

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 4. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 17, 1940.

6d. Weekly.

THIS "AMERICAN" BUSINESS

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

JOHN KENNETH HYATT
Counselor at Law
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York

16 July, 1940.

Major C. H. Douglas,
The Social Crediter,
12, Lord Street, Liverpool.
My dear Major Douglas,

I have been receiving for some months The Social Crediter, thru the courtesy no doubt of some kind friend. In these times it is of importance as well as interest to read the views of those in other parts of the world. However there is so much that is constructive and worth while that one can not permit oneself indefinitely to waste time on that which is not. Therefore I ask that you discontinue sending me your publication.

It indeed seems deeply regrettable at a time when English speaking people in all parts of the world should be united in thought at least in the common cause that you and your associates should be fostering feelings of antagonism by your unwarranted defamations of The United States which you have the poor taste to mail to us in this country. Your reference in the June 29th issue to the German-Jew-American Crooks is disgusting and your remark that in three months (of the last war) Germany was decisively defeated is stupid. If it were true, what depths of degradation and impotence these two great nations have sunk to in twenty-five years!

Very truly yours,

John Kenneth Hyatt.

The letter which is reproduced above seems to me to afford an opportunity to deal faithfully with a matter which I believe to be perhaps more important than any other at the moment. As it was not marked "Private" and, in spite of the form of address, I am not aware of having met Mr. John Kenneth Hyatt, I feel sure he will not object to

the publicity thus given to it. I hope that his, to me, unknown benefactor will continue to send him this journal until he has had an opportunity to consider what I am about to say.

In the first place, I quite understand that Mr. Hyatt is annoyed. Regarding him as a typical decent American (of whom I know, and like, hundreds) I should expect him to be annoyed. Obviously I intended him to be annoyed.

Because the point I am endeavouring to make to him, not, it would seem, without success, is that, writing as I am doing at this moment within sound of falling bombs, and only a few miles from where the flower of Europe, and in my opinion, of the World, is engaged in mutual extermination, it does not really interest me that "English speaking people in all parts of the world should be united in thought at least in the common cause". I don't think the common cause (by which I mean his, and mine, not that of the U.S. or other Government) is going to be furthered by that kind of thought.

Because I think that certain powerful influences in the United States with confederates in Europe, and particularly in Germany, but not excluding England, are directly responsible for this war, I am equally convinced that it is the business of Mr. Hyatt and those Americans like him, to realise that, while as individuals they would repudiate that accusation, they are responsible for the policy of their Government, and must be judged by it, even if it is inspired from non-representative sources. And my practical objective is to see, to the extent of any small influence I might have, that either the Mr. Hyatts of America shoulder the responsibility for their Government's policy, and modify it, or that as many people as possible in Great Britain and the British Empire should know exactly where that unmodified policy will lead them.

Although it is not the beginning, it is quite convenient to start from Mr. Hyatt's statement that "your remark that in three months (of the last war) Germany was decisively defeated, is stupid". Passing over the fact that this is the opinion of all competent military critics, of whom, of course, I cannot claim to be one, I do not think Mr. Hyatt understands what was meant by the statement. Perhaps I may explain it to him.

All German strategy for dealing with a War on two fronts was based on the "Theory of Interior Lines", that, being inside a circle, you can get to a given point on the circumference quicker than if you are outside.

In August, 1914, Germany confidently relied on this factor to smash France, and Great Britain's Expeditionary Force, to a time-table which would enable her to detach her Western Army to deal with the formidable force of Russia on her Eastern Front. When Von Kluck swung right at the Marne, Germany's major strategy collapsed. It was impossible for her to release sufficient men to face a Russian Army of even half the number of men of whom Russia disposed. What really happened in Russia will probably never be fully known. She was most certainly not beaten by German arms. Tannenberg was a

LECTURES AND STUDIES

The correspondence course will be ready for distribution in September, on the same terms and conditions which held previously.

The syllabus (3d. post free) may be had on application to:

Mrs. B. M. Palmer,
35, Birchwood Avenue,
Sidcup, Kent.

massacre, not a battle.

What we do know is

- (a) That Mr. Walter Hines Page, American Ambassador in London, cabled to President Wilson at the outbreak of War "The British Empire is delivered into our hands", which it certainly would not have been if Germany had been defeated in six months.
- (b) That the German Embassy in the United States banked with Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of New York, and that Kuhn, Loeb did everything in their power to secure the success of Germany by the disruption of Russia. We have Jacob Schiff's own authority for this. We know that Germany quite naturally collaborated in Schiff's plans.
- (c) We have the authority of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador to Washington, for the belief that President Wilson, during 1914-15-16 was almost completely controlled by Kuhn, Loeb, (i.e., the Schiffs and Warburgs). Unfortunately, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice died suddenly on his way to England to report further on the matter.
- (d) We know that Great Britain and France poured munitions and equipment into Russia, none of which was allowed to reach the Armies, and that the scandal became so flagrant that Lord Kitchener and a specialist staff were deputed to go to Russia to endeavour to straighten matters out, and that the "Hampshire" on which this Mission travelled, was sunk under highly suspicious circumstances.
- (e) We know that as a result of all this, Germany was relieved of the war on two fronts, not by force of arms, but by treachery and the "Dark Forces", a condition of affairs curiously similar to the collapse of Belgium and France in the present war. Germany then began what was, in effect, a new war, which cost millions of French and British lives.
- (f) We know that, when Britain, France, and Germany, now balanced so that a quick and decisive victory was impossible, had fought

themselves to a standstill, certain terms, by which *inter alia* Great Britain *alone* underwrote the cost of the war *in gold* and, we strongly suspect, mortgaged control of the so-called Bank of England as security for a payment which never could be made, and which the United States Government knew could never be made, were agreed, and the United States entered, and won the war with comparatively negligible loss, Kuhn, Loeb co-operating. The Balfour Declaration on the Jewish Home produced the well-known American "wise crack": "We may'nt be a Monarchy, but we made Balfour an Earl, anyway".

- (g) We know that the Warburg family was represented at the Peace Conference both on the side of Germany and on the side of her military opponents.
- (h) We know that the only sane method (i.e. method of war-avoidance) of dealing with Germany at the Peace Conference was to insist that the artificial Bismarckian Reich should be broken up, and that Germany should revert to the largely independent states of which she is naturally and culturally composed. But that the whole weight of the United States was thrown against this policy, and the League of Nations, the misbegotten child of Jewish centralisation, was foisted on an unwilling and exhausted Europe, disowned by its progenitors, and left to be a convenient centre for financial and political intrigue.
- (i) We know that, in association with the "Bank of England", British policy has been dragged at the tail of Wall and Pine Street since 1917 with catastrophic results. Every attempt at rational reform, or even normal progress, has been blocked by reactionary Finance. The attempted return to the Gold Standard in 1925 under transatlantic pressure, was one instance, and the cool transfer of a loss of £42,000,000, advanced by the "Bank of England" to the Credit Anstalt *et al.*, to the Exchange Equalisation Account (i.e., the

British taxpayer) was another. The grinding and unnecessary taxation on a scale unequalled outside Great Britain is another.

Had we been allowed to use the artificial depression of 1928-33 to build up our air strength, there would have been no war.

- (j) We have fairly good authority for the statement that Hitler was financed both from the United States and the "Bank of England" because he attacked "Reparations", i.e. payments to France and England on Public Account; and thus made possible the payment to Kuhn, Loeb & Co. of the very large post-war loans they had made both to Germany and German industrialists.
- (k) We know that Russia, having been reduced to scrap value, has been "reconstructed" (and how!) largely to the advantage of the German-American - Jew interests which caused her wreck.
- (l) We noticed the storm of abuse which swept the Press of the United States when, in September, 1938, it appeared barely possible that another Great War might be averted, the speeches of United States Senators, such as Senator Pittman, exhorting us that it was better to die than to live disgraced, and we have not failed to remark the assumption that the British Islands and their population don't really matter very much if the British Fleet is available to protect the American Atlantic seaboard, and so forth. We don't attach undue importance to these things but we observe them, meditatively.

Now I feel sure Mr. Hyatt will agree that there is a repetitive pattern running through the necessarily sketchy picture I have endeavoured to draw in answer to his letter. And I hasten to assure him once again that I don't imagine he, or Americans like him, are engaged in schemes of international exploitation. Nor do I suggest for one moment that the United States has a monopoly of crooks. On the contrary, we have a very flourishing Branch Office over here, many of whom, like his local brand, profess the most exalted principles.

What I am suggesting, with all the seriousness of which I am capable, is

that the artless assumption that all the virtues reside in the Government of the United States for the time being, and that European Governments are something quite different, simply will not do. On the whole all Governments are rather worse in 1940 than they were in 1914, because they have become more powerful tools of "interests", and so far as Governments go, there is absolutely no ground for assuming that there is any deviation from the pattern to which I have referred, or that the chaos of the twenty years armistice would deter the

"interests" from preparing the ground for more disasters.

As Mr. Chamberlain, who is so unpopular in Washington, has said, "We are fighting evil things". These evil things would be comparatively powerless if people like Mr. Hyatt and myself were not organised into increasingly powerful masses capable of being used for purposes of which we disapprove.

Let there be no misapprehension about it. We, in Great Britain, intend to win this war, which in my opinion, has been thrust upon us, and we shall be really and truly grateful for assistance

to that end. But I think that I am speaking for all but an infinitesimal minority of the population of this country when I say that we would rather go down fighting than "win" and have the terms of "Peace" imposed by Agencies, acting through Governments, which plotted the war in order to impose them, alike on the "Victors" and the Vanquished. Therefore, we intend to win the Peace, also, this time.

C.S. Douglas

NEWS & VIEWS

"Yes, we have some Bahamas!"

It would be kind of U. S. A.
To let some succour come our way.
To let us have some obsolete
Additions to the British Fleet
But what they'd ask us in return
Is something we have yet to learn.
— *Excalibur*.

In January, 1921 the Scottish Labour Advisory Committee, after strong opposition by Mr Emmanuel Shinwell, who is a Jew, born in London and now a Scottish "Labour" Front Bench M.P., asked the *Miners' Federation* (not the "Labour" Party) to investigate the Social Credit Mining Scheme, with a strong recommendation in favour of it.

In some mysterious manner, the "Labour" Party side-tracked the *Miners' Federation*, and appointed a Committee of its own. Sixteen months afterwards a report so preposterous that none of the Committee would sign it, although they sponsored it, appeared, condemning the Scheme. The Committee consisted of: C. D. Burns, F. C. Clegg, G. D. H. Cole, Hugh Dalton, Arthur Greenwood, F. Hodges, C. M. Lloyd, Sir Leo Chiozza Money, R. H. Tawney, Sydney Webb.

We don't know what happened to Messrs. Burns, Clegg, and Lloyd. Mr. Hodges (*Miners' Federation*) was almost immediately after the issue of the Report made a Director of the Bank of England, Messrs. Cole and Tawney became Fellows of Oxford Colleges, Dr. Hugh Dalton (Sir Ernest Cassel Reader in Commerce, London School of Econom-

ics) is a Cabinet Minister, so is Mr. Arthur Greenwood, Sydney Webb (Chairman of the Statesman Publishing Company whose paper *The New Statesman*, attacked the scheme before the report was published) is a Peer, Sir Leo Chiozza Money-er-hem.

The *Labour Party*? Oh, yeah.

While his father was Prime Minister, Mr Oliver Baldwin published a series of articles on Machiavelli, with a cryptic warning to the British Public. Odd, wasn't it?

Roosevelt has ordered Mr. John Cudahy, the United States Ambassador in Brussels, to return home, which Mr. Cudahy is said to be doing posthaste, from London, after giving an interview—the cause of the American President's order—to a representative of the Press Association.

The affair has points of interest, not the smallest of which is the Ambassador's assertion that he thought the feeling of Belgians was one of attachment to the British, "and they knew that the British cause was their cause."

The Ambassador's offense is that he "talked". His views—or 'certain of them'—are "not to be construed as representing the views" of the American Government. By implication, the unpopular 'view' held by Mr. Cudahy is a view favourable to King Leopold, who, he says, informed—"and fully informed"—the Allies three days before he acted upon his decision to surrender.

Mr. Cudahy denied he had heard of "one authentic case of atrocity since the Germans went in." He also advocated United States co-operation with the Germans in feeding the Belgians. Whether this suggestion or what amounts to an accusation of lying against M. Reynaud appears the more heinous offense to American eyes is not made clear. It is fairly clear that Mr. Sumner Welles and the Ambassador are in disagreement.

The important letter from Major Douglas published in *The Social Crediter* for August 3 defined a plane of cleavage common to England and America. "The real Britain, and the real America, have sustained one defeat after another. But the final battle is yet to come." If Commander Sir Archibald Southby's plea that the Ministry of Information should supply information instead of manufacturing the raw materials of Information is attended to (and why not?) we may hear more of both the real England and the real America, and be able more clearly to identify their exponents. Meantime an eye should be kept on anyone who appears promising: people who both know and talk (particularly when not desired by the Whigs to do so) always seem promising.

ULSTER AND EIRE

Newspapers sent abroad, including *The Social Crediter* must be submitted to censorship. This occasions some delay in delivery of the paper to subscribers. Ulster and Eire are subject to censorship regulations. Subscribers should note that any delay that is occurring is the result of this censorship and cannot be remedied by us.

PLAIN Mr. JOHNSON (II)

By B. M. PALMER

A conversation with a friend last week recalled to my memory the "Autobiography of Anthony Trollope"

He was not a man of letters, but a gentleman who wrote books. Concerning them Nathaniel Hawthorne said: "They precisely suit my taste,—solid and substantial, written on the strength and through the inspiration of ale, and just as real as if some giant had hewn a great lump out of the earth and put it under a glass case, with all its inhabitants going about their daily business, and not suspecting that they were being made a show of. And these books are just as English as a beef steak."

Anthony Trollope would have known exactly what was meant by "plain Mr. Johnson", for he was "plain Mr. Trollope".

So I took a copy of his autobiography from the library, and on re-reading Michael Sadleir's preface recalled that when the first edition had been sold out in 1883 the book was unobtainable until it was reprinted in 1922. It "extinguished its author's good name for a quarter of a century, and vanished." Where other writers found neglect, "he found contempt, in some quarters hatred."

And this was a man who during his lifetime had made over £70,000 by the sale of his books, not because he was a mere "best seller" who had to tell stories, but because he had stories to tell.

The reasons for the sudden disappearance of certain books are frequently extremely interesting. Michael Sadleir suggests that it was the "aggressive horse-sense of his views on life," which killed Trollope's reputation in the 80's.

Trollope was a civil servant until the age of fifty-two. He viewed with misgiving the introduction of the competitive examination system into the Service, because it was based on the idea of equality. There are places in life, he says, which can hardly be well filled except by gentlemen, though no one now dares to say so in print. The son of the butcher may be as well qualified as the parson's son, but the chances are greatly in favour of the parson's. The gates of one class must, of course, be

open to the other, but no good whatever can be done by declaring that there is no difference between them.

"Privilege produces ten winners—genuine winners—to one produced by work, unprivileged" (*"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom,"* January 13.)

A man who indulged a life-long passion for cross country riding might be expected to understand what is meant by breeding. Trollope kept a stable until he was an old man.

He entirely failed "to reach the altitude of those who think that a man devoted to letters should be indifferent to the pecuniary results for which work is usually done. An easy income has always been regarded by me as a great blessing. Not to have to think of six-pences, or very much of shillings; not to be unhappy because the coals have burned too quickly, and the house linen wants renewing; not to be debarred by the rigour of necessity from opening one's hands, perhaps foolishly, to one's friends, all this to me has been essential to the comfort of life."

He became Chairman of the "Fortnightly" review with the determination that the periodical should provide some increase in literary honesty—"we would let any man who had a thing to say, and knew how to say it, speak freely. *But he should always speak with the responsibility of his name attached.*" Unfortunately he did not include purely political articles in this ruling. Party politics seems the one subject in regard to which his sound common sense stood him in small stead—though we must remember that the party politics of last century, conducted by men of independent incomes, was very different from the party politics of to-day. "When it is necessary to affect the judgement of only a small number of comparatively well-educated people, constantly in touch with each other, and familiar with the practice and technique of governmental action, a change of policy is easy and can be comparatively rapid. But such is not the case to-day."

At the last general election (1936) the wife of a member for a large town in the Midlands indiscreetly remarked

that she did not know how they would live if her husband lost his seat. This created quite a sensation among the sentimental idealists of the place; but it also helps to explain why it is now unheard of for a government to be turned out by its own supporters, although before the middle of the nineteenth century this not infrequently happened. Party politics, Trollope would surely have said, can only be well conducted by gentlemen.

The unrecognised dishonesty of much literary criticism, the bribery and corruption and back-stairs influence exerted to obtain favourable press notices, Trollope considered to be a marked evil in English literature. It was a few words from this portion of his biography which first drew my attention to his way of looking at things; and I think that, few as those words are, they hold the key to the service which is perfect freedom.

Demands for praise are, he says, disgraceful in every walk of life, and adds:—

"As censure should beget no anger, so should praise beget no gratitude. . . . Praise let the author try to obtain by wholesome effort; censure let him avoid, if possible by care and industry. But when they come, let him take them as coming from some source which he cannot influence, and with which he should not meddle."

There speaks plain Mr. Johnson. It is he alone who knows, among the peoples of this world, that as a personal soul he has a right to an existence which needs no justification from his fellow beings. The Kingdom of Heaven is within him. What need has he of praise?

Perhaps this is the last and most difficult lesson which we have to learn, and when we have learned it we are free indeed. Without it, I do not believe that the material freedom for which we are fighting on so many fronts, can exist. There is no freedom for a nation of specialists whose only right to existence is as state functionaries. Plain Mr. Johnson is above criticism.

This must never be forgotten.

Read his life. You will smile at his Victorianism; but you will lament what we have lost, even since 1870.

LOOKING TO THE LAND

"Look to the Land" by Lord Northbourne.
7/6. J. M. Dent & Sons Limited.

It is a peculiar thing that a man who, like Lord Northbourne, can give expression to so much sound thought can still mistake a symptom for a cause. In his view the cause of the social and economic troubles which beset the world is neglect of the land, and a defective distributive system, such as our present money system, is an effect of it. Thus we read:

"There can be no real solution of the problem of distribution other than a rebuilding of society on a sound organic basis, which must involve a better distribution of the population, both within most countries and in the world as a whole. To attempt to look at the problem of distribution in isolation is to be led into the snare of 'planned economy'—equally a snare whether the planning be done by the State, or by private interests holding quasi-monopolistic powers. The only possible foundation for a sound organic life within any community is a close association of the people with the land."

Yet in the next paragraph we are told:

".....Such conditions are not impossible of attainment, and will probably come about of themselves if the main obstacles to the evolution of a free and natural economy are removed, and if circumstances force upon people a clearer realization of where their true interests lie....."

and we have been told earlier in the book that:

"The true economy of farming has largely been obscured by the obtrusiveness of a superimposed financial economy....."

But, having recognised this, Lord Northbourne runs away from it:—

"The real situation is one of poverty in essentials amid plenty of non-essentials. Expressed in financial terms only, poverty has been greatly reduced in the past few decades.....That is the real question. We have plenty of manufactured goods and more if we want them. We can have plenty of money as soon as we care to allow money to be equated to production;....."

"Industry was made for man; yet men are now looked on as being creatures useful to industry—either as machine minders, salesmen, or, most important to-day, as buyers of the products of industry. This outlook prevails among many modern reformers, especially monetary reformers, whose main idea seems to be to make men more efficient purchasers, so as to relieve the machine of its present chronic constipation....."

Faulty reasoning, however, is definitely the exception and not the rule in this book. The author sees things the right way up and expresses a wisdom which this country is in dire need of to-day, for he has the organic conception of life:

"The spiritual value of contact with reality, of feeling oneself part of nature, like all the most valuable things, is not statistically measurable, but is no less real for that. Close contact with living things brings a kind of wisdom not always appreciated by those to whom such things are unfamiliar, to whom in fact it often appears as a kind of slowness. This wisdom comes through a gradual absorption, usually unaccompanied by conscious realization or power to put into words, of the principles which govern the behaviour of living things, of which man is but one."

"Farmers have a reputation for individualism and independence. These are sound qualities, but they are not appreciated in modern large scale business. (But then that is a debased form of organization.) They are not incompatible with the highest forms of social organization—indeed they give it value; for they improve the quality of the smallest units, from which any such organization must grow. Nothing can grow downwards from the top. 'The master's foot fats the soil' is a true saying. The farmer must be master of his plot, however small. He then really cares personally for it, more than for what he can get out of it, which is the first condition for the building up of a sound biological unit....."

"It is one of the consequences of the obscure and uncomprehended state of helplessness to which the individual

has been reduced by prevalent conditions that most people, when they think about putting into practice any idealistic conception, think of the problem in terms of organization. People even speak seriously of the 'organization of prosperity,' as if prosperity were something reducible to formulæ, and as if all would be well if only the right organization could be brought about. That is bad enough, but it becomes worse when the bringing about of the right organization is not distinguished from the imposition by some kind of authority of a sufficient degree of organization. The worship of organization has gained such strength that it has among its adherents a large number of comparatively intelligent or at least intellectual people. Its chief advocates often exhibit a conscious intellectual superiority which is evidence of nothing more than their own lack of humility.

"Organization and planning mean control, either by the State, or, in the minds of people who dislike State control, by 'captains of industry.' Political parties differ chiefly in the kind of control they desire to impose."

Whilst, apart from the important reservation of mistaking cause for effect, the author has a very fair appreciation of the falsities in our present financial and economic situation, he evidences such a despair that anything might be remedied by means of political action that politics are virtually ignored by him.

"It is in fact difficult to see how much real improvement can come about until people cease to expect anything whatever of the Government, and consider instead how they can make themselves, and then their neighbourhood, most independent of it....."

"We can only hope that the British genius for adaption may be allowed to effect all necessary changes as it were imperceptibly, and without hurry."

There are however several passages in the book which demonstrate a realisation of some of the factors which realists in politics must take account of if they are not to pursue planned action in place of organic politics.

J. M.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Home and abroad, post free: One year 30/-; Six months 15/-;
Three months 7s. 6d..

Editorial Office:

4, ACREFIELD ROAD,
WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL.
Telephone: Gateacre 1561.

Business Office:

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

Vol. 4. No. 23.

Saturday, August 17, 1940.

THE RIOM TRIALS

In an issue (August 10) which contains, so far as we can discover, no word of news about the Riom trials, *The Times* presumes that 'no further report' of the tribunal will be published for a long time to come. 'Heterogeneous' is the word chosen to describe the accused and the charges against them. The former are 'scapegoats', and their names and the sentences passed upon them will be known 'probably many weeks' hence.

So far as any evidence to the contrary may be forthcoming in this country, *The Times*, which after all, has a good deal of 'say' in what reaches the knowledge of Englishmen, may prove to be right (or prove itself to be right); but one wonders whether *The Times* is always safe to presume on much more than the notorious shortness of memory of the public. A method of 'checking-up' of *The Times* which provided illumination concerning that newspaper's treatment of the Alberta Experiment was the simple expedient of pasting up cuttings from its pages from day to day. Concerning the Riom Trials, some interesting cuttings concerning the movements of M. Mandel (and some contradictory news of the movements of certain other persons) are already available, from which it appears that the anxiety shown by *The Times* concerning events which at all events it deems to be 'many weeks distant' is not entirely explained by the conventionally-phrased charges disposed of, in advance, by its leader-writer. On one point *The Times* may be commended:—

There should be no disposition in England to prejudge the issue of these trials. Especially if the tribunal can be induced, or is allowed, to publish the facts that it establishes, they may in the long run do good.

Mr. Robert Nichols intervenes in

the debate. Why must we have the comment before the facts—particularly since the facts are admittedly not public property? And isn't it curious how convinced 'reputable' news agencies in this country are that to obtain (much more to sell) a report of the proceedings would amount almost to high treason? We shall have to try the Ministry of Information.

Through a Process of Law

Described as the "full text" of a notorious and often quoted article which appeared in the *United States Bankers' Magazine* of 1892, the following is reproduced by the *New Era*, with the suggestion that it should be filed for reference:

"We must proceed with caution, and guard well, every move made, for the lower orders of people are already showing signs of restless commotion.

"Prudence will, therefore, dictate a policy of apparently yielding to the popular will until all of our plans are so far consummated that we can declare our designs without fear of any organised resistance.

"The Farmers' Alliance, and the Knights of Labor, organizations in the United States should be carefully watched by our trusted men, and we must take immediate steps to control these organizations in our interests or disrupt them.

"The coming Omaha convention, to be held July 4th, our men must attend and direct its movements, or else there will be set on foot such antagonism to our designs as may require force to overcome.

"This, at the present time, would be premature. We are not yet ready

for such a crisis. Capital must protect itself in every possible manner through combination and legislation.

"The courts must be called to our aid. Debts must be collected, bonds and mortgages foreclosed as rapidly as possible.

"Where, through a process of law,* the common people have lost their homes, they will be more tractable and easily governed through the influence of the strong arm of government applied by central power of imperial wealth under the control of leading financiers.

"The truth is well known among our principal men now engaged in forming an imperialism of capital to govern the world. While they are doing this, the people must be kept in a condition of political antagonism.

"The question of tariff reform must be urged through the organization known as the Democratic Party, and the question of protection and reciprocity must be forced to view through the Republican Party.

"By thus dividing the voters, we can get them to expend their energies in fighting over questions of no importance to us except as teachers to lead the common herd. Thus by discreet actions we can secure all that has been so generously planned and successfully accomplished."

* "Through a process of law"—English readers may recall, as a characteristic example, the determination displayed to preserve quite gratuitously offensive features (e.g. compulsion, stigmatised by Mr. Malcolm Macdonald as 'impossible') of the billeting scheme, which Lady Reading and others advocated so strenuously. Bye the bye, could any reader who specialises in analysis of literary styles suggest the Banker-stylist's identity—or, alternatively, a twin production of the same hand?

Mr. LOFTUS'S SPEECH

To the Editor.

Dear Sir,

In connection with my letter of July 31, published in your issue of August 10, I should like, at the earliest moment to say that I have received a courteous explanation from Mr. Loftus in regard to the paragraph in his speech of July 25, to which I took exception, which makes it clear that the paragraph in question was misreported in *Hansard*.

Yours, etc.,

C. H. DOUGLAS.

BACKING BOTH SIDES

By JOHN MITCHELL

The policy to which the British Government is giving effect follows so closely that which has been and is being preached week by week by *The Economist* that two leading articles which have recently appeared in its pages, one on July 20 and the other on August 3, would deserve serious attention even if one did not know who controls the policy of that journal. One of these articles was entitled "England's Example" and the other "Dynamic Democracy".

The first article begins by repeating the words of Pitt: "England will save herself by her exertions and Europe by her example". It is with the "example" by which we are to "save" Europe that *The Economist* is concerned in these articles, and it takes as its text: "we must answer the Nazi dynamic with one of our own. We must impose on others our own conviction that our system is not only physically stronger than Hitler's, but morally preferable and emotionally more attractive".

The discerning will be suspicious of the phrasing of those sentences, for whilst they carry superficially a suggestion that we are fighting "Hitler" because we are fundamentally opposed to all for which he stands, we do not have to read much more before discovering that in the view of *The Economist* we are fighting this war to establish English "Hitlerism" in the place of German "Hitlerism", exoterically stated by *The Economist* as the "English Dynamic" in place of the "Nazi Dynamic". We read:

"We have avoided the doctrinal excesses with which new ideas have forced themselves on our Continental neighbours. But we have never avoided the new ideas themselves. On the contrary, the English tradition has been to welcome them with eager curiosity and to graft them on to the continuing growth of the nation. We fought the French Revolution and its heirs for a quarter of a century—and emerged not only as the most liberal nation in Europe but as the avowed champion of Liberalism. The secret formula of England is to be at once conservative and progressive, to press forward with new ideas just as fast as the mass of the people can be carried along, but no faster."

"..... The English tradition is not to bow the head to the East, whether it be to Mecca, to Munich or to Moscow, but to see what can be taken from each new fanaticism to enrich our own heritage."

In the opinion of *The Economist* we can absorb the "careful, far-sighted planning and cohesive organisation" of the "Nazi-Fascist heresy" and the "joy with which the individual citizen gives his service to the community". It would seem that *The Economist* is determined that although we resist the German armed forces we should not resist the Nazi-Fascist ideas. Let us adopt them under the guise the eclecticism and by calling things by different names! How? When we come to the article "Dynamic Democracy" we find that "All that is necessary is to see what is under our noses, to take some temporary expedient that is forced upon us by war and, with such adjustments as are necessary, build it into the permanent structure of our growing democracy [sic]"

"There are here the makings of a new Social Contract

between the citizen and the State. By the gradual addition of one temporary expedient to another, we are, in actual practice (though we may not realise it) drawing up a modern Bill of Rights"

The Economist would have the Bill of Rights of our "growing democracy" include: "freedom of speech, writing and religion, the right to a fair trial, the subordination of all government to the rule of law." The ease with which *The Economist* can talk about democracy (which can be truly described as government in accordance with the will of the people) as being in conformity with the subordination of all government to the rule of law is typical of the chicanery which permeates almost every line of both articles. Admittedly "rule of law" is not defined, but everything goes to show that the term is not intended to refer to the only natural law to which government can be subordinated—the will of the people.

It is further proposed that the Bill of Rights should have its counterpart in a Bill of Duties.

"..... In a modern community there are a thousand ways in which the citizen can give his personal service to the State, and the minimum of Rights will be more cherished if it is paid for by a minimum of Duties. For too long have we thought and talked of the State, an impersonal dispenser of free doles; we must now think of the community, the common-wealth, to which we give, from which we receive, of which we are all members. This is the democratic answer to one of the great problems of the age, the proper relations between the citizen and the State. We are fighting Hitler because we detest the solution that he has imposed. Here is a means by which, while the war is still in progress, we can establish our own solution and proclaim the faith by which we live and die."

There is no fundamental distinction between the "solution" urged by *The Economist* and that being imposed by Hitler. Both of them are for the subordination of the individual to the institution, and the institution to international law; this international law being administered by the same group of people who financed the Bolshevik revolution and the Nazi revolution and who are behind *The Economist*. "Feudal levies of private monopolies," *The Economist* calls them:—

"Within the last generation, the British national economy has been converted from one based on competitive free enterprise into one whose strategic centres are controlled. But the occupying forces are not those of the State, still less do they fly the flag of the public interest; they are the feudal levies of private monopolies. The effect of combining a policy of Protection with a deliberate encouragement to monopoly has been to put the country in thrall to the ring, the combine and the cartel. Even before the outbreak of the war there was hardly an important price in the whole country that was not rigged by those who charged it. The irony of the matter is that this system was frequently referred to as control by the producers; but the emergency of war has shown that to produce is the one thing our costive neo-

feudalism finds the utmost difficulty in doing."

The Economist however appears to have reached the conclusion that the "State" should now relieve the "occupying forces", the "feudal levies of private monopolies", because, in a further leading article entitled "Government by Exhortation", it is said:

"We have got beyond the stage where the Government can regard industry as something external to itself, from which it purchases what it wants and takes no responsibility for the rest. We have reached the stage where the Government must assume responsibility for the total organisation of industry. Manufacturers and merchants would be, in effect, the Government's agents, guaranteed a restricted profit, insured against loss by Government aid and mutual arrangements, and prevented by the rigid rationing of materials from diverting their resources to needless work. Workers would be the Government's

servants, and they would be prevented from withholding their labour or wasting it in unnecessary employment. Every life and every piece of property are now at the Government's disposal; the counterpart is that the Government should find a useful task for every machine and every pair of hands."

It is pointed out later in the same article that "A few weeks ago" *The Economist* put forward the maxim "If Hitler can do it, we can." To this *The Economist* thinks might be added the further precept "If it is necessary to win the war, it can be done."

These outbursts from *The Economist* came shortly after it began to appear that Hitler's plans to invade Britain were not working out as it was anticipated they would do. The British people are making it necessary to win the war. Perhaps they will soon recognise the necessity of dealing with the Real Enemy who is backing both sides.

EYE ON PARLIAMENT

The following passages are taken from the House of Commons Official Report (Editor, P. Cornelius), known as 'Hansard'. The date and occasion of the words are given above each section, and the speakers' names by the side. The number of columns occupied by the printed report of each section cited is also given. Lack of space imposes a severe limitation on the selection of matter for reproduction.

July 30. Oral answers to questions. (42 columns)

Mr. G. Strauss asked the Prime Minister whether the Swinton Committee is attached to any special Government Department?

The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill): I have already told the House in answer to a Question last week by the hon. Member that it is not in the public interest to give information about this committee or other committees connected with Secret Service, counteracting Fifth Column activities and the like. I take full responsibility for the control, character and composition of the committee, which contains among others a prominent trade union leader.

Mr Strauss: Can the Prime Minister say how long the trade union leader has been a member of this Committee; whether this Committee is in any way responsible for the police searches which are going to many parts of the country in homes of Labour and trades union officials, and does he approve of the prohibition—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must confine his Supplementary Questions to the subject of the Question on the Paper and the answer. I cannot allow all these Questions to be asked.

Mr. Strauss: May I ask this Question, which, I submit, arises directly out

of the answer given by the Prime Minister, who went into some detail? May I ask him whether he approves of the prohibition which has gone out that no newspaper may mention this Committee without special permission?

The Prime Minister: Yes, Sir, and I am rather surprised that the hon. Gentleman persists in asking this Question. The Government have stated on their own responsibility that they do not think that it is in the public interest that this should be discussed.

Mr. Strauss: Is the Prime Minister aware that there is very considerable public uneasiness about this matter?

Written answers (24½ columns)

SUBSIDIES (COST OF LIVING).

Sir G. Mitcheson asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the estimated cost to the Treasury per annum of the present subsidies designed to prevent increases in the cost of living?

Sir K. Wood: At the present time subsidies on articles of food entering into the Cost-of-Living Index are at the rate of approximately £53,000,000 a year. This figure does not include anything in respect of losses which may be incurred by the Ministry of Food as a result of the increases in price of home agricultural products recently announced.

August 1.

Emergency Powers (Defence) (No. 2) Bill.

(11 columns)

Lords Amendment considered

CLAUSE 1.—(Power to provide for trial of offences by special courts in certain areas.)

"so, however, that provision shall be made for such proceedings being reviewed by not less than three persons who hold or have held high judicial office, in all cases in which sentence of death is passed, and in such other circumstances as may be provided by the Regulations.

Lords Amendment: In page 2, line 22, at the end, to insert:

Mr. Shinwell (Seaham): I think we may, without reserve, extend our congratulations to the right hon. Gentleman on the wisdom which he has displayed in formulating this Amendment. At the same time we may congratulate ourselves on our part in having brought about this desirable state of affairs. It is largely due to the activities of hon. Members that we have reached the favourable conclusion represented by this Amendment, and I am bound to say that, listening to the right hon. Gentleman's speech this afternoon, one hardly recognised him as the Minister who spoke in our discussion a few days ago. This afternoon he spoke with a breadth of vision and humanity which was certainly foreign to his con-

tributions to our previous Debate. However, it is not for us to complain and we would rather see the right hon. Gentleman in his present guise than in the robes which he wore when we were debating this matter last week.

Adjournment—War-Time Social Survey. (42 Columns)

Commander Sir Archibald Southby (Epson): I cannot think that now is a proper time, whatever the scientific value of these investigations may be, to institute them when the ordinary housewife and householder, if living at home, are much more exercised in their minds on many more matters.

Whether this a good scientific investigation or not is surely a matter of opinion, but collectors of statistics, some medical men and every sort of crank, never cease trying to harry and use as specimens members of the community, in the interests of what the investigators are pleased to call science. I suggest that, so far as one can, the time has come to leave in peace the ordinary law-abiding citizen of this country. Leave these people reasonable freedom, and do not treat them as a sort of scientific cannon fodder to be used as a ground on which scientific investigators, whether unleashed by the Ministry or any other organisation, may work their wicked will.

..... It does not seem to be any part of the Ministry's duty, which this House set the Ministry up to do, to go snooping and spying round the homes of the ordinary citizens, who are already sufficiently harassed and perturbed. These people are exceedingly courageous, and are not in need of being told by the B.B.C. to be courageous and to stand up to the situation. Whatever may be wrong with the Ministry of Information, this country has not got the jitters, and is perfectly happy. There is a sort of feeling among investigators that you have to stir up the people of this country. Leave the people of this country alone. They are not apathetic. They are worried, as everybody must be worried by reason of the war, at this time, but they are not jittery or worried in a way which makes it necessary for people to be going round to find out exactly what they are thinking. These investigations seem to me to be stupid and unnecessary.

There is something much more important than that. The Ministry of Information is a Ministry to provide information. It is no part of its duty that it should become a propaganda organisation. Propaganda must of neces-

sity be tainted and tinged by the personal views of the investigators who go round under the ægis of the right hon. Gentleman. I am afraid that these people must, of necessity, in asking their questions, put over some form of propaganda. One cannot imagine that the Noble Lady the Member for the Sutton Division of Plymouth (Viscountess Astor), if she had been told to go round and find out the reaction of the ordinary individual of this country to beer, would be able to ask her question on the subject of beer being bad for people without conveying her own views.

..... That propaganda must obviously tinge the questions of these investigators with their views is borne out by a most interesting criticism or critique which appeared in the "Daily Telegraph" last February, written by the present Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Information. He was reviewing a book called "War begins at home," by Mass Observation, compiled apparently by two gentlemen, Mr. Harrison and Mr. Madge. Their organisation would appear to be doing what the Ministry of Information has sent out these investigators to do. What the connection may be between the two organisations I do not know. It may be close or it may not;

..... The most illuminating thing in this excellent critique is—and of course, the Ministry of Information and others should be most grateful for this information—

"Interesting examples are provided of the unthinking optimism of the masses"—

It is thereby obvious that the Minister would smile upon the activities of this mass-informed organisation. I am glad that the masses are optimistic. It sometimes requires some effort to be optimistic. I said just now that I believed that the masses were optimistic, exceedingly courageous and quite unworried. He went on to say:

"of their indulgence in rumour, and of the bewilderment which assails them, owing to the absence of news."

The Ministry of Information has been set up to provide the unthinking and bewildered masses with news. Perhaps the masses would not be so overwhelmed if they had some news from the Ministry for a change.

..... I would like to give the House two examples of what is going on in regard to the activities of the Ministry of Information. Recently at Bournemouth, acting under the ægis of the Ministry, members of the Information Bureau were

instructed quietly to spread it around, as I am informed; that those who could evacuate Bournemouth should do so. Nobody said a word to the town clerk about this; he was not consulted. He rang up the Ministry of Information and got on to somebody in a subordinate capacity who confirmed that the instruction had been given. The Regional Commissioner was then communicated with and apparently knew nothing about it all. When he was asked, he said that such instructions were entirely contrary to the present policy of the Government and that he considered that the spreading of such information was wrong. I am informed that the town clerk got in touch with a high official of the Ministry of Information who admitted that a mistake had been made in sending out these instructions. When it was pointed out that the least that could be done was to try to undo the harm that had been caused the Ministry flatly refused to take any steps in the matter. If that sort of instruction is going out, if the Regional Commissioner is not being told, if the town clerk who, after all, has some responsibility for the town in which he lives, is not allowed to know what is going on; if something is done contrary to the suggestion. "Stay where you are until invasion begins and only leave when the military authorities tell you to"—which seems to be the policy at the moment—and if the Ministry say, "Get out if you can," one can imagine the alarm and excitement which will be occasioned, even in a place so quiet as Bournemouth.

..... It is as wrong for a person who holds views of which I approve to go into a constituency of an hon. Member opposite and propagate those views from door to door, just as it is for somebody else holding views with which I disagree to go into my constituency and pass those views round.

Mr. Hubert Beaumont (Batley and Morley): Is it the hon. Member's view, therefore, that propaganda is not part of the work of the Ministry of Information?

Sir A. Southby: I think the work of the Ministry of Information is to give information and not to create public opinion by going round the houses. With regard to this organisation called Mass Observation, a book of which was reviewed by the hon. Gentleman the Parliamentary Secretary, I have just seen its latest bulletin. This organisation works in much the same way, presumably, as these investigators. As I have said, I do not know how much they are in liason. They

may not be in liason at all, or they may be in what is known as "close cahoots." Anyway, this is going on and going on *pari pasu* with the work of the right hon. Gentleman's organisation. Here is an investigator who is reporting something which is happening in Worktown:

"War talk is down almost to nil again."

Viscountess Astor (Plymouth, Sutton Division: Thank heavens!

Sir A. Southby: The scientific investigator says that they are getting in the crops and not talking about the war. That is what we want them to do, to stop talking of the war and to get on with business of making munitions and getting the crops in, and when they do that, let us not call it apathy. There was once somebody who said that he wanted to stir the natives of India out of their "pathetic contentment." That is their apathy. I say: Leave the people of this country alone—

Mr. Kenneth Lindsay (Kilmarnock): And not let them think?

Sir A. Southby: No, let them think in their own way. Do not try to be a sort of super-nursemaid. Let people have views of their own. Let them have a little individual expression of opinion and do not go snooping around and making them think in your particular way. This Mass Observation document refers to the Press. It seems to me that we are standing in a position of some difficulty. Here is a reference by the Mass Observation bulletin to the "Sunday Pictorial." It quotes that paper as saying that there was a week towards the end of July which would find a place of honour in the history of the fight for freedom. It proceeds as follows:

"The editor then goes on to list 'the case for jubilation,' i.e. (1) end of the silent column, (2) review of alien internments and consequent defeat for Sir John Anderson, (3) defeat of Sir John Anderson over court-martial and indeed from the point of view of defeating or retreating Government policies, the past few days have been terrific."

They complain that this newspaper should have expressed this view. What has happened in the last week has not been something wrong. It has been an expression in this House of the opinions of the Members of this House. This House has performed its proper duty; it has expressed the views of its constituents. If the Government have had to alter or amend certain of their proposals, it is because the House has expressed the view of the people outside. The hon. Member for Seaham (*Mr. Shinwell*) remarked to-day that if this House had not debated the Emergency

Powers Bill, but had let it be pushed through in five minutes, on the plea that we must have speed, the Amendment which the House passed, in the interests of the country, would not have been put into the Statute. That is true. If investigators are going round and telling people this as their view of what is being done in this House—"the case for jubilation," "end of the Silent Column," etc.—these people are doing a disservice to the State. They say:

"The retreat on overseas evacuation, the retreat on press censorship, the retreat on taking away A.R.P. wardens' uniforms, the retreat of the Burma road, all these and others reflect a bewildering lack of determination or co-ordination in the Government. For the first time since Churchill became Prime Minister, we have had a picture of Ministerial confusion and obvious lack of foresight, exactly comparable to the Chamberlian winter period of chaotic legislation, which we described and listed in 'War Begins at Home' (Chapter 13).

It cannot be right for investigators to try to find out public opinion by putting such a false construction on what has been done in this House by the elected representatives of the people.

Mr. Lindsay rose—

Sir A. Southby: Let me finish this point.

Mr. Lindsay: I just wanted to put this question.

Sir A. Southby: Since the hon. Member left his Ministerial job, in which, of course, he was silent on every subject except his own, he has not been prepared to let any other hon. Member express a view.

Mr. A. P. Herbert (Oxford University): Is the "Mass Observation" body, for which I share the hon. and gallant Member's detestation, now a part, or is the leader of that body now a part, of the organisation of the Ministry of Information? If so, I am entirely with the hon. and gallant Member. It is important that we should know whether that is the case.

Sir A. Southby: One of the channels whereby public opinion and criticism may be expressed is this House of Commons—up to the present, at any rate. Let us see to it that that channel is kept inviolate and intact. The other channel whereby reasonable criticism may be levelled at Ministers or government or at policy is the Press of this country. I venture to suggest that this House has many shortcomings and many failures. The Press certainly has many shortcomings and many failures. We are the best people to remedy our shortcomings, and it has always seemed

to me that the best people to remedy the shortcomings of the Press are the Press themselves. But the two things go together—a free House of Commons and a free Press. If you lose a free Press, you lose a free House of Commons, and if you lose a free House of Commons you lose a free Press. At a time when we are trying to maintain freedom and liberty and are making every conceivable sacrifice to that end, I suggest to my fellow Members in the House of Commons that we should do everything we can not only to maintain our own freedom and the freedom of the Press, but the freedom, as far as we can, of the individual.

..... I hope and trust that the right hon. Gentleman, for whom I personally have the greatest regard, will do something to meet a question which, however badly I have expressed it, does arouse a very real public resentment and apprehension.

..... This is a demand which comes from people of all sorts and in all walks of life in this country, and I believe it is one to which he would do very well to pay attention. There is no question of attacking him personally, and, as some people are saying, of the Press attacking the Ministry of Information. I do not believe that that is true. I believe that they have a great apprehension that their liberties were being jeopardised. I do not believe that he has meant to put them in jeopardy, but there are people in the Ministry of Information who would be only too glad to smother the Press and to smother criticism in this House, and if this Debate has achieved no other useful purpose, it will at least have drawn attention to the feeling in the country in regard to the operation of these people which is causing a great deal of resentment throughout the land.

Viscountess Astor; I have watched what has happened in this House in regard to the Home Secretary. There could have been nothing more unfair than the universal outcry against the Home Secretary. It should not have been done.

Mr. Herbert: On a point of order. Is the Noble Lady entitled to refer to attacks on the Home Secretary?

...*Mr. Speaker*: The Noble Lady is quite in order on the Motion for the Adjournment.

Mr. Herbert: May I ask the Noble Lady why, if the nation is so united, as she so truly says, it is necessary to have this canvass?

*European Background***(VI) THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH**

By NORMAN F. WEBB

Even before the Emperor Constantine founded Constantinople and the Eastern Roman Empire in A.D. 330, the Roman State was beginning to break up, and lose unity and purpose. From this time forward all vitality and concentration were in the East. Italy and Rome were largely neglected and became a prey to all those forces that make their appearance on the removal of a highly centralized despotism. The setting up of a second line of Emperors in Rome did nothing towards arresting this movement or checking the barbaric invaders from North and North-Eastern Europe, who began to overrun and occupy almost the whole of Italy.

The last Roman Emperor died in A.D. 572 and Italy, though still nominally under the rule of Constantinople, drifted further and further away under a process almost of absorption by successive Germanic occupations. It was really impossible to rule or defend Italy from Constantinople and the effort was early abandoned, and the Eastern Empire, fortunate in her natural impregnity, left Rome to her fate. The truth was that the Classical Age was dead, and with it Imperial Rome. The Eastern Empire was something intrinsically different, Christian instead of Pagan. Christianity, that is, the theory that the spirit is supreme, was in control; what is known as the Middle Ages had been inaugurated, and was to last for over eleven centuries.

Christianity emerged from Palestine a rebel from that which produced it, Judaism—the Judaic Experiment as we have called it. It refused allegiance to the Roman God-Emperor; and ultimately Rome found herself forced to abandon him and embrace the Christian God, and we find the Bishop of Rome in his place, and with very little official backing from Constantinople, facing the barbarian foes of the Roman State. The outstanding fact of the first half of this period under consideration, that is to the middle of 10th Century, is the subjugation of these Germanic tribes to Christianity, accompanied by the disintegration of the material Roman system. The process was prolonged and possibly painful, as the break-up of any great organisation must of necessity be—for at least four centuries there was nothing approaching peace or stability in Western Europe—but as to whether it altogether deserves the specific appellation of the Dark Ages, which modern historians have given it, is a matter of opinion and a question of values. It is a fact that some of the most beautiful pictorial and architectural art in the world stands to its credit.

In the East, for exactly the whole eleven hundred years of the Middle Ages stood Constantinople and the Christian-Byzantine Empire. Successfully defending herself from invasion, and keeping alive and developing in her own unique manner all the Arts and Graces of civilization. In the West, however, had it not been for the sheer power of inspiration derived from Palestine, there seems little doubt that the entire civilization would have broken down under the weight of barbarism, and the city of Rome itself become no more than a name.

The truth was that the Roman Empire when she came

to die had not a great deal to bequeath; her genius was a personal and material one, and to a large extent died with her. Roman prestige and Roman arms alone had kept the Goths at bay; but little had been done to solve the problem of barbarian hordes on the frontier. Now, themselves pressed by Asiatic invaders in their rear, they descended on Italy in successive waves against which there was no military defence. But in a very peculiar sense, and just because human systems in the shape of the Roman State, had failed, the age seems to have been held together by the Christ-idea and the invaders, while militarily successful, succumbed one after another to the superior faith.

The spiritual energy represented by this result was terrific, and there is no doubt it was a great victory for Christianity. The outward sign of what had taken place was the crowning of the Frankish King Charlemagne by the Pope in A.D. 800, over what was to be known as the Holy Roman Empire, which persisted in substance for nearly two hundred years, and as a shadow to the present day.

The second period, from the 9th Century onwards, was one of comparative calm, and the true pattern of what we may call Medievalism began to emerge. Its predominant characteristic was the community-spirit—the natural outcome of Feudalism. Its organisation therefore tended to be local, and to some extent functional, in the Guilds of craftsmen.

It has been usual to assert that material standards seriously declined in the Middle Ages, but really this is a matter of opinion and view-point, since such standards are not absolute, but relative. With the breakdown of the wonderful Roman system of communication, there is no doubt that much of what may be termed the luxuries of life disappeared, but with a picture of Rome in her decadence before us this might not appear such an irreparable loss. It is inevitable that standards would be less sophisticated and refined, but they were ample and generous, and leisure, that coveted boon, under a Church that decreed something like ninety holidays in the year, was enjoyed to an extent that is difficult for us even to imagine in these mechanised times.

Coming between the highly centralized rule of Rome and the more or less ordered monarchical systems of modern Europe, this age gives the impression of being wholly unorganised, in our modern sense of the term. Possibly this is more in appearance than in fact—decentralized might be a better term. It lacked political focus, such as Constantinople supplied in the East; medieval Italy, herself, regarded from one angle, seems just a chaos of warring city communes and principalities. None-the-less there was a very definite unity prevailing—far more actual than anything that the last four centuries can show,—and that unity centred in, and spread out from the city of Rome and her bishop, and notwithstanding that politically she was perhaps the most impotent and distracted community of the lot.

(To be continued)

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday's issue.

BELFAST D.S.C. Group. Monthly Group Meeting on First Tuesday in each month, in the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at 8 p.m. Open to the public. Correspondence to the Hon. Sec., 17, Cregagh Rd. Belfast.

BIRMINGHAM and District Social Crediters will find friends over tea and light refreshments at Prince's Cafe, Temple Street, on Friday evenings, from 6 p.m., in the King's Room.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Association: Weekly meetings every Tuesday evening at 7-30 p.m. at the Friends Meeting House, King Street, Blackburn. All enquiries to 168, Shear Brow, Blackburn.

BRADFORD United Democrats. Enquiries to R. J. Northin, 11, Centre Street, Bradford.

CARDIFF Social Credit Association: Enquiries to Hon. Sec. at 73, Romilly Crescent, Cardiff.

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER is obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Weekly meetings of social crediters and enquirers will continue, but at varying addresses. Get in touch with the Hon. Secretary, at "Greengates", Hillside Drive, Woolton, Liverpool.

LONDON LIAISON GROUP. Next meeting, Friday, August 23rd, 7 p.m. at 4, Mecklenburgh Street, W.C. 1.

NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association are compiling a register of Social Crediters on the Tyneside. Register now and keep informed of local activities. What are YOU doing? Let

us know, we shall be glad of suggestions. Write W. Dunsmore, Hon. Secretary, 27, Lawton Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: Enquiries to 115, Essex Road, Milton; 16, St. Ursula Grove, Southsea; or 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor.

SOUTHAMPTON Group: Secretary C. Daish, 19, Merridale Road, Bitterne, Southampton.

WOLVERHAMPTON: Will all social crediters, old and new, keep in contact by writing E. EVANS, 7, Oxbarn Avenue, Bradmore, Wolverhampton.

MISCELLANEOUS

TO LET—Proportion of rent to Expansion Fund. Two very sunny and comfortable furnished cottages in North Devon, glorious views. (1)—has electric light, bath and h. & c., indoor san., oil cooker, large living room, kitchen-dining room, 3 bedrooms (sleep 3-4). Garage available. (2)—has 2 sitting, 3 bed., (sleep 5), kitchen, oil cooker, lamps and radiator; garage. Also a large one-room hut, completely furnished for two. Elsan sanitation. Water, oil cooker. On the North Devon Coast.

WANTED. Has anyone a spare copy of "Economic Democracy" and of "Warning Democracy"? Please reply to Advertiser, c/o The Social Crediter, quoting condition and price for either or both books.

The Social Crediter

If you are not a subscriber to **THE SOCIAL CREDITER**, send this order without delay.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd.,
12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

Please send **THE SOCIAL CREDITER** to me

Name

Address

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-

„ Six „ „ 15/-

„ Three „ „ 7/6

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer,
Social Credit Expansion Fund,
c/o The Social Credit Secretariat,
12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

I enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H. Douglas.

Name

Address

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND.)

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., at 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.

Books to Read

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy
(edition exhausted)
- Social Credit 3/6
- Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
- The Monopoly of Credit 3/6
- Warning Democracy
(edition exhausted)
- The Tragedy of Human Effort ... 6d.
- The Use of Money 6d.
- Approach to Reality 3d.
- Money and the Price System ... 3d.
- Nature of Democracy 2d.
- Social Credit Principles 1d.
- Tyranny 3d.

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster 4d.
- The Nature of Social Credit ... 4d.
- Debt and Taxation 2d.

ALSO

- The Douglas Manual 5/-
- The Economic Crisis:
Southampton Chamber of
Commerce Report 6d.
- The Bankers of London
by Percy Arnold 4/6
- Economics for Everybody
by Elles Dee 3d.

All from

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

Name.....

Address.....

**TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE,
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.**

I wish to support Social Credit Policy as defined in the terms of association of and pursued by The Social Credit Secretariat under the Advisory Chairmanship of Major C. H. Douglas.

I will, until further notice, contribute

£ : : , { per month,
per quarter,
per year,

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

I herewith enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the above mentioned funds.

Signature.....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.)