

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 4. No. 19.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 20, 1940.

6d. Weekly.

RED BOLSHEVISM OR BROWN?

By JOHN MITCHELL

Hopes that the fortunes of France had at last reached the aid of honest and not untalented hands in control of the French Government have been shattered. General Weygand's influence has waned. Commenting on this a former editor of *Petit Parisien* wrote in the *Sunday Times* on July 14:—

"The future now rests with the triumvirate of General Weygand, M. Baudouin, and M. Laval in the Petain Cabinet. Petain himself can be disregarded as a mere figurehead.

"As for the triumvirate, how soon will one of them oust the other two?"

"Less than a month ago many bets would have been on General Weygand, including his own. His suggestion for an armistice was quickly carried far beyond his own honourable intentions, and when he heard the terms favoured by M. Baudouin, discouragement did the rest. His one strong point if ambition tempts him, will be his position as Commander-in-Chief of the army which respected, but did not love, him."

The Enemy of mankind is truly ubiquitous.

The Economist of July 12 makes the following comment:—

"Thus the defeat of France has a bitter lesson for any in this country who might be tempted by mistaken patriotism or selfish interest to preach a military capitulation. The Nationalists—the Weygands, the Pétains—who loved France sincerely and wished to spare her suffering, have destroyed her liberty and sacrificed her soil in a vain attempt to conciliate the conqueror. The capitalists and politicians—the Baudouins, Prouvosts and Lavals—may have purchased a respite from "Red revolution" but only at the cost of placing their country at the revolutionary mercy of Brown Bolshevism. Their lease of political life will be as short and inglorious as that of a Von

Papen, a Hugenberg or a Juan March. Transfer these conditions to our own soil and it is clear that no section of our people, whatever their motives, can hope for anything but annihilation if they accept Hitler's 'honourable peace.'"

The people of Great Britain are in no doubt of the menace of Brown Bolshevism. But, of its ally Red Bolshevism, which with the aid of Masonry and High Finance, has in other countries so effectively laid down the red carpet for the invader, it remains merely suspicious.

The leader writer in the *Daily Mirror* on July 12 wrote:

"This week-end of the great festival of dead Republican France, we shall see two senile Royalist Generals, one renegade Socialist, a handful of international financiers and a crook adventurer of considerable wealth, engaged, under Hitler, in assassinating all liberty, and, if possible, all culture in France.

"Yet the Chairman of Veteran Motorists [Lord Elibank] can assert that France's imprisoned or persecuted Communists killed France! Feeble-minded Communist policy was powerful enough to do that!

"When a man's mind is full of fear he sees 'red' everywhere.

"In this country, if an aged General, a doddering Admiral and a few big bankers sold us, as France was sold, to Hitler, they would say that they did it to avoid revolution. They would then be plundered and shot by the Nazis.

"What of that? Better be shot by the rich than face a 'disturbance' by the people!

"This insane fear of 'revolution' is a mortal peril to all free countries.

"It led our former imbecile Government of crusty-country loonies to hand Spain over to our enemies. It has

betrayed France, through the Banque de France gang of concealed bullies. It may betray America through the influence of Big Business—rescued from its own follies by President Roosevelt. It may betray us.

"If our Ministry of Information here is really going to buck up at last and start 'an urgent and intensive campaign' to organise a Silent Column, and an attack on chatterbugs, let it not omit to include, amongst futile panic-mongers, the shivering rumourists of 'revolution.'"

In Great Britain we have the Right Press whitewashing the bankers and the Left Press whitewashing the Communists. Both of them are the mortal enemies of the British people. Both of them undermined France. There is a grave danger that the Silent Column will act as their shield.

FEDERAL UNION

A front page article in the *Christian Science Monitor* of May 20, 1940, bears the headline "Europe 'Federalized' by Nazis is Berlin Post-Victory Plan."

ON OTHER PAGES

"The Gorged Python"
by T. J.

"European Background (II)"
by Norman Webb

"Dead Centre?"
by B. M. Palmer

"M.P.s. Criticise the Policy
of the Banks".

DIARY OF EVENTS (July 4 -- July 15)

(Military events are recorded in italics, political events in ordinary type.)

- JULY 4—*Mr. Churchill announced in the House of Commons that Britain had seized a considerable part of the French Fleet. The French commanders were given several alternative lines of action including demilitarisation of their ships, or their internment in the United States of America or the West Indies. Failing acceptance of these terms the British would use force to prevent the ships falling into German hands. At British ports two battleships, two light cruisers, some submarines and more than 200 other vessels were taken over by the British with the loss of two lives. At Oran, in North Africa, the French Admiral refused to accept British proposals, and the British Vice-Admiral opened fire disabling the battle-cruiser "Dunkerque" and damaging the battle-cruiser "Strasbourg," sinking two destroyers, and setting the seaplane carrier "Teste" on fire.*
The oil pipe supply from Mosul through French Syria has been diverted to Haifa.
The British liner "Arandora Star" with 1,500 aliens (Germans and Italians) on board, on their way to Canada for internment, was torpedoed and sunk by a German U-boat.
- JULY 5—*Marshal Pétain's government, now at Vichy, decided to break off diplomatic relations with Britain. It issued an account of the British attack on the French Fleet omitting the offer to permit warships to be interned in the West Indies or the U.S.A.*
There was an air-raid on Gibraltar. German sources stated that the raiders were French bombers that had not yet been demilitarised.
- JULY 6—*The Government announced that British aeroplanes had laid a minefield extending the entire length of the German Baltic, Norway, and North Sea coasts.*
- JULY 7—*The French Fleet at Alexandria was demobilised amicably.*
- JULY 8—*Successful action was taken by British Navy to prevent the battleship "Richelieu" falling into enemy hands. The greater part of the French Fleet was then assured from being used by the Germans. Mr. De Valera declared Eire's determination to preserve neutrality and resist attacks by Germany or Britain.*
Great Britain informed Japan that it would not close the Burma road to China to arms for China.
- JULY 9—*The Japanese Government expressed their deep dissatisfaction over the British reply to their request, and urged the British Government to reconsider their reply.*
Tea rationing began. Margarine will be rationed in a fortnight's time.
- JULY 10—*Lord Beaverbrook has appealed to the women of Britain to give their aluminium pots and pans to the Ministry of Aircraft Production.*
More coin was in circulation than at any previous time in British history.
Conversations between Japan and Britain were continuing.
- JULY 11—*The abandonment of the purchase tax was urged by the Association of British Chambers of Commerce in a discussion of the Purchase Tax Bill with Government representatives.*
- JULY 12—*The Government announced that evacuation of children abroad would be postponed, as the responsibility for taking the risk of the ships' being torpedoed was too great.*
- JULY 13—*The United States Department of State and Justice have relaxed immigration regulations with respect to children from Britain and other war zones.*
- JULY 14—*Mr. Churchill, in a broadcast speech, re-iterated the British determination to continue the fight at all costs, even if it meant resisting the enemy street by street through the towns and villages.*
- JULY 15—*It was announced that the registration of all Canadian citizens over 16 will probably begin on August 19.*
Marshal Pétain's scheme for the government of France was described as aiming to restore the French provinces of the Monarchy as administrative regions, and encouraging them to develop along their own lines. The Senate will consist of members some of whom will be appointed by the Chief of the State, others to be chosen from among prominent Frenchmen and yet others to be elected. By decree, M. Laval has been made successor to Marshal Pétain should the latter not be able to take up his functions.
During the days under review constant and successful air-raids have been made by the R.A.F. on German military objectives, particularly those which might be used in any invasion of England. German aeroplanes have also been over England every day.

"TAX-BONDS or BONDAGE and THE ANSWER TO FEDERAL UNION"

by John Mitchell

PRICE 1/- (Postage 2½d.)

Many people are interested in this book because of its bearing on our efficiency in war-time. The publishers are therefore extending their offer of a discount of 33½ per cent. plus postage on single orders of not less than 30 copies until the end of July.

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

M. REYNAUD

The rumour (which reached some of the newspapers) that M. Reynaud was in America seems to have been a distortion of Marshal Pétain's offer to make him ambassador from protected France to the United States. M. Reynaud refused this appointment, and later, according to the Havas agency, had a very serious motor accident. He was able, however, to attend the meeting of the Chamber of Deputies at Vichy.

NEWS & VIEWS

FRANCE IN THE GERMAN ORBIT

Of the re-arrangement of the Pétain government in France and its new constitution *The Times* of July 15 says:

"The new French Ministry contains four non-Parliamentarians, MM. Alibert, Baudouin, Bouthillier, and Caziot; four members of the armed forces (besides Marshal Pétain), General Weygand, General Colson, Admiral Darlan, and General Pujol; three Senators, MM. Laval, Mireaux, and Lemery; and three Deputies, MM. Marquet, Ybarnégary, and Piétri.

"The decree appointing M. Laval successor to Marshal Pétain as Chief of State, should the Marshal not be in a position to take up his functions before the ratification of the new Constitution, lays down that if M. Laval should in his turn be prevented, his successor shall be appointed by the Council of Ministers, by a majority of seven votes.

"Marshal Pétain's scheme to put an end to the excessive centralization which gave Paris such predominance in the country and which denied any initiative to other regions, is said to aim at restoring the French provinces of the Monarchy as administrative areas, and at encouraging them to develop on their own lines, without continuous interference from Paris. The provincial Governors are to represent the central Government, and will not only be the *liaison* between the province and the Government, but will also form a sort of State Council.

"The Senate is to be maintained. A part of its members, it is understood, are to be appointed by the Chief of the State. Others are to be chosen from among prominent personalities in the scientific, political, and diplomatic world, and those who have rendered services to agriculture, trade, and industry. Others yet are to be elected according to a system which has not yet been fixed. The Lower House is to be corporative, possibly on the Portuguese pattern. Provincial assemblies may be created and trade unions are expected to disappear, at least in their present form.

"M. Lebrun, the retiring President, has stated that he intends to live the life of a plain citizen. . . .

"Every French soldier, on demobilization, is to be given a bonus of 1,000f. (not more than £5), of which 200f. will

be paid at once and the remainder later, under conditions to be fixed by the Cabinet. The Minister of Finance has informed the banks that all Treasury bonds, in particular armament bonds, will be redeemed when they fall due as well as interest coupons on loans and bonds issued or guaranteed by the State. The exchange value of the franc will no longer be fixed at 176 $\frac{5}{8}$ to the £ sterling, but will be based on the United States dollar, at a rate to be fixed later.

"The projected transfer of the seat of the Government to Versailles is ascribed, it is said, to the fact that the Government, which preferred to share the nation's fate rather than leave French soil, propose to carry out their work as near as possible to the populations which will be called upon to suffer most. The transfer, if it is made, will be carried out in a spirit of complete autonomy and the Government will only move after having obtained the necessary guarantees for assuring their complete independence and full freedom for foreign diplomatic missions, accredited to the French Government, to enjoy their rights under international law."

M. LAVAL

M. Pierre Laval, who by decree is to take charge of the French State if Marshal Pétain should for any reason be unable to take up his functions before the ratification of the new Constitution, is a 57-year-old lawyer who started his political career as Mayor of Aubervilliers became, in 1914, Socialist Deputy for the Seine. In 1925 he took office as Minister of Public Works in the Painlevé Cabinet, and later as undersecretary of State for the President of the Council and of Foreign Affairs in the Briand Cabinet. Since 1926 he has been Independent Senator for the Department of Seine. He was Minister of Justice in several Briand Cabinets in 1926, Minister of Labour in 1930 and Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1931-32. Subsequently he had many terms of office, mostly to do with affairs abroad, and again held the premiership and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in 1935-36. In 1934-35 he was a member of the League of Nations Council. During the

(continued at the foot of the next column)

LECTURES & STUDIES

NOTICE

The institution of a department of the Secretariat for organised instruction, followed by examination and certification of individuals who desired their knowledge of Social Credit to be tested, was intended to meet a phase of public controversy which has passed.

The delay which may have been noticed in carrying out the preparations for an examination on a higher standard is an indication of the changing circumstances.

At no time was the Secretariat's willingness to arrange for the examination of candidates based on considerations of an order higher than the strategical; and certificates issued bear only the information that those to whom they have been issued were deemed to have replied satisfactorily to questions put to them. But this strategical value is now thought to have ceased for the time being, and it has been decided to suspend further action along these lines.

Certificates will be sent to those entitled to the award of them.

In common with the best existent in England and abroad we are fighting for "a chance against a certainty," the certainty being that a victory for Germany would be a victory for the centralisation of the power of finance: for the centralisation of initiative in human society. To that we are implacably opposed, and for effective opposition every ounce of available strength is and will be needed.

The Lecture Course

The course of lectures should, it is thought, continue to be distributed as widely as possible, as an introduction to the serious study of Major Douglas's books and articles.

J. M. B.,

Assistant Director, L. & S. Section,
Social Credit Secretariat.

course of the Abyssinian War it was M. Laval who with Sir Samuel Hoare devised a peace plan to be submitted to the two combatant nations when it became apparent that application of 'sanctions' to oil imported by Italy might cause a European war. Their peace plan, notable for the amount of territory and influence which it would cede to Italy, leaked out into the Paris press and caused an uproar in both France and England.

DEAD CENTRE?

By B. M. PALMER

This is not the first time we have been brought face to face with a definite situation needing careful self-adjustment. We have for some years been engaged in what we have come to think of as Social Engineering, and most of us understand that we must adapt ourselves and our tools to the problem in hand. We do not expect the problem to conform to our pre-conceived ideas of what should be. This, I believe, is the most important difference between a Social Crediter and a Socialist or planner.

And what is the situation which we have to face?

It has been set before us in the terms of a metaphor which cannot be improved on. It is as if, during all these years, we had been pressing the keys on an adding machine. We are not the only people who have pressed those keys, but perhaps it would be correct to say that no others have pressed them with such persistence, or with more exact knowledge of what they were doing.

The period for key-pressing is passed. The handle is being turned. No power on earth can recall the past to press more keys, or to undo what has been done. You cannot wipe out the score. All you can do is to wait for it.

The result, as yet unknown, will be delivered by the machine in the usual manner.

No action we can take can alter the result; no information we can give others can affect it. That particular phase of our work is over.

Action on the old lines may injure both ourselves and the machine.

There is, however, no need for us to retire into the background. Nothing is inevitable, and everything we do should be directed to increasing our prestige as responsible citizens. Character and creative knowledge (not intellectual knowledge) may be of the greatest value in the near future. If we can act in such a way that we command respect, if our behaviour and bearing in face of what situations may occur are such as to reflect credit upon our own philosophy, if our spoken words are apposite and realistic, we shall be recognised as men and women who know, and who are able to accept responsibility at need. Perhaps the people's most urgent need could be summed up in the words "character and

judgment." Men with these attributes can lead the way out of confusion.

I feel that at first some of us may find the adjustment difficult. Are we no longer to devise openings for discussing the anomalies in the financial system, or direct the conversation of those we chance to meet into channels favourable to our point of view, so that they may be stimulated to action? Cannot this be done *at the same time*?

No, for the very simple reason that it is not a sound engineering principle. You cannot have one objective in view while running another as a sort of side-line. It is like having an industrial system for producing goods and services, and at the same time for making more work. Or trying to run a war to save democracy, and at the same time to save the international financial system.

It does not mean, however, that we cannot speak of the things that lie nearest our heart when occasion arises, provided we show ourselves as men and women of the world, well endowed with that rarest of qualities, common sense.

"Let your light so shine before men . . ."

"Let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay."

It is a question of being and doing, not of saying, and still less, of persuading to action.

And the being and doing will concern only those things with which everyone of us will be concerned.

A parallel might be drawn from the past. Before 1935 the Social Credit movement very properly devoted its time to making quite certain that the policy of the fuller life was a practical policy. This involved a close study of technique. But when the Electoral Campaign was devised as a mechanism to enable the public to impose their will on Parliament it was necessary to understand that we were dealing with sanctions or power. We were attempting to arouse the sense of personal sovereignty in the individual voter. To have confused the issue by attempting to *educate* the electorate in technique at one and the same time would have been just as senseless and harmful as to hit the keys of the adding machine with a hammer.

If we emerge from the maelstrom on

the right side it will be in a world in which many facts, perhaps the majority of facts with which we used to conjure will be as tinkling bells and sounding cymbals. It will be a world in which character and creative knowledge will be above pearls.

We do not know; let us prepare for the best. In so doing we shall keep our sanity. Our enemies have prepared for the worst. Let them go on. They cannot, at their damndest, take from us what we have had.

July, 11, 1940.

NO SIGNPOSTS

There are superficial disadvantages, including the waste of a considerable amount of petrol, involved in the removal of signposts and nameplates from their appropriate situations. But maybe England is not sorry. Might she not have been suffering from the constraint proper to her native folk when forced—as sometimes at meetings or conferences—to label themselves prominently? And it has shown us that doing away with the label 'Preston' does not do away with the name 'Preston', still less with the town, Preston.

The road leads to the place it does lead to, whether there is a signpost or not, and the lie of the land must be considered carefully before rushing headlong down any pathway. The country, instead of existing as a series of dots, labelled neatly and tied loosely together by the string of roads, takes on its geographical character again. The web of roads is filled out by the contour of the land over which it is lain. As well as the lanes it is the fold of the valley that encloses our villages and fields and crops in the yellow sunlight of this summer. As well as the arterial roads, it is the rivers and the seaboard and the plains that lead down to the towns, now bristling bravely with barbed wire and concrete pill-boxes. The stems of signposts blossom flowerless to the sky, without meaning and irrelevant, some fungoid growth fostered (like bank premises) only on the peculiar virtues of the Corner Site.

Travelling by train becomes a test of vigilance by day as well as by night, and after a long period of being familiar with everywhere it is once again not only possible but imperative to 'explore'. The world is more exciting. A thing must be known by its configuration, by its smell (who would not know London merely by the zones of smell through which one passes on approaching

The "Daily Mirror" and the Banks

it?), by its noise and its behaviour; the contour of the factory, the green hill and the gnome-infested back-garden; the noise of the sea and the aromatic smell of the hills in hot weather.

To label a thing is to give it the properties of the label to trail along with its own features. Why did Sir John Simon choose the Pembroke village of Stackpole Elidor for his name town when he became a viscount, if not to associate with himself the lily ponds and the fragrant approach to the grim, rocky shores of those parts? Or perhaps he felt the need of the alias provided by a village, which, carefree in the possession of two names, is gravely recorded by the Ordnance Survey Commissioners as "Cheriton or Stackpole Elidor."

"The name of the song," said the White Knight, "is called 'Haddock's Eyes.'" "Oh, that's the name of the song is it?" Alice said, trying to feel interested. "No, you don't understand," the Knight said, looking a little vexed. "That's what the name is called. The name really is 'The Aged Aged Man.'" "Then I ought to have said 'That's what the song is called?'" Alice corrected herself. "No, you oughtn't: that's quite another thing! The song is called 'Ways and Means': but that's only what it's called, you know!" "Well, what is the song then?" said Alice, who was by this time completely bewildered. "I was coming to that," the Knight said. "The song really is 'A-sitting On a Gate': and the tune's my own invention."

Alice would have been still more bewildered if all the variables had been expressed by the same arrangement of letters, the same word or phrase. So much has an arbitrary and invented relationship between labels been mistaken for the description of the behaviour of the realities behind the labels, that any device which enforces the transfer of attention to the realities themselves is a step in the right direction.

In The *Daily Mirror* of July 11 'Cassandra' wrote the following:

Subversively Yours

On July 4 (Independence Day!) I had the temerity to publish what I thought was a relevant piece concerning the banks.

The gist of it was, that the banks were not doing their part in this war, and that the usurious principles to which they so rigidly adhere, do not make a very inspiring ideal for the soldiers to defend and maintain.

The matter has now been taken up in Parliament. I have been fiercely attacked by Sir Irving Albery, the Conservative Member for Gravesend, who described my article as "extremely ignorant, extremely ill-informed and, with reference to financial matter, subversive." This M.P. remarked in passing that he thought we had in this country the best banking system which exists.

Who for—the bankers? If so, I heartily agree.

No attempt was made by Sir Irving Albery to deal with any of the points I raised.

That is not surprising. This gentleman has been a member of the Stock Exchange for nearly forty years and now frequents the revolutionary precincts of the Carlton Club. It is therefore hardly surprising that suggestions of monetary reform are distasteful to him.

This assault on your correspondent, however, did not go unchallenged. Mr. J. J. Davidson, the Socialist Member for Maryhill, said:

"... It is natural that the people in many parts of the country should express the desire that the Chancellor should explain fully and exactly what the banks

are doing regarding the national war effort.

"As long as the Government hesitate and as long as the Chancellor hesitates to make that point perfectly clear, so long shall we have these articles, and rightly so, in the public Press."

There are many people who believe that the banks are unambitious organisations, under enlightened administrators who have not the slightest desire for power.

A pertinent comment on this was made by Lord Novar at the centenary meeting of the Union Bank of Scotland.

Said his lordship:

"Fortunately the real power is still in the hands of the independent banks when they like to combine in the public interest."

That's frank enough, anyway!

Lloyd George, who did so much to win the last war, is also under no illusion as to the merits of the banking fraternity:

"I want to urge the Chancellor again not to be too frightened of the City of London. Since the war the City of London has been invariably wrong in advising the Government. . . . These men, who have mishandled this monetary question, not merely advise what to do but establish a veto on every proposal which is made for national development."

To criticise these people just now may be inconvenient for them.

Well, I, too, want to win this war, and my desire for victory will bear comparison with that of Mr. Montagu Norman and his friends. And to be called subversive by gentlemen like Sir Irving Albery will certainly not deter me.

In fact, I think it is something of a compliment.

The "Sunday Times's" Opinion

In his column in the *Sunday Times* 'Atticus' makes a delicate—and interesting—contrast in comment. Of Air-Marshal C.F.A. Portal, he says:

"As Chief of the Bomber Command he is responsible for the hammering of the enemy that is going on every day and night. Although by no means lacking in humanity, he possesses that streak of ruthlessness which is essential to great commanders. He is only forty-seven, and when one realises that he enlisted in the

ranks in the last war as a despatch rider one has an encouraging proof that ability will find its way to the top even in the Fighting Services. He won the M.C. and the D.S.O. in the last war, and now in the present struggle, he has become an Air-Marshal and a K.C.B."

Then he speaks of Air Chief Marshal Sir Cyril Newall:

"Over them all, however, is the enigmatic personality of Air Chief Marshal Sir Cyril Newall. He neither

exudes charm nor vitality. He does not broadcast or impress himself either on the consciousness of the R.A.F. or the nation. He has his champions, but also his detractors, who say that the head of the R.A.F. should be more glamorous, more dynamic. He listens to your suggestions with a poker face, and when the interview is over he endures the parting without emotion. But do not be surprised if early next morning an R.A.F. officer calls you on the telephone and says he would like to go more deeply into the subject you were discussing last night with the Air Chief Marshal."

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. 19.

Saturday, July 20, 1940.

The Gorged Python

Whatever else may be happening at the moment, Mister Hitler is behaving, in some respects, like the gorged python. The python is a reptile of enormous strength which it devotes exclusively to the maintenance of enormous strength. The stages of this process are clearly marked: (1) control of the source of strength; (2) crushing the source of strength; (3) engorgement. Venomous snakes, of which the cobras which adorn the doors of the Bank of England are an example, are terrible; but the constrictors, of which the python is an example, are terrible and repulsive alternately. Doubtless there are snakes which combine the disagreeable features of both classes, and Mister Hitler may be one of them, without being by any means the only one.

There seems some ground for believing that the capacity for mischief of the gorged reptile is less than of the ungorged or the about-to-be-gorged, and that one may pause a moment before it to examine it at close range.

Mr. Belloc has just been doing this; but he has done it less satisfactorily in some respects than in others. He points out that the enemy has announced his conviction that the satisfaction of material needs is all that the mass of men desire and is now engaged in satisfying the material wants not only of his own proletariat but of the industrial wage earners in every area he controls. But the idea that Mister Hitler, or anyone else, presumably, can evade "a universal reaction throughout mankind" to this "absurdly crude simplification," Mr. Belloc dismisses. "Strength," says Mr. Belloc, "is best founded upon a recognition of reality." We should go farther and say that strength—or, to give abstractionism an even wider berth, a strong thing—is, like a weak thing, or any thing at all, a part of reality or nothing.

The war and everything connected with it and contributory to its course and direction is altogether a matter of relative strength, and to say anything about it that is in the least degree likely to be true involves an accurate assessment of strengths. Our Social Credit strength is probably best described as one of the intangibles. It may be little and yet sufficient; it may be enormous and yet insufficient. It is a question of the application. We are not going to commit the mistake of going off at half-cock. Having no sanctions of our own, we have got to align ourselves with the side that has, provided always that that side is with us in its real direction, wittingly or unwittingly. If there is no such side, the battle's over; we're not going to win. We believe there is such a side and that victory awaits it.

Whether we are fighting the real enemy or not at the present moment, we are certainly fighting the troops of the real enemy, for pan-Germanism, 'High' freemasonry, nazi-ism, bolshevism, are all the same thing and Mister Hitler's monstrous machine is its effective expression. As Mr. Belloc says, "nothing more monstrous has appeared in our midst throughout all the two thousand years of our culture." We're fighting something monstrous. Taking account of the state of national preparedness and morale we're doing it rather marvellously. The point is we have got to do it even more marvellously, and with great respect to Mr. Belloc, we shall not do that unless certain misconceptions are removed: misconceptions which even Mr. Belloc shares.

"There is no threat," he says, "of class war nor any appreciable tendency towards it. There is no racial division. There is not even any religious division upon a scale sufficient to modify the homogeneity of the nation and its

corresponding power to resist all strains from within and in fact from without. The great standing quarrel of our time throughout all European civilisation and its expansion overseas is the quarrel between the proletariat and those who control the means of livelihood. This peril to society has created the Communist movement, which is most violent in the great industrial cities of the Continent. This country is the most industrialised of all the greater nations and is yet freest from Communist disruption or decline . . ."

It will not escape notice that the cogency of this argument rests principally upon matters of fact; and concerning these matters of fact our observation by no means coincides with Mr. Belloc's. It does not matter very much where one is in this country, there is an absolutely "uniform" feeling—doubtless not unconnected with the uniformity of selective "freedom" conferred on the Press. And this uniformity may indeed imply a kind of unity. But whether it is unity of a desirable kind, or even unity in resistance to Mister Hitler is another matter. Quite noticeably, it is something which unites with fellows like himself the sort of man who feels that the whole thing is breaking up—and actually likes the feeling. This liking of the prospect of disintegration is the worst feature. It isn't an intellectual matter at all but an emotional; which makes it all the more certain that mere intellectual conviction of its error is not enough to combat it without quick and powerful support from the unconscious. A *Zeitgeist* (a Time-spirit) is not a construct of the intellect: it is something deeper than intelligence with its flickers of illumination; and when you are confronted with two "Zeitgeists", one real and the other manufactured, as we are at present, and these two cross-related as to their intellectual and emotional constituent parts you seem to be in for a crash. Nature does not preface her accomplishments with introductory remarks.

If you base your antagonisms on the assumption that someone has been grinding the faces of the poor when, in fact, someone has been sowing dissension by grinding the faces of the rich and making it impossible for the rich to enrich anybody, not even themselves, it is obvious you will find yourself emotionally on the side of someone who just loves poverty-all-round. It doesn't mean that when class cleavage has won poverty-all-round everybody will like it, anymore than they will like the thing to which

poverty-all-round is just a stepping-stone. The best cultivator of land was the hereditary landowner; but the working-class (particularly in that phase of its existence in which an exaggerated and misapplied notion of class is combined with not working at all) hates the landowner and is quite tolerant of the industrialist who has ground its face to putty. What could be more symbolic of complete servitude than to hang your own coat on a rail to be hoisted out of reach until such time as you may cease work and put in on again?

The tax-payer now supports great research establishments whose sole objective is the elaboration of such

devices for divorcing the loss of freedom from the resentments which it might be expected to entail. They call it "industrial psychology." There never was a department of "agricultural psychology." If the industrialist has been obliged to lay himself open to a charge of oppression (as the landowner certainly was) by an over-ruling financial tyranny; he has done it with something akin to zest. Class cleavage is an artificial product. If the workers are ever going to win anything—and why not?—they must be sure what they are fighting. No one can say that a race of men whose chief relaxation is the thrill of backing blood-stock for a place if not for

a win while at the same time basing the whole of its social philosophy on the doctrine that there's nothing in birth is sure of anything. There's craftsmanship in birth, and, among men, an infinite variety of craftsmanships—among them the craftsmanship of establishing a correct relationship between men as men and men as functionaries. The injunction: "Let him who would be greatest among you be your servant" is closer to the truth of that matter than the injunction to "Get it off someone else." The hand that guided the peasant to get it off the landlord and the bureaucrat to get it off the peasant is the wrong hand to play.

T. J.

European Background.

(II) THE GREEK CONTRIBUTION

By NORMAN F. WEBB

The modern interpretation of history is purely materialistic. In the world to-day we see the results of this attitude to life as a practical proposition, and no one appreciates them.

These notes represent an attempt to see history from the Christian point of view—the metaphysical, as opposed to the physical interpretations of events.

Historically speaking, nothing ever begins or ends; but historians have always been obsessed with a desire to distinguish and label epochs and to trace influences to their sources, and generally date and document. It is very difficult wholly to avoid the practice, and possibly not wise to try; but the point should be made here at the very outset, and kept clear, that such divisions and period are largely arbitrary and to be regarded more as mental conveniences than anything else.

It is easier to assess the Greek achievement than to say to what extent it has been permitted to influence modern Europe. Classical culture, in combination with Christianity—the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth—is the attributed basis for the modern, scientific world, and if we do not take the statement too literally, and give it only provisional weight, it will serve well enough as a point of departure for a brief survey of European civilization.

The contribution of Greece to human experiences is very great indeed. The Athenian Republic and the Greek city states generally, represent one of the two almost perfect examples of a small-scale experiment in social environment ever carried out. The second example (to be examined later) is, of course, the Judaic experiment in Palestine, which might be better described as an experiment in mass psychology; an imposition, as opposed to the Greek attempt at exposition. The results of the Greek expository method were very considerable indeed, no less than the discovery of documented knowledge and—quite as important—of the ideas of Leisure and Liberty. *And from Greece, too, came the first philosophical expression of the idea that the essence of the universe was metaphysical rather than physical.*

Intellectually and philosophically Plato was the discoverer of God in the sense of a universal Essence, or Principle. Men had felt and acted, had even thought and reasoned on

these lines long before; great men, like Moses and Isaiah had probably experienced far more profound and personal inspiration than Plato, but it was in practical terms of the nation and the occasion that they thought, which make the universal application of their inspiration a matter of extreme difficulty. Plato universalized and systematized the idea, and made it an accessible generality—at least to students. But Platonic monotheism has largely remained a speculative theory, except in so far as it has influenced, and been incorporated with Christian theology. In isolation it lacked what alone could make it a practical reality: that is, it lacked incarnation—the co-ordination of theory and practice.

The essence of the Greek spirit, and its greatest bequest to Posterity, was Science—the humble and enquiring mind—and the testimony to the wonderful effectiveness of this attitude is to be seen in the sheer volume of knowledge accumulated by this small nation of independent people, apart from any other of their remarkable achievements. From the time of Thales of Miletus in the fifth century B.C., who may be said to be the first scientist, through Aristotle down to Theon of Alexandria who wrote in the latter part of the 4th century A.D.; that is, over a period of at least eight centuries, the Greek mind and thought laboured originally and conscientiously, investigating Man and the world he lived in, as they had never been examined before, and were not to be again for over a thousand years. In architecture and literature the achievement of the Greeks was no less conspicuous. While, in the example of republican Athens, they gave civilisation more than a hint of what a free democracy might produce.

One has to be on guard to avoid fulsomeness in writing of the Greeks. In this world of blundering and make-shift, they preserved such a sense of the vital importance of method, and of the Principle they had evolved. There is

something particularly exemplary about the behaviour of Greek culture—if one may speak of a culture behaving. In its manner of going to work, of permeation, it was the reverse of fanatical. This was certainly not due to a lack of common efficiency, nor to an inability to employ force. Greek military exploits are among the most dramatic and sensational in history, and in the Macedonian Alexander, the pupil of Aristotle, Greece produced the greatest military leader and conqueror of all time—a terrific empire-builder, but of the recognised pattern. Under him the shores of the Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea became Greek. He founded Alexandria, one of the great cities of antiquity, and took Greek culture to India. None-the-less, the essence of Greece was not force, but a sweet reasonableness; how potent in its influence, its subtle and unexplosive nature probably kept a secret even from those upon whom it was working.

From the 6th to the 4th centuries B.C. Classical Greek culture flourished supremely, with its social and architectural high-spot in republican Athens, and in the buildings in the Acropolis. Then as an Empire she faded, and gave place to Rome, becoming politically merely tributary to the Western power and the happy hunting-ground of wealthy Roman art-collectors. That was the end of classical Greece; yet from her decay she rose again in the Middle Ages and flourished greatly, both politically and culturally, and even imperially, for a thousand years when Rome was little more than a memory.

The Mediaeval Greek Empire is a strange and much misunderstood phenomenon—the first meeting-ground of the Christian and Greek spirit. When early in the 4th century A.D. the Roman Emperor Constantine accepted Christianity for the Roman state, he accompanied the act by the founding of the city of Constantinople and the consolidation of the Eastern Roman Empire there as the strategic and economic centre of the whole. But Rome had never been able either to conquer or absorb Greek culture, and the newly-formed Byzantine (to give it its original Greek name) Empire, while nominally Roman, was in fact fully four-fifths Greek from the start—Greek and Christian. The impact produced not so much a national revival as an entirely new and original culture; one in which mystical experience seems to have taken the place of the Classical Greek scientific speculative passion for natural science and philosophy, but with no material loss to society, rather the reverse; and in which the Greek genius in co-operation with Christianity had a new lease of architectural and administrative life; so different from Athens although geographically so close, and politically so divergent from the Athenian democracy, as to demonstrate the almost, one might say, incorrigible originality of this remarkable people.

But the history of Byzantium belongs properly to the Middle Ages, not to classical Greece, and cannot be dealt with here. The job on hand is to sum up classical Greece, and assess what it was exactly that she bequeathed to the modern world. This is important, because the popular conception of Classicism, held ever since what is known as the Classical Revival in the 15th Century A.D. is that it is essentially Pagan materialism—the Rational and Hedonistic outlook on life. That, undoubtedly, was a side of Greek life, and as in the case of all Pagan civilisation, a very considerable side. But it was not essentially Greece; and the important point for us is not, how much of this or that which happens to suit our turn can be picked up from the Greeks, but what in sum was their essential gift to humanity

—the quality they existed to exemplify?

It was not worship of the body, or the delights of the flesh, though at no time in human history have those matters received more successful attention; it was not in the rational and materialistic outlook on Life, though no people have ever been more matter-of-fact—less transcendental—than the Greeks; it was not even in the written word, for Greek philosophic speculation, great as it was, was not all of Greece, nor even the major part—Greek learning was only a foundation to be built on and superseded. No; the prime achievement of Greece was, without a doubt, the discovery of the power of knowledge, Truth, and the effective value as a means to acquiring knowledge of what has been called the scientific spirit. The essential quality of this spirit is, as has been pointed out, a humble and enquiring mind; an attitude of wonder—of worship, if you like—a passionate interest in Creation, rather than an itch to create.

The fact that the birth of the scientific spirit in Greece was accompanied by so much that was materially beautiful, is a tribute to it as a method of achievement, a way of doing things; “If the eye be single” the whole body cannot help but be full of light. The Classical Greeks approached this singleness of vision more closely than any nation before or since, fully demonstrating its effectiveness within the limits of what was available to them. Why the nation, as a nation, failed to carry on; and why, having once started along the path to knowledge the Greeks stopped where they did, is not very clear. On the question of the application of their knowledge it must not be forgotten that Aristotle and Greek scientists in general held grave doubts as to the practical wisdom of applied science—doubts which our present world is doing its best to justify. It would seem that what the Greeks lacked—a want common to all Pagan civilisation—was a concrete, incarnate, sense of Unity, of a single, underlying Principle, or Law of Life. This lack Plato attempted to supply for he recognised that ultimately there can be no such thing as knowledge without Law; since the very concept of knowledge pre-supposes an absolute Truth, no matter how approximate or tentative the knowledge. To know anything about nothing is impossible. Only monotheism then, as Plato recognised, can supply the complete basis for science—the belief in one unchallenged power. It is a curious fact to contemplate that monotheism was in Plato's day an established fact actually within the boundaries of the Greek Empire, in Palestine. It will be necessary to return to that, only noting that Jewish monotheism existed in such a narrowly tribal, and exclusive form as to fail to attract even passing attention in Greece.

Historians close the Classical Age of European culture with the founding of Constantinople in A.D. 320, by the Emperor Constantine, and the official acceptance to Christianity. The Age is presented as a homogeneous whole—Graeco-Roman and Pagan. To start with that is a false grouping, for the Greek and Roman minds had almost nothing in common. This Classical culture—thus the history books have it—was attacked internally, and finally overcome, by a rival and absolutely incomputable doctrine known as Christianity, to which Constantine capitulated. This statement is no more true than the previous assumption that Greek and Roman culture were in any sense one; and furthermore it completely ignores the fact of the Graeco-Christian partnership that endured so beautifully for the astounding period of a thousand years in Constantinople.

M.Ps. Criticise the Policy of the Banks

In the debate in the House of Commons on Supply (Supplementary Vote of Credit, 1940) which was considered in committee on July 9 several members urged the necessity for a realistic financial policy. Speeches of some of them are reprinted below together with Sir Kingsley Wood's reply.

Mr. Benson (Chesterfield): ... There is one factor and one factor alone involved in the rate we have to pay for Treasury bills, and that is the re-discount rate at which the bill market can get its money from the banks, and that in itself is a purely artificial rate. The re-discount rate is a rate agreed upon between the Treasury and the banks, and I want to know why the Treasury, which agreed to a re-discount rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. before the war, has now agreed with the banks to increase it to 1 per cent.

In the first six months of the war the cost of that extra $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., irrespective of any increased borrowings, was more than £3,000,000, and as we shall be borrowing continuously larger and larger sums of Treasury bills, that £3,000,000 in six months, representing £6,000,000 a year, will grow. After some nine months I think we are entitled to a clear and definite explanation from the Chancellor why the Treasury has agreed with the banks that the re-discount rate shall be 1 per cent., because it means a definite present of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to the banks. The money that the banks utilise is not bank money; it is purely artificial money. It is created money, and the Treasury themselves are the controllers of the amount of that money which is available for re-discount. They can put the banks in funds by open market operations to any extent they like.

The banks are not so much creators of this money as the conduits. The money that we borrow on Treasury bills, is, in fact, the credit of the country, and is not a credit of the banks. The banks are merely the machinery that makes it available. The banks themselves can make it available only if the Treasury, by open market operations, puts them in funds. There is no reason at all why the re-discount rate should not go down to $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or, if our issue of Treasury bills increases beyond a certain point, to $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. On this question of Treasury bills, it ought not to be regarded as an interest rate, but as a remuneration for services performed, and that remuneration ought to be cut down to a reasonable limit. We had far fewer Treasury bills before the war, and the banks received only $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Now that tender bills amount to between seven and eight hundred million pounds they should not

be allowed to charge 1 per cent. We have had no explanation from the Chancellor of the Exchequer so far, and I hope that he will give us one as to why this indefensible bargain has been struck between the Treasury and the banks.

Sir Richard Acland (Barnstaple): I wish to support the plea put forward by the hon. Member for Chesterfield (Mr. Benson), and I would impress upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he really must produce for us a careful and reasoned answer to the case which has been presented so ably, though briefly, by the hon. Member, one which has been presented over and over again in all parts of the House at Question Time. Although it is a complicated question, it seriously troubles the minds of a great many people who will, perhaps, never be able to understand all its intricacies. This is one of the influences which, I believe, are damaging the morale of this country at the present time. This kind of question goes on being asked, and no answer is being given to it, except elusive answers which arouse interest just because they are so cleverly elusive. No serious answer is given to a case which seems to be absolutely irresistible. We have been asked to sacrifice for democracy; if this were really a 100 per cent. democracy, this kind of thing could not happen. You could not have a case of this kind put forward by hon. Members in this House, never answered, and treated as though it were a matter not requiring an answer.

We are asking that this rate of interest of 1 per cent. should come down to $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. There seems to be no reason why this extraordinary and costly policy should continue, and no serious answer is ever given to us. I believe that one thing is certain; we are determined that in and through this war we shall break the power and the control of the little group of gentlemen who work so harmoniously with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but over whose comings and goings he expresses himself incompetent to exercise any control; which means that he can arrange anything with them, but that this House and this Committee have no control over the matter at all. It is very strange, but every time a Chancellor of the Exchequer says, "I have no control

over them," he is really saying that the people of this country have no control over them. That sort of thing is not to go on at the end of this war. The sooner the people of this country say that in matters of this kind the policy of this country is to be determined differently after the war, the better it will be for our morale. The longer the arguments which people expect to be answered are left unanswered, the worse it will be for our morale. May I say one thing to Members of the Liberal party who are on the Treasury Bench? If the country sees that their presence in high places in this Government has made no difference to the habits of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and of other Ministers, and no difference to the answers which these Ministers give, we shall begin to wonder what difference has been made in the machinery of government. I appeal to them to use their influence in putting these points more, privately, to Ministers.

Mr. Loftus (Lowestoft): We all realise that we are dealing with a colossal sum. My hon. Friend the Member for Ealing (Sir F. Sanderson) said that taxation has nearly reached its limit. That means that an immense sum must be borrowed. The point is, Where is the money to come from? It can only come from genuine savings, and as regards genuine savings I would certainly give $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. or over 3 per cent. interest, but I doubt whether any hon. Member thinks that genuine savings would actually bridge the gap. There must be created money to bridge the gap. We know that most of the National Debt consisted of created money lent by the banks to customers, who again subscribed that money to the Exchequer. Last November there was an article in the *Economist*, headed "The Technique of Inflation," which warned the country that in this war we must not follow the same technique as was followed in the last war. We must not have bank-created money lent to customers and burdening the country with 4 per cent. and 5 per cent. The *Economist* strongly urged the Government to utilise genuine savings with a fair rate of interest. Will the Government do that with the joint stock banks and charge them $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which was the

figure mentioned by the *Economist*? Something on those lines will have to be used if we are to refrain from burdening the nation with an intolerable debt in future.

Sir K. Wood in a later speech replied to these points.

... The hon. Member for Chesterfield (Mr. Benson) raised again a matter which is very dear to him, and on which he put a number of questions to my predecessor. He put forward, with great force, his argument about the difference between the rate given to the banks before the war and that given now. If he will address a question to me, I will give him a considered reply. I have observed the replies given by my predecessor, and I thought they were explicit, but I will endeavour—not, I am afraid, with much success—to be more explicit still. The fact that $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was the rate at which banks lent money to the market before the war does not mean that it would be appropriate now. It does not take into account several other considerations, like the general financial and economic situation, and the fact that the volume of Treasury bills issued to the market is now much greater. The lending rate is, in fact, settled by the banks themselves, but the whole structure of short money rates has to be considered in the light of all present circumstances. That, as I remember it, was the gist of my predecessors reply. Some statements have been made this afternoon also about the position of the banks in relation to the general financial situation. I will study them, but it is only right that I should say that, at any rate in my belief, the banks have in fact given the fullest assistance, in close co-operation with the Treasury and other Departments, in financing the war effort, and in providing for the needs of the community during the emergency. I do not myself think—and I must testify to what I know—that there is any case for the suggestion that they are not playing their part in the war effort.

Mr. Davidson: The Chancellor has stated that he believes that the banks are playing their part. Does he mean their full part, and, if so, will he expatiate on whether the banks are giving the Treasury any special facilities with regard to percentage rates?

Sir K. Wood: No one can say for certain whether a particular institution is playing its full part or not. It is to some extent a matter of opinion. I have given my opinion. That does not mean that the hon. Gentleman need not hold the contrary opinion. He is as much entitled to

THE BRITISH EMPIRE

The British Empire: How it Grew and How it Works: by Ramsay Muir. 6d., pamphlet. Jonathan Cape.

In these days when to be British rather than American is to lay oneself open to a charge of being not quite reliable politically, it is a relief to find freely displayed on our bookstalls among the extensive array of American propaganda a pamphlet which actually praises not merely the British Empire, but the philosophy underlying it.

This philosophy has been expressed in action rather than words, and the nature of it is made clear in the following sentence (Muir's italics):

"Every colony established by the English was endowed, as a matter of course, with rights of self-government. No colony established by any other people was ever endowed with these rights."

This, as Professor Muir makes clear is "the most distinctive characteristic of British colonisation," and is the chief contribution of the British conduct of the affairs of mankind.

Decentralisation and control by the people on the spot is the essence of the British idea of freedom, as opposed to the idea of Centralised Control and absentee management which is inherent in such philosophies as Nazi-ism and Federal Union. The British Commonwealth represents a real practical achievement in

which the good far outweighs the evil.

It is to be expected that in a short propaganda pamphlet the shameful side of British history should not be stressed. Nevertheless, the author makes it clear that where British Government has failed and disasters have occurred, as in Ireland, South Africa and India, it has been because this British principle of Decentralisation has not been followed.

Referring to the difficulties in the way of Indian self-government he writes:

"The first arises from the mere size of India—an area as big as Europe leaving out Russia, with a population which forms about one-sixth of the total population of the world. No system of democratic government has ever been established for a country of anything like this size, except in China, where the attempt to establish it produced chaos. Democracy works best in little countries . . ."

This is the first time that I have seen this fundamental objection to the Union idea in print except in a Social Credit publication. It is evident that Professor Muir, like ourselves, is to be counted among those who are not ashamed of the philosophy and the way of life which were native to these islands and which have shown the other peoples, including the Americans, the meaning of the word freedom.

IVAN MAISKY

"Squat-built Ivan Maisky, Soviet Russia's smiling but inscrutable Ambassador, was always on friendly terms with Winston Churchill when the Premier was a gladiator in the ranks of freelance politicians. In pre-war days they often met, dined and talked . . ."

"When Russia marched into Finland and popular opinion went anti-Soviet, Churchill said as little as possible. He was a member of the Chamberlain government by that time. But he remained as kind to the Socialist State in his criticism as he had been to France in more recent days.

"When First Lord of the Admiralty, Winston was too much immersed in his work to see much of Maisky. As Prime Minister he did not see him at all. Last week, however, Ivan Maisky got a surprise. He suddenly received a telephone message to call at Downing Street."

—"*News Review*," July 11, 1940.

PACKARD ACCEPTS

The Packard Motor Company of Detroit, has agreed to take a contract for making 6,000 Rolls Royce aeroplane engines for this country, as well as 3,000 for the United States.

Alternative to Roosevelt

Mr. Roosevelt has not yet decided whether he will stand for a third term as president of the United States: nevertheless, the general opinion expressed in the press is that Mr. Roosevelt will allow his name to be put forward provided that the members of the Democratic Nominating Convention are unanimous in choosing him, and that if he does accept nomination he will probably be elected.

The Republican Nominating Convention has already chosen as Republican candidate Mr. Wendell Willkie, a business man from Wall Street.

After the way of American business men, Wendell Willkie has had a varied career. In his boyhood he used to work with the migrant workers on the harvests, starting early in the southern states and moved northwards with the summer. He was also a travelling farm labourer in California, a labourer in a steel mill and on a sugar plantation in Puerto Rico. By these activities he earned enough to take him through college, where he specialised in history. There he made a reputation as a soap-box orator of radical opinions. For a while he taught history in a Kansas school, and then went back to University to study law. Academically, he did well.

At the beginning of the war he enlisted as a private, and by the time peace was declared was promoted captain of the artillery.

After the war he became lawyer to the Firestone Tyre and Rubber Company in Ohio and, specialising in corporation law, was remarkably successful. Soon after he married, the depression started, and on the basis of his success with a subsidiary of the Commonwealth and Southern Company he was transferred to New York city. Soon he was running the Commonwealth and Southern Company and getting on well in Wall Street. He first came into conflict with the New Deal government when the Tennessee Valley Administration encroached on the territory served by his power company in the south. By his persistence he increased by \$30 millions the price the government had to pay to acquire the Commonwealth and Southern system.

Mr. Willkie has that essential quality of high office holders—charm.

One American columnist says of him:

"It isn't merely that he is a big,

tousled bear of a man with a kindly and amused expression. It is principally a quality of Will Rogers, who 'never met a man he didn't like' . . .

"We might call this quality 'charm', but let's not, because the word for that abstraction has been worn out on Mr. Roosevelt's great and undoubted quality. Franklin could charm a canary out of a tree to sit at a tomcat's supper. The difference is that Mr. Roosevelt has to turn his on for the occasion. Mr. Willkie's seems to be effortlessly working all the time."

This charm of Mr. Willkie's (and by his photographs he is very charming indeed) has been developed by his experience in selling electricity, at which he was so successful that in the last seven years he has reduced the cost to the consumer of his company's electricity by 41 per cent. and increased consumption by 83 per cent., figures far better than any other improvement on either score in that period anywhere at all.

As regards policy Mr. Willkie has little new to suggest. Of home policy in the United States he says that the New Deal set out to achieve reformation and recovery. The reforms have been accomplished, but where is the recovery? He offers recovery by means of what he calls a "free-enterprise system." In an article in the *Saturday Evening Post* of June 22 he says, charmingly:

"The free-enterprise system is a system of movement. It must always go ahead, because within it there is always a competitor setting the pace. It is not simply a 'profit' system; it faces loss far more often than profit. It is a profit-and-loss system; in which the opportunity for profit is worth the risk of loss. . . . Sometimes a group of businessmen may set up a monopoly, so that competition is eliminated and, within that industry, enterprise is no longer free. That is bad. . . . Sometimes a group of Government officials sets up a monopoly of political power that can freeze the enterprises in an industry and drive capital out of it. That is bad also . . ."

But on the other hand:

"We want a budget that tells us exactly where we stand financially. And we want the Government to make a serious effort to balance it. We know that it cannot be balanced this year or next year. But at least the deficit can be reduced." And he also asks for a

'solution' to the unemployment problem by giving people work instead of leisure; and for severe economy of government expenditure.

On the matter of foreign policy he seems to agree with Mr. Roosevelt: England and France constitute America's first line of defence, but Americans must dismiss any thought of going over themselves to help them. "We have no troops, and if we had troops we should lack equipment," he said in May, "It would be enormously to our advantage to have them win. It must, therefore, be to our advantage to help them in every way we can, short of declaring war."

As Mr. Willkie's bias towards the 'business' world would probably mean the devolution of the tremendous powers now in use by the New Deal Government to 'business', inevitably *big* business, it seems that the policies of the prospective candidates, from the point of view of the individual American, will not differ much. His 'choice' will offer little alternative. It should not be forgotten, either, that Wall Street is backing Mr. Willkie, the president of a huge utilities company.

EVACUATION OVERSEAS POSTPONED

The government's scheme to evacuate children abroad is now postponed. After the torpedoing of the *Arandora Star*, which was taking interned aliens to Canada, the responsibility is considered too great to be taken by the government.

Some children, however, have already arrived in America: the Queen's niece and nephew, the Hon. Davina and Simon Bowes-Lyon and three of their cousins went to New York; the Earl of Athlone's daughter with her three children has arrived in Montreal; a nephew and some nieces of Mr. Anthony Eden reached Quebec with the grandchildren of Lord Simon. Among the passengers of the ships for children arriving in New York were Lady Knollys and her two children; Baron and Baroness Alphonse Rothschild and their two daughters; and Julian and Karis Mond, children of Lord and Lady Melchett, who had gone to the United States a fortnight earlier.

The *New York Times* is charitably suggesting that American ships should be used for the transport of British children to the United States. It is also suggesting that children of the poorest parents should be sent.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

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.

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 will be obtainable outside the Central Bus Station on Saturday mornings from 7-15 a.m. to 8-45 a.m., until further notice. It is also 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 on Friday, July 26 at 7 p.m. at No. 4 Mecklenburgh Street, W.C.1. Meetings will be held fortnightly when possible. Enquiries to B. M. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

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, Oxbarne 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.

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.

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.)