

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 2025] NEW SERIES Vol. XLIX. No. 9. THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1931. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	97	THE FILMS. By David Ockham	105
The <i>Daily Express's</i> ultimatum to the Co-operative movement because of anti-bank and anti-American articles in the Co-operative Press.		<i>Love Among the Millionaires. The Crazy Ray. Indiscreet.</i> This week's films.	
NEWS NOTES	101	FRIEND PERKINS. By "Old and Crusted"	105
CURRENT POLITICAL ECONOMY. By Ben Wilson	102	The <i>Anchor Magazine</i> , house-organ of Barclay Perkins & Co.	
President Hoover's proposed debt-holiday.		LAW NOTES	106
DRAMA. By Paul Banks	103	GEORGE LANSBURY	106
<i>Noé. Judas.</i>		<i>My Life</i> (Lansbury)	
MUSIC. By Kaikhosru Sorabji	104	REVIEWS	107
Wireless performance. <i>Falstaff and Sadko</i> at Covent Garden.		<i>The New Political Fellowship</i> (Pape).	
		CORRESPONDENCE	107
		A. Garber, T. C. Wrycroft, and H. C.	

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The London Co-operative Society's Political Committee has fallen foul of the *Daily Express*. The circumstances are these. The Committee publish a monthly 4 pp. journal called *The Citizen**, the centre spread of which contains matters of general interest printed throughout the whole edition, and the outside pages of which contain matters of local interest selected and printed in sections of the edition according to the localities in which they are to circulate. Thus, in the *Southend-on-Sea Citizen*, or the *South Islington Citizen* (to indicate two centres of circulation) the general matters are common to the two while the local matters differ. The total circulation of the "*Citizen Group*" of papers, so to call it, runs into some hundreds of thousands, representing a respectable proportion of the 6,000,000 members of the Co-operative Society, and hence any news and opinions published in the centre pages exercise considerable influence among the shareholder-members of the Society. Now, in the issue for May there was an article in the centre part of the paper entitled "No Need For Economy—Public Delusions About Debt," and, in the issue for June, another entitled "Where Does Money Come From?—Bankers Create It Out Of Nothing—Power Taken Away From The King." The two articles embody a true and well-told account of how money is created and manipulated, following closely the line of analysis which readers of THE NEW AGE have been accustomed to see in it during the last ten years, and with which most of them are so familiar as to yawn over it. Apparently, however, the *Citizen's* recent dissemination of this branch of public education has had the reverse effect: it has cut yawns short upon stairs and called down upon itself a menacing lead-brook's organ charges the *Citizen* specifically with making the "grotesque suggestion" that "the

Bank of England is owned by American financial houses," and, generally, with undertaking "a dis-creditable campaign which has as its avowed object the smashing of the whole economic structure of the country." At the close of a heated tirade which declares the propaganda to be "the most subversive in any country to-day save Russia," and in which the the words "monstrous" and "malicious" are included there is the following ultimatum:

"We warn the directors of the Co-operative movement that the country is at the end of its patience. Co-operative trading is being made the mask for a dangerous and disruptive political movement.

"If the type of propaganda which we have described is not immediately brought to an end, then the Co-operative movement as it is now constituted, together with its special privileges, must be crushed by the will of the community."

Lord Beaverbrook refrains from calling the propaganda *disloyal*—for the reason that the *Citizen* expressly complains of the removal of the King's face from the currency notes. The *Citizen* drives home its point by publishing a picture of His Majesty in *British* naval uniform together with one of Mr. Montagu Norman in his customary *cosmopolitan* attire. A careful reading of the two articles fails to disclose any other "avowed object" on the part of the *Citizen* than is contained in its proposition that "the Bank of England must come under public control." For Lord Beaverbrook to withhold from his readers the fact that this, and no more than this, is the *Citizen's* policy, and then to describe it to them as one of *smashing the whole economic structure of the country*, is, in our judgment, unpardonable conduct, and ought to be actionable at law.

The *Citizen's* political policy is a logical expression of the true economic interests of the Co-operative Society. When it asks for public control of the Bank of England it is asking for a control in which 6,000,000 co-operators will participate by virtue of the vote. The question of whether the vote gives the power of *effective* participation is irrelevant to

*Printed by the National Co-operative Printing Society, Temple Avenue, E.C.4.

the present argument, because Lord Beaverbrook, along with the rest of the Press, would declare in public that it does. For example, he implies it by speaking about the crushing of the Co-operative movement by the "will of the community." If that "will" can be exercised in any other way than by voting, it is up to him to explain how—and we should enjoy hearing him do so. In the meantime we must assume his assent to the proposition that public control of the Bank of England would give the Co-operative movement a share in that control nominally proportionate to its voting strength—say, a proportion of 6,000,000 in a total electorate of, say, 20,000,000. This being granted, we can take his Lordship a step further and point out to him that the control-power of the 6,000,000 votes is *potentially* greater than that of the other 14,000,000, for the reason that, given a clear issue on national financial policy, the 6,000,000 co-operators could unite for a certain policy whereas the 14,000,000 others would be more or less divided between alternative policies, arising out of mutually competitive interests. This does not mean that the Co-operative vote at the polls would necessarily win a majority of seats in Parliament, but it does mean that Co-operative Members of Parliament might, and probably would, wield influence over financial policy out of all proportion to their numerical strength. (By "Co-operative Members" we do not mean only members running exclusively under the Co-operative movement's auspices, but all members willing to support a given financial policy adopted by the movement.) This would be the more likely because already the Co-operative movement contains people of all political persuasions, bound together in support of the policy of extending the economic activity and usefulness of this great undertaking. The *Citizen's* attack on the Bank of England is not an end in itself; its purpose is to show (a) that the business activities of the Co-operative movement, and indeed of the whole community, are restricted under the Bank's present policy, and (b) that the traditional justification for that policy can be rationally impugned. When Lord Beaverbrook calls such a purpose disruptive he is virtually saying that 6,000,000 co-operators with their business executive are fools or knaves or both. If they are, then so is the whole community, for they are a cross-section of it. We can understand the professional bankers' disliking interference with their policy, and their claiming that they are best fitted to direct the country's financial affairs; but we cannot imagine how the editor of a popular newspaper in a democratic State can voluntarily commit himself to the proposition that Parliament must never ask them to prove their claim. Granting that the Co-operative movement might in theory come to command the balance of influence in the Parliamentary control of finance, that is no excuse for threatening to crush it without waiting to ascertain how it might use its influence.

Our readers will have noted that up to this point we have been discussing the matter on the popular assumption that the mobilisation and deployment of voting power are the decisive factors in establishing control of policy—in short, that the power of action is governed by public opinion. This assumption, as they know, is an inversion of the truth, and hence our conclusions from it amount to little more than debating points. They are worth making, however, insofar as they show that under conditions where the views of the *Citizen* on the one hand and of the *Daily Express* on the other were to compete on fair terms for public support, the directorate of the Co-operative Society would not need to take any notice of threats about "crushing." For before the "will of the community" delivered judgment the intelli-

gence of the community would have investigated the charge of "disruption" on which judgment was asked.

We will now change our terms of reference and bring them into close relation to the realities of the situation. Let us set them down in the following formula: Political power reflects economic power: economic power reflects financial power: financial power reflects military power. The vote of a worker has less power than that of an employer who can sack him: the vote of an employer has less than that of a financier who can bankrupt him: the vote of a financier has less than that of an armed man who can shoot him. This, of course, does not mean that arms create financial and economic resources, but it does mean that in a world of bitter competition, power of decision on what shall be done with these resources rests on the power of coercion, of which brute force is the ultimate expression. Against this background the warning of the *Daily Express* takes on a new meaning. We can exclude consideration of military coercion—for the principles governing the exercise of coercion are (a) that no more force shall be used than is necessary to achieve an object and (b) in a "democratic" system, that, other things equal, the less public the form of force used the better. So the directors of the Co-operative Society need not fear the arrest of their bodies by soldiers and police! But they have to take account of possible attempts to arrest their business. We say possible attempts, because Lord Beaverbrook does not say that he will take steps to "crush" the Movement. He appears as the disinterested adviser who foresees, or thinks he does, "the people" spontaneously taking action themselves or acquiescing in the result of similar action taken by others elsewhere and out of their sight. The last is the most probable alternative, for the "will of the community" is a *post-facto* will: the power of that will is simply the power to approve what has been done—or to disapprove it while something else is being done—something which, in turn, they will approve or disapprove in due course, and so on *ad infinitum*.

The question is: what are the directors of the Co-operative Society going to do? They, responsible for the trading side of the movement, are called upon to coerce those responsible for the political side. But the Political Committee have the right to ask them: "On what grounds of Co-operative principle?" The directors could only meet this challenge by affirming the doctrine that the politics of Co-operation must be such as not to provoke external interest to attack the business of the Society. But since the Co-operative movement has, throughout its history, been fighting off attacks in the economic field, and has succeeded in winning and consolidating its position without the help of direct political representation in Parliament, any proposal involving its business because those views cause offence outside comes very near to a complete reversal of its traditional policy of getting on with the talking. Our advice to the directors is to go on getting on with their job, and at least wait until something actually hits them on the business side before they fidget about what is being done on the political side. That something *can* hit them, and *may* hit them, we are quite aware; for we know that hitherto the banks have remained neutral to the economic struggle between the Co-operative and the Capitalist systems, whereas now they may be about to take sides. Nevertheless, in the larger interests of the Co-operative movement we recommend the directors to let the blow fall. *Que Messieurs les 'crusheurs' commencent*.

This recommendation is subject only to one reservation—but that a vital one—which is that, if and when anything happens, the directorate shall disclose it fully and frankly to the public. It may take the form of a restriction of refusal of banking accommodation; or it may take the form of a run on the financial resources of the Society. But whatever it is, publicity will turn the edge of it. More than that: the occurrence of such things after the *Daily Express's* published warning, would open up general political issues in which many more influences than the directors are aware of would be ranged on their side.

There is another argument for putting the warning to the test. It is that developments in finance—capitalism, domestic and international, have reached a point where the Co-operative movement is threatened with absorption in a Public Corporation, or with partition and absorption in several such Corporations. There is only a step between the existing prohibition of the Society's extending its activities into, let us say, electricity-generation and other so-called "public services," and taking away from the Society some of its present activities. For instance, the *Daily Express*, on the day following its attack (June 27) announces in bold type "a sensational project for State control" of all forms of insurance. To the uninitiated this would look like an extension of the Co-operative principle, for the scheme contemplates limiting profits to 5 per cent.—and even these "profits," accruing to the State, could be regarded as dividends to the population. And so with any other all-in Public or State Corporations: they could all be made to appear as subserving a State Co-operative policy. Presuming, as we must, that the directors of the Co-operative movement would not wish this to happen, the only arguments on which they could base their resistance to absorption are those which are explicit or implicit in the Political Committee's recent form of propaganda. This Committee, in furthering enquiry into the operations of Capitalist Finance, is doing the only thing that can be done to preserve the economic integrity of the Co-operative Society. If the directors disown the Committee's propaganda in order to dodge the "crush" of the devil they will perceptibly hasten their absorption by the deep sea. The *Citizen* is insisting that the bankers control economic action whether nominally under private management, co-operative management, or State management. If this is untrue, let the bankers or the Press disprove it. If it is true, the question of the bankers' policy and their methods is of immediate concern to every producer and consumer outside as well as inside the Co-operative movement. The directorate has everything to gain, and nothing to lose that is not already in process of being lost, by taking a firm stand against external pressure.

Let us now look at Lord Beaverbrook's complaint. What is there "grotesque" about the idea that the Bank of England is owned by American financial houses? He might well apply the adjective to a claim on the part of the *Citizen* to be able to prove it, because, in the nature of the case the evidence, if any, will be locked up in Threadneedle Street or Wall Street, and it would be grotesque to suppose that the *Citizen* could get hold of it. The Bank is a private institution. When Mr. Maxton proposed to introduce a Bill to nationalise it a few years ago the Committee who examined the Bill reported that "it was not in order because it proposed to deal with private property." We commented at the time on the obscurity of this reason—for all private property held by Englishmen can be constitutionally acquired by the State (as is attested by recent legislation), but we allowed that in the case of property

in England belonging to people of another nationality the Examining Committee would have a plausible reason for ruling the Bill out, and a good reason if the true ownership of the property was a State secret between the two Governments. (It might be useful to look up this episode in *Hansard* or *The Times*.) Not only is the Bank of England private property but there is nothing in its Charter providing that its stock must be exclusively in the hands of English holders. The stock is as freely transferable (subject to the directors' prior option to buy what is offered for sale) as that of a newspaper-property or any other concern. All that Lord Beaverbrook is entitled to say (for even he could only know for certain by having become the owner of the majority of the stock) is that no suggestion as to who are in control is provable. (We believe that a question bearing upon the Bank's business was put to Mr. Norman by the MacMillan Committee. If so, it ought to be in the Report.)

The real point is the policy pursued by the Bank. Far from wishing to believe that its policy is controlled in New York, all its critics, ourselves particularly, would find their hands strengthened by the knowledge that it had unfettered discretion to pursue the policy it thought best. We could then press the Bank (a) to show that its objective was the promotion of British interests, and without causing international complications, and (b) to explain to us the technical principles and methods which it was following in pursuit of that objective. And why, in that case, should we not get frank and full answers? A free Central Bank need not keep these things hidden from its own people, whereas a tied one might be obliged to. Unfortunately, the balance of antecedent probability is that the Bank's initiative is limited by the United States. Mr. Norman was trained in finance in the firm of Brown, Shipley and Co., bankers, in New York. He was appointed Governor of the Bank of England at the time when deflation commenced in England and America. Instead of retiring at the end of his year of office, he has remained Governor ever since. The frequency of his visits to the late Mr. Benjamin Strong, President of the Federal Reserve Board, during that period is notorious. And the fact that it was Mr. Norman who visited Mr. Strong, and not Mr. Strong Mr. Norman, has been noted and commented upon. More recently the Federal Reserve Board appointed an Adviser (now Dr. Sprague) to reside here to advise the Bank of England; and when a suggestion was mooted that it might be useful if an Adviser from the Bank of England were to go to the Federal Reserve Board, the Board caused it to be announced in the United States Press that they were apprized of all they wanted to know regarding conditions in Europe, and did not need any further advice. We submit that these facts are more consistent with the theory of American ownership of the Bank of England than with that of British ownership; and they justify the *Citizen's* suggestion, which, after all, can be disclaimed by the Bank if it is untrue. And what has it got to do with Lord Beaverbrook anyway?

The real challenge to the financial monopoly lies outside questions of control by one group or another, and consists in the technical analysis of the credit-structure. On this subject the assertions made by the *Citizen* are correct, and can be proved correct by evidence which cannot be concealed. THE NEW AGE has been making the same assertions, and many more, and advancing proofs of them, for the last ten years, to the knowledge of the whole London Press, without evoking a public attack on it from any newspaper. Why then this sudden uproar because the *Citizen* has begun to disseminate part

Current Political Economy.

HOOVER ALL THE WORLD.

All the English-speaking people are praising Mr. Hoover for saving the world. By a great dramatic gesture he is said to have restored optimism, confidence, and certain stock-exchange values. The only bad boy left, threatening to "wreck the delicate mechanism of Mr. Hoover's clock-work," is France. Naturally, the English-speaking people desire France to see reason, and to perceive that her moral prestige outside France is worth twenty-millions, safeguards, and everything else she would sacrifice by acknowledging the *de facto* world-government of Hoover, Mellon, and Stimson. Even in France the strongest argument for partial sacrifice is that no country can afford to run counter to the wishes of the United States. Outside France the belief is cherished that if, first, France does not give way, and if, second, prosperity does not return at once, France will be guilty.

It is not necessary to defend the French attitude to victory, security and reparations. On all these questions France is temperately timid. She has exacted a demonstration of victory greater than any victor should require; and persistently she seeks by material means a degree of security which material means cannot give. Nevertheless, among a world of romantics and optimists whose right hands know not what their left hands do, France is clear, logical, and free from hypocrisy. If, as the French believe, France was not consulted before the Hoover "dramatic" declaration was made, she has a right to complain at the way in which she is being forced to sacrifice what have become contractual debts. If she was consulted, the force has been definitely declared. No matter how desirable it may be to "save" Germany, it is an exceedingly undesirable and ominous thing that Britain should ally with the United States to force an unwilling France into making the biggest sacrifice, as, of course, it is, in spite of the fact that the United States foregoes a much greater nominal sum.

The statement that France's failure to adopt the Hoover proposals in full will prejudice the disarmament conference is next door to hypocrisy. Any nation which trusts the others to recognise its goodwill is at liberty to disarm completely, and depend on its good will. In the present state of Europe disarmament is quite impossible, since each nation lives in fear of invasion, or of civil war, which would provoke invasion. Disarmament conferences are shop-window peace for the sentimentalists. Armament develops far more rapidly than disarmament, which nobody proposes to apply to the developing points, electro-magnetic ray, gas, and air-war. Moreover, if war could be abolished by the following:—

- (1) Scrapping of all armaments,
- (2) public hanging of all chemists, physicists, and inventors who found anything capable of being used in war,
- (3) oaths by all Governments neither to attack nor defend by force,

the whole world would be the field of economic war in which the defeated would have no appeal except to the mercy of America, an intolerable humiliation.

The claim that Hoover has caused the sun of Peace and Prosperity (with initial capitals) to rise again is part of some mysterious propaganda for enamouring us of America just now. Dawes and Young presided over the ruination which Hoover is said to be clearing up. America was more respon-

sible than any other country for putting on the shackles which she is offering to remove for a year so that one of the economic prisoners may not die. America could have been generous in 1919. Her shrewdness, not her generosity, is evident now. The situation in Germany threatened not only financial collapse, but in addition civil war between Communists and Nationalists. Whether, in return for support from other countries, the Nationalists would have given up their repudiation theories or not, they could not, even in the event of victory, have fulfilled their promises. If the civil war had come about, the Communists would have expected aid from the Soviet Union just over the border. It might have been easy for England and France to oppose Russia, but the United States position was different. To allow the explosion to take place would have meant the loss of America's interests in both countries, and would have brought about a division in America, based on German and Russian interests, which would have threatened civil war in America. In short, Europe threatened to become the battleground of World - Nationalism and World - Communism. America, representing neither one nor the other, but Financial World-Oligarchy, had to stop it at any price, even that of coercing France. What America is saving, therefore, is not Europe for the Europeans, but for Finance. She has merely let out an extra yard in the donkey's ropes.

The world temporarily saved for Finance is not being saved for prosperity, nor, ultimately, for peace. The readjustments of stock-exchange values are purely financial. The relief which Germany has obtained gives her a little extra to spend abroad, a little better standard of living for her discontented middle-classes, a little more to stave off revolt by the oppressed poor. But the total sum involved is only a pittance, a very small fraction, for example, of the amount collected under Mr. Snowden's last Budget. The total stimulus given to consumption, therefore, all round, is very small, and will be absorbed in a very short time, having merely increased Germany's power as a competitor in the world-market. The one good thing which could come out of the moratorium is unintentional. It gives the world a little longer time in which to decide to socialise credit for consumption instead of fighting the Nationalist versus Communist battle in the dark, knowing not for what end.

BEN WILSON.

A Worthy Merchant.

The beauty of its style apart, this passage is worth reading as an indication of what the Elizabethans felt about their merchant princes. It is taken from *Good and Bad*, by Nicholas Breton, b. 1542, d. 1626.

"A worthy merchant is the heir of adventure, whose hopes hang much upon wind. Upon a wooden horse he rides through the world, and in a merry gale makes a path through the seas. He is a discoverer of countries and a finder out of commodities, resolute in his attempts and royal in his expenses. He is the life of traffic and the maintainer of trade, the sailor's master and the soldier's friend. He is the exercise of the Exchange, the honour of Credit, the observation of Time, and the understanding of Thrift. His study is Number, his care his good name. He fears not Scylla, and sails close by Charybdis, and, having, beaten out a storm, rides at rest in a harbour. By his sea-gain he makes his land-purse, and by the knowledge of trade finds the key of his treasure. Out of his travels he makes his discourses, and from his eye-observations brings the models of architecture. He plants the earth with foreign fruits, and knows at home what is good abroad. He is neat in apparel, modest in demeanour, dainty in diet, and civil in his carriage. In sum, he is the pillar of a city, the richer of a country, the furnisher of a Court, and the worthy servant of a King."

Drama.

Noë: Ambassadors.

This week the company of fifteen from the *View Colombier*, Paris, are performing André Obey's "La Viol de Lucrece." I urge everybody who can to see and hear them. Those who know very little French will find the play quite intelligible, and will be delighted to experience the degree of communication which can be established, in spite of strict economy of gesture, by speaking the words with the emotion due to them. With some knowledge of French the delight is, of course, greater. So clear is the actors' diction, so free from anything but the simple decision to communicate the experience to the audience, that, soon after the curtain has risen, one has forgotten the existence of every other speech but French. What a comment this gymnastic of the vocal organs and facial muscles, for clarity's sake, is on most of the articulation and diction nowadays given by English actors, who, while acting anything from Egyptian slave to American millionaire, have less desire to establish their capacity as actors than their Oxford origin. These French folk teach us by contrast how slovenly our English diction has become.

M. Obey's "Noë" is a Frenchman's version of "Green Pastures." It accordingly differs from "Green Pastures" as the mind of the Frenchman from that of the negro. Marc Connelly produced the lumps in his audience's throats by deliberately viewing the world through the eyes of a child, particularly unsophisticated even for a child. God had an office and charwomen and errand-boys, precisely as the New York Magnates that the negro knows. He was the exasperated father of naughty children, the standard of naughtiness being the conventional Puritan morality of the American South. While M. Obey also aims at an unsophisticated play, success is quite impossible. Sophistication challenges and defects M. Obey's sincerity, with the result that every time the play is about to attain grandeur it breaks down into French sentimental and ironic pessimism. "Noë" is a play for children before they attain the critical age, before they know enough to become self-conscious of the degree of sophistication in the straining after *naïveté*. A child may not mind when Noë puts his spectacles on in the manner of an old French general dealer. A grown-up may tell me that Shakespeare perpetrated anachronisms. The reply is that Mark Twain's "Yankee" did the humour of *deliberate* anachronism to death, and that it can never rise again except for children who do not recognise it. When Noë is distraught by the discontent of his children after their long incarceration on the ark, and seeks consolation with the Almighty, he uses the address, "Vieux Camarade." Translate as one will, it will not pass. As an inset to the programme giving the story of the play says, the brief and bare story of Noah in the Bible appeals to imagination to develop it. Then why not do so? Why alter it by presuming Noah's sons to be unmarried? Why mould it with the modern French convention of theatre-circus? Why substitute sentimentality and irony for sincerity and dignity? Why, in short, not dramatise the imaginative truth about Noah even if it does not result in a sob-making comedy in a particular style?

Judas: Royalty.

Seeing Mr. Frank Birch's Cambridge Festival Theatre production of F. V. Ratti's *Judas*, Mr. Leon M. Lion felt that London ought to have a chance to see it. Summer after summer, Mr. Lion has made it worth while going to the theatre by assuming that the intellentsia only could be drawn there against the competition of golf, tennis, or motoring in the country until bed-time. It may as well be admitted at once that the acting is not good. Not only the charac-

ters, but the setting before which they had to play, demanded the very best, in capacity, technique, and experience; which were more than the players available to Mr. Birch could give. Nevertheless, the obvious sincerity of the actors, and the quality of the play, call for a public vindication of Mr. Lion's venture. "Judas" is not anachronistic humour of the nursery type. It is not irony of the Anatole France type, combining cynicism with sentimentality. The author has experienced the paradox of Judas, and tries to present him in a way to illuminate him. Naturally the result is a reflection of ourselves, as every work of art, in Nietzsche's phrase, is an autobiography. But it is a sincere one.

As a child, S. Ratti's Judas had been banished by his father, the learned Simon Iscariot, who again turns his back on him when he returned. His pockmarks bring him only disfavour. His common-sense almost causes him to be stoned. He is accordingly intellectually and in all ways ambitious; introspective, and demanding a degree of certainty, scientific, logical, intellectual, that so simple a fellow as Thomas, who could believe even the evidence of his senses, could not understand. At a spiritualist séance Judas would have seen through everything, and found the naturalistic explanation. He required a security for his soul that nothing in earth or Heaven vouchsafes to any man. S. Ratti's Judas, in brief, is the archetype of the present-day intellectual neurotic, doubting and fearing more, while knowing more, than those around him, by whom he is equally doubted and feared. If Christ had the secret, He could be put to a scientific test. In the hands of the Powers Temporal, would he not disclose it? He does not do so, and Judas's rope is as much heri-keri as suicide. Do not suppose that S. Ratti imposes this psychological theorising on the action or dialogue. He restrains himself to the dramatic situations, relationships, and portraiture, which enable the onlooker to do the interpreting for himself.

There is no theory which logically accounts for Judas in terms of theology and history combined. He is the paradox of all theology who has enabled ironists to invert it. That Christ would have had to die peacefully in bed, or be walking the earth yet, but for Judas, who, therefore, saved the world, occurred to most of us as an original hypothesis before we were twenty. Unless the Christ myth is the reflection of the human mind, Christ as the sun or fundamental ego and the disciples as the constellations of functions and motives which support or betray the ego, Judas cannot be interpreted. Accept the myth as the drama of the individual, at some time all men are Matthews, exercising a public man's discipline. Peter's denying the friend for fear of public opinion, and Judas's betraying the self because of the desire for intellectual certainty rather than the reward that follows action taken in faith. S. Ratti's play is planes removed from the ordinary anthropomorphic, historical, or ironical dramatisations, because, although it is an historical presentation, the psychological values are truthfully reached.

Mr. Frank Birch's staging substantiates his claim to be a developer of the theatre. His use of simple shapes, cubes, levels, lighting, shadows, grouping, etc., to stimulate the imagination and induce a mood, without chaining the senses to details, is true scenic creation. But he has not yet solved the even greater problem of teaching actors to justify themselves before such settings. Mr. O'Dempsey's translation requires to be edited. The play would be improved if some of the phrases which cannot possibly keep company with the Biblical quotations were deleted. "It's terrible, it's horrible!"—to give one terrible example—cannot be said from any stage, outside melodrama.

PAUL BANKS.

ACADEMY CINEMA, OXFORD STREET

(Opposite Waring & Gillows).
A Season of Unique Films. Dreyer's Masterpiece,
"PASSION OF JOAN OF ARC"

Next Week: MOZART'S WORLD-FAMOUS OPERA, "THE MARRIAGE OF FIGARO" with Alexander Moissi, also "WAX-WORK," with Emil Jannings, Werner Krauss and Conrad Veidt.
Phone: Reg. 4361.

TUBERCULOSIS

ITS TREATMENT AND CURE
by Dr. ADRIEN SECHEHAYE.
(Translated from the French.)

No one interested in T.B. can afford to miss reading this book.
Price, 5/- from Booksellers or Post Free from the Publishers,
B. FRASER & Co., 62, Pepys Road, S.W.20.

THE "NEW AGE" CIGARETTE

Premier grade Virginian tobacco filled by hand in cases made of the thinnest and purest paper, according to the specification described in this journal on January 23, 1930.

Large size (18 to the ounce). Non-smouldering.

Prices: 100's 7/6 (postage 3d.); 20's 1/6 (postage 2d.)

Price for Export ex English duty quoted on minimum quantity of 1,000.

FIELDCOVITCH & Co., 72, Chancery Lane, W.C.2
(Almost on the corner of Holborn and Chancery Lane).

A consecutive introductory reading course in Social Credit is provided by the following sets of pamphlets:—

SET A.

Comprising:—

Social Credit in Summary (1d.).
The Key to World Politics (1d.).
Through Consumption to Prosperity (2d.).
Great Britain's Debt to America.
Post free, 6d. the set.

SET B.

Comprising:—

Set "A" above
The Veil of Finance (6d.).
Post free, 1s. the set.

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.

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.**

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 Breakdown of the Employment System. 1d.
The Control and Distribution of Production. 7s. 6d.
The Engineering of Distribution. 6d.
Social Credit. 7s. 6d.

These Present Discontents: The Labour Party and Social Credit. 1s.

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.

A + B. 1d.

Social Credit Principles. 1d.

DUNN, E. M.

The New Economics. 4d.
Social Credit Chart. 1d.

H. M. M.

An Outline of Social Credit. 6d.

HATTERSLEY, C. MARSHALL.

This Age of Plenty. 3s. 6d. and 6s.

POWELL, A. E.

The Deadlock in Finance. 5s.
The Flow Theory of Economics. 5s.

SHORT, N. DUDLEY.

It's Like This. 6d.

TUKE, J. E.

Outside Eldorado. 3d.

Critical and Constructive Works on Finance, Economics, and Politics.

DARLING, J. F.

Economic Unity of the Empire: Gold and Credit. 1s.
The "Rex"—A New Money to Unify the Empire. 2s.

FOSTER, W. T., and CATCHINGS, W.

Profits. 17s.

HARGRAVE, JOHN.

The Great Pyramid—An Analysis of the Political-Economic Structure of Society. (With diagram.) 1d.

HEWART (LORD).

The New Despotism. 21s.

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.

Instructional Works on Finance and Economics.

BARKER, D. A.

Cash and Credit. 3s.

Address: 70, High Holborn, London, W.C.1.

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70, High Holborn, London, W.C.1 (Telephone: Chancery 8470), and printed for him by THE ARGUS PRESS LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London, E.C.4.