

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 6. No. 5.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

## IS THIS A CIVIL WAR?

By B. M. PALMER

A friend of mine has sent me the January number of the *Mirror*, New Zealand's National Home Journal, a magazine written for women, full of fashions, recipes and knitting. There is, however, a note on current events by VETERAN, a writer who is unknown to me, but whose awareness and clarity of thought need special commendation. The following passage seems particularly appropriate in the light of present events:—

"MR. BEVIN, the well-known British trade-union leader, was not exactly happy in his choice of phrases in his American tour in describing the conflict in Europe as 'a great civil war.' The struggle, he said, was not so much a war between races as between conflicting ideals. This is true up to a point, but the fact remains that one ideal has been adopted by the German nation and the other is held by the British nation, and the actual war is between nations. Furthermore, it has not been suggested that the object of the war is to impose a particular form of government on the German nation; on the contrary, the object is to resist German interference with the Governments of other States. Finally, the phrase 'civil war' is unhappy in that Hitler's bosom cronies in Moscow have been screeching for the last twenty years at every congress of the Communist International that the grand object in a European war must be to turn international war into civil war and revolution in the various States. As everybody seems to be 'misrepresented' nowadays, it may be that Mr. Bevin has suffered the common fate. Let us hope so, anyway.

"DEMOCRACY is becoming an over-worked word these days, and those

whose business it is to follow up the political news through the years find a certain amount of quiet amusement in noting the somersaults effected by some who are now loudest in their attachment to the current slogan. Six short years ago, for instance, the Socialist League section of Britain's Labour Party—the said league being now defunct, though its leading lights are alive and well—demanded that when next Labour took political office it should forthwith pass instantan an Emergency Powers Act establishing a dictatorship. These bright young lads affirmed that this was the only way to get Socialism in Britain. The British, they held, were so confoundedly conservative that local resistance to Socialism would be invulnerable unless Commissars were forthwith installed, with full powers to over-ride every Little Puddlington Parish Council, and send the entire country with one great bang into the Socialist millennium before anybody realised what had happened. Whatever the merits or demerits of this idea, it was difficult to catalogue it as 'democratic.' Strangely enough, its sponsors nowadays fairly foam at the mouth at mention of the word 'dictatorship,' and never has the world seen such democrats as they. Dictatorship, it seems, is one thing when viewed from the dictating end and quite another matter from the dictated end."

Whoever VETERAN may be, here's more power to his pen. Similar sanity in our own home journals would be very encouraging, but cannot be expected while they are controlled by those who want what Mr. Bevin wants. The recent articles by C. H. Douglas *Wheresoever the Carcase Is* have made the general background clear. Enough has been done by Mr. Bevin during the

last weeks to prove that he has not been misrepresented. It is quite plain now that he does regard the present war as a civil war, and the Emergency Powers Act as an opportunity to establish a Socialist dictatorship in Britain, though of course he would not now care to use the word "dictatorship." The question is, how far can he and his colleagues press on their schemes before there is a general awakening? an awakening to the fact that such a world as he and his kind are rapidly bringing about is indistinguishable from the world of Stalin and Hitler. If this is a civil war, Mr. Bevin is certainly not on the side of the British people.

The onlooker sees most of the game, and let us hope for wide awake onlookers in New Zealand, Australia and Canada. It may be their turn very soon; perhaps they will be warned in time.

Confirmation of the Socialist doctrine of Civil War was given by Miss Margaret Bondfield recently, when she spoke on "Artisans of Peace" in the Psychology Classroom of the University of Edinburgh. According to the press reports:—

"She believed that the present war was really a great international

### On Other Pages

THE WORLD AFTER  
WASHINGTON (I)

By C. H. Douglas

THE UNCOMMON 'PRIG'

By T. J.

THE PLACE OF THE  
'SOCIAL ENGINEER'

By John M. Macara

civil war—a war of ideas—that the idea we were combating was the idea of hierarchy, quite literally the idea of a master class, this time composed of a few individuals, hand-picked to be the associates of the great Führer. Under that were the party members, the people who would carry out the edicts of the Führer, but underneath that again there was the slave class, which had no rights, no powers, no freedom, no citizenship.

“She was a long time before she believed that such a thing could be re-created in the world; she had no idea that the world could harbour that kind of infamy, and the only thing we had to put against it was our own faith in democracy, our own faith in the importance, in the sight of God, of the individual man and woman, the importance of character and personality, without which we could have no freedom, and the importance of our being able to make a choice.”

It is impossible but to believe that Miss Bondfield is a well-meaning idealist—her record, I think, proves that. But what is lacking is “the ability to check constantly and almost automatically, theory and ideas against experience.”

It seems almost incredible that the woman who was in the Cabinet in 1931 should not recognise the existence of a

financial hierarchy, quite as much a master class as any of the Führer’s hand-picked associates, and capable of far more evil—yet “she had no idea the world could harbour that kind of infamy.”

In 1931, “Twenty men and one woman—a British Cabinet—waited one black Sunday afternoon in a Downing Street garden for a final decision from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York,” writes Mr. Tom Johnston, who was Lord Privy Seal in that Government. It seems that Miss Bondfield does not recognise the forces that destroyed that Government for what they are—no, they are not “forces”—they are men without responsibility, but with enough power to change a British Cabinet, probably even nominating the next Prime Minister, now Earl Baldwin.

Can she not learn from her past experience to surmise the rôle now being played by Mr. Winant, Mr. Harriman and Mr. Harry Hopkins, and their adviser, Mr. Benjamin Cohen? Is it not more than likely that they are bringing pressure to bear on Mr. Ernest Bevin? To one who is already convinced that he has a mission to introduce “Socialism” such pressure would be welcome. He sees himself, no doubt, as Labour Commissar in a Socialised Britain.

One pities the students who listened to Miss Bondfield’s address. She said she believed it would be fatal for this country to have only one party in the state; but Sir Thomas Holland, who presided, said the ideal was nearly in sight, for divisions of class and party politics were now nearly obliterated.

So they went home, not knowing whether party politics were desirable or not, not knowing who the protagonists in the civil war might be, only carrying away with them a vague feeling that they must co-operate to win the war against Germany, and that they must have known before the meeting began, if they were normal British men and women.

But it is our part, yours and mine, to throw the lime light on the protagonists, to show that while we are straining every nerve to defeat Nazi Socialism abroad, we have enemy socialists at home who are striving to modify the British social system in accordance with the doctrine of Karl Marx, and without any mandate from their electors. This article must necessarily be inadequate, and the reader is urged to make himself fully acquainted with the facts set forth by C. H. Douglas in a series of articles of which the first appeared in this paper on March 22.

## Letter to Mr. Stokes, M.P.

R. R. Stokes, Esq., M.P.,  
House of Commons,  
Westminster.

Dear Sir,

My attention has been drawn to a statement made in your contribution to *After the War*, where you say “as a gesture of goodwill all nations concerned will immediately hand over the effective material fighting strength of their air-forces to a selected neutral or neutrals.”

I do not know how you would reconcile this statement with the first of the Pope’s five peace points which postulates the right of all nations, great or small, to independence, but it would appear that you would entrust the use of military force to unknown individuals whom we would be powerless to control. Rather than trust the brains which God has given us to solve our own problems, you would remove responsibility to persons whose only competence is that they happen to reside or meet in one of those

selected sanctuaries where the world’s mischief-makers watch in safety the fires which they have created. Surely you would not agree, for example, that non-combatant millionaires in America (or their nominees) are the heaven sent guardians of European warriors “After the War?”

If you recall your splendid, but unsuccessful, attempts in the House of Commons to find out who is responsible for financial policy, you will see what is likely to happen should the benevolent and self-righteous neutral (?), like the Bank of England, use its powers, as it surely would, to further anonymous international interests.

Again the same first peace point says that reparation and restoration of rights cannot rest upon the sword. I think many Catholics have been caught quite unwittingly in a philosophy alien to that of the Catholic Church. In other words we must make up our minds whether the New Jerusalem is to be

founded primarily on armed might or the ‘force’ of good example. That is not to say that the sword must be abolished for the punishment of evil-doers, but that it is much more likely and possible that a Christian Nation will develop the use of force of both kinds to re-establish and maintain a Christian culture than an absentee and irresponsible alien management.

I would say that whatever war-aims are advertised by our intellectuals, the ordinary Englishman considers that he is fighting for his right to manage his own affairs, and as you well realise our enemies are not confined to Hitler & Co.

With every good wish in your work against the “enemy within.”

Yours etc.,

PASCO LANGMAID.

199, Heathwood Road, Cardiff,  
March 23, 1941.

In reply to the above letter Mr. R. R. Stokes, M.P., sent his correspondent three leaflets of which the latter remarked in a further letter: “... I would point out that these do not enlighten me on the questions which I raised.”

## Bureaucracy in Germany

The following passage is from "How Strong is The Nazi Economy?" by Peter Drucker, an article in the "Saturday Evening Post" of March 1, 1941:—

"As great a danger as this slow starvation—though a completely different one—is that arising out of the very thoroughness of the German economic machine—bureaucratic rigidity. Everything in Germany has to be planned and every single detail has to be co-ordinated with a thousand others. As in a modern airplane engine, the parts of the machine must fit into one another without any tolerance at all. Yet the parts of the Nazi machine are not made of steel; they are human beings. And the jobs they have to perform cannot be decided in advance, once and for all.

"The Germans see clearly the danger that their complicated machine will fail and break down as soon as it is confronted by tasks not worked out in advance. They try determinedly to re-introduce some elements of personal initiative, to decentralise, to limber up. They have been successful, however, only at the very top; in Goering's Central Economic Council there are men whose work is not scheduled and who are given a free hand. But the attempt to re-introduce such personal initiative into subordinate organisations has been

wholly unsuccessful.

"The individual cogs in the machine are far too afraid of the personal consequences of mistakes to dare to act without orders. To neutralise this dangerous tendency toward complete automatism and apathy, the Nazi planners have tried to work out blue prints for all possible situations and emergencies; German engineers have elaborate instructions about what to do if British bombs destroy part of a plant—which orders to rush through at the expense of others and which workers to use for reconstruction. But though the instructions are probably excellent, no plan devised by man has ever succeeded in providing for all contingencies. . . .

"The complete and thorough government control of all economic activity has another dangerous consequence. It has led to bitter fights between the various governmental agencies. Each of these agencies is jealous of the power it wields; each has its own policy, its own aims, its own political connections. And each of them—the Labour Front, the Farm Estate, the Raw Materials Board, and so on—is prone to concentrate on that line of action which will be most likely to advance its own cause. In addition, each of the major control organisations in the economic field is

headed by a highly ambitious party politician who looks upon his job as a stepping stone to even greater personal power, and upon his organisation as his own personal machine. . . . .

"With 2,000,000 persons engaged full time in controlling the economic activities of other persons, everything is buried knee-deep in paper. Bureaucracy is so rampant that corruption has almost become indispensable to efficiency. For bribery is often the only means to obtain a decision from a government office. 'I am willing to pay even to get an unfavourable decision,' a German industrialist once said; 'at least then I know where I stand, and can go back to work.' Simple transactions sometimes require upwards of 300 printed forms; and many more if something unexpected happens.

"The Nazi economic system has become stronger than ever before, but it has lost in flexibility what it has gained in strength. It is as hard as steel, but it may also be as brittle as glass. . . . As long as the machine can run without disturbance from outside, there should be no breakdown. But can a system as ponderous and as bureaucratic adapt itself if unexpected blows from the outside should demand sudden changes in Plans?"

## DIARY OF EVENTS

APRIL 1—United States Government refuse German and Italian demands for release of 28 Italian and 2 German ships and the crews, seized in her ports on March 30. Vichy radio confirmed that M. Daladier and M. Reynaud, released from imprisonment near Riom, are to live under surveillance; the charges of war-guilt under which they were arrested have not been followed up.

*Asmara, capital of Eritrea, taken by British forces.*

APRIL 2—Four additional governors appointed B.B.C., Captain Sir Ian Fraser, Dr. J. J. Mallon, Mr. Arthur Mann and Lady Violet Bonham-Carter; the two present governors are Sir Alan Powell (chairman) and Mr. C. H. G. Millis (vice-chairman).

APRIL 3—*In East Africa, Italian native troops said to be revolting.* Count Teleki, Hungarian Prime Minister who signed the Tripartite Pact on behalf of Hungary, found shot, probably suicide.

APRIL 4—*In Libya, British have withdrawn from Benghazi in face of German-Italian attack. German air-*

*raid on Bristol.*

APRIL 5—Of 2,614 members of the Scottish Transport and General Workers' Union who voted on the Government scheme to eliminate casual labour on the docks, 2,405 voted against it, 188 accepted it. The Regional Port Director states that nevertheless the scheme will be put into operation soon.

APRIL 6—*Germany invaded Greece across the Bulgarian frontier and Jugoslavia from the south-east, without warning or declaration of war.*

*Announced that British troops were already in Greece and R.A.F. reinforced.*

*Jugoslavia signed pact of non-aggression with Soviet Union. In Abyssinia, British troops took Addis Ababa.*

APRIL 7—Sir Kingsley Wood brought in budget, income tax raised to 10/- in £, earned income and other allowances reduced, extra revenue from latter to be placed to credit of payer in P. O. Savings Bank for use with certain restrictions after the war. *Slav army broke into Albania; Greeks were standing at Rupel pass. R.A.F. bombed Nazis in Sofia and Greece.* Britain broke off relations with Hungary.

## The Place of the 'Social Engineer'

By John M. Macara

The world is full of chaos. Wherever we turn we are met with that which fills us with loathing. Yet all these horrors are made by us—or rather they are made by forces which flow from us.

Therefore we are responsible because we are the source from which flow all our difficulties. No rectification can be undertaken until we trace a trouble to its source. If the engine of our motor car fails to give service, the first thing we do is to endeavour to locate the source of trouble. We look to the ignition, at the fuel supply, *etc.* Until we have located the source of the trouble we can take no step to remedy it.

To blame Hitler only, is simply to admit that our thinking is superficial. Hitlerism is only the result of forces thrown up from us. All social conditions and institutions; all social disorders, are built up by forces which originate in us.

### Social Dynamics

Dynamics is the study of force in action. The study which concerns itself with electric force is known as electro-dynamics; the study of the forces which operate in society we may readily call social dynamics.

Man has applied himself to the understanding of the force of electricity and has thereby in large measure changed the whole of his physical environment. As the result of this study we now travel by fast electric trains instead of by the old stage coach. Man's control of power has been multiplied many thousand fold.

As a result of orderly study man has become able to direct forces to his benefit which previously destroyed him. Man's first acquaintance with electric power was in the form of destructive lightning; that force he has now harnessed to his service in industry.

The history of electro-dynamics must become the history of social dynamics. The first step in all systematic study is careful observation of simple phenomena. The study of electro-dynamics arose from man's observation that a piece of amber when excited by friction

had the peculiar property of attracting to it light objects. The fall of an apple to the ground started a train of thought in the mind of Newton which ultimately enabled him to account for the mysterious movements of planets.

Observation must go hand in hand with careful recording. Phenomena must be approached by the open mind uncoloured by preconceptions.

A dangerous bye-path which we must studiously avoid in any science, and particularly in the science of social dynamics, is the tendency to confuse our preconceptions with our observations. There is no room in the mind of the would-be student of social dynamics for a moral preconception which is denoted by the words "should" or "ought" in relation to human action.

Social dynamics has nothing to do with morality; it is a study of the forces which do actually operate in mankind and has no relation with a moral conception of what "ought" to operate.

The student of social dynamics must proceed with careful observation and recording to amass data which may have no apparent relation one to the other. It is only after a considerable mass of such data has been assembled that the pieces are found to fit themselves together, as do the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle.

Observation and recording come first; relation becomes established afterwards.

The point of origin of social force is the individual; its nature is "*desire*;" its characteristic behaviour is that it tends to satisfy desire.

Desire ceases to operate when it has been satisfied. No social force flows from a satisfied people. To obtain from the South Sea Islanders—whose every need is so fully satisfied by a bountiful nature—a flow of social force which can be directed, is a problem which has always been beyond the skill and cunning of the exploiter, who would divert to his own profit the social force of such a community.

Desire may be defined as a recognition by the individual of a lack within himself. The individual in some way feels that he is not satisfied; he feels a

vacancy within himself, and as he recognises within himself the tension which arises from this vacuum, he begins to define for himself with greater and greater clearness the nature of the object of his desire.

In other words he must know what he wants with some degree of clearness before he can move towards satisfaction. No one can go into a shop and say "please give me" and expect to be served; he must know what he wants before he can receive and obtain satisfaction.

It is a well-known psychological fact that if any one holds consistently and persistently to a well-defined desire he will ultimately be moved into circumstances and actions which will bring about the achievement of the object of his desires.

Like seeds, desires do not fulfil themselves in the twinkling of an eye. In order that a seed may be developed it must be planted, watered and tendered. So it is with desire. There are those who flit from desire to desire, as a butterfly moves hither and thither. Such a one does not give to his desire the necessary continuity of attention to bring it to fruition. It is the function of the will to give continuity of direction to desire so as to bring about fulfilment.

Desire is related to our conception of reality. Our conception of reality is directly related to the point of view of our philosophy. THE POINT OF VIEW IS ALL IMPORTANT. An airman, from his elevated point of view, will look down upon the great pyramid and perceive it as a square. When approaching the same monument from the level of the desert he will see it as a triangle.

### Philosophy and Politics

Every philosophy gives rise to a policy. If in a crowded street one perceives a great bus bearing down upon him, that is his conception of reality; that is his philosophy. Inevitably he forms a policy, a plan of action related to his philosophy. His policy is quickly determined—he runs to the kerb.

Mankind is divided into two classes

according to their point of view as to the point of origin of authority. There are those who conceive of authority as proceeding from a point external from themselves. They look to Jehovah, to the "Elders," to the "Dictator" as the source of authority which must be satisfied. We may describe the philosophy of these as Judaic.

On the other hand there are those who conceive authority as arising within themselves; who feel that so long as they have satisfied their own interior sense of rightness, they may be indifferent to any sanction which may be brought to bear on them from an external source. Such a philosophy was expressed by Jesus of Nazareth when he said, "The Kingdom of Heaven is within." We may describe the philosophy of such as the "Christian" philosophy.

Each of these philosophies inevitably gives rise to a policy. These policies are in deadly conflict, one with the other. The world has become too small to contain both of them; and the titanic struggle which fills the world stage to-day is nothing less than a struggle to the death between them.

The Judaic policy results in the centralisation of power at an apex further and further removed from the base. As it develops tyranny becomes more and more ruthless. It has been said that power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely.

The characteristic of the Judaic policy is imposition and prohibition, "Thou shalt not"; its symbol is the policeman; its method is centralisation and planning; its agency, "Boards"; its flower, "dictatorship"; its fruit, chaos and destruction; its foundation, a lie.

Jesus delivered the most shattering blow to the Judaic philosophy in his supreme teaching, "The Kingdom of Heaven is within." The characteristic of the Christian philosophy is the attitude 'live and let live'; its method, organic growth and decentralisation of power; its agency, individual initiative; its fruit harmony, and peace; its order, "not of the policeman" but the order which fills the forest.

It has been said that the end of man is unknown, but we believe that he proceeds most easily towards his objective in a condition in which the individual is free to choose or reject one thing at a time. It is the aim of the student of social dynamics so to use the social force which flows from each individual to build a social structure in which the individual may advance in

peace and harmony towards man's unknown end.

## Social Engineers

Society is an organism. Different parts have different functions. No one will think of giving attention to his eye when he wants to listen: in the same manner the social engineer must be careful to see that he discerns the function which may reasonably be expected to be associated with the appropriate part of society.

It is a common notion that in order to change the unsatisfactory direction in which we are heading it is necessary to "educate" the masses. That is not so. In a steamship we do not have to give attention to the engines to change the course of the vessel. The 'mass' corresponds to the engine in a steamship; it is in the 'mass' that power originates. The comparison must be abandoned because it does not go far enough—the engines of a ship could not consciously decide where they wanted to go. But in a community of people, when a sufficient volume of desire has been generated in the mass it only needs the intelligent action of a few social engineers to give direction to that force so that the general desire may be satisfied.

It will thus be seen that the hapless task of "educating" the masses is quite unnecessary. It is for the masses to *decide what they want*, and then all that is required is that there shall be a number of experts, social engineers, with capacity to realise the nature of the appropriate action, and the appropriate time for that action. When a great boulder is resting on a small base at the top of a mountain it only needs the touch of a hand to send it into one valley or the other.

We are not the first social engineers in the field. Those before us, however, have interested themselves in the control of social forces in order to achieve their own ends. Such ends have invariably been the centralisation in themselves of the control of power, which flows from us. The devices they have used are ingenious and varied.

The natural result of action is to bring about a condition of satisfaction or dissatisfaction thus giving rise to a desire to pursue lines of action which lead to satisfaction.

The old social engineers have set up an arbitrary system of rewards and

punishments which mostly operate through a money policy. Those who pleased the exploiters were rewarded by affluence; those who displeased them found themselves in a condition of penury. To intervene with a system of rewards and punishments is to supersede nature, but so long have we been inured to this system of rewards and punishments that we have almost ceased to be conscious of the limitations thus imposed upon us. We have almost come to look upon them as natural.

Another powerful device of exploitation is what has been called "Education," a thing which would be more accurately described as "human conditioning." The young child is taken from his natural protection, his mother or his nurse, and placed in a kindergarten while his being is so plastic that it will be easily moulded. There he is taught the first great heresy of obedience to external authority.

His integrity is so violently assaulted that a moral injury is inflicted upon him from which he recovers, if at all, with the greatest difficulty. This process, begun in the kindergarten, is continued through his primary and secondary education and further continued in the field of industry.

It is to bring to an end this assault upon the integrity of the individual that very early efforts must be made, for the true function of "education" is to convey information about the world in which we live and to inculcate self control, with neither submission to nor domination of others.

Propaganda is another great weapon which the exploiter has used with great effect. The control of propaganda and the centralisation of power go hand in hand; they are mutually essential one to the other.

Another weapon in his armoury is the substitution of abstractionism to fill the place of reality. When the exploiter would destroy us he never baits his trap with mean things which appeal to the self-interest of the individual. Rather he employs bait which appeals to the desire for self-immolation; he baits his trap with "sacrifice."

The aim of the new social engineer is not exploitation and centralisation of power. It is to build a social order in which the individual is free to choose or reject one thing at a time, because he believes that in such a condition the individual will advance most rapidly and easily towards his unknown end.

## 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. 5.

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

Saturday, April 12, 1941.

## The Uncommon 'Prig'

"To think," Master Bates said to Fagin when the Dodger was taken from him, "To think of Jack Dawkins—lummy Jack—the Dodger—the Artful Dodger—going abroad for a common twopenny-halfpenny sneeze-box! I never thought he'd done it under a gold watch, chain, and seals, at the lowest. Oh, why didn't he rob some rich old gentleman of all his walables, and go out as a gentleman, and not like a common prig, without no honour and glory!"

'With this expression of feeling for his unfortunate friend, Master Bates,' it is said, 'sat himself on the nearest chair with an aspect of chagrin and despondency.'

But how would the chagrin and despondency of Master Bates be changed to pride and elation could he have lived to read *The Times* of Saturday, April 5! And Mr. Fagin too. We can picture him peering craftily over the reader's shoulder. "Ha! ha!" cried Fagin, extending his right hand, and turning to Mr. Bolter in a fit of chuckling which shook him as though he had the palsy; "See what a pride they take in their profession, my dear. Ain't it beautiful?"

And, indeed, Master Bates would have cause to be proud of the Dodger's profession!

*The Times* is explaining that people have more money than they can spend. The "natural result" (but not the inevitable result) "would be an uncontrollable rise in prices" (but aren't prices controlled?) and so *The Times* urges the Government to "take back the money out of the pockets of the consumers."

Wherein lies the difference between this case and that (which he would most

certainly disdain) of the Editor of *The Times* (let us say) who meets a small boy in the street. Let us assume that the following conversation ensues:—

Editor: "Well my boy, how much money have you got?"

Small Boy: "Sixpence, Sir."

Editor: "Sixpence, eh? And what are you going to do with it, may I ask?"

Small Boy: "Keep it, Sir."

Editor: "Keep it, eh? Can't you spend it?"

Small Boy: "No, Sir. Nothing to buy with it: shops are all empty. It's the war, Sir."

Editor: "Tut! Tut! 'Hm! And so you can't spend your sixpence, eh?"

Small Boy: "No, Sir."

Editor: "'Hm! Can't you, you young rascal; you young rogue; you young economic hooligan, you! Give your sixpence to me, Sir! At once, Sir! I'll spend your sixpence for you, Sir! And when the war is over and you'll want sixpence—all the sixpences there are, I'll be bound, to provide yourself with wages to buy what comes on the market then (or some of it!),—why then, Sir, I'll give you a farthing and LEND you threepence."

"There is no cause for dismay," says *The Times* in the fact that over £4,000 millions have been 'spent' during the past year. "The only safe limits we can set to our effort are not financial, but the physical limits of man-power, raw material, and the organisation to make effective use of them."

Precisely! But why, when you have pushed man-power to its physical limit, should you rob it of all that it cannot spend now because you are destroying the goods it might spend it on?

The motive is, of course, obvious: to prevent it from having the money to take productive industry out of pawn to the banks.

The excuse is the bogey of "inflation." The vast bureaucracy (which itself absorbs more and more of labour's 'earning') now in existence has learnt the technique of several kinds of price regulation since war began—and there are others!—so that control by pocket-picking is at least out of date!

T. J.

## YASS MEN ARE NOT YES-MEN

The Victoria State Government has postponed the local government elections, presumably on the model of Great Britain. This action won no approval from the general public, and in one rural municipal council aldermen have declined to remain in office beyond their elected term. Every member of the Yass Municipal Council, except one, has resigned, because "we thought in a democracy it was fit and proper to hold the elections." A member of the Rockdale Council, a former mayor, has followed the same course. The people of Yass maintain a conception of democratic institutions to which the State Cabinet in this instance has shown itself curiously insensible; for it cannot be doubted that the feelings of the Yass aldermen faithfully reflect the opinion also of their ratepayer electors. The Minister for Local Government, Mr. Martin, refused recently to give details of the authorities who (he said) favoured postponement of the elections.

### Two Important New Leaflets:

(1)

"IS Mr. CHURCHILL GOING TOO FAR?"

Price: 12 for 1/-; 50 for 3/6

(2)

"BOMB THE GERMAN PEOPLE"

(containing two letters by C. H. Douglas).

50 for 1/-; 100 for 1/9;

500 for 7/-; 1,000 for 12/-

N.B.—Leaflet No. 1 is a four page leaflet and includes leaflet No. 2.

Obtainable from:

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

# THE WORLD AFTER WASHINGTON (I)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

*Interest attaches to the date at which the following article by Major C. H. Douglas was first published. It was 1921. It is reprinted now because of the assistance it may give to many outside our immediate circle in clarifying their ideas of the world which has to be put straight—for it is still THE WORLD AFTER WASHINGTON which we inhabit.*

This world is a testing ground for theories. When we say that we understand what is going on in the world we mean that we can, or think we can, relate the facts, as we see them, to some theory into which they fit, and from which as a logical consequence we can predict the emergence of further facts, not for the moment visible, much as the finding of a preposterous hat on the fragment of a political jigsaw puzzle stimulates us to search for other salient characteristics of Mr. Winston Churchill. Which is the method of modern science.

Now, the validity of this method depends on due recognition of the fact that theories of themselves have no value; that is to say, a fact which will not fit a theory is still a good fact, but a theory which will not explain or fit the facts is a bad theory. It is the purpose of this article to show that the actions of the responsible Governments of this planet are taken in accordance with a theory which is a bad theory; to which the facts of life do not fit, and from which actions, in consequence, come results which are not in accordance either with the theory, or, to be charitable, the expectations of those statesmen from whose deliberations they proceed.

This theory, although transcending all the bounds of what is commonly called theology, is most easily epigrammatised under the title of the Doctrine of Original Sin. It assumes the existence of an ideal world, possibly a new Jerusalem, in which people would act, not merely differently, but from fundamentally different motives from those now at work in the world. It "judges" those motives, finds them "bad," and as a direct and logical consequence conceives the function of Government, using that term in the broadest possible sense, to be mainly to run and see what Johnny is doing and tell him he mustn't. That is to say, it is Authoritarian.

The implications of this theory are almost endless, but it is sufficient for our purpose to examine its effects on the problems of War, Industry and Social Revolution. War, considered in the light of the popular interpretation of it, arises out of a fundamental desire, a wicked desire, on the part of peoples, to fight each other. It is to be eliminated, if it can be eliminated, by the cultivation of "goodwill" among peoples (whatever that may mean) and by the concerted action of Governments to "regularise" the conflagration if and when it should break out. And so we have the Washington Conference.

But by no process of stretching can this explanation of war be made to fit the observed facts of the First World War. It is most improbable that one thousand persons in England, France and Germany collectively, had they been asked as individuals, would have agreed to walk out of their homes in August, 1914, and each, on his own responsibility, to start a personal fray with an opposing national. Modern war is only possible from the existence of a huge machine

capable of overriding personal opinion, backed by an equally elaborate organisation for mis-directing and perverting it. Even by 1918, when half the world had sustained injuries at the hands of the other half, it required the most elaborately organised "hate" campaign that the world has ever known to carry public opinion in support of the measures deemed requisite by the omnibus term "military necessity."

Nor is it fair to say that the average man in the street is such a natural born fool that after four and a half years of a war in which, as an individual, he was killed, maimed, broken in health and home, ruined financially, and—as very rich bankers like Lord Inchcape never tire of telling us—impoverished nationally, although a "winner," he requires safeguarding from a far worse war because of a widespread desire to repeat these experiences. Not a bit of it. There is a growing tendency to *acquiesce* in the inevitability of another war, because along with war came certain phenomena which can be collected under the term of economic prosperity. Close reasoning not being a conspicuous attribute of the man in the street, he assumes that peace and economic depression are necessarily inseparable.

Since Social Revolution indisputably has an economic basis, it is clear, then, that these three phenomena—War, Industrial Depression, and Social Revolution—are closely inter-connected. The most cursory examination of History will supply the necessary confirmation—every modern war has been preceded and followed by economic depression, and has been accompanied by economic prosperity, and the majority have involved attempts at Social Revolution.

Bearing this in mind, let us suppose for a moment, as a tentative hypothesis, that wars are caused, not by the wickedness of human nature, but by a desire for economic prosperity, a desire baulked, not so much by natural as by artificial difficulties. It may be noted, in passing, that even this desire has been more or less successfully criticised—witness the astonishing acquiescence in the idea that our troubles arise from an Acquisitive Society. The necessity, inherent in the Doctrine, for providing means to keep humanity in the straight and narrow way, involves the existence of both a negative and positive mechanism—a machine for permitting human beings, on terms only, to achieve certain amenities, such as economic prosperity, on the one hand, and to prevent them from doing things, by the imposition of active discomfort, on the other. The agency of the first is Finance, with its concomitant of Employment as the condition of bed, board, and clothes; the agency of the second is Law.

Now observe again that these agencies fail to pass the pragmatic test—they do not deliver the goods. He would be a bold man who would contend that human nature reached its highest exemplar in the self-made rich; and the decline of sheep stealing, since that healthy and invigorating pastime ceased to be a hanging matter, is only para-

lled by the increase of delirium tremens in America subsequent to the passing of the Prohibition amendment; which brings us again, by easy stages, to Washington.

America is the modern citadel of the Doctrine—the G.H.Q. of Dollar Diplomacy, the home of moral uplift, the Blue Sunday, and the hit-don't-argue policeman. We have progressed ourselves a good deal in this direction lately, but not so that it would be noticed in Chicago. That the majority of American citizens, among whom are some of the kindest souls in the world, detest these things is, of course, quite beside the point—they have no more control over them than has the average Englishman over the price of petrol.

The real objective (towards which the Washington Conference was one move) is the stabilisation and centralisation of the present World Order of Finance and Law, and the Hegemony, or final, permanent, and indisputable control, of that centralised Order by the powers represented by Wall Street and Washington. That aim involves certain limited and preliminary objectives. It is obvious that a situation, such as would arise should the United States become involved in war with Japan on anything like equal terms, would leave the British Empire (which has developed a culture too tolerant for Doctrinal purposes) in somewhat the same position in which America herself was left by the late-lamented war—relatively unexhausted and a creditor to all combatants, a position which would shift Financial World Power back to London. Utilising the financial power recently acquired, the movement of which the Washington Conference was the visible symbol, drove a wedge into the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, reducing the naval armament question to a question of credit-power, *i.e.*, potential building capacity, rather than actual power, thus apparently eliminating, or at any rate greatly delaying, any possibility of distraction from the main objective, and at the same time, forcing a settlement of the Irish question on lines which seem well calculated to eliminate Great Britain as an Atlantic Naval Power, while strengthening the hold of Finance on Ireland. Without offering an opinion as to whether the situation was inescapable, it may be remarked at once that President Harding is justified in his complacency. His term of office marks the bloodless surrender of the world's greatest Empire, and its deletion as an effective voice at other than parochial conferences. The British Government being wholly in the grip of International Finance, and, indeed, simply an instrument of it, is passive in the matter, which is not to say that all individuals in that Government are necessarily acquiescent.

Once again it is the power of the machine, not the will of the man.

It would appear, therefore, that the Washington Conference had achieved definite results. It would seem to mark a victory for "normalcy," a staving off of a situation which might involve not merely political, but economic revolution, and, at the same time, progress on the part of Wall Street and Washington to the goal of *Arbiter Mundi*. And that would be so had not the conclusions attained by it left unsolved, and even complicated, problems fatal both to the theory and to the policy, which problems it is our business to examine.

In order to grasp the reality of these problems it is necessary to go back a little, to inspect afresh the pivot on which the whole situation turns. The Doctrine says, "If a man will not work neither shall he eat"; and both High Finance and Extreme Labour chant *Amen*, each of them mentally reserving, for their own purposes, the right to define what is work.

But, enter a third party, Modern Applied Science and Technology, which says, "I will show you how to place the burden of Humanity on the backs of machines; to harness solar energy, through the medium of steam, oil, water-power, and even atomic energy so that one man, working under conditions of great comfort and enthralling interest, shall produce enough for one thousand, both of food, clothes and housing."

Thus, between Modern Science and the Doctrine, is declared war to the death; for either Science will win, in which case the increasing majority of human beings will, in the nature of things, and not by any legalistic process, be released from the slavery of arbitrarily conditioned Employment (which is the stronghold of the Doctrine) or Finance and Legalism will continue, as at present, to counter each advance of Science, so that labour-saving machinery will only enable men to do more "work," while sabotage and mis-direction of effort will dispose of and waste the product, until such time as Science, misused and prostituted by the Captains of Industry, who know everything about their business except what it is for, will destroy civilisation.

Observe, then, that every industrialised Nation is faced with what it calls an "Unemployment" problem, and that organised Labour (oblivious to the glut of goods, and the organised attempts to restrict output on the part of the very people who called for more production three years ago) is calling for "Work or Maintainance." Just in that order.

## PARLIAMENT

WOMAN-POWER: RESPONSIBILITY FOR POLICY (DOCKS): BROADCASTS

March 20.

Oral Answers to Questions.  
(30 columns).

CIVIL DEFENCE  
DETENTIONS.

Sir I. Albery asked the Home Secretary whether, in view of the fact that

in 55 cases of detention under Regulation 18 B he has not given effect to the recommendations of the Advisory Committees, he is still satisfied that the Advisory Committees are in all cases provided with adequate information before making their recommendations?

Mr. H. Morrison: All the informa-

tion which is available is put before the Advisory Committee, and if in a small proportion of cases I have taken a different view from the Committee, this is not because I have any information about the particular case which is not available to the Committee, but because on the same facts I have formed a

different judgment as to the necessity of detention for the time being for purposes of national security.

*Sir I. Albery:* May I ask whether in such cases the right hon. Gentleman acquaints the Committee with his decision and gives them any reason for it?

*Mr. Morrison:* I acquaint them with my decision, but I do not give reasons.

### WOMAN-POWER.

(85 columns).

*Mrs. Hardie* (Glasgow, Springburn): ... I cannot imagine the present Minister of Labour ever conscripting women who have young children to look after, but I go further and say that they should not be encouraged to leave their children in the care of minders in order to go into filling factories. A woman who is training and bringing up children is doing a far more important job for the future generations, for which we are supposed to be fighting, than filling shells with which to kill some other woman's son. We know how infection spreads among children and that mothers often dread sending their children to school because, as soon as they go into communities of that kind, all kinds of infectious disease is caught. There is the same danger if you get together a number of young children and put them into some unsuitable premises with some minder to look after them. I hate the word "minder." It seems to imply that the children are of no importance. Generally the minder is some old woman who takes a dozen children and keeps them sitting in a room with insufficient air when the children should be outside. I hope that, in spite of the difficulties, we shall not be driven to such extremities as to encourage women with young children to go into munition works and put their children into places of that kind. ....

*Viscountess Davidson* (Hemel Hempstead): I am sure that a great many people will welcome this Debate, because there are numerous questions connected with woman-power which are worrying many of us. At the beginning of the war it was urged upon the authorities that proper machinery should be set in motion to deal with women who wanted work connected with the war effort. Like many other Members, I was inundated with requests from women who either wanted to change their work in order to get into war work

or who had lost their jobs on account of the war and found themselves in a position to undertake war work. Many of them were trained women, efficient women with long experiences behind them. They put down their names at the Central Register and the Supplementary Register, but again and again they found that they were rebuffed. They could get no work: many of those efficient and trained women have been lost because there was no proper machinery existing to deal with their cases and find them employment. We are told that there is now a great improvement in the position, but I should like to read a letter which came to me this morning from a constituent of mine. She writes:

"May I draw your attention to the atrocity that seems to have descended upon the people who run the Ministry of Labour Supplementary Register for the Employment of Women. When it was a new thing and was run by overworked people it did a certain amount of good. I saw—"

Here she mentions certain names—

"including a girl who was very bright. She knew that I knew Italian and got me a job to go to Italy."

This is one of the exceptions, because I have never heard of any other case where an applicant who knew a foreign language who was actually sent to a country where she could make use of her knowledge.

"Since my return from Italy I have been countless times to the office of the Supplementary Register. They have blossomed into a big new place. There are now stores of files and whole handfuls of women Civil Servant clerks of the usual half-baked type."

Those are not my words—

"I have never been interviewed by the same clerk twice, nor seen anyone of a calibre to assess my merits or demerits in the labour market. I have been discouraged by some, even told by one clerk it was no use calling. Of jobs I have heard nothing."

She goes on to give her qualifications, which are very good indeed, and continues—

"We are told on all sides that the Government want trained women. Do they? I wonder; or is it just the ineptitude of the Ministry of Labour in the way they run their Supplementary Register and Central Register...."

During the last few days we have all been extremely anxious about the effect of the speech of the Minister of Labour upon the public... The effect of the Minister's words has been most disquieting, and I beg that some definite instructions will be issued to the Labour Exchanges and to those who will interview the applicants that they be told not

to leave their present jobs until they are needed. ....

The impression universally given was that young mothers should make arrangements as soon as possible for their small children to be looked after by helpers or minders, in order that they themselves could go into factories. It has come to my personal knowledge that young mothers with babies on their hands and entirely responsible for them, have rushed off to find how soon they could make arrangements to get the babies off their hands in order that they can take on national work. There is nothing worse than to take these mothers away from the responsibility of looking after their children, or to create the impression that they should do so. ....

*The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health* (Miss Horsbrugh): ... My hon. Friend the Member for Hemel Hempstead (Viscountess Davidson) referred to mothers who feel they may be able to do war work. There has been some misunderstanding. My hon. Friend the Member for Springburn (Mrs. Hardie) also spoke as though the idea were that mothers should be asked to hand over their children to anybody to look after, so that they might go into something else. That is not the view of the Government. For some time past the Ministry of Health have been anxious on this subject. I would remind hon. Members that in peace-time a great many married women were working in factories. We have been putting up more day nurseries, but for certain reasons the day or night nursery does not meet all the needs. Let me give the example of the woman who was going out to work before the war. She does not want to go out of the street in which she is living and into another direction before she goes to the factory. It is the placing of the day nurseries that is one of our difficulties. There has grown up in the country a scheme by which women who are working in the factories may leave their children with minders. The suggestion has now been put forward that there should be registered minders. ....

*Dr. Edith Summerskill* (Fulham West): ... Will my right hon. Friend not agree with me that, in the engineering industry, in spite of the fact that women are being given bonus upon bonus, the basic rate of payment to women is £1 per week—just the same as in 1914?

*Mr. Bevin:* Unfortunately, the engineering trade appeared to believe in

perpetual war because they carried one war bonus on to the next.

*Dr. Summerskill*: It is good of the Minister to say that, because it only bears out my statement. Is it not an amazing state of affairs to find that the basic rate of pay for women in 1941 is £1 per week, the same as in 1914! Therefore, I hope that the country will not merely indulge in all this flattery that we have had in the last six months, but, if they really believe that women are playing their part in the war effort, will treat them in an equitable manner. . . .

I am sorry that the Minister of Labour is not here at the moment, but I believe he said on Sunday that minders were to be provided for children—by the way, the word “minders” appals me; in the South of England we do not use the word—the mother to pay 6d. a day and the State to pay 6d. per day. I would remind the Minister that the women’s attitude towards the care of children has changed since 1918. We have done a tremendous amount of propaganda in order to teach women that the most important thing is to feed their children properly. Now the Government say to the mother, “We have found an old woman round the corner who will look after your child.” The woman may be old because I take it that the Government will not exempt anybody. I anticipate that this scheme will fail because a good mother will not leave her child with a minder who does not in her belief make a perfect foster-mother, and it will be found, therefore, that after a time a bad minder will make a bad worker in the factory, because a woman will not concentrate on her work, if she finds that her children are not being looked after properly. I say to the Government: This whole scheme of yours is wrong. . . .

*Mrs. Adamson* (Dartford): . . . I lived in Lancashire for many years and I always felt revulsion when I saw young mothers take their babies out of warm beds early in the morning, carry them out into the cold and take them to minders. I, therefore, hold very strong views about it. I hope that when the Government comes to deal with this question there will be no semblance of an approach to the suggestion that was made in responsible quarters early in the war that baby nurseries or creches should be established in the grounds of industrial organisations, under the control of employers of labour, where well-intentioned and well-meaning people, with no qualifications or efficiency, would look after the children. When I was canvassed

about that idea, which emanated from a titled lady in this country and was supported, unfortunately, by people in public life who ought to have known better, my retort was that to start a baby creche in Woolwich Arsenal was an intolerable idea. If we intend to do the job let us do it properly. . . .

Question, “That the Bill be now read the Third time,” put, and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time, and passed.

### March 26.

#### Oral Answers (41 columns)

#### TRANSPORT

##### DOCKS CLEARANCE, GLASGOW.

*Mr. A. Edwards*: Can the Minister say to what extent the Customs authorities are holding things up?

*Lieut.-Colonel Moore-Brabazon*: I do not think that is for me to answer.

*Sir C. MacAndrew*: Will my right hon. and gallant Friend make further inquiries, as his answers do not tally with what shipowners say about that area?

*Lieut.-Colonel Moore-Brabazon*: Certainly, Sir.

*Mr. Shinwell*: When the Minister says it is not for him to answer questions of this kind, and when we are informed by other Ministers that it is not for them to answer, can we be told who is to answer?

*Lieut.-Colonel Moore-Brabazon*: If the hon. Member raises a Question about the Customs, no doubt the Chancellor of the Exchequer would reply.

*Mr. Shinwell*: But when there is delay in clearing docks, and when everybody knows there is serious congestion at the principle docks, why do Ministers constantly “pass the buck” from one to another? Cannot we get some clear explanation of the position? Who is responsible? Is it the Government?

*Mr. Garro Jones*: Is it more important for the Minister to protect the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Customs Department than it is to inform the House of an important reason why the turn-round of ships is delayed?

*Mr. Buchanan*: Is not the Minister aware that the position in Glasgow is well known to any ordinary observer? Will he not take some interest in this matter himself and put it right?

*Lieut.-Colonel Moore-Brabazon*: The position in Glasgow is not at all

bad. It is probably as good as in any other of the Western ports. I refuse to be responsible for answering for the whole policy of the Government. I am in charge of my Department only, and if hon. Members want to question the whole position of the docks in a general sense, they must address a Question to the Prime Minister.

*Mr. Davidson*: Will the Minister deny categorically that there is a private agreement between the L.M.S. and the L.N.E.R. at the Shieldhall Docks?

*Mr. R. J. Taylor*: Is the Minister aware that it is alleged that we are working on an entirely peace-time basis?

*Mr. De la Bère*: Is it deliberate that we should be eternally deceived?

#### MINISTRY OF INFORMATION

##### BROADCASTS (POLITICS).

*Mr. Hely-Hutchinson* asked the Minister of Information whether he is aware of the injury to our united war effort arising out of the propagation on the British Broadcasting Corporation, in war-time, of highly controversial political doctrines which many men and women are unwilling to receive: whether he is aware of the growing misuse for this purpose of the religious talks, preceeding the 8 a.m. news, by anonymous speakers claiming the support of high authority in the churches for their views; and whether he will take power to control this abuse of public confidence?

*Mr. Cooper*: It is the policy of the B.B.C. to permit a fair balance in the free expression of all opinions except those which are opposed to the national war effort. Steps have recently been taken to ensure that religious talks receive the same general scrutiny as is applied to other broadcasts.

*Mr. Hely-Hutchinson*: Will the Minister, in the interest of fixing responsibility, take powers to prevent anonymity in broadcasts?

*Mr. Cooper*: That is another question. On certain occasions it might be desirable that a speaker should be known and in others it might be desirable that he should not be known, but I will look into the matter.

*Mr. Maxton*: Will the Minister say what are the qualifications of the gentlemen who go over the religious broadcasts?

*Mr. Cooper*: The people looking over them have hitherto been looking over other broadcasts. It is not considered desirable that politics should

enter into religious broadcasts, and the point of the supervision is to ensure that they should not.

*Sir Herbert Williams:* Is my right hon. Friend aware that two of these broadcasts have advocated two political schemes which have been condemned by annual meetings of the British Labour party?

*Mr. Silverman:* Will the Minister assure the House that the B.B.C. will do nothing to frustrate the general desire in this country that the world after the war shall not return to the parlous state that it was in before?

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE).

*Mr. Thorne* asked the Minister of Health in what way grants are made to the local authorities because of the high rates; and what amount has been granted?

*Miss Horsbrugh:* Local authorities to whom financial assistance is afforded to enable them to maintain essential services receive, as and when required, monthly advances based on estimates of cash receipts and payments. Except in special circumstances 75 per cent. of each advance is treated as grant, and the remaining 25 per cent. as an interest-free advance, in respect of which the Government retains the right to call for repayment after the war in the light of

the financial circumstances then obtaining. The amount advanced to date is £3,859,720.

*Mr. Thorne:* Would there be any difficulty in publishing in the OFFICIAL REPORT the names of the local authorities which receive the money?

*Miss Horsbrugh:* I must have notice of that question.

March 27.

Oral Answers to Questions.  
(43 columns).

CIVIL DEFENCE.

SHELTERS.

*Mr. Frankel* asked the Minister of Health whether he is aware that the Wembley Borough Council have been forbidden to continue their manufacture of air-raid shelter bunks; and whether, in view of the fact that these bunks were being made at a price much below that charged by private manufacturers, he will have the embargo placed upon the Wembley local authority removed?

*Mr. E. Brown:* I am aware that the Regional Commissioners for London have declined to approve the continuation of manufacture of bunks by the Wembley Borough Council. The Commissioners have had the costing figures supplied by the Wembley Borough Council examined and also the bunks. The Commissioners are not satisfied

that the bunks are of equal standard to those supplied by the Government nor that the price quoted represents the full cost of manufacture. Local authorities were warned as far back as the 30th November not to make further arrangements for local purchase or manufacture. This action was necessary in order to secure central control, and consequently more economical use of the limited supply of raw material available. Notwithstanding this direction Wembley made their own arrangements for manufacture three weeks later.

**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.

**“Expatriate Passion”**

“What William, Cardinal O’Connell calls ‘exalted hysteria,’ burned high at Mecca Temple, in New York. The wick was Clarence K. Streit’s *Union Now*, which at first was propaganda for a confederation of Western democracies and turns out to mean simply Anglo-American union. There are Americans who have an expatriate passion for it. Somerset Maugham was there. As a British subject, serving his government here, he was for it. He had been converted. How astonishing! Henri Bernstein, the French playwright, was there. He denounced American isolationists, says *The New York Times*, every one of them as a ‘masked appeaser.’ Mr. Bernstein, we understand, is a guest in this country because it is safer and more comfortable here than anywhere else in the world, thanks to a century and a half of American iso-

lation. We would remind him that freedom of speech is a right that belongs only to an American citizen. To the guest it is a privilege, and may be very easily abused. And we say the same to all the eminent literary persons who presume upon the amenities of their social welcome to be acting among us as foreign agents and propagandists, besides having the bad manners to tell us how we ought to think and feel and behave.”

—From “*The Saturday Evening Post*,” January 25, 1941.

**“THE ECONOMIST” ON MONEY**

“...In this war, the public has from the start clearly grasped and approved the distinction between ‘genuine’ savings, which it is right to remunerate

with interest rates of up to 3 per cent., and created credit, which should be borrowed by the Treasury at no more than the cost of handling...”

“...The individual should be told that his duty is to reduce his consumption by every possible means...Once he has economised as much as he can, it matters very little what happens to the money he saves thereby. The saving once done, it is of no advantage to the State to pile up enormous figures of subscriptions to Savings Certificates and War Loan. Indeed, it is to the State’s advantage not to borrow at 2½ per cent. or 3 per cent. if it can raise the money more cheaply, and the truly patriotic citizen is he who, having reduced his consumption to the absolute minimum, leaves his spare money in the bank...”

—Extract from “*Profits, Savings and Inflation*” in the “*Economist*” of March 22, 1941.

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

Public Meeting on April 16, 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 17.

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/-
Barrier to Health by Dr. Douglas Boyd..... 6d.
Lower Rates (pamphlet) ..... 3d.
The Press Ban on Parliament by John Mitchell..... 1/6
(All the above postage extra.)

Leaflets

- Invincible Britain by John Mitchell .....2d. each, 1/6 doz.
What we are about by H. E. ....50 for 1/6
Hitler and Churchill Finance by John Mitchell .....50 for 1/9
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.