mechanics among them; and

how those left behind were out of work and starved of every thing that made life worth living for *years and years*—and how their wives and children did not even have enough food? Will they remember? The same thing that drove them out then is now driving them back—have they ever been free from the first instant of life? Is there any freedom in sight?

Yes, after we have conquered "aggression," so we are told.

What is "aggression"? Is it not only another result of the very same force that closed the ship yards?

We are told that every restriction to which we are now subjected is a step to freedom later on. We could willingly bear the restrictions if we knew the steps

were leading in the right direction.

Mr. Roosevelt has defined freedom as—

- (1) Freedom of speech.
- (2) Freedom of worship.
- (3) Freedom from wrong.
- (4) Freedom from fear.

There were at one time chattel slaves in the Southern States. Many of those slaves enjoyed these four freedoms. What do they amount to? You can allow a man to SAY anything, provided he can DO nothing. There was a man working at Coventry whose wife was missing after a London air raid. He knew she was alive, but he couldn't trace her through the official channels, so he swore at the manager, hoping to get the sack.

"It's all right, Jack," he was told, "Say what you like—we know you want to quit."

Not one of those freedoms is incompatible with a nation of well-fed slaves.

There is only one freedom. "Free-

dom to choose one thing at a time." Things, not words.

There are other questions that arise out of Mr. Roosevelt's speech.

If work for all is wanted, and if all want work, as we are constantly being told, and, moreover, if food clothing and shelter cannot be obtained except in exchange for work, how is it that the provision of unlimited work entails sacrifice for all?

From now on the American nation is to make itself the arsenal and granary of Europe. America's unemployment problem will disappear. Millions of people will now be living on wages, who for months, perhaps years, led a hand to mouth existence on charity and government assistance. A boom of the most colossal size is in sight. Every American knows in his heart that the "sacrifice" of longer hours, lower profits and higher taxes will be entirely offset by the increase in production, at first. What is lying in wait for the American people is yet to be seen—but of one thing we can be quite certain, it is not

intended that the people as a whole will benefit—in the long run. Only a few will benefit. Who are they?

It is quite plain that if everything goes according to plan a few men at the end of this war will be in control of larger masses of their fellow men and women than has ever before been known. Mussolini boasted that he had only to press a button and eight million men would spring to arms. Something very like this is envisaged by our lion tamers. When they press a button millions of men will rush to the ship yards, millions more will go back to the land, or millions of women will leave their homes to enter industry as required. There has not been seen, so far, one single sign that after the war this pyramidal control will be relaxed. Every sign on the contrary goes to show that it is intended to continue.

But we know beyond doubt that although it may continue long, it cannot continue indefinitely. Therefore we must take the long view, and not allow ourselves to be daunted.

ROOSELINGS

"The sign of the revolution that has taken place is the switch in discussion from Britain's to America's war aims. Co-partnership talk is rife about a future world society in which the keys would be held by the English-speaking peoples."—(The *Observer's* Washington Correspondent, March 16, 1941.)

"Roosevelt or Hitler?"—(Headline to Garvin's article in the *Observer*, March 16, 1941.)

"Important to remember is fact that, if the British withstand coming assault, they will be badly battered—will have a crippled industry, a crippled air force, a crippled navy; will be dependent upon U.S. for weapons with which to continue fighting; may be dependent upon U.S. for man power. It's uncertain."—(United States News, February 7, 1941, p. 5.)

"The Studebaker program for producing airplane engines will have no effect, in itself, on the Studebaker production of automobiles. The equipment in Studebaker plants is not suitable for the manufacture of airplane engines, and therefore separate equipment for that purpose is being provided. Studebaker

production of automobiles will be affected only if defense requirements for materials or labour necessitate a curtailment of production by all automobile plants. Studebaker is offering more real value... than anybody else in the automobile business. The Studebaker Champion... lowest priced 6-cylinder sedan in America. See it and drive it now... You may use your present car as part payment—easy C.I.T. terms."—(From advertisement in the *United States News*, February 7, 1941.)

"The American Navy would not object to trading old destroyers for new battleships if the British should be interested in a deal of that kind. Britain's needs for big battleships are limited while her needs for small escort craft are unlimited. U.S. Navy, operating far from home, is interested in floating forts."—(United States News, February 7, 1941, p. 40.)

"It would not be surprising if the Federal Reserve Board asked Congress to permit it to remove the last vestige of private bank ownership and control of the Reserve Banks as a means of removing objection to broader authority over the nation's credit structure."—

(United States News, February 7, 1941, p. 40.)

"Henry Morgenthau is insisting that, in any bond-selling drive to attract savings from workers, the Government must avoid high-pressure sales methods."—(United States News, February 7, 1941, p. 40.)

"Back of removal of 'moral embargo' against Russia is the State Department desire to avoid any action that would cause the Russians to withdraw further support from Chinese armies that now keep the Japanese partially immobilised from other adventures."—(United States News, February 7, 1941, p. 40.)

"President is very cool to suggestions that the Government use its commanding power to frighten industry into line on prices."—(United States News, February 7, 1941 p. 40.)

"Reason why President Roosevelt objects to giving Army and Navy chiefs veto power over transfer of military and naval equipment to Britain is that international policy as well as military considerations will enter into any transfers that are made."—(United States News, February 7, 1941, p. 40.)

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.

BELFAST D.S.C. GROUP

Group Meeting on April 3, 1941. In the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at 8 p.m. Correspondence to the Hon Sec., 17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Association: All enquiries to 168, Shear Brow Blackburn.

BRADFORD United Democrats. Enquiries to R. J. Northin, 11, Centre Street, Bradford.

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER is obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Meets regularly on the first and third Sundays in the month. Time 2-30 p.m. Enquiries to Wavertree 435.

LONDON LIAISON GROUP.

Lunch-hour reunion on the first and third Thursday in each month at 12-30, at the Plane Tree, Great Russell Street. Next reunion on April 3. Enquiries to Mrs. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association. It is important that all Social Crediters on Tyneside should maintain contact. Write Hon. Secretary, R. Thomson, 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

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

SOUTHAMPTON Group: Secretary C. Daish, 19, Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

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.)

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.)

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.)

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 3d.
and
'This 'American' Business' 3d. each
12 for 2/-

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster 4d.
Debt and Taxation 2d.

ALSO

- The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold 4/6
Economics for Everybody by Elles Dee 3d.
The Power of Money by J. B. Galway 3d.
The Purpose of Politics by H. E. 3d.
Tax-Bonds or Bondage and the Answer to Federal Union by John Mitchell...1/- (Postage 2½d.)
Barrier to Health by Dr. Douglas Boyd..... 6d.
Lower Rates (pamphlet) 3d.
(All the above postage extra).

Leaflets

- Invincible Britain by John Mitchell2d. each, 1/6. doz.
What we are about by H. E.50 for 1/6
Hitler and Churchill Finance by John Mitchell50 for 1/9
Bomb Hitler! by C. H. Douglas (out of print)
What 'Capital Levy' Means to You by C. H. Douglas.....100 for 2/6
Beware of Federal Union by R. L. Northridge.....50 for 1/9
(The above are post free).

All from

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

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