

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 11. No. 4.

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

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"Great Britain and the United States warned the Soviet Government of information in their possession, that Germany was preparing to attack. . . The British Ambassador, Sir Stafford Cripps, asked for an interview with Stalin, to communicate this information to him. It was declined. He asked for an interview with Molotov. It was declined. He finally succeeded in seeing Vyshinsky, . . . and the general impression was that Vyshinsky went so far as to indicate that he considered Sir Stafford a 'provocateur,' for implying that Germany would turn against her Soviet friends."

— *Moscow Dateline* by HENRY C. CASSIDY.

We have received a copy of a Memorandum issued over the signature of Professor Soddy, F.R.S., stated to embody his ideas of "honest money." No one who has ever had any contact with Professor Soddy can fail to appreciate his transparent sincerity and public spirit.

Equally, a study of his views on monetary problems emphasises the curiously "Legalistic" working of his mind so far as this subject is concerned. No one, so far as we are aware, has ever been able to get it into his head that it is the mechanism by which people obtain money and its registration in that process by the price system, and not whether the money is "honest" or not, which is important, and that this process is completely unaffected by whether they get it from the State or from the banking system. Either can give it away, and neither will. Failing this, the "State" has no more "right" to create money than have the banks.

The Memorandum is accompanied by a facsimile letter from Mr. Andrew McLaren, Socialist M.P. for Stoke-on-Trent (Burslem), which contains exactly the kind of rhetoric calculated to do the subject of monetary reconstruction a maximum disservice.

Mr. McLaren probably knows less about the land question, which he drags in, than about the price system, which he does not mention.

If monetary reformers would only recognise (a) that the monetary policy of the major nations, during war-time at least, is nationalised; (b) that it offers no problem whatever on the issue side, (c) that it is prices which do offer a problem, and that this problem has been solved with spectacular success by the use of the Compensated Price, they would perhaps cease to worry about money issue and realise that there are only three financial questions for their attention.

First, Price Structure. Second, the acquisition of interest-bearing securities. Third, Taxation.

It is, unfortunately, obvious that numbers of people

with a conscious or unconscious will to domination have come to realise that a managed money system (as distinct from a reflective or realistic, money and price system) offers the most tremendous instrument of generalised tyranny at present known. It is particularly significant that advocacy of managed money is coming to be combined with advocacy of centralised control over land. Sir Reginald Rowe, a managed money advocate, writes to the threepenny daily so well known for its democratic principles, in its issue of September 17, that "some provision such as that proposed by the Uthwatt Report is necessary." So it is—if we are aiming at the Totalitarian State with a slave population.

Planners are solidly in favour of the abrogation of individual privilege and its transfer to them.

"If Herr Doktor Goebbels had come to America with the express purpose of making a complete mess of food production, he could not possibly have done as good a job as has been done in Washington."

— *America isn't going to have Enough to Eat* by LOUIS BROMFIELD.

It sounds familiar, somehow.

The native good sense of the Englishman is beginning to get the upper hand of the alien poison with which the Trades Union Movement has been drenched, and we should not be surprised if the Fabian-P.E.P. element lost ground rapidly from now onwards.

"THE GREAT AUSTRALIAN FOOD-SUPPLY BUNGLE. REVERSAL OF POLICY NEEDED."

— *The New Times*, Melbourne, July 2, 1943.

What, Australia, too?

"The [Russo-British] Agreement was announced jointly in London and Moscow at 2 p.m. July 13 [1941]. The Soviet authorities gave the agreement a good press, but it was not swallowed quickly by the public. As it was being announced on the radio, I heard a Russian say, 'I thought we were signing with honest people.' There had been too much anti-British propaganda before the war for the people to make an immediate turn-about."

— *Moscow Dateline* by HENRY CASSIDY.

Perhaps the most vicious fallacy prevalent in these days is that a privilege is something taken from someone else. The idea is equivalent to saying that good health causes bad health.

It is the basis of the idea that the poor are poor because the rich are rich, and its logical consequence is degradation

for all. The only hope for the world is that every man shall be confirmed in his privileges, and they shall be extended. That was Magna Charta. The perfect example of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, is a Desert. Above that level, there is no liberty without inequality, *i.e.*, privilege.

INDIVIDUALISM

The following letter appeared in THE SCOTSMAN of September 18, 1943:—

Sir,

There is, I think, a certain congruity in the appearance in the pages of *The Scotsman* of a discussion on the merits and place of individualism, and there must be a considerable body of readers, not only in these islands but overseas, who would be well satisfied to see the subject pursued to a definite and helpful conclusion.

It is not necessary to invoke the authority of the Christian philosophy (although that is unequivocal on the point) to realise that the relationship of the individual to the group is not arguable. The group exists for the benefit of the individual, in the same sense that the field exists for the benefit of the flower, or the tree for the fruit. Groups of any kind, whether called nations, business systems, or any other associative label, inevitably decay and disappear if they fail to foster a sufficient number of excellent individuals, using those words in their precise significance. It is also true that excellence involves exercise—a man does not become a good cricketer by reading books on cricket.

But not everyone wants to play cricket, and not every cricketer wants to play seven days a week. If the M.C.C. becomes so all-pervasive that in place of being a group for the encouragement and progress of cricketers who freely choose cricket as their game, it becomes an organisation directed to the abasement of non-cricketers, then it is a field which has not been farmed with proper understanding.

The individualism which is justifiable and necessary is not that which insists on making the rules of every game, and at the same time, devises methods of compulsion to provide players.

It is obvious that advantage is being taken of the orgy of waste through which we are passing to stampede us into mere units in an industrial-financial group. The case which the Society of Individualists has to make for itself is, I think, less concerned with the value of individualism than with the methods by which it proposes to restore to the individual the opportunity of becoming excellent by the exercise of his possibly unique talent rather than by the life-long performance of a mechanical task.

I have read many of the attractive writings of Sir Ernest Benn, who is prominent in the Individualist movement, and they never fail to amuse and delight me. But I notice that Sir Ernest is a stalwart supporter of the orthodox financial system. And there is no more future for the genuine individualist if the pre-war financial system is not radically modified in the interest of the individual than there is for the deluded victims of Karl Marx.

I am, *etc.*,

C. H. DOUGLAS.

September 14, 1943.

MR. ILSLEY'S DEBT ACT

In late July a new Farmers' Creditors' Arrangement Act was introduced into the Canadian House of Commons by Mr. J. L. Ilsley, the Finance Minister, and rushed through the House in the last few days of the session, before the farmers of Western Canada had had the opportunity of seeing it.

Mr. Ilsley refused to consult representatives of the legislatures of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, which each had recorded unanimous support of legislation to help bankrupt farmers, and he also refused to consult or receive representations from farmers' organisations or other interested and informed bodies. The new Act which has been described by the EDMONTON BULLETIN as "little less than a sell-out to the mortgage companies," does not even specify maximum interest rates to be charged on farmers' adjusted debts, and "the western farmer," adds the EDMONTON BULLETIN, "is to be left to the tender mercies—and whims—of district court judges."

We print below the gist of the statement on this subject issued by Mr. LUCIEN MAYNARD, K.C., Attorney General of Alberta:—

On March 24, 1943, I wrote Mr. Ilsley, on behalf of the continuing committee of the Western Farm Debt Conference, offering to meet him at any time that would be convenient to him in order to discuss our proposal in greater detail as well as meet any objections he might have to our proposal. We were never given this opportunity. We were never told by Mr. Ilsley that our proposal was not acceptable. We were never given any objections to our proposal. As a matter of fact we never received an acknowledgement from Mr. Ilsley until yesterday when we finally received a letter dated July 16 in reply to our letter of March 24. In this letter Mr. Ilsley stated:

"As we were very fully informed of the views of your committee we felt that we should take the responsibility of working out the legislation along the lines that seemed best suited to meeting the situation, with some assistance from members of parliament, but without the further assistance of your committee."

We also asked Mr. Ilsley to give us some indication beforehand of the nature of the amendments that he proposed to introduce so that we would have an opportunity of meeting any objections that were raised to our proposal. This was not done with the result that the bill was introduced in the House on a Friday afternoon, distributed to the members on a Saturday, put through second reading on the Monday and discussed in Committee of the Whole on the Tuesday. Very few people in the West are even acquainted with the terms of the bill as yet.

And now as to the Bill itself. The provisions of the Bill are some slight improvement over the existing Farmers' Creditors' Arrangement Act in that it does permit the re-hearing of the early cases adjusted by the Board of Review before December 21, 1938. The new Bill also clarified some legal points in connection with the definition of debtor and the position of the estates of deceased debtors. . . .

Offsetting these improvements, however, some of the benefits the farmers enjoyed under the old Act have been eliminated. For example, the debtors and creditor repre-

representatives on the Board of Review have been done away with, leaving the Supreme Court Judge alone with the name of his office changed from that of "Board of Review" to "Appeal Court."

By putting the adjustment of Farm Debts in the hands of the Courts—the District Court Judges in the first instance with an appeal to a Supreme Court Judge—without making provision for legal assistance for the farmers, the new Bill imposes a tremendous handicap on the farmers. It compels them to go to unnecessary legal expense which the farmers can ill afford.

Past experience has demonstrated that the mortgage companies suffer no such handicap.

In view of the fact that Mr. Ilsley has stated that the Bill submitted to the Dominion government by the Western Farm Debt Conference [which has never been made public] was unsatisfactory I feel the farmers of Western Canada would be interested in knowing some of the details of the proposal made to the Dominion government as compared with what they actually received from the Dominion government.

... Under the Dominion government Bill, the jurisdiction to consider proposals under the act is given to the district or county court of the judicial district in which the farmer resides with an appeal to a Court of Appeal consisting of one judge appointed from judges invested with the original or appellate jurisdiction in bankruptcy.

In the Western Farm Debt Conference proposal we requested that the jurisdiction to adjust farm debt should be given to a Farm Debt Board consisting of a supreme court judge and a representative of the debtors and a representative of the creditors. Provision was also made for district representatives of the board throughout the province in order to facilitate the application of the debtors to have their debts adjusted. The decision of the Farm Debt Board was to be final.

In the Dominion Bill the right to apply for a proposal is confined to a farmer if two-thirds of the total debts owing by him were incurred prior to May 1, 1935. Furthermore, the right to review cases is restricted to cases adjusted before December 31, 1938.

Under the proposal of the Western Farm Debt Conference there was no limitation on the right to apply for a proposal and the power to review extended to proposals made under the Farmers' Creditors' Arrangement Act of 1934 and to proposals made under the proposed act if made after the expiration of one year and within five years from the filing of the proposal.

In the Dominion Bill there is no power to extend or postpone payments due to crop failure or to any other causes as provided for in section 9, sub-section (6) and section 22 of the proposal submitted by the Western Farm Debt Conference.

Under the Dominion Bill the court is directed to base its proposals upon the present and respective capability of the farmer to meet his debts as they may come due, and the productive value of the farm. Under section 15 of the proposal submitted by the Western Farm Debt Conference the Farm Debt Board was to give consideration to various other matters including:

(a) the value of the farmers' equity in the land in-

cluding amount of cultivation, improvements or labour made by him;

(b) the cost of maintenance of the debtor and his family on a reasonable standard of living.

The proposal of the Western Farm Debt Conference provided that the Board "shall have the power to formulate a plan of settlement with respect to any debts of the farmer which will, in the opinion of the Board, insure that the farmer will continue to farm the land and be an efficient producer."

Under the Dominion Bill there is no right to stay proceedings or to prohibit action without leave of the court while the proposal is in effect as contained in section 19 of the proposal submitted by the Western Farm Debt Conference. This means that immediately a farmer is in default a creditor can take proceedings without reference to the court.

The proposal submitted by the Western Farm Debt Conference contained in Part II provisions for a stay of proceedings in cases where a proposal had not been formulated and where a farmer required only temporary assistance in order to carry his family over to the next harvesting season. No such provision is contained in the Bill.

The disastrous clause in the Dominion Bill is undoubtedly section 7 which provides that the right to apply for a proposal is confined to a farmer if two-thirds of the total debts owing by him were incurred prior to the first of May, 1935, and which provides further for the review of only those cases decided before December 31, 1938.

The effect of this clause will undoubtedly be to prevent many farmers who were entitled to make an application under the old Farmers' Creditors' Arrangement Act from making any under the new act.

Many farmers in 1935 were only indebted on mortgages and agreements for sale. Since then, however, many other obligations have been incurred, hospital bills, doctors' bills, other unsecured debts, not forgetting taxes. If these debts exceed one-third of his total indebtedness, the farmer cannot apply for a proposal.

Yesterday we wired Mr. Ilsley asking him to extend the cut-off date of May, 1935, to December, 1939. We also asked him to amend the Bill in order to provide that the appeal court should consist of debtor and creditor representatives acting with a Supreme Court judge. We finally asked that the power of reviewing cases already adjusted should be extended beyond 1938.

From information received this morning, it would appear that these recommendations were not accepted by Mr. Ilsley despite strong protests by certain members of the house.

I can only sum up by saying that the Dominion government has once more sacrificed the interests of western farmers for the benefit of the mortgage companies.

(From TODAY AND TOMORROW).

J. C. SMUTS

According to the *Jewish Chronicle*, the South African Prime Minister is to visit Palestine and the settlement of Ramat Jochanan, which is named after him.

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.
 Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 11. No. 4.

Saturday, October 2, 1943.

Truth, The Times and the Doctors

In a highly controversial half-column 'leader' pressing its totalitarian dogma that "broadly speaking the foundations of a health service are laid," *The Times* reaches out impatiently for the promised Government White Paper. "In the meantime," it says, "controversy might well be suspended. . . ." It might! There is little mystery concerning the occasion for this cry of "Kamarad!" "...there have been some unedifying examples of irresponsible pamphleteering by unrepresentative sections of the medical profession in the past few months."

From *Truth* we learn that "*Punch* recently threw a strong, if unintentional, sidelight on what might happen to us all under a State system of medical services. It depicted a private soldier facing an M.O. with the dialogue. 'Now, my good man, you'd never have come to me with such a complaint in civvy life, would you?' 'No, sir, I'd have sent for you.'" *Truth* thereupon promises to deal "until the threat is ended" with "the graver aspects of the question." That is good news!

The graver aspects of the question are two in number, (1) The determination of an entrenched minority, in possession of practically limitless resources of money and publicity ("Finance and the control of publicity are concentric"), to snatch a decision from a public fattened on misinformation concerning matters of fact—e.g., that it is impossible and/or impracticable so to distribute the financial equivalent of the vast surplus of modern production, capital goods and consumable goods, that the individual may enter freely into his own contracts for the disposal of his just quota; and, (2) the drenching of the medical profession with the same false doctrine, while at the same time depressing its *morale* and sabotaging its efficiency by a vast interwoven system of levelling agencies (e.g., mis-selection and mis-education, in alliance with centralised 'research' institutions, all these being under the complete and inescapable domination of 'high' finance) in conjunction with 'obsolescence' devices represented practically by 'big' chemicals and 'big' industry, both of which, in their ways, elaborate a fashionable paraphernalia of gadgets and plant, belittling to the honest craftsman in respect of his professional resources and paralysing to as much of his mind as his education has left him. In the background an intricate 'jungle' of quacks, charlatans and dissident faddists, whose lack of systematisation and control is more apparent than real, stands ready for exploitation by the same hands as have draped the rest of the ghastly stage.

T. J.

"THE PAMPERED DEPOSITOR"

Remarking that the architecture of banks "is chosen (perhaps subconsciously) to suggest massive permanence," and that "behind this. . . facade" a bank "will be a significantly different institution after the second German War," *The Economist* has lately (September 4) delivered itself on the subject of the future of banking. Since 1913, something like £3,000,000,000 of bank credit has been created "and has lodged in the deposits of the banks" the journal asserts, and asks the pertinent question, "Who owns these deposits?" To say (as *The Economist* does say) that "a bank nowadays is an institution which holds [our italics] the credit money of the community" is merely to say 'I've got your money.' *The Economist's* method of adding: 'and I'm going to stick to it' is rather more circumlocutory, viz:—"The depositor of to-day is rendering no service to the banking system in 'depositing his money' with it; he cannot help himself; and the banks are performing a very large service of convenience to him in handling his transactions. . . . It follows that there is no longer any justification for the pampering of depositors in which the British joint-stock banks, perhaps more than those of any other country, still indulge." It is proposed, therefore, that "the aim should be to shift the greater part of the burden of meeting the operating costs of the banks. . . . on to the depositors," anything left over being charged to the Exchequer! This is equivalent to the banks' saying to the public: "What's yours is really mine; but if it's *really* yours, of course it's mine; and, in any case, you'll have to pay me for it and jolly well pay what I tell you to pay, in either case." This is called 'catching up the banks in the mechanism of the state beyond the possibility of disentangling.' As the process approaches completion it approaches intelligibility even to the citizen most affected, and to be intelligible is to be found out.

T. J.

IF NOT BY STEALTH, THEN OPENLY!

According to *The Economist* for September 18, the Uthwatt Report has now little chance of being adopted. Therefore, "this concealed measure of nationalisation" (vide the general manager of the Halifax Building Society, Mr. David W. Smith) must *inevitably* be replaced by "the more radical and more thorough alternative," i.e., *unconcealed* nationalisation!

"We count upon attracting all nations to the task of erecting the new fundamental structure, the project of which has been drawn up by us. That is why, before everything, it is indispensable for us to arm ourselves and to store up in ourselves that absolute reckless audacity and irresistible might of the spirit which in the person of our active workers will break down all hindrances on our way." — Protocol X (3).

THE STRUGGLE IN U.S.A.

War supply contracts of more than \$50,000 in value made in America between June, 1940 and November, 1942 total \$59,558 million. Seventy point one per cent. of this total has gone to 100 firms, and \$19,534 million, or nearly one third, to five firms, General Motors, Curtiss Wright, Bethlehem Steel, Douglas Aircraft and United Aircraft. The Bethlehem Steel figure of over \$2,900 million does not show this firm's supply of steel to other firms, but only direct supply to Government, mainly shipbuilding.

THE BEVERIDGE PLOT

An impartial analysis of the proposals contained in the Beveridge Report reveals them in broad outline as a plan, simple enough in essence, though vastly complicated in detail, for taking money away from everyone, and returning some of it under special conditions, the chief of which is the acceptance of a continuation, and increase, of controls and restrictions now tolerated only under stress of war.

The manner of presentation of these proposals to the public forms a useful subject of study for anyone interested in understanding, and counteracting, the technique of mass mind control which is at present being practised on us; for it provides probably the most blatant example to date in this country, of the methods, familiar enough in Russia and Germany, whereby whole populations are induced by means of massive propaganda and misrepresentation of the facts, not merely to accept, but to clamour for and 'demand' oppressive and restrictive legislation which they would not think of tolerating if presented to them in a form they could understand.

It will be noticed that, except for the very small proportion of people who can afford the money to buy, and the time and energy to study in detail the full Report, the public has been given no access through the Press, Radio and abridged versions published, to the restrictive proposals actually contained in it—proposals which if carried into effect, will affect their lives more closely than those which have been given publicity. The vast attention focussed upon the "benefits" to the exclusion of other features clearly indicates the determination of those responsible for it to secure acceptance of the whole Plan without revealing its less acceptable parts. This speciousness of presentation is not the least obvious in the official Report in Brief, which was alleged to contain 'all that anyone needs to know about the Beveridge Report,' and which contains no hint of the extent of the restrictive and oppressive regulations contained in the full version.

For instance, merely as one example, the following paragraph (p. 142, ¶ 371 b, in the full Report) is not to be found in the Brief version:—

"Persons failing to fulfil conditions for benefit. The most important of these are likely to be (i) men disqualified for unconditional unemployment benefit through refusal of suitable employment, through leaving work without just cause, through dismissal for misconduct, and (ii) those who are disqualified for conditional unemployment benefit by failure to attend a work or training centre."

The full implications of this paragraph, thrown in as it is as a minor item under the heading 'National Assistance,' take a little while to sink in. They are then seen to constitute a meticulous provision against freedom of choice of occupation in the Work State of the future. The next paragraph (372) on the proposed Unified Means Test—'based on estimates of what is necessary for subsistence'—is also worthy of more attention than it has received. The omission of all reference to matter of this obvious importance in the popular presentation of the Report provides some measure of the integrity of those responsible for its presentation to the public.

Another, and slightly more subtle aspect of this presentation is worth drawing attention to here, since it has been little appreciated. The Report has been rather cunningly represented as constituting an attack upon the 'vested interest' of the Insurance Companies, which are now so unpopular that any opponent of them is sure of majority approval. So successful has this 'line' been that a letter of the writer's in a local newspaper, criticising the Report, was discounted by the allegation that all such criticism necessarily emanated from the Insurance Companies. "Prudential Threatened" is an example of a headline, referring to the Beveridge Report, in the same paper a short time afterwards.

Now if we look carefully at the facts, we find that the only vocal opposition to the Report from Insurance sources concerns itself solely with the Industrial Assurance proposals which are not an essential part of the Report, and that the whole gist of the Report, which is to make Insurance universal and compulsory, places the personnel of the Insurance trade in an exceptionally favourable position as regards power and employment.

Quite apart from this general consideration, however, we find in ¶ 239 the following statement: "*direct encouragement of voluntary insurance... is an essential part of the Plan for Social Security proposed in this Report.*" The conditions for receipt of a pension, to be found in ¶ 248, also included only in the full Report, provide a further somewhat appalling insight into the means by which this "direct encouragement" is to be given.

First, it must be realised that it is proposed to replace unconditional pensions by pensions conditional on giving up regular earnings. "*No fresh unconditional pensions should be granted after the day appointed for beginning the new scheme.*" (¶ 249).

The conditions in ¶ 248 include the following:—
"*Every person receiving a pension will be required to sign a periodic declaration either that he has earned no more than, say, £3 in each of the preceding three months or how much he has earned if he has earned more. From one-half to two-thirds of the excess above £3 a month will be deducted from his pension for the ensuing quarter.*"

"*Enforcement and detection of fraud presents no difficulties in the case of earnings by way of employment*"—but there are "greater difficulties" "*in the case of gainful occupation otherwise than by way of employment.*"

"*Provisionally it is suggested that no person retired on pension would be permitted to hold an occupation card in respect of a shop, small holding, fishing boat, etc.*" However, "*the shopkeeper, or small holder of advancing years will be able freely to do odd jobs and help in the shop.*"

It was an experienced insurance manager in one of the big companies who drew my attention to these provisions, and explained that his Head Office well appreciated the fact that they are calculated to drive all those capable of saving, and desiring to escape the barest penury in their old age, into the hands of the Insurance Companies for additional annuities. This is seen more clearly when we remember that High Financial Policy has, by the reduction of interest rates in recent years, almost eliminated ordinary investment as a means of providing adequately for retirement. Since a deferred annuity involves living on capital, the effect of

these proposals on inheritance should be obvious.

An exposition of the above facts has, in my experience, a salutary effect upon those simple minded people who believe that any deep-seated opposition to the Plan can arise from Insurance Interests.

A further point, of importance to those who are already included in some pension scheme, is that the Beveridge Plan is not intended to be additional, but to incorporate such schemes, which would be expected to "re-adjust" pensions "in the light of the basic provision being made for all" (§ 149) i.e., you would get the same pension, plus—not the State Pension—but the State restrictions and compulsions.

Space allows but a few more illustrations of Beveridge's attitude to his fellow-men, e.g.:—

§ 128: "with the limitation of scope hitherto, it was felt necessary to allow persons to qualify for pensions by a relatively short period of contribution of five years as employees; this gave temptation to the making of factitious contracts of employment with relatives for the last five years of working age. Extension in the scope of insurance makes it possible and desirable to insist on contributions covering the whole of working life as a condition of pensions."

Change 13. "Making of disability benefit at full rate indefinite in duration, subject to imposition of special behaviour conditions."

§ 130 "...new classes not hitherto accustomed to industrial discipline."

§ 131 "Men and women in receipt of unemployment benefit cannot be allowed to hold out indefinitely for work of the type to which they are used or in their present places of residence, if there is work which they could do available at the standard wage for that work."

"Conditions imposed on benefit must be enforced where necessary by suitable penalties."

§ 340 "This [marriage] grant is desirable both as compensation... and also in order to obtain prompt notification of marriage."

§ 346 "If she [a widow] does go out to work, a reduction of the full guardian benefit will be made, of a proportion of her earnings." This is one of the conditions under Change 17: "Replacement of unconditional inadequate widows' pensions by provision suited to the various needs of widows."

§ 347 "...if the marriage ends otherwise than by widowhood, she [the wife] is entitled to the same provision as for widowhood, unless the marriage maintenance has ended through her fault or voluntary action without just cause."

"...while making it clear that she can in all cases at need get assistance and that the Ministry of Social Security will then proceed against the husband for recoupment of its expenditure."

§ 348 "The decision in regard to maternity grant may depend on whether or not it is thought to be practicable and desirable administratively to require previous registration of an adult dependant. In that case a man who had an unmarried woman living with him as his wife, on registering this, would be qualified to obtain dependant allowance for her during unemployment and disability and maternity grant also."

§ 358 "Every person not holding an employment book,

occupation card or housewife's policy will be required to hold a security card and to affix to this an insurance stamp ... for each week..."

§ 363. "those who get unpaid domestic service from daughters or sisters... should pay the security contributions for these persons."

§ 423. "The [children's] allowances should continue so long as the child is in approved full time education, up to the age of 16."

§ 73 I quote in full as it provides a clear statement of the basis of this or any similar Plan:—

"CASES OF SPECIAL DIFFICULTY. At the basis of any system of Social Security covering all those who comply with reasonable just conditions for insurance and assistance, there must be provision for a limited class of men or women who through weakness or badness of character fail to comply. In the last resort the man who fails to comply with the conditions for obtaining benefit or assistance and leaves his family without resources must be subject to penal treatment."

These quotations are sufficient to show the spirit of the thing, though inadequate to demonstrate the full extent of the network of talmudic regulation and Prussian bureaucracy which is being prepared for us. We are impudently to be bribed with our own earnings, confiscated in taxation, prices and compulsory contributions, to accept control by officials over every phase of life, even the most intimate. Not one single benefit is to be given except at the price of freedom, and those who object are to be treated as criminals.

The point to which I wish to draw attention is the gross treachery of the presentation of this Prison Plan to a people at war as the Gateway to the Life More Abundant. The Official Report in Brief consists of some 30,000 words of argument and exposition of the 'benefits' to be obtained with at most 100 words of incidental reference to a few of the vast number of oppressive restrictions which would accompany them, chiefly included in the list of proposed 'Changes' on page 14. Apart from these, not one of the quotations used above is to be found in the 3d. Report or in the newspapers.

The suppression of all criticism in the Press, other than that from Insurance Companies, Capitalists or other sources easily represented as 'vested interests' is a further example of the technique by which we are governed.

C. G. D.

RECONSTRUCTION

The "Glasgow Evening Times"
Articles of May 1932
on Social Credit

By Major C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 6d. (Postage extra)

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

"Behind the Scenes in Russia"

Under this heading, the *Review of World Affairs* dated August 31 says:—

"The course of political events in the Soviet Union is most interesting. Important developments have recently occurred apart from the growth of military influence, which is only one factor in a situation about which little is known outside a very small group of highly expert observers. Amongst those who do know something of contemporary Russian affairs is the United States Ambassador. His information sources are said by other observers to be good. This fact accounts for the self-confidence with which the State Department handles Russo-American relations. There is a certain ease and boldness in the American policy which is notable. This is also strongly reflected in the press.

"Beneath the outward growth of the Red Army's influence an entirely new general policy is evolving. Moreover Marshal Stalin is at present by no means a dictator in the sense of being able to impose his unbridled will upon a government of sycophants. On the contrary the Government consists of two main groups which hold strong views on different aspects of policy and quite boldly press those views.

"These two main groups became quite clearly defined about six months ago. The first, and by far the more important comprises Zhdanov, Beria, Stomonyakov, Vishinski and Dekanossov. These represent what is being called the 'New European Policy School of Thought.' The second group has Kaganovitsh at its head and stands for an older fundamentalist view—rather in the Litvinov line.

"The alliance between Beria and Zhdanov is a new and interesting development. Zhdanov is one of Stalin's oldest associates and a possible successor. Like Dekanossov he was a strong advocate of the 1939 foreign policy. In those days, however, Beria was never closely associated with him. Beria has long been another of the main and most powerful forces in support of and behind Marshal Stalin. He controls the whole OGPU and all its affiliated and subsidiary bodies. His alliance with Zhdanov therefore brings immense influence and power to that very important man. Beria now has the rank of general in the army and a very large number of his assistants now have military rank.

"At the beginning of the war Zhdanov, Dekanossov and several of their friends were seen in Moscow but seldom. Now they are amongst the most prominent active political forces in the Russian capital. Vishinski is the most powerful man in the Foreign Office and he therefore adds immense prestige and influence to this inner governmental group, the power of which therefore extends to the army, the OGPU and the Foreign Ministry.

"Zhdanov and his friends are largely responsible for the recall of M. Maisky and M. Litvinov. They consider that Russian interests would be better served by the appointment of functionaries to these two diplomatic posts. They do not think that in future it is desirable to have Ambassadors in London and Washington of such exalted prestige as MM. Maisky and Litvinov undoubtedly enjoyed in many circles.

"The Zhdanov Group considers that less conspicuous

and more aloof officials would be more likely to convey the desired impression. It is very interesting to notice that Marshal Stalin eventually agreed to the views of Zhdanov about the replacement of MM. Litvinov and Maisky.

"Zhdanov is above all a Russian nationalist. He stands first, last, and all the way for what he conceives to be the interests of his country. His signature stands on the Decree dissolving the Comintern. He is a man of extraordinary intelligence and shrewdness. We must recognise that he occupies a key position in Russia to-day. He has distinct and lucid views on war aims, the conduct of war, and foreign policy, of which we have had a most interesting account from an observer watching the inner events of the Soviet Union.

"This Group believes that Russia's position is such that a more determined policy could and should be followed in the sphere of strategy and foreign policy. It believes that whatever happens the Soviet Union holds trump cards which if properly played (without weakness) will produce handsome results. It has the clearest conception of what should be done in the varying conditions which the next phase of the war itself may create.

"It is utterly opposed to any policy of drift or compromise with Britain and America where such a compromise would involve the sacrifice of what it conceives to be a Russian interest. Finally, it considers that whenever its views have been overruled, events have proved this overruling to have been disastrous. Hence Zhdanov's growing self-confidence.

"There can be no doubt that every problem which arises in the relations between Russia on the one hand, and Britain and America on the other, increases the strength and prestige of this Group and strengthens the possibility of its policies being adopted. Its influence is probably already nearly predominant. All this represents one of the most vitally important developments in modern history."

A RUSSIAN REPORT

"Von Neurath and Schacht have been removed from their nominal posts as members of the German Government, according to Moscow radio.

"The report added: 'The decision has not been published in case it gives rise to more rumours about conflicts within the German Government.

"Goebbels explained their formal dismissal to a Nazi party conference by stressing the undesirability of leaving anybody in the Government who might become the objective of foreign alien political intrigues."

— *Daily Telegraph*, July 29, 1943.

THE LATE MR. ROBERT STEEDMAN

The Newcastle and Gateshead Douglas Social Credit Association has recently suffered a great loss by the death of Mr. Robert Steedman, at the age of 76.

Mr. Steedman took a very active part in the Electoral Campaign, the Lower Rates Campaign and other work in Newcastle, bringing an enthusiastic and original approach to everything he engaged in. He will be greatly missed by all his social credit friends.

T.H.R.

IDENTIFICATION

"The prisoner [Rudolf Hess] was taken to Maryhill Barracks and among his possessions were found photographs of himself and of a small boy, also the visiting cards of Dr. Karl Haushofer and Dr. Albrecht Haushofer, his son. No other documents or identifications were found on the prisoner." — Mr. Eden's statement about Rudolf Hess.

Professor Karl Haushofer, who has been called "Hitler's one-man 'brain trust,'" is the originator of the racial theories and the system of Geo-Politics, on which Nazism is built. His wife is a Jewess.

To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

Affiliation to the Social Credit Secretariat, which was accorded to Groups of Social Crediters, has been replaced by a new relationship and all previously existing affiliations were terminated as from January 1, 1942. This new relationship is expressed in the following Form which Associations* desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members of Association

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat.†

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy for every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Signature

A brief statement is also requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,
Director of Organisation
and Overseas Relations.

*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The following Groups and Associations are registered as working in association with the Social Credit Secretariat:—

GREAT BRITAIN

- ABERDEEN D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., W. J. Sim, 18 Adelphi, Aberdeen.
- BELFAST D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. A. Crothers, 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.
- BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., A. Davies, 73 Manor Road, Blackpool.
- BRADFORD D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
- CARDIFF D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., Miss H. Pearce, 8 Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
- GLASGOW D.S.C. Group: W. Forrester, 81 Mitchell Street, Glasgow, C. 1.
- LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmier, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
- MIDLAND D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. Sanders, 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
- NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE and GATESHEAD D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., T. H. Rea, 23 Clarewood Place, Fenham, Newcastle, 5.
- PORTSMOUTH and SOUTHSEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., Mrs. Waite, 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor, Portsmouth.
- PRESTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., B. H. Ferguson, 46 Atherton Road, Fulwood, Preston.
- SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., C. Daish, 19 Coniston Avenue, Redbridge, Southampton.
- STOCKTON D.S.C. Group: L. Gilling Smith, Eastrea, Durham Road, Stockton.

Registered Groups are also working at LEPTON (Yorkshire), RUBY AND REDNALL (Birmingham), WOKING, and WOODFORD (Essex). Enquiries concerning these should be addressed c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

AUSTRALIA

- New South Wales** Hon. Secretary.
NEW SOUTH WALES D.S.C. Assoc.:
WOMEN'S SECTION
DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH
THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN
(The above are closely allied)
INFORMATION SHEET
COWPER D.S.C. Group
Miss Grace Marsden.
W. H. Hand (Editor).
J. McDonald.
- South Australia**
ADELAIDE D.S.C. Group
GLENELG D.S.C. Group
C. H. Allen.
H. W. Lee.
- Western Australia**
PERTH D.S.C. Group
EAST PERTH D.S.C. Group
W. F. Andrews.
A. Cook.
- Queensland**
QUEENSLAND D.S.C. Association
A. W. Noakes.
- Victoria**
COBURG S.C. Group
A. J. O'Callaghan.
- Tasmania**
HOBART D.S.C. Group
James Guthrie.

NEW ZEALAND

- PATEA ELECTORATE V.P. Association G. J. Billingham.

SOUTH AFRICA

- PORT ELIZABETH D.S.C. Group L. W. Smith.

CANADA

- VANCOUVER D.S.C. Group Mrs. Brooks.
- LIVERPOOL (Nova Scotia) D.S.C. Group
T. E. D. Watson.
- OTTAWA (Parliamentary) D.S.C. Group.