

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

ORGAN OF THE NEW AGE SOCIAL CREDIT SOCIETY

No. 2335] NEW SERIES Vol. LXI. No. 6. THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1937. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION TO THE SOCIETY 30s.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE	PAGE	
ALBERTA: THE NEXT MOVE	25	THE DUKE'S WEDDING	29
Mr. G. F. Powell's visit—diary of John Hargrave's earlier visit—adoption of the "Hargrave Plan" by Ministerialists—Powell to oppose adoption of this plan or any other—to recommend adoption of the "Douglas Strategy"—what is the plan of strategy?—is it more immune from legal invalidation than a Social-Credit plan?—why seek to avoid invalidation?—Hargrave's plan part of his strategy—Douglas's strategy necessitates postponement of plan—what are the "interests of other Social-Credit Movements"—the Secretariat a Conservative section of the British Movement—fears subversive effect of Social-Credit education.		The enterprise of the Vicar of St. Paul's, Darlington—pronounces the blessing of the Church—reaction of Bishops—Penguin Island comedy revived.	
		GREEN SHIRTS AND PUBLIC ORDER ACT	30
		Prosecution of Green Shirts under the Act fails at Luton.	
		THE MEANS AND THE END. By B. C. B.	30
		Inquiry into the nature and significance of Social Credit.	

ALBERTA.

THE NEXT MOVE.

Any Advance On The Hargrave Plan.

The Secretariat's official weekly announces (June 4) that one of its directors, Mr. G. F. Powell, has left for Alberta in company with Mr. G. L. MacLachlan, who came over to invite Major Douglas to go out.

The ostensible object of Mr. Powell's visit is to inquire into the situation: but really it is to counteract the effects of John Hargrave's visit.

In order to clarify the position we insert hereunder a diary of Hargrave's itinerary and work between November, 1936, and March, 1937, with comments. This diary (and comments) is reproduced verbatim from the first issue of the new official organ of the Social Credit Party of Great Britain, called "N.V." (*The National Voice*). The typographical emphases are ours.

John Hargrave, Founder and National Leader of the Party, returned from Alberta on March 21. A brief diary of events will be of special interest:—

- Nov. 13. Hargrave sailed for Canada.
- Nov. 22. Arrived Ottawa.
- Dec. 2. Toronto.
- Dec. 5. Winnipeg.
- Dec. 8. Edmonton (Alberta).
- Dec. 17. Called into conference by Premier Aberhart.
- Dec. 18. Met members of the Cabinet.
- Dec. 19. Called in as Social Credit Adviser to assist Government Planning Committee appointed by Aberhart.
- Dec. 28. First draft of Hargrave Plan (embodied in Report of Planning Committee) signed by members of the Committee, and by Hargrave.
- Jan. 9. Final draft of Report containing Hargrave Plan signed by members of the Committee, and by Hargrave.

in the presence of Premier Aberhart. (One signed copy retained by Government, a second signed copy retained by Hargrave.) Report brought before Cabinet by Aberhart. Decision taken to submit Report to Party Caucus.

Jan. 11. Report brought before Caucus.

Jan. 12. Hargrave called before Caucus, and questioned for two and a half hours. Report approved and passed by resolution.

Jan. 14. Special interview with Hargrave published in the *Edmonton Journal*. Interview exposed the fact that there is no Social Credit in Alberta, and that no proper steps have been taken to introduce it.

Jan. 15. Hargrave invited to speak to Social Credit Party Convention.

Jan. 18. Hargrave asked by Premier Aberhart to cooperate with Government "Propaganda Committee."

Jan. 19. Attends first meeting of Propaganda Committee.

Jan. 20. Attends second meeting of Propaganda Committee.

Jan. 21. Attends third meeting of Propaganda Committee. Nothing decided at any of these meetings.

Jan. 22. Hargrave attended fourth meeting of Propaganda Committee. Asked to sign certain documents for publication, in which Hargrave was to (1) recant criticisms in Press interview of Jan. 14, (2) congratulate Aberhart and Government on "splendid progress" made towards introducing Social Credit during past sixteen months, (3) strongly repudiate G. S. Officer R. Halliday Thompson because of (perfectly correct) criticisms made by him after his visit to Alberta some weeks previously. Hargrave could not comply with these outrageous requests. This meeting, attended by Aberhart, revealed only too clearly the fact that Aberhart and his Government had no intention of acting upon the proposals embodied in the Report of the Planning Committee.

Jan. 25. Hargrave issued a special statement to the Press, and left Edmonton for Ottawa.

Mar. 12. Sailed for England.

Mar. 21. Arrived at Liverpool.

The result of the visit of our Leader to Alberta has been seen in the revolt of some of thirty-five M.P.s of the Alberta Legislature. These "rebel" M.P.s, as they have been called in the Press, are demanding that real Social Credit be introduced without further delay; and they appear to have forced Premier Aberhart to agree to call in Social Credit experts and to carry out their advice. The latest report in the *Daily Telegraph* (April 16) states that, "A cable has been sent to Major C. H. Douglas, inviting him immediately to act as technical adviser on the establishment of Social Credit in the Province of Alberta."

But for Hargrave's work in Alberta, and his sudden departure from Edmonton (which had the effect of "a cold douche" that awakened Aberhart, his Cabinet, and not a few of the M.P.s), the opportunity of even attempting to "put in" Social Credit might have been lost. Hargrave's investigations on the spot revealed that the idea of Social Credit had been allowed to fade into the background of ordinary political procedure, and was rapidly fading out of the picture altogether.

The next move is with Douglas.

The crucial event is that of January 12, 1937, when the "Caucus"—which, let it be remembered is the name given to the whole body of Government supporters—approved the Report of the Planning Committee embodying Hargrave's plan. Let us call the "Caucus" by the name of the Ministerial Party or the Ministerialists, which is what it would be called in this country. As the diary relates, the Ministerialists put Hargrave through 2½ hours' examination on his Plan, and, after hearing him, passed the Report and Plan by resolution.

We can add information from other sources that the questions asked covered not only the *technical content* of the Plan, but the *constitutional implications and consequences* of its adoption. On the latter issue Hargrave dealt with questions put by (among others) the Attorney General. Further, the passing of the Report and Plan was done by a series of resolutions, clause by clause, and in each case with no opposition.

A Spoiling Tactician.

So it is perfectly clear what the situation is that Mr. Powell is going to "inquire" about. It is that the Ministerial Party stand committed to an authentic Social Credit plan and to a demand on the Aberhart Cabinet to introduce it. Mr. Powell's task is to persuade the Ministerialists to abandon that position. This is obvious from the fact that he is the mouthpiece of Douglas, who contends that the introduction of a Social Credit plan will wreck his own strategic plan. And it is confirmed by the fact that Mr. Powell has never professed to understand Social-Credit technique, and, indeed, has never been keen about technical education. So it is quite certain that he would not be going out if there were any question of investigating whether the Hargrave Plan, or any improvement on it, should be incorporated in legislation. Mr. Powell has gone out to prevent the adoption of any Social Credit plan at all.

For this task he is undoubtedly well qualified. He has a strong personality. By profession he is a sales-organiser. Give him something to sell, and if it is saleable at all he will sell it as quickly as the next man. So if anybody can smash the revolt of the thirty-five M.P.s who are demanding Social Credit legislation he is the best man to do it.

Tortuous Diplomacy.

His task is likely to be facilitated by the following factors. First: Hargrave, having inspired the Ministerialists to demand swift action, has correctly left the field open to Douglas (or, as it now appears, to Powell)

to make what use he likes of the new will-to-action that has been created. Second: the reactionary, timid and inert elements among the Ministerialists and their constituents will welcome Douglas's strategy-policy (a) because, since it must precede any Social-Credit legislation, it makes for delay in commencing action; and (b) because, since the strategy-policy is not accompanied by any strategy-plan they are provided with an opportunity to reject Hargrave's Social-Credit plan in favour of Douglas's strategy-policy without thereby necessarily committing themselves to any plan of strategy which Douglas might thereafter see fit to formulate.

We stress the distinction between "policy" and "plan" for the reason that while it is conceivable that a strategy-policy might be implemented without a Social-Credit plan, it is not conceivable that a strategy-policy should be implemented without a strategy-plan. Now, we know what the strategy-policy is in principle. It is that of *taking power to use Public Credit*. But we do not know by what methods Douglas believes that the principle can be applied.

Judicial Invalidation.

It may be that Powell has been authorised to outline such methods to the Albertan Ministerialists. If he does this he may make out a case for the postponement of a Social-Credit plan. But to achieve that it is necessary that the methods should be superior to those which Douglas has prescribed in his latest book. For these are no less vulnerable to attack than would be methods of implementing a straightforward Social-Credit policy. Both sets of methods can be constitutionally invalidated or unconstitutionally frustrated.

Here is an item of news in *The Daily Express* of June 5.

EDMONTON (Alberta), Friday.

The five judges of the Alberta Supreme Court to-day unanimously declared the Settlement of Debts Act passed by the Social Credit Government of 1936 invalid. The Debts Act limited interest on all private debts to 5 per cent. and lowered the principal of all debts entered into before 1932.

Refer to pages 185, 186 and 187 of *The Alberta Experiment*, and you will find there advice from Douglas which amounts in principle to what has now been invalidated by the Alberta Supreme Court. The Court's reasons for the judgment are not available, but we know that these Courts have previously applied the rule that debtors may not vary the terms on which they contracted their debts. If that rule is invoked it is just as fatal to Douglas's proposal for Alberta to pay debts in kind as it has been to Aberhart's legislation to knock off some of the interest on them.

We agree that Douglas's proposal for varying the terms has superior merits to Aberhart's, but its superiority rests, not on the calculation that the Court could not invalidate it, but on the strategic advantage accruing to its sponsors if the Court *did* invalidate it. Note this well.

We call attention to this because in his book Douglas seems to make the invalidation of some of Aberhart's legislation an indictment against that legislation. In our opinion it is illogical and unjust to insinuate that merely because a Court, interpreting and applying what we all agree is a bankster Constitution, disallows certain legislation, therefore the legislation is necessarily

unsound. No; if invulnerability to invalidation is going to be made the sole and final test of sound legislation (whether technical or tactical) then we had better abandon all attempts to defeat the bankers through Parliamentary action.

This brings us to the argument that we outlined last week, namely that invalidation may be something to be welcomed, not avoided. We shall agree that if there is a plan which gets something done without giving the Courts a chance to interfere, then that plan is the best to adopt. But the snag is *getting something done* with immunity from interference. If Mr. Powell has a plan which avoids this snag it will merit the sympathetic consideration of the Albertan Ministerialists.

If no invulnerable plan is forthcoming, then a vulnerable plan must be chosen. Invalidation will have to be taken for granted; and the problem will be to decide on the best procedure for exploiting the Court's veto when it comes. This will bring the Hargrave Plan into the picture. Not because it is the best plan, but because it is a plan for "putting in" Social Credit, and, at present is the only plan examined by the Albertan Ministerialists. It is a bone which the dog can test with his teeth on the bridge, and one to which he will be wise to devote his attention until someone fishes up the better bone from the brook.

The Hargrave Plan.

We must emphasise here what we said just now about the Hargrave Plan, namely that Hargrave was examined on it not only with regard to how it would work technically if the Government were permitted by the bankers (or the Court) to carry it out, but also with regard to what he would do, supposing that he were in the position of the Government, in the event of external interference or prohibition. That fact is sufficient to show that in Hargrave's judgment a plan for using Public Credit is not inconsistent with a plan for *taking power* to use it.

It is, of course, open to any qualified person to say that Hargrave's judgment is at fault, but the point here is that in devising his technical plan he has not overlooked questions of general political strategy. We do not know except in very broad outline what Hargrave's plan and strategy are, but from the information which we have received concerning his examination by the Ministerialist Party, we should say that he has designed his technical plan to be an integral part of his strategic plan. At any rate, both he and the Ministerialists have implicitly endorsed the proposition that the two plans can be reconciled.

Against this Powell will urge that they cannot be reconciled. Well, Hargrave has at least put his cards on the table. He has said in effect: "This is how I should put in Social Credit: and this is how I should deal with external obstruction." He has thus given hostages to his opponent. Mr. Powell will be made acquainted with the details, and will have an opportunity of proving, by reference to them, how and where Hargrave's calculations are wrong. If Mr. Powell makes honest use of this opportunity his visit will clear the air.

The electors of Alberta are waiting for a plan to be adopted and started on without further delay. Whether

it is a technico-strategic plan or a strategic plan only is secondary to the necessity for the Government to engage the enemy at once, and, let it be added, engage them in such a way as will be seen by the electors to be an advance towards the concrete objective of delivering the Dividend.

We hope that Ministerialists will ask Powell to explain the meaning of Douglas's latest reservation concerning advice to Alberta, namely that he has to *consider the interests of other Social Credit movements in the world*. That lends itself to the construction that Alberta must mark time until other countries catch up with her. And that construction is reinforced by the fact that Douglas insists on constitutional procedure. As already seen, he carries that doctrine to the length of suggesting that no legislation must be passed that the Courts can invalidate. In that case Alberta will mark time all right!

Social Credit and Society.

Let us here re-state what Social Credit is in the political frame of reference.

Social Credit is a technical monetary device which, if adopted, will enable society to break through economic restrictions without disturbance to its internal structure.

That is to say, the breaking through can be accomplished while the rich man stays in his castle and the poor man remains at the gate. Status is unaltered. The Lord Chamberlain's table of precedence remains inviolate. There is no social gatecrashing. Society crosses over into the Promised Land on its own bottom. It doesn't tilt; it doesn't even wobble. In short Social Credit is a perfect Conservative method of Reform. That is why the Socialists don't like it.

Now, as all the veterans of the Social Credit Movement know, this was our great selling-point. We said to the ruling classes and the elders of the old Parties of the State: Here is an invention which will settle all your problems (and ours, too) if you will adopt it.

Well, they did not adopt it. That is to say, the influential classes at the upper end of society declined the opportunity to save society as a whole. The opportunity remains open, but the question has arisen: Are the classes below to wait for those above to change their minds, or are they to assist them to do so?

As we have stated before, the answer of THE NEW AGE was, and is, that we shall have to wait for an alignment of forces none of which we can control. That is what has been called the "defeatist" view. Anyhow, it is outside the argument we are pursuing, and need not be discussed. We are concerned with the view put forward officially, which is that the lesser orders of society can and must assist the greater to change their minds about adopting the Social-Credit device.

Here we come to the root of the matter. There seems to be a confusion of thought among official leaders of the Movement which can be expressed in this way: That because the Social-Credit device can be used without affecting the structure of society, and because Social Creditors uphold it on that ground, therefore pressure from the lower part of society can be effectively applied to the higher part without affecting its structure, and Social Creditors must confine themselves to exercising this kind of pressure. We do not say that these con-

clusions are untrue, but we do say that they are not logically related to the premises. Let us illustrate the fallacy by a clearer example. An animal-lover can recommend a butcher to use a humane killer; but if the butcher declines, and the animal-lover decides to assist him to change his mind, it does not follow that the assistance must be rendered humanely. It might have to take the form of a punch on the jaw!

Social Credit and Subversion.

The application of this apparently academic analysis is of practical importance. The present directors of the Secretariat are, without exception, Conservatives in temperament and outlook. They are respecters of wealth and rank. They are upholders of constitutional forms and social distinctions. In itself this is nothing against them; but the one-sidedness of their outlook (really Douglas's personal outlook—for they are yes-men to Douglas) unfits them for the sole direction of the Movement, or of responsible external bodies like the Albertan Ministerialists.

They entirely lack the spirit of the Rebel, whether that of the modern *Left* or of the old *Tory Right*. Yet a majority of authentic Social Creditors (who alone constitute the Social Credit Movement) are rebels at heart. If they were not born so they became so when they were born again into the knowledge of the way of economic emancipation. The fact is that education in Social Credit breeds rebels. Every point in the analysis of how the credit-system defeats the public's purpose, of how the bankers conceal that process by false figures, and of how they perpetuate it by false philosophy, is an incitement to subversion. Think this over, and you will see that it is true. And since it is true you will realise the sinister significance of the Buxton fiat three years ago denouncing this kind of education as a dispersion of energy. You want no other explanation of the paralysis which has settled on the Movement since.

Another vital merit of this education is that in the process of inspiring you with the spirit of rebellion it corrects your impulse to break out into blind revolt. If you had a Movement of educated Social Creditors, or even one officered by such in the proportion of one in ten, there would be no need for a central directorate to keep them from precipitate action. But on the other hand they would take care not to accept control by a directorate who made it a matter of principle to suppress the rebel instinct.

Now, leaving all questions of possible personal motives aside, a reasonable objection to Hargrave's plan (and strategy) could be that its speed of operation involved greater risks than the people would stand up to. We are guessing this; but it is a good guess because Hargrave does represent, and also embody, the rebel spirit which animates the authentic Movement. The Planning Committee and the Ministerialists will not need any word from us to realise that Hargrave possesses the qualities of courage, resolution, decision, quickwittedness, and energy, combined with a deep knowledge of Social-Credit technology and social dynamics.

So, though we do not suggest that his plan of advance is the best one to take, we do suggest that it contains elements which must not be ignored even if officially condemned, and certainly not if the condemnation is unaccompanied by reasoned argument.

"The New Age" Social Credit Society.

NOTICES.

Names Wanted.

Hereunder are published preliminary lists of Credit Reform Organisations and of Representatives thereof. Will readers help us to correct or extend them, but remember that we do not wish to publish persons' names unless these have already been published in other quarters, or unless they are now consenting parties?

Warning.

In fact we have special reasons for advising persons who are supporting this Society, the Social Credit Party of Great Britain, or the London Social Credit Club, not to let their names be published without carefully considering their own positions in view of the contingency that indiscreet or unscrupulous use is made of them by agents hostile to the policies of these organisations. One reason is that we know of a case in which a person who had given us his name for publication was privately persuaded to withdraw it and advised not to liberally disclose to their employers in circumstances calculated to prejudice their promotion if not to put them out of their jobs.

Credit Reform Organisations.

C.G.—The Chandos Group.
C.P.C.—The Coventry Petition Campaign.
G.S.—The Green Shirts.
G.S.C.C.—The Glasgow Social Credit Club.
L.S.C.C.—The London Social Credit Club.
P.C.O.—Petition Central Office.
S.C.P.G.B.—The Social Credit Party of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
S.C.S., Ltd.—The Social Credit Secretariat, Ltd.
Y.L.C.—The York (Conference) Liaison Committee.

Representatives of Credit Reform Organisations.

Bardsley, W. L.—S.C.S., Ltd., Secretary.
Brenton, Arthur—*The New Age*, Editor.
Byrne, L. D.—S.C.S., Ltd., Director.
Coleman, A. W.—*The New Age*, Tech. Contributor.
Cousens, Hilderic—C.G.: Y.L.C.
de Castro, Miss M. B.—S.C.S., Ltd.
Douglas, C. H.—S.C.S., Ltd., Director.
Gibson, A. L.—S.C.S., Ltd., Director.
Golder, James—*The New Age*, Trustee.
Griffiths, Frank—S.C.P.G.B., Hon. Sec.
Hargrave, John—S.C.P.G.B., Leader: G. S. Leader.
Johnson, Very Rev. Hewlett—S.C.S., Ltd., Director.
Laub, T.—S.C.S., Ltd., Director.
Luxton, F. C.—S.C.S., Ltd., Director.
C. G. M.—S.C.S., Ltd.
Mairet, Philippe—*The New English Weekly*, Editor.
Mitchell, Dr. Joyce—L.S.C.C., Hon. Sec.
Northbourne, Lord—P.C.O., Trustee.
Northridge, R. L.—S.C.S., Ltd.
Orr-Ewing, Captain H.—P.C.O., Organiser.
Orr, Hugh—G.S.C.C., Hon. Sec.
Powell, G. F.—S.C.S., Ltd., Director.
Presbury, Edgar E.—*The New Age*, Secretary.
Purves, J. Ewart—L.S.C.C., President.
Reckitt, Maurice B.—Y.L.C., Chairman: C.G., Chairman.
Rowe, Sir Reginald—P.C.O., Trustee.
Scott, Capt. Creagh—S.C.S., Ltd.
Scrutton, Robert J.—*On To Prosperity*, Editor: C.P.C. Organiser.
Symons, W. T.—*Purpose*, Editor: C.G.: Y.L.C.
Tavistock, Lord
Tuke, James E.—S.C.S., Ltd., Director.
Vickers, Vincent C.—P. C. O., Trustee.
M. J. W.—S.C.S., Ltd.
Welford, Arthur—S.C.S., Ltd.
Willox, W. A.—S.C.S., Ltd., Director.
Wylde, L.—S.C.S., Ltd., Director.

The Duke's Wedding.

The result of the offer of the Vicar of St. Paul's, Darlington, to perform the ceremony of marriage at Candé is a striking demonstration of the dynamic force of private initiative. Taking as accurate in detail the story told by the *News Chronicle's* Special Correspondent on June 3, the Rev. R. Anderson Jardine brought off what appeared to be a human impossibility, through the exercise of his own personal wit, courage and resolution. To begin with it looked impossible for anyone in his humble position to get a telephone call put through at all. Next it seemed impossible that the Duke of Windsor would assent at that late stage of the wedding-preparations. But the astute and intrepid Vicar had got this all weighed up. Instead of saying: "Hum, ha—it occurs to me that you might like to make use of my unworthy services on this solemn occasion, etc., etc., etc.," he says: "I am coming across to France to marry you." And when the Duke began to ask him whether he had considered the consequences he cut in decisively: "I have sought no authorisation for my decision, and I intend to go through with it. I leave by train to-night."

Even so there remained what would have seemed an insuperable obstacle, namely the moral certainty that the line would be tapped by Post Office officials and measures taken to prevent the Vicar from crossing the Channel.

Since the above was written (on the morning of the wedding) further reports make mention of later telephone messages between Darlington and London relating to arrangements for crossing the Channel. It looks as if, when the Vicar announced that he was leaving "to-night," the Duke told him to wait a few hours so as to make sure that there would be no misunderstanding as to time and route. There is no mention, by the way, about a passport. Unless the Vicar had one he would not have been able to rush across overnight. For these and other reasons we are inclined to think that there was connivance in official quarters somewhere to assist the Vicar out of England before any of the big noises hostile to Edward VIII got wind of what was up. It may be that Fate took a hand in providing the facilities, for, as will be noted, the event synchronised with the swapping of Premiers and reshuffling of Ministers, an operation which must have given rise to many preoccupations, and thereby created a sort of blind spot in the eyes of the bankster watchdogs.

Later accounts during last week contradict the *News Chronicle* story. They say that the Vicar first wrote offering his services, and that all subsequent negotiations took place between Darlington and London. This seems the more credible version: it clears up our difficulty about the telephone and passport. But if the Vicar did not telephone to Candé, whence came the intriguing piece of dialogue published by the *News Chronicle*? If it has no foundation (and it appears so) it affords a striking example of the careless distortion of fact arising out of newspaper-competition: it suggests that Correspondents, in their haste to overreach one another, test the information they pick up on the principle of verification by dramatisation. If it thrills it's true.

However, the main thing is that the Vicar got through

and did the job. And now it remains for the Bishops to decide what they are going to do about it. From a certain angle the kind of counsels that they must be taking together will call to mind the episode in *Penguin Island* where Anatole France pictured the proceedings in Heaven of the Council of Saints called together to advise the Almighty what to do in the matter of the blind priest who had baptised the island-full of penguins under the illusion that they were human beings. Birds with souls! Preposterous! Yet having been baptised, they had to have souls. The old priest had dropped a brick, what? Well, it will be remembered that one Solon among the Saints found the right answer. The birds must have souls, he declared, but these need not be large-sized souls, he pointed out; and he recommended the Almighty to give the birds small-sized souls. In such wise did the Omniscience and Omnipotence of the Heavenly Powers maintain the distinction between the higher and lower orders of creation.

Readers familiar with Anatole France's immortal satire will remember that those penguins were not at all handicapped by the short allowance of soul-power. No; in their methods of developing their social and political organisation they managed to produce disastrous results indistinguishable from those attained by human beings. One might almost deduce from this strange outcome that the large human soul was an inflation of the small animal soul, and that the Almighty, by handing out deflated souls, was simply establishing the penguin civilisation on a sounder moral basis. As Mr. F. R. Hirst might have said: The more soul you have the less it will buy in terms of spiritual prosperity.

If that be so then well-wishers of the Duke and Duchess of Windsor can afford to contemplate with tolerant amusement the promised reactions of intolerant ecclesiastics. They may perform the gesture of reversing the mystic catalysis by which the Church's blessing perfects the miracle of the *travail made one*; but will that cancel out the miracle? We don't know. We leave it to our latter-day magicians. It is said that they may punish the "blind priest" for mistaking the Duke and his Lady for human beings made in God's image. Well, events will show whether a Penguin Dynasty is going to fall short in good works of that which the Anglican Hierarchy are so concerned to maintain inviolate.

We can understand the point of view of those who hold that one party to a marriage should not re-marry while the other party remains alive. But we also understand the point of view of those who hold that one member of the Royal Family should not occupy the Throne while another with prior right of succession remains alive. The mystery of marriage and the mystery of primogeniture are aspects of each other, and they must be respected together or else rejected together.

If the Vicar's letter bag is a true index of public feeling the Bishops must be feeling a draught. Only four protests among a thousand letters of commendation is conclusive evidence that the Vicar's conscience was in tune with that of his fellow countrymen on the matter of the religious ceremony. Also, we feel inclined to suggest, it strengthens the presumption that we discussed last December that if the public had been allowed more time to reflect on the issues involved in the abdication-crisis there might have been no abdication.

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON),
12-14, Red Lion-court, Fleet-street, E.C.4,
England, and printed for him by THE ARGUS
PRESS, LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street,
London, E.C.4, England (Phone: Central 3701).