

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 6. No. 6.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

BUDGET 1941-42

By H.R.P.

The country's petty cash account has once again been presented with the usual theatrical trappings in Press and Parliament. As usual our elected representatives cheered the Chancellor before his speech. As usual the debate consisted largely in Socialist M.P.s complaining that the taxation is not savage enough. As usual no fundamental criticism was audible. As usual Press comment was either fulsome flattery or emphasis on insignificant points. *The Social Crediter* and its predecessors have printed all there is to say about this year's first Finance Bill—there may be more later—in past years, so that it seems waste of time to draw attention to the fundamental fallacy of taxation at any time except in war and to the various other fallacies underlying all Budgets.

Only two points deserve specific mention. One is the remarkable admission that "the State" can spend about £2,500,000,000 per annum over and above the income of its exchequer and retain a financial position that is "sound." In fact that statement is true, but we should remember it for after the war. It is remarkable because in 1931 and at other times savage taxation was made still more savage on the grounds that the only sound finance of the country was one in which the Exchequer's income from taxation exceeded its outgoings, including even capital charges. There seems to be a lack of principle, in both senses of the word, in certain authoritative quarters.

The other point worth mentioning is the "compulsory saving" clause. Some of the tax we pay will be credited to us after the war, D.V., etc. It is a simplified method of Keynes's scheme that has already been explained in these

pages and contrasted with that put forward by Major Douglas. The amount to be credited is the total additional tax arising from the increase of 1/6 in the £ in the standard rate of tax, and that arising from reduced allowances. The commentator in the *Daily Express* makes a most illuminating remark. He explains that the 1/6 will not "go down the drain" like other tax payments. This certainly sheds a lurid light on the muddle-headedness not only of the deluded general public but also of those who are regarded as experts in financial matters. The 1/6 will be spent on precisely the same sort of expenditure as the remaining 8/6. There is not even the pretence of a "fund." If the 1/6 does not "go down the drain" then the 8/6 doesn't either. There would therefore and in fact be no reason why the whole of the taxation paid should not be credited to us. As an admission of principle this 1/6 credit is important as it is an admission of what can be done.

If public services amount to a sum covered by say 2/- in the £, there is not a shadow of an excuse for crediting less than 8/- in the £, as all this extra purchasing power will be required after the war in view of the enormous increase in productive capacity now taking place, despite all the destruction.

But it is very doubtful whether the promise to credit is sincere. As it is, it will require further legislation and when the time comes to honour the pledge another Chancellor will control the Treasury. It will be easy for him to declare that "conditions have changed since the Spring of 1941," or "certain difficulties were overlooked by my illustrious predecessor," or "we are so poor that what is wanted is more work, not

a windfall," etc. You just won't get it. The general opinion seems to be that the proposal is hypocritical. After all, if the Government was sincere in its intentions, the obvious and simpler method of implementing them would be to credit the sums to a P.O.S.B. account on payment. The account could be blocked until after the war; but the credit would be there.

HIDING THE GAP

"... As the Chancellor himself said, 'the national accounts will always balance,' and even if there were a large volume of inflation of the crudest sort, it would show itself, not in an item specifically labelled 'Inflation,' but in a swelling of some of the other items,

On Other Pages

THE WORLD AFTER
WASHINGTON (II)

By C. H. Douglas

UNION IS DEATH

By Geoffrey Dobbs

'THE ECLIPSE OF THE
HIGHBROW'

By B. M. Palmer

WHAT ABOUT TURKEY?

By E. S. E.

particularly Nos. 7 and 8 in the above table.

"The White Paper figures cannot therefore be taken, as they stand, as a demonstration that there has been no 'gap' in the recent past. Some of the figures for the six months to September, 1940, to February, 1941, look rather swollen when grossed up to an annual basis. For example, it is difficult to feel quite confident that drafts on domestic capital at the rate of £480 millions a year, or personal savings at the rate of £640 millions a year, would have been possible without some assistance from the creation of credit—particularly in view of the strong circumstantial evidence that credit was, and is, in fact, being created at a considerable rate."

"... It is impossible not to suspect that the old sin of underestimation has again been committed, and that the eventual figure of domestic expenditure will be several hundreds of millions more than £3,700 millions."

"... It is difficult not to see a third piece of optimism in the belief that 'genuine' personal savings, which were only some £150 millions in 1938, will have risen to between £840 and £940 millions in 1941-42. The Chancellor's belief that he has closed the gap represents the most optimistic view that can be taken of the position. It is possible to put against it the not unreasonably pessimistic view that there may be a 'gap' in the coming year of several hundred—perhaps a thousand—millions."

—From "The Economist," April 12, 1941, article entitled "The First War Budget."

IN THE DARK AGES

"What, again I ask, is the meaning of the words 'public riches'? What is, or ought to be, the end of all government and of every institution? Why, the happiness of the people. But this man seems, like Adam Smith, to have a notion that there may be great public good though producing individual misery. They always seem to regard the people as so many cattle working for an indescribable something that they call 'the public.' The question with them is not whether the people, for whose good all government is instituted, be well off or wretched, but whether the 'public' gain or lose money or money's worth."

Cobbett had not fallen for the puritan-financiers' propaganda that although God always would keep us practically starving, we were at any rate ten times richer than in the profligate Dark Ages. This English writer shews that pauperism and poor laws arose not out of England's past but from the modern financier. In the hundred years since Cobbett the forces of slavery have closed in on Europe, still keeping our eyes on some dream future, off the lunacy under our noses, ensuring that our perception should be flabby and vague: "Those who make wars," said Cobbett, "generally know how to give them a good name."

The people of these Dark ages handled tyranny roughly, and not being slaves they had no tyrants. Edward II and Richard II could not hide behind votes of confidence or a threat of inflation. Thomas Usk writing about

1385 says: "The soverainnesse should thinke in this wyse: 'I am servaunt of these creatures to me delivered, not lord but defendour, not mayster but enfourmer; not possessour but in possession; and to hem liche a tree an whiche sparowes shullen stelen, hir birdes to nourisshe and forth bringe, under suretee ayenst al raveynous foules and beestes, and not to be tyraunt themselves.'"

Before Henry VIII collared the mints, money was decentralised, being issued locally by Royal and Church mints. Chaucer's Parson has a word on Economics: "Of thilke bodily marchandise, that is lewful and honeste, is this; that, there-as God hath ordeyned that a regne or a contree is suffisaunt to himself, thanne is it honeste and lewful, that of habundance of this contree, that men helpe another contree that is more nedy. And therefore, there moste be marchants to bringen to and fro that o contree to that other hire marchandise. That other marchandise, that men hauten with fraude and trecherie and deceite, with lesings and false othes, is cursed and damnable."

These were the times about which Shakespeare wrote epics. Money was controlled by usury laws, issued locally when wanted, and English land was used to feed English people, who incidentally could afford to support a church within every four square miles. The realism of attacking the absurdity under our eyes must be used again unless what is left of England is to float across the Atlantic on some deep flowing current of meaningless bombast.

(REV.) HENRY SWABEY.

DIARY OF EVENTS

APRIL 8—Greeks have been holding on along Bulgarian frontier; R.A.F. bombed targets in Bulgaria. In Libya, Italians claimed recapture of Derna. R.A.F. bombed Kiel very heavily.

In Great Britain, 4,259 civilians were killed in air raids in March, and 5,537 severely injured. New schedule of reserved occupations announced.

APRIL 9—Germans entered Salomika; R.A.F. continuously active on Greek front but British troops not engaged. Yugoslavian separated from Greek army, except in Albania. In Libya, British troops withdrawn to Tobruk; in Eritrea, Massawa occupied.

Coventry and other midland towns heavily bombed.

APRIL 10—Berlin bombed for three hours.

APRIL 11—In Greece, British forces, commanded by Lieut.-Col. Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, in contact with German forces. Yugoslavia invaded by Hungarians, Zagreb captured by Germans.

President Roosevelt opened Red Sea and Gulf of Aden to American shipping.

APRIL 12—Italian and German forces linked up in Albania.

Heavy German air-raid on Bristol and south-west.

APRIL 13—U.S.S.R. signed pact of neutrality with Japan.

APRIL 14—In Balkans, British forces have withdrawn to new positions and Yugoslavian forces to mountains. In Libya, our forces have repulsed attack on Tobruk.

'The Eclipse of the Highbrow'

By B. M. PALMER

Quite an entertaining controversy on this subject has enlivened the correspondence columns of *The Times* during the last two or three weeks. It ranged over the immense field of the purpose of art, and its relation to life and politics, used in the accepted sense.

Though it would not occur to me to attempt to define art or its purpose, it seems reasonable to assume that art is not something which has no relation whatever to reality. Conversely, the artist and his art must be firmly planted in reality if they are to be of more value than tinkling brass or sounding cymbal, and when we have reached this point quite a wide field of thought is before us.

In the essay which opened the controversy (March 25) *The Times's* leader-writer states that it is only in the cultivation of the virtues of endurance unselfishness and discipline "that talent in the arts, as in other things, can, save in the most exceptional cases, make anything useful and beautiful of its own capabilities." He also says, "those are the virtues which the highbrow—being often impatient, intolerant, self-indulgent and touchy—for the most part lacks, but which the ordinary citizen must possess if he is to achieve any sort of security for himself."

How fond *The Times* is of the ordinary citizen! And how long will it take him to discover that there is no such person (in spite of Mr. McKenna), and that, so far as the theory of the 'ordinary citizen' is useful, the Editor of *The Times* is ordinary, and so is the Duchess of Kent, the Archbishop of Canterbury and our Winston!

We are familiar with this leader-writer's way of personifying the abstract virtues, as though we could find endurance and discipline lying neatly labelled in a little box and take out as much as we wanted; whereas they are simply ways of applying action to meet particular cases, and to personify them in this manner is merely to elevate the means above the ends. The leader-writer seems to believe that art cannot exist without moral progress; but we should not accept his implied definition of moral progress as a cultivation of virtue for its own sake. This we should deny with both hands, as Alice might

say.

There is another definition of moral progress:—

"The only rational meaning which can be attached to the phrase 'moral progress,' is firstly a continuous approach to Reality (which includes and perhaps is, real Politics), and secondly, the ordering of our actions, in the light of such approach, so that they tend towards our own and the general good. And if, as may be held, Reality and Good, or God, are synonymous, these two come to much the same thing."*

In the light of this definition it seems that art is bound up with moral progress in its rational sense, not in the other worldliness which passes for morality with *The Times*. The more thought that is given to this masterly definition, the plainer it seems that here, in these few words, lies the key to the understanding of the purpose of art, as well as of everything else which gives a meaning to life.

And as for the expressions middlebrow, shambrow, and lowbrow, horrible terms which to me have not even the saving grace of humour, but simply betray a complete lack of comprehension on the part of those using them of what are the elements of the subject they are discussing—these terms seem to be based on the assumption that it is possible for everyone to understand everything, that we may all be experts. Surely we may admire and even cross the Sydney Bridge without understanding it as a structure, or deprecating our lack of engineering knowledge with regard to it.

But perhaps the man who coined the word "highbrow" was trying to express the delusion of the supremacy of the intellect. If so, the term means one in whom 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."†

I think the artist, like every other man who aspires to do anything worth

while, *must* be able to check theory and ideas against experience—when he is able to do this, there will be no difficulty in our accepting the result, as we all accept Shakespeare.

That brings me to the words of Samuel Johnson quoted by one of the correspondents—"By the common sense of readers, uncorrupted with literary prejudices, after all the refinements of subtilty and the dogmatism of learning, must be finally decided all claims to poetical honours."

The common sense of the English people—if we ever had the greatest literature in the world, and as some say, the greatest music in the Elizabethan Golden Age—must have lain somewhere between intellect, "common" sense, and their continuous approach towards Reality, or God.

VELOCITAS

That sureness is not exclusively associated with slowness might be the motto of *Velocitas*, the journal of the Huddersfield Corporation Passenger Transport Employees' Social Club, which publishes articles of a realistic attitude that might well make the larger journals sit up.

"The danger of the German threat has been quite well emphasized," remarks 'Watchman' in the issue of March, 1941. "and the country is alive to it, but there still remains the threat of the dead hand of bureaucracy and centralisation, helped by the foolish apathy of the general public, who seem content to endure endless inconvenience, rather than make an attempt to control their own democratic institutions... When the electors in this Empire of ours begin to issue instructions to the people they employ [their representatives] they can expect to see results..."

In the January issue, F. D. Vautrey, in an article on Unemployment, says:

"Remove from our records such things as ship loads of Spanish oranges being shovelled into the seas because certain gangs of people could not agree about the price to be charged for them when they arrived.

"... The same goes for the fellow who cannot get a job. Let him live, and live decently. Do not penalise thousands, nay, millions, because there is not enough work to go round."

**Whose Service is Perfect Freedom* by C. H. DOUGLAS. Chapter IV.

†*Where the Carcase is*—by C. H. DOUGLAS. Chapter II.

UNION IS DEATH

By GEOFFREY DOBBS

"They (small nations) are a symptom of the ugly and mean separatism which is frustrating the drive towards a unified world."

"World order sooner or later is inevitable . . . because it is in the trend of evolution."

From *The Case for Federal Union* (pp. 102, 119) by W. B. CURRY.

It is the usual practice of verbal propagandists to describe those ideas which tend towards their objective with sympathetic words, and those which tend away from it with antipathetic words, so that, in time, they are able to make even abstract terms, such as Unity and separatism, which originally were devoid of 'moral' flavour, take on a desirable or hateful appearance from their constant association with other words.

This choice of words, however, which is intended to make thought turn in the desired direction by holding, as it were, a stick on one side and a spoonful of syrup on the other, also has the effect of revealing to the intended victim the philosophy of the propagandist.

If I say, therefore, that the philosophy revealed by such commonplaces of World Order propaganda as those quoted above is the philosophy of Death, I have so far made it plain only that I am opposed to it, and want to discredit it by association with an unpleasant word.

Before we can go further, and decide whether *my opinion* can be regarded as correct, these abstractions must be made to mean something by being brought into relation with the real Universe, as experienced by mankind in general, and by ourselves in particular.

If we make lists of those words which are handled sympathetically by the World Order enthusiast, and of those towards which he is antipathetic, we find that the first list includes many words which have, at least until recently, been regarded as colourless, or even slightly unpleasant by the majority of people (the markedly unpleasant words of similar meaning are of course left alone by the propagandist who wishes to induce sympathy), and the second list contains many words which formerly stood for something attractive, but which the World Orderer endeavours to associate with unpleasant things.

Thus, the first list, of words favourable to his philosophy includes the following:—

Union, Unity, Unified, Universal. Great, powerful World-wide, international. Order, organised, planned, Law, regulation, Police, controlled, centralised, federated. Equality, common, collective, orthodox. Give up, pay for, sacrifice.

The second list, of words of which he disapproves, includes these:—

Many, separate, different, distinction, secession, partition, boundary. Local, national, patriotic, sovereign, independent, loyal. Natural, unplanned, uncontrolled. Inequality, superiority, nobility, aristocracy. Gain, profit,

property, private, personal, peculiar, heterodox.

If we continue the first list by the inclusion of those words which clearly belong there since they express the same general ideas, but in terms so dreary that they cannot be used in a favourable sense, we get the following: Uniformity, monotony, standardisation, sameness, inorganic, non-living, *Death*. A similar inclusion of words too obviously 'good' to cast a slur upon, brings these into the second list: Diversity, creation, invention, original, change, individual, parturition, birth, *Life*.

I do not claim, of course, either that these lists are complete, or that they illustrate the immutable use of the words by such people, but I think that experience will, in general, show them to be broadly correct, with the exception that all but the crudest propagandists will pay some lip-service to some of the ideas in the second list, always, be it noted, in a manner which makes them secondary, or subservient to the first-list ideas; as when a speaker, after delivering a lengthy address on the need for World Order, assures his audience at the end that quaint old local patriotisms, and individual peculiarities will be preserved, provided that 'some sacrifice of individual liberties' is first of all made! The federalist, in particular, has specialised in this sort of technique, and may be heard assuring people that the World will be much less uniform under one Government than it is under many, and that we shall all be much 'freer' when we have sacrificed some more of our independence. If there is any doubt as to where his heart lies, however, let the main planks of his programme be borne in mind: they are effective centralised control of money and of armed force.

When we examine these two lists of words we find that they correspond with two primary tendencies (or whatever else we like to call them) in the universe: on the one hand, the movement from sameness to difference, homogeneity to heterogeneity, non-living to living, which we may call Creation, and which corresponds to the second list; on the other hand, the movement from difference to sameness, heterogeneity to homogeneity, living to non-living, which we may call Death, and which corresponds to the first list.

Both these processes are real, and part of our experience, though we will leave it to the philosophers to discuss whether they are both equal and continuous, or whether one or the other dominates the Universe. "It is as natural," says Bacon, "to die as to be born"; but is it equally natural for a man, or for a whole generation of men, to incline towards Death rather than towards Life?

It is true that we are all dust, and must return to the dust, but need we worship the dust? We are all protoplasm, and cannot escape from it, but is it as important as the fact that we are discrete lumps of protoplasm? We are all men, but is that as significant as the fact that we are all *different men*?

Indeed, there is no escape from our Unity, our Sameness; there is no need to preach it, to 'support' it, to propa-

gandise it. All we have to do is to give up, to yield, to stop struggling but for a moment, and behold, we fall into its arms! There is a time for dying, and for giving up with dignity the little difference which is our life, but what can we think of a generation which makes this into a Cult?

No one who has seen the accelerating development of that deadly sameness which we call Civilisation can be surprised at seeing it flower into wholesale destruction:

"Hell is a city much like London," Shelley wrote even more truly than he knew.

The houses, the shops, the offices, the factories, the cinemas, the roads, the buses, the lives, those standardised workers' lives, who can be surprised to see necrotic spots developing on the thing! Heaps of rubble with beams and legs sticking out, deep holes showing drains and other entrails! what could be more natural! After all there was still a certain difference between a dwelling house, a shop, an office, a pub and a church, but between so many heaps of rubble—O magnificent Unity! What could be more in tune with the Universal?

There are some still among this generation of Levellers who find it hard to believe that Death has such a following, despite the evidence of their senses. They forget that the bulk of the priests and prophets and poets and propagandists generally have kept their most moving words for Death and the Universal. For indeed Death has his dignity, his pomps and his power.

Consider our heritage in literature, it is full of Death and levelling; the Old Testament, even the best of the Prophets is full of such things as these:—

Trust ye in the Lord for ever: for in the Lord JEHOVAH is everlasting strength:

For he bringeth down them that dwell on high; the lofty city, he layeth it low, even to the ground; he bringeth it even to the dust. (*Isaiah 26, 4 and 5*).

Or again, and more famously (*Isaiah 40, 4*):

Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain.

Let us go on to the poets:

Sceptre and crown must tumble down
And in the dust be equal made
With the poor crooked scythe and spade.

"Equal"! that's the word for your modern generation. Down with unfair distinctions—and all distinctions are unfair:

Golden Lads and Girls all must
As Chimney-sweepers come to dust.

"Serve 'em right! the dirty parasites!" or more pompously "We are all agreed that equality of sacrifice must take prior place."

A letter which was given great prominence on the centre page of the *News Chronicle* (*God and the War Discussion*, January 31, 1941) actually contains the following sentence:

"This time we must not win until equality of sacrifice becomes a reality."

which means—"until we are all dead" or else nothing at all! But it was *meant* to mean something, and was strongly approved by many. There is no denying that Equality and

Union are all the cry nowadays, even while we fight to prevent our Union and Equality with the other slaves of Europe, and the very Peace which is desired and hoped for is the Peace of Union, which is the Peace of Death, carrying with it the loss of that liberty "which no honest man will lose but with his life."

It is the fixation, the end of growth, and the beginning of the death of the Human Race which is being plotted. One World Government has never before been possible, but now, because it is so, those minds which have grasped the possibility seem everywhere to be fascinated with it, and to be attempting, almost against their will, to bring this nightmare to reality.

It is our doom, they tell us, our fate, we cannot escape it, for it is in the trend of evolution! As if the Human Race, Nature's newcomer, which has just burst fresh upon the World, were in its dotage. I can imagine that in some sad century to come, a dwindling and degenerating race of men may be forced to unite, to pool their resources and huddle together in order to prolong for a few generations their lives upon a cooling planet, before the species goes back into the earth from which it came. But now! in the dawn of youth! to bring all those teeming millions under the rule of one Government, *one* little group of men, sooner or later inevitably and effectively *one* man; to bring Science and Art, and every manifestation of life and action under *one* Money Power, *one* Police, *one* Law, *one* Central Authority and Censor, whatever multiplicity of secondary laws, governments and restrictions there may be which cannot challenge the Central one; what a pitiful vision. No wonder that the people perish!

Fortunately it is not yet possible of realisation; there is too much vitality left in the Human Race. We may speak of Union, but we fight Hitler, and though the other Unifiers hope that we shall be too tired to resist *them* when we have finished, I believe that we shall find strength to fight them too. For if not, then we shall have to fight them later, when they are established in power, and the reckoning will be worse. The human spirit will fight against Unity as the human body will fight against death, and for the same instinctive reason; but if war-weariness should make us yield, so that some Union, and perhaps even some World Government should be set up, then directly strength and vitality began to return there would be revolts against it; and if it were strong enough to suppress these revolts, it would have to deal with revolt after revolt, until the whole World went down into the blood and chaos of a Dark Age longer than that which followed Rome.

The alternative is to suppose that the Central Government could be permanently successful in controlling the activities of Mankind without serious rebellion, in imposing one Law upon the whole Race (i.e. one set of habits of thought and action). This would inevitably result in the fixation of the species which, having lost its adaptability, would soon follow those many others which have trodden this path before it, back into the Greater Unity of Nature.

It is the argument of Federal and Nazi Unionist alike that it is the existence of small nations, with their dividing boundaries and distinctions which is the chief cause of war, and there is this much truth in it, that it is the nature of Man and indeed of all living organisms to resist absorption

(continued on page 11)

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. 6.

Business Office:
12, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.
Telephone: Bank 5260.
Saturday, April 19, 1941.

What About Turkey?

Why hasn't Turkey come in to the war? Many people are puzzled by her attitude to the fight in the Balkans; daily we are led to believe that she is about to plunge into the conflict on our side. Daily, she refrains.

The key, of course, lies with M. Stalin in his role of sinner-on-the-fence in chief, who is at the moment finding it desirable to lay more ground bait for those who are eager to believe, with the minimum excuse, that he has not already climbed down on the German side. For these was designed the solemn pronouncement of disapproval after the annexation of Bulgaria, a statement that came far too late to influence events. For these, too, the gesture to Jugoslavia, a soothing gesture which, according to one daily paper, may be used by the United States as a reason for exporting arms to the Soviet.

In the House of Commons, answering a question from Mr. Price as to whether, in connection with the Anglo-Turkish Alliance, he could make any statement on the declaration of Soviet Russia on its relations with Turkey, Mr. Butler said on April 2:

"The recent Turco-Soviet declaration contained the following passage—

Should Turkey in fact be the object of aggression and be involved in war in defence of her territory, Turkey could then in accordance with the Turco-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact count upon the full understanding and neutrality of the Soviet Union.

"The House will remember that under Protocol 2 of our Treaty of Mutual Assistance with Turkey, the obligations undertaken by Turkey cannot compel her to take action having as its effect, or involving as its consequence, her entry into armed conflict with the Soviet Union. Such a possibility would appear to be even further removed by

the recent declaration of the Soviet Government."

Turkey, in fact, can only enter the war with Soviet Russia's consent. And this would be no whit less true if the protocol quoted above had never been drafted. Turkey is far too vulnerable to a threat from Soviet Russia for any other power to be the determining factor of her policy. Anything Turkey does will be 'by permission' of Soviet Russia.

Nor is M. Stalin's policy as enigmatic as he tries to make it, a quality which the press finds so picturesque for cartoons and highly coloured articles.

Not only is the German-Russian trade agreement in full working order, but Russia is importing vastly greater quantities of goods from America and exporting more or less equivalent quantities of her own goods to Germany. In effect, she is acting as a corridor for the passage of American materials to Germany. As British air attacks become more destructive of factories in German domain, factories are being built on Russian soil for the manufacture of armaments for Germany. Germany provides the technicians and the plans; Russia provides labour. The major part of the output goes to Germany. In the wake of German conquest Russia has acquired parts of Poland and Rumania. Further, in a pact some clauses of which have been announced this week, Russia has concluded a peace in her sporadic war with Japan. Only the secret clauses could give explicitly the clue to her attitude to the war in general, but the pact's immediate effect is to free Japan for aggressive behaviour in the Pacific.

In every major action, therefore, Russian policy has been solidly pro-German,—which is not surprising, con-

sidering that it is built on the precepts of a German Jew by revolutionaries introduced to Russia and financed by Germany in the last war.

The struggle in the Balkans may be the crucial one of the war, and it is surely a profound breach of loyalty with the people of this country for the contingent nature of Turkey's help not to be made quite clear. For it is obviously associated with considerable power on the part of Russia to blackmail this country. And against undesirable concessions, in either our internal or external economy, only informed public opinion is the safeguard. E.S.E.

U.S. CHEMICALS

The New York Department of Justice is investigating complaints that the German Dye Trust has been attempting to dominate the American chemical trade, to build up dollar credits for Germany, and to preserve its world markets intact, all through its control of production and trade by means of its patents.

It is alleged that the Trust has been dominating the American chemical trade by means of patent-assigning arrangements that were entered into through various Swiss and American interests since the war started. About 400 patents, it is said, were assigned to one American interest.

Corporations under subpoena in this connection are the Schering Corporation and Ciba and Hoffman Laroche companies in New Jersey, and the Swiss Bank Corporation, the General Aniline and Film Corporation, the Sterling Products Company, and the Winthrop Chemical Company in New York.

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 (II)

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 (the first part appeared in "The Social Crediter" of April 12) 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.

We began by saying that this world is a testing ground for theories, and we can proceed by the proposition that every organisation, social, industrial, national or cosmopolitan, is the incarnation of a theory, of which, sooner or later, the individual is the judge. An organisation such as, for instance, the World Financial Organisation, may appear, and may in fact stand, for numbers of quite disconnected objects so long as its general validity and usefulness is not clearly challenged by the supreme arbiter, the self-conscious human spirit. But when that time comes every organisation has to declare its long suit, and discard from weakness.

Now, that is the position of the Doctrine of Original Sin to-day, incarnated ultimately in the Financial Temples of Wall Street, with Chapels-of-Ease in Lombard Street, the Rue Scribe, and elsewhere. Only a few years ago the proposition, that the object towards which the High Priests of those temples were working was the raising of the standard of living, and an increase in the amenities of life, passed without more articulate and reasoned dissent than was contained in sporadic strikes of disgruntled "workers," mostly on pretexts which could be shown without difficulty to be either illogical or absurd. But one veil after another has been torn from this fairy-tale by patient, acid, investigations into the methods of Financial Sabotage; the investigations carried on almost independently by widely separated persons and groups, mostly engineers, in the great industrial and financial countries; and it has become quite clear that the object of the Financial System under which we live (let it be clear that no personal attack is necessarily involved) is *not the distribution of goods and services up to the limit to which they can be produced. It is Employment—Employment for its own sake.* The street-corner orator, who always exaggerates, calls it Slavery, but of course that is absurd. No one is forced to compete for employment who is willing to starve, although the converse is not true.

It is necessary to rescue the foregoing statements from the damning charge of rhetoricism. It would be possible to fill pages with statistics of the undistributed output, actual and potential, of the fields, factories and farms of this country alone. It would be possible, and rather amusing, to tear to bits the latest financial bluff that we are a poor, poor country after the war and that our acres of new factories, filled with the finest machinery the world could produce—most of it adaptable to peace uses—our farms developed by the stress of demand, our stupendous reserves of motor and marine transport, didn't really mean wealth at all. But an extract from a speech by Senator E. F. Ladd, as reported in the Congressional Record, 67th Congress, 2nd Session (December 15, 1921, Washington, U.S.A.) is sufficiently illuminating. He said:—

"This country [U.S.A.] alone has resources more than sufficient to feed, clothe, and shelter the entire population of all civilised countries. Probably it would not be too strong

a statement to say that with our present man-power, and material equipment, properly and effectively applied to our natural resources, we could furnish all the principal necessities for the economic support of all the people of the earth for years to come. It has been computed that we have standing room for all the human beings now living in the world in the State of Texas alone, giving to each individual 66 square feet of space. It has been estimated that California alone could furnish all necessities and many luxuries for one-half of the present population of the United States. That section of the country usually referred to as the North-West could feed the present population of the United States, with the exception of such things as are grown in tropical countries, without any great strain upon its resources, and its surplus will be sufficient to purchase these products. Taken together with the Pacific North-West it could furnish all the bread-stuffs, meat products, dairy and poultry products, wool, flax, shoes, lumber, iron, steel, coal and water power, the entire country could use in the next 500 years."

"The like could be said of almost any other great subdivision of the United States, yet there are millions in this country to-day who are facing a winter of threatened suffering from exposure and lack of food. At the same time, the farmers of this country have produced so great an excess of food that it cannot be carried over by our transportation, marketing, and credit system, and placed in the hands of consumers, even though we have employment at prices within their reach. We have ample resources of coal and other fuel to meet all needs for industrial and domestic uses of our people and more; yet many parts of the country are facing the practical certainty of a fuel famine in case the winter should be severe."

Now, it is the fact which lies embedded in the above statement which must be grasped before any useful conception of the World Situation can be formed. The problem which is racking the world to-day is not a technological or agricultural problem, and so "increased production" is no remedy for it; it is not an administrative problem, and so Socialism, in the ordinary acceptation, is no remedy for it; it is a directive and distributive problem, and so in the truest *though not in the orthodox sense*, it is a political problem, because the direction of policy and the control of distribution are both resident in Finance.

Let no one ride off with the idea that the United States is a special case. With all her natural resources, her problems are identical in character, and even greater in severity, than those afflicting Great Britain. Apart from the fact that these islands are much nearer to being potentially self-supporting than financial interests would have us believe, the question turns on a totally different matter, which is only remotely affected by natural resources; that is, that the buying power distributed to individuals during the process of production is not available as effective demand for

more than a fraction of the product.

The explanation of this apparently paradoxical fact is somewhat complex, but the fact itself is now hardly challenged by any competent authority. It ought to be obvious with this fact in mind that a country which cannot buy its own production, cannot buy goods exchanged for the unliquidated surplus, and, consequently, only the distribution of the original fraction of production is affected by such exchange. That is the position of every industrial nation to-day.

Again, the definite charge which is here made, that the energies of the working population are perverted by the financial system so that scientific and industrial progress is persistently thwarted in its task of releasing men and women from the bondage of purely economic production, is not made on the ground of any abstract or doctrinaire theory of "right," or "justice." On the contrary, all such ideas belong to the static world beloved of the Doctrine, whereas our hope lies in Social Dynamics. In plain English, that means that when, say, Professor Soddy, is engaged on critical investigations connected with the structure of the atom, it is absurd that he should not have someone to black his boots if that is the only way to get them blacked. But it is equally absurd that any human being should black his boots if the work can be well and conveniently done by a quiet little machine operated by the tide in the Bristol Channel.

And the outcome? Well, War, Murder, Inconclusive Revolution, Chaos—or a change in the Financial System. The strategy of Wall Street and branches is plain enough and sound enough *in vacuo*—in an abstract world in which all the factors are "given." It is to support and stimulate all movements which attack private, personal, and individual means of livelihood and consequent liberty, by the steady inculcation of the idea that economic "work" is the only title to life ("Down with the parasites!"), and the devising of means to sabotage production and raise prices, and so maintain and enhance the illusion of scarcity. ("We are a poor country after the war—only hard work and economy can save us.")

Carried to a successful conclusion this results in bringing the world under the sway of the purveyors of Employment. At the same time, with the aid of the same plea for economy, and by the exercise of financial pressure, steps are being taken to force the reduction of armaments in every country, so that only a highly specialised naval, military,

and aerial caste, trained to rigid obedience, and with a strong class bias, shall retain the determinant of armed force. By the control of credit, which controls policy, the local, omnipotent police forces thus formed, will be at the behest of the money kings; and one squadron of bombing aeroplanes will be happy to show any social or industrial malcontents what's what.

It is not a negligible scheme, but it is not so good as it looks, by reason of its dependence upon time. Much of the best talent in the world is in those ranks of society equally removed from great wealth and that utter submergence which makes intelligent action almost impossible; and many of the individuals possessing it are feeling the pressure of the policy while not yet entirely disarmed. Out of these, technicians, professional men, and others, action may come. High Finance will not have a complete walk-over.

The methods by which the great and final effort to subordinate Humanity to a system—to make men the slaves of machines rather than machines the servants of men—can be effectively countered are technical matters for experts and so out of place here. But they are known. It may be well to point out that the ballot-box has very little to do with them.

Governments, Cabinets, Ministers of State, are administrators, not originators of policy. The battle cries of the hustlings do not touch the questions of credit-control and price making, nor does the mechanism exist at the moment by which the political democracy could be made effective on such issues. Similarly, when elected, the "representatives" of the people can vote on a machine-made issue, or can abstain from voting, but it is elementary knowledge that none of them can create a live issue and keep it alive against the "interests."

Let it be repeated—you do not capture policy by capturing administration, but you do acquire control of administration if you are in a position to impose policy.

There is no time to lose. The easy method of delegating someone else to pull the hot chestnuts out of the fire is not going to meet this emergency. If, however, the manufacturers, traders, engineers and professional men of Great Britain could be persuaded to stop repeating the optimistic sentiments served out to the Press from the Bank Parlours, and would look facts in the face, as the English of Elizabethan days looked a very similar situation in the face, then there might be just enough time.

PARLIAMENT

CONCENTRATION OF PRODUCTION:

SUNDAY OPENING OF THEATRES

March 27.

CONCENTRATION OF PRODUCTION

(97 columns).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—[Mr. James Stuart.]

The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lyttleton): I will now deal as clear-

ly and explicitly as possible with the subject of concentration of production, and if in doing so I am obliged to enter into matters of technical detail, I hope the House will bear with me. The principles which underlie this policy are very simple. We have now reached a stage in our production at which we can afford to waste nothing. All the ingredients of production are precious. A demand for

labour on a very big scale is beginning to be felt. There is a strain on our raw material supplies and on our shipping space, and there is a strain on our capacity to produce munitions of war... I think it is mandatory that we must economise in our use of labour and see to it that no man or woman works part-time... If that is once admitted as an axiom, and I suggest that it is an axiom,

then concentration of production is the only solution. . . .

. . . .If we concentrate production in the ordinary way the total revenue surplus of any industry should be increased by saving in overhead expenses, saving of waste due to the under-employment of labour or machines, saving in part—I say “part” advisedly—of selling costs, saving by some standardisation of products and in fuel, power and transport. Further, the present position of industry will be improved to the extent that the Government have to use requisitioning powers. Under the Act, the Government pay compensation when they requisition a factory.

. . . .The Board of Trade will indicate, from its knowledge of what the degree of concentration to be achieved is or, in other words, what the degree of redundancy in any industry is, and where the concentration should take place geographically. . . .There are two main methods by which concentration is secured, either the commercial or the financial method. I will give two instances of the commercial method. First of all, a group of firms may arrange that one of them manufactures the actual product which was being made by the other and for the account of the other, and by “manufacturing for the account” I mean that the nucleus firm manufactures at cost and sells the product to the closed down firm at cost. The closed-down firm, with admittedly a reduced number of salesmen, will then sell its own product. . . .There is another type of commercial arrangement which might be mentioned. A certain manufacturer has been allotted a supply of raw materials by the Ministry of Supply and may sell the rights to use that raw material to another firm for a cash payment.

These are the main lines on which commercial arrangements will go, but they are not a universal application. . . .

Sir H. Williams: . . . I am not at all clear on what is the policy. If there are four factories making the same thing on a 25 per cent. basis, that, obviously, is uneconomical. The President of the Board of Trade says, “Put one factory on to making the same thing on a 100 per cent. basis,” but I am not clear about what is to happen to the three empty factories. Are they to be used for the production of raw materials? That was not stated in plain terms. If they are, why not give them orders now, before you destroy them? A firm is not a collection of 400 people; it has a soul, an entity and is a real and living thing. It is a place with traditions. Ever since

the war started some of us have been begging and beseeching Government Departments to spread contracts more freely so that small firms could have a share. What has been the attitude? Resistance all the time. Orders have been given only to the big firms. That has been the policy throughout. Many firms are engaged on mixed work, partly on the production of war material and partly on the production of civilian goods. I know one of the troubles, which is not the fault of the President of the Board of Trade. It is due to the bad advice given by the Air Staff, who drew a line on a map and said that factories on one side of the line were in a dangerous area and that those on the other were in a not so dangerous area. Coventry was one of the safe places—

Mr. J. J. Davidson (Maryhill): So was Clydeside.

Sir H. Williams: Liverpool was safer still. That was the theory, and great factories were built without any consideration as to the amount of labour available, or houses for the people. No arrangements were made for transport, and in many cases factories were built where there was no electric supply available.

Mr. Andrew McLaren (Burslem): And no water.

Sir H. Williams: Now, as a result of the follies which have been committed, people are taken from one district and shifted to another and are sometimes called unpatriotic because they do not want to move to places where conditions are deplorable. In some towns where there is undue concentration of war industries, conditions from every social point of view are deplorable. . . .

Mr. Horabin (Cornwall, North): I yield to no hon. Member in this House in admiration for, and in an absolute belief in, the soundness of the British people. I know that whatever is coming to us we shall stick it out. If you add to the suffering caused by enemy action unfair treatment by the Government, then you are trying the people of this country too much. If you go round and talk to the small shopkeepers, the small business people, the small capitalists, and the small rentiers, you will find that they are beginning to believe that there is no hope for them even in victory. That is the position which largely caused the downfall of France. Let us face up to it and not bury our heads in the sand. Why has not the President of the Board of Trade tackled one of the most urgent problems and one of the greatest sources

of man-power in this country? Why has he not tackled the concentration of distribution? There are hundreds of thousands of shopkeepers in this country who have built up their livelihoods, over a number of years, by great sacrifice and effort, who are being pushed out of business as a result of the Limitation of Supplies Order.

What is the Government doing? They are allowing them to die with the coldest savagery, which has only been equalled in the worst periods of *laissez faire*. Why is nothing being done to help these people, whose commitments are causing them sleepless nights and days of misery? Is it because the problem is too difficult? If that is so, I would use the words employed by the Secretary of State for India on another occasion. I would say to the President of the Board of Trade and to the Chancellor of the Exchequer: “If you think this problem is too difficult, as I have heard outside, for God’s sake go, and give way to men who have greater moral courage to tackle this problem. . . .”

Mr. Shinwell (Seaham): . . .First of all, let us consider the amazing suggestion that if this scheme is adopted, industry will return to a normal condition at the end of the war. This statement is, no doubt, intended to appease the small manufacturers, but in my view it is a piece of downright deception, or, if that language is regarded as too strong, an indication of crass ignorance in face of the obvious developments in British industry. What is the purpose of the scheme if it is not to promote greater efficiency? Are we to understand that we intend to become more efficient during the war, and then, when it is over, we are to return to industrial conditions, where efficiency is of less consequence? It is obvious, if the scheme was found in practice to be efficient and satisfactory that we should never wish to abandon it. But does anyone really suppose, once the industrial power has passed into the hands of the large industrialists, that the small man will ever be allowed to go back?

My right hon. Friend furnished the necessary indication in the course of his speech, reminding us of the existence of the Export Council, and informing us of its reconstruction. We were told the names of two industrialists who were to engage in the task of assisting in the concentration of industry under the scheme. One of them was a representative of the firm of Unilever, and the other a representative of the firm of Guest, Keen and Nettlefold—two monopolistic undertakings. . . . Are we to suppose

that these gentlemen, possessing great skill and knowledge in matters of this kind and believing, as they must believe, in the desirability of concentration in industry and in the creation of monopolistic trade undertakings, are going to pave the way for a return at the end of the war to a whole series of heterogeneous trading units? It is inconceivable. My right hon. Friend himself furnished the reply to his own case. In my opinion this scheme sounds the death-knell of the small men. There is to be no resurrection for them. . . .

Mr. Burgin (Luton): . . . It is very much easier to talk in Debate of concentration of industry than it is to apply it in practice. It is very difficult to apply in practice; it is probably impossible to apply without considerable injustices being caused. The point to which I wish the President of the Board of Trade to direct his attention is the increasing frequency with which power and knowledge are divorced. The President in his speech referred to his Industrial and Export Council; he told us some of the names of the leading members and referred to their impartiality. Their impartiality is not in doubt, but the President went on to say that their impartiality would not be tested because in almost every case they were dealing with industries with which they have nothing to do. The point I wish to emphasise is that this increasing frequency with which power is vested in some executive body, which has not at its elbow detailed knowledge of matters over which it is exercising power, is one that is causing distress to the rank and file of this country. . . .

Mr. G. Strauss (Lambeth, North): . . . the President of the Board of Trade has been in a dilemma. He has made a promise which is appreciated by those managers and directors of industry who believe they will benefit, although I am doubtful whether they themselves believe, having made this omelet, it can be "unscrambled" again and all the eggs put back as separate units. Anyone who watches the tendency of industry must see that it is to concentrate industry, not just during the war, but permanently, under big control and in some form of monopoly. I think that the man who sees his factory closed under this scheme, whether he is a worker, manager, or director, does not really believe there is any likelihood of it being reopened as the same sort of concern as it was before. It may be—and I ask the President of the Board of Trade to bear in mind the social undesirability of such a thing—that these units, which are placed in the

wrong parts of the country, may open again, when there are a thousand-and-one reasons why they should not be reopened. I hope in any future declaration he makes in that respect he will bear that point in mind. . . .

Captain Waterhouse: . . . He [Mr. Shinwell] went on to say that this was the death-knell of the small man. That was really the pith of his argument. I suggest that this is not the death-knell of the small man but that a continuance of the present tendency would inevitably be. Without concentration, the small man can hardly continue to survive with the curtailment imposed by the Limitation of Supplies Orders. How long would his money last? How long would the bankers continue to support the small members of manufacturing industries when, month by month, they see the money they are lending seeping away and they know there is little chance of any revival in that industry? Our policy is not the ruthless method of destroying the small trader. To my mind—and this particular aspect of the thing is also in the mind of my right hon. Friend—it is a means of salvation to the small man who would otherwise be hard put to it to carry on for the rest of the war. . . .

. . . the scheme. . . is not either "Socialism in our time" or "Fascism in our time." It is not an effort to wipe out the small man. It is not a Departmental design to teach industry how to run itself, and neither is it, I am personally happy to say, either planning or rationalisation in the rather restricted and controversial sense in which these terms were often used before the war. It is, on the other hand, a recognition of the hard facts of the case as I have said already, an invitation to firms as a whole to get together and to curb for the time being their healthy competitive instincts and so work out some mutually advantageous arrangement designed to achieve the end in view. I want to make it clear again that our plans are neither stereotyped nor exclusive. . . .

April 1.

Theatres and Music Halls

(Sunday Opening)

(57 columns)

[For reasons of space it is not possible to make full abstracts from this debate as a result of which The Regulation allowing Sunday Opening will be annulled. Mr. A. P. Herbert's speech, however was notable:—]

Mr. A. P. Herbert (Oxford University): We have all, I am sure, admired the sincerity and eloquence, though not

always the Christianity, of the speeches that have supported this Prayer. I admire their dexterity the more, in that at least three hon. Members who have spoken have committed themselves to two incompatible propositions, first, that nobody wants Sunday facilities and that when they are granted nobody really uses them; and secondly, that if there are Sunday facilities the Christian Church will be brought down in ruins and the Sunday school will come to an end. . . . But I must confess that I have not been moved by any of these eloquent and sincere speeches to believe that on my rare Sundays off I may not allow myself, if the local authority decides that I may, to go to a play by Shakespeare or even to a music hall. [Interruption.] I have so much admiration for the brave work which the Noble Lady the Member for the Sutton Division of Plymouth (Viscountess Astor) has been doing in her constituency that I hope she will not provoke me into making a sharp reply to her. I think it is right to tell the House, especially after the importance attached by the right hon. Member for Newcastle-under-Lyme (Mr. Wedgwood) to letters and "mail," that I have the honour—and if anyone says that the honour is undeserved I shall not argue very hotly—to represent more clergymen of the Church of England than any other Member of the House. Of my constituents, I reckon that about 25 per cent. are clergymen. I may be regarded now as a lost soul, I am not often at home, postage is very expensive, and the price of protest is high, but owing to special circumstances I have been at home during the last few days, and I have not received a single protest against this Prayer from a single clergyman of the Church of England. I do not want to press that argument too far, but I think it is worth mentioning, because it seems to me that much of the opposition outside—I do not speak of the very sincere speeches we have heard to-day—is what I may call a sort of professional opposition from societies which exist to oppose, and, to use that horrible and almost meaningless phrase, have a "vested interest" in opposing this sort of thing, and which very soon will be out of business.

That leads me to my main point. . . . When anybody talks about bringing down the English Sunday in ruins and so on, he should remember that the kind of Sunday he is talking about rightly or wrongly no longer exists. You are not merely shutting the door after the horse

has gone, but when it is far away up the road.

Let me justify that statement. There are two main points always in this controversy. First of all, there are the interests of those who may be required to serve on Sundays, the actors and actresses and so forth. So long as I understood they were against the proposal I made no move in favour of it, but I understand that on the whole they are for it. Secondly, there are the interests of those who are going to be served, and that is the general interest. On that, I would point out that we are at war, and, whatever anyone may say, soldiers and sailors and Civil Defence workers cannot take their leave when they wish, and therefore cannot always put in their theatrical time, so to speak, during the week. I was told by an hon. Member just now of a unit which carefully puts its men off on Saturdays so that they can go to the theatre, and makes them work on Sunday.

Supposing a soldier or sailor does take his leave on Sundays, there are a great many recreations open to him. First of all, the pubs are open. Secondly, there are what are called the perils of

the streets; and if my hon. Friend had ever spent a fortnight in a barge with a barrage balloon, even he might not be so careful about the company he kept on the following Sunday. Thirdly, a man can go to the cinema and see the enlightened and instructive—we must say no more, in view of what the United States are doing just now—film displays of Hollywood. Fourthly, if the man stays at home, or if he goes to the house of a friend, and there is an efficient wireless, he can enjoy the entertainments put over by the British Broadcasting Corporation. And this is important. Let us look at what happened last Sunday—[Interruption]—forgetting the unfortunate episode to which my hon. Friends refer. According to the *Radio Times*, there were no fewer than seven theatrical entertainments put forward by the B.B.C. last Sunday. The entertainments, which were performed by professional actors, would be unlawful in the theatre outside. . .

Meanwhile, as my hon. Friend has already pointed out, on Sundays in Fleet Street and in every other big town there were hundreds of thousands of men

preparing Monday's *Times* and *Express* and all the papers which my hon. Friend reads in bed on a Monday without a protest or a qualm. . . I do not think that this picture of a quiet, peaceful, Christian Sunday, into which we are now going to throw some new and devastating explosive, corresponds to the facts. Anyhow, if the English Sunday is worth anything, surely it does not exist in bolts and bars and prohibitions. It exists in the hearts of the people, and it will never be displaced if it is a real thing, as I think it is. That is my answer to the hon. Member when he tells me about institutions. I believe in the Church of England, and I believe in a real sense in the British Sunday. But we are at war. The bells of our churches are no longer ringing to call the people across the valleys. The sons of the village are not there to walk with their fathers across the fields. But they will come back, or some of them will; and the bells will be heard again, but in that day I do not believe that their appeal will be any the less because of the little thing that we do for those boys to-day.

UNION IS DEATH—continued from page 5.

by their environment. For most of Man's history as a species Nature has provided the unifying environment which has had to be fought, first of all as individuals and small family groups, then as tribes and nations of increasing size competing with each other in a world of real scarcity, but now that the scarcity has been defeated by technological advance, and we are set free from the struggle against Nature and against each other for the fruits of Nature, and there is at last no need for war any more, the danger has become internal, and we still have to fight to preserve our independence from those who would unify us under some planned security—the Tyrants, the Planners, and their millions of followers, who seek the Nirvana of Union.

"Why should man be in love with his fetters, though of gold?" asks Bacon, "Art thou drowned in security? Then I say thou art perfectly dead. For though thou movest, yet thy soul is buried within thee." The answer is that man loves his fetters only when he is very weary and sick to death of wars and tribulations. When his strength begins to return he attempts to cast them off—and hence more wars and tribulations—and more weariness.

It is quite certain that so long as Unifiers of mankind can be sure of a big following, so long will there be wars. We can, of course, take the view that it is those who resist unification who are responsible for the wars; that Hitler, who has absorbed half Europe without war and would gladly have swallowed the rest in the same way, is not to be blamed for the war which has been caused by those who have opposed him; and that those who resist World Order and Federal Union are the warmongers rather than those who are attempting to thrust these things upon the world; it is all a matter of point of view, and there are plenty who take

this view, but it is insane, nevertheless.

It is so easy to say that nations make wars, so abolish nations! Independence means conflict and inefficiency, Life itself is a struggle, so abolish all these things! Death, Unity, the Universal alone is perfect and dignified. Life indeed has its dignity, but it is marred by so many things: Birth is not a very noble or pleasant beginning, and the pitiful agony of death itself belongs not to Death at all but to the failing life. Without life there is no sin, no pain, no struggling, no ugliness, no meanness, no boundaries, no distinctions, no inequalities! It is easy to see why Unity and Death have their followers.

Fortunately there are fewer such among the British race than among the others. In the world to-day its political expression, the British Commonwealth, stands alone, instinct with life, decentralisation, independence, throwing off and separating free, healthy young nations as a living thing should, free to secede, as Eire has, or to co-operate in defence, as the others are doing!

Compare the rest of the world! the grinning skeleton of Hitler's New Order, the huge carcass of Stalin's Russia, the still twitching moribundity of Lincoln's Union, maintained by Civil War, and ripened into Roosevelt's Bureaucracy! There is no hope except in us, and if our enemies within or without should succeed in blotting out, or diluting that difference which is Britain dreary indeed would be the prospect; but if another great uprush of Anglo-Saxon independence, originality, creativeness, bursting up and smashing the monomaniacs' dreams of unity to smithereens, should give the world a living example worth following, with our present command over Nature there is no end to the joy and satisfaction which might result.

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 May 1, 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 May 1.

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 ½d.
- 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
 - This Plan would Enslave Britain
by John Mitchell 9d. doz.
50 for 2/6
- (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.