

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 2180] NEW SERIES Vol. LV. No. 8. THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 1934. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

| | PAGE | PAGE |
|--|------|------|
| NOTES OF THE WEEK | 85 | |
| Lord Strabolgi's Motion in the Lords. Ezra Pound answers Crowther's articles in the <i>News-Chronicle</i> . The German moratorium on foreign loans. Privilege—further comments on the Committee of Privileges—the Commons debate—centralised government—"wills and wallets." Cricket and politics—the case of Larwood once more—the English selectors and political influence. Hilaire Belloc's article on Social Credit in <i>G.K.'s Weekly</i> . | | 92 |
| CHRIST'S ECONOMIC TEACHING. By A. B. <i>The People's Rights</i> (Rev. J. Stuart Roach. The Social Credit Press, Melbourne.) | 89 | 92 |
| THE GREEN SHIRTS. By F. G. Lord Strabolgi's Motion—Earl Stanhope on "green shirts." Deputation of women to 10, Downing Street. | 90 | 93 |
| "VRAIBLEUSIA."—II. By "Old and Crusted" <i>The Voyage of Captain Popanilla</i> (Disraeli). | 91 | 94 |
| | | 95 |
| THE POINT OF THE PEN.—IV. By R. Laugier | | 92 |
| THE THEATRE. By Vernon Sommerfield <i>The Comedy of Errors. The Queen of Scots. Mrs. McConaghy's Money.</i> | | 93 |
| THE FILMS. By David Ockham <i>Hi! Nellie. This Side of Heaven.</i> | | 93 |
| EARL STANHOPE ON THE PRICE-INCOME GAP. By A. B. | | 93 |
| THE SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY. <i>Democracy at the Cross Roads. Major C. H. Douglas before the New Zealand Government's Monetary Committee.</i> | | 94 |
| MUSIC. By Kaikhosru Sorabji <i>The Finnish National Orchestra.</i> | | 94 |
| REVIEWS <i>Scientific Research and Social Needs</i> (Julian Huxley). | | 95 |
| CORRESPONDENCE J. G., John Hargrave, R. Halliday Thompson. | | |

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Lord Strabolgi's Motion.

Lord Strabolgi duly introduced his motion on a monetary inquiry in the House of Lords on June 13. The report in *The Times* on the following day is very meagre. The debate on the Committee of Privileges' Report in the House of Commons runs to columns on columns in this number of *The Times* and will have distracted attention from a subject many times more important than Mr. Churchill's complaint. The only point reported from Lord Strabolgi's speech was his reference to the correspondence in *The Times* on the Money question a few weeks ago as evidence of the growing interest in financial policy. Lord Arnold, supporting the Motion, is reported to have said that the policy of Mr. Montagu Norman and the Bank of England for the last fifteen years had been wrong; and that it had been in process of weakening the confidence of foreign investors in 1931, thus helping to precipitate the crisis which forced the Labour Government out of office in that year. Earl Stanhope, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs (London-Basle department, presumably!) replied that a new inquiry would only cover the same ground as the Macmillan Report; that the relevant information was in "everybody's possession"; and lastly that the Government held the view that there was "no short cut by any monetary change that would enable this country to get back to prosperity." All we can make out of this bare summary is that the Government appear to think that there is nothing to inquire about but the theories and evidence which were admitted within the terms of reference that the Macmillan Committee laid down for themselves. Apart from that, the news that the information they collected is in everybody's possession—at something like £3 6s. for the Report and Evidence!—is surely a sign that prosperity is back already and there is no need to move from where we are. We hear from someone who was present to hear the debate that there was some back-chat across the floor in which Major Douglas's name was frequently mentioned, and also that of the Green Shirts. The game two together. What prompted it was the fact that shortly before the debate a deputation of Green Shirts

visited the House of Lords with a letter for Lord Strabolgi, presumably encouraging him to take up a strong Social Credit line. We have no further details.

The "News-Chronicle" Articles.

In the *News-Chronicle* of June 14 Mr. Ezra Pound is allowed a short, but prominent, space in which he lets forth a semi-jocular tirade against Mr. Crowther's articles criticising Social Credit. It is not at all effective, and we are afraid that it will give ordinary readers the impression of more or less empty abuse. The *News-Chronicle* adds a footnote explaining that Mr. Pound is an American poet—a sort of wink to its readers, as much as to say: "Sorry, but you know what these poets are."

The German Moratorium.

On June 14 the evening newspapers reported that Dr. Schacht had held up the services of the Dawes, Young, and Potash Loans for six months, and that there had ensued heavy selling of these securities in London. Dr. Schacht's decision is reported to have come as a "shock" after the warning given him recently by the British delegation that the Government would take a "grave view" of his suspending these services. We must now wait to see if the Lord Mayor sets up a Mansion House Fund for the widows and orphans afflicted by this default. It is true that the newspapers attribute most of the holdings to financial houses, but even so, who can tell how many humble people have their savings invested with them?!

Privilege.

The facts which we discussed last week apropos of Mr. Churchill's allegations against Sir Samuel Hoare and Lord Derby, their reference at his instance to the Committee of Privileges, and the publication of the Committee's Report, afford a basis on which to review the utility of this institution of inquiry.

What Mr. Churchill appeared to focus his attention on was the roles fulfilled by Sir Samuel Hoare. This gentleman's functions seem to have been divided into three compartments. As a unit in the Cabinet he was an agent unwittingly subserving a world-cotton-trade policy inspired by international finance and transmitted via the Bank of England and the Treasury. As chief

of his Department, his job was primarily to look after Lancashire's interests in connection with the projected new Indian constitution. As member of the Joint Committee, his function was more judicial; it was to balance Manchester's interests against Bombay's. Thus he had to be barrister, judge and banker at one and the same time, and on an issue where merits were to a large extent withdrawn from the sphere of advocacy and adjudication. As advocate he was gagged by himself as the judge, and as judge he was blinkered by himself as the banker. And since he did not know that he was the banker (and all of us are bankers who accept the axioms of finance laid down by authority) the miracle is, not that he acted "unusually"—to use the guarded hypothetical language of the Committee of Privileges—but that he didn't get a nervous breakdown. Only a congenial wirepuller would occupy such a false position if he could help it. But statesmen invariably place themselves in that position by their absentminded acceptance of office and their ignorance of its real implications within the financial system. So much for Sir Samuel's part in this matter. We will now deal with the task of the Committee of Privileges.

The first thing to notice is that the allegations did not impute anything corrupt in a Parliamentary frame of reference, much less anything indictable in a legal frame of reference, against the two alleged offenders. Their object might be lofty and their motives beyond reproach, but neither of these considerations was a defence to the submission made by Mr. Churchill that these gentlemen used irregular means to achieve their object. The Committee, as we know, did not uphold the submission. But the fact that they inquired into it shows that the question of its truth or otherwise involved a constitutional principle. If true it would have meant that an apparently independent body, the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, had been influenced by private pressure amounting to intimidation, to put their signature to testimony which, by dictated omissions and additions, misrepresented their real opinions and also (probably) the facts behind them. The essence of the irregularity would not have been in its form, that is, in its intimidatory character, but in the circumstances of its commission, that is, its secrecy. The two factors are complementary, but the second is the dominant one; for it is clear that coercion exercised publicly would have been useless for its purpose: the public would have rejected the evidence or at least discounted it.

The Committee of Privileges, in this case, have virtually pronounced the secrecy to have been harmless because the act secretly done was not of an intimidatory nature. The meaning of their judgment, in the context of the Report, is that the private communication of facts and use of arguments does not constitute a breach of privilege, and, as they point out, has long been recognised in practice between the India Office and the trade interests in Lancashire and elsewhere. Naturally this interpretation is based on the assumption that the facts are facts and that the effect of communicating them is to assist judgment, not confuse it. It would not, or should not, cover cases where, although facts were communicated, some material facts were knowingly withheld. As readers of these "Notes" will realise there can be such a thing as innocently communicating, as facts, matters which are not facts, and of unknowingly withholding matters which are material facts. We all see it happening in the Press every day, let alone what is done in secret conclaves. Such innocent falsification of issues would not constitute a breach of privilege in the conventional sense; but that does not alter the fact that it would have the same consequences which the Committee of Privileges is there to prevent, namely, the misdirection of public opinion. Of course the existing Committee, having regard to its personnel and to the circumstances in which it functions at present, is powerless to prevent such misdirection by such

methods, whether the agents of it are aware or not of the deception, because they themselves do not possess the technical knowledge necessary to detect the deception and assess its consequential significance and dimensions. If they did, and if they had the opportunities and the powers to identify the agents and stop their activities, the game of "private contacts"—the main-spring of political bargaining—would not be worth playing. For that matter, nobody would then be tempted to play it—as every student of Social Credit will appreciate.

Coming to more immediate matters, there will be no question that in hypothetical cases where the cogency and relevancy of all the material facts were within the knowledge of agents, a Committee of Privileges should hold them to be guilty of a breach of privilege if they concealed them (wholly or in part) in negotiations with parties having less knowledge than themselves. The Committee would be expected by the public not to draw any distinction between trickery and intimidation. And alternatively, in cases where the trick were innocently played, the public, while assenting to the exoneration of the agent, would expect Parliament to repair such injury as had befallen the victim of the deception. This would often be a counsel of perfection; for unfortunately, in actual life, such an act of deception produces undesirable consequences of one sort, which, by the mere efflux of time, become irreversible without producing others of another sort. Each new event, however caused, changes the frame of reference in which the desirability of reversing it has to be considered. This fact, of course, heightens the culpability of those whose behaviour sets such moral dilemmas. They benefit by their blunders, and afterwards invoke the fact that the consequences cannot be undone to stigmatise criticism as futile. And so it is in this narrow sense, but unless it is made known to everybody concerned nothing can be done to prevent the repetition of irregularities.

Since writing the foregoing the House of Commons has accepted the Report of the Committee of Privileges. In the debate Lord Hugh Cecil said that if the Joint Committee on India had been found to be a strictly judicial body the action of Sir Samuel Hoare and Lord Derby might have been found "unusual." But as it was not, continuing, he remarked that the "persuasion" of witnesses before they gave evidence was not a breach of the privileges of the House, but it should not be "carried too far"—a pronouncement which leaves it vague whether the over-persuasion is a matter of deception or coercion. It would be futile to quarrel with this as a general statement, because under the present financial system diplomacy between parties or nations is bound, for practical reasons, to be secret on certain matters "for reasons of State," or "in the public interest," as the phrases go; and once you accept the primacy of State interests you are obliged to condone any "irregularities" which can be proved to be necessary to preserve those interests. For instance, in the present case, once you agree that the success of the Mission to India was vital to this country's interests, and that this success would be jeopardised by allowing the Manchester Chamber of Commerce unfettered discretion as to what evidence they should publish in this country, then you have to regard as legitimate the measures taken to fetter their discretion, and have no opening for criticism except on the technical question of whether the fetters were heavier than was necessary to achieve the object. Basically the occasion of Mr. Churchill's *coup* is part and parcel of the whole system of bureaucratic despotism described by Lord Hewart.

The situation we all have to face is that the "war" end war" began one, and that whereas in 1918, as a certain general observed, the war was settling down to peace conditions, in 1934 the peace is settling down to war conditions. We are in a state of war all the time and therefore we must accept the limitations on democ-

cratic freedom of speech and action which logically arise from the conditions and objectives of warfare. Against this background the pressure exercised on the Manchester Chamber of Commerce was probably much the same as that exercised on conscientious objectors when this country resorted to conscription, and might even have been as light in character as the white feathers which young ladies used to present to eligible men out of uniform in the earliest days of the war. So, in one way, the citizen is fortunate in having any judicial machinery left at all to investigate interferences with his liberty; and perhaps Mr. Churchill has made a real contribution to the cause of freedom by reminding the public that this machinery exists, and by setting it in motion. To use a cricket analogy, the Committee of Privileges has come on to the field after its long retirement, and if it has not bowled out any bureaucrats during its first over or two, we can hope that it has at least loosened its arm and warmed itself up for further spells of bowling later on, and if it gets a little "Douglas" message and liniment in the dressing room during the intervals, so much the better.

In a real sense an all-party Government is a self-constituted Government. When, as in this country, you have a joint appeal by three party executives, on the basis of a concerted programme, financed by one pool of party fighting-funds, backed by an all-party Press combination with its own fighting-funds, and the lot of them secretly supported by an all-in consortium of money monopolists, you have an appeal for a public mandate against which no counter-appeal is possible. The "approval" of the electorate is predetermined and virtually automatic. The mandate which, in form, is the expression of the will of the people, represents, in fact, the suppression of their will. For evidence of the existence of any will at all the statistics of abstentions from the polling booth are probably more reliable than those of the majority or minority votes. If the time has not come yet, it is near at hand when all legislation will be passed in the name of a minority of the voters. Whatever the conscious motivation of the absentees may be, there is prevalent a vague apprehension of the fact that political programmes, as formulated and loudspoken nowadays, permit of any interpretation to adopt and implement any chosen interpretation resides in the control of massed mobile money.

"And what is your will, then, my pretty maid?" "My will's in your wallet, sir," she said. Funds behind funds behind funds tower up and away, forming an inverted pyramid in terms of size and power, while enclosed within it is an upright pyramid representing the numerical measure of human controllers. The million at the bottom in control of one pound are ultimately governed by one man in control of a million pounds. That is the pattern of the situation in which we are living to-day; and it is such a pattern, or anything resembling it or foreshadowing it, which all true seekers after economic security and personal liberty, or leaders and guides of such, are determined to expose and destroy by every means in their power wherever they detect it. Wherever the principle of massing wallets in advance of consulting wills is carried out be sure that the two or three gathered together to do it have the Devil in their midst.

Cricket and Politics.

Readers will remember that at the time of the leg-theory controversy in Australia when the English team were playing there we wrote a series of "Notes" on the relation between the bad feeling on the playing fields and the bad economic conditions elsewhere—between Niemeyer's bullying from Canberra of Australian statesmen and editors in the name of England, and the crowd's barracking from "the Hill" of the English players and his return from Australia wrote a book on the tour in which he mentioned two significant things, the one being the supreme confidence of the Australians before the

Test that the victory of their team was a foregone conclusion, and the other the astounding volume of resentment in higher quarters there at the decision of the English team to visit New Zealand on the way home after the Tests were over. These argued an exuberance of pride on two different planes, and centred round the technical performances and social contacts of the English team in such a way as almost to suggest that the laws and spirit of the game of cricket were part of the Australian Constitution. And Mr. J. H. Thomas's unofficial intervention in the controversy started by the Australian Cricket Board and the M.C.C. on Mr. Jardine's policy and Mr. Larwood's methods during the tour made it seem that cricket and politics were functions of each other in Anglo-Australian relations.

Last week we touched on the balloon comedy at Nottingham with the above reflections in our mind. So it will be understood when we now suggest that the victory of Australia has been a victory for the sponsors of the quota system imposed by London Finance on Australian primary producers. When you consider that practically the whole Australian population were sitting up all night to follow the fortunes of their team, you will realise that the universal joy over its having drawn first blood in the cricket contest will immeasurably assist the efforts of Mr. Bruce and others to persuade the Australians to let the London Bankers have their quota system as a consolation prize. "Ha, ha! We've won on the field: so what's it matter that thieves have gone over our clothes in the dressing room?" "The Englishman," once remarked a French wit, "is the most cheerful winner that I have ever come across"—and it may be that the Australian is the most generous winner. There must have been much rubbing of hands in Threadneedle Street over the collapse at Trent Bridge.

Unfortunately there has been much gnashing of teeth elsewhere, so much so that Mr. Jardine came out in the *Evening Standard* last week with an onslaught on the policy, or suspected policy, of the English selectors, quite out of keeping with his traditional diplomatic attitude on these matters. Has there been, and is there, he asked, a policy of refusing to invite Larwood to play in the Tests except under conditions prohibiting his exploitation of leg-theory bowling? In terms of our above analysis, is there a policy which is designed to risk the loss of the rubber rather than to affront Australian susceptibilities? Mr. Carr, the captain of the Nottinghamshire Cricket Club, wrote on the next day enthusiastically endorsing Mr. Jardine's challenge, and adding the information that he himself was not being allowed full discretion on this matter in handling the County team. The latest news at the moment of writing is that the English selectors are permitting assurances to be published that providing Larwood is fit he will be invited to play in the next Test without conditions other than those always affecting players in action under the direction of their captain.

Students of cricket news will be aware that certain captains of county teams had been publicly reproaching leg-theory bowling during the few weeks preceding the first Test. The fact that County captains are drawn from a higher social class (they are mostly amateurs) renders it probable that they are on dining terms with bankers, not to speak of the likelihood that members of their families are in the financial game. Assuming this, it is not over-stretching an inference to suggest that these criticisms have a common ultimate inspiration in the City. It is true that there are immediate reasonable and practical objections to body-line bowling, but that does not invalidate the theory of financial prompting when they are publicly canvassed. The banker always employs innocent agents when he can.

(The above comments were written last Friday. Those following deal with the news up to Sunday morning.)

The details of the comedy have a real bankster smack about them. Postulating that the bankers did not want Larwood to spoil their game by playing his own, this is how they would work it if they had the responsibility of choosing the English team. They would first of all question whether he was fit enough to play. They would then seek out those English cricketers who disapproved his bowling methods. On the basis of such complaints as they assembled and published they would be able to frame up a case for their policy without bringing into the issue the question of whether the Australian team objected to Larwood or not. "This is purely a matter," they could say "of sportsmanship in the Test matches, and unity among the English players chosen to participate in them." And on that moral ground they could contrive that Larwood should agree with them to alter his bowling policy, or that the captain chosen should agree with them to prohibit him from carrying it out on the field. What would suit them best in either case (if only it were possible) would be an arrangement by which an "acceptable" bowler, disguised to look like Larwood, should take his place in the team.

As a matter of fact some such development has taken place. It began months ago with references throughout the Press to Larwood's general health and his form. The central theme was "Larwood's toe"; and the variations were tributes to his strenuous work in Australia, the physical strain which he had undergone, the resultant trouble to his foot, and so forth and so on, culminating in the dark speculation whether we should ever see the old Larwood any more. The sequel was Larwood's own declaration of his unfitness to play at Nottingham, thus sparing the selectors the problem of deciding whether to invite him or not. But last week he provided the cricket world with a practical demonstration that his stamina and pace were restored, and, more disturbing still, that he was determined to exercise his right to bowl leg-theory if he thought fit. Perhaps most important of all was the fact that the batsmen against whom he employed this method had no objection to make about it, some of them even volunteering the opinion that he was one of the "fairest" bowlers in the game. That Larwood's recovery of his old form was largely due to the moral support contained in the articles of Mr. Jardine and Mr. Carr last Wednesday is strongly suggested by his performance on the following Saturday when during one period in the game between Nottinghamshire and Lancashire he took six wickets for one run—and—the joke is—without bowling leg-theory! To the elated cricketing public—the "consumers" of the game—that settled the whole argument about whether to play him or not. But on the next day the *Sunday Express* gave them a shock: it announced that Larwood had refused to play in the forthcoming Test match at Lord's. The theory put forward by Larwood's colleague, Voce, in a long interview on the event is that the selectors have instructed the captain-designate of the team for that match to "restrict leg-theory bowling." In the same interview Voce lets forth volleys of abuse against the English selectors, asking how long "three men" shall select English teams to suit the Australian Cricket Board against the feeling of the "forty million people who are England." "Questions," he goes on "ought to be asked in Parliament" and the whole mess of intrigue and double-crossing cleared up once and for all. He might have followed Mr. Churchill's example and called for a "Committee of Privileges."

In the meantime it is important to notice that the Australian players and their manager are keeping silence; in fact, ever since they landed they have observed discretion to such a degree that they might have been a team of central bankers under the charge of Mr. Montagu Norman. Players are, of course, always expected to guard their tongues on the occasions of tours like this, but never before has the silence been so pro-

found. Great issues may hang on the spin of a coin, and anyone might be pardoned for wondering whether the destinies of this country were involved in the winning of the rubber—whether on one solitary English cricketer depends the issue of Australia's secession from the Empire and the consequent disequilibrium in the world's balance of power.

However, no-one will envy Larwood's situation even within the more immediate frame of circumstances. He was bitterly assailed by the barrackers and Press when in Australia, but that was more or less to be expected at that time and in that place because he was employing novel methods with success in front of crowds almost religiously intent on the victory of their team. But in the opposite frame of circumstances on this side he is entitled to expect different treatment. Is leg-theory bowling fair or unfair? The answer depends upon whether it involves bodily danger to the "class" batsman on a properly prepared wicket. The element of danger is bound up with the speed and skill of the bowler on the one hand and the quick-footedness of the batsman on the other. Now it is claimed for Larwood that no bowler of his pace more accurately controls his pitch; and if that is so all that is required to eliminate danger is for batsmen who are to meet him to be quick-footed. There are plenty of them. Moreover, unless leg-theory is exploited by an accurate bowler it threatens danger to the fieldsmen close in on the leg side who might easily be knocked out by a pulled or hooked shot off a short ball. In a word, leg-theory is ineffective unless done well, and if done well is comparatively innocuous in the best class of cricket. If Larwood's accuracy be granted, the fairness of his bowling is certain. It is a technical, not a moral question; and has nothing to do with the immediate feelings of partisan lookers-on, whether English or Australian spectators. In any case there are always enough disinterested spectators, and even partisans, who, with due reflection, can be depended upon to judge whether a special technique as perfected by Larwood is a desirable one to practise. Neither the captain, members nor supporters of a team would tolerate the extended use of a bowler who inflicted a succession of casualties in such wise that his analysis began to read—One Over; one Maiden; no Runs; six "Retired Hurt."

In these circumstances it would be a reflection on Larwood, other players, captains and spectators (who, as Voce has put it, are England) for the selectors to say downright that bodyline is to be barred. They do not say so; but everything that has happened confirms the theory that they are trying to enforce such a decision by hidden methods; and nothing has happened that conflicts with that theory.

We do not invite judgment against them except within the immediate sporting frame of reference. Inside it there is a *prima facie* case against them of arbitrary policy and irregular or "unusual" conduct (the Committee of Privileges might say) which calls for reprobation—and in fact is getting it. But if, as we have hinted, high-political considerations have had to be taken into their calculations we can appreciate their difficulties, and might probably endorse their action on a survey of all the facts. With all the diversity of explosive material ready for another world war, it is not, almost any wide outbreak of controversy might easily act as a detonator. When a sportsman like Voce seriously urges a "Larwood" debate in Parliament and is given the front page of the *Sunday Express* which to whip up public support for it, the possibility of the danger stands out as self-evident. Sir Stansfeld Jackson, the chairman of the selectors, could probably say much in defence of their policy. He was Financial Secretary to the War Office (1922-3) Chairman of the Unionist Party (1923-6). He served in South Africa (1900-1902). (Note that Sir Stansfeld Game, Governor of New South Wales, as well as

Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, were serving there at the same time.) Until lately he has been Governor of Bengal. With this experience of his own, and his frequent contacts with his fellow-members of the Carlton Club, he stands out as the most likely man to shape the policy of the selectors in cases where high political issues are involved; and if that is the case now, no doubt he could give a completely satisfactory explanation of their suspected course of action—one moreover which would present the Larwood controversy in its proper reduced perspective in the general picture of world problems. All the same, assuming this to be the case, he is open to criticism for neglecting, as he would appear to have done, to take Mr. Jardine and Mr. Carr more into his confidence. They are not irresponsible men, and it is most unlikely that they would have fed the Press with the provocative matter that they have done if they had been advised of any "reasons of State" for localising the controversy and abating animosities arising from it. It is just possible that they have been told at least something, but that the popular discontents arising out of England's defeat, and the eagerness of Fleet Street to cash out on them, have driven these two captains into print. They may possibly have said to themselves: "After all, if political statesmanship has got into a mess, it is the business of political statesmen to get out of it, and by other means than sacrificing the reputation and career of a deserving and popular figure on our cricket grounds."

And the moral? It is that more and more things are being sucked into the swirl of the economic pandemonium set spinning by the forces of an uncontrolled money system. Mr. Jardine and Mr. Carr, on their plane of protest and probing, are doing the same thing as Lord Strabolgi and Lord Arnold on theirs—not to speak of the activities of the rest of us who know exactly what the root of all the trouble is and where to locate it. We can sit still and applaud all such attempts to resolve complexities, knowing that when pursued by honest men with singleness of purpose the effect of their participation must be to reinforce and quicken the drive against the Money Monopoly.

Hilaire Belloc on Social Credit.

The favourable article on Social Credit by Mr. Hilaire Belloc in the current issue of *G.K.'s Weekly* is evidence that intellectual honesty—hall-mark of a great mind—is still to be found. *G.K.'s Weekly* has been the ground of some lively controversy on Social Credit, and Mr. Belloc's authoritative pronouncement is therefore all the more welcome. He says, "The Douglas Scheme of Credit, which is deservedly occupying an increasing place in contemporary discussion, is a suggestion to do quickly and completely what would be done more slowly and less completely by a good distribution of property." Mr. Belloc's influence in Roman Catholic and other circles is considerable; his pen is formidable, his courage undeniable. We welcome him as an ally in the more intense phase of the struggle now opening.

Christ's Economic Teaching.

A new pamphlet* has just reached us from Australia. It is by J. Stuart Roach, Vicar of the Parish of Noosa, Queensland, who describes it as "A Simple Dissertation on the Morality of Social Credit." It commences with the recital of Major Douglas's familiar Three Principles (Swanwick) and then treats of them in chapters entitled successively "Freedom," "Something More than a Change of Heart is Needed," "Unearned Bread," "Personal Wealth," and so on.

For lucidity, sincerity, and insight this pamphlet will take a high place among works relating Social Credit to the People's Rights. (The Social Credit Press, 20, Queen Street, Melbourne, Australia. 56 pp. Price 9d. A limited number of copies are on sale at the Credit Research Library, 70, High Holborn, W.C.1, price 10d., post free.)

Christianity. Few readers whose problem it is to break down moral prejudices against the objective of Social Credit will hesitate to say that here is a composition which, considering its compass, is the most comprehensive, thorough and persuasive piece of writing that they can call to their aid. Although Mr. Roach openly writes as a believer in the Christian religion, there is no invocation of moral principle which will not command the assent of thoughtful followers of any other religious system. Listen to the following:

"I cannot see any reason why, for instance, a manual labourer should not be a highly cultivated man. . . . Under Social Credit we might lose the foolish, snobbish attitude taken up against manual work as being something inferior, and only to be performed by inferior people. . . . We often try to forget that our Blessed Lord was a carpenter.

"The ex-Kaiser William's hobby is chopping down trees; Mr. Winston Churchill's recreation is brick-laying; but ex-Kaiser William would not like to be scrub-cutting on wages in Queensland, nor Mr. Churchill earning a precarious living as a member of the Bricklayers' Union. The great difference is this, their manual work is undertaken in a freedom of choice, and it incurs no social penalty.

"In all reverence I say this, our Lord's teaching is economically quite sound if accepted in its due place with all His other teaching about duty to God and our fellow men; I mean, the morality and the economics of the Gospels hang together and form a comprehensive whole, and any neglect of one injures the other. Our Lord's economic teaching seems to us absurd, because we can only think of it trying to function in a moral setting which is distinctly un-Christian. We ourselves by our unjust and dishonest order of society make it impossible for His principles to be applied without serious and far-reaching qualification.

"Nothing can produce more unhealthy sex morality in the community to-day than our present economic system, with its suppression of natural desire. With the widespread knowledge of the use of contraceptives we are forcing healthy men and women to gratify a wholesome natural desire in unholy and unnatural ways. This is nothing less than the degradation of human personality made in the image of the Divine Creator, and if encouraged by the economic system which will not permit men and women to marry at an early age and build a home for themselves, we shall commit social and moral suicide." These passages are no more than a fair sample of the whole dissertation. One other, of a different character, must be quoted. Discussing the cases of ill-treated wives who unjustly suffer because they "cannot do anything else," Mr. Roach remarks:

"Through the operation of the National Dividend each woman in the community will be given sufficient for her needs of food, clothing and housing. . . . And so if her dear 'John William' does not behave himself as he promised at the altar to do, she can leave a note in the kitchen and tell him where to find the corned beef for tea, and set up a separate establishment of her own with no other thoughts than peace of mind for herself. Mind you, I hope the women under Social Credit will not be too severe on the men, but as they have endured bondage for a pretty long time, the sudden acquisition of independence might make many of them act in a hurry. If they do, we must hope that after one glorious fling of liberty they and the 'John Williams' will see the foolishness of a broken partnership, and with wiser minds and more devoted hearts again build up the broken domestic hearth."

Sufficient has now been quoted to establish in the mind of the reader the antecedent probability that Mr. Roach has provided the Social Credit Movement with a weapon of dynamic power for use in overcoming psychological resistance to the objective we are striving to reach. At any rate, that is the profound conviction of the writer of this inadequate review.

The Green Shirts.

NOTES FROM THE GENERAL SECRETARY.

In connection with the motion on the Order Paper of the House of Lords calling attention to "the growing opinion that defects in the principles governing the issue and recall of money and credit are primarily responsible for continued economic distress in a world which has never been so well equipped to provide for all material needs," a letter from the Green Shirt Movement, dated June 11, was sent to Lord Strabolgi, the originator and mover of the Motion (House of Lords, June 13).

Writing in reply (June 12) Lord Strabolgi said:—
" . . . I shall be very glad to receive a Deputation, as I intend to bring this subject up in other forms on future occasions, notably when the Finance Bill comes before the House of Lords."

A deputation of Green Shirts duly waited upon Lord Strabolgi.

The following extracts are taken from Parliamentary Debates, House of Lords, Wednesday, June 13, 1934, Official Report (Unrevised), issued by H.M. Stationery Office (price 6d. net), under the heading "Monetary Policy":—

Lord Strabolgi had the following Notice on the Paper:—To call attention to the growing opinion that defects in the principles governing the issue and recall of money and credit are primarily responsible for continued economic distress in a world which has never been so well equipped to provide for all material needs; and to move to resolve, That His Majesty's Government do institute an immediate investigation of the monetary system apart from its administrative machinery, with terms of reference sufficiently wide to permit full inquiry into its principles and proposals for its modification; and to move for Papers.

(Lord Strabolgi's speech follows here. Earl Stanhope replied for the Government, after speeches by Lord Iliffe, Lord Monkswell, and Earl Peel.)

The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Stanhope): My Lords, I was somewhat puzzled when I saw the noble Lord's Motion on the Paper. I wondered which of the many different devices he was going to suggest to your Lordships' House. As your Lordships know, a great many solutions have been suggested for the monetary problem—bimetallism and many others—and at last I thought I discovered in the closing sentences of the noble Lord's speech the reason for his Motion. I find he is a Green Shirt, and that is why my noble friend Lord Peel has not come across the same views. I understand that he, at any rate, does not wear either a green shirt or a black shirt or anything but a shirt of normal colour. The Green Shirt represents, of course, the policy put forward by Major Douglas, which is called the Douglas Social Credit scheme. . . . The Government feel that there would be no advantage in having a new inquiry. . . . In the view of the Government there is no short cut by any monetary change to enable this country to get back to prosperity. . . . The noble Lord referred to the Douglas scheme, the Green Shirt scheme. I would remind him that that scheme was put before the Macmillan Committee. Major Douglas himself gave evidence, but the Committee apparently did not think it of sufficient importance to refer to it in their Report.

Lord Strabolgi: I am sure the noble Earl does not want to misrepresent me. I did not put forward the Douglas remedy at all. The Douglas cause I referred to, but not the remedy.

Earl Stanhope: I understood the noble Lord to put forward a similar scheme. He said: "Is it true that it is possible that industry raises an income insufficient to purchase its goods?" That is the Douglas inquiry.

Lord Strabolgi: That is the Douglas complaint. (Earl Stanhope continued his speech, which should be read in full.)

Lord Arnold, in the course of the next speech, said:—

. . . I think Lord Strabolgi has done well to put this Motion on the Paper. He put forward a very reasoned case and a very moderate case. He did not specifically advocate any particular scheme. I do not know why the Douglas scheme should be fastened upon him. I did not understand him to support the scheme. The noble Earl surely knows perfectly well that the Douglas scheme is not entirely a new kind of thing. The Douglas scheme merely brings to a head in a certain way certain principles which have been in the minds of persons interested in currency problems for generations. My noble friend did not support the scheme and he cannot be accused, if it be an accusation, of wearing a green shirt.

We are still awaiting a reply from Mr. Montagu Norman to our letter of May 28.

No reply having been received to the letter addressed to the Prime Minister, dated June 6, and delivered at No. 10, Downing Street on that day by members of the Women's Section, another squad of Green Shirt Women marched to No. 10 on Friday, June 15, again to request that a deputation be received on behalf of the women of Great Britain. This squad arrived at 6.30 p.m.

The leader carried a letter reminding Mr. Ramsay MacDonald that there had been no reply to the previous letter. Having knocked at the door, she was asked by the porter to deliver the letter to him. She stated that she must give it to the Prime Minister in person, or to his Private Secretary. Thereupon the porter fetched another official, who said that he would undertake to deliver the letter to the Prime Minister. The Green Shirt squad-leader insisted, however, that she must give it to Mr. MacDonald or his Private Secretary.

After waiting a few minutes she was conducted along a corridor and presented to Mr. Neville Butler, the Prime Minister's Private Secretary. The following conversation took place:—

Mr. Butler: "Did you wish to speak to me?"
G.S. Leader: "I have a letter for Mr. Ramsay MacDonald."

Mr. Butler: "Oh, yes, I will give it to him."
G.S. Leader (not giving the letter): "Can you give me a written guarantee that it will be handed to the Prime Minister?"

Mr. Butler (backing away): "No, I cannot do that."
G.S. Leader: "Our reason for asking for such a guarantee is: that the letter we left here last week has not yet received any reply."

Mr. Butler: "No, I know, but—er—it was delivered to the Prime Minister, only he is very busy, and—er—it will receive his attention in due course"

G.S. Leader: "Oh, I see. Can I have a note saying that I have delivered this letter, as we are not supposed to carry verbal messages?"

Mr. Butler (after thinking deeply): "Er—oh, all right. (Sits down to write, and after writing for a minute, says, out of the back of his head): "Won't you sit down?"

G.S. Leader: "Thank you very much." (Sits down.)
Mr. Butler (writing letter, stops halfway and calls for a nib in an agitated voice): "This is a very poor nib."

G.S. Leader: "Have you put that this letter will be given to the Prime Minister?"

Mr. Butler (kindly but crushingly): "I will show you what I have put." (Hands letter to G.S. Leader, who reads it and hands it back. It is placed in an envelope and handed to her.)

G.S. Leader: "Thank you very much."
Mr. Butler: "Good night."

The squad of Women Green Shirts then marched away. We ought perhaps to say that we have particular reasons for reporting in detail what took place during this inquiry.

Notice.

All communications concerning THE NEW AGE should be addressed directly to the Editor:

Mr. Arthur Brenton,
20, Rectory Road,
Barnes, S.W.13.

Renewals of subscriptions and orders for literature should be sent, as usual, to 70, High Holborn.

"Vraibleusia."

By Old and Crusted.

II.

Behold Popanilla* embarked on his compulsory voyage in an inadequate canoe provisioned with fresh water, bread fruit, dried fish, and a basket of alligator pears. It is sad to reflect that they sent him on his Odyssey without even one flask of wine to give him a bit of Dutch courage: for he was in a blue funk.

After a rough passage culminating in a terrible cyclone the storm-tossed post-captain awoke one morning to a cloudless sky and the view of a magnificent city rising out of the sea. He observed that the quays of the harbour he was rapidly approaching "were crowded with beings who, he trusted, were human." They were: and immediately came to his assistance. When, in answer to their eager questions he proclaimed himself "the most injured of human beings, the victim of a despotic sovereign, a corrupt aristocracy and a misguided people," the warm-hearted inhabitants of Vraibleusia, who are highly emotional and love claptrap, not only gave him a sympathetic welcome, but immediately sent round the hat, with such good results that "ere six hours had passed since his arrival as a coatless vagabond in this liberal city, Captain Popanilla found himself a person of considerable means."

When he had recovered from his astonishment he asked the receiver of the subscriptions, a certain Mr. Skindeep who had taken him in tow, what was the name of this charitable city.

"Is it possible," replied his companion, "that you are ignorant of the great city of Hubbabub; the largest city not only that exists, but that ever did exist, and the capital of the island of Vraibleusia, the most famous island not only that is known, but that ever was known?"

That has the true blue ring. Had Mr. Skindeep lived a century later he certainly would have been a member of the Primrose League and a notable pillar of the Carlton Club. At that moment a poor wretch on crutches hobbled up and in a broken voice begged for a little charity to support his wife and twelve infant children. The impulsive Popanilla was about to empty the contents of his purse into the mendicant's cap when his companion "repressed his unphilosophical facility." Turning to the beggar he advised him in a mild tone, to work; calmly adding, "that if he presumed to ask charity again he should certainly have him bastinadoed. Then they walked on." Feeling rather embarrassed by the coin in his pockets Popanilla inquired of his companion how he might more comfortably dispose of it, and was informed that they had now "arrived at a part of the city where I can ease you, without difficulty, from your troublesome burthen; let us enter here!" "Here" was a splendid palace where they were received with every courtesy by a charming personage who willingly relieved the over-laden post captain of his gold and, after due computation by a couple of attendants, presented him with a small packet of pink shells, which he subsequently learned was the "most precious coin of the land."

"That was the King's, of course?" said Popanilla when they were fairly out of the palace.

"The King!" said his companion, nearly surprised into an exclamation; "by no means!"

"And what then?"

"My good friend! is it possible that you have no bankers in your country?"

"Yes, it is very possible; but we have mermaids, who also give us shells which are pretty. What then are your bankers?"

"Really, my good friend, that is a question which I never remember having been asked before; but a banker is a man who—keeps our money for us."

"Ah! and he is bound, I suppose, to return your money when you choose?"

"Most assuredly!"

"He is, then, in fact, your servant: you must pay him handsomely for him to live so well?"

"By no means! we pay him nothing."

"That is droll; he must be very rich then?"

"Really, my dear friend, I cannot say. Why, yes! I—I suppose he may be very rich!"

"'Tis singular that a rich man should take so much trouble for others!"

"My good friend! Of course he lives by his trouble."

"Ah! How, then," continued the inquisitive Fantaisian, "if you do not pay him for his services, and he yet lives by them; how, I pray, does he acquire these immense riches?"

"Really, my good sir, I am, in truth, the very last man in the world to answer questions: he is a banker: bankers are always rich: but why they are, or how they are, I really never had time to inquire. But, I suppose, if the truth were known, they must have very great opportunities."

But that did not satisfy Popanilla. He was determined to get to the bottom of this pink shell business. It occurred to him that as pink shells abounded on all the beaches of the island it would be a simple matter to collect sufficient during a morning stroll to obtain command over "every luxury of life."

By no means, my friend!" retorted his companion; "no one has the power of originally circulating these shells but our Government; and if anyone, by any chance, choose to violate the arrangement, we make up for depriving him of his solitary walks on the shore by instant submersion in the sea."

After further conversation on this and kindred subjects, such as debt and interest, Popanilla said:

"I see I have yet much to learn. But with regard to these pink shells, how can you possibly create for them a certain standard of value? Is it merely agreement among yourselves that fixes any value to them?"

"By no means! You are so rapid! Each shell is immediately convertible into gold; of which metal, let me again remind you, we possess more than any other nation; but which, indeed, we only keep as a sort of dress coin, chiefly to indulge the prejudices of foreigners."

"But," said the perpetual Popanilla, "suppose every man who held a shell on the same day were to—"

"My good friend! I really am the last person in the world to give explanations. In Vraibleusia, we have so much to do that we have no time to think; a habit which only becomes nations who are not employed. You are now fast approaching the *Great Shell Question*; a question which, I confess, affects the interests of every man in this island more than any other; but of which, I must candidly own, every man in this island is more ignorant than of any other. No one, however, can deny that the system works well; and if anything at any time goes wrong, why really Mr. Secretary Periwinkle is a wonderful man, and our most eminent conchologist, he, no doubt, will set it right; and if, by any chance, things are past even his management, why then, I suppose, to use our national motto, *something will turn up*."

Let us end here. It would be impossible to give a fair summary of Popanilla's adventures in Vraibleusia and during his visit to the neighbouring island, Blunderland, or adequately to comment on them in the space of a few columns. But what is inadequately set down here will serve the purpose of emphasising something that has developed in the mind of the writer during the processes of reading and writing. That is briefly this:—

Is there a poet and dreamer, a prophet or seer amongst the aristocracy of Jewry to-day worthy to wear the mantle of Disraeli and do in co-operation with the Social Credit Movement the work which Disraeli in his early days was compelled to abandon by the insuperable forces of stupidity and passion?

* The Voyage of Captain Popanilla. Benjamin Disraeli.

Now there is no race that has suffered so much in the past or is suffering more in the present from sheer malignant stupidity than the Jews, and every educated Jew at home and abroad knows that "Vraibleusia" is the last of the Great Powers in which a modicum of liberty is left. That little remnant of freedom is already threatened by a combination of stupidity and passion of which Fascism, in all its forms and colours, black, brown or red, is the sinister embodiment. Moreover, Christianity would appear to be in sore need of an ally if it is to succeed in "building up a Christian Commonwealth to replace the financially directed society in which we live." That ally Jewry can provide; so whilst Bishops and Archbishops, politicians and economists are quibbling and hesitating on the threshold of Social Credit dare we hope that another Disraeli may be vouchsafed us who will call the Jews from all over the world to join us in the great fight against the Money Power, and so hasten the day of victory when we shall see the forces of stupidity "as dust before the wind: and the angel of the Lord scattering them."

(The end.)

The Point of the Pen.

By R. Laugier.

No. 4.—WHAT THE PUBLIC GETS.

The little men of Big Business have said to the world: "Come unto us all ye who are heavy-laden, and we will give you jazz, Tarzan, the 'pictures,' cross-words, Pip, Squeak, and Rothermere." Results of this policy are known to the intelligent and the sensitive. But the position is not comprehended by Fleet Street editors, or by the gentlemen who, under the watchful eye of the publicity manager, buy articles and "yarns" for "popular" periodicals. Fleet Street still confuses what the public gets with what the public wants; men whom it would be gross flattery to call "mediocrity," are yet able to consider themselves intellectually superior to the public. The minds of such men are filled with absurd, but unshakable dogmas, deeply settled, like an anchor lost in river mud. These men state, directly or indirectly, that they know what the public wants; and in the manner of mediocrity they place immense reliance upon experience.

The truth is, of course, that no one can know "what the public wants," for members of the public do not know themselves. Obviously there is not "a public," but many publics: the readers of Mr. Sydney Horler and Mr. Havelock Ellis are dissimilar, and so on. If Fleet Street apprehended public taste, the limits of a newspaper's circulation would be those imposed by "machining"; as it is, circulation managers are naively proud of gaining two or three million readers, out of a possible thirty or forty million.

The most intelligent caterers for public amusement admit their success is largely due to a lucky flair, enabling them to guess right seven times out of ten. These men, unhampered by the idiocy of Business, would probably score successes almost every time, for, contrary to general belief, it is not difficult to "hit" a public, and to keep on doing the trick. Every popular, and many esoteric authors find their "faithful readers" all the time—once the middle-men allow these artists publicity.

Experience in itself has nothing to do with this question. As Walter Bagehot pointed out, apart from experience of life there is also the "experiencing nature." In matters essentially artistic Business cannot "experience": all Business can do is to make a "corner" in what it, rightly or wrongly, imagines to be popular art, and then thrust the monopoly goods on the public.

Some fourteen years ago, when I first entered Fleet Street, I found many editorial dogmas functioning: Firstly, that one "story" a mile from Fleet Street was worth, to the London public, a dozen "stories" in, let us say, the north of Scotland, and a hundred—or was it a thousand—in the South Sea Islands. The idea

was that unfamiliarity bred contempt: the public were not interested in what went on in exotic lands. Perhaps the cinema has changed these views, but, more probably, the dogma is still alive. Editors seldom change their minds, and the rejection-slip is mightier than the pen.

A second dogma was, that "sword and cloak" stories were unpopular, and therefore were not to be bought for serialisation. Also stories of fantasy. Also stories containing anything "unpleasant," such as an illegitimate child; a chronicle of successful crime; a "bitter" or "unlovable" character. These further dogmas were a little less rigid; they recognised fashions in fiction; and they capitulated, instantly, when confronted by a well-known, or admittedly successful "name."

Such dogmas, and their sponsors would be very amusing, but for the results; they have, in England, killed the art-forms of verse, satire, parody, fantasy, the short story, the printed play, and (incredibly enough) the good melodramatic, sensational *feuilleton*.

Actually the modern editor insists upon "popular" writing being badly done. Only the successful may even write "good stuff"; but, in that case, how is one to become successful? The vicious circle is obvious. So we have fine short-story writers, spending months in producing indifferent novels, in order to get the "name" which will make their short stories pay.

The remedy for this sorry state of affairs is the remedy for all our social ills: Business must be made to serve culture. Only the artist can give members of the public the joy they desire. The artist does not care a damn what the public wants, but he gives of his best. Being a man of acute sensibility, those things which the artist finds amusing, pathetic, dramatic, his public will find amusing, etc. Even artists who are somewhat mental freaks find their public.

But Business and its hirelings will never understand these simple facts. How should they? Even money which they passionately adore, they have never understood; artists have explained it to them, in vain.

"The Abolition of Poverty."

We have just received a copy of the fourth impression of this pamphlet by Mr. R. S. J. Rands, B.A. It is printed and published by W. E. Harrison and Sons, The Ancient House Press, Ipswich, at 4d., as before. Two diagrams are added to the appendix, which the author hopes will be found to increase the usefulness of the pamphlet. In addition, certain passages on the technique of Social Credit have been improved in expression, in compliance with suggestions made by certain students whom the author has consulted.

The Theatre.

"The Comedy of Errors." Produced by Maxwell Wright. "Comus." Produced by Robert Atkins. The Open Air Theatre, Regent's Park.

Sydney Carroll has again been fortunate in the weather for his outdoor season, and there is no more pleasant way of spending a summer evening than in seeing Shakespeare in Regent's Park. The production is admirable, and Mr. Carroll—himself a journalist—is to be congratulated on the arrangements for the convenience of the Press.

"Queen of Scots." By "Gordon Daviot." Produced by John Gielgud. New.

There is very little justification for a play that makes an attempt either to depict Mary Queen of Scots from a new angle or to concentrate on the obvious drama of the subject. Norman Ginsburg has lately shown us in "Viceroy Sarah" how history should be recreated for the stage, and in the same production Barbara Everest brilliantly reincarnated the queen. Gwen Frangon-Davies fails to make Mary credible; her impersonation bears scarcely a trace of royalty or a hint of tragedy; in place of the luckless queen, brought up from infancy in the atmosphere of courts and the expectation of a throne, she portrays throughout a young girl from

from a convent school. It may be charitable to suggest that she has been badly miscast.

As to the play itself, "Gordon Daviot," who had a commercial success with "Richard of Bordeaux," may fittingly be reminded that a talent for writing easy dialogue is not the whole equipment of the playwright. John Gielgud's production is too stagey. I can unreservedly praise the settings of E. McKnight Kauffer.

"Mrs. McConaghy's Money." By Hugh Quinn. Produced by André van Gyseghem. Embassy.

This is the first time the Irish Players have visited Swiss Cottage, and they have chosen an admirable play for the occasion. It is vastly refreshing to happen on so human, simple, and natural a theme—the money-worshipping shrew who speculates in life policies, and whose deeds are kinder than her words, the husband in his second childhood, the daughter who marries when her young man draws his arrears of unemployment pay, the gossiping neighbours who drop in for a crack, the insurance agent who takes whisky "for me heart." And behind it all, the slave morality that conceives existence for the poor to be bounded by death and the fear of the workhouse. These people live; there is more reality and drama in the McConaghy's parlour than in half the plays inflicted on the West End in an average year.

Marie O'Neill dominates the whole play. That was, in part, the author's intention, but it is also due to Miss O'Neill's artistry—with a shrug of her shoulders, a lift of her hands, a raising of her eyes, she can make her own dialogue. Arthur Sinclair is an excellent foil, but even so finished an actor is in need of reminding that an actor must be audible. The very good cast also includes Tony Quinn, Patricia McNabb, Fred O'Donovan, and Cathleen Drago. Praise is, as usual, due to the production of André van Gyseghem and the settings of Bagnall Harris.

"The Country Wife."

The Ambassadors revival of "The Country Wife" was commended by me in THE NEW AGE for March 15, when I described it as one of the most amusing of the current West End productions. Wycherley's comedy has proved so much to the liking of the public that it is still entertaining audiences nightly, but a number of important alterations have recently been made in the cast. George Grossmith succeeds Baliol Holloway as Mr. Horner, Athene Seyler has replaced Agnes Lauchlan in the part of Lady Fidget, and the roles of Mrs. Dainty Fidget and Althea are now being played by Diana Morgan and Peggy Livesey respectively.

VERNON SOMMERFIELD.

The Films.

"Hi! Nellie." Warner Brothers Production. Directed by Mervyn le Roy. Regal.

If you can stand another film of American newspaper life, with the inevitable crook politician, and a murdered man buried under an alias, go and see Paul Muni in this fast-moving and amusing picture.

"This Side of Heaven." Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Production. Directed by William Howard. Empire.

Lionel Barrymore is in danger of prosecution because he has unwittingly connived with embezzlement. His wife is asked to go to Hollywood in connection with the filming of her first novel, but apparently does not get there. One of his daughters starts to elope, but thinks better of it. A son has a motor accident after failing to secure some distinction in a college "fraternity." But, what the hell, I don't know what this film is supposed to be about, or why it is called "This Side of Heaven," but I do know that it is one of the most dreadful pictures I have ever seen.

DAVID OCKHAM.

"AN UNOFFICIAL MARKET." The committee of the Stock Exchange last year deferred a decision on six applications for dealings pending the production of accounts of the first year's working.

A new company now offering shares to the public has decided not to make any application until its first trading accounts are ready. This is a very important development. Subscribers to such issues may have reason to sell or buy shares of the companies while they are awaiting Stock Exchange permissions. "The time will come when wider market facilities will have to be organised for them." (*Evening Standard*, May 10.)

Glasgow Douglas Social Credit Association.

During summer months, members meet for informal discussion each Thursday evening, 8 o'clock, Cranston's Smoke Room, Kenfield-street, Glasgow. Communications to H. C. Munro, 6, Greenlodge-terrace, Glasgow, S.E.

Earl Stanhope on the Price-Income Gap.

Earl Stanhope's speech in the House of Lords against Lord Strabolgi's Motion (referred to in the "Notes" and elsewhere) calls for special remark because it represents the views of the Government. The noble Earl said this among other things:

"Obviously if there was no sufficient amount raised by industry by its wages and salaries and so on to purchase its goods the goods would have been unsaleable until it died out. That is untrue because, as we all know, industry has steadily increased."

Again:—

"For instance, raw products bought by one industry are often the finished articles of another industry, and therefore have already been counted in the way of wages, salaries, and so forth."

One line of reply to this is to point out that the "increase" in industry has taken the form of an increase of irrecoverable debt, and to submit that this phenomenon is consistent with the "Douglas" contention that the "counting in the way of wages, salaries, and so forth" (as the noble Lord happily puts it by accident) results in putting the costs of production "in the way of"—i.e., expanding them beyond—the means of consumption. (Arguments in support will occur to any student.)

It is not contended by Douglas that the gap between costs and incomes is invariably and wholly left unfilled; he expressly says that it may be filled, but that if so, from another source than the earned incomes previously distributed—that is from bank-loans. These loans are recorded as debt. The debt proves and measures the gap.

A. B.

The Social Credit Library.

Democracy at the Cross Roads. By Leslie H. Hollins, M.A.I.A.E. (The Ruskin Press, Melbourne.)

Here is an outstanding book on Social Credit by an engineer. These engineers always get at the root of things as soon as they see the "Money Economy" under which we work to be just a mechanism. The foreword is written by John T. Lawton (a clergyman who is doing good work on behalf of Monetary Reform), and he expresses there a very basic truth, "moral exhortations do not, and cannot, atone for errors in arithmetic." This gives the key to the book, for the author, after confessing to the trouble he had in understanding the A + B theorem when applied to its whole of industry, was finally able to satisfy himself as to its accuracy. The book is written clearly and concisely, and some very useful diagrams are given showing how the method of Banking accounting must produce unsold goods (or alternatively debts). There are fourteen chapters in a well reasoned sequence from the problem "Man's Problem" to its solution "Social Credit in Operation."

This book should find a place in the armoury of Social Credit supporters.

C. C.

Major C. H. Douglas before the New Zealand Government's Monetary Committee. Notes of Evidence and Examination with Correspondence Preliminary Thereto. (Dawson Printing Co., Vincent Street, Auckland, N.Z. 29 pp. Price 6d., or 7d. post free.)

The title of this pamphlet just received from New Zealand explains what it is all about. The type is small and the size of the pages large (9½ by 6 inches), so that the contents would appear to cover most, if not all the hearing. More-over, the reader is enjoined on the cover to "read the full questions and answers," and not to be misled by "news-paper quotations and misquotations." From this it may be safely assumed that the version is practically complete. It should be borne in mind by intending readers that the proposals outlined by Major Douglas, and on which he gave evidence were explicitly formulated by him on the hypothetical assumption (which he denied was true) that sufficient purchasing power exists to buy goods for sale at remunerative prices. In a word, he did not put forward a Social Credit scheme, but a set of proposals of which the immediate effect would be a distribution of more money. These proposals set a political rather than a technical problem—that is to say they are easy enough to grasp, and the reason for them is intelligible; but it will need strong determination to put them over against the opposition of the financial classes. They are interesting because they call the bluff of opponents who base their hostility to schemes which are "unintelligible," and of reformers and neutrals who excuse their lack of interest on the same ground.

A. B.

Music.

The Finnish National Orchestra.

One of the most interesting events of the season has been the visit of the above orchestra to London for the first time, making, naturally and appropriately enough, a special feature of the compositions of Sibelius. The orchestra hardly ranks with such as the Vienna Philharmonic, the Amsterdam Concert-Geboouw, the great New York Philharmonic Symphony, the Boston Symphony, or the Augusteo. There is a certain roughness, or perhaps not so much roughness as coarseness of quality. One thing most noticeable about the orchestra is the fact, that almost alone among modern orchestras, the wood-wind thereof does really balance and tell against the string-mass, a very important and almost unique merit. The conducting of Professor Georg Schnéevoigt I found good sound musicianship, but essentially uninspiring, and uninspired. His reading of the wonderful "Swan of Tuonela" of Sibelius in the first programme was far inferior in penetration of the innermost spirit of the music to that of Stokowsky as recorded upon some H.M.V. records published about a year and a half ago. The marvellous melody which persists practically unbroken throughout the composition had not that intensely concentrated quality of expression that is called for, and that Stokowsky really succeeds in getting into it. Better was the performance of the Seventh Symphony—by the same composer—but even here, it is impossible to pretend that it is not hopelessly eclipsed by the performance of Kussewitsky recorded for the Sibelius Society. Indeed, anyone who possesses the remarkable records made for this Society was not at all inclined to be impressed by anything he heard at either of these concerts.

A fascinating work new to me, "Pohjola's Daughter," was also played upon this occasion (the first concert) full of those magical implications, that, as Mr. Cecil Gray has shown us, are so bound up with Finnish legend and mythology. It shows a quite unfamiliar aspect of Sibelius's art, his equal mastery in orchestral evocation, one had almost said impressionism, did that unlucky word not tend to belie the superb organic quality and essentially logical cohesion of Sibelius's musical thought, as far removed as it is possible to imagine from loose straggling "programmatic" conceptions. The First E minor Symphony tends to be rather eclipsed by the amazing series of masterpieces in the form that have succeeded it. How profoundly original and individual a conception it is, one has only to look around upon the sort of thing being elsewhere done in music in Europe at the time it was written—1899—to realise. Again here, the performance we already possess in recorded form, is to my mind far superior to that we heard upon this occasion.

The second concert was notable for the inclusion of the "Night Ride" and Sixth Symphony. The first is perhaps the nearest thing that Sibelius has ever got to "programme" music in the ordinarily accepted sense. How far that is from Sibelius's sense, one has but to hear this beautiful and imaginative work once, to perceive. It is not the external onomatopoeic associations that move Sibelius to musical utterance, but the trains of musical thought that certain events, literary, actual, or psychological give rise to in himself. He is not concerned in finding a kind of musical symbolism for the leg of a chair or a dog being sick, as so often Strauss is apt to be.

Of the Sixth Symphony Mr. Cecil Gray, in his admirable programme notes, has put his finger—with his usual fine tact—on the very nerve ganglion of the matter, when he says that poise and serenity are its outstanding characteristics. Almost one has said a Yoga-like detachment and meditative ecstasy, using the word in its strictly technical implications, of a standing outside oneself.

From this wonderful work to the Selim Palmgren Tone-Poem, it ought, I suppose, be called, for piano and orchestra, "The River" was a sorry drop. Palmgren manipulates all the stock-in-trade of the graphic-picturesque in the music of the thirty years preceding 1910, with a complete lack of distinguishable individuality, originality, and with great accomplishment and skill. The models are unimpeachable—but are they, having given rise to all these reams and reams of tedious dull stuff?—the matter, but it is not possible to discover any. But an admirable pianist—Mme. Sigrid Sundgren—performed the elaborate and difficult solo part with such effect as to hold one's attention with her admirable pianism (beastly word!). Here for once was a really fine woman pianist, just a fine pianist, with no accursed feminine charm. She was so good an artist that she had no need of such base subterfuges.

KAIKHOSRU SORABJI.

Reviews.

"Scientific Research and Social Needs." (By Julian Huxley. Watts, 7s. 6d.)

This is a book which should appeal to Social Creditors more than to anyone else, not only because they alone know the answer to the many problems it raises, but also because it provides so much ammunition for them, in the form of facts patiently garnered from all available sources concerning the application of science to all fields of human activity. And the fact that the author is not himself writing from the Social Credit point of view adds to the objective value of his observations.

And always the tale is the same:—

"But practically all the research men I have talked to showed an interesting mixture of optimism and pessimism. They all knew the scientific importance of their work, and were convinced of its possible value for practice; several of them said to me that a doubling of the present amount of food grown in this country was not only perfectly possible, but a modest estimate of what could be achieved. But in contrast to this. . . . What is the good of doubling the number of sheep in the country, if sheep prices fall so low as to wipe out any reasonable profit for the farmer? What is the good of inventing new brands of wheat that will make it possible to grow more bushels of wheat to the acre, or to push wheat cultivation nearer the Pole, if the world's wheat producers have on their hands vast surpluses they cannot dispose of profitably, and are clamouring for a restriction of output and cultivation? What is the good of inventing new methods of cold storage which enable ships to ransack the recesses of the Arctic Ocean for fish, if a large portion of the annual catch is thrown away or disposed of for manure?"

Mr. Huxley is thus well aware that the issue is fundamentally an economic one, and more than once he faces it fortuitously trivial by-path. Can it be (horrible thought!) that even the scientific mind is subject to taboos, if they concern economics or finance? How else is one to explain the exasperating preface contributed to this book by Sir William Bragg, F.R.S.? Here we have one of the foremost scientists of our day gravely balancing the pros and cons on the question of whether science is a friend or enemy to the human species, and not even showing sufficient courage to come to a conclusion one way or the other. Yet surely he ought to be able to realise that something more than a mere sitting on the fence is forced upon him, if not by the prominent and well-merited position he holds, then by the logic of his own remarks? For if it be true, as he says, that "the machine, though extremely useful, has often produced unemployment, which is an evil, however temporary it may be," then his course is logically clear and unavoidable. It involves a confession that he and all other scientists have been leading us a stray, and that Science is Enemy and not friend. The suggestion that the unemployment caused by the machine is merely temporary is a trap for simpletons, rather to be expected from a financier than from a scientist.

Mr. Huxley is not quite so simple as this, yet he, too, is under the spell of the taboo. When he speaks of the world of science his words are clear and his thought honest, but so soon as he touches economics or politics, he begins to mumble and jumble like any moralist or banker. The root trouble, brethren, is not anything so simple and adjustable as a shortage of purchasing-power, it is the terribly vindictive and spiteful attitude of men which preserves Mr. Huxley's grandfather fought a valiant battle against those logical dogmas, and amongst others that of Original Sin. His grandson, apparently, wishes to reinstate that doctrine though the phrasing is different.

And this theological prejudice, which I do Mr. Huxley the justice to believe is almost unconscious on his part, yet permeates the whole of his outlook, so that in sociology and politics he sees the task of science as being a matter of curing the individual rather than of freeing him. Though he knows enough of psychology to realise that this is hopeless as regards the individual man, he yet believes it is possible and necessary on the national scale. He does not realise that all that the features he deplores in nationalism are directly referable to patriotism, but to the miserable dread of losing markets under which every nation ekes out its wretched existence, nor that the impossible struggle for expanding markets is forced upon the nations by the growing productivity given by science on the one hand, and the proportionate loss in purchasing-power denied by the financiers on the other.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is in the discussions with which it is interspersed, especially those

between Mr. Huxley and Professor H. Levy. The latter has the suppler mind of the two, and seems to see the problem in a more complete setting. It is he, for example, who expresses doubts as to the legitimacy of "planning" as applied to the birth of children and to other human activities. Naturally, Mr. Huxley's bias prevents him from realising clearly that the business of science is to plan the world for mankind, and not to plan mankind itself. Organisation is necessary for production, but the end of production is consumption, and what is needed in consumption is the very opposite of "planning"; it is the maximum possible liberation.

Until this is realised, Science may indeed be the enemy of Mankind, though in a different sense from that feared by Sir William Bragg.

But Mr. Huxley's work is so interesting and so important that it has seemed worth while to criticise it at length.

N. M.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

DISTRIBUTION AND CREDIT POLICY.

Sir,—In G.K.'s Weekly, on June 14, Mr. Hilaire Belloc contributes a long article entitled "The Douglas Scheme of Credit," at the end of which he expresses the opinion that the method of issuing credits to consumers may be a less cumbersome way in which to reach, or approximate to, the objective advocated by the Distributists than any other. This opinion is foreshadowed and fortified earlier in the article where he gives two hypothetical examples graphically illustrating the function of the banker (a) as the intermediary in the exchange of products and (b) as the provider of credit for the process of production—both examples being excellently chosen and described. The central theme of the article, however, is not concerned with technical exposition, but, as its conclusion indicates, rather with the practical problem of looking round to see what weapons are lying about which upholders of personal liberty can snatch up against the Red and Black forces of despotic collectivism now besieging and bombarding the shrine of their ideal.

In such an emergency there is no time to test the temper of this or that steel: anything within reach which looks like a sword and will cut like a sword has to do. Mr. Belloc has the perspicacity to see this; and his article may be reasonably interpreted as an authoritative direction to Distributist Crusaders to equip themselves at the Douglas Armoury. That, at any rate, is how I interpret it; and I think that many other readers of THE NEW AGE who see the article will concur in my view, and will applaud Mr. Belloc's sagacity and courage accordingly.

J. G.

"INDIVIDUAL REACTION TO SOCIAL CREDIT."

Sir,—I have read very carefully the paper entitled "The Individual Reaction to Social Credit," by Mr. Hewlett Edwards, published in your issue of June 14.

We think so highly of it, and consider it to be of such practical value, that all Green Shirt leaders are being instructed to study it as part of their training. It will also be included in our Officers' Training Course at National Headquarters.

JOHN HARGRAVE.

Green Shirt National H.Q.,
44, Little Britain, London, E.C.1.

LEISURE AND BOREDOM.

Sir,—I have just re-read the article entitled "Revolt and Leisure," by Mr. R. Laugier, and it seems to call for an answer.

The author starts from a narrow and erroneous idea of what an artist is. He appears to take it for granted that only painters, sculptors, and those who are actually executives in a limited range of conventionally accepted activities have any right to be called artists, and, having stated dogmatically that only such are rebels, he goes on to say that to the average man leisure means boredom.

It is my conviction, after a long period of work which brings me into contact with boys at an early age, that the boy is an artist in the wide sense of the word which I propose to define.

An artist is a man who, from the creative urge within him, finds expression of his emotion in movement which

may or may not shape or re-arrange material in concrete form.

In this sense there are very few who have not this driving force of interest and what may be termed skill hunger, which is gradually killed in most by the present instructional system, which is designed to produce wage slaves in the mass, whose individuality must be killed by a constant appeal to authority, and whose vital urges must be thwarted by concentration on the bitter fruits of erudition plucked from trees planted on sterile ground.

It seems to me that we are too much concerned with what others will do with their leisure. Ask any individual what he would do with an extra three or four hours a day of paid leisure, and whether he would be intolerably bored. I doubt if many would answer in the affirmative. The individual questioned can always think of a dozen things he wants to do, and cannot for lack of time. It is always someone else who would be unutterably bored by leisure, the average man or the humble poor.

The author of the article displays the classical mentality with its mania for generalising. In a Social Credit State the "average man" will disappear and be relegated to the limbo, together with the means test and war debts. In his place will be the individual, with his own way of seeking self-expression, and material at hand to take on the particular form of artistic expression which he, and he alone, can offer his fellow-beings as a delight to the senses.

If Mr. Laugier has not read *Le Jongleur de Notre Dame*, by Anatole France, I recommend him to do so, both as another example of a masterpiece of the "conte," and as showing that even the poor juggler, who exercised his talent in the market-places, a member of "the humble poor," was yet as acceptable to the powers of light as were the limners and sculptors.

Besides, is not his article irrelevant? Does any intelligent supporter of Social Credit suggest that "the average man, the humble poor, and the uncultured rich" are to have leisure suddenly thrust upon them? A little more leisure there certainly will be, but not enough to make "a purgatory," even if Mr. Laugier's cynical views were correct: the vast amount of work needed to clear up the mess of the hovels and galleys of the slaves of the Golden Calf will give ample occupation to those who wish to escape the unashamed, naked, stalking boredom of leisure.

R. HALLIDAY THOMPSON.

Jersey, June 7.

Forthcoming Meetings.

The New Age Club.

[Open to visitors on Wednesdays from 6 to 9 p.m. at the Lincoln's Inn Restaurant (downstairs), 305, High Holborn, W.C., (south side), opposite the First Avenue Hotel and near to Chancery-lane and Holborn tube stations.]

Colchester.

June 27, at 8 p.m., in the Albert Hall. Mr. John Hargrave, National Leader, the Green Shirt Movement. Subject, "Britain Arise! The Green Shirt Call to Action!"

The London Social Credit Club.

A public meeting will be held at 7.45 p.m. on Thursday, June 28, 1934, at Denison House, 296, Vauxhall Bridge Road, S.W.1. Speaker, L. D. Byrne, Esq., of Southampton. Chairman, P. J. Hand, Esq. Further information may be obtained from the Secretary, D. Joyce Mitchell, 2, Bromley Common, Kent.

"BANKS GET TOGETHER."

One result of the political propaganda in the United States against the banks has been to bind the banks together in a much stronger solidarity than existed during the boom years. . . .

"Rivalries which used to prevail between American banking institutions have given place to co-operation on policy. The fact that it has become the rule rather than the exception for banks to consult together appears paradoxical to those who recall 1929 conditions. Officers of rival institutions now meet openly during business hours. In 1929 this would have provoked rumours of a merger." (Evening Standard, May 10.)

ACADEMY CINEMA, Oxford Street.
GER. 2981.

The gay masquerade
"LIEBES KOMMANDO" (U)
 Delightful Viennese music and
"THE ROAD TO LIFE" (A)

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).

Social Credit Reading Course

SET A.

Comprising:—

Social Credit in Summary (1d.).
 The Key to World Politics (1d.).
 Through Consumption to Prosperity (2d.).
 Social Credit Principles (1d.).
 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.

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.

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.
 The Veil of Finance. 6d.
 Through Consumption to Prosperity. 2d.

C. G. M.

The Nation's Credit. 4d.

DEMANT, V. A.

This Unemployment. 2s. 6d.
 God, Man and Society. 6s.

DOUGLAS, C. H.

Credit Power and Democracy. 7s. 6d.
 Social Credit. 3s. 6d.
 The Breakdown of the Employment System. 1d.
 Canada's Bankers. (Evidence at Ottawa.) 2s. 6d.
 The Monopoly of Credit. 3s. 6d.
 These Present Discontents: The Labour Party and Social Credit. 1s.
 The World After Washington. 6d.
 Social Credit Principles. 1d.
 Warning Democracy. 7s. 6d.

DUNN, E. M.

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

GALLOWAY, C. F. J.

Poverty Amidst Plenty. 6d.

GORDON CUMMING, M.

Introduction to Social Credit. 6d.

GRIERSON, FRANK

A Study in Purchasing Power. 2d.

H. M. M.

An Outline of Social Credit. 6d.

HATTERSLEY, C. MARSHALL.

The Community's Credit. 1s.
 This Age of Plenty. 3s. 6d. and 6s.
 Men, Machines and Money. 3d.

RANDS, R. S. J., B.A.

The Abolition of Poverty. A Brief Explanation of the Proposals of Major C. H. Douglas. 4d.

POWELL, A. E.

The Deadlock in Finance. 3s. 6d.
 The Flow Theory of Economics. 5s.

TUKE, J. E.

Outside Eldorado. 3d.

YOUNG, W. ALLEN.

Ordeal By Banking. 2s.

W. W.

More Purchasing Power, 2s for 6d.

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

DARLING, J. F.

Economic Unity of the Empire: Gold and Credit.

HORRABIN, J. F.

An Outline of Economic Geography. 2s. 6d.

LUDOVICI, A. M.

A Defence of Aristocracy. 7s. 6d.

SYMONS, W. T., and TAIT, F.

The Just Price. 4d.

Instructional Works on Finance and Economics.

BARKER, D. A.

Cash and Credit. 3s.

CLARKE, J. J.

Outline of Central Government. 5s.

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

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70, High Holborn, W.C.1, England (Telephone: Chancery 8470), and printed for him by THE PRESS, LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London, E.C.4. (Telephone: Central 3701).