

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 4. No. 25.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 31, 1940

6d. Weekly.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REFEREE?

By JOHN MITCHELL

In an article in *The Saturday Evening Post* of August 3, James D. Mooney, President of General Motors' Overseas Corporation says:—

"During the past twenty-two years I have had a ring-side seat at all the principal wars and revolutions: World War I, the Russian Revolution and experiment in Communism, several Mexican revolutions, the great civil war in Brazil in 1930, the Italian conquest of Ethiopia, in the Spanish civil war, the Sino-Japanese war, and on and on to World War II. During all these long years, every war or revolution I have observed was impelled by selfish political or economic interests, hopes and ambitions. Meantime ideological slogans were invented to fool and excite the people. The good old terms 'justice' 'freedom' and 'liberty' were regilded on the banners, and the propaganda mills were turned on to generate the emotional background among the people to drag them along into the war or revolution.

"You can make your own general check on the truth of this statement by getting out your map of the world and marking on it the countries that have been embroiled in wars and revolutions since 1914. Then go over the map again and check any of these countries that have made any advance in the art of governing a free people, any countries that are really operating under the principles of democracy

"Thus, preparations for war invariably tend toward the concentration of power in the hands of the central government authority—toward a dictatorship, if you want to call it that. History shows, too, that the redelegation or decentralization of this concentrated authority and its return to the original points of control after the emergency has passed is a very slow and difficult process.

"It would be a very serious mistake to imagine that our own country can escape the workings of this historical principle. Indeed almost every newspaper edition even now records one more advance in the process of compressing the threads of our national life into a solid strand leading to Washington. Some of these threads will not be disentangled and freed for a long time—a generation or two, probably.

"Our friends, the English, are taking a hell of a beating [*sic*] and it is about time for us to help them if we expect to substantiate our sympathy in any kind of sincere way. ...

"During the past twenty-three years, beginning with our declaration of war on Germany in April, 1917, we have

very often taken an aggressive position in world politics and particularly European politics. We have blown hot, and, later, we have blown cold and abandoned our position. Some of the positions we have taken, particularly in the field of international trade and finance, have had a great deal to do with causing the impoverishment of Europe, and, in turn, the present war.

"Some of our theatrical encouragement to England to make a last stand, while meantime we are powerless to render effective help—perhaps we don't intend, in any event, to help—reminds me of the bloodcurdling yells I have often heard at prize fights, when one of the fighters in the ring is taking what our sports-writer friends call an 'awful shellacking' [*sic*].

"I hear excited calls from behind me addressed to the poor lad who is almost knocked out [*sic*], but who meantime is battling courageously to stay on his feet. I look back over my shoulder, curious to see what this bloodthirsty fellow might look like who is crying so excitedly, 'Stand up and fight!' Nine times out of ten, that fellow I see over my shoulder looks like some pale-faced cake-eater who never had on a boxing glove in his life.

"The fighters in the audience, the men who know what it is all about, meantime want the fight stopped, and always approve of a referee who has the guts to stop a fight as soon as it is evident one man or the other is really beaten and before the fight gets messy.

"It is high time to stop this fight, and save England from further misery. It is high time for us Americans to save our friends from a further beating.

We can't get into the ring to stop the fight, but we can challenge the referee to stop it.

"The referee is Washington—our Government."

We are also told:—

"In other words, what we have to say to the political group in England is, 'If you won't talk peace now, but insist on continuing with the struggle, we will not enter the war in a military way to help you.' On the other hand, we have to say to the political group in Germany, 'If you won't talk peace now, and talk reasonably, we will arm to the teeth and make war ourselves, if need be, against you.'

"If in this way we take a strong, positive position in the direction of compelling peace, obviously we must be

expected to sit in on such discussions of peace. We must be prepared to moderate the terms of peace, if necessary, in any direction that will make the peace terms provide the kind of world we thought we were fighting for in 1917 and 1918."

It is understandable that this refreshingly honest and disillusioned view of the effects of war, as well as the unexceptional statement of sentiments accompanying it, should be marred by the false impression that we are losing the Battle for Britain, because no doubt Mr. Mooney has been deluded, like other Americans, by the Jew-controlled press of his country into that belief, with the false hope in the case of newspaper controllers that it would be true.

It is not surprising that, as *The Saturday Evening Post* informs us, Mr. Mooney's views, which he had previously stated at a public meeting, were "so little quoted by the press".

We have Mr. Mooney's agreement to the fact that the policy of the U. S. Government has "had a great deal to do with causing the impoverishment of Europe, and, in turn, the present war"; and we are told that in addition to being the promoters of the present war the U. S. Government is acting as "referee", and we are also told that the American people "can challenge the referee to stop" the fight.

But there is something curiously unfinished and unreal in what Mr. Mooney says. We are not told who is in fact deciding the policy of the U. S. Government. Who engineered the policy of the Washington Government so that it became both the promoter and the referee of the European war? Who paid for the full page advertisement in American newspapers on August 19, taken by the Federal Union Movement, with the caption "If Hitler gets the British fleet can he take the United States"? And which according to *The Times* said: "..... the British fleet still sails the seas under the Union Jack," and "until it is sunk, scuttled, or surrendered we are as safe as if *Blitzkriegs* had never been heard of"—the advertisers propose first to "help to prevent the conquest of England by sending the destroyers, aeroplanes, and torpedo boats which she needs desperately, and which we will not need as long as Britain survives." Secondly, the advertisers call for "union now." Union, they explain, "is the thing that Winston Churchill offered the French after the fall of Paris..... a thing which the French Cabinet was too unfamiliar with or too far gone in treachery and defeatism to accept."

According to *The Times* the advertisement argues

gratuitously that if this type of union is forged with the "present strong anti-Nazi Government..... then, no matter how the Government of the British Isles changes, it can no more surrender the naval, air, or armed forces than the Government of New York can surrender any of the armed forces of the American Union."

The comment of *The Times* on this was: "This plan has probably not even the proverbial 'Chinaman's chance' of being accepted by the American public, but it is noteworthy as another public recognition of America's dependence for safety on the British Fleet".

Churchill consulted neither Parliament nor people when he offered "Union now" to the French Government; nor has a single M.P. asked him where he got his mandate from to enable him to make such an offer. If the proposal had been properly explained to the British people there wouldn't have been, nor will there ever be, "a Chinaman's chance" that they would agree to it. There is more than a suspicion that the U. S. Government intends to "offer" to the British Government a "union" of the two countries as the terms upon which they will aid us and that the offer would be made and accepted without either the British or American people being consulted. Plans, however, particularly ambitious plans of this nature, have a way of slipping up. If Mr. Mooney and the America he represents will challenge their Government and make them toe the line to *their* policy the plans will certainly slip up. As far as the British are concerned they have not yet reached the degenerate state described by Miss Dorothy Thompson in her broadcast from Montreal on July 23: "The plutocratic England, you attack, Hitler, is to-day a Socialist State—a Socialist State created without class war, created out of love, and led by an aristocrat for whom England builds no eagles' nests or palaces out of the taxes of her people—a man who cares nothing for money, nor ever has, but only for Britain and the coming world that a free and Socialist British society will surely help to build if ever it is built".

As Mr. Churchill admitted in his "Road to Victory" speech "we have been nurtured in freedom and in individual responsibility and are the products not of totalitarian uniformity but of tolerance and variety."

"If all these qualities are turned, as they are being turned, to the arts of war we may be able to show the enemy quite a lot of things they have not thought of yet."

And might we add not only Hitler and his Nazis.

MYSTERY AGAIN

"Shortly before the first editions of the national newspapers were due to go to press [on Sunday, August 18] a news agency sent out a message saying that the R.A.F. had bombed five divisions of German troops massed on French beaches and completely disorganised an invasion bid. The message had been passed for publication by the Censorship Department of the Ministry of Information.

"If this message was true it was

one of the most sensational of the war and demanded a big 'splash' on the front page. But if it was not true, to give it such prominence would have a most unfortunate effect on the public.

"The *News Chronicle* therefore rang up the Ministry and asked for guidance. Was the story true? The Ministry did not know. It was sorry but it really couldn't help us. All it could suggest was that we should get in

touch with the Air Ministry. And—if you please—would *we* be good enough to let the Ministry of Information know what the Air Ministry said!

"But the Ministry of Information then had second thoughts and five minutes later telephoned to say the story was untrue. By that time, however, it had already got into the first editions of several newspapers."

—*News Chronicle*, August 20, 1940.

NEWS & VIEWS

My, Sadie, ain't our Barney wonderful? Won't be long before he's in that there Buckingham Palace now. Canada, Trinidad, where the oil and bitumen is, and then p'raps the gold-durned British may get some of those scrap-heaps in the Navy yard. But only p'raps. Waal, waal, waal.

Come on, lads, let's roll on to wider lands and better days. What do these lands and days matter, if Wall Street, to itself, do rest but true?

The French Government have dissolved the Grand Orient Lodge of Freemasons, and the Grand Lodge of France. As the Grand Orient Headquarters are now in Eire, we can restrain our enthusiasm.

Eamonn de Valera is half Irish, and half Portugese Jew. He has blocked financial reform in Ireland consistently, while understanding the problem completely. Since Germany is supposed to be anti-Jew, isn't it odd that de Valera appears to be pro-German?

The House of Commons is supposed to control policy. Giving away 99 Year Leases of the Empire, on undisclosed terms, isn't policy, of course.

The Bishop of Blackburn had a "feature" article in a Sunday paper of wide circulation, to explain that British Freemasonry had no politics. Yeah! Is that why we are, where we are?

If you want to understand what this war is about, just consider which countries are gaining out of it, and on the other hand, who is doing the fighting and the paying.

"FREE" PRESS

In the course of an article on the Havas news agency the *News Review* of August 22 throws some light on the methods of controlling the 'free' press:

"Another reason for doubt was the intermixing of publicity with news.

Havas organised a tremendous publicity agency.

"Favourite trick was to gather papers into the Havas web by guaranteeing to place with them a predetermined quantity of advertising over a period of 12 months if they published Havas editorials.

"French provincial organs were easily snared. Havas organised campaigns throughout the country with the greatest ease, for dozens of publishers depended upon the Agency not only for news but also for their income.

"Important advertisers could without difficulty buy 'Opinion' and cover an extremely wide field at the same time."

CHANGES IN FRENCH GOVERNMENT

Important changes are expected soon in the Petain Cabinet, according to reports reaching the Spanish frontier from Vichy yesterday.

Two reasons are given. One is a difference of opinion between Vice-President Laval and Paul Baudouin, Foreign Minister, over foreign policy. The second is German pressure on Petain to dismiss General Weygand, War Minister, and Admiral Darlan, Minister of Marine.

Both these Ministers are considered by the Germans to be too pro-British.

— *Daily Express*, August 24, 1940.

JEWRY LOOKS FORWARD

The following extract is from the editorial of "The Jewish Chronicle" of August 23, 1940:

The reasons which Mr. Churchill gave for refusing at this moment any fresh and definite statement of war aims were solid and sensible. But the Anglo-Jewish Community should not make this wise pronouncement an excuse and irrelevantly apply it to their own plans and studies for the future. It is not too early to give the most serious attention to the position of Anglo-Jewry in the post-war world that is clearly taking shape. First we must make up our minds that the old pre-war world has gone, never to return. The system of society in which some Jews could achieve spectacular success in commerce

and trade is on its last legs. It is being replaced by a society in which not money but the social conscience rules. Money, which once commanded honour and obsequious deference for its own sake, among both non-Jews and Jews, is being hurled from its pedestal. In its place is being planted a new deal for all God's creatures. Materialism, the "get on" obsession, the kind of outlook which caused parents to regard the failure of a son to ride in his own motor-car as a family disgrace, is being ruthlessly scrapped. In its stead, let us hope, will reign devotion to service, a pure devotion, not for the limelight that it attracts but for the blessing it confers

Under the hammer blows of terrible retribution society is changing from a crowd of competitive snobberies into a family in which all sides of the human character are developed, and each man seeks his own good in the good of all men. In that system there can be no room for the ugly, greedy "get-rich-quick," the vulgar "go-getters." Occupations will be chosen not only for the cash or title they bring but for the service that they can render. And in its train will come peace of mind, and hatreds will wither and perhaps die.

For Jews, it will spell emancipation from excrescences foisted onto the Jewish mind by wicked hostility. It is indeed Jewish in spirit and teaching, through and through.

"TAX-BONDS or BONDAGE and

THE ANSWER TO FEDERAL UNION"

By JOHN MITCHELL.

Price 1/- (Postage 2½).

The information in this book is most important for a correct understanding of war-time policy.

The publishers are therefore offering a discount of 33½ per cent plus postage on single orders of not less than 30 copies.

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

LEON TROTSKY

By E. S. EDWARDS

"The national question, so important in the life of Russia, had practically no significance for me. Even in my early youth, the national bias and national prejudices have only bewildered my sense of reason, in some cases stirring in me nothing but disdain and even moral nausea. My Marxist education deepened this feeling and changed my attitude to that of active internationalism."

— Leon Trotsky.

The recent murder in Mexico of Leon Trotsky by the enraged son of a Belgian Jewish diplomat, born in Persia, on account (so it is said) of hard words over a Russian-born naturalised American called Sylvia Ageloff ends the career of a successful and accomplished internationalist. Lev Davidovitch Bronstein, later known as Trotsky, was a fervent exponent of internationalism, and one of the chief instruments in the building of the second great internationalist 'federation' of to-day. He was an energetic man, unattractive in personality but clever with his pen, a magnificent orator and an efficient organiser. First he was against Bolshevism (although in favour of revolution). Then he was for it. Then, again, he opposed it. But whatever he professed by word of mouth or by stroke of pen, it was through his agency that Russia became what she is: a tool, not for the comfort of individual Russians but for the cunning subjugation of those people whose lives are still their own and not the State's.

The pattern of our political situation is suspiciously symmetrical. Behind Great Britain, in this war, is America, the first great internationalist state; behind Germany is Russia. There is one difference: whereas America at present talks more than she performs, it is probable that Russia performs more than she talks. Great Britain and her Allies alone prevent these two States annihilating Europe and its old leisurely, tolerant culture of personal freedom and initiative as a nutcracker crushes a nut. For it would surely be obliterated by a German victory.

This alignment of powers is a direct and undoubtedly intentional result of the last phase of the war in 1914-18—the direct result, on one hand of the financial supremacy of America accruing from the four years fighting, and on the other of the formation of the tyrant Federation of Soviet Socialist Republics from the war-weary ruins of the old Holy Russia, a process financed by Germany and America.

Leon Bronstein, who played so great a part in the making of the Soviet, was born of Jewish parents in a small

town in South Russia in 1879 and was educated in Odessa. At nineteen he was sent to Siberia because of his revolutionary activities, and there he had the time to make a very careful and thorough study of Marx's books; so that when, in 1902, he escaped on a passport forged in the name of Trotsky (his guard), he was sent to London to join Lenin.

London at that time was still the centre of the financial world; the transfer of power across the Atlantic, which was to be consummated by a great war, was only beginning. The group of revolutionaries, with their ambitions, their ideologies and their plans, was ready to expand them when and where opportunity and finance were provided. Its members did not even agree among themselves; in 1903 there was a split between Trotsky, with the Mensheviks, and Lenin, with the Bolsheviks.

Trotsky returned to Russia for the rising of 1905 and became President of the first Soviet in St. Petersburg: as a consequence he was once more arrested and sent to Siberia (this time to the arctic circle). He escaped to Finland, and subsequently led the life of a political refugee on the continent. He lectured in Germany, edited more than one revolutionary journal and turned out many pamphlets. The outbreak of war found him in Austria, at his headquarters, from where he eventually went to France. By this time he had broken with the Mensheviks and was again drawing closer to Lenin.

At the beginning of the war two of Lenin's associates, Zinovieff and Lunarcharsky, sounded the German authorities on the possibility of finance for a revolutionary movement in Russia.¹ One of the bankers with whom they were in contact was Max Warburg, whose brother Paul Warburg was associated with Jacob Schiff in the American banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb and Company. Meanwhile Trotsky, whether ironically or not, conducted a vigorous anti-war campaign from Paris. It was not until 1916 that he was stopped and turned out of France on the charge of being a German agent. He arrived in

the United States in the early months of 1917. *The Times* says of his stay there that he won "popularity among the Russian Jews and the International Workers of the World".

The Russian Jews of New York, many of whom were veterans from the revolution of 1905, had been discussing ways and means for starting a revolution in Russia since the beginning of 1916. The only serious problem was that of finance but "whenever this was raised the assembly was immediately assured by some of the members that this question need not cause any embarrassment as ample funds would be furnished by persons in sympathy with the movement of liberating the people of Russia. In this connection the name of Jacob Schiff was frequently mentioned."² So, while Lenin and his associates were in touch with Max Warburg in Germany, it is possible that Trotsky saw Jacob Henry Schiff in New York.

The opportunity for the revolution was the signal for Trotsky to abandon his opposition to Lenin, and the partnership was formed which was to direct the vital phases of the revolution that was one of the objects of the Four Years War. For internationalists, their training had been impeccable: but it is probable that neither would have been effective without the other. Lenin, through whom came the more constructive ideas defining the policy of communism and its general conduct, had little executive ability. And he had one other disadvantage—physically he was a coward. Trotsky on the other hand was brave and ruthless and his powers of oratory and organising were to be invaluable.

When in March 1917, after the "bloodless" revolution, a provisional republican government was set up in Russia with Kerensky at its head, some crisis seems to have been reached and resolved by the hidden directors of events. The Tsar had on March 23 received permission to retire to England with his family. At the beginning of March, Trotsky had been taken off a Russia-bound ship by the British author-

ities at Halifax, in Canada, and interned. On April 10 the Tsar's invitation was countermanded and early in April Trotsky was released and allowed to continue his journey. One authority states that this journey was financed by Kuhn, Loeb and Company.³

With regard to the first incident, the British Ambassador to Russia received a telegram direct from Lloyd George (one time lawyer for the Zionist movement) countermanding the invitation, as it would offend the English Labour Movement.⁴ The communication was not made in the usual way through the Foreign Office.

Trotsky's detention has never been explained adequately. Trotsky reached Moscow by May 7 to find Lenin and his group of Bolsheviks already there, having been conveyed across Germany in a sealed train. Trotsky threw in his lot with the Bolsheviks and worked with them to overthrow the moderate, pro-ally Kerensky government. He was their ablest executive. Their first attempt to seize power was frustrated and in mid-July Trotsky was again in prison, and Lenin (typically) in Finland. They were accused of being German agents. Lenin directed the insurgents by letter, from Finland, to the members of the central committee of the Communist Party, to which Trotsky was elected in August. As soon as he came out of prison Trotsky turned his attention to organising another revolt and the successful October revolution was planned by him. At this time both Lenin and Trotsky were receiving German Funds. The Bolsheviks, although powerful, were in the minority, and were not greatly liked. When Trotsky, newly appointed Commissar for Foreign Affairs, arrived to take over his work, he found the building deserted, the rooms empty and the desks bare. In his new capacity he was particularly virulent against Britain, inspiring anti-British articles in the Press and using his powerful oratory to stir up anti-British feeling.

Russian troops were still fighting Germany on the Eastern front, and Trotsky's first job was to arrange a peace treaty. The terms offered by the Germans at Brest-Litovsk were so bad that he refused to sign them. But he also refused to continue to fight. He believed that the Germans would find it impossible to move troops against people who refused to fight—but the net result was that a week or so later a peace treaty was signed embodying

terms still better for Germany than those he had formerly refused.

Trotsky next became Commissar for War and spent some strenuous years bringing the new Red Army into being. It was he who devised and organised the system of universal espionage by which discipline was enforced and who instituted the Political Commissars who keep an eye on the orthodoxy of soldiers' politics.

He worked in very close contact with Lenin until the latter's death in 1923. His resource and driving power were made use of to the full by the Communists, but by many of them he was resented as a late comer to the party. It is said to be this fact that led to his supersession by Stalin with whose policy he disagreed. He said later: "We were fighting party bureaucracy we were for an international policy as a basis of revolutionary Marxism as against the new national conservatism". Certainly Trotsky wrote many articles and pamphlets against Stalin, which led in 1927 to his exile to central Asia and finally in 1929 abroad. But considering the later development of Stalin's policy, which has been severely nationalistic at home (within the vast boundaries of Russia) and internationalist abroad, Trotsky's activities since his exile have been far from detrimental to it. He has gathered into the Communist fold many who might otherwise have had the good sense to be repelled by the example provided in Russia.

In exile he lived in turn in Turkey (1929-33), France (1933-35), Norway (1935-36) and Mexico. It is worth noting that at least two of these countries are known to have been prominent centres of Grand Orient Freemasonry, an institution which, at least since the French Revolution, has worked through revolutionary agents.

While he was in France the German press (early Hitler regime) accused him of plotting revolution, and to make matters more complicated the French communist journal *L'Humanité* suggested that he was an agent of the French government preparing the way for military invasion by Soviet forces.

Trotsky was condemned to death in his absence by the Soviet Government and subsequently figured in an unofficial enquiry into his guilt made by a committee of prominent Americans under the chairmanship of John Dewey. This committee disproved some of the cir-

cumstantial evidence that had been brought up at Moscow, and published its report in two heavy volumes.

¹ Document quoted by E. Sisson in *The German-Bolshevik Conspiracy*, reprinted as an appendix to *One Hundred Red Days*.

² Boris L. Brazol in *The World at the Cross roads*.

³ Louis T. McFadden in a speech in the United States Congress on June 10, 1932.

⁴ Meriel Buchanan in *The Surrender of an Empire*.

Letter to the Editor

"THE RUSSIAN QUESTION"

Dear Sir,

Your article "The Russian Question" suggests that a *rapprochement* with Russia would meet with the approval of this Group.

I am unaware of any passage, appearing on any occasion, in the pages of the Memorandum issued from this Office, which would substantiate such a belief. Indeed, scrutiny of issues as far back as February, 1939 would present a definitely opposite picture of the conclusions arrived at and consistently maintained by our observer staff, and I am at loss to recognise the issue from which the quotation published on page 10 of *The Social Crediter* for 24th August was taken.

No such passage was ever printed in any document issued from here.

Yours faithfully,

K. DE COURCY,
Imperial Policy Group.

13, Old Queen Street, Westminster;
August 27, 1940.

[The passage in error attributed to the Imperial Policy Group was from *The Economist* of July 27. We are glad to correct the misconception caused inadvertently. — EDITOR.]

POLISH GOVERNMENT (ITALY AND RUSSIA).

Mr. Malcolm MacMillan asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information as to the relations between the Polish Government, now in this country, and the Governments of Italy and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, respectively.

Mr. Butler: My Noble Friend does not feel he is in a position to give information on the relations between an independent Government and other foreign Governments.

— *Hansard*, August 15, 1940.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

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

Editorial Office:

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

Vol. 4. No. 25.

Business Office:

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

Saturday, August 31, 1940.

Quick Change Governments

Our Government, often erroneously referred to as Mr. Churchill's government, seems to be in need of repairs, and Lord Beaverbrook's *Sunday Express* has been demanding that "us" should be given the best men. Nothing short of the best will do. "Give us the best men" cries this newspaper. "Two months of war-time government, when men's lives depend on the decisions he takes, may be as exhausting to a Minister as two years of peace-time administration".

A change of personnel every two months is a bright, though not a new, idea, and perfectly safe from the point of view of "the government". 'Artists' (with a capital 'a' and sometimes with an 'e') have long astonished the public by appearing at intervals of a few seconds as a procession of individuals different in every respect but the 'artist' underneath. Allowing for an administration of 45 individuals, it would take at least two years to exhaust the possibilities of the present members of parliament and nearly 200,000 years before it became arithmetically necessary to include Major Douglas in the administration or indeed anyone else with sound views on what an administration is for. The very high improbability of the 'quick-change' system advocated leading to an administration united in anything but support of "important" interests would itself ensure that the "great spiritual awakening" of which England is said to stand in need would be less substantial than the wildest phantasy.

All the same, taken in conjunction with other signs and portents (not Mr. Naylor's, whose prognostications—labelled 'frivolity' on Lord Beaverbrook's ascent to the Cabinet—are nevertheless interesting), recognition that the Government needs adjustment is welcome. The

astrologer specially mentions Mr. Duff Cooper, Mr. Bevin and Sir John Anderson, whose horoscopes may "react" to the changeful stars glowing over Westminster. Mr. Duff Cooper and Sir John Anderson our readers know as well as Mr. Bevin's excursions into 'planning'—by which this simple-minded statesman seems to understand merely the avoidance of a certain confusion and not the dangerous drug which his mentors in and out of parliament (but mainly out) press upon him.

Party is unfashionable at the moment—and naturally: the logical conclusion of blending all parties in a war-government is to divest any one of them of special responsibility and thus economise in the energy necessary to rebuild a shattered party later on. The implication that 'the best man' is not to be found narrowing his mind and giving to Party what's meant for Mankind, while welcome on its own account, still leaves open the question 'best for what?' One of the 'great discoveries' of the last war was the gentleman who has since become Lord Stamp, an industrious person who has reduced the largest British railway to a condition of expensive discomfort (for the traveller) undreamed of by any traveller of forty years ago, when 1st class 'sleepers' were cheaper than so-called '3rd class sleepers' in 1939, and ran on steel-tired wooden wheels of marvellous silence. The square deal and the raw deal have taken the place of such gentlemanly amenities. Obviously we don't want any more discoveries of that kind.

The discovery we do want is that of men—and their number in the House of Commons is increasing—who can and do at last see through the sinister shadow-play of politics and are enough kith and kin of the people of England

to make that people's cause their own—at least until such time as a "great spiritual change" will replace advocacy by representation as the parliamentary member's function.

A little pressure to secure this will at least dispel the notion, if it exists, that this is "not the time to press our views." It is always the time.

T.J.

FLAG DAY

"On Tuesday week the war will be a year old. How is the grim anniversary to be celebrated? By a flag-day.

"It is in aid of a most worthy object—soldiers, sailors, airmen, and their families.

"Am I wrong in finding bitter irony in the fact that part of the proceeds will go to wives who are still awaiting their subsistence allowance. It seems to me scandalous that the delays in paying these allowances—and often their inadequacy—are such that women have to depend on private organised charity to give them what should be theirs by right.

"Thousands of them are in terrible straits," I am told.

"I asked the flag-day organiser yesterday what emblem was to be sold on September 3. 'Just an ordinary cheap Union Jack,' she said."

— William Hickey in "The Daily Express" August 23, 1940.

Mr. WILLKIE ON THE JEWS

"In his speech at Elwood, Indiana, on Saturday, accepting nomination as Republican candidate for the U.S. Presidency, Mr. Wendell Willkie denounced the Nazis for their 'barbarous and worse than medieval persecution of the Jews,' a race that has 'done so much to improve the world's culture.'

"Recalling that his grandparents had fled from similar persecution in Germany, Mr. Willkie pledged himself to preserve America as 'a land free from hate and bitterness and from racial and class distinction.'"

—*Jewish Chronicle*, August 23, 1940.

Three hundred thousand Jews in Northern Moldavia (Rumania) and that part of Bukovina not occupied by Russia are said to have told their Jewish leaders in Bucharest that they wish to be incorporated into Soviet Russia.

"TO BUILD THE GREATER CANADA..."

Mr. ABERHART'S statement on the reception by the Canadian Federal Government of Alberta's application, on a mandate from the people of the province, for the incorporation of a provincial bank.

Ever since our country was plunged into the terrific struggle against the menace of Nazi-ism and totalitarian aggression, the Alberta Government, on behalf of all the people of the Province, has done its utmost to co-operate with the Federal government and with the governments of the other provinces in the dominating national task of putting forth our maximum war effort. It has been our endeavour to push all political antagonism and differences into the background in the imperative cause of federal unity and national solidarity.

As the people of Alberta know we have gladly donated buildings and comforts for the troops; we have loaned the Province's engineers and surveyors to the Federal authorities to help in the construction of camps and air bases; at the expense of our own highway program, we have available to the Federal government a portion of our up-to-date machinery for air-port construction work; and we have set up agricultural boards and committees to co-operate with the Federal and other Provincial governments in surveying the situation with a view to greater and better planned production of food for the Empire's war effort. Also in making arrangements to receive children evacuated from Britain and in protective legislation for our citizens who have joined the forces. In the field of Federal war finance and in many other ways we have done our best to carry out in the spirit and to the letter our share in assisting and co-operating with Ottawa in every possible way.

In the fact of all this it is hard to understand the extent to which some of the members of the Federal Parliament have gone in heaping insult on injury in their consideration of Alberta's application to incorporate a provincial bank.

PROVOCATIVE TACTICS

The tactics used against Alberta in their application for a bank charter, I feel, must have appeared to many of our citizens entirely unwarranted and most provocative. I have refrained from commenting on the manner in which the Province's request has been treated by

the Federal Government and the Banking Committee, not because I felt satisfied but because I did not wish to provide any pretext for such conduct.

This is no time to play politics or to treat lightly serious Dominion-Provincial affairs when such great issues are threatening the very foundations of civilization and the need for Federal unity is a most vital factor of our national life.

The *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix* has this to say about the sessions of the Banking Committee:

"There is not much real opportunity for the old game of politics in the House of Commons at Ottawa these days; so it is hard to blame the boys for having a bit of the old-time fling when there is an opportunity such as the bill to create a state bank for Alberta furnishes."

I have been much encouraged by the comments of many prominent Alberta citizens who, after following the proceedings at Ottawa, volunteered their opinions that the mandate which we had received from the people at the last election was being treated more or less as a farce, and its importance for the welfare of our people was being entirely ignored.

I was astounded by and very naturally disappointed with the antagonistic opposition to Alberta's application for a bank charter which was voiced in Parliament by Finance Minister Ralston on behalf of the Federal government, when it was a well known fact, that had been drawn to our attention on many occasions, that Finance Minister Dunning, apparently with the full approval of his colleagues, had declared that the Federal Government would be prepared to recommend to Parliament the granting of a bank charter to Alberta within the four corners of the Bank Act.

I had thought that Prime Minister King and his government would have recognized the people's mandate given to the Alberta government at the last election. Surely, with this direct democratic approval, the federal government could not consistently have refused us the opportunity to demonstrate the efficiency of our proposals. Even if they

are unable to comprehend the importance and the technique of the new economy, under the scientific laws of progress at least they should have allowed Alberta to demonstrate within its own confines the change absolutely essential in the existing financial system if we hope to meet effectively the exigencies of the present crisis and to prepare for the after-war period of reconstruction.

Are we to suppose that the bitterness of the two Alberta Liberal city members, coupled with the hostility of the loquacious Mayor of Calgary and the effervescent secretary of the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce are more effective upon the administration at Ottawa than a definite application of a constitutionally-elected government having a clear mandate from the people of one of Canada's great provinces? If so, the people may well ask: "What type of democracy have we in Canada?"

I am definitely of the opinion that this play-acting was for the purpose of concealing the sinister hand of Finance which is exacting its toll from our country for supplying the credit that is so necessary to the nation's life at this crucial time, and which is so determined that nothing shall be allowed to diminish the power it wields through its exclusive private monopoly.

THE OBJECTIONS

Two main objections were offered to Alberta's application for a bank charter. The first was voiced by the Hon. J. L. Ralston on the ground that granting Alberta a charter would in effect make the federal government a rubber stamp for the Premier of Alberta. Are we to conclude from this that the then Minister of Finance admits that when a charter is granted to any group of men forming the directorate for a privately owned and controlled chartered bank, parliament becomes a rubber stamp for that directorate? That is in effect what it does, but Alberta's application was the first attempt that has been made to reverse the relationship and to make the banking institution subservient to the will of the people. Under the Alberta charter the representatives of

the people as a whole would alone be eligible for the directorate; and the affairs of the bank would of necessity be conducted, therefore, in accordance with the will of the people or the directors could be at once removed.

That is the essence of true democracy. Parliament in any true democracy must be a rubber stamp for the will of the people.

How different is the position where a private group seek direction of a bank incorporated to deal with the money affairs of the people as a whole.

In granting them this power, Parliament becomes a rubber stamp for the directorate of the bank, which represents only a very small number of people, and in whose election the people as a whole have no voice and even the shareholders have very little freedom of choice.

We maintain that until this present method of incorporating banks and of leaving them free to pursue any policy of credit expansion or contraction without reference to the will of the people, is reformed, "all talk of democracy is idle and futile."

The other objection was even more astounding and far reaching in its effect on the sovereign rights of the people of Canada. A law officer of the Crown declared that the bill to incorporate the Alberta Bank was *ultra vires* of Parliament because Parliament had no power to grant a charter to a province for the operation of a bank under the Government's direction. This *ultra vires* expression is becoming very familiar to the people of Alberta. It would almost seem that anything contrary to the interests of finance is *ultra vires* of the Canadian constitution. We seem to have no option but to conclude that while Parliament has the power to give banking privileges to a few persons in Alberta under directors acceptable to them and operating for their own profit, yet Parliament does not possess the power to give banking privileges to all the people of Alberta, under the direction of their elected government and operating for the benefit of the people as a whole.

WHO HAS AUTHORITY ?

What a strange situation we have got ourselves into! We have always been under the impression that under the B.N.A. Act and the Statute of Westminster those sovereign powers which are not reserved exclusively to the

provincial legislature are assigned to the Federal Parliament. I wonder if Canadian citizens can explain for us how any province could ever get the right to have its own bank if the Parliament of Canada has no power to grant it a charter? From whom could this authority be secured? Is this a new idea of sovereignty? Or again if perchance a Federal Parliament decided to give a province this authority, who would have the right to prevent them? These questions, you see, bear directly on the freedom of the Canadian people—a freedom which we proudly cherish and defend.

There is another aspect of this question which I must mention before we leave the matter. If it is a fact that the bill to incorporate the Alberta bank was *ultra vires* of the Ottawa house why were we not informed about this months ago when we first forwarded our application for a charter to the federal government? Are we to suppose that the law officers of the crown did not know about it at that time?

You see there is something discouraging in any attempt to help the common people that is detestable.

I do not mean by this that I am discouraged. Far from it, for it makes me more determined than ever to combat this sinister reactionary force behind the scene.

Many thinking people will, no doubt, give grave consideration to these matters, particularly in view of the open hostility which has been displayed by the financial institutions to any and every attempt made to reform the present widely discredited and disastrous money system.

There is a growing realization throughout the English speaking world, that the time is long past for far-reaching changes in our system of finance. To the British peoples who are fighting a ruthless and powerful enemy it is becoming more and more evident that the methods of finance which in time of peace results in poverty amidst plenty, restriction of production, trade stagnation, oppressive debt and taxation, and all the other evils we have experienced, cannot possibly serve adequately the tremendous and imperative requirements of war time. Moreover it is also clear that any attempt to make this debt-generating system meet the needs of a war economy will inevitably create such colossal after-war problems that the results will be disastrous.

The following quotation from the

May issue of the monthly memoranda circulated throughout the empire by the Imperial Policy Group of England, under the chairmanship of Lord Phillimore, deals with this question in forceful terms:

"There is an immense field for fresh minds to assist the more mature. The economic strategy of the war for instance, not only could, but must be carried out, both as an important offensive weapon against the enemy, and for preparing the basis for sweeping changes in our whole system. They are long overdue. Without them, the private individual (so essential to our way of life) will become crushed under an impossible burden, and be turned into a creature of the State.

THE SOLUTION

"Yet, there is a solution. It is not to be found in a wretched compromise, the principal object of which is to expand our present economy for the duration of the war and then hastily to contract it afterwards. It is only to be found in the creation of something new, based upon a simple and much-neglected principle, viz., that the only limit to our wealth which we can legitimately accept, is the Empire's power to produce, carry, and consume. With unlimited means of production at our disposal, it is only common-sense to create a freely expandable currency; the price level must and can be controlled by a more sensible means, than so taxing the individual that he cannot create a demand for goods when they are scarce, thus risking the dangers of uncontrolled inflation.

"The British Commonwealth is a union of kingdoms vastly rich, and absurdly undeveloped. The whole great enterprise has been hampered by any number of arbitrary restrictions which until now have been hurtful and may become dangerous. This war should not be allowed to ruin, but greatly enrich us. If we use the dire emergency in which we find ourselves to sweep away all that is inefficient, foolish and bad, we can create conditions within this Union of Nations, which will at once restore the individual and enrich the community. If we lacked the natural resources, if some enemy power commandeered the seas, if our man-power was strictly limited then indeed there would be cause for anxiety. But we suffer from none of these physical restrictions. All that we can desire in the way of the necessary materials already belongs to us. If we do not use

them it will be our own fault. If we allow ourselves to sink into an unnecessary poverty, we shall have no one but ourselves to blame."

I will say no more on this matter at the moment. Notwithstanding the refusal to grant the province a bank charter, the Alberta government will go ahead with the development of every and any means at its disposal to protect and support those who need same. We shall continue to co-operate wholeheartedly and to the fullest extent

within the limits of our ability in the vigorous prosecution of the war for liberty, justice and fair play against selfishness, lust and paganism wherever they are found.

Though now somewhat handicapped we shall do our utmost to cope with the grave problems facing our farmers and with the even greater national problems of the after-war reconstruction period as they are likely to affect Alberta. Thus by putting forth our best in the immense task facing our

country and the Empire at this time, and preparing to meet in our own sphere the task which lies beyond, we can help to build the greater Canada that is the inspiration of our endeavors.

I hope most earnestly that no narrow political prejudices or sectional interests will be permitted to mar the sincere efforts of the people of Alberta in attempting to do their share in the solution of the tremendous problems which face us.

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.

Oral Answers to Questions

(37 columns)

August 14.

PUBLIC OPINION (TESTS).

Mr. Mander asked the Minister of Information whether he will consider the advisability of conducting a series of tests of public opinion in selected constituencies through their Members of Parliament, as an alternative or addition to methods at present employed?

Mr. Cooper: I am always grateful for the co-operation of hon. Members, and if any hon. Member is prepared to give the necessary time to work of this kind, I shall be glad if he will communicate with me.

Mr. Mander: Do I understand from the reply that if a sufficient number of Members send in their names, the right hon. Gentleman will be willing to put into operation a scheme of this kind?

Mr. Cooper: I will gladly go into it with any hon. Member who wishes to co-operate.

Mr. Lawson: What is the need for these tests of public opinion? Why cannot the people be trusted?

Commander Bower: Is it not time we came to the conclusion that the people of this country have guts.

WAR-TIME SOCIAL SURVEY.

Captain Bellenger asked the Minister of Information whether questions on the inadequacy of, and manner of dealing with, applications for supplementary old age pensions have been, or will be included in the investigations of

the social survey conducted by his Department?

Mr. Cooper: No, Sir.

Captain Bellenger: In view of the considerable information which is apparently in the possession of Members of Parliament on this subject, and which Members think ought to be brought to the notice of His Majesty's Government, will the right hon. Gentleman put some of these questions to his inquisitors who are now going round to try and find out this information?

Mr. Cooper: This is a matter which concerns another Department of State, and I should not take any steps to interfere with its work.

Captain Bellenger: On what basis are these social surveys carried out? Who sets the questions on which the people go round to find out information?

Mr. Cooper: All that was very fully explained in the statement which was made a fortnight ago, and I cannot go into the whole facts now.

Mr. G. Griffiths: Is it not a fact that the Minister's "snoopers" would not get through one street a day if they were inquiring about old age pensions?

Mr. Mander asked the Minister of Information whether he will make arrangements for hon. Members interested to have an opportunity of meeting the investigators in the employ of the War-time Social Survey?

Mr. Cooper: As I have explained to the House, these investigators are not appointed by the Ministry of Information, but I should be glad to put the

hon. Member in touch with the senior officials of the War-time Social Survey.

Mr. Mander: Is that invitation extended to any Members of the House who may desire to meet them?

Mr. Cooper: Certainly.

August 15.

Oral Answers to Questions

(46 columns)

Mr. Craven-Ellis asked the Minister of Labour what is the approximate percentage of the 60,481 increase in the number of the unemployed for July attributable to the policy of restricting the sale of consumable goods; and why this restriction is imposed at a time when there are 827,266 able-bodied persons registered as unemployed?

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Ernest Bevin): The information asked for in the first part of the Question is not available. With regard to the second part, I would remind my hon. Friend that there are other matters than the use of labour governing this policy as has been made clear by my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade and by my hon. Friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade in reply to Questions by the hon. Member for Seaham (Mr. Shinwell) and the hon. Member for Westthoughton (Mr. Rhys Davies) on 6th June and 23rd July.

Mr. Craven-Ellis: If my right hon. Friend is unable to give any information on the first part of the Question, how are the Government able to say whether their policy of restricting the consump-

tion of consumable goods has succeeded or not?

Mr. Bevin: Questions as to the policy affecting the restriction of consumable goods should be addressed to the Department responsible, namely, the Board of Trade.

Mr. Craven-Ellis: I thought that my right hon. Friend was responsible for labour.

Mr. Kirkwood asked the Minister of Labour, in view of the increase of 114,491 in the number of the unemployed in Scotland, what steps he is taking to provide employment for these people?

Mr. Bevin: The figure 114,491 is the total number of unemployed registered in Scotland on 15th July. The increase over the previous month was 3,218. This increase, some part of which was due to seasonal causes, was confined to women and juveniles. A certain amount of unemployment is to be expected during the process of transferring workers from peace-time employment to war-time industries, but I am taking steps to find other employment as rapidly as possible for persons displaced.

Mr. Kirkwood: While thanking the Minister for that reply, may I inform him that Scotsmen have a greater terror of unemployment at the moment than they have of the Germans?

Mr. Robert Gibson: Will the right hon. Gentleman deal with the question of the transfer of the workers displaced from sugar refineries?

Finance (No. 2) Bill: as amended, considered. (79 columns).

Mr. MacLaren: ... The Chancellor knows that I believe in taxing nothing that mankind wants. Therefore, my views on taxing china are on a par with my views on taxing women's knitting frames, and on taxing men for wearing trousers when going to work. I think the Chancellor might have pushed earthenware into the third column had it not been for a suspicion that he has that china and porcelain are rather expensive commodities.

It is a delicate production, of which the Potteries, and more especially the English Potteries, are justly proud, and it is a production which I would beg of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consider from this point of view. It is perhaps one of the most widely known industries. It has a world-wide reputation, and it is not too much to say that the pottery industry in the Potteries has

now come almost on to an equal plane of development with the highest production of the Ming period. It is an industry of which this country should be particularly proud. It is therefore unique in the markets of the world and in the field of British industry itself. It is an industry which is not altogether industrialised in the sense that there is still in the industry a large element of the personal, artistic touch which brings out rare qualities among the people that I have the honour to represent in this House. The products of this industry have such a reputation abroad that even to-day in America people will pay enormous sums, and even higher tariffs, in order to place on their table or in the china-cupboard some specimen of English manufacture. I would beg of the Chancellor to view the industry from this point of view. It is one of those industries which carries the reputation of a great tradition far afield into almost every country. It has been argued with some force that this industry, in order to carry on a successful export trade, must have a very successful internal market within the country itself. That is the plea that is put before the House now.

Why should we spend enormous sums of money upon the so-called Ministry of Information in order to carry propaganda abroad when one of the finest pieces of propaganda, in terms of industry and production in this country, is our English china porcelain and earthenware. Why should we impair it in any way by putting a tax on and injuring its internal trade at the expense of external trade.

May I beg the Chancellor not to injure this excellent product by the weapon of taxation? But perhaps my pleading is all in vain! If I were capable of supporting my plea with the language of Shakespeare and the wisdom of the gods, it would not, I am afraid, dispose the Chancellor to remove this tax under present circumstances. But for the future I would ask the Chancellor, when he is looking for a source of revenue, to look directly somewhere else and look askance at this industry. It is one of the few rare things in industry that carries our English tradition marked in the highest artistic form which other countries are proud to receive and which we are specially equipped to produce. It is propaganda embodied in rare form which should be encouraged rather than burdened by taxation.

Lieut.-Colonel Moore - Brabazon (Wallasey): Budgets in war time

are a great deal easier to get through the House than in peace time. The papers tell us that everyone is very disappointed at not having been taxed more. I do not take that view myself, and it is a very curious one to see expressed in the Press, but I think it is based on this thought, that it really does not matter what occurs to your own private fortune when other people are giving their lives. I think that is the reason why no one really minds what happens to his own welfare. In spite of all the praise that I give to the Chancellor, I think there is a sort of vague general feeling that the Finance Bill does not entirely fill the bill. There seems to me a lack of grasp and imagination of the difficulties.

We are in a new world in conditions which we have never met before, and yet the imagination of the Treasury has not gone with the time. All that they are doing is to strain and stretch the old Gladstonian idea of finance, which really has not moved in thought for many years. Of course, our generation never knew the horror which was caused to the country by the imposition of the first sixpence of Income Tax.

A capital tax takes place by virtue of death duties, and it will take place, of course, owing to the present legislation, but I maintain that the man in that class of society who lives on an assured income, whether earned or from investments, is a very worthy member of our society and from the National point of view ought not to be extinguished. In the scientific world Newton, Cavendish, Clerk-Maxwell, and hundreds of other people have ornamented our country, and they have all sprung from that class of society.

We cannot keep for ever the 100 per cent. Excess Profits Tax. It is related to war needs, of course, but the Chancellor and the Government must give an indication that initiative and invention and development in this country are to be allowed to go on after the war. If anybody thinks that it will be possible to develop industry after the war on the basis of Government factories he had better think again. It is not going to happen. The Minister of Labour has very rightly got this 100 per cent. tax now, but if equality of sacrifice means anything, then the Income Tax must be brought to those making money at the present time—that is, the well-paid workers in the factories—though it would be impossible, of course, to ask them to pay the rate of Income Tax which is demanded from those

higher up the income scale.

Surely, to create wealth is to put work into something and make it something that is useful instead of useless. The raw iron and the other things from which a motor car is made are useless until the whole fabric of the factory works on them and makes them into a motor car, and from that moment certain wealth has been created. I have given an example of a man [Mr. Ford]

who made a vast fortune, without swindling anybody, by creating wealth. There is another type of millionaire, a man like Mr. Smith, an American, who made an immense fortune out of selling short on a bear market. That is a discreditable thing to do, for it adds to the poverty of everyone. Under our present system of society, both people have been allowed to make a fortune. My point is that I do not think the Government or the

Treasury have ever really discriminated enough between those two types of people. If we are to have prosperity after the war, we must encourage the industrialist and not so much the financier. It is easy to go to the industrialist, for he is at his works or in his building; it is easy to attack him. Yet the financier wriggles about making profits here and there, and the only time at which you sting him is when he is dead

European Background

(VII) The Classical Revival and the Church of Rome

By NORMAN F. WEBB

No record of European history can omit reference to the rise of Islam, for the Moslems of Arabia, in conjunction with the Jews played an important part in what is known as the Classical Revival.

The Western Empire was never Hellenized to any extent; the adoption of Greek culture outside Greece was confined to the Eastern end of the Mediterranean, with Alexandria as its centre. But following the appearance of Mahomet—he died in A.D. 632—there was a tremendous uprising of spiritual energy among the Arab peoples, which quickly affected or conquered the adjoining populations and territory as far East as India and West along the Mediterranean coast to the Atlantic; including practically the whole of Spain. Chiefly through Alexandria, the whole of Islam was profoundly influenced by Greek philosophy and science, and pre-eminently by the writings of Aristotle and Plato. The whole basis of Arabic learning, which was considerable, was Greek, and there were active schools of speculation as far apart as Syria in the East and Spain in the West. The centre from which Arabic culture spread was Alexandria, where, it must not be forgotten, the spirit of Greece had come under strong Judaic, as well as Christianizing influence in the schools of the Gnostics and Neo-Platonists. The Jews in Alexandria numbered over a million at one time.

The Arabic school of philosophy at Cordova, the capital of Saracenic Spain, is of particular historical significance, for contrary to the accepted historical belief, it was primarily through it that the Greek Classics interpenetrated Western Medieval Europe. This school, like that at Alexandria, was predominantly Jewish in personnel. Its main claim on posterity was undoubtedly the production of a number of the translations of the Greek Classics into Latin, chiefly during the 11th and 12th Centuries. These were carried out mostly by European church-men with the aid of a Jewish society of translators. There were produced, too, a considerable number of original works by both Jewish and Christian writers, which had a profound effect on the thought of Christendom. Many of these were of an astrological character—a bias of the Jewish, rather than the Classical mind—and strongly influenced by the Medieval church-men.

From at least the 11th to the 14th centuries, that is over a period of three hundred years, this process of infiltration through Spain continued, supplemented by way of Sicily, also under Saracenic rule; and after the 13th century to a much smaller degree by scholastic drift from Constan-

tinople, then tottering to its fall under frontal attacks from the infidel Turks and light-hearted stabs in the back delivered by the jolly crusaders *en route* for Palestine.

The period of the consolidation of the Islamic Empire in Asia and North Africa, from the 7th to the 10th centuries, coincides with the last three of these five centuries occupied in Medieval Europe by the subjugation of the Germanic barbarians to Christianity. While the Eastern Empire had lost much territory to the infidel, Western Christendom was slowly regaining the lost Roman dominions to a spiritual control, symbolized in the formation of the Holy Roman Empire in A.D. 800.

Up to this—indeed, up to the eleventh century—the growth of the Church and of Christianity were identical. But gradually the natural, evangelistic zeal to see “the world for Christ,” began to take the form of “the world for Holy Church”. The creation of the Holy Roman Empire itself, even if it was a conscientious attempt to solve the problems of Europe, contained all the elements of temporal compromise—the elevation of a means to an end. Right up to the 16th century the Church presented the appearance of increasing power and influence, but subsequent events proved that it was an illusion of strength.

Gradually, under these conditions, the fruits of the Churches’ compromise with Paganism began to develop, giving a clearer idea of the real cost of the victory which Christianity had won when Constantine gave it official recognition in place of persecution. The strength of Christianity, as opposed to Polytheism, as we must never forget, was its sense of Unity—one harmonious principle as opposed to many divergent ones, and it was undoubtedly this Principle that overcame the barbarians of the North, just as it had previously superseded the Roman State. When Christianity made terms with Rome, however, she had to deal with an enormous mass of Pagan thought and superstition—polytheism at its lowest—and much of this had perforce to be incorporated. With the increasing secular power of the Church in the second half of the Medieval period, these latent tendencies seemed to have developed and began to show themselves in the deification of the Holy Mother, and in an ever-growing catalogue of lesser dieties in the persons of the saints. It was a proper and confusing Pantheon, the worship of which, along with a number of Pagan observances and festivals gradually grew to be the compromise which we know to-day as the Church of Rome.

(To be continued)

