

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 15.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

## CARTHORSE CONDITIONS FOR ALL

or

### 'There's No Want In A Workhouse'

#### Sir William Beveridge's Plan to Impose Perpetual Poverty 'Without Want'

Politicians are like abscesses. You cannot scratch a politician without letting out pus.

We are told that we have a 'National' Government.

At any moment an Election may be fought to displace it or to 'fortify' it, in either case to impose a policy upon it.

The 'National' Government as at present constituted is a device, agreed to by all the Parties. And a very convenient device it is. If a policy, foul, noxious and detestable to everybody except the Politicians kept in power to impose it, is decided upon, the Party with the loudest voice is put up to 'press it upon the Government' of which no negligible proportion is made up of their own members. When ministerial or bureaucratic zeal outpaces discretion, and rents and tears appear in the fabrication through which peep intimations of 'what they're really up to,' the softer accents of another Party save the 'situation,' making ready for a 'swing' the other way later on when 'vested' interests can be less dangerously served. The interest vested in the people is the only 'vested' interest of which no one takes much account, least of all the electors themselves.

Party Politics, even when 'Nationalised,' provide a career and a livelihood, and there is, even in war time, no career, and certainly no livelihood outside Parties. It is the business of Finance in particular and "Big Business" in general to facilitate the advancement in a political career of those who can be relied upon to take advice in regard to policy. Or, to put the matter in the plainest possible way, FINANCE HAS ITS NOMINEES IN THE KEY POSITIONS OF EVERY PARTY ALMOST EQUALLY. It may not be primarily in the ranks of the Parties, or their titular Leaders that this influence is so effectively exerted. Permanent Party officials, "packed" Committees, and those who appoint them, "Research" Committees and other agencies which present the M.P. or the Cabinet Minister with the material on which he is bound to act, are much more effective channels of influence.

It is not necessary to draw invidious distinctions between the denizens of the political underworld, and to the extent that it is necessary, exactly the same thing will be found in similar places in the Liberal and Conservative Parties as in

the Labour and 'Communist' Parties. Nevertheless, the so-called 'Labour' *Electorate* is potentially much more dangerous than the Whig Electorate, and it is therefore in the headquarters of those Parties which 'mobilise' the largest number of votes, and play most habitually upon (or with) the real passions of the public that we should logically expect to find the most astute and unscrupulous nominees of Finance.

If *The Times*, after a penurious and uncertain existence as an obscure weekly newspaper, printed 'cheap,' and often taken out of 'pawn' by pennies, hastily collected in mean streets and alleys, had slowly established itself as a 'popular' daily to shout centralisation at the small shopkeeper and 'communal' kitchens and eating houses at the housewife, and every kind of subordination of the individual to the group, it could not have functioned as a steadying influence upon the more shrewd and forceful and powerful elements in the community. It was much 'better' to let 'new' newspapers fight a mock battle for popularity, and when the community had been thoroughly saturated with the false doctrine that the individual exists for the State, not the state (which is at best a mechanism "without a body to be kicked or a soul to be damned") for the Individual; and then to 'finish it off' by bringing in the lordly *Times* to sigh beatifically over the 'inevitability' of 'progress.' 'Victory' is 'won.' What the son of Abraham Jacob Smuts calls the 'lure' of our race, which is the 'vision of progress'\* (not progress, only the vision of it!) has worked.

The time has now arrived when the Parties and the Press speak with the same voice—and say the same things. *The Times*, the *Daily Herald*, the *New Statesman* and the *Economist*, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Gaumont-British Broadcasting Corporation may use different vocabularies. Their *policy* is the same. Fierce disputes still proceed; but, look into them, and the discerning citizen sees that they matter as little as whether chicken-food shall be withheld by using a blue ration-card or one of a pale shade of buff-Orpington.

THIS WAR, which began before the last one finished, THIS WAR WHICH THE BANK OF "ENGLAND" ASSISTED

\*Speech at St. Andrews, 1934.

THE PUPPET VILLAIN HITLER TO PREPARE FOR WHILE EVERY EFFORT WAS BEING MADE TO SECURE THAT WHOEVER GOT READY FOR IT GREAT BRITAIN (called Britain by the "B."B.C.) DIDN'T, THIS WAR WHICH NO PEOPLE BEGAN AND NO POWER CAN STOP, has a purpose behind it.

THAT PURPOSE IS (1) THE OVERTHROW OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE, WHICH WAS (when the war began) THE GREATEST OBSTACLE TO THE ERECTION OF A WORLD-WIDE TOTALITARIAN STATE: AN EMPIRE WITHIN WHICH THERE HAD ALREADY BEGUN THE DETACHMENT FROM THE BLACKMAGIC OF FINANCE AND THE REALISATION OF INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM (See *How Alberta is Fighting Finance*, K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LIMITED, 2d.—You have not been allowed to know the truth about this war within a war even now proceeding in a British Province.) AND

(2) THE STRIPPING FROM EVERY SOVEREIGN NATION OF THE WORLD OF ALL POWER OVER A HIDDEN POLITICAL JUNTA: THE SUBORDINATION OF EVERY PEOPLE ON THE EARTH'S SURFACE IN REGIMENTED, PLANNED OBEDIENCE TO THE WILL OF A FEW, WIELDING, WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF ITS EVER BEING WRESTED FROM THEM, ABSOLUTE AUTOCRATIC POWER.

And so we come to Beveridge's bribe.

Judas got thirty pieces of silver, and hanged himself.

The price has been advanced to forty, and if they take it, the people of England will have betrayed themselves and their heirs for ever, and there is no saying what they will do.

"ONLY IN WAR, OR UNDER THREAT OF WAR, WILL A BRITISH GOVERNMENT EMBARK ON LARGE SCALE PLANNING." The words appeared in a publication of one of Sir William Beveridge's "Research Committees," POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PLANNING, an organisation of vast industry, kept quiet for many years, presided over by the Vice Chairman of Marks and Spencer, Mr. Israel Moses Sieff.

Hence the war itself and the Beveridge-Greenwood Report.

Sir William Beveridge's 'Committee,' being paid servants of the public, were precluded from signing the document because of the "issues of high policy" with which it dealt. All the same most of these departmental experts had some acquaintance with the London School of Economics over which Sir William Beveridge formerly presided, which, according to the late Lord Haldane, Sir Ernest Cassel, who founded it, intended as a "training ground for the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State." So their 'Advices' and 'Assessments' may have been as well 'planned' as the Report, and who signed it will not make much difference. The 'planning' has gone on a long time.

On the very day the Report was issued, a Member of Parliament, Mr. MacLaren, told the House of Commons he "loved these gentlemen who write vast tomes on poverty and unemployment, who usually find their professors in that incubation of nonsense the London School of Economics." The same member remembered Sir William Beveridge's proposals in 1906, when he suggested employment exchanges. But "then Sir William Beveridge came face to face with... this problem of recurring cycles of depression in trade. Sir

William Beveridge and many other economists cannot understand what is the cause of it... So Sir William Beveridge said, 'I cannot explain this phenomenon, but I must get over it somehow, so I suggest a tripartite contribution'... That was the beginning of what I call Fabianism... That was the beginning of the destruction of the liberty of the individual, because it was as clear as noonday that once that step was taken, the upas tree of bureaucracy was bound to grow and expand."

If Sir William Beveridge's Finance-inspired remedies produced the detested labour queue, the means test, and heavier and heavier taxation EVERY PENNY OF WHICH WAS SHEER ROBBERY BY THE STATE AT THE INSTIGATION OF THE MONEY POWER, why should the mere ironing-out of some of the tests, even accompanied by bigger (but not necessarily better) 'doles,' promise a richer harvest of satisfaction? Is a mess really any better because we are all in it? And, as Mr. MacLaren wanted to know, Why the mess?

That is the issue, not whether "Now, when the war is abolishing landmarks of every kind, is the opportunity for using experience in a clear field." (Beveridge: *cp.* Sieff!) Nor, whether "A revolutionary moment in the world's history is a time for revolutions." (Beveridge: *cp.* again the Vice-Chairman of the proprietors of those stores suitably described as 'Chain'-stores.)

Sir William Beveridge, who foresaw so little in 1906, now knows (after the event) some things which less eminent men, and many of them, knew all along:—

(1) "WANT COULD HAVE BEEN ABOLISHED BEFORE THE PRESENT WAR BY A REDISTRIBUTION OF INCOME WITHIN THE WAGE-EARNING CLASSES, WITHOUT TOUCHING ANY OF THE WEALTHIER CLASSES." (Beveridge *Report on Social Insurance and Allied Services*, page 165.)

(2) "ABOLITION OF WANT JUST BEFORE THE WAR WAS EASILY WITHIN THE ECONOMIC RESOURCES OF THE COMMUNITY; WANT WAS A NEEDLESS SCANDAL DUE TO NOT TAKING THE TROUBLE TO PREVENT IT." (*Report*, page 166.)

(3) "It is clear that abolition of want BY RE-DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME IS WITHIN OUR MEANS." (*Report*, page 167.)

(4) "Want could have been abolished in Britain [*n.b.* No longer 'Great?'] just before the present war. It can be abolished after the war..." (*Report*, page 168.)

How does he reach this conclusion? Easily! If you have a stable, with ten stalls, and a carthorse in each stall, and if you feed hay to eight of the horses, and they all leave some, you can take what they leave and feed it to the other two. This abolishes 'want' (in carthorses). Sir William Beveridge, the Fabians and Planners, P.E.P. and Israel Moses Sieff are now ready to concede carthorse conditions for all. But human beings are not carthorses. The readjustment of 'income' effected by our Social Stablenmen is to be an initial charge against the public of £86,000,000, at present the equivalent of 1/- in the £ on the income tax. The expenditure of money *under the scheme* is tentatively estimated at £697,000,000 rising to £858,000,000 in 20 years, "though the cost would still be increasing substantially then." In 1965, £161,000,000 would fall to be met entirely from the Exchequer, a charge equal to nearly 2/- in the £ on the

income tax. Wage-earners and employers would all the time be 'contributing' £179,000,000 between them, the employers' portion a perpetual charge on the cost, and therefore the price, of goods. Sir William Beveridge's mind works that way. It is perhaps easier to see its workings when he says that "while one Bristol family in nine in the year 1937 was in sheer physical want, two families out of every five had half as much again as they needed for subsistence. . . . In East London, the total surplus of the working-class families above the minimum was more than thirty times the total deficiency of those below it." Take it 'off them'! Rob Peter to pay Paul, and Paul to pay Peter, and what neither Peter nor Paul receives pay to the little boys of the London School of Economics for doing the robbing good and proper! This, too, helps to 'cure unemployment,' and thus encourages expressions of satisfaction from *The Times* and *The Daily Herald* alike on the ground of the 'incentives' the Plan provides to persuade an enlightened democracy to walk boldly into the Work State—and go far enough in never to be able to get out. Only the 'popular' newspapers share Sir William Beveridge's idea that his proposals are 'revolutionary.' They are, of course; but not in the sense that is understood in 'popular' circles. *The Times* does not by any means admit their revolutionary character. The newspaper says the implications of the proposals "involve no new departure in principle from the policies and methods which have characterised the development of the British social services during the last half-century." You didn't know that England had been walking into perpetual slavery for fifty years, did you? WHEN WILL THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND LEARN THAT A REVOLUTION MAY BE ONLY ANOTHER NAME FOR TURNING A SOMERSAULT IN A PRISON, WHILE SOMEONE IS BUSY FORTIFYING THE WALLS AND STRENGTHENING THE DOORS? "The term 'social insurance' . . . implies both that it is compulsory and that men stand together with their fellows." Pool your poverty!

But pooling poverty is not abolishing it.

Pooling poverty, in a world so potentially rich that it can blow more wealth to bits in war than it is permitted to produce in peace, and is forced to this periodical purgation at least once three times in the human span of three score years and ten because the resources of sabotage by Finance do not suffice sufficiently to prevent the productive resources of Man, is not the datum from which rational action can proceed.

Modern production is directed more anxiously to the production of WORK than to the production of consumable goods, or indeed a 'profit' in any form—goods which you are still alive to consume when you have produced them are the real cost of another programme of production, and if your efforts are or can be made light enough to carry on the process and take a rest, that rest is profit on your enterprise. Man does not live by work. He lives by bread, but not by bread alone, it is the glory of human nature to be able to profit by the production and consumption of more than bread. At all costs our planners wish to enforce the substitution of Sacrifice for Profit: to rob Man of his heritage.

Naturally, that heritage is cumulative, and consists of a power constantly being enhanced, and at an ever accelerating rate, to produce a bigger result with less effort. The only 'problem' which has confronted Finance for centuries is the problem of how to hide this fact from common knowledge, and how, at the same time, to destroy the evi-

dences of its truth—goods. The most potent weapon has been

### THE FICTION OF FINANCIAL DEBT.

To avoid poverty you must PRODUCE MORE, cry the half-witted economists.

More what? The answer, gained from even casual inspection of what IS done in a modern community is MORE THINGS YOU CANNOT CONSUME, factories, plant, capital, More inventions to render these 'obsolete' so that you will make work for yourselves in destroying them, and More And More DEBT, which is the surrender of claims we, the Financial System, have acquired by secret process, to the goods we have allowed you to work to produce. THE LABOUR PARTY HAS NEVER EVEN HENTED AT THE POSSIBILITY OF DISTRIBUTING the natural DIVIDEND INHERENT IN IMPROVEMENT OF PROCESS. It is a LABOUR Party, and averse from anything that would alleviate the lot of man.

The institution of a financial system (NOT the transference to that abstraction The State of the mechanism of the present system) but the institution of a modification suitably designed and intended to do so, would rapidly increase the (what is called) material wealth of everyone without detracting from the wealth of anyone.

It might be imagined that once agreement had been obtained as to the feasibility of such a readjustment, opposition would cease.

Oh no!

The sacrificialists wish to impose WORK.

The more important the individual with whom one is dealing in these matters, and the more able such a person may be to assist in the desired end, the more likely is one to find a very definite dissent, not as to the competency of the mechanism, but as to the desirability of the end. It is a curious feature of the average human being that he deems himself singular in the ability to make a right and proper use of wealth. 'It is a good and desirable thing for me to have ten thousand pounds a year. I am a sober and a right-minded person. But it would be absolutely disastrous for my neighbour over the way to have even a comfortable income, unless he worked too long and hard to spend it. He would not know what to do with it, and it would only hasten his career of drunkenness and depravity.'

IF THE CITIZENS OF THIS COUNTRY CANNOT DISENGAGE THEMSELVES FROM THIS POISONOUS NONSENSE WHICH REPRESENTS LIFE AS NECESSARILY DEPENDENT UPON MINDING EVERYONE ELSE'S BUSINESS BUT ONE'S OWN, THE ETERNAL SERFDOM OF MANKIND IS ASSURED.

"Virtue may flourish in the gutter; but if it can only flourish in the gutter, then there is something wrong with the nature of virtue."

Very little was heard (Sir William Beveridge was not then in the forefront of the 'Revolution') during the years before the war of a campaign well organised in many cities throughout the country. It took the form of the house to house distribution of forms, many thousands of which were signed and collected. Interferences of a mysterious order led to the suspension of the measure, but not before the

soundness of its conception had been demonstrated. The form was as follows:—

### **WE WILL ABOLISH POVERTY.**

#### *Elector's Demand and Undertaking.*

- (1) I know that there are goods in plenty and therefore that poverty is quite unnecessary.
- (2) It is my will, therefore, that poverty shall be abolished.
- (3) I know that more goods would be made if they could be sold, but at present their production is restricted because people lack the money to buy them.
- (4) Therefore I want a National Dividend paid to me and to every Briton, so that all goods desired that can be made will be made.
- (5) This Dividend must not increase taxes, or prices, nor deprive owners of their property nor decrease its relative value.
- (6) As a democrat, I say that Parliament exists to *make my will prevail*—not to force on me what it thinks is good for me.
- (7) So I pledge myself to vote for any candidate who will undertake that this my declared policy shall be carried out before any other legislation.
- (8) If the present M.P. here won't undertake this I will vote for some other party, and keep on changing until my policy has been achieved.

Signed..... Address.....

The Beveridge plan IS THE ANSWER TO THIS FORM AND THE INDECENT DESIRE WHICH IS BEING SHOWN TO HASTEN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IT UNDER THE COVER OF THE WAR OWES ITS ORIGIN TO THE KNOWLEDGE THAT ENGLAND COULD NOT BE ENSLAVED IN PEACE TIME CONDITIONS.

It is habitual to consider that so vast has been the destruction caused directly and indirectly by the war (hence its prolongation by the same interests which set the stage for its commencement) that Plenty will not accrue again from the efforts of civilised communities in our lifetime. This is a topic far from the attention (but possibly very close to the mind) of Sir William Beveridge. Here are some figures given by Mr. Lyttelton to the House of Commons last July, when the House insisted that some adequate return should be made to the country for the vast dislocation, and elaboration, and effort it was putting forth without evident result:—

The Bofors platform took 1,000 man-hours; now takes 230. (ratio 4.3/1).

A machine-gun component took 2½ man hours. It now takes six minutes. (ratio 25/1).

A 2-pdr barrel took 193 man-hours. The far larger 6-pdr. now takes 72 man-hours. (ratio 2.7/1).

Components of aero engines took 8¼ hours [man-hours?] now take 3. (ratio 2.75/1).

The Minister went on to give index figures representing the increase of production:— aircraft 100-244; warlike stores 100-289. Production, he summed up, 'nearly trebled' between January 1941 and June 1942. No reason was given for supposing that the whole of this increase was not due to improvement of process. The suggestion was that it is. Then

why are we all being pushed about as we are? Mr. Lyttelton is in no doubt concerning the cause of the increases he cited. They are due to "ingenious re-design." Then what were Mr. Bevin's 'little lot' doing at this time?

"There are really only three alternative policies in respect to a world economic organisation:—

*"The first is that it is the end in itself for which man exists.*

*"The second is that while not an end in itself, it is the most powerful means of constraining the individual to do things he does not want to do; e.g., it is a system of Government. This implies a fixed ideal of what the world ought to be.*

*"And the third is that the economic activity is simply a functional activity of men and women in the world; that the end of man, while unknown, is something towards which most rapid progress is made by the free expansion of individuality, and that, therefore, economic organisation is most efficient when it most easily and rapidly supplies economic wants without encroaching on other functional activities.*

"YOU CANNOT SPEND TOO MUCH TIME IN MAKING THESE ISSUES CLEAR TO YOUR MINDS."

— C. H. DOUGLAS.

Which are you for? What is your policy, No. 1, or No. 2, or No. 3? Can there be any doubt that the principles expressed in the third paragraph are the principles of a just and a desired order?

In the early twenties, after tedious delays a Committee of the Labour Party, among them an anonymous financier now known to have been Mr. Emil Davics, and Mr. Greenwood, 'reported' on these principles that they were "fundamentally opposed to the principles for which the Labour Party stands."

And so they are.

Sir William Beveridge was entrusted with the preparation of his Report by a Labour Minister, Mr. Arthur Greenwood.

### **THE BEVERIDGE PLAN IS A PLAN FOR THE SERVILE STATE.**

#### **THE PARINGS**

The form and size of the present issue of *The Social Crediter* have been determined (in part) by Sir William Beveridge's anxiety to cast a wide net, in the hope of gaining adherents to his creed. It is stated that the 'net' (of paper) measured 70,000 x 150 x 9½ x 6 square inches. Readers who protest against this high-handed action on the part of the future Dictator of the World, may be partially consoled by the knowledge that, so far as subscriptions go, the present issue will be treated as supplementary to a future issue. In order that some who might not otherwise see the issue may do so, a few copies will be obtainable at a reduced price.

— Editor.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.