"Vengeance is mine; ... saith the Lord". But "Cato", anonymous author of the book "Guilty Men," thinks otherwise. The preface to this book has two paragraphs:—"On a spring day in 1793 a crowd of angry men burst their way through the doors of the assembly room where the French Convention was in session. A discomfited figure addressed them from the rostrum. 'What do the people desire?' he asked. 'The Convention has only their welfare at heart.' The leader of the angry crowd replied: 'The people haven’t come here to be given a lot of phrases. They demand a dozen guilty men.'

"The use of recriminating about the past is to enforce effective action at the present." —Mr. Winston Churchill, May 29, 1936, now Prime Minister of Britain.

The "guilty men" are referred to as "the cast" and are named as follows: Mr. Neville Chamberlain, Sir John Simon, Sir Samuel Hoare, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Lord Baldwin, Lord Halifax, Sir Kingsley Wood, Mr. Ernest Brown, Captain David Margesson, Sir Horace Wilson, Sir Thomas Inskip (Lord Caldecote), Mr. Leslie Burgin, Lord Stanhope, Mr. W. S Morrison, Sir Reginald Dorman Smith.

Their "crime" is that "they were responsible for the lack of armaments of the B.E.F. and, in general, for the ill-preparedness of this country for war.

The demand is that "those guilty men" who still remained members of the Government should resign. The reader will apprehend almost at once two things about this book. Firstly, that Mr. Hore Belisha, War Minister for the first months of the war and for some time previously, and a member of the British Government for several years before the war, is not cast as a "guilty man". Secondly that the publisher of the book is Victor Gollancz who, like Hore Belisha, is a Jew, and is the founder of the Left Book Club, the main disseminator of Communist ideas in this country, and a warm advocate of an alliance with Soviet Russia.

In the opinion of the author: "War preparation is fundamentally a matter of economics". And it is pointed out that the Government’s Economic Adviser during the early months of the war, was Lord Stamp. But considerable care is taken to exculpate him as far as possible. We are told that one of the causes of the trouble "was that Lord Stamp was only asked to give half his time to the job". We are also told: "Whatever the true cause, the matter is academic. The soldiers of Britain had insufficient tanks and aeroplanes to protect them for the simple reason that insufficient money had been spent to buy them. It was not really Lord Stamp’s fault. He was only half guilty. The Nation’s railways must be carried on." Having regard to the 17½ per cent. increase in railway charges in the brief space of the last five months, we cordially agree at any rate that it would have been a happy thing if the other half of Lord Stamp’s time had not been devoted to the Railways.

It is, of course, very clear that the real object of the book is to obtain the removal from the Government of Mr. Chamberlain in particular, and of all those Ministers who are not prepared to turn over this country completely and permanently to Socialism.

This book, which went through eleven impressions during the first month after publication, is clever and spurious propaganda. Someone has to bear the heavy responsibility for what has obviously not, but should have been done during past years. There is of course solid justification for placing a large measure of responsibility at the doors of all those who are in this book dubbed the guilty ones. But no attempt is made to distinguish between the grey sheep and the black so that it seems suspiciously as if the black sheep were included in the flock for the purpose of damming the grey. An examination of the sheep in the next field would probably show many of them to be black (and not even grey) too; but this is ignored. The occasion for the play of such propaganda as this ought to provide a first-class lesson for all those who are attempting to withstand the march of Socialism in this country: that the fighting of rear-guard actions will not suffice to defeat these evil forces.

The charges "Cato" makes are based on the assumption that the main object of national policy over the past ten years has been to prepare for war. Convenitely ignoring all other national aspirations, and starting from this position, it is not difficult to convince an uninformed public that those politicians who have in earlier years preached spectacular policies based solely on a war objective, are prophets and leaders to whom the nation should now turn. To the informed however, the utter dishonesty of the book is manifest; we are told that "War preparation is fundamentally a matter of economics". But it is not pointed out that the prophets and leaders to whom "Cato" would now have us turn never once attempted to warn the nation of the real causes of our economic troubles, nor does he himself make any attempt to enlighten us in regard to this all-important matter.

This book is part of a deep
scheme of propaganda and revolutionary activity carefully planned in advance and adapted to English conditions. It is vital that people should take account of the special revolutionary technique now being developed in this country. In line with this activity is the propaganda being disseminated by Sir Richard Acland and his associates, which has as its aim, "equality of standards" in lieu of "equality of sacrifice".

The British people do not want "Guilty Men". They want certain specific results.

INSANITY

"Among the Jews the proportion of insane has been observed to be very large. From statistics collected by Buschan, he concludes that they are four to six times more liable to mental disease than are non-jews."

— Jewish Encyclopaedia, 'Insanity.'

"The gradual movement of the Jews from the Eastern to the Western hemi-sphere, so that within three hundred years almost one third of the Jewish people have settled in the American continent is one of the most significant facts in Jewish history . . . ."

— Encyclopaedia of Jewish Knowledge.

"The 'hospital hours' spent in the United States on mental disease are now annually one hundred and seventy-three million, against the hundred and twenty-three million spent on all other diseases put together."


PLANNING AND THE PEACE

"The most orthodox economists in England, who condemn any government interference in business, admit that even a victorious peace would be accompanied by an extension rather than by a reduction of government control and planning . . . ."

"The European discussion about the economic organization of the peace is therefore no longer much concerned with the basis, which is generally admitted to be that of a planned, government-controlled economy, whoever wins. Only the methods are debated. Should, as the Socialists demand, government actually own the key industries? Or should it just control them? And which of the four major controls is the most important and efficient one—control of labour, of raw materials, of capital and credit or of distribution? Should the planning be national or international? And should it work directly through the planning of production—the German and Russian way—or through manipulation of the monetary machine, as J. M. Keynes, the famous English economist, and his school suggest? None of the proposals for the post-war organization of Europe that has been made by Europeans seems to regard as possible a return to the economy of free enterprise and free competition . . . ."

". . . . in the event of a German victory, three quarters of all the world trade will automatically be on a totalitarian basis. But would Great Britain, if victorious, be able to return to free international trade?"

"This question was a pressing one even before Mr. Chamberlain resigned. But Mr. Chamberlain at least wanted the clearing system to be only temporary; he was fully convinced that democracy can be preserved only if the planned totalitarian economy of the war is abolished as soon as the war is over. There is every reason to think that Mr. Frank Ashton-Gwatkin, Mr. Chamberlain's adviser on international economics, was absolutely sincere when he declared in Washington last April that planning, restrictions and controls were nothing but temporary emergency measures forced by dire necessity upon an unwilling British Government. And M. Reynaud, the French prime minister, was equally sincere when he said at about the same time that the restoration of economic freedom was precisely what his government was waging war for."

"But the management of Allied economic affairs did not rest in his hands; it lay in London. And Winston Churchill has entrusted key positions in the management of international economics to two men who did not see in planned economics and controlled foreign trade temporary measures but permanent solutions. Mr. Robert Hudson, the British Minister of Agriculture, and Dr. Hugh Dalton, Mr. Churchill's Minister of Economic Warfare, do not believe that democracy and planned government-controlled economics are incompatible. On the contrary, both are convinced democracy cannot survive without them . . . ."

". . . . Hudson, tall, well dressed, debonair, is the typical English gentleman of independent means. Dalton, high forehead, high stiff collar, bald and with a suave, slightly unctuous manner, looks like one of the absent-minded, impoverished English lords in a Wodehouse story."

"These two men will not have it all their own way. Sir Kingsley Wood, Mr. Chamberlain's man Friday, who is Chancellor of the Exchequer, and thus controls the purse strings, is bitterly opposed to all but the most necessary economic experiments. Should he be ousted, there is still the ultraconservative Montagu Norman, who, as head of the Bank of England, wields great political power without being responsible to government or parliament. But if the war continues for any length of time the planners will get complete control not only in England but everywhere in Europe. And then the British Empire is not likely to be able to scrap the poor man's economy—even if victorious."

"Discussing the attitude of this country toward war and peace in Europe, the London Times said recently: 'Americans must realize that. . . . when the fighting is over, all national economies in Europe will be, in essentials, controlled economies; and there is little likelihood that the controls will disappear later as (largely at American bidding) they did after 1918.' And if the London Times is famous for one thing, it is for its infinite capacity for understatement."

—From an article by Peter F. Drucker entitled "Poor Man's War", published in "The Saturday Evening Post," July 20, 1940.
THE REAL WAR

By H. R. P.

No apology is necessary for a recapitulation of what is the most important problem to-day. It cannot in fact be repeated too often that the present war is fundamentally a clash between the individual and the institution. To be accurate, the present military conflict is a phase in a war extending over centuries and millennia between the individuals comprising mankind and a very few individuals controlling key institutions.

Human history, progress as well as decline, deals with human beings and their activities. Institutions are founded and carried on only in connection with those activities. This is merely to say that institutions serve some human need or aim, or else do not exist at all. They are a means to an end and can in no circumstances whatever be an end in themselves, even where tendentious propaganda holds them up as such. The apparent aim of an institution can of course be very different from, indeed just the opposite to, the real aim of its controllers. It is sufficient to mention the League of Nations and the Bank of International Settlements. The real aim can be guessed at by an investigation into the interests and mentality of its controllers and perceived by actual results.

In testing the usefulness to mankind—and that is the only touchstone possible—of some institution, it is essential to examine in an unbiassed way what are the objectives, the real ones, for which it exists. Whether we as a nation should fight for or against it must depend on whether it benefits us personally as men and women or not.

After all, institutions are figments of the imagination, mere labels for our convenience, a sort of heading to chapters of our activities. They are, like money, mere conventions, a psychological precipitation of thought and activity. An institution has in fact no physical existence. It is not a clearly defined and identifiable entity. It can only exist as a number of human beings in association. To take a simple example, a tennis club is formed by individuals so that they may satisfy their desire to play tennis in congenial surroundings as is possible within their means. The club house and grounds alone are not the club. The club is unthinkable without the members. Besides, it has other amenities; a bar, a card-room, and so on. Non-playing members may join for the social pleasures and advantages to be gained. But throughout there is the inevitable, essential condition that the association is formed and maintained for the benefit of the members. The latter are unanimous on policy, on what they want.

This condition applies to every form of association, to every institution, and particularly to the political institution called the State. There have been instances where the institution has not, on balance, been a benefit to the majority of its members; but only because these did not realise the fact. Evil men have at times gained control of institutions and exploited them for their own benefit at the expense of other members' benefit. To effect this they have had to resort to propaganda. They have had to instil in the minds of the majority an inflated idea of the value of those benefits the latter manage to get out of the institution. Worse still they have succeeded, as in Russia and Germany to-day, in warping the minds of others to such an extent as to elevate the institution into a kind of divinity, claiming blind worship and implicit obedience to its priests. It can be said without exaggeration that ever since the dawn of human history most States have for most of the time been so exploited.

History tells us of a few instances where fortuitous circumstances either prevented or stopped the domination by a few over their fellows. The irresistible vitality and intelligence of man were given free play and the individual came into his own, i.e. freedom of action within the limits set by nature at that time and place. Ancient Greece is a most notable instance, and the determined though unsuccessful effort by Xerxes to stop the Greek experiment most significant. No doubt many minor instances of such development have passed into oblivion and only the memory of major experiments has survived deliberate suppression and failure in appreciation of chroniclers. This is no doubt particularly the case as these instances of human progress have occurred at the fringes of civilisation, away from the dead hand of centralised power.

Now the British people are a synthesis of mainly two races, Anglo-Saxons and Celts. It so happens that both of these races were endowed with a generous love of freedom. Their ancient institutions were designed to that end and jealously guarded. The spirit, at any rate, still survives. The main characteristic of the Briton, which finds expression in a blend of tolerance towards others and a fierce regard for our own rights, has been modified but not overtaken by the implacable and adventurous spirit of the Norseman and the keen and aristocratic mind of the Norman. The general character of the British people has on the one hand enabled them to wrest from the force of evil a greater measure of liberty than is enjoyed by any other nation, and on the other hand has attracted the deadliest hatred of the British by those self-same forces.

This is the real war of which the present military conflict is but the latest, though perhaps the decisive, campaign. So far as the British are concerned, the war extends back to before Magna Charta. The effort expended in widening our liberties little by little, is out of all proportion to the results. Thus can we measure the enemy's strength and his capacity for remaining unrecognised. Very few people are ever really conscious of the active resistance to all efforts at progress in this field, so subtle and all pervasive is that resistance. All means of communicating with the people as a whole are controlled by the forces of evil. They put our continuous propaganda on this question of individual versus institution, with the deliberate aim of distorting the human mind and lulling human intelligence into a drugged sleep.

It is well to remember that wherever and whenever we come across such propaganda exalting the institution over the human being, we are face to face with the agents, conscious or unconscious, of subversive forces; subversive to national sovereignty, to legitimate human aspirations and to man himself.

Trajan would say of the vain jealousy of princes that seek to make away those that aspire to their succession: "that there never was a king that did put to death his successor."
Letters to the Editor

JULIUS STREICHER

Sir,
I refer to the paragraph under the above head published in your issue of the 10th instant.

As there are still people who question whether anti-semitism in Germany was sponsored by Jewish international financial interests I enclose for your information an outside cover of World Service.

This was a bulletin edited by a Colonel Fleischauer who I understand was perfectly sincere in his intentions.

Nevertheless the contents, some of which were undoubtedly true, were presented in such a form as to merely increase the unreasoning hatred of the Jew by the anti-semite while yielding further scope for the ridicule of those who are ignorant of the Jewish question and its menace.

As will be observed from the marginal notes of this cover the Banks through which payment for the bulletin had to be made are all directly or indirectly German-Jew controlled!

The object of the anti-semitic movement was not only to purify the German people in preparation for this war but to assist the immigration of revolutionaries into Britain and other countries for the promotion of the world-revolution which has been repeatedly declared as the ultimate aim of the present struggle.

In this latter connection a careful scrutiny of the officering and training of the Home Guard is called for.

I shall be grateful if you will grant the courtesy of space to this letter.

Yours, etc.,

R. L. NORTH RIDGE.

BELFAST; AUGUST, 1940.

ADVERTISING FREEDOM

To the unsophisticated it seems a little ludicrous to advertise the value of the 'liberties' that remain in this last stronghold of liberty. What on earth are 'liberties' if by inspection we cannot recognise them without help and if by experience not find them so much worth having as to be notable?

To insist on the necessity for such advertisements to the extent of advertising it is still more unexplainable—until we see that the advertisement is done by an advertising company. And further scrutiny of the quarter page advertisement in The Times reveals the fact that prominent in their formulation of the liberties that we are fighting to preserve is the freedom to form secret societies and to be freemasons (paragraph 2).
Canadian Mobilisation

Mr. John Blackmore, the leader of the New Democracy party in the Dominion House of Commons, moved an amendment to the mobilisation bill placing the responsibility for financing the war on the Bank of Canada, and urging the conscription of "corporations, industries and financial institutions" before persons. He urged the adoption of the principles of social credit.

The Bill, like the British Emergency Powers Bills, was scheduled for immediate and swift passage, and in the Canadian Press great play was made with the fact that this amendment was the cause of delay. Although in the newspapers much space was devoted to reports of the debate, in at least one Alberta daily there was no report of the speeches in favour of the amendment, nor was the text of the amendment given.

The report was a triumph for "clumsy" journalism.

The amendment was defeated by 147 to 17 votes. All the Conservatives and Liberals in the Chamber voted against it, while New Democracy representatives, C.C.F. (the Canadian equivalent to the Labour movement), and Mrs Dorise Nielsen, a 'Unity' candidate, voted for it.

Unorthodox Banker

On another page it is pointed out that the most orthodox institutions such as The Economist are becoming careless of maintaining appearances by supporting financial orthodoxy. That bankers are similarly affected is shown by the following speech of Mr. H. J. Kelliher, a director of the Bank of New Zealand, given at Darwin and reported in the Brisbane Courier of June 10.

"Avoidance of major part of the economic aftermath of the war should be ensured by the replacement now of privately-created money by State-issued money. By so doing the British Empire would be freed from the crushing interest burdens that were mounting up under its present financial system, for State-created money would be interest free," said Mr. H. J. Kelliher, a director of the Bank of New Zealand, when he arrived at Darwin in a flying boat from Singapore to-day, on his way back to the Dominion.

"To fight a war on privately-created money is to fight two enemies—one without and one within," he said. "The latter is the enemy of perpetual indebtedness, which we have never conquered. The sums of private credit money being borrowed are becoming so fantastic in their magnitude that every one recognises the impossibility of ever repaying them."

"The ever-growing interest burdens eventually will enslave masses of people by depriving them of purchasing power and creating large-scale unemployment."

"Contending that the tremendous monetary expansion entailed by prosecution of the war must inevitably be followed by industrial economic stagnation and unemployment, Mr. Kelliher said that such repercussions would be all the more severe when the money employed was privately created and spent on wasting assets accompanied by large-scale destruction of real wealth such as occurred in war-time."

"The logical thing was to prepare for a sound post-war footing and extricate ourselves from the debt in perpetuity system by instituting effective monetary reforms before it was too late. The State should replace private capital by State-created money distributed through State banks, assisted by the monetary reforms before it was too late."

The plans for assisting Latin America, though conceived with the admirable purpose of keeping the purchases of raw materials from that continent. Even the proposal to send American ships to take the children to safety is made dependent on Hitler's permission and therefore falls into that category of empty moral gesture for which the English-speaking peoples are famous. The substantial truth is that once the last shipment of surplus material arrives (if it has not already done so) we shall be getting less, not more, help from America than in April. And none of it, of course, is 'given'.

"This does not mean that we cannot look forward to massive assistance in the future. After the election is over, President Roosevelt—or President Willkie—will be able to move with less circumspection, and even congress will, for a spell, be more anxious to please the majority than to avoid infuriating a minority. . . . The likelihood is that by 1942 we shall be receiving a flood of munitions from across the Atlantic—including Lord Beaverbrook's 3,000 aircraft a month. So far as this autumn is concerned, however, America can give us very little help and—despite the very strong wish of the majority of her people—will give us even less help than she can.

"... Indeed, it has become our historical mission to hold out in our fortress and give the Americans time to think things out. If we play our part, they will play theirs."

From "The Economist," Aug. 10, 1940.

America does not "Give"

"...There is a great and growing gulf between American words and American actions. There is no room for doubt that an overwhelming majority of the American people are in agreement with the policy which is usually stated as 'giving the utmost possible help to Britain short of war.' This movement of opinion sprang up in the dreadful days of May and June and in its first access a number of things were done which were undoubtedly of immediate assistance to the Allies. Stocks of 'surplus' war materials were sold and shipped to us; the rather absurd requirements for the delivery of aircraft at the Canadian border were waived; undertakings to buy raw materials were entered into which had the effect, if not the intention, of putting dollar exchange into the hands of the British Treasury.

"In the last few weeks, however, the tendency has been reversed. As the demands for increased help to Britain have grown, more and more obstacles have, in fact, been placed in our way. Congress effectually stopped the disposal of surplus stocks. Embargoes were placed on the export of steel scrap and aviation spirit which, though they were doubtless intended to hurt others, certainly do not help us.

"'Neutrality thus demands that those whom America herself regards as worthy of support should suffer with the guilty. When, however, it comes to measures which, while treating all alike, would in fact benefit Britain alone, such as the repeal of the Johnson and Neutrality Acts, there is not a whisper of the possibility of action being taken.

"The sums of private credit money being borrowed are becoming so fantastic in their magnitude that every one recognises the impossibility of ever repaying them."

"The ever-growing interest burdens eventually will enslave masses of people by depriving them of purchasing power and creating large-scale unemployment."

"Contending that the tremendous monetary expansion entailed by prosecution of the war must inevitably be followed by industrial economic stagnation and unemployment, Mr. Kelliher said that such repercussions would be all the more severe when the money employed was privately created and spent on wasting assets accompanied by large-scale destruction of real wealth such as occurred in war-time."

"The logical thing was to prepare for a sound post-war footing and extricate ourselves from the debt in perpetuity system by instituting effective monetary reforms before it was too late. The State should replace private capital by State-created money distributed through State banks, assisted by the existing banks, backed by national resources, and placed on a commodity basis."

"This money should be used fully to develop national resources and put forth a maximum war effort."

(Report from the Sydney "New Era" of June 21.)
RATHER DOMESTIC

One of the earliest and most distinguished converts to Social Credit is reported to have told Major Douglas: "You see you're introducing something unfamiliar to us. Cost and price have always been exactly the same thing to us." That is the whole root of the matter. Whatever costs is not necessarily the price which has to be paid for it without loss being sustained by anyone. If there is an excess of production in any accounting period over current consumption in the same period, true cost is a fraction, less than unity, of the apparent, or financial cost which must be recovered (in prices if there is no other source) to prevent loss to the producer. A simple example of a kind familiar to economists (who like desert islands and so ad infinitum) is that of one coconut half a coconut, not a whole one. This seems at first sight paradoxical and economists under pressure to consider it will be found to flee precipitately from the scene of the coco-palm's labours to some other scene—usually that of the labours of another forest of coco-palms on another desert island (and so ad infinitum) .......

Like Newton's Laws the truth of this matter is not demonstrable by mathematics but by experience.

But the statement, nevertheless, remains unfamiliar, that where there is excess of production true cost is a fraction of financial cost. The true cost of supplying the earth's population with the necessities of life and with the munitions of war as well is the necessities of life. When populations want wars at this cost, they can have 'em. When they are free to get them at this cost, they will make a wiser choice probably in deciding what to do with their spare time and energy. They may not; but in any case the choice will be their own not that of a self-interested minority.

The Social Credit movement has for many years, been trying to make these truths familiar and has experienced great obstruction from quarters better supplied with powers (or sanctions)—better supplied because for the present the suppliers control the supply, their own and other people's. While, this matter was being brought to an issue, the war supervised, and it is now more than ever apparent that a general argument rests upon the assertion that unity of control. It has not got the power. It has no ful forces, identifiable with as much or greater ease, are against us. And so it is with other functionaries. Life becomes increasingly unsatisfactory for all. Those whose functions are not highly elaborate are most conscious of discomfort; those whose functions call for higher creative powers are becoming conscious of something which might be appropriately called not so much discomfort as dis-ease. People fly from disease even more quickly than from discomfort; they are imaginative as well as sentient. If we set out to offer expert advice, it should be expert advice. The post-card to your M.P. has had its day (though it may have its Indian Summer). Arguments about the costlessness of credit have likewise had their day. Money no longer matters very much—even The Economist is losing interest in the maintenance of the appearances! It will have another day, on a different plane. What holds the field of our interest at the moment is the opportunities which are opening out for thorough and realistic service, advice that is intelligent, considered, comprehensive. "If you would be heard speak with the mind of your hearer". That does not mean that you cannot inform it.

T. J.
We are repeatedly assured by all the agencies of propaganda that this is a war for liberty, and it is certainly true that we shall not have liberty unless the war is won. That is to say, victory in the field is only the first step towards liberty; after that, we must face again the enemy that won so decisive a victory between 1919 and 1922.

That campaign was a signal example of how a very small number of people, whose sole superiority lay in knowing exactly what they wanted and how to set about getting it, were able to impose their will upon infinitely superior numbers without a recognised objective, without cohesion, and without technique. If that is not to happen again, some knowledge of the objective and enough technique to avoid certain obvious traps will have to be fairly widespread throughout the country. It need be possessed only by those individuals who by temperament and training are fitted to act as an example to those around them.

To be clear upon what you want is the first step towards obtaining it; liberty itself has been defined by Major Douglas as the ability "to choose or refuse one thing at a time." That is to say, your alternatives must have no conditions attached other than the natural consequences involved. For instance, a "free" choice between unemployment and peace on the one hand and employment and war on the other, is not liberty.

There are, however, at least two factors modifying an absolute social liberty for everyone. The first is the liberties of others; obviously, complete freedom to drive on whichever side of the road you please would render the roads useless, with a consequent reduction in the freedom of everyone including the offender. The second is more subtle, and consists in the desirability for a universal refusal to make a choice, free or otherwise, between rival methods. It has frequently been pointed out that there can be only one head in any efficient enterprise, productive or otherwise, and that the other individuals therein must surrender their liberties and carry out their orders. It is even claimed in certain quarters that this undeniable fact makes liberty a delusion and a dictatorship the only possible effective organisation in the world as it is.

**FREEDOM AND EFFICIENCY**

The fallacy here resides in a confusion between ends and means. The former is the concern of the entire community, as individuals; the latter, the province of relatively few persons who are qualified technicians. The rank and file in each organisation require to have, as was stated in Economic Democracy, "absolute freedom of choice, not of conditions, but as to whether such conditions are acceptable." The technician, then, in the interests of efficiency, lays down the conditions under which the work shall go forward; the rest of the community, considering the hours of work, rates of pay, the purpose of the organisation and kindred matters, must be able to decide in absolute freedom (which presupposes a "private" income at least sufficient to maintain life) whether they will or will not co-operate. If they decide to do so, then they are under orders in all matters relating to the organisation and the sole liberty in that respect remaining to them is liberty to contract out of the organisation when and if they please. On the other hand, if in sufficient numbers they decide that the conditions offered are unacceptable, then by their non-co-operation they force a modification of those conditions.

Liberty on the part of the rank and file to interfere in the technical running of the organisation—in short, to meddle with methods—is merely liberty to destroy liberty, or the material basis of it. It may be argued that any man should be free to hang himself but, as most people desire to remain alive, the objection is mere academic.

Liberty of the individual, therefore, is perfectly possible without any sacrifice of efficiency in the productive or social organisation, no matter how complicated, and efficiency applied to correct ends is of course highly desirable. It is the art of getting things done with the least possible expenditure of material, time and energy—and time and energy are life itself. Indeed, efficiency increases with liberty, for psychological reasons that need not be discussed here. What we have now to consider are the methods by which communities are prevented from attaining the liberty, otherwise entirely possible, whose structure has just been described.

Stupidity, "unawareness", was, according to Buddha, the first of the Seven Deadly Sins and indeed, judging by the results (which is the only means we have of judging at all) there are strong grounds for believing this assessment correct. Most men are reasonably well-meaning and well-doing citizens and if were not for ignorance, and its offspring inertia, the activities of the evil-minded few would come to very little. As it is, by a perversion of the truth, and especially the truth concerning liberty, these few have been able to set one-half the world at the throats of the other half.

The perversion usually appears to take this general form: The obtaining of liberty is delegated to one man or group, either by formal election or by passive acquiescence, and the idea of liberty itself is permitted to be divorced from its personal application and applied to an institution, usually the state. In spite of a uniform series of failures, the ordinary man will still attempt that impracticable but alluring "short cut" to liberty which consists in vesting the power belonging to each individual in a sufficiently energetic and vociferous "leader" or party.

**THE LEADER AND THE LED**

It is illogical to blame the leader for the deplorable results of such a policy; he becomes almost as much a victim of the faulty technique as his dupes. Starting very often with the best and most patriotic motives (without which he would hardly have the drive and gain the following necessary for success) he is very early in his career taken up into a high place by the devil and shown the glories of a very considerable section of the world. When he has thrust his way to power, i.e. wrested the liberties of his fellow-men either from themselves or from their present masters, all that will be his. The really subtle part of the temptation lies in the thought of all the good he will be able to do (i.e. force upon) his fellow-men once his power is absolute. In a passion of altruism he succumbs—and is cor-
raptured. For the devil (or his representative) does not vanish once the bargain is struck; he proceeds to harvest the fruits of his cunning by manipulating his puppet. Thereafter it is the greatness and freedom and power and prosperity of men-in-the-mass, i.e. the nation, that the dictator is concerned with and can be condemned with. These are the things he wants for himself, and he seeks to confer them upon the nation—at least partly because in so doing he confers them upon himself. But the “nation” is an abstraction whose interests may well be made to seem to run counter to those of the individuals comprising it, and who are the sole reality. Moreover, these qualities that he seeks to confer upon his country are not in anyone’s gift. It appears to be a law of nature that one man cannot make a practice of giving others anything without pauperising them, spiritually or materially—except an example of correct conduct. That is a truth which shows itself in a hundred ways to-day, and yet is obstinately disregarded by rulers and ruled alike. Men have always desired a Messiah who would give them or win for them, freedom and prosperity, and they will actively resent being told to look within themselves for the Kingdom of Heaven. Yet they will find it nowhere else, and it must (and can) come from their own efforts or not at all. The two Antonines were the wisest and most upright dictators the world has seen or is ever likely to see, yet the benefits they bestowed upon the Roman Empire did not survive the death of the second. Such benefits were not, and could not be, of any permanent account: they were given, and had not those roots in the will and character of the people which alone could make them an enduring possession.

THE PRESENT WAR.

In a fundamental sense, this is the real cause of the present war. Men everywhere have taken, through ignorance or sloth, what seemed the easy way to freedom and security, and set up, or permitted the setting up of, a leader or an oligarchy to obtain these things for them. The best opinion and all experience proclaims such a course disastrous and we are now in process of receiving one more lesson.

It will be dearly bought, but it will be cheap if this time we really learn it. And we may have good hope that the years of patient, unremitting work in education and example done by the men and women of this movement will shortly bear fruit; for such work will in any case not be lost, whatever happens. Great as is the resistance to change of habit, particularly of mind, and formidable though the power of vested interest may be, the immense momentum generated by correct action must in the end prove victorious, provided that a sufficient number of examples, over a wide enough area, of such action can be given. Only thus can permanent individual liberty be established, and only thus can a real and a stable civilisation be at last achieved.

COMMENTARY

UNSOLICITED TESTIMONIALS (Grade A).

“The elimination of Chamberlain—of the Hoares and Simons—would give us the confidence necessary to produce the enthusiasm we need if we are to collaborate with England adequately, without reserve, and put our hearts in it”.

— Magazine of Wall Street, New York.

Isn’t it odd that Wall Street and the Communists want the same thing? Or isn’t it?

* * *

UNSOLICITED TESTIMONIALS (Unclassified).

“After our own President Roosevelt Mr. Churchill is America’s greatest Radio Star”.

— Miss Elva Williams, San Francisco.

No comment.

* * *

Charles Rist, Governor of the Bank of France:

“This process continues from stage to stage (of production); in other words, the continuation of production at the same level is only possible if the credits are increased from stage to stage” (Professor Rist’s italics).

But Social Credit is founded on a fallacy, you know—that credits have to be increased from stage to stage.

* * *

No, Clarence, we aren’t going to have a Capital Levy just yet. The Government is only increasing postage and encouraging the “Bank of England” controlled railways to put up their fares, so as to give a hint to everyone to raise prices and ask for more wages, so that that hundred pounds you saved for your old age will only be worth fifty pounds. Not a capital levy, Clarence.

* * *

Etcetera.

Stella, Marchioness of Reading
Rt. Hon. Leo. S. Amery, M.P.
Miss Rosa Rosenberg
Emmanuel Shinwell, M.P.

WALTER LIPPMAN

In one of his books Wyndham Lewis expressed the view that political columnists such as Madame Tabouis and “Pertinax”, so freely quoted in the press of this country, come by their publicity chiefly in order that their views may be quoted and used abroad as typical of those of the people of the country for which they work. Both are now in the United States of America and perhaps in a few months time we shall be saying wisely “But according to ‘Pertinax’…” as a limitation of American opinion.

In the absence of the two French commentators the most quoted columnist on international events in the English Press is now Walter Lippman the American.

Born in Manhattan of Jewish parents Walter Lippman was educated privately, sent to Europe to gain background and then to Harvard. After leaving Harvard he tried his hand at journalism but left in 1912 to become secretary to George R. Lunn, a crusading parson who had been elected Mayor of Schenectady on a Socialist programme, and after a few months wrote a book called Preface to Politics. At 25 he became a star writer on the Liberal weekly review New Republic, which in those days more or less reflected the ideas of President Woodrow Wilson. Lippman was made assistant to the secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, and afterwards joined the American Expeditionary Force as a captain in the Military Intelligence, later attending the Versailles Peace Conference.

After the war he wrote for the New York World, and when that paper was discontinued the New York Herald Tribune invited him to contribute a daily independent article on world affairs. To-day Lippman’s column appears simultaneously in 160 United States and Canadian organs.
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August 7.

Written Answers (21¾ columns)
Ministry of Supply
CONTROL OF INDUSTRY (DEFENCE Regulation 55).

Sir J. Mellor asked the Minister of Supply the number of instances in which he has, under paragraph 55 of the Defence Regulations, 1939, purported to authorise persons appointed by him to carry on existing undertakings as agents for the undertakers; whether any persons so appointed have pledged the credit of the undertakers; and whether he intends to indemnify undertakers against consequential liabilities?

Mr. H. Morrison: Such action has been taken in respect of 11 undertakings. As regards the last part of the Question it will not be expected that I should be able to supply information as to the details of the day-to-day transactions which may have been entered into on behalf of the undertakers. Nor can I make any general statement on the subject, as the position of paragraph 4 of Regulation 55 of the Defence (General) Regulations is now under consideration by His Majesty's Government.

• • •

Appropriation Bill (117 columns)

Mr. Stokes: The right hon. Gentleman spoke about American purchases. Again, I did not follow all that he had said, but I will call his attention to the fact that since the beginning of the war the prices of American machine tools have gone up by 300 per cent., and it looks as though someone on the other side were making a good thing out of the business.

Mr. Austin Hopkinson (Mossley): Can the hon. Member tell us the average rise in the cost of English machine tools?

Mr. Stokes: My impression is that it is about 50 per cent., but it does vary enormously in the type of the tool. I have not found that machine tools produced in this country have gone up in price nearly as much as I expected they would, having regard to all that has happened since the war started, but they are difficult to get and one has not been able to make many purchases. Another point that I wish to put forward concerns the sad economic plight of many small businesses of £500 or £600 a year. It seems to merit the attention of the Economic Policy Committee. All up and down the East Coast there are small businessmen, retailers of one sort and another, who are really all "broke." They have plenty of stocks, plenty to sell, but everybody who comes into the shop says, "No, I must not buy, because I have been told not to." I question very much whether the policy of restricting purchases is as right as people like to believe it is. My question is answered by the bare fact that there are over 800,000 people unemployed. It seems to be thoroughly bad economics to suggest that people must not make purchases if there are both goods and materials available and idle men who could produce more wealth to keep the whole economic system in action. The whole thing is based on a profound misconception of the meaning of money, but I do not want to go into a long dissertation upon what money is. I do not want to start that hare.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Supply (Mr. Harold Macmillan): I do not think that the Government can complain of the tone and character of the Debate, which has covered very wide grounds.

The other subjects dealt with have ranged over monetary policy, inflation, the system of land tenure—upon which we have had advantage of the rival views of the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Stokes) and my hon. Friend the Member for Brigg (Mr. Quibell)—property in general, State capitalism, State socialism, and syndicalism, and we have even seen the delightful spectacle of an agreement between my hon. Friend the Member for Mossley (Mr. A. Hopkinson) and other Members of the House that for the purpose of conducting a war some system of State socialism must be regarded as necessary. It is still left uncertain whether that is to be regarded as an argument against State socialism or in favour of the war.

The hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. E. Smith) gave a very interesting speech, as he always does, well thought out and constructive, and he went into wider territory. I must disappoint him as to the Government's exact plan for announcing to the world our intention of making a federal union between the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States, Mexico and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Although the persuasive eloquence of the Prime Minister might possibly carry that rather ambitious scheme, I am sure the hon. Member will regard it as beyond the function of a Parliamentary Secretary to plunge into such dangerous waters.

August 13.

Oral Answers to Questions
(36 columns).

Mr. Stokes asked the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the balance-sheets published by banks do not, in fact, give a true return as they do not reveal the extent of authorised overdraft; and, as the concealment of any relevant figure is a breach of the Statute, Companies Act, 1929, will he consider taking steps to regularise the present practices?

Sir A. Duncan: Section 124 of the Companies Act, 1929, requires that every balance-sheet of a company shall contain its liabilities and its assets, together with sheets published by banks strictly conform to these statutory requirements.

Mr. Stokes asked the Prime Minister whether he will give time for the discussion of the Motion standing in the name of the hon. Member for Ipswich, regarding the revocation of the Bank Charter granted to the Bank of England
in the reign of William and Mary?

...[That this House calls upon His Majesty’s Government to revoke the Charter of the Bank of England whereby the right to issue money was passed to private interest in the reign of William and Mary, and to repeal all Acts of Parliament passed in support thereof since its granting, so as to take back for the benefit of the people the power which rightly belongs to them, whilst still empowering the Bank of England to continue to function in the capacity of a joint stock bank for legitimate banking as different from issue activities.]

Mr. Attlee: I can hold out no hope of a special opportunity being afforded for the discussion of the Motion standing in the name of my hon. Friend.

Mr. Stokes: Is it really because there is no time, or is it because the Government are obeying the dictates of influential people who do not want it?

Mr. Gallacher: Is it not time there was a discussion on the banks and the robbery they are carrying on?

Agriculture (Credit Facilities).

Mr. Craven-Ellis asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether consideration will be given to the formation of an agricultural discount bank whose chief business would be to make 80 per cent advances to farmers on the security of nine months commercial bill guaranteed by the Government to enable farmers to finance their crops, such bills to be discounted at a rate not exceeding 2 per cent.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture (Mr. T. Williams): I have been asked to reply. The answer is in the negative.

Mr. Craven-Ellis: May I ask why it is that agriculturists cannot get some assistance in carrying out the Government programme to provide more food? Is it not unfair to expect the joint stock banks to give further facilities, having regard to the decay which has taken place in this industry?

Mr. Williams: The proposal of my hon. Friend would involve a very large indirect subsidy to farmers’ credits, which at the moment is not necessary and has not been called for by the National Farmers’ Union.

Mr. Granville: Is the hon. Gentleman completely satisfied with the present system of extending credits to farmers?

Mr. De la Bèque: Is it not a fact that no real assistance is intended? Why not be honest about it?

The Russian Question
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LECTURES AND STUDIES

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

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

Mrs. B. M. Palmer,
35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.
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 interpretation of events.

The tendency of all this was to minimize racial differences—national differences in our modern European sense hardly existed. Notwithstanding the break-down of Roman travelling facilities there was a great deal of coming and going in the affairs of the Church. Indeed, taking Christendom as that heterogeneous and major portion of Europe under the influence of the Western Church, we have at this time the nearest, in fact, the only approach, to true "internationalism", as it is called, that has ever existed among men of differing races—that is, one founded on community of needs and objective.

Leaving out altogether the difficult and controversial question of the intellectual level of the age, there was within Christendom a common knowledge, in a common language, Latin, and a common inspiration,—the Christ-idea; and there was a community of social aims in the city communes, and of cultural expression in the building of churches to the worship of the one Christian God. This last must have been the foundation of a real technical free-masonry, in a literal sense, such as only scientists understand to-day.

It might be asked: If all the main impulses of Life, and of intellectual life in particular, were so universalized in Medieval Christendom, was the result not a tendency to stereotype existence? The answer to that not unreasonable question is in fact. It is true that in the departments of philosophy and scientific speculation the Middle Ages appear to our modern eyes academic and narrow, always remembering that a point of view is a very unstable thing. The age, like every other age, not excluding our own, was in reaction, and the mood of its earlier and somewhat desperate phase may be summed up very broadly in the words of St. Ambrose: "To discuss the nature and position of the earth does not help us in hopes of the life to come." It is enough to know what the Scripture says that "he hung up the earth upon nothing." That spirit leaned away from Reality on one side, but no more than did the 18th and 19th Century Rationalists on the other, when they in their turn reacted.

But apart from this lack of variety and adventure in the realms of material speculation, the conspicuous feature of the Medieval landscape was just exactly its variety and diversity. Its basis and impulse and objective were as unified and controlled, as organic, almost, as that of a flower garden; and its effect, its visible, tangible results were every bit as diversified and unsterotyped, and it may be added, as beautiful and satisfying to look at.

A great deal of sentimental nonsense, one way and another, has been written about Medievalism by those who persist in believing that the same result can be attained by different means, and under wholly different circumstances; but no one in possession of his faculties, looking at the survivals of this age in say, Chartres Cathedral, or such cities as Augsburg, or in the abbeys of Yorkshire and the English West Country villages could deny their almost mysteriously natural beauty.

It has frequently been the case that the only really reliable facts about a bygone age are aesthetic facts. If we include the Eastern Byzantine Empire within Christendom, as, in spite of dogmatic feuds, it must certainly be included, then judged by modern aesthetic standards, which are much less narrow and prejudiced than were those of the 19th and previous centuries, we are forced to admit that the architecture of this epoch with which we are dealing, stands on a level with that of Classical Greece, and far above anything comparable produced in the last four centuries. That is an historic fact that has to be accepted. The Christian church of St. Sophia, built by the Emperor Justinian in the 6th century ranks with the Parthenon in Athens as being the most beautiful building in the world. Wherever Byzantine and Norman and Early Gothic architecture is to be found, from Durham to Syracuse, or the Adriatic to Syria, you have recorded in stone, the tangible results of the impact of the Christ-Idea of Unity on the European, Gentile mind; and there are no works of Man more lovely anywhere.

Now, where in all this was the Christian Church? Unquestionably somewhere very near the centre. Notwithstanding the unhappy schisms between East and West, it can probably be said with truth that during the greater part of this period there really was a consistently Christian Church—that is, at the level of Christianity attained by the amalgamation of the Roman state and the Early Christian communities. The symbol of this amalgam in the West was the bishop of Rome; and steadily throughout these earlier centuries the power—the spiritual power—of the Pope as he came to be called, increased. Through social disorder and disaster to what at its political best could only be called turbulent truce, the Christian Church held firm to what it had of the Light, and gradually, without either arms, or sanctions other than moral, dominated and ultimately quelled the tumult. This is the historical fact, leaving out all controversial questions of aims or methods; and to be accepted along with that other fact of architectural achievement.

That there was obscurantism and superstition and a considerable degree of mental tyranny cannot be denied; these abuses, however, have always existed in society and in more or less close association with whatever has been the existing authority; it is only their form that changes. But it is not necessarily upholding either tyranny or superstition to suggest that civilization did actually, and considerably move forward in the Middle Ages. Not perhaps in the straight line of Truth—what age has?—but still forward, and in a special sense, when the legal and military co-ordination of Rome was replaced by the co-ordination of an idea, however roughly presented.

*The first instalment of Part VI of European Background appeared in The Social Crediter of August 17.
The above mentioned funds.

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

Signature ...........................................
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