

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 1924] NEW SERIES Vol. XLV. No. 13. THURSDAY, JULY 25, 1929. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	145	VACCINATION AND SLEEPY SICKNESS. By John Grimm	150
The Metropolitan Water Board's increased charges. Australia's public debts—Mr. J. R. Collins's pamphlet—how sinking funds deprive borrowers of initiative, and give bankers control of economic policy. The Marconi scandal of 1913—the examination of Mr. Orage, Editor of "The New Age."		MUSIC. By Kaikhosru Sorabji Speech-Chorus from the Goetheanum. <i>Tannhauser</i> (Carl Rosa). <i>Rigoletto</i> (Royal Academy of Music).	151
CONSUMERS AS CAPITALISTS (Editorial)	148	DRAMA. By Paul Banks <i>Easter</i> (Four Strindberg Plays. Cape). "MARCONI RUMOUR" (Extract from the <i>Star</i> , 1913)	152
VERSE By L. S. M.	148	LORD MELCHETT ON REPARATIONS. (Extract from Speech)	154
ELIZABETHAN STAGE CIRCLE. By John Shand <i>Biron</i> .	149	REVIEWS <i>Nature in English Literature</i> . Barbarian Stories. <i>Child of the Deep</i> .	154
TWELVE O'CLOCK. By Sagittarius	149	ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT To G. F. W.	155

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

As the result of an increase in assessments in the South West of London last year a correspondent had the value of his house put up from £29 to £42. On the old assessment the actual amount which the Metropolitan Water Board periodically charged him for domestic supplies of water was 18s. On the new assessment the actual charge has been raised to 24s. Now there are two possible explanations. One is that the cost of filtering water has suddenly gone up 33 per cent. and has to be paid, no matter what the assessed value of rateable property may be. The other is that there has been unevenness in the incidence of assessments, causing some ratepayers to shoulder a heavier proportion of the total cost of water than others. In the absence of both these reasons, a ratepayer whose assessment is, say, doubled, ought to be charged only one half the former rate in the £. Instead of, say, 5 per cent. on his, say, £50 assessment he should pay 2½ per cent. on his £100 assessment. This is what the local rating authorities have themselves been saying in order to reassure nervous small ratepayers who got the idea that their bills for rates would go up in the same proportion as had the new valuations of their little houses. "Oh, no," the authorities have said, "the Council's total expenses are so much, and the whole body of ratepayers will only pay so much: the higher the assessment the lower the rate have had to pay if your assessments had not been increased."

Our correspondent wrote to the Metropolitan Water Board about its charge, and received the following letter from a gentleman called the Revenue Officer:

I enclose herewith the official receipt for your remittance in payment of the current half-year's water rate. In reply to your letter which accompanied the payment, I have to state that the charge for domestic purposes has, by law, to be based upon the Rateable Value of the premises as fixed by the local Rating Authority. The recent revaluation under which the value of the

above house has been increased affects only a fourth part of the whole of the Board's rateable value. The Board have to fix one rate of charge for their entire area, and the estimated increase from the revaluation represents but 6 per cent. of the total rateable value upon which the water rate is based, whilst the change from 6½ per cent. to 5½ per cent. is a reduction of 11½ per cent. The effect of this reduction in individual cases is, of course, governed by the incidence of the new assessment.

This is a circular letter—everybody who asks for an explanation gets the same reply. So far as the comprehension of the ordinary ratepayer is concerned the Board might just as well have quoted to him the first chapter of Genesis. Perhaps some of our expert readers will set to work with their slide-rules and logarithms and tell us what it is all about. As for our correspondent, he is in the inverse position to the blind man in the Gospel narrative whom Christ cured, for he is unable to answer any heckling about how it was all done, or why, or when, or where: all he knows is the single fact that "whereas once I paid 18s. now I pay 24s." We suggest that readers in the same position would do well to follow this matter up. At the very least the Board, instead of juggling with percentages of percentages and incidences of incidences, could have given the aggregated assessment values and revenues on which they work out their results. For instance: (a) What is the present total rateable value of the whole area they supply? (b) What was this value in each of the last eleven years, and in (say) 1913? (c) In what sections of the whole area has the rateable value been altered—and from how much to how much? (d) What total costs have they incurred year by year over a period? All these and other massed statistics must be easily available and would need no research to prepare. The job would be merely a routine one for their cost-accounting department.

The need for someone to make it his business to stir this matter up is the more imperative in view of the impudent attitude of the Board last week. It has been summoning people for using water during a drought. Well; and when do people need water

most but during a drought? Take the case of our correspondent. The Board says to him: "You must pay us 33 per cent. more for your water"—(he is not using any more than he ever has; in fact less, for his family are scattered)—"but as we're rather short you must cut down your consumption." Imagine a baker raising the price of a loaf from 6d. to 1s. and having you fined if you do not accept half a loaf for your shilling.*

Of course, we shall be told that this is a most unreasonable attitude to take up. The function of a Water Board, you must understand, is to collect water rates for sure, and to deliver water if it rains. It helps you to save for a rainy day. You will see, therefore, that you are a most ignorant fellow if you suppose that the Board is going to do on a large scale what you would do on a small—put out washing-tubs and pails to save rain for a dry day. One of two things. The present scare about supplies running dangerously short is either a lie or the truth. If a lie, it is a financial swindle. If the truth, it reflects an economic swindle—a disgraceful lack of foresight. The blame is not the Board's as a Board: it is, of course, due to high-financial policy, under which the public are never able to defray the costs of capital installations, and are condemned to put up with what they can pay for. So long as the purses of the public lag behind the revenue-requirements of capital the provision for their needs must always lag behind the needs. It is no use for apologists of the system to ride off on the plea that water is a special case. The same thing has been happening with coal-gas (and nobody will say that there is a coal-drought!) and is beginning to happen with electricity. And even in the case of water, no-one should ever need go short even during a record drought. It is all a question of looking ahead and putting money down. The community contains all the knowledge and skill necessary to provide for its safety and comfort, but its activities are paralysed because the bankers will not put the money down. Clear them out of the way, and if pushed to it for a drink we could distil the waters of the Atlantic. In the meantime, what about a rebate in the next half-year to consumers for going short of water now?

We have been looking through a pamphlet entitled, "The Public Debts of Australia," issued last April from Australia House by Mr. J. R. Collins, C.M.G., C.B.E., who is Representative in London of the Australian Loan Council. The object of the pamphlet is to expound the merits of Australia as a field of investment. Mr. Collins quotes statistics of Australian borrowings and of the assets behind them, and goes into all such other matters as he thinks will reassure the City of London. The lesson of Mr. Theodore's, the Queensland Premier's, failure to borrow money in London some years ago has been well learned. Mr. Theodore had carried legislation in that State which revised the terms of certain leaseholds. The electors of Queensland gave him a mandate to do this, but the City refused to let him have any money if he did. Since then there has been much thought bestowed in Australia on the question of co-ordinating State borrowing-powers. The result is a new law requiring the Commonwealth to "take over" all the State debts on July 1, 1929. This law of course is inspired by Mansion-House policy, for, as Mr. Collins points out in his narrative, directly the decision was arrived at for "taking over" State debts it became clear that these States which transferred to the Commonwealth their direct liabilities to investors might easily feel encouraged

* One official of the Board genially remarked that any "sensible" person would have a sponge down instead of a bath.

to contract new debts on State account. So the further decision was made to set up a Loan Council and to decree that State borrowings should henceforth be done through that Council. This illustrates the Mansion House method of putting over its policy—it gets you to decide on swallowing the sugar on the pill, and then later on you find yourself swallowing the complete pill. The idea of the Commonwealth's "taking over" debts sounded pretty, but the idea of its taking over the right to regulate future borrowings does not. The City has got what it wanted, the spreading of its loan-risks over the whole population of Australia. In this way it spares itself the necessity of interfering in the State politics of Australia and needs only to keep an eye on the centralised Commonwealth politics. No doubt in the past if a single Australian State had defaulted the City would have got its rights all the same; it always does; but the new Loan Council is going to be a much more efficient instrument not only for making the Australian tax-payer foot the bill for deficits but for lessening the risks of defaults. Of course the State taxpayers do not get any relief from the "taking over." They must pay charges for sinking-fund and interest on the transferred debts on an agreed scale.

It is amusing to read Mr. Collins's account of the problems which had been discussed at the time when the question of the Australian Federal Union itself was contemplated—

"When the terms of the proposed federal union were under discussion, no question was found more difficult than that of the financial arrangements to be made between the Commonwealth and the States. The difficulty arose out of the fact that the carrying out of the functions to be handed over to the Commonwealth did not then require an expenditure of money equal in amount to the customs and excise duties, which were to pass absolutely into the hands of the Commonwealth. The States, on the other hand, were to be left with functions that required expenditures exceeding the amount that could, with reasonable facility, be obtained by means of direct taxation. It was, of course, recognised as desirable that the finances of the States should be made entirely separate from those of the Commonwealth, but no practicable scheme for doing that could be found; and this explains why the new Constitution required the Commonwealth to 'return' to the States, during a number of years, at least three-fourths of the customs and excise revenue. At the end of that period of years the Commonwealth Parliament gave to the States the annual sum of 25s. per head of the population, in lieu of the 'return' of customs and excise revenue." (Our italics.)

This policy of getting the States to allow a large part of their revenue to be collected by an external body who would return some of it some time afterwards is an old trick. Assuming that the difference withheld was a legitimate levy on those States, there remains the fact that the whole revenue was to pass into the control of the centralised body. Mr. Collins does not say whether the States got their legitimate portion of the customs and excise taxes returned to them as and when collected. Most probably not; for if that had been contemplated why should they not have continued to collect these taxes themselves and paid the Commonwealth its due portion? No; the policy was to get the first handling of the money into the control of the bankers—the Commonwealth Treasury, like all other Treasuries, being annexed to the Central Bank or to its nominated agency. We think it is practically certain that the Treasury retained substantial balances as securities for State loans. We notice that at a certain date the Treasury is going to return a fixed sum of 25s. per head of population to the States instead of 75 per cent. of the revenue. How does anybody know (outside banking circles) either (a) what proportion of the total revenue this

25s. per head will represent, or (b) what its purchasing-power will be at that time?

We will now revert to Mr. Collins's account of the new law. He explains that—

"All the States have for a long time had sinking funds, but not in every case an effective one; and regular purchases [i.e., of bonds] from the market were not arranged for in all cases. The argument might be put forward that it was not necessary, at least in theory, that a State should with one hand pay off debt, while with the other it was raising new loans; for it could be argued that if revenues available for a sinking fund were applied directly to the creation of the reproductive assets that are the object of all new loans, it would be possible to cut down new borrowing by a similar amount. Another view has prevailed, however, and the new law extends to the main principles of the Commonwealth's sinking fund to the public debts of the States. This practical course is obviously better than the theoretical one previously referred to."

"It could be argued that—" We will warrant this it was argued, presuming there were any people with common-sense allowed to be parties to the discussion. It was a natural and plausible argument to use. If you raise £100 this week and can collect £5 a week to pay it off, and have to raise another £100 next week, why should you not keep your £5 and borrow only £95. You would then owe £195 instead of £200. And if you could (as you should be able to), collect £10 in that week, you could reduce the next week's borrowing to £90. You would then owe £285 instead of £300—and so on in a diminishing proportion of bank-debt (and of interest charge) to public capital-cost. But "another view has prevailed" remarks Mr. Collins, who neglects to explain the reasoning on which it was founded. He simply remarks of the "prevailed" policy: "This practical [Why more practical than the other?] course is obviously better [Why? And for Whom?] than the theoretical one [Why more theoretical than the other?]" previously referred to.

The reason has nothing to do with what money the bankers or the borrowers gain or save as between the alternative procedures. It is wholly a matter of banking policy, which is that of retaining a monopoly of the control of financial credit. We hope our arithmetic is not wrong (if so will some expert reader put us right) but as we see the case it is this. Assume that a public body borrows £100 a week from the bank. It is able to pay the bank £5 a week in respect of each £100. The weekly progression of accumulating debt will be £100, £200, £300, and so on; and the weekly progressive total of the sinking fund £5, £10, £15, and so on. Let this go on for twenty weeks. Now, if every week the sum due for repayment has been actually repaid to the bank, the bank's total debit against the public will be £950 (the difference between £2,000 lent and £1,050 repaid). If the sum due for repayment has been kept out of the bank and applied directly to financing the works the total debit of the bank against the public will be £1,050, namely the total of a series of loans in the diminishing weekly progression of £100, £95, £90, £85 and so on down to nil. So far it will be seen that the two cases are practically identical. In both of them you have a net debt to the bank of (let us call it) £1,000, and you have (ex hypothesi) an ability on the part of the public body to set aside £100 a week for sinking fund. But now assume that the public body needs to proceed still further, and there is all the difference in the world between the two alternative courses. In the first case—representing the "view which has prevailed"—where it is obligatory on the public authority to part with its sinking fund before it can

borrow again, it has to apply for a £100 every week; and must do so in this twenty-first week which is now in point. But in the second case—regarding the view which has not prevailed—the public authority has the £100 it requires in the till. It need not borrow a penny. And granting the assumption that its ability to put by a sinking fund increases commensurately with the progress of the public works in question,* it can begin to repay the bank its £1,000 without ceasing to employ and re-employ its own fund of £100, or supposing there was no need to extend the works it could pay the banker out in ten weeks, and the ratepayers would have a free title to the property.

As we indicate in our footnote, there are snags such as the costing-system which would jolt this smooth picture in practice, but that fact does not invalidate the consideration we are concerned to make prominent. It is that the regular repayment of sinking funds is the plaiting of a leash upon freedom of enterprise. Withhold them, and the initiative is yours: yield them up, and the initiative is the banker's.

We can get the principle involved here into clearer perspective by referring to one of (we think) Lord Beaverbrook's latest stunts. In England, according to him, there is £30 millions worth of iron ore waiting to be picked up. Why not set to work and pick it up instead of importing similar material from Spain? Well; we are patriots, so we must not oppose his Lordship's idea by reason of any sentiment for Spanish mine-owners. But suppose these people have to close down. We have not got rid of competition thereby. The "closing down" would probably mean simply the expropriation of the present owners by the banks, who would step in and collar the mines on the ground that the owners had defaulted in repaying loans by neglecting to maintain sinking funds. They would then appoint a new company to run them on a reconstructed capital valuation amounting possibly to only a fraction of the capital which we should be investing in the British enterprise. The resulting cut in the price of Spanish ore would either burst up Lord Beaverbrook or else start him on a "national campaign" for a safeguarding duty.

Looking upon the whole world as a closed credit area we see the international bankers retiring their credits not only through sinking funds but through insurance premiums, and also through systems of taxation, with the result that for every new enterprise somebody has to come to them for a new loan. Then they pit all the enterprises against each other to earn the means to escape the penalty of default. Lastly they use the property of defaulters to drive the rest into profiteering at the expense of consumers or of economising at the expense of workers. The fortunes of any one country to them count for no more than those of any State in Australia. The "efficient" come to the top wherever they are, and the one great test of efficiency is the ability to squeeze money out of the public.

The latest piece of humour is the news that bread is to go up by $\frac{1}{4}$ d. The necessity for the rise is easily accounted for by the glut of wheat across the Atlantic. The Malthusians will soon be talking again about the pressure of the population on the wheat-crops—not, of course, about the pressure of the wheat-pools on the population.

* For this illustration is not to be regarded as a general Social Credit analysis—that is to say we are not dealing with a closed credit-area, so our public authority may accomplish the feat.

We reproduce elsewhere an account from the *Star* of April 24, 1913, of a session of the Marconi Committee of Inquiry at which Mr. A. R. Orage and Mr. Hilaire Belloc were examined. Suggestions had been made by the *New Witness* about six months earlier about Ministerial corruption in regard to the purchase of Marconi shares. British Marconis, which had been worth a few shillings, had risen in a very short period to as many pounds in market value. The occasion of the boom was the decision of the Asquith Government to place a valuable contract with the British Marconi Company. Mr. Godfrey Isaacs was Chairman of the Company, and his brother, Sir Rufus Isaacs (now Lord Reading) was a member of the Government. So were Mr. (now Sir) Herbert Samuel and Mr. Lloyd George. There was no evidence that any of these had used his foreknowledge of the placing of the contract to enrich himself or his relatives, but the whole Press was full of comments on the rumours, and the Government had to appoint a Committee to investigate them. It soon transpired that there had been dealings, but not in the British Company's shares. The transactions were in the shares of the American Marconi Company. A fortnight before the session in question (THE NEW AGE, April 10, 1913) the following passage occurred in the Notes:

"When, in common, no doubt, with other journals, we had offered to us for publication last summer alleged documentary and sworn proofs of the dealings of Ministers in Marconis . . . the 'proofs' did not interest us, documentary corruption being, in our opinion, the least dangerous form of corruption; but we have no doubt that the 'evidence' was of interest in Fleet Street."

Its summing up of the situation was to the effect that the three Ministers in question had contributed to the suspicions—irrespective of whether there was any substance behind them—by their "hoity toity" manner of dealing with them.

"An Englishman among them (and note that none of the three is English) would have explained and bedamned the matter forthwith in October last. But first we had a generalised denial simply; then followed the carelessly staged 'Matin' affair; next Sir Rufus Isaacs let out a little of the transactions; then Mr. Lloyd George let out a little more. Where the devil, we may ask, are the revelations to end? . . . They have treated the public as if we had no concern even in a public matter; as if their dealings in shares, which for all we knew were British Marconis, were as private to them as their motors. Well, they are not; and now, let us hope, they know it."

Readers of the *Star's* report will be amused at Mr. Falconer's suggestion that Mr. Orage, if he must quote rumours, ought to do so in a form which would provide Ministers with grounds for a libel action. Wouldn't they like it! Imagine the Press obliged to pay damages every time it asked Ministers to explain unpleasant rumours about them. It is rather the Ministers who should be fined for not volunteering information directly the rumours come to their notice.

(OF ANTHRACITE AND IRON ORE.)

"Who's for the Empire?" Well, before we answer, let us make quite sure of this: Whom is the Empire for?

L. S. M.

MERGERS.

A "mind that moves on merger lines" As does the hungry Whale, who pines To merge the fish on whom he dines

Invited to the Feast, they sail With waving fin and whisking tail Into the belly of the Whale.

"United all and Self-Contained"— Of Gather-brained and Scatter-brained Which will be "Self," and which "Contained"?

L. S. M.

Consumers as Capitalists.

In our Notes of April 18 we examined the operation of the price system, taking as an illustration the case of an "industry" of six men, "A—F," continuously at work on a six-stage series of processes—one man one stage. We considered alternately what would result if the chain of processes ended in the output (a) of consumable goods only, and (b) of capital goods only. Then we considered the financial effect of costing capital goods in the price of the consumable goods, and showed that under the conditions we had laid down the cost of the goods put on the market daily by "F" would exceed the aggregated daily incomes of the six men, and that the deficit would be exactly equal to the sum of their several charges for depreciation of capital.

Now let us get a nearer representation of what goes on in industry—namely, the simultaneous production of capital and consumable products. We can do this by doubling every figure in our original table and assuming that the six men are making both classes of product in equal proportions. The table will stand thus:

Days	1	2	3	and so on.
A	£2	£2	£2	" " "
B	£4	£4	£4	" " "
C	£6	£6	£6	" " "
D	£8	£8	£8	" " "
E	£10	£10	£10	" " "
F	£12	£12	£12	" " "

The six men will now be receiving a daily income of £2 each for their work, and daily putting on the market through "F" £12 worth of the two sorts of products—£6 worth of consumables and £6 worth of capital.

Now the governing factor in the situation is that the bank is demanding and getting back its six separate loans daily from "A"—"F." So these six people collectively must yield up all their income—one part by purchasing consumables and the other by purchasing capital (i.e., investing, or "saving"). This must be the final daily result no matter how each of them apportions his income between the one form of purchase and the other.

Notice carefully what this means. They buy and take home half the products, each saying: "These are mine to do as I like with." If any theorist came and said to them: "Look here, these things have cost something to produce, and you must charge that cost up (to yourselves) as and when you consume them," they would ask him where he escaped from—and rightly so. They would tell him: "These things are consumer-property: their cost is cancelled directly we buy them." Yet these same people innocently go and charge themselves with the cost of their capital products. They do not realise the fact that the principle of personal ownership, with all its implications is entirely unaffected by the circumstance that they happen to take one half of their property home and leave the other half where it is.

All capital is consumer-property.

The financial cost of standing capital (factories, machinery, equipment, and all else) represents a receipt for a completed purchase exactly as does a receipted bill for a hat. It is not a legitimate debit, it is what the Frenchman would call an *acquittance*.

"Oh," someone may say, "but the capital is used for the benefit of consumers, and in some way it comes to the same thing in the end." But let us look at a case. A lady goes to Barkers and buys two pairs of scissors. One pair she takes home and the other she leaves behind. A little later she orders a costume there, and Barkers use her scissors to cut the cloth. On what principle should Barkers charge her anything for the use of the scissors? Are they not her scissors? Granted that technically

she did not buy the scissors, but was in principle buying a share in Barkers of the value of the cost of the scissors, are they not in principle still her scissors? The objector may say: "Yes, but in that case she will expect Barkers to earn her a dividend on the use of her scissors." But if Barkers are to earn this dividend for her by making her pay it, they can equally well charge her nothing and pay her nothing; and can continue to do so until the scissors are worn out. Again, principle apart, she cannot pay money for the depreciation of her scissors until Barkers pay her the dividend: nor can Barkers pay her the dividend until she has paid them the depreciation charge. Nobody can break this deadlock but the banker—the conjurer who can produce money out of a hat.

This analogy will not be convincing to most people because they will see, or think they see, the money which was originally invested in the scissors existing somewhere inside Barkers' establishment—that is to say, that Barkers are holding the money which represents the investment. But in the case of investments generally, the money subscribed for capital issues is being continuously retired by the banks in the way shown in the table. Thus, in our illustration, the bank's loans to "A"—"F" went back to the bank and no money was circulating overnight. And every day £6 worth of capital was added to the stock of resources—and still no money was circulating overnight. What the bank was doing was compelling those people to buy revenue-earning assets, but was cancelling the money which those assets were expected to earn.

Elizabethan Stage Circle.

MR. WILLIAM POEL PRODUCES A CHAPMAN PLAY.

Mr. William Poel continues to experiment in methods of producing the Tudor dramatists. The special audience which forms the Elizabethan Stage Circle were present at the Royalty Theatre last Monday to witness yet another example of his work. The "vile body" upon which Mr. Poel operated was the huge double play by Chapman called "The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Biron." By brave cutting and slashing of the text—many of the speeches are very long—Mr. Poel was able to squeeze into a matinee what originally required two performances.

"Biron" was first presented by the "Children of the Chapel, Blackfriars." These were the "little eyases" whose great popularity so upset the temper of Shakspeare and his company. These infant phenomenons used to play in the Chapel Royal, but the Queen at length transferred them to the old Blackfriars monastery, where they performed in the Great Hall. The interesting point is that they were playing indoors and by artificial light. Mr. Poel had not therefore to take up half the stalls in order to build a platform stage in imitation of the Tudor theatre, as he did at the Holborn Empire for his production of "Sejanus." On the contrary, he this time used but a small portion of the ordinary stage, and blacked out the rest with sombre curtains. He called this rectangular curtained opening a "tableau platform." Very correctly, one concluded. For the actors, cabined and confined by a very literal lack of elbow-room and by a floor which was a series of steep narrow steps, were certainly unable to move with any freedom. They moved, when at all, at the speed of figures seen through a slow-motion camera. Even a gesture was made as carefully as though the actors were walking on a tightrope, as in some sort they were. All this had its effect on the rate at which they spoke. The actors suited the word to the action so consistently that each line seemed to drop from lips that were loth to part with it. The tone also was very quiet. As no one moved but with a conspirator's caution, so no one spoke. This slow, muted recitation from brightly-coloured figures standing in tableau, seemed suitably reminded us of the monastery in which the play was first seen. One enjoyed it. But whether this was at all like the way in which Chapman heard the "full proud sail" of his magniloquent verse recited by the children, one begs leave, at least, to doubt.

Within the bounds set by the producer, the actors were entirely admirable. Mr. Robert Speaight as Biron and Mr.

Duncan Yarrow as the King, uttered their reams of verse most musically. If they gave little hint of the masculine force of Chapman's often very fervid rhetoric, sufficient reason has been given to excuse them. The smaller parts were well done, in so far that every word could be heard. But the scene which gave one the most authentic thrill was that between Biron and an astrologer. This duet was perfectly played by Mr. D. Hay Petrie and Mr. Speaight.

JOHN SHAND.

Twelve O'Clock.

"Shakespeare strikes twelve every time."—Emerson.

EXTRACTS FROM "THE NEW AGE."

Edited by Sagittarius.

"The accountancy of modern industry requires a large body of costs to be paid twice by a community which gets the money only once."—Editor's reply to correspondent.

"Power does not lie in the ownership of money, but in the control of money."—Notes of the Week.

"Wars are not bred of casual quarrels, but from the existence of some standing menace, and from the preparations made to ward it off."—H. M. M.

"Most of the things we want to do are things nobody would pay us for doing."—H. M. M.

"What agriculturists mostly need is not teaching, but the means of putting into practice what they already know."—Ben Wilson.

"Pacifists will not be able to do any good until they investigate the originating cause of international discord."—Notes of the Week.

"Distribution tends to stick at a given level, no matter what amount of money is employed in wealth creation."—Notes of the Week.

"Expansion of personal consumption is the only way of preventing trade competition from breaking out into war."—Notes of the Week.

"All improvements in process should be made to pay a dividend to the community."—C. H. Douglas.

"All employers are at the mercy of forces outside their control."—H. M. M.

"Whether your business wins or loses depends on factors outside your control, and even outside your powers of calculation, however good your business may be."—Notes of the Week.

"Where no law is, there is no transgression."—St. Paul.

"Stupidity conceives the law."—C. H. Douglas.

"Blest paper credit! last and best supply! That lends corruption lighter wings to fly." (Pope: *Moral Essays*, Epis. iii., Line 30.)

"As Mr. McKenna has said, the amount of money in any country depends exclusively upon the action of the banks in putting it there or taking it away. If populations cannot create extra money by making extra things, it is certain that they cannot collect extra money from each other by making extra things."—Notes of the Week.

"Ideals, like morals, decay and are changed; but miseries flourish eternally."—Drama.

" . . . war-time terror of the loss of life itself, followed by post-war decline of the prospects of advancement, has caused the middle-classes to doubt whether the universe distributes its rewards and punishments according to the gospel of Samuel Smiles."—Drama.

"There is no greater folly in the world than a man's life should be ordered by the tolling of a bell, and not by the dictates of good sense and understanding."—The Abbe of Theleme (from Rabelais).

Vaccination and Sleepy Sickness.

A few weeks ago Miss Olive Hunt, aged 31, a housemaid living at Sloane Court, S.W., was vaccinated. She died sixteen days later. At about the same time the same fate befell two London children, girls aged 10 and 14 respectively, and in the same circumstances. The immediate cause of death in all these cases was inflammation of the brain and spinal cord, to which the doctors apply the designation *encephalitis* and the people *sleepy sickness*.

Anybody acquainted with the literature of the Anti-Vaccination League will be aware that there is nothing new in the phenomenon of post-vaccinal disease or death. Hitherto the vaccinists have reassured the public by the use of statistics, pointing out that the death incidence was 1 in 10,000 or 1 in 50,000 cases (to quote two recent independent estimates). But the public comprises individuals, and in every case of fatality some particular individual is the victim and some particular parents suffer the affliction. If I were to lose a child by vaccination I should consider that it was adding insult to injury to be told that 49,999 other children were not lost.

Consequently upon the existence of such a psychological reaction there has always been an intensive force of private counter-advertising at work undermining the effect of the public advertising of the merits of vaccination. To such a degree has this succeeded that to-day anyone who wishes may legally contract out of the "duty" of being vaccinated, or of having his children vaccinated, merely by making a declaration of conscientious objection before a commissioner for oaths and paying 1s. 6d. When I was a young parent I had no such privilege. As the law stood then applicants had to appear before a bench of magistrates who invariably resorted to arguing the theory of vaccination with them, the result in almost every case being that the magistrates won the argument and decided not to grant relief. In a word, the magistrates construed the law as conferring upon themselves the right of having a conscientious objection to recognising the anti-vaccinists' conscientious objection. Readers of this journal can picture a parallel case by supposing that the law allowed one to avoid repaying an overdraft provided that he could satisfy a committee of bankers' nominees that he had a conscientious objection to doing so. Such a law could be safely passed, for the psychology of the lending profession is antecedently incapable of appreciating that of the borrowing community. If the bankers could floor you on a technical point they would consider you to have lost on your claim to be regarded as a sincere objector to their policy. As a matter of historical fact, the late Sir James Szlumper, at the Mortlake Court at the time I have spoken of, addressed me from the Bench as follows:

"If your objection to vaccination is based only on something you have read, it cannot be a conscientious objection." (My italics.)

The whole Bench took the same view, and my application was refused. What this meant was that the only ground of exemption which they would recognise was evidence of a previous fatality or illness following vaccination in the family of the applicant. Like the dog, the serum must have its first bite. And, even then, the magistrates would hark back to the inquest and require to know what the verdict was. And since there was hardly a case of an inquest into post-vaccinal death in which the medical witnesses did not ascribe it to its immediate cause—leaving the predisposing cause unmentioned—thousands of once-bit applicants were condemned to risk a second bite. There was an authoritative

instruction circulated to doctors as to their duty in such matters; it said they should take all the precautions they could to "preserve vaccination from reproach." So conscientious objections were made to appear as attempts to reproach the irreproachable. How could the objectors be sincere? To revert to my parallel: how could, e.g., the coal-owners convince a committee of bankers that they really believed bank-policy to have been responsible for the ruin of the coal trade? Again, even in the rare case where an applicant was able to prove from an official verdict that vaccination had been named as the cause of death (or one of them) the record of the inquest would probably disclose the fact that some medical witness had suggested contributory neglect on the part of the parents—they had not "kept the arm properly clean." And so with the coal-owners: have they not "mismanaged their business"?

And now for to-day. The recent batch of fatalities has encouraged the Anti-Vaccination League to send yet one more deputation to the Government to get the vaccination laws formally repealed. The League virtually requires the Government to treat members of the community in the same way as the late Government treated members of Trade Unions. The Trade Disputes Act allows a Trade Unionist to refrain from contributing to the Labour political fund without going through any form to establish his right. Conversely, if he desires to pay he will take the trouble on his own initiative of handing in his name. As may well be supposed, thousands and thousands who used to pay under the old system when they had to take some trouble to get exempted now do not pay. And so with the citizen apropos of vaccination. "You don't care about it? Well, don't have it done. Finished! That's all there is to it." The Anti-Vaccination League wants to deplore the Vaccinist Authorities of the benefit of exploiting the inertia of the mass of the people. From its own point of view the change is well worth striving for. It can be defended on the fundamental principle that people have the right to make mistakes. To the retort that they have no right to cause other people to suffer by their mistakes, there is an obvious reply so far as vaccination is concerned. It is derived from the vaccinationist theory itself. This theory in general is that people who are vaccinated are protected against small-pox. How, then, are they in danger when unvaccinated people contract the disease? Is the sort of small-pox caught by an unprotected person more contagious than the sort that comes from nowhere? Some authorities urge that it is more virulent in the unprotected, who "get it badly." But even if true (and it is only an hypothesis) this is not a relevant answer, unless, of course, the vaccinists tone down their original hypothesis and say that vaccinated people are protected only against the less virulent forms of small-pox. If they say this they are saying that vaccination can only protect against the least dangerous and most easily curable visitations of the disease. To the extent to which they press this point to that extent they constrain the public to make comparisons between two risks—the risk of mild small-pox on the one hand and the risk of fatal sleepy sickness on the other.

In view of the disquietude now prevailing the sponsors of vaccination are busy revising their case. Mr. Ingleby Oddie, the Westminster Coroner, hinted at a new theory at the inquest on Miss Hunt. It amounts to this:

(a) The germ of sleepy sickness has not yet been isolated.

(b) Children are more likely to acquire this germ during life than to be born with it inside them. (Dr. John Taylor, pathologist of St. George's Hospital, in his evidence.)

(c) Therefore vaccination in infancy is the safest.

You must hurry and get the vaccine into the child before the germ arrives on the scene.

(d) If not, and the subject is vaccinated for the first time in later life (from, say, 3 years onwards) "the germ that was long dormant and had not been identified might be"

(e) "lit up." (Mr. Oddie's summing up. Dr. Taylor's expression. My italics.)

Mr. Oddie concluded by preaching the moral.

"A serious responsibility falls upon parents of newly born children when they do not elect to have their young children vaccinated in infancy.

"At the early stage of life there are no germs of encephalitis dormant in the system, and vaccination will not cause post-vaccinal encephalitis.

"It is to be hoped that people will not be alarmed by the fact that encephalitis does follow vaccination, because it is quite easy to avoid its development provided that children are vaccinated as early as possible.

"It is quite plain in this case that there was nothing unsatisfactory in the lymph or method of vaccination, or the treatment of the arm."

The expert statement that the encephalitic germ has not been "isolated" is a statement that it has not yet been discovered. Nobody can say whether there is such an animal. But assuming that it exists; nobody, again, can say whether it enters any human body or is inside all the time. Again, nobody can say whether it resides only in some bodies, or in all. There is, I believe, a school of theorists which holds that every human body harbours every conceivable germ, and that when, in particular diseases, some particular sort of germ manifests itself, the reason is that the disease is the cause of the germ (so to speak) and not the germ the cause of the disease. According to this theory, disease itself is probably conceived of as the disturbance of a microbic equilibrium—or, shall we say, a breach in some part of a prison-wall through which a contiguous group of microbes make their escape, and (perhaps in some cases) go and unlock the cells of their brethren. If so, one might say that disease disturbances resemble industrial disturbances, the microbes being correspondent to trade unionists who voluntarily come out on strike against uncomfortable conditions—or are locked out by the thing that gives rise to those conditions. Thus it would seem that what we recognise as a particular disease may be the symptom of resistance to an unrecognised super-disease. Students of the relationship between the credit system and the industrial system will not require me to extend this parallel further than to point out that the Coroners of the political system are united in speaking of unemployment as an economic "disease," and in regarding men out of work as microbes.

But now to resume my central theme: the hypothesis of the experts that vaccination does not introduce the germ of sleepy sickness, but merely "lights up" an already resident germ, is virtually a restatement, and not a contradiction, of the hypothesis that vaccination causes sleepy sickness. The "catching" of any disease at all—including small-pox itself—may be interpreted as a lighting-up of its corresponding lurking germ. If the experts point out that the risk of injecting vaccine is practically negligible, the answer is that so may be all risks arising from natural exposures of the human body to infection. Until they can show us statistically how many persons get ill of any complaint out of the number who ought to get ill, they leave the whole argument suspended in a cloud of guesswork. If twenty people sit on wet grass, how many will "catch cold" or get rheumatism? How many smokers get "smoker's-throat"? What is the ratio between the number of "risks" run by people in general and the number of the logical penalties incurred by their "carelessness"? "One man's meat is another man's poison," says the old proverb. One man's

food "lights something up" and another's does not—and nobody can explain why.

The final proof or disproof of the efficacy of vaccination must rest on statistics—but not statistics compiled under the supervision and control of the defenders of vaccination. This would be much like deciding the truth or otherwise of rumours against the soundness of a business concern by reference to its own balance sheet. For instance, at one time, during small-pox epidemics, the doctors used to produce overwhelming evidence for vaccination by dividing the patients into two groups, the one "vaccinated" and the other "unvaccinated." But their test of whether vaccination had been performed was the visibility of the marks. In the virulent ("confluent") types of the disease these marks (if any) were obliterated by the pustules. Therefore all the worst sufferers were automatically set down as unvaccinated.

The wider the range of statistics chosen the less risk of such distorted conclusions; and it is significant that the case of the anti-vaccinists derives its support from general vital statistical figures on a population-scale over periods of years as against specific statistics on a hospital-scale over a period of a month or two. In fact, so far as the higher-dimensional figures afford any support to the vaccinists they prove too much. For instance, while they show that since vaccination was first made compulsory small-pox has been virtually extirpated in this country, they also show that the same phenomenon has happened with a whole group of other infectious and contagious diseases. That suggests a common cause. The anti-vaccinists define that cause in the words—improved methods of hygiene. In early times the patient was almost hermetically sealed up in his bedroom. He was also provided with a needle and told to prick the pustules. To-day nobody would dream of prescribing such treatment. It is our better knowledge of the precedent conditions which maintain health in general which is the fundamental protection against any disease in particular.

JOHN GRIMM.

Music.

Speech-Chorus from the Goetheanum.

The season's music has come to an end some three weeks since, but the otherwise deadness of things (and incidentally there is no period of the year when London is so utterly depressing after the close of the Opera season till the beginning of the "Proms," when not a note of music is to be heard except the end-of-term-busmen's-holidays affairs of the Academies and the various students' concerts) has been relieved by the visit of the Speech-Chorus from the Goetheanum—the headquarters of the Anthroposophists—founded by Rudolf Steiner—to the beautiful little Rudolf Steiner Hall near Clarence Gate, Regent's Park. This astonishing body, consisting of twelve men and twelve women, recites in a sort of rhythmical chant midway between the speech voice and the singing voice, the extraordinarily powerful and moving effect of which it is impossible to describe in words. The chorus commands a staggering unanimity. This is indeed ensemble in excelsis. It is as one manifold voice, combined with every nuance of inflection and emphasis, and the intense and concentrated absorption of every member is as remarkable as it is impressive. Here is living realisation of that towards which Schönberg has been feeling in *Pierrot Lunaire*, and since in his monodrama, *Erwartung*, but with a freedom, a beauty, and flexibility, and a really musical as well as emotional expressiveness that Schönberg cannot reach. A rich and very wonderful new experience.

"Tannhauser" (Carl Rosa).

In the condition of bored and weary *désœuvrement* that intervenes between a busy period of con-

cert going and the departure for *villegiatura*, I betook myself to a Carl Rosa *Tannhäuser* performance at the Lyceum on Tuesday the 9th. One dreads such performances being seen or heard by foreign visitors—dreads, because the latter have no means of finding out that this country does produce better singers than the people we heard on this occasion, not one of whom emitted a fairly good series of good vocal tones the whole evening. Miss May Busby has an excellent natural voice, and if her use of it were more skilful would be quite a good singer—though woefully lacking in imagination—but she was the only one in the cast of whom as much can be said: the rest appeared to have as little natural endowment as they had technical competence. One cannot imagine where Mr. Arthur Hammond derived his singular and, one hopes, entirely personal ideas of the *Tannhäuser* score, much of which he seemed trying, not unsuccessfully, to turn into a fox-trot. The production was lamentable and inept. Is there presumably no one to prevent a stage-trumpeter appearing in a dressing-gown six inches too short, below which his trousers and brown boots appear in scandalous nudity, and to prevent mediæval German pages and pantomime-young-women-varlets wearing high-heeled evening-shoes?

"Rigoletto" (Royal Academy).

And knowing what to expect from Academies and Colleges of Music one was prepared for something considerably worse than the above-mentioned performance from the Opera Class of the Royal Academy of Music. Instead of which the *Rigoletto* performance, by these young people, was in all respects very much superior. It is true, none of them have yet learned to sing, but there were at least three excellent voices in the cast on July 13.

But the Royal Academy of Music is labouring under a grave misapprehension when it speaks of the study of opera as an "adjunct to the training of singers," as it did in its programme. Such a view may be current here, where few know, and still fewer can teach anything about operatic work, but one does not expect such a half-baked notion to receive encouragement from one of the two official music-teaching organisations of the country. The study of opera is not an "adjunct" to the study of singing—it is the study the singer only begins when he is already an accomplished and fully-trained singer, or should be. To return, however, to this performance—the *Gilda*, Phyllis Edmundson, has a quite small but charming natural voice, at present produced in the worst English style, that is, breathy and filmy, with no firmness, nor brightness, nor clarity, and if she goes on unchecked she will not be long before she wrecks her voice. She has no *appoggio*, is hardly ever on her notes, and instead of the tones gaining brightness as they ascend they become more and more clouded and veiled. Edgar Elwes as the *Monterone* and *Sparafucile*, and Bernard Cannon as *Rigoletto*, had easily the best voices, and with proper training and guidance should both do good work. Edgar Elwes was the best all-round talent, as regards both singing and acting. *Rigoletto* was quite a creditable effort, but of parts like this one quotes Vincent d'Indy—*il faut dix ans pour apprendre le métier et dix ans pour apprendre l'art*—they call for the highest singing and acting artistry.

KAIKHOSRU SORABJI.

"Mr. Oliver Baldwin, the Socialist son of the late Prime Minister, is to ask the War Secretary in the House of Commons if he will state how much the Bank of England pays the State for the military guard it uses; and whether there are any other cases of a private company receiving military protection in this country."—Press report last week.

Drama.

Strindberg.

When Bernard Shaw was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in 1926 he gave the whole sum to the endowment of a foundation for promoting a knowledge of Swedish literature in Britain. Thus he tried to do for Strindberg in his old age, with his wealth, something of what he did for Ibsen in his youth with his vitality. This volume* is the first publication of the Anglo-Swedish foundation. All the plays included have been published in English before, the authorised translator being Edwin Björkman. It would have been of interest if the present translators had discussed why those of Björkman were unsatisfactory, and if they had said whether any use had been made of the work of Björkman, who gave very careful thought to it. In the introduction to the present volume, for example, Professor Robertson refers twice to Strindberg's "Lady Julia," which Björkman translated Miss Julia; for which various reasons were given which appear good until better are brought against them. From every point of view, biography, comment, exposition, and criticism, Professor Robertson's introduction is too cursory, especially for the first volume of a series; and, unless the introduction to subsequent volumes makes amends, the Björkman series will be more valued by students and collectors of dramatic works. Strindberg began, as Ibsen and others did, with histories and romances. It is his subsequent work, however, which has aroused most interest in this country. Influenced by the revolt declared by Zola against

"French comedy, with its Brussels carpets; its patent-leather shoes, and patent-leather themes, and its dialogue, reminiscent of the questions and answers in the catechism,"

as Strindberg wrote "from the Stage-Director to the Intimate Theatre" in 1908, he wrote, "Lady Julia," "The Father," and "Codicils." Commenting on these Professor Robertson says:

"In our time, when uncompromising realism is a turned page, it would be idle to claim that these forty-year-old tragedies have any longer a vital message. . . . But they were doughty deeds in the battle for the new faith."

So they were, but does this depreciation mean that these plays are to be excluded from the series? Miss Julia, I believe, is under the ban of censorship, so that it is a part of Swedish literature which our male grandmothers do not wish us to know; but all three have been produced in London during the last year or two, and "The Father" is being revived at the Everyman Theatre. In the quotation from Professor Robertson, then, there are two major inaccuracies. First, "uncompromising realism" is not "a turned page." The work of the German impressionists, for example, is not impressionism in the sense of being antithetical to realism; but in the sense of being more realistic than "naturalism." It is, indeed, a technique for being realistic about masses and types, and about the machine-environment in which these masses are ground up, and the types are stamped. When an uncompromising realist—who could be more so than O'Neill or O'Casey?—moves out of the naturalistic into the impressionistic technique, as O'Casey does in "The Silver Tassie," his motive is that naturalism is not realistic enough. The dramatists who are shaking up the world consciousness at the present time are as realistic about the whole of society, including the masses, as Ibsen and Shaw were about the middle classes, whether the dramatists be men or women.

* "Easter; The Dance of Death; The Ghost Sonata; The Dream Play." By August Strindberg. (Jonathan Cape, 7s. 6d.)

The second major inaccuracy is that these plays contain "no vital message" for this time. The word message is rather inappropriate, as tragedy is not normally expected to deliver messages. These plays are, however, still vital, for the same reason as is "The Dance of Death," which was written much later, and which Professor Robertson calls "the most unforgettable—if the most hopeless and depressing—of all Strindberg's tragedies of married misery." It is the romantics of the pre-war generation, the enthusiasts for feminine equality, whose work seems no longer vital. Whether the desire of women for freedom and equality has become a semi-conscious desire for acknowledged mastery, or whether the realisation of the impossibility of equality has left destructive enmity on one side and braggart superiority on the other, Strindberg plays on sex-war, on the persecution of the rational male to lunacy by the female determined to humiliate him to the uttermost, and with any weapons, now exercise a great appeal on the stage. The attitude of the persecuted male—and of the "protesting" female—may be neurotic and foolish, but it remains that in Strindberg's realistic plays on marriage what so many are trying unsuccessfully to portray—what so good a dramatist as O'Neill failed at in "Welded"—is shown with dramatic perfection, with rich undertones of meaning in every line, and on the universal plane. Miss Julia differs from the others in that it presents a sociological theme; but it is nevertheless a commentary on feminism. "Miss Julia," Strindberg wrote in his preface,

"is a modern character, not because the man-hating, half-woman, may not have existed in all ages, but because now, after her discovery, she has stepped to the front, and begun to make a noise . . . selling herself nowadays for power, decorations, distinctions, diplomas, as formerly for money . . . The type is tragical, offering us the spectacle of a desperate struggle against nature."

The impulse when quoting from the preface to "Miss Julia" is to quote all of it. Enough has been reproduced, however, to settle the question as to whether the play is out of date for either technical or other reasons.

Two and a half of the four plays included in the present volume—the half is the first part of "The Dance of Death," which Colonel Loraine produced London during the last few years, along with several other Strindberg plays besides those already mentioned. For this volume let me not seem ungrateful. It is good to have such plays in one's possession, and gladdening that a new edition reminds the public of their existence. They are autobiographical, as is most of Strindberg's work, in the special sense that they dramatise the author's thought, and reflect his effort to arrive at peace and understanding. They were all written in the creative period which followed Strindberg's passage through "The Inferno," that condition of depression and semi-lunacy which he looked upon as punishment for his materialist scepticism. "Easter" is almost a miracle-morality play, itself portraying the sin, agony, and resurrection, of a family living in debt and fear, which found its affairs resolving themselves when its members began to live with courage and faith. Strindberg said of "The Dream Play" that, as in his earlier "To Damascus," he

"to imitate the disjointed but apparently logical order of a dream . . . Time and space do not exist . . . on an insignificant groundwork of reality, imagination spins and weaves new patterns . . . Characters are split, doubled, and multiplied; they evaporate and are condensed. . . . But a single consciousness holds sway over them all—that of the dreamer. . . ."

As all who have read the dreams recorded for expository purposes by psycho-analysts have noticed, a dream, although as a rule pure-picture, is essen-

tially dramatic. In Strindberg's case there is philosophy, reason, and feeling in every line, so that profundity goes with the drama. In all plays such as "Easter," "The Dream Play," and "The Ghost Sonata," Strindberg is chiefly occupied on planes of causation other than the physical; on those planes which all materialists deny on principle, and of which they relate examples as a life-long stream of coincidences. Whether these planes of causation belong only to the primitive unconscious, being a relic of the idea of moral causation translated into terms of animism by primitive man, or, on the other hand, to the super-conscious, as the Swedenborgians believe, is immaterial to the fact that they are in the plays dramatic and overpowering even when not fully comprehended. In "The Ghost Sonata" the ghostly milkmaid, whom only those born on Sunday could see, bathed the eyes of the young man who had saved a child from a fire; her apparition terrified the old man who had killed her. The old man in this play is the old man of psycho-analysis and mythology; the old man vampire, the Old Man of the Sea who clung to Sinbad's neck, and had to be made drunk while Sinbad remained sober for release to be obtained. He is the old man Mephisto, promising power in return for service, but producing only demoralisation; and himself being destroyed by truth. The ghost of the dead man who lived for show walks round to inspect the wreaths and cards at his funeral, "and woe to any which are missing." The young lady in whom the wellspring of life is weak is also killed by the stripping away of pretension. The fire of life burns only in the good and the fearless. "The Ghost Sonata" is truly a musical composition in dramatic form, one of Strindberg's technical experiments in intimate theatrical complexity. Once again some string in the audience's mind is struck by every line, though the unity of the thoughts belongs to a world of Fate and Providence, rather than to the amoral world of scientific causation. The play is bound together by a theme that Strindberg could not forget—that "everything," as he said in Easter, "the good, as well as the evil, comes back." "The Ghost Sonata" portrays the ethical continuity of all worlds. Reflecting on Emerson's "Compensation" and "Oversoul" one might say that "The Ghost Sonata" is Emerson fantastic.

PAUL BANKS.

"Marconi Rumour"

(Report published in "The Star," April 24, 1913.)

The Marconi Committee resumed to-day the examination of journalists who had attacked the conduct of Ministers.

"The New Age."

Mr. Hilaire Belloc and Mr. Cecil Chesterton were in attendance, and the first witness was Mr. A. R. Orage, editor of THE NEW AGE.

Mr. Orage said that in the first reference to the subject in THE NEW AGE they said that after the Insurance Act of Mr. Lloyd George they could believe anything of him.

Between October 17 and November 3 he received a visit from an inquiry agent, whose name he had forgotten. This agent referred to THE NEW AGE articles, and asked if he had any private information. Witness told him that American Marconis had been bought by Ministers, and that was no doubt the origin of the rumours.

The Chairman (Sir A. Spicer) asked if witness knew about the American Marconis at this date.

Witness: Perhaps I ought not to say it was the American, because that is a deduction that is made afterwards.

Documents for Sale.

This agent said he was in a position to sell documentary evidence of the dealings of Ministers, mentioning Mr. Lloyd George and Sir Rufus Isaacs.

Witness declined to buy. He thought that if there was any corruption, it was of small importance in comparison with the corruption of the nation by offering 9d. for 4d. (Laughter.)

"Decided to Have a Flutter."

Mr. Falconer questioned witness about one of the articles in THE NEW AGE, which remarked that Ministers, "being apprised that the Marconi Company was about to conclude an advantageous arrangement with the Government, decided to

have a Stock Exchange flutter." It further stated that:—
Not only did they buy Marconis at £2, and sell them at £28, but they put their Parliamentary friends on to this Liberal thing.

Mr. Falconer demanded whether witness had any evidence that Ministers bought at £2 and sold at £28.

"With What Truth We Know Not."

Witness said he had not, and never had. He simply repeated a rumour, and he pointed out that the article contained the words "with what truth we know not."

Repeating the Rumours.

Witness was asked whether he thought it fair to circulate rumours of that kind without any evidence, and replied that the rumours were so persistent that he thought it his duty to give Ministers the opportunity of denying them. He thought the honour of the nation more important than the honour of Ministers. He thought that, as Sir Rufus Isaacs had mentioned their indebtedness to the Paris "Matin" for giving them an opportunity of denying the rumours. THE NEW AGE made no charge, and merely stated the rumours, giving them the opportunity of denying them.

"A Measure of Circulation?"

Mr. Falconer: You did not give the Ministers an opportunity of bringing an action against you?

Witness: I suppose that, seeing we have no advertisements, no Minister would have thought THE NEW AGE worth his notice.

Mr. Falconer: What do you mean by that?

Witness: Mr. Asquith has already said that in the case of one newspaper it had so few advertisements that it was not worth powder and shot.

Mr. Falconer: It is a consideration in bringing an action, is it not?

Witness: It ought not to be.

Is not the amount of advertisements a measure of its circulation?

Witness: Amongst the most ignorant of the population, yes.

Unknown Inquiry Agent.

Lord Robert Cecil: Yours is a Socialist paper, and to you the whole existing organisation of society is corrupt or objectionable.

Witness: Objectionable; not technically corrupt.

Therefore the question of corruption in one Minister more or less does not appear to be a matter of importance to you?—

Witness was unable to give any clue to the identity of the private inquiry agent who called on him last October.

Mr. Falconer: You don't now suggest that there is any corrupt act by any Minister with regard to Marconi shares?

Witness: Not to my knowledge.

The "Objection" to Lord Robert.

Mr. Parker, the Labour M.P., pressed witness very closely about his attack on Lord Robert Cecil's fitness to sit on the Committee. Mr. Parker remarked that, as a Socialist, he wanted to know what the journalistic attitude was towards a scandal of that kind.

Witness maintained that he was right in objecting to Lord R. Cecil after he (Lord Robert) had declared his belief in the personal integrity of Sir Rufus Isaacs.

Mr. Parker: Your opinion does not count for much with me.

Mr. Orage: I anticipated that from a fellow-Socialist. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hilaire Belloc.

Mr. Hilaire Belloc attended and read a statement, in which he said that one Minister (the Postmaster-General) gave to the brother of another Minister (the Attorney-General) certain public advantages, including either the payment of public money or its equivalent, which would multiply the value of the shares by seven.

Public contracts increase the wealth of private citizens; it is a dangerous precedent. "That is the gravamen of the charge; that is the root of the whole matter," said Mr. Belloc.

Heard of a Minister Unnamed.

He had heard of a Minister who had tripled his wealth by an investment in Marconis, but he could not give his name. He perpetually made the point that wealthy men were able to increase their wealth, while the small investor found it impossible to keep his money.

Charge of "Antipathy to Jews."

Reference was made to Mr. Charles Granville, who had spoken of Mr. Belloc's attitude as being one of "antipathy to Jews." Witness replied that there was no question of Mr. Granville becoming editor of the "Eye Witness" when witness resigned his editorship.

The two principals criticised in this matter were Jews—Sir Rufus Isaacs and Mr. Samuel—but anybody less Jewish than hardly be imagined.

"For the protection of my own dignity and honour," Mr. Belloc denied the charge of antipathy to Jews. He protested that his friends in his college days had included Jews. Those who consulted his works knew that he felt that "cosmopolitan

finance" was a dangerous power. That was an opinion held by the majority of educated men. He did not think the Jewish racial element was important in "cosmopolitan finance," and he should still object to the latter even if it became controlled—as appeared possible—from America. He had never any prejudice or hostility to the poor or oppressed members of the Jewish race.

"To My Knowledge."

Mr. Handel Booth pointed out that he had alleged that his reference to the public man contained the statement that he had "to my knowledge" received information.

Witness replied that the words "to my knowledge" meant that he had information on which he relied. He declined to give the name of his informant; he would not drag anyone else in.

"I call that knowledge," said Mr. Belloc.

"Do you call it your personal knowledge?"—"My knowledge?"

Witness: If it seems to you as a critic of English too strong a phrase I shall be glad to correct it.

Mr. Gordon Harvey protested that the witness's answer was a grossly insulting one.

Refusal to Answer.

Mr. Booth read from an article in the "Eye Witness," which contained these words:—

It seems that it is not quite so certain that the fraud will go through.

"Did you write these words?" Mr. Belloc was asked.

Witness: Mr. Chesterton is the responsible editor. He is about to go through a trial of the utmost possible importance, and I will not be led into answering any question that should properly be addressed to Mr. Chesterton.

Mr. Booth: I am asking you, Did you write this?

Witness: That is my answer.

Mr. Booth: That I must ask somebody else.

Witness: You must ask him under what circumstances these articles appeared, whether he altered or added to them.

Here is another sentence, "Another reason why the swindle did not go through." Did you write these words?

Witness: I can't answer you.

On August 15 these words appeared in the "Eye Witness":

"Mr. Samuel is a man who is decidedly below the average of his own countrymen." Did you write that?

Witness: I again refer you to the editor of the "Eye Witness."

The Chairman: Do you refuse to say whether you wrote anything in connection with the "Eye Witness"?

Witness: I frequently helped Mr. Chesterton. I do not run away from this. I am proud and glad to have helped Mr. Chesterton.

Mr. Booth: Is it because you don't recollect?

Witness: No, it is because of the principle of editorial responsibility upon which the whole structure of our Press reposes.

Witness explained at length that with regard to unsigned newspaper articles, the editor was alone responsible. "I am determined not to give answers which may hurt the editorial position."

Asked for definite data in support of his articles, Mr. Belloc said he relied upon the fact that the Postmaster-General had given advantage to the brother of the Attorney-General. He had no special knowledge.

Are you prepared to point out the articles you wrote and to justify them?

Witness: No.

Mr. Mooney said after Mr. Belloc's attitude, it was pure waste of time to go on.

Mr. Belloc: you won't get a different answer.

The Room Cleared.

Mr. Handel Booth having asked the Committee to support him in pressing the unanswered questions on Mr. Belloc, the room was cleared and the Committee sat in private.

Reviews.

Nature in English Literature. By Edmund Blunden. Hogarth Lectures, No. 9. (Hogarth Press. 3s. 6d.)

Mr. Blunden's pleasant book would have been more aptly named *Nature in English Verse*; for, although there are some interesting references to old books on farming in his general survey, and the best part of a chapter on White of Selborne, the weight of the book rests on the poets. Nor has Mr. Blunden quite found his length; the book is, as he admits, rather a series of footnotes than a concerted whole. It is too short to be useful as a text-book, and too long to succeed as the charming essay which I believe Mr. Blunden might have written on the subject. But for what it is the book is good. There is one remark in particular which demands attention. "I am not wholly certain that I would rank Richard Jefferies' 'Story of My Heart' beside Miller on 'Gardening' for the truth about our intercourse with Nature." This is a healthy dig at the kind of writer who, as Byron said of the Lake Poets, walks the woods for their description. "The Story of My Heart" is what the title suggests, a self-conscious book; but, to be fair to Jefferies, whom Mr. Blunden neglects, it is in his "Wood Magic,"

"Bevis," and "Amaryllis at the Fair" that, of all English novels, we taste the smell of fresh air and feel the golden heat of the summer sun. When Jefferies writes of an oak, the word stands out from the printed page like one of Bunyan's "trumpets"; it is more than a word; it is, as Emerson said, vascular; if you cut it it would bleed. Few of the poets have this disinterested, single-minded love of the country; Wordsworth's lakes and mountains are chapters in a noble work on moral philosophy; Shelley's skylark is a blithe spirit, not a mere, mortal, feathered bird. Shakespeare, of course, takes everything for what it is. His

daffodils,

That come before the swallow dares,
are as much daffodils, for all the beauty of the lines, as the one that Jefferies' Amaryllis found flowering by the damask rose in the cold March wind. But failing Shakespeare and his kind, Mr. Blunden is right to suggest that the man who loves Nature will do best to make his own poetry out of the raw materials to be found in such prosy works as "Miller on Gardening" and "Ellis on Sheep." M. J.

Barbarian Stories. By Naomi Mitchison. (Jonathan Cape. 7s. 6d.)

With the exception of the last, the stories in this volume give glimpses of life in the countries surrounding the Roman Empire at periods ranging from the Early Bronze Age to the time of the Norman Conquest. They do little to support the common fallacy that everything was quite all right before the invention of machinery. Mrs. Mitchison depicts life in those bygone days as a desperate struggle in the teeth of horrors compared to which those of to-day become almost insignificant—slavery, piracy, black magic, torture, and religious martyrdoms. Most of the stories are, indeed, terribly tragic, though some are merely adventurous. The remaining story deals with life in the year A.D. 1935, when modern conditions will have so hardened people that they restore gladiatorial shows as an amusement, assassination as a means of political controversy, and human sacrifice as a sort of social safety-valve. To help "satisfy the hunger in the minds of the Have-Nots," one of the "Haves" is chosen by lot each year to be put to death with all due ceremony! Those depressed by Mrs. Mitchison's forecast of the future may draw consolation from the rest of the book. The intelligence and spirit that have found means of coping with the evils that have gone before may surely hope to deal with those which are developing under the present financial system. I. O. E.

"Child of the Deep." By Joan Lowell. (Heinemann's, 8s. 6d.)

All who delight in stories of he-men will welcome Miss Lowell's autobiographical narrative. She commenced her career on board ship at the tender age of eleven months, difficulties as regards her feeding being overcome by the simple plan of acquiring a goat from a protesting native. She was treated almost like one of the crew by her Spartan parent, who seems to have spent most of his time disciplining her. Her book is full of exciting episodes. She was present when a shark was dragged aboard and slaughtered on deck; she saw another shark kill one of the crew; she was tarred and feathered with guano when crossing the equator; she was present at a very informal native *accoucheuse*; her ship was nearly nipped in the ice-floes and deluged by a waterspout; she assisted in amputating a sailor's arm with a razor and a belying-pin; and, finally, her ship was burnt and she had to swim three miles for life. One of her ambitions seems to have been to swear like a seaman; and, judging by this book, she probably attained it. If Miss Lowell talks as she writes, she must be a stimulating young person to know. I. O. E.

"My information is that this influx of American capital is being deliberately encouraged by banking interests on the ground of alleged necessity dictated by high financial policy. If this be so, I am advised, it is yet another instance of banking financial policy clashing with Britain's industrial interests."

"Incidentally, a Socialist view that finds expression at this stage is that a future Government in Britain, desiring to nationalise electricity supply so as to protect consumers from exploitation, might find itself subjected to very severe opposition from American financial quarters."—*Daily Herald* Lobby Correspondent, July 16.

ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT.
G. F. W.—Thanks for your letter. As it deals with the technique of advertising we are passing it on to "E. L." We do not think that your specimen poster would "put anything across."

Retrospect.

JULY 23, 1925.

The boom in rubber—a history of rubber politics since the restriction scheme of 1923.

China—conflict between American policy and that of England and Japan—dollars for red propaganda.

Anglo-Catholics and international relations—Mr. Maurice B. Reckitt's tract—Dr. Gore's preface.

Wickedness in High Places. (Article by C. M. Grieve reviewing of Sorley Brown's "T. W. H. Crosland"—the hushing up of scandals.)

JULY 22, 1926.

Captain Peter Wright's expulsion from the Bath Club.

The fall of the Briand Ministry.

The *Daily Mail* on America's debt—its epithet "Uncle Shylock."

Mr. Baldwin's jibe at the Churches—his insinuation that in industrial affairs they have no *locus standi*.

Wall Street and the British Empire. (Editorial article on Sir Oswald Stoll's fear of a "redistribution" of the Empire.)

The Church and the Mines. (Editorial article on the Church's deputation to the Government.)

JULY 21, 1927.

Mr. Churchill on the gold standard—lowered prices has meant an increase in "real wages"!

Mr. Churchill on the function of the Secretary of the Treasury—only an adviser.

The economic crisis in Italy—the deportation of Signor Grassi, the Turin millionaire landlord, for refusing to lower his rents.

Lord Halsbury on poison gas and "the war that is coming."

The *Statist* on American bankruptcies—the world "not bound to continue" on the gold standard.

Sir Herbert Samuel on Royalties. (Editorial article on his article in the *Observer* advocating the public ownership of mining royalties.)

Electricity as a Credit Basis. (Editorial article on Mr. David Ferguson's proposal in *World Power*.)

The Midland Bank and a Financial Inquiry.—III. (C. H. Douglas.)

Index to titles and contents of twenty-four chief expository articles in previous issues of THE NEW AGE (1925-1927).

JULY 19, 1928.

The Imperial Chemical Industries' advertisement in the *Daily Herald*.

The *Observer* pushes the Kellogg Peace Pact.

Resistance to raising of land-tax in Bardoli—peasants on strike.

The Savidge Report—the policeman as private redresser of public injustices.

Lord Athlone on South Africa's economic dependence on gold production.

Expropriation in excelsis. (Editorial article on the origin of the Pacific Phosphates Company.)

The Starting Point of Money. (C. H. Douglas.)

"The single exception of importance to favourable factors is the money situation. For the last year or more expansion in credit, principally on Stock Exchange loans and on loans to individuals secured by stock, has been almost continuous. The Federal Reserve banks have attempted to check the over-expansion by admonitions and open-market operations, but were reluctant to force higher money rates except as a last resort, because of the burden that would impose on the industry and trade. When the date approached for the April 1 quarterly transactions, comprising record disbursements in dividends and interest, closely following the March 15 income-tax payments, and the usual seasonal demands for agricultural and commercial loans, a substantial portion of call funds was withdrawn from the money market, and precipitated a crisis that was comparable only to the 1921 deflation and the 1907 panic in this century. Tuesday, March 26, is a day that will be long remembered in Wall Street. The charge for call loans soared to 20 per cent., a rate almost unheard of by the younger generation. . . . As an emergency and a temporary measure, however, a number of the large New York banks offered to supply a limited amount of additional money, which served to avert fears of a credit panic."—*American Bankers' Association Journal*, April.

THE LATEST PAMPHLET.

An Outline of Social Credit

By H. M. M.

With a Foreword by C. H. Douglas.

52 pp. Price 6d. Postage ½d.

Special terms for quantities quoted on application.

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY,
70, High Holborn, W.C.1.**The Social Credit Movement.**

Supporters of the Social Credit Movement contend that under present conditions the purchasing power in the hands of the community is chronically insufficient to buy the whole product of industry. This is because the money required to finance capital production, and created by the banks for that purpose, is regarded as borrowed from them, and, therefore, in order that it may be repaid, is charged into the price of consumers' goods. It is a vital fallacy to treat new money thus created by the banks as a repayable loan, without crediting the community, on the strength of whose resources the money was created, with the value of the resulting new capital resources. This has given rise to a defective system of national loan accountancy, resulting in the reduction of the community to a condition of perpetual scarcity, and bringing them face to face with the alternatives of widespread unemployment of men and machines, as at present, or of international complications arising from the struggle for foreign markets.

The Douglas Social Credit Proposals would remedy this defect by increasing the purchasing power in the hands of the community to an amount sufficient to provide effective demand for the whole product of industry. This, of course, cannot be done by the orthodox method of creating new money, prevalent during the war, which necessarily gives rise to the "vicious spiral" of increased currency, higher prices, higher wages, higher costs, still higher prices, and so on. The essentials of the scheme are the simultaneous creation of new money and the regulation of the price of consumers' goods at their real cost of production (as distinct from their apparent financial cost under the present system). The technique for effecting this is fully described in Major Douglas's books.

CHEST DISEASES

"Umckaloabo acts as regards Tuberculosis as a real specific."
(Dr. Sechehayé in the "Swiss Medical Review.")
"It appears to me to have a specific destructive influence on the Tubercle Bacilli in the same way that Quinine has upon Malaria."
(Dr. Grun in the King's Bench Division.)

If you are suffering from any disease of the chest or lungs—spasmodic or cardiac asthma excluded—ask your doctor about Umckaloabo, or send a postcard for particulars of it to Chas. H. Stevens, 204-206, Worple Road, Wimbledon, London, S.W.20, who will post same to you **Free of Charge**.

Readers, especially T.B.'s, will see in the above few lines more wonderful news than is to be found in many volumes on the same subject.

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.

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.

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY**Books and Pamphlets on Social Credit.**

- ADAMS, W.
Real Wealth and Financial Poverty. 7s. 6d.
- BRENTON, ARTHUR.
Social Credit in Summary. 1d.
The Key to World Politics. 1d.
Through Consumption to Prosperity. 2d.
The Veil of Finance. 6d.
- COLBOURNE, M.
Unemployment or War. 12s. 6d. (Procured from New York to order.)
- DOUGLAS, C. H.
Economic Democracy. 6s.
Credit Power and Democracy. 7s. 6d.
The Control and Distribution of Production. 7s. 6d.
Social Credit. 7s. 6d.
These Present Discontents: The Labour Party and Social Credit. 1s.
The Engineering of Distribution. 6d.
Canada's Bankers and Canada's Credit (Reprint of Major Douglas's Evidence at the Government Enquiry in Ottawa). 2s. 6d.
The World After Washington. 6d.
- DUNN, E. M.
The New Economics. 4d.
Social Credit Chart. 1d.
- GALLOWAY, C. F. J.
Poverty Amidst Plenty. 6d.
- H. M. M.
An Outline of Social Credit. 6d.
- HATTERSLEY, C. MARSHALL.
Men, Money and Machines. 6d.
- POWELL, A. E.
The Deadlock in Finance. 5s.
- SHORT, N. DUDLEY.
It's Like This. 6d.
- SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT (Symposium by members).
Social Credit and Economic Democracy. 6d.
- TUKE, J. E.
Outside Eldorado. 3d.

Critical and Constructive Works on Finance and Economics.

- CHASTENET, J. L.
The Bankers' Republic. 6s. [Translated by C. H. Douglas.]
- DARLING, J. F.
Economic Unity of the Empire: Gold and Credit. 1s.
- FOSTER, W. T., and CATCHINGS, W.
Profits. 17s.
- HORRABIN, J. F.
The Plebs Atlas. 1s.
An Outline of Economic Geography. 2s. 6d.
- MARTIN, P. W.
The Flaw in the Price System. 4s. 6d.
The Limited Market. 4s. 6d.
- MCKENNA, RT. HON. REGINALD.
Post-War Banking Policy. 7s. 6d.
- SODDY, Professor F., M.A.
Cartesian Economics. 6d.
The Inversion of Science. 6d.

Instructional Works on Finance and Economics.

- BARKER, D. A.
Cash and Credit. 3s.
- COUSENS, HILDERIC (Editor).
Pros and Cons. A Guide to the Controversies of the Day. 3s.
- HILTON, J. P.
Britain's First Municipal Savings Bank. 1s. 6d.

Address: 70, High Holborn, London, W.C.1.
Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70 High Holborn, London, W.C.1 and printed for him by THE ARGUS PRESS, LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London, E.C.4