

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER"

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND ART

No. 1674] NEW SERIES Vol. XXXV. No. 24. THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1924. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] **SIXPENCE**

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	277	CONTEMPORARY CRITICISM. Theories of Life and Art. I. By C. M. Grieve	284
THE SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT. Notes and Notices	280	THE THEATRE. Play Publication. By H. R. Barbor	285
"A + B" AGAIN. By C. H. Douglas	280	MUSIC. By Kaikhosru Sorabji	286
WILFRID BLUNT AND EGYPT.—V. Downing Street: Political Intrigues	281	LETTERS TO THE EDITOR. "The Gold Standard," Rene Charles Dickens: "Average Income," E. V. Chambers	287
VERSE: On the Ashes of Civilisation. By Josip Kosor	282	REVIEWS: Modern Australian Literature	287
RETROCESSION. By A. Newberry Choyce	286	PASTICHE. Truth in Advertising. By "Old and Crusted"	287
NOTES ON THE NEW PHILOSOPHY. By S. F. Meade	283		

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

"There is a crack in everything that God has made," said Emerson. Hypnosis is no exception to the rule, for, like the hedgehog, it has a soft belly. It must not be tilted. This reflection has arisen in part from Major Douglas's reference, in his article appearing elsewhere, to the prevailing "collective hypnosis" on the subject of finance, and to the necessary process of de-hypnotisation which is thereby indicated. But it has also arisen from an announcement in the *Financial News* of last week which we now quote:

The decision of the American Bankers' Convention to counteract the systematic attacks against banking represents a change in their policy in this respect, for hitherto bankers both in the United States and in other countries have regarded it as the best policy to ignore these attacks. Our Correspondent hopes that banks in other countries will follow the American example, as, in his view, the accusations, if left unanswered, are likely to influence those classes of the public which prefer to accept other people's opinion instead of forming their own."

The last five words of this message tempt us sorely, and if we should falter in the course of our further argument will our readers make allowances, picturing us as a terrier, hauled along in semi-sitting posture on the lead of duty, with nose turned round, sniffing back after that lightly buried humour which we ought to have scratched up, and which some other dog will now fetch out and carry home.

The significance of this announcement is important, not only to economists but (shall we say?) to psychologists, for it directly concerns the subject of hypnosis. Before we say anything ourselves thereon, let us refer to another announcement—this time not in a newspaper of last week, but in a book called "Brande and Taylor's 'Chemistry,'" printed in 1863, one of the authors of which, appropriately enough, was William Thomas Brande, "of Her Majesty's Mint." The subject of the announcement is crystallography, and the particular concern of the writers is with the behaviour of Sulphate of Soda (in these days popularly advertised for price-swelling

purposes as *Glauber's Salt*.) Let us hear these authorities:

This salt when dissolved at a boiling heat in the proportion of two parts by weight of crystals to one part by weight of boiling water, may be cooled to 60 degrees or below without depositing crystals, provided the vessels are kept at rest, or their mouths firmly secured by caoutchouc or bladder.

Upon agitating the liquid, or exposing it to air by cutting through the bladder, or by plunging into it a glass rod or a crystal of the salt, the sulphate immediately begins to crystallise, either from the surface or around the rod or crystal; and the whole speedily forms a crystalline mass.

We have preserved a solution of this kind, with the process of crystallisation thus suspended, for three years; and the ordinary mechanical causes above-mentioned brought about crystallization in the whole mass after this long period.

As these two patient and particular observers have long since fallen on sleep awaiting the agitation of the Last Trump in the sure and certain hope of a glorious recrystallization we can only nod to each other our recognition of their evidence, and make what use of it we may.

What have they shown us? They have defined hypnosis in the term "suspended crystallization." They have given us a picture of the resolution of an hypnosis. We have, it seems, the choice of three attacks on it; we can jolt the vessel containing it, we can let air in on it, we can dip something into it. Now we are in a position to realise the significance of the decision of the American Bankers' Convention. It is really a decision to cut through the bladder which has sealed up their mysterious solution for the symbolic three years. So long as it remains a solution they are able to call it a solution of everything of the most precious—even dissolved diamonds! But once let the air in, and the whole mystery is precipitated in those efflorescent monoclinic prisms which, however useful they may be in cases of gall-stones and liver disease, most obviously are not precious stones. But why should they unseal the vessel? The answer is that the tremors of revolt are shaking it, so that the feared crystallisation will happen in any case. The stamp of the cold foot of an unemployed

worker outside the Labour Exchange sends out vibration; so does the chink of broken glass when someone rifles a jeweller's window; the thud of the falling suicide—the motion of the Official Receiver's pen—the wails of the evicted—the threats of the underpaid—all these things thread their way through the minutest interstices of the bankers' laboratory and fling their impacts against the walls of their vessel. The potency of the law of "sound finance" depends upon silence—stillness. That is why the bankers have kept quiet. But there are others capable of producing a noise than they, and if noise be the danger, then when these others talk, the spell is doomed to break. It does not matter what sort of a noise it may be so long as its waves flow towards where the law lies in suspended crystallisation. In other words, all agitations now proceeding which involve questions of credit and currency are working together to precipitate the crystals, irrespective of whether they are intelligently conceived or not. And, more important still, all counter agitations, instead of deadening the vibration are sharpening it. So, by a divine irony, the American Bankers' Congress is now forced to contribute to the dissipation of the hypnosis which they—in common with the monopolists of credit everywhere—have guarded so well and so long.

It is not to be expected that this institution, which the *Financial News* says "has voted a substantial sum for the purpose of counteracting hostile propaganda against the banks," is going to risk a direct public challenge to the principles of the New Economics. It will confine its opposition to the less intelligently conceived forms of attack. Not only that, but even in the limited field of controversy where it will fight it is going to "strew on it herrings, paganda . . . has in the background . . . race hatred or class interests, and aims at convincing the masses of the population that banking is the root of all evil." Again, "certain industrial and commercial interests," the report says, "are endeavouring to make banking the scapegoat . . . so as to free themselves from their own share in the responsibility" for the defects in the economic system. "Yet the attacks against banking from industrial quarters have another object. They are resentful that the banks are in a position to control the sources of credit, and they resent being dependent upon banks for the satisfaction of their credit requirements." After thus imputing obliquity of motive to their enemies the banks will develop the informative side of their defence. Under the heading "Rôle of Banks," the following passage appears in the report (the italics are ours):—

The accusations according to which banks restrict credits in an arbitrary manner, and thus do harm to the country's trade, are based on the misinterpretation of the rôle that banks play in economic life. Their part is far more important than that of a mere intermediary between the owners of savings and those requiring loans; it is their task to prevent over-production or excessive speculation in every branch of commerce and industry. In doing so, they follow their own interest, which is to avoid losses, but at the same time they render an invaluable service to the community as a whole, through reducing the extent of crises as far as it is humanly possible. Dealing with a great number of firms and with a great number of branches of business, they are in a position to form a clearer view on the general situation than any of their individual customers, who may not understand the motives which lead to the restriction of credit, and are ready to blame the banks for doing so.

Let us take an example. A manufacturer of, say, gramophones, whose enterprise has been prosperous for the last few years, cannot understand why it is that suddenly his banks become reluctant to grant him credit, notwithstanding the favourable position of his business. He feels that he is being treated unfairly on the part of the banks, and suspects malevolence. Yet the reason which led the banks to restrict credit to him, as well as to others in the

same branch, is that they find the expansion of the particular trade is rather beyond the normal, and believe that it may sooner or later lead to a crisis. If the expansion is stopped in good time the crisis may be averted, or at least its dimensions would be smaller. On the other hand, if the credit demand of the manufacturers were met to its full extent, the crisis might not occur till later, but then it would assume greater dimensions, and cause heavy losses to banks.

It is an error to believe that banks restrict credit unless it is absolutely necessary to do so. Their business is to lend the maximum amount that can be lent safely. Moreover, it is only with great reluctance that they disappoint their customers. So long as they do not see any genuine reason for a restriction, they will certainly satisfy every sound credit demand within the limits of their means.

We need hardly point out that if the above quotations even approximately foreshadow the form and direction which the bankers' propaganda will take, there will be developments on a scale that can only be imperfectly realised. The "industrialists" and the banks have been inseparable allies during all the long period of "capitalist" development, and if they are now to be thrown into a sort of civil war, a whole number of things may happen. We cannot imagine that the industrialists are so impoverished of ideas not to raise the retort: "Since the monopolisation of credit gives to the banks, by their own admission, control of economic policy, who but the banks should shoulder responsibility for defects in the system? We can only endorse the hope of the *Financial News's* correspondent that "the example of the American bankers will be followed by banks in other countries." If the financial hedgehog is going to roll over on its erstwhile companions, there are quite a number of terriers ready to turn it into something like a rifled chestnut pod.

It was recently stated in the *Observer* that the third census of production is to be taken by the Board of Trade next year in respect of the present year. Among other particulars of the kind of information that will be asked for, we select the following (our italics):—

Secondly persons required to make returns will have to state in one sum the value of all materials, including fuel, used in the production of their output; and also, separately, the amount paid to other firms for work given out to them, the value of which is included in the value of the output of the firm giving out the work. The object of these two requirements is to enable the census office to avoid duplication, and so to obtain particulars concerning the net value of production. After deducting from the value of the gross output the cost of all materials used and the amount paid for work given out, the balance represents the fund out of which provision has to be made for wages, profits, depreciation, rent, rates, taxes, and all similar charges.

The discerning will see in this announcement and the explanation accompanying it a little snap-shot of old economists wiring up their house for the New Economic current. In fact, whether the Social Credit theorem be explicitly affirmed or denied, there are indications in more than one direction that the apparatus of its technique is being assembled for some purpose or other. Authorities may decry it, or they may ignore it, but nevertheless circumstances are bending them into the attitude of Tennyson's young lady who, swearing she would ne'er consent—house-hunted. If this goes on we shall be tempted to revise our superstition as to the tyranny of the sponsors of the old economics, and perhaps we shall establish the fact that their cruelty is only coyness—that while defying celibacy they are busily knitting babies' vests. These midwives' tales apart, moreover, we recommend the last few lines of the above paragraph to the attention of the opponents of the

"A + B" theorem. Will they notice that the expenditure of firms in the purchase of supplies (both of goods and services) from other firms are definitely excluded by the census experts from the fund out of which profits and wages are to come. How is this? Have we not been told that these purchases represent wages and profits just as much as do the direct distribution of these items by the purchasing firm to its own shareholders and employees. Why have they, then, been ruled out of consideration? Someone ought to ask a question in the House about it; for if the matter is not cleared up the conclusions from the census figures may contain an enormous margin of error. Again, what is this "net value of production," in which, apparently, the "amounts paid to other firms for work given out to them" is not to be included? Really somebody ought to stir himself or we shall all be in the suave clasp of the Just Price before we know what is happening.

We have received a pamphlet issued by the Executive of the British Empire Fascisti, whose headquarters are at 13 Glenhurst-avenue, Highgate-road, N.W.5. In a foreword the Executive state that they are "ardent admirers of Signor Mussolini and intend following his example." The rest of the pamphlet tells "What the B.E.F. Stands For." Full Protection with Empire Preference; drastic cuts in the salaries of higher paid officials, Civil Service, Army, and Navy; holders of War Stock to accept 1 per cent. interest instead of the present 4 or 5 per cent.; the growing of £200,000,000 more food-stuffs in these islands ("every square foot of soil would be utilised"); every employee to become a "shareholder and partner (minor) in whatever firm he serves"; an attempt to simplify taxation by "one tax on a rising scale on net profit or income earned for the current year." On foreign policy the object of the B.E.F. is "first of all to get our own house in order." "We have no faith ourselves in the League of Nations when America refuses to come in. Rather we favour, if possible, an alliance with the United States." They are not "out for revolution or broken heads; such measures are unnecessary in Great Britain," but they intend to "force our way by weight of numbers," so that "when the time comes, as it will shortly, owing to the incapability of present Governments to reduce taxation, cheapen living, cure unemployment, and improve conditions for the mass of the population; then, as the strongest driving force in the country, we shall be asked to take over control." Women, as well as men, may join. Minimum age, sixteen. "Ex-Service men will start in the Fascisti Battalions at their rank held in the war. Each battalion will be under the control of the District Headquarters, and these in turn under the County, and these under the Headquarters in London." Lastly, the Executive "will be pleased to receive any favourable or critical remarks, suggestions, and improvements." It is because of this last sentence that we have given an extended summary of the pamphlet; and the headquarters address of the B.E.F., which, being in the formative state of partial fluidity, and not yet a concrete institution, is to that extent susceptible of benefiting from the advice that anyone may desire to offer it on the several points of its preliminary programme. Fundamentally, it does not seem to stand for a policy, so far, which excludes the application of the New Economic principles. In fact, so far as it (1) emphasises the fact that the duty of the British people is first of all to themselves, (2) develops the idea of all workers becoming shareholders, (3) presses for a large and intensive agricultural policy, and (4) advocates the simplification of taxation in the direction outlined, it deserves support. And even if, as it says, its formation will be "on Army lines," at least, it is not on financial lines. Its programme is conspicuously

innocent of reference to (a) stabilising other people's currencies, and (b) pushing British exports on to them. The one specific object of intensive production it mentions is something to eat as well as to sell. That is all to the good. The defects in its programme are of minor importance, and their removal would not spoil it. The executive could usefully reconsider two of them—(1) the "drastic cuts" in salaries, which are not necessary for its purpose, and (2) the idea that the development of our internal resources necessarily depends upon "full Protection." If it gives a little time to the investigation of the price-system and its relation to credit, it may come to appreciate the Social Credit device by which foreign dumping can be turned to the enrichment of the British people instead of to their impoverishment. And the same course of study will incidentally reveal the possibility of increasing all incomes without cutting any of them.

In view of our Note a week or two ago on the subject of the selection of Cabinets by the "invisible Government" we are intrigued to stumble over the following passage on the threshold of the Labour Party's Annual Report at Queen's hall this week. Here it is:—

"Last year, when the President, in the course of his address to the Annual Conference, referred to our Party as being 'on the threshold of power,' our opponents commented upon the presumption of the prediction, and our friends wondered somewhat at its optimism. However, by a strange mis-calculation of one of the opposing political Parties, we found ourselves fighting at the polls long before we expected the event—

The Executive evidently seem to believe that nothing happened to force this "miscalculation" on Mr. Baldwin—

"—while, by the design of the other section of our opponents, we quite as unexpectedly found ourselves 'over the threshold,' and we now meet our Conference with a Labour Cabinet in the seat of Government for the first time in British history"

—or to suggest this "design" to Mr. Asquith. "Did not expect," "miscalculation," "found ourselves"—"quite as unexpectedly," "design," "found ourselves"—so flows the chant of the catspaws in honour of the god, and wonder at the act of the god—in the machine. Whether the Executive as a whole are deceived we do not know, but some of them are probably aware of earlier luncheon parties than Leatherhead. Looking back, how suitable it was for all interests concerned that after a war to make the world safe for democracy the new predatory barque of organised finance should be christened with beer instead of champagne. They lay deep plans, these financiers. Labour has "found itself" where they wanted it; and since Mr. Snowden is their Minister, Labour will find that the only comfortable seat of Government in this refractory world is the exact spot where it "finds itself." Long views, these financiers take. Why, Mr. MacDonald was measured for the Premiership when he went to India. There is no costume in the universe but there is an Isaacs and a tape measure to fashion it.

Sir George Paish, Mr. Henry Bell, Dr. Dernburg, and Mr. F. W. Hirst, all spoke at the three days' conference at Caxton Hall of the International Committee to promote universal Free Trade. "If trade barriers were removed," he said, "the volume of world trade could be doubled within ten years." Conversely, we suppose, if every county in England erected a tariff wall, the volume of our internal trade would be halved in the same time. We should like to see the theory worked out before we try to believe it. And our scepticism is not mitigated by Sir George's next remark: "If the existing policy is maintained the nations will never be able to pay their international debts," but we feel a little more at home with the whole subject. Mr. Bell said that he

"did not think that among the bankers of London of any eminence he could discover one who was not a Free Trader, and he had found that even bankers from Protectionist countries were almost exclusively Free Traders." This we can believe without any difficulty. We reflect upon the tragedy of poor Mr. Baldwin. He was going to start a boom in trade with a large issue of credit. But that was "inflation." The bankers would not have it. He then wanted to protect our meagre trade against competition by fiscal means. But that was "Protection." The bankers would not have it.

The Social Credit Movement

NOTES AND NOTICES.

Forthcoming Meetings.

The next meeting of the London Area Committee will be held at the office of THE NEW AGE, on Thursday, October 16, at 7 p.m. It will be open to anyone to attend who is interested in the movement. The conveners will be pleased to see as many as possible on that evening at Slater's Restaurant, 55, High Holborn, from 6 p.m. onwards, at the far end of the room as before.

Mr. Arthur Kitson will deliver a "lunch-hour" address at Devonshire House, 136, Bishopsgate, E.C.2, on Monday next, October 13, at 1.20. It will be entitled "The Science of Plenty." If any readers of THE NEW AGE can go to hear Mr. Kitson they will find it worth while.

London Area Committee.

The meeting held last Thursday was well attended. The main business was to discuss Mr. Judges' proposals respecting the gathering of information from the Press by members of the Movement and its distribution to persons willing to collate and index it. The preliminary work of planning the analysis of subject matter for allocation to the "indexers" was undertaken by one of the members, and his scheme will be considered at the next meeting on October 16.

"A + B" Again.

By C. H. Douglas.

One of the many things of which I have learnt in the period which has elapsed since, unrequested, I added the business of social engineering to the more orthodox technique of that profession, is the immense and almost unsuspected power of hypnotism, or if you prefer the term, suggestion, in the modern world. Now a hypnotised person has two marked characteristics. The first of these being that he believes something which is not true and, believing it, acts as if it were true, and so does everything possible to make it true. And the second characteristic is that he is very nearly impervious to either statements, arguments, or logic, which conflict with his subconscious belief. The process of de-hypnotising such a person very largely consists in raising the belief which he holds out of the region of the sub-conscious into that of the conscious, in which latter plane it becomes, for the first time, amenable to his waking judgment.

A remarkable instance of this hypnotism, which is so general that it may almost be said to be collective, is in connection with the subject of finance. Not only do most people not question the financial system at all, but a very large number of persons who are not really "wicked financiers," are made actively uncomfortable by any suggestion that there could be anything wrong with the financial system, and a still larger number of persons have a blind spot in connection with any demonstration of such defects, no matter how apparently glaring, to a de-hypnotised person, those defects may be. This is

particularly so in the case of what has come to be called the A + B theorem, partly because it is of the core of the financial hypnosis.

Five years ago, when this theorem was first made public, it took three months to make one intellectual convert to it, Mr. Orage. He was a very valuable convert, and, with his aid, the rate of conversion rose fairly rapidly, but the astounding inability on the part of many people who were neither dull nor consciously antagonistic, to grasp its meaning, was a revelation in practical psychology. In the last two or three years several books have been written by authors entirely unconnected with the Social Credit Movement, both in this country and in America, proving the same theorem by different methods of attack, and there is no doubt whatever that the collective hypnosis, strongest perhaps amongst bankers and orthodox economists, is showing very definite signs of dissipation.

But there is also no doubt that it is still extraordinarily difficult, to many people, to grasp the proposition which is involved, by *intellectual* methods, although considerable numbers find it easy enough by intuitional, and to a less extent, by mathematical processes. For this reason the following explanation from a somewhat different angle may be helpful.

In the production of any articles by modern industry there may be said to be three factors: finance, real capital, and labour. To be clear about this, consider what is actually employed in a modern factory. There is money for wages, salaries and outgoings, that is finance; there are tools, buildings, and materials, the latter being practically always semi-manufactures, and these are collectively real capital; and there is labour both manual, technical and administrative. Before going any further, let the reader be quite sure that he is in firm possession of the idea that while labour and real capital are expressible in physical units, physical units are not used in finance, but financial units are used. Now imagine the factory under consideration to be fully organised and in possession of all the necessary tools, material and labour requisite for physical production, and to have a department which corresponds in the method of its workings with the technique of a modern bank. That is to say, imagine it to be able to create a financial credit. The factory now starts working, and its cost accountants allocate wages and salaries to the cost of the product, sums to depreciation, etc., and so on. Indisputably the cost of the product, and therefore the minimum price, will be represented by the total of the credit created *plus all the sums charged against the product for use of tools, etc.*, and production will go on until this credit is exhausted. Therefore, the minimum price, without profit, of the production would be equal to the amount of the credit created, plus overhead charges. Note particularly that these "overhead charges" are simply *figures* representing money to be recovered in prices in the future. Suppose this transaction to take place on the desert island, which is so convenient for experiments of this kind; clearly by orthodox financial methods, the whole of this credit has to be repaid, so we will imagine that when the credit is exhausted production stops and consumption begins. The stream of credit begins to flow back from the public to the banking department of the factory through the agency of prices. At once one of two things happens; either the departments connected with overhead charges intercept a portion of the stream of returning "money" and immobilise it in either a financial or physical form (new machines, etc.) in their respective departments to represent the sums they have included in cost, in which case the loan could not possibly be repaid in full; or else the loan being a first charge, it *is* repaid in full, in which case the whole of the product cannot possibly be sold, since when prices equal to the original credit have been

paid, the extant credit would be nil, and the public would have no money.

Probably in the modern world both of these situations exist at the same time. It should be particularly noted that it is a matter of no importance to this argument that the overhead charges do actually represent machinery which has been worn out, etc., etc. The difficulty is an arithmetical difficulty, not an ethical difficulty. This situation is clearly not affected by separating the finance of the process into a separate business, nor is it affected in principle by assuming that the factory in question has a stock of savings which it disburses and recovers in the manner outlined for the loan provided by the bank.

There *is*, however, a very marked difference introduced into the situation by the separation of the banking process from the business which it finances, which difference is quite additional and separate to the process we have just been considering; and this difference, no doubt, has a great deal to do with the progress towards the breakdown of the financial system as a whole, which is now obvious.

When the old-fashioned business financed itself, the period during which its credits were outstanding was co-terminous with the time that it took to make and sell its goods. With the increasing sub-division and complexity of industrial processes the average period necessary to convert raw material into a finished product, and to dispose of it, has very considerably increased. Iron ore mined this year will probably appear as sewing machines three or four years hence, and the sewing machines will be paid for by the public three or four months after that. But probably half a dozen stages at least of this conversion process have been financed by selling trade bills, maturing in ninety days, and the maturity of every one of these bills destroys the amount of purchasing-power which is the equivalent of the costs and profits incurred during the period. To put the matter another way, there is no relation at all between the extant amount of purchasing-power and the extant price of goods. A moment's consideration of the effect which would be produced by the whole population of this country trying to sell its possessions at once, or even a consideration of the enormous disparity between the secondhand price of a perfectly good article and its trade price ought to be sufficient to convince anyone that the financial credit which attaches, even to visible goods, is not, to a considerable extent, in the hands of individuals.

The key to this lies, without a shadow of a doubt, in the fact that a workable money or credit system must be a double entry system, in which every entry on the production side has an equivalent credit on the consumer's side, which credit remains available and equivalent up to the actual moment of its cancellation by the actual transfer of goods. Since it is of the very essence of the credit system ("Faith—credit—is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen") that production will not take place except in the reasonably sure anticipation of a ready market, it seems perfectly clear that the trouble arises from the fact that *the consumer gets his credit from the producer instead of the producer getting his credit from the consumer*. In other words, if the producer knew that the power of rendering credit visible, which is now a monopoly of the banks, were resident in the consumer, he would take orders for his product up to the limit of his capacity from the consumer with the same readiness that he would now take them from, let us say the Midland Bank. I have never heard of any manufacturer refusing an order, payment for which was guaranteed by one of the large banks.

Wilfrid Blunt and Egypt.*

V.

DOWNING STREET.

By 1882 the enthusiasm for Liberty which had carried the elections of 1880 had completely cooled. Lord Hartington and the Whig leaders were all for 'strong measures' in Ireland and Egypt, and Gladstone had only Harcourt and Bright. Granville did not even trouble to read the despatches, and Dilke, who had assumed Gambetta's policy, and was working with Colvin and Co. to force intervention, had things his own way at the F.O. Gladstone's secretary, Edward Hamilton, was sure that armed intervention was an 'impossibility'; but Algernon Bourke, Blunt's cousin, who was the political intermediary for *The Times*, and intimate with the Rothschilds, had a "low opinion of Mr. G.'s ability to deal with a case in which the money interests were so largely concerned."

On March 10 Blunt went to the F.O., but Dilke, instead of listening to what he had to say, "poured out a string of complaints," telling him that 'Arabi had spent half a million sterling on the army since coming into office.' This was actually the *annual* appropriation. Granville declared that the Chamber must give up its claim to vote the Budget, and he had 'certain knowledge that Arabi had been bought by Ismail: a conviction which rested on a second-hand account of a boast of the ex-Khedive. From the F.O. Blunt went to Morley, but he "believed implicitly in Colvin, and his hope of a political career lay in the patronage of Dilke and Chamberlain." Walter, of *The Times*, promised to send a special correspondent to Cairo, but his manager would not go to the expense, being "quite satisfied with the kind of news Scott sent. English people had only two interests in Egypt—the Suez Canal and their bonds, if they had any, and Scott's news on these two matters was what they wanted; beyond this they did not care in any special way about the truth"; but they would be glad to print letters which did not have to be paid for. Allen of the *Anti-Slave Trade*, was indignant at the Nationalists' policy of suppressing slavery: 'they had no business to, for, if they did, what would become of the society?'

On the 12th came the news of de Bliquière's resignation, and Colvin's withdrawal was in the balance, but "he was too strongly supported by Dilke." The next day Blunt saw Goschen, who "affected much sympathy, and was particularly anxious to impress on me that he was not taking a financial view—'Whatever they do will be on general grounds of policy, not in the interests of the Bondholders.'" The same day there was a violent article in the *Pall Mall*, and after a talk with Sir Garnet Wolseley, Blunt delivered Arabi's complaints in a letter to Granville, exposing the incompetence of Colvin and Malet, and also sent a copy to Gladstone.

On the 20th Rivers Wilson boasted that he had helped to draw up a new Note at the F.O., but this was apparently cancelled, and on the 22nd Blunt managed to get an interview with Gladstone, who was encouraging, but did not see what he could do about Colvin and Malet. 'They are esteemed public servants, and have received honours for their work in Egypt.' The G.O.M. legend was really as great a fraud as Liberal principles: by the time he was thirty he had learnt to look on the Vote of the House as the supreme criterion of right and wrong in public things, so that his own personal impulses of good had assumed

* "Secret History of the English Occupation of Egypt," by Wilfrid Scawen Blunt.

1. Following a complacent report to the Press of his suggestion to shoot Arabi, Colvin, instead of being recalled, was knighted.

the character of tastes which he would like to indulge but was restrained from by a higher duty, that of securing a Parliamentary majority. As yet, however, Blunt did not realise this, and he begged the Nationalists to wait for a Commission he had proposed under Lord De la Warr; Granville dawdled with it, but appointments went astray on several important occasions. On the 26th Blunt received through Bourke a note from "a person in a very responsible position"—"22nd, I am very anxious that Mr. Wilfrid Blunt should meet and see Natty Rothschild, whose Egyptian interests require no explanation. . . . To bring them to an intelligent understanding would be a real service. . . . I am desired to ask if you could bring Mr. Blunt to lunch at New Court on the 27th. Do if you possibly can. It will be useful in many ways." Unfortunately 'Natty' was called abroad that morning, but he left a request for Mr. Blunt to 'write him his views.' W. B. did so, "recommending financiers who had interests in Egypt to accept the revolution, and predicting that they would lose more by war." This was afterwards "resented by Rothschild as a false prophecy."

POLITICAL INTRIGUES.

By an unfortunate coincidence, the crisis in Egypt occurred during the April recess, and Gladstone's defeat by the Whigs over Ireland. From Naples the ex-Khedive had conspired with the Circassian officers to destroy the Ministry and the chiefs of the army, but the scheme was disclosed and the officers sentenced to banishment. Malet, now entirely under the influence of Colvin, took their side, and Scott sent a story to *The Times* of Arabi torturing the prisoners. The Khedive, by Malet's advice and contrary to the Constitution, refused to sign their sentences, and the Chamber decided to depose him. The Rothschilds and Bismarek tried to get the Sultan to intervene, but this was resisted by the French and English, and the Foreign Office proposed instead of the Commission to send a British, a French, and a Turkish general to 'restore discipline in the army.' Morley refused to print an important letter on the Circassian plot, as 'nobody cares about Egypt.' Forster had just resigned the Irish Secretaryship, and Hartington, after the assassination of his brother, demanded coercion in Ireland, and Gladstone gave way over Egypt as well. On May 13 the Press announced that the Chamber had joined Tewfik against the Ministry, though actually the Khedive had only a minority with him. An Anglo-French fleet was sent to Alexandria, it being "one of Granville's maxims that a threat was as good as a blow," and he repeated in the House the false statements that the Delegates and the whole of Egypt were behind the Khedive, and promised a repetition of the Joint Note. Furious at this exhibition of Liberalism, Blunt telegraphed to Arabi, Sultan, the Sheykh el Islam, and others that Annexation would follow disagreement, and they all replied that the differences were settled. Sultan's telegram he had printed in *The Times*, but in the next morning's Press Reuter stated that Sultan and the Sheykh "had recanted their telegrams as having been written under military intimidation." Sultan did this under Malet's threats of the fleet and promises as to the Chamber's Rights. Blunt wrote to Gladstone emphasising how unreliable was the information sent from Egypt, but on Hamilton's assurance that the fleet was only going for the security of British subjects, that no troops would be landed, and that a Commission would be sent out, he stopped

publication in *The Times*. This was a mistake, as the Press wrote of Blunt as 'an incendiary' and his exposure of its lies might have averted Malet's ultimatum of the 25th, demanding Arabi's retirement.

On the 27th the Ministry resigned, but the next day there was a great popular demonstration, and the French, German, and Austrian Consuls demanded that Arabi should be re-appointed War Minister. Tewfik had to give way, and on the 30th the *Pall Mall* declared that 'the time has at last come for immediate action. The 12,000 loyal Bedouins reported to be encamped around the Khedive have vanished into thin air.'

Blunt decided to go out and help the Nationalists, but Hamilton 'implored' him not to, as his "connection with Gladstone would be misunderstood and make a terrible row." Mr. G. was staying with Rosebery, who had just told Blunt: 'I have no views on Egypt but those of a bondholder'—"Rosebery was being pushed forward by the Rothschilds to do their political work for them, though it was said that he got rid of his Egyptian stock before taking office." On June 1 Gladstone, while repeating that no troops would be landed, asserted that Arabi intended to depose Tewfik and proclaim Halim Khedive, a rumour reported by Malet as being 'hardly believed by the Khedive.' G. B.

On the Ashes of Civilisation.

By Josip Kosor.

On the ashes of civilisation
I built an empire of mightiest solitudes,
Only free spirits populate the blue Space,
And each of them a perfect man.
They speak the language of Eternity:
They keep deep silence
In vain stars, aurora and fate implore them to speak,
They hold great Truth in universal Silence.
With naked breast and clear, proud forehead
They await Aurora's flaming birth of the new
Apocalypse,
While radiant girdles of suns and stars
Encircle their strong bodies,
Exalting them as heroes of Light!
Retired into themselves
They are continually aware,
With their delicate senses feeling endlessly,
How on the face and in the bowels of earth and
oceans,
Essences and colours ferment, ripen
And mellow to fruit, pearls, gold and diamonds.
And with visionary eyes they follow
The sun in its endless flaming journey
Far away upon the azure green lines of oceans
Unto its purple lair

And only now and then,
Returning from their tilling and sowing
Of the eternal corn,
The mightiest spirit of them,
Ascends his pedestal
And moving his head dismally
Tells shuddering legends
Of an old hypocritical buried faith,
Whilst their heads sink ever deeper,
As though bowed with the weight
Of strange crimes.
And stars, aurora and fate
Circle ever more passionately in vain
Over their sunken heads
Imploring them to speak.
In the eternal silence
They keep the great Truth!

2. The falseness of this was shown by Malet's despatch: 'My French colleagues and I think the political advantage of the arrival of a combined squadron at Alexandria so great as to override in consideration the danger it might possibly cause to residents in Cairo.' (M. John Ninet, a Swiss, who fought with Arabi, asked what would be thought if 'the Catholic powers were to send a fleet to pacify Ireland.')

Notes on the New Philosophy.

By S. F. Meade.

Philosophy is concerned with a conception of the nature of reality. What wise conception of the nature of reality have the members of the Social-credit Movement in common, which, referring to "The Movement" as an entity, we may call "Its Philosophy"?

There is no great *explicit* philosophy in our Social-credit Movement; all its activities—the brilliant Noes of the Week which so dexterously criticise a decaying institution and push in the idea of a new one—co-ordination, propaganda, etc.—are (and quite rightly are) so many strategic moves in order to get social-credit proposals known and accepted.

If the *explicit* philosophy of the Movement must be named, we might call it "opportunism," or "altruism," or choose another "ism" which suits a particular move, or which suits a particular idea of the Movement such as "libertarianism." Or if we isolate various ideas of the social-credit proposals we find that "individualism," "socialism," "communism," "idealism," "realism," "materialism," etc., fit one or other of the ideas

But the *implicit* philosophy of the Movement is the conception of the nature of reality which can be deduced from Major Douglas's books and articles, and this conception is no more and no less than *CREATIVENESS*, and is a New Philosophy.

If we wish to express "economic freedom," or any other idea of the social-credit proposals, we must first make an abstract of the fundamental philosophy out of which, and only out of which, particular ideas arise.

The New Philosophy is based on Relativity. Relativity is not a new idea, but its conception as being the nature of the frame-work of the universe is a new idea developed by Einstein. Nothing changes the nature of "ideas" in general more than a principle of relativity. For instance, no standard measure of space or time changes our *idea* of space and time. This is reflected in the New Economics, where we find that no standard of money value changes our idea of money.

"Economic freedom" or "liberation" is an effect of finding and revaluing a relationship which corresponds to reality. Consumer-interests relate the group called "capital" to the group called "labour," and to the comprehensive group called the "community." Thus we are able to conceive "willing co-operation." The result of this relationship is social-credit. Social-credit is related to, partly derived from, Communal Inheritance.

The administrators of social-credit may be called "financiers," but if their office and function are modified our idea of a financier, *quâ* financier, is changed. A lot of ideas are changed by applied relativity. For instance, "obedience," which must arise out of willing co-operation, is still "obedience," but when the undue penalties attached to declining or being declined as co-operators become non-existent, the nature of that obedience has changed.

In short, Relativity suggests an inducement *viâ* a relationship which corresponds to reality.

In "non-relativity" philosophies "liberation" is an effect of cutting free from something conceived as "lower"—less valuable. Financiers are seeking and finding "liberation" in the sense of freeing their activities from Government restrictions. This is typical "liberation without licence." The New Economics have penetrated into the Labour Party and elsewhere, but the New Philosophy, from which the conditions of social-credit proceed, has not penetrated into the Labour Party. Non-relativity is a conception which does not correspond to reality; something happens to upset calculations even (often especially)

when coercion is employed to impose the false conception.

"Liberation" in the sense of cutting free from financiers (on our part) is not an idea which arises out of the New Philosophy, but is an idea which arises out of the dilemma engendered by the clash of two opposing philosophies, i.e., the New Philosophy versus the "non-relativity" philosophy upon which the financial system and a lot of other institutions are based.

All our activities are concentrated on the dilemma, but we need not let the dilemma enter into our philosophy. If we tinge the dilemma with the complexion of a plot we must take care that our doing so does not call forth a moral judgment which may obscure discrimination and lead us into positions in which we contradict the validity of our philosophy. We are sure to find ourselves arguing in a circle and contradicting our fundamental theorem unless we isolate the dilemma from our philosophy. The dilemma when narrowed down is a choice of instituting social credit proposals or accepting catastrophe. We may confine our efforts to economics so long as we realise that the proposals we support arise from a particular philosophy.

It would be superficial to say that civilisations have perished because they did not distribute social credit. No civilisation that we know of was founded on a philosophy of Relativity out of which social credit could flourish, but lots of philosophies have fumbled about for Relativity. We are unique in having at a critical moment a principle of Relativity and a New Philosophy. Human institutions have always been founded on a philosophy. If we became a colony of monkeys with a mechanistic view of the universe, that is a philosophy of Fatalism which may have an optimistic or a pessimistic bias. Philosophy, whether it be a conception or a misconception of the nature of reality, is a turning point between the inorganic and animal world on the one hand and the human world on the other. The New Philosophy is in outline a philosophy of man and the universe, or, in other words, Relativity makes relations which invite other relations.

Einstein's theory of Relativity is "knowledge of structural form, and not knowledge of content. All through the physical world runs that unknown content, which must surely be the stuff of our consciousness." (Eddington). Major Douglas makes most striking use of all the factors of the financial and industrial system. We find the relative structural form and a dynamic view of the growing contents. Therefore the philosophic conception of the New Economics is "productiveness."

The New Philosophy, however, does not stop at economic productiveness, but leads us on to the Aristotelian idea of the financial and industrial system existing in order to give the community leisure to develop ideals. We must, therefore, carry on the idea of "productiveness," to "creativity" as being the nature of reality. And we have arrived at the following abstract of the philosophy:—

"The nature of reality is creativeness, which is seen to mean abundant life, and is therefore 'good.'"

This is an affirmative conception. We are not asked to deplore our imperfections (negative) nor to assert our superiority (positive), but to affirm our creativeness, to exert our individual enterprise, to recognise our communal nature and inheritance, and to distribute its social credit.

This is a *yea-saying* to economic life. This New Philosophy need merely to economic life. This New Philosophy need not disturb our private philosophy. It merely asserts that if our particular philosophy corresponds to reality, that "reality" is by nature creative. Nor need the New Philosophy disturb a preconceived idea of "reality." There may be different degrees of "reality," as Lord Haldane seems to suggest—there are certainly different forms of

"creativity." There may be an absolute "reality"—but the absolute of the New Philosophy is "creativity."

A scientific principle which Major Douglas illustrates by saying a manufacturer converts raw material into the finished article and confers a use-value on it, is "Nihil ex nihilo." The meaning of this principle is often missed by artists. There is a difference between assuming the attributes of the creator or of assigning an attitude to the created, and of affirming creativity. This affirmation is a first step, if not the last word, to the relativity of the New Philosophy.

Relativity is the key to most of the problems and many of the secrets of the world. It is like using two eyes instead of one, and adds a dimension—the familiar third dimension—to our mind's eye. Einstein has given us the key. Major Douglas has shown us how to use it.

Contemporary Criticism.

By C. M. Grieve.

THEORIES OF LIFE AND ART.—I.

These three books* are well worth reading in conjunction for the cross-lights they throw upon each other, and upon some of the most important problems in life and letters. According to the Shorter Catechism the chief end of man is to glorify God and to enjoy him for ever. Mr. Lindsay's principal thesis—developed in a fine headlong have-at-you fashion with a series of genuine *cris-de-cœur* for undertones and a plethora of subordinate theses which range from the sublime to the ridiculous—is that it is physically and psychically impossible for the vast majority of mankind to do anything of the sort, and that Nietzsche, rightly recognising that "man must be surpassed," erred in seeking for his superman in the wrong direction—that he mistook the road of man's destiny, since "his search did not lead him to the one enduring element of man's life—which is creative effort—but to that which is least durable—the created state." Nietzsche, he says,

"For the first time affirmed the aristocracy of Beauty, gaiety, Uprightness; 'all that goes on light feet.' To the tottering fabric of Christianity he delivered a gigantic blow, from which there is no recovery for that debased creed. It matters nothing that the shell of that fabric remains, or that the common mind still wears its trappings. The common mind has always worn the trappings of Christianity, thousands of years before it tagged the name of an obscure Jew to its resentment against all efforts to rise above the level of its dictum that all men are equal in the sight of God. . . . Again let it be said that there can be nothing permanent to life that is built on the service of Existence. To govern a multitude well does not mean that either the ruler or the ruled become higher men; it only means that they lead a better ordered existence. . . . Universal education, universal culture—all this talk is idle. One thing alone in existence is manifest, permanent, indestructible, and that is the individual effort to create thought and beauty. This passion to create something finer than the creator himself is the one permanent and enduring element in man, and since creative effort is the rarest, most difficult achievement, it remains the greatest stimulus to high development, and this development is Life."

Only a handful of men—creative artists—have been of any consequence. He repudiates the idea that their purpose is to serve the others—"to bring each generation of mankind to a sense of the serious things of life, so that it, too, may die aimlessly, endlessly"—as an effort out of all proportion to the

result?; and he answers the angry protest of the common mind—"What, common minds by the million, and this handful of writers and artists to claim precedence—execration on such vile egotism!"—by arguing that "all that rises above the level implies effort for those who remain below, and the animal in man wishes most of all to feed himself and to relax."

But he shifts his feet in a disconcerting fashion when he asks why such a name as that of Cervantes conjures up in our minds a sense of greatness, and answers: "Before he wrote *Don Quixote*, the normal Earth-Savage, that is, the 'Good and Just' of that period and locality were burning human beings alive at the rate of some 30,000 a year; Cervantes wrote *Don Quixote*, and these burnings ceased." If that were true, his argument would fall to the ground—for it would show that Civilisation was a product of Art, and the common mind could justifiably claim that that was Art's real purpose. Mr. Lindsay's case is good; but most of his examples are wrong—he cites the very people (Shakespeare, Burns, Pepys, Boswell) whom the mob appreciate: not those "artists for artists" who can never have any existence for, or any influence upon, the *canaille*. An occasional hysteria of style—and the mere fact that he has written a book of this sort, which, stimulating reading though it makes, is not art—shows that Mr. Lindsay is not a great enough artist to consistently practise according to his own precepts; which is not surprising in the present state of affairs. Of more than Nietzsche it can be said: "You say Nietzsche corrupted the German people. I reply that the Germans corrupted Nietzsche." Would he had held to the essence of his case:—

"Since the baser mind has never hesitated to claim immortality for itself, how can the higher mind join issue? The pride of intellect alone must disdain immortality shared by hodmen and millionaires. But might not intellect pause to ask if hodmen and millionaires will be permitted to share the immortality of intellect. The immortality, be it understood, for even hodmen and millionaires contain an inextinguishable spark of life, a mere ember, perhaps, as undeveloped as any other protoplasm, but nevertheless heir to the universal Futurity. It has not developed here—well, it may have the chance to develop there."

It is, at any rate, refreshing to read Mr. Lindsay, after such a confession as the late Mr. Conrad's that "the mass of prose and verse may gleam here and there with the glow of a divine spark, but in the sum of human effort it has no special significance. There is no justificative formula for its existence any more than for any other artistic achievement. With the rest of them it is destined to be forgotten, without, perhaps, leaving the faintest trace."

Where does the truth of the matter lie between Lindsay and Conrad? Mr. Kingsland, perhaps, in his brilliant and almost superhumanly comprehending volume, supplies it when he says—quoting Faust's "I have, alas, Philosophy, the Law, and Medicine, and to my sorrow Theology also, with ardent labour studied through and through. Here I stand, poor fool that I am, no wiser than I was before":—

"Study for yourself every system of Philosophy ever launched upon the world, and if you are merely a formal logician with sufficient determination, you will doubtless in due time excogitate a metaphysical system of your own, in which the shortcomings of the 'logic' of all previous metaphysicians is successfully exposed, and something more 'rational'—in your own estimation is substituted. And then?—well, then, even if you have really made an advance, you will only have opened up a further vision of Infinity, and defined more accurately the limitations of the rational mind—unless, indeed, you have not thus happily discovered that the highest 'logic' of life is to be, in a manner which demands no explication, no logomachies."

That applies equally to the artist and to the ordinary Earth-Savage. They must be—what they are. It may be possible to help a certain number of either category to become what they are—and perhaps Mr. Lindsay is not so far astray if he is to be considered

rather as putting the mob in its proper place than temporarily abandoning his own as artist.

As Edwin Muir has pointed out, the substantial point in Mr. Lindsay's argument has already been emphasised:—

"This enigmatical character of art, this ultimate impossibility of making it turn any moral will, has been noted occasionally in the last two centuries: by Blake, in his affirmation of imagination against reason, an affirmation which it will take centuries and centuries of play to understand; by the advocates of '*l'art pour l'art*,' whose only fault was that, while their theory was true of art, they were not talking of art, but of their own works; by Nietzsche, when he forgot his philosophy and spoke as a psychologist and a poet; and by Mr. Clive Bell in his vain and pasty book on art containing as its one gem the theory of 'significant form.'"

"Centuries and centuries of play!" "All that goes on light feet." In Muir, Lindsay, Kingsland, and scores of other current writers of consequence, I have noticed this convergence of ideas recently. Muir stresses "the antagonism of wisdom and life"—wisdom a necessary enemy which serves life in combating it—and he parallels Kingsland's passage quoted above in his essay—"Beyond the Absolute," when he declares, in words that may be commended to Mr. Lindsay's closest consideration: "Life itself is 'eternal' denial of Truth, 'eternal' destruction of all that wisdom has contrived, and—in our hearts we would have it so."

(To be continued.)

The Theatre.

By H. R. Barbor.

PLAY PUBLICATION.

The sensational crash of the revival of a bowdlerised adaptation of Robert de Flers' "Le Roi" at His Majesty's Theatre last week serves once more to draw attention to the poverty of actable dramatic literature. In the course of many years of practical experience of the theatre, I have been forced to the conclusion that one of the main menaces to the artistic development and commercial prosperity of the English theatre is the neglect by the generality of managers to foster an efficient and profuse supply of plays. Chaotic economics and unbusinesslike procedure are the rule rather than the exception in theatreland, and nowhere is this shown more definitely than in the attitude of managers towards authors, actual or potential.

From careful inquiries made in various quarters I gather that the inability of managers to judge plays is only equalled by their indifference to the potential dramatic output. Almost every successful dramatic author will tell of the struggle, not only for recognition, but for ordinary business courtesy, in respect of his early work. It is common knowledge that many record-breaking plays have been hawked for years from manager to manager before their production. Every now and then some Press ramp draws attention to this matter, and prominent impresarios are wont to say in unison: "Where are the plays?" Occasionally I have prosecuted personal inquiries in these quarters, and these have generally proved quite definitely the inability and indifference above mentioned.

There is, I think, a way out of this pauperising impasse, but consideration of that must be left to another occasion. It must suffice here and now to indicate the poverty of imagination and business acumen which seems to typify the majority of Big Heads of theatreland. For many years the staple fare of the English theatre has consisted of proved American successes, which may or may not "go" on this side of the Atlantic. Many of these are products of English authorship, but the writers have had to state and maintain their claim to attention *via* the more alert and discerning showmanship of American impresarios. It is interesting in this regard to note

that several of the major successes of the past and present seasons owe their presence on the English stage to American showcraft. William Archer, whose typically English melodrama, "The Green Goddess," ran lately for a year in London, found his market first in New York. Leon Gordon has another success in "White Cargo," and this English actor-dramatist steered the same course as the distinguished critic. "Back to Methusalem" and "Saint Joan" both received the attention of America before their native English audience was permitted to view them, and one suspects that the latter play would probably have been long delayed had it not been for the initiative and will-to-excellence displayed by Miss Thorndike and her producer-husband, Lewis T. Casson. Miss Thorndike has herself told me that even she did not expect the Shavian master-work to last more than a few weeks in a West-End theatre—a reflection on the taste of the British public of which only theatrical managers as a class are capable, and a viewpoint dictated in the case of Miss Thorndike not so much, one imagines, by individual belief as by the convention of theatrical mentality.

In large measure it has been left to the haphazard and circumscribed activities of play-producing societies to give to foreign authors or to unpledged British aspirants to this most difficult sphere of literary craftsmanship adequate testing of their wares before an English public. Among a wide theatrical acquaintance I have encountered only one practical man of the theatre, Frank Vernon, who has seized upon or drawn attention to the necessity of focussing and concentrating the imperfect but not imperfect works of amateur dramatists into practicable theatrical form. Mr. Vernon's speculations on "border-line plays" I recommend to the attention of theatrical managers as a whole.

So far as the general public is concerned, as apart from the limited membership of the play-producing societies, the introduction of unusual or of novel dramatic currency is almost exclusively in the hands of the publishers of plays. The publication of plays is, one gathers, not looked upon by the generality of publishing houses as a particularly profitable venture, and there is an inclination to avoid works which have not had the sanction or publicity of West-End production, or, alternatively, which are not the work of writers of established reputation. A notable exception to this Safety First rule in pre-war days was the firm of Messrs. Sidgwick and Jackson, whose publications assisted materially the emergent drama of a former decade. A lineal descendant in our own time seems to be the firm of Ernest Benn, whose series of Contemporary British Dramatists demands the consideration of managers and players who are seeking plays and parts as well as of the public at large.

Maybe I have been unfortunate in my acquaintance, but I must record as one of the oddities of contemporary theatrical culture that not a single manager or player and only one producer to whom I have had occasion to mention this admirable series had even heard of or seen a single volume from about a score which have already appeared at intervals of a fortnight from Messrs. Benn's establishment.

The amateur of the drama who finds all too rarely intellectual or recreational satisfaction in the playhouse should willingly turn to this series. Considering that many dramatists are under contract to or associated with other firms, and considering also the slight encouragement given nowadays by the theatre to authors of imagination and uncompromising culture to write for the stage, Messrs. Benn's self-appointed task of discovering every two weeks a piece worthy of the permanence of print is a task indeed. To say that many examples already submitted indicate a failure of complete achievement is not to deroga-

* "Rational Mysticism." By William Kingsland. (16s. net. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.)

"Creative Effort: An Essay in Affirmation." By Norman Lindsay. (10s. 6d. net. Cecil Palmer.)

"Psychology and the Sciences." Edited by William Brown. (7s. 6d. net. A. and C. Black, Ltd.)

The title of the book Mr. Grieve discussed last week should have been given as "European Writers of the 19th Century," by Benedetto Croce, translated by Douglas Ainslie (Messrs. Chapman and Hall).

gate from their admired ambition and from the distinct debt which drama owes to their initiative. That the theatre should leave it to publishers to provoke a public interest in dramatic literature is regrettable. That a publishing house should rise to such responsibility is evidence of the belief in one quarter at least in the increasing popularity of drama.

(To be continued.)

Music.

Mr. W. J. Turner's last book contains among others nine chapters, so courageous, so outspoken, so completely informed with a just perception of what is the matter with music in this country that his book would be of the first value as a mental fog dispeller—and how dense that is in this in some ways so admirable country, only those of considerable insight and thoughtful intelligence can realise—even if it contained nothing else but what were entirely worthless, which is not at all the case. In the first, "My Country—the Land of Shams," he traces the connection of which so few people are aware, with the exception of such a brilliant thinker as Anthony Ludovici, the most profound, imaginative, and able writer on sociologico-political problems writing in English, and consequently practically ignored, between intelligence, clearheadedness, and food. The English consume as diet adulterated, doctored, devitalised, and ruined rubbish that would never be tolerated for a moment in France, Germany, or Italy. Add to that a system, or lack of it, of cooking that would disgrace a bushman or Hottentot and, as Mr. Turner points out, it is not astonishing that people of such lack of healthy palatal discrimination—for obviously no healthy palate would tolerate such filth—are equally without discrimination in matters of mental and artistic taste.

"Popular Music and Drama" is admirable, for its spirited protest against toadying to the herd and flattering the "democracy," and for the explosion of the preposterous notion that the tiny handful of Promenade Concert goers (who applaud bad music with at least as much enthusiasm as they applaud good) are in the least representative of a public actually consisting of millions, a notion so beloved of the canting, sentimental optimist, the trust-the-good-sense-of-the-public person, and others of like breed. "English Singers" says some things very much to the point about these people, as does also "Musical Nationalists," and draws attention to the complete lack of standards of judgment or criticism in a London audience. But to say how much better the singing of Gerhardt is than that of Tetrizzini is, first, to say that which is not the case, and further, to institute comparisons between the art of a fioritura soprano whose métier is the music of Donzetti Bellini et al., and a mezzo *lieder* singer, which is extraordinarily inept in a critic of Mr. Turner's intelligence.

The choice of Gerhardt as a "beau idéal" of a singer is also an unhappy one. Gerhardt is a great interpreter of German *lieder*, and nothing else. She is by no means a great singer as well, she has several of the worst faults of the English singer, noisy stertorous breathing, a wobble, and unevenness of scale. Julia Culp, on the other hand, is not only a superb singer, but far surpasses Gerhardt in versatility, and is more than her equal as an interpreter of German *lieder*. The same remarks apply to that solitary and so superb English artist Louise Kirkby Lunn; solitary, because she is the only English woman singer of the highest order. It is singular, too, to find Mr. Turner sneering at the coloratura soprano and the music of her genre. Surely that sort of thing is out of date now, when we are again coming to realise the beauty and expressive power of the consummate

and perfect vocal writing of the older Italian operatic composers when sung by supreme masters and mistresses of it. Moreover, in speaking of Gerhardt's cantilena, and saying that it is worth more than the coloratura of a thousand Tetrizzinis, Mr. Turner not only ignores the fact that Gerhardt's cantilena is very unsatisfactory, but that in no florid soprano part is "cantilena" absent, and that a florid soprano, if she is worth her salt *must* have a fine "cantilena," otherwise she will simply be incapable of coping with such things as "Regnava nel Silenzio" from "Lucia," or "Casta Diva" from "Norma," to name but two instances only.

The egregious Mr. Wells, with his impertinences and Cockney insensibility to the significance and value of great artists to the world, receives a thoroughly deserved trouncing, as also the people of the "Opera-in-English" kidney, and their like. It could hardly be imagined that a critic of Mr. Turner's profound good sense could have patience with this preposterous nonsense, to which I myself devoted some space in these columns some few months ago. It is a singular thing that the more utterly absurd and ridiculous a thing is, the less people appear to be aware of the fact, and the more closely is it held to, and the more vigorously preached. In an "Explanation" it is good to see Mr. Turner speaking the truth about the British National Opera Company, and sweeping away the elaborately woven cobwebs of swaddle, fulsome flattery, and dishonest propaganda that have been inflicted on us regarding this company, for which, however, to do them justice, they have not been responsible.

The concert season is slowly coming to life with the usual swarms of nonentities, who should never be allowed to show their noses on a public platform, and a sparse sprinkling of more important people. Moiseiwitsch gave his only recital at Queen's on the 27th. He is a depressing example of the extent to which a once charming and delightfully musical pianist can degenerate under the influence of American tours. The qualities granted perhaps, not great ones, for which he was remarkable—exquisite delicacy of touch, nuance, elegance of style and phrasing—seem to have left him, to be replaced by alternations of dullness and rather vulgar assertiveness. His playing seems to have lost, too, a rhythmic freedom and elastic verve that it once had. This was terribly evident in his playing of a work that demands these qualities in the highest degree—the delicious and marvellously clever concert transcription by Godowsky of "Fledermaus" of Johann Strauss. The prescribed rubatos and hesitations of the genre were there, but they were dead and mechanical as a pianola badly controlled, while of the light-hearted dash and sparkle with which the work should go there was none. The Händel Variations of Brahms lacked entirely the massive dignity and sculpture-like quality so essentially characteristic of the work. A group of Chopin—an inevitable ingredient in the recital pudding—was played with deftness and technical skill, but little poetic imaginativeness. KAIKHOSRU SORABJI.

RETROCESSION.

I shall go back when Spring is burdening
The apple boughs with a bright-shining load,
And stand awhile where the cream blossoms cling
On the dark trees at night-time down that road.
And see the yellow-hammers, twain and twain,
Wing downward like faint golden flowers and sway
Preening their sweet pale plumes among the rain,
Sealing their kisses on the quivering spray.

I shall go back again if I can bear
To load my heart with such rare agony;
Back to that place of lustrous blossoms where
On other nights her shining breast would be.
A. NEWBERRY CHOYCE.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

The Gold Standard.

Sir,—I apologise to Simple Simon who (like the ladies) puts his personal points in his postscriptum, for using his name as a peg. . . . which I trust will not prevent him from "pegging away" at the currency question.

We cannot allow the banker to have what standard of finance he wants (a) because that standard is wrong and (b) because it is disastrous for the rest of us.

We cannot have what standard of finance *we* want (a) because we have not yet made it sufficiently well known to bring about its adoption, and (b) because the bankers believe that their standard is better than ours, and their press is feeding that idea into the people's mind.

The standard adopted by the banker being also the national standard, asking why the bankers should not have their standard, and why *we* should not have ours simultaneously is like asking *why two things cannot be in the same place at the same time.*

RENE CHARLES DICKENS.

Average Income.

Sir,—I do not wish to quarrel with Mr. Biddulph, but for the sake of accuracy I must explain that the only occasion on which I used figures bearing the faintest resemblance to those with which he charges me was a letter published in *Forward*, of November 24, 1923. They appeared in that letter as a quotation from an article by Major Douglas in the (then) current *NEW AGE*. This quotation ran as follows: "Professor Bowley, who was, if I am not mistaken, connected with this institution (the London School of Economics) in a treatise on the Distribution of the National Income, referring to a period immediately preceding the first world war, estimated that the total British Income in excess of £160 per family per annum was only £250 millions. Taking the population of Great Britain as forty-five millions, and the average number of persons per family as about 4.5 . . . it is clear that an absolutely 'equitable' division of this income would result in an increase of the average family income by £24 per annum."

I used the above, not to show that an even distribution of income would make little or no difference to the really poor—this I know to be quite untrue—but to show that the resultant average would not be nearly large enough to give people the status of life that they are justified in demanding.

E. V. CHAMBERS.

Reviews.

MODERN AUSTRALIAN LITERATURE.

"Modern Australian Literature," by Nettie Palmer (Lothian Book Publishing Co. Pty. Ltd., 3s.), is the 1924 Prize Essay, established by the publishers in order to encourage a more discriminating attitude towards Australian literature, and is a straightforward, useful "measuring up" of the Australian output from 1900 to 1923. The publishers quote one of their readers as having said that this essay "covers the ground remarkably well, and seems to me to say the right things in the right way, with enough 'eruptive' matter that will cause the folk to discuss it." In the subdued atmosphere of Australian letters the veriest commonplace is probably eruptive. Certainly there is nothing said in this essay that is more challenging than the sort of note to intending contributors that the editress of a *Girl's Friend* or *Love Chat* over here would be likely to write. The chronicle is one of very small potatoes indeed. If "the opening of the twentieth century is a convenient starting-point

for the examination of tendencies in Australian literature, a milestone recognised by poets, politicians, and patriots," since "that 'Australia is the unit' was the refrain of some hammering verses by Joseph Furby" and "others looking at the Commonwealth less in the spirit of propaganda than of prophecy saw:

'The peeping glories of her opening page,'
then the opening page must have been the blank flyleaf. Australian literature in any distinctive sense is still merely the title of an unwritten corpus. There is little discussion in this essay of the prerequisites of such a literature: although the writer points out that D. H. Lawrence, in his "Kangaroo" has written a novel, shot with a wayward beauty, which will be of permanent value to our future writers." Lawrence's latest book, "The Boy in the Bush," is of even greater importance from this standpoint, and these two novels are worth far more than the entire writings of the two or three score of writers listed by Miss Palmer. Australia may have found its feet, but it certainly hasn't found its head yet.

Pastiche.

TRUTH IN ADVERTISING.

BY OLD AND CRUSTED.

We have a noble lord holding forth on "Advertising and the Empire," on behalf of "The Convention of the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World." Lord! What a reason for starting a club! Betting clubs, goose clubs, money clubs, not to mention "The Beefsteak" and "The Bachelors," I have heard of and can appreciate, but an advertising club is surely the last word in futility. But the unconscious humour of his lordship's appeal lies in his ingenuous statement that

"the fact is now recognised by all advanced advertisers that veracity is of supreme importance," which would imply that it was not ever thus, and that the pre-war variety of profiteer who winged his way to the House of Lords was a whole-hogging disciple of Ananias. I don't believe it. After all, the one article without which we could not be happy and the other worth a guinea a box were just as truthfully pushed as "Sunspot Soap," neither more nor less.

We are finally informed by this ornament of the plutocratic peerage that

"the choicest specialists of the world are to assemble with the object of finding out by discussion how untruth in advertising can be eliminated."

All that I can say is, I should like to hear that discussion. For example, a certain cigarette or tobacco is freely advertised as "the best in the world." Well, is it? If not, why not? And what will happen if the over-bold advertiser is requested by his competitors to modify his assertion? Shall we see hordes of men with sticky pots and long brushes rushing about the country pasting penitential apologies over pragmatic posters? I doubt it.

I wonder whether it has ever struck these pushful peers and their pals that we are all only too anxious to get hold of their goods, and would willingly take a large quantity at a reduced price. For instance, there is a philanthropic vintner who advertises a really sound port. I have had some, and could do with a lot more. Let him offer me six cases at 50 per cent. discount off to-day's quotation and see what happens. Impossible? Why? Because these super-business men do not understand their job! If they want to learn it and treble their trade let them subscribe to *THE NEW AGE* and digest its contents. Cheaper than advertising!

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The English Folk Dance Tradition. By Rolf Gardiner. (The Author, 9 Lansdowne-road, W.11. 1s. net.)
A Searchlight on the European War. By C. H. Norman. (Labour Publishing Co. 6s. net.)
The Bride of Corinth. By Anatole France. (The Bodley Head. 2s. 6d. net.)
The Gods are Athirst. By Anatole France. (The Bodley Head. 2s. 6d. net.)
The Coming of Amos. By William J. Locke. (The Bodley Head. 7s. 6d. net.)
Medical Insurance Practice. By Harris and Shoeten Sack. (The Scientific Press. 7s. 6d. net.)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT

SECRETARIES OF LOCAL GROUPS.

- ABERDEEN.—J. Crombie Christie, 12, Pitstruan-place.
 BELFAST.—E. Salthouse, 172, Albert Bridge-road.
 *BRIGHTON.—J. E. Whittome, Stanford House, Stanford-avenue.
 BRISTOL.—W. Arthur Evers, 12, Aberdeen-rd., Clifton, Bristol.
 CAMBRIDGE.—Rolf Gardiner, St. John's College.
 CARDIFF.—C. H. Williams, 47, Whitchurch-road.
 COVENTRY.—H. E. B. Ludlam, 12, Grantham-st., Coventry.
 CROYDON.—T. Gillis, 66, Southbridge-road.
 DUBLIN.—T. Kennedy, 43, Dawson-street.
 EDINBURGH.—Lawrence McEwen, 9, Douglas-crescent.
 GLASGOW.—H. M. Murray, 73, Ingleby-drive, Dennistoun, Glasgow.
 *GOLDERS GREEN (The Hampstead Garden Suburb).—Mrs. K. Roche, 32, Hogarth Hill, N.W. 11.
 HAMPSTEAD.—Mrs. H. Cousens, 1, Holly Hill, Hampstead, N.W.
 *KENILWORTH.—W. F. Alty, Windy Arbour.
 LARKHALL.—W. McPheat, Laurel Villa.
 LEAMINGTON SPA.—John Willows, Arno Villa, 63, Willes-rd.
 LEEDS.—Geo. Kay, 7, Wyther Park-avenue, Armsley, Leeds.
 *LEICESTER.—Chas. Crisp, "Edyson," Hobson-road.
 LIVERPOOL.—E. J. Pankhurst, 22, Beckenham-avenue; F. H. Auger, 45, Fieldway, Wavertree, Liverpool.
 *LONDON, S.E.—R. Edwards, 28, Westmount-road, Eltham, S.E. 9.
 *LONDON, S.W.—William Repton, 5, Pentland-gardens, Wandsworth, S.W. 18.
 *LONGTON, STAFFS.—D. Amyas Ross, 66, Trentham-road.
 MANCHESTER.—F. Gardner, Edge Bank, 105, Queen's-road, Cheetham, Middlesbrough.
 MIDDLESBROUGH.—Mrs. Ella M. Dunn, 2, Linden-grove, Linthorpe, Middlesbrough.
 NELSON (LANCS.).—M. Harrison, 11, Lane Ends.
 NEWBURY, READING.—Leslie Forrest, Rosedale, Thatcham.
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.—Arthur Bartram, 107, Morley-st.
 *OXFORD.—Thomas Carter, Lawn Upton, Littlemore.
 PAISLEY.—R. K. Reid, 47, Oakshaw-street.
 PLYMOUTH.—F. R. Crowe, 1, Beaumont-road.
 PUDSEY.—Joseph Smith, Smalewell Hall, Pudsey, Yorks.
 PORTSMOUTH.—Thos. K. Justice, 34, Dunbar-road.
 RICHMOND, SURREY.—N. Dudley Short, 32, Marlborough-rd.
 ROTHERHAM.—R. G. S. Dalkin, 41, Wellgate.
 RUGBY.—W. Bramwell Bridges, Frowlesworth, Rugby.
 SHEFFIELD.—A. L. Gibson, 9, Paradise-square; W. H. Bolton (Theosophical Society's Group), 8, St. Paul's Parade; H. Delamore, 47, Broad Oaks, Darnall, Sheffield.
 *STOCKPORT.—Alex. Gordon, 86, Kennesley-road.
 *STRATFORD-ON-AVON.—W. H. J. Woodward, Arden-street.
 SUDBURY (Suffolk).—J. Rimmer, Station-road, Sudbury.
 SUFFOLK.—T. J. Faithfull, The Hall, Walsham le Willows.
 SWANSEA.—J. A. Rees, 23, Hanover-street.
 SWINTON, ROTHERHAM.—E. G. Trowbridge, Glenholme, Station-street.
 *WATFORD.—W. Coles, 16, Queen's-road.
 WESTERTON (Near Glasgow).—Jas. Gibben, 5, North View.
 WORCESTER.—F. G. Davies, 47, Hill-avenue.
 *YORK.—W. M. Surtees, Elmfield College; W. Hallaways, 38, Lindley-street.
 *No group yet formed, but correspondence invited.
 Hon. Secretary: Miss M. Alexander, Fern Cottage, Grindelford, near Sheffield.

- SOUTH AFRICA.—A Stedman, Hon. Sec., South Africa Social Credit Movement, P.O. Box 37, Johannesburg.
 CANADA.—The United Farmers of Alberta, of Loughheed Building, Calgary, Alberta, are willing to accept subscriptions for THE NEW AGE, and may sometimes be able to put inquirers into touch with people interested in the Social Credit Proposals. In this last connection the Editor of the Ottawa "Citizen," Ottawa, would doubtless advise correspondents.

DIRECTORY.

- Names and addresses of Social Credit Advocates or Adherents who are willing to (*) answer queries on the subject or who would be pleased to (†) exchange views with others similarly interested. (This list is supplementary to that of the local Secretaries of the Movement given on this page.)
 †ANDERTON, Roger, 51, Carr-lane, Windhill, Shipley, Yorks.
 †BROOM, E. J., 70, Marylands-road, Paddington, W.9.
 *DEMANT, Rev. A., 64, Purrett-road, Plumstead, S.E. 18.
 *DOUGLAS, Major C. H., 8, Fig Tree-court, Temple, E.C. 4.
 *DALKIN, R. G. S., 9, Morthen-road, Wickersley, Yorks.
 *GALLOWAY, C. F. J., 37, Cale-street, S.W. 3.
 †KIRKBRIDE, J. S., The Old Hall, Lowdham, Notts.
 †MCINTYRE, A. HAMILTON, 9, Townhend-terrace, Paisley.
 †MEADE, Miss S. F., Sandpit, Horsington, Templecombe.
 *O'NEILL, JOSEPH, 31, Hayfield-road, Claremont Estate, Pendleton.

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY

TWO NEW PAMPHLETS.

Socialist "First-Aid" for Private Enterprise!

A reprint of the "Notes" in the "New Age" of April 17th. A critical examination of the I.L.P.'s "Nationalisation" policy from the "Social Credit" point of view. A useful pamphlet to distribute in Labour and other reformist circles.

The Monetary Catalyst—Need Scientific Discovery

Entail Poverty? A reprint of the "Notes" in the "New Age" of June 5th. Written with the special object of attracting the attention of business, technical and scientific men.

Both pamphlets are the same dimensions as the "New Age" pages, and will fold conveniently and neatly for posting in an ordinary foolscap envelope. Single copies will go for 1d. postage, as "printed matter," if the envelope is unsealed. The price of each is 1d. (postage 1d.). Larger quantities: 10—10d.; 25—2s.; 50—3s. 9d.; 100—7s.—all inclusive of postage.

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY, 70, High Holborn,

W.C.1

"THE COMING CRASH"

By W. T. SYMONS.

This 24 pp. pamphlet reproduces one of a series of lectures delivered in the winter of 1923-1924, under the general title "Can Civilisation be Saved?" They were designed to arouse interest in Major Douglas's Credit Theorem.

Price 6d. for single copy (postage 1d.). Thirteen for 5s. post free from

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY, 70 High Holborn, W.C.1

BOUND VOLUMES OF "THE NEW AGE."

Half-yearly Volumes of "The New Age" are published at 25/- net to the public.

Special Price to Direct Subscribers, 15/-

Special combined subscription for a half-year, including bound volume in addition to the weekly copies, 25/-

Address: The Manager, "THE NEW AGE," 70, High Holborn, W.C.1.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

The Subscription Rates for "The New Age," to any address in Great Britain or Abroad, are 30s. for 12 months; 15s. for 6 months; 7s. 6d. for 3 months.

Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to "THE NEW AGE PRESS."

All communications should be addressed, Manager, THE NEW AGE, 70, High Holborn, W.C.1.

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70 High Holborn, London, W.C.1, and printed for him by THE ARGUS PRINTING CO., LTD., 10 Temple Avenue, E.C. 4.