

# THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 2241] NEW SERIES Vol. LVII. No. 17. THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 1935 [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE	PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK . . . . .	133	
The French situation—M. Laval's deflation-decrees—Deflation the Disarmament of Democracy—the dilemma of the French Chamber—the hook in the bait of the <i>short-time</i> experiment—deputies' virtual surrender of the power to end it—the Government's probable attitude when the Chamber meets in October—the impotence of the Chamber to reverse policy by constitutional action.		
THE GREEN SHIRTS. By F. G. . . . .		137
Notes by the General Secretary.		
OLIVER BALDWIN'S PLAN. By John Grimm . . . . .		137
Oliver Baldwin's article in <i>The Daily Mail</i> of August 7 on "How I Would Soak the Rich."		
THE POINT OF THE PEN. XLIII (ii). By R. Laugier . . . . .		138
<i>Irish Free State: Impressions</i> (Part II.).		
METHODOLOGY IN LAW. III. By James Golder . . . . .		140
<i>Prologue to Nomostatistics</i> (Jaffin).		

## NOTES OF THE WEEK.

### Dictatorship in France.

"Recovery By Decree." This is the headline to the leading article in *The Times* of August 13 in which the writer discusses the measures taken by the French Government to operate what may be described as the Laval Retrenchment Plan. It will be remembered that early in June last the French Government demanded and secured from Parliament emergency powers to put its plan into force without running the gauntlet of debates. These powers were reluctantly and uneasily granted by the Chamber, partly because its assent marked a departure from the democratic tradition, and partly because in France, more than anywhere else in the world where representative Governments function, the electoral constituents of every deputy hold him personally responsible for the consequences of the votes he gives in the Chamber. Further, when these constituents consider that he has let them down they are not content to turn him out "at the next election," but adopt prompt and direct methods of making his life a misery to him. These methods are of the character which were, in this country, exemplified at Invergordon when the "baby's shilling" was confiscated, and subsequently in the Midlands when the "kitten's-farthing" criterion of affluence was applied to means-test applicants.\* The difference is that whereas in this country such outbreaks are few and far between, in France they are more or less normal features in politics.

The personal risks which French deputies run are reflected in the Chamber's rules governing voting. A writer in a London newspaper a few weeks ago pointed out a peculiar and amusing difference between the privilege accorded to a Member of Parliament in this country and a deputy in France. In the British Parliament a Member who speaks in debate is allowed to alter what he

\* "If you can afford milk for that kitten you don't need assistance." (Means-test official to old widow whom he called to interview.)

has actually said to what he ought to have said, or meant to say, so that the revised version only will appear in Hansard; but he has to stand by the vote he has recorded. In the French Chamber, however, a deputy is allowed to "correct his vote" after the division-list has been published. The writer proceeded with great pains to sustain the submission that the Tweedledum system of evasion of responsibility in France is much worse than the Tweedledee system in Britain. On the question of principle most of our readers will doubtless agree that there is precious little difference between the agreeing of a vote and the agreeing of reasons for it. But when the question of expediency is invoked, well, *qu'voulez vous, donc?* It is all very well for the British M.P. to stand by an unpopular vote when he knows that his constituents will tolerate it on account of the good intentions revealed in his speech (revised version!), but would the fellow be brave enough to do it if his constituents insisted, like the French do, on inferring his intentions from the consequences of his vote? Was it not M. Tardieu who, once speaking to an audience, said: "Are you satisfied with the consequences of our policy?—because, if you are, then of course you are satisfied with our policy." *Voila. Fini!*

So, as we say, the deputies gave M. Laval his powers with much uneasiness. In doing so, however, they probably derived a little comfort from two considerations. The first was that M. Laval's demand was backed by what appeared to be compelling and urgent practical reasons (formulated and elaborated by financial experts belonging to the Bank of France and the French Treasury) showing that a refusal of the required powers would precipitate universal industrial chaos. The second was that, just as the unmarried servant's baby was legitimatised by the smallness of its dimensions, so was M. Laval's assumption of dictatorial power by the shortness of its duration. The Chamber was to have the right to review M. Laval's programme after the lapse of a few months. As *The Times* leader-writer puts it: "In any case, Parliament retains the final

authority, and when it meets in October it can modify and even cancel everything which M. Laval has done." So it can—in theory, and if the French deputies believe that the theory will work out in practice there is some substance in the consolation they may derive from their belief. But we doubt whether they do believe it; in any case the balance of probability is that when October comes the Chamber will find the process of reversing what it doesn't like in the Laval Plan nothing like so easy a matter as *The Times* leader-writer makes it look.

He says, in an airy manner: "By that time the full scheme will have been in operation long enough to show whether it is likely to produce results." Quite so; but the point is glossed over that the scheme has been, and is producing results all the time; and the practical question to ask is: How will the results now in process of achievement affect the power of the Chamber to modify the scheme next October?

The Laval Plan was put forward as an experiment in deflation. The ultimate general consequence of deflation is confiscation. This confiscation takes two forms, the first being the retirement of money from the community, and its destruction by the banks; and the second (which is a function of the first) the weakening of the community's power of exercising pressure on the Government. Whether the propensity of the community tends towards the orderly signification of disappointment at the Government's actions through the ballot box, or towards the disorderly manifestation of resistance to them through demonstrations, strikes and mutinies, makes no difference to the fact that either method involves the use of money for its effective implementation. This is not to say that money is necessarily the only factor in the problem of controlling the policy of the Government, but it is the dominant factor. And our readers, who know that the bankers make the laws of the constitution, will appreciate the significance of the fact that the community's attempts to control the Government are the most expensive when they are the most constitutional. Back in the days of the Protection controversy in this country which was to culminate in the General Election of 1906, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's supporters made use of one argument which ran as follows: "You Free Traders are prophesying all kinds of evil consequences arising from our protectionist policy; but why not give it a trial? After all, if your prophecies come true, you can reverse the policy." To this the Free Traders retorted: "That's all very fine; what about the vested interests which would have made and mobilised profits under Protection and would use them to perpetuate Protection? We should have to raise millions of pounds and work for ten years or more before we could hope to undo what had been done." Undoubtedly the Free Traders were right. A year or so of Protection would have abstracted huge amounts of money from the pockets of the community generally (as consumers) and of the non-protected producers in the community, and have reposed them in the coffers of protected combines. In short, the potential political fighting funds of the victimised majority of the community would have been captured by the protectionist minority. In this event the only hope which would be left of reversing the policy would depend on the automatic injurious repercussions of it on the Protectionists themselves; that is, it would depend,

not on the imposition of the will of the dispossessed but on the weakening of the will of the dispossessors. Unless the dispossessed were prepared to flout the laws of constitutional procedure (which, of course, the Free Trade politicians at that time did not dream of contemplating) they would have no option but to wait until the victorious protected combines got dissatisfied with the fruits of their victory.

Reflection on this process will show that the policy of Protection (dramatically defeated in the 1906 Election) would have resulted in the political disarmament of the majority of the community by a minority group. But, as just pointed out, the effect of this disarmament would not have been irrevocable in practice for the reason that the minority of the community would find their own safety automatically threatened by the continued impoverishment of the majority. After all, capitalism, though devoid of sentiment on the one hand, is not infected by moral indoctrination on the other hand. Though quite ready to fleece whom it can, it is quite ready to stop the fleecing when satisfied that the policy doesn't pay. It will cook up a moral philosophy to excuse its rapacity so long as profits accrue, but directly it discovers that profits are ceasing to accrue it will abandon its policy—and the moral philosophy along with it! Producers and consumers are made kin by that touch of nature which impels each human being to get all he can for what he gives. The first want plenty of money for their goods: the second want plenty of goods for their money. Left to themselves the two parties arrive at a balance of their conflicting self-interests, and in pursuit of their respective self-interests. Between them they achieve, in the political sense described earlier, a balance of political disarmament corresponding to the sharing up of money and money's worth. Fiscal protection causes a one-sided bargain, but it does not destroy the principle of bargaining—of *letting live* in order to *live*.

#### The Disarmament of Democracy.

The bearing of these reflections on the situation in France will not need much explanation to students of Social Credit. The policy of Deflation is the policy of Protection raised to a higher plane, a plane on which the mitigating circumstances affecting the victims of Protection disappear. For whereas under fiscal Protection a majority of the community are forced to yield up their arms to a minority of the community, under "Deflationary Protection" the whole community yield up their arms to a Financial Combine which has no part or lot in the fortunes of that community. Deflation is the disarmament of Democracy. It raids the financial reserves of producers and consumers alike, and, in so doing, lessens, and may even extinguish, the community's power to arrest or modify the official policy. Whether the reserves are in the form of party-funds intended for constitutional resistance to the policy or in the form of strike-funds intended for extra-constitutional resistance, the result is the same. The banking interests collect and destroy these "arms," thereby killing two birds with one stone.

With this as a background it will be seen that the four-months "experiment" approved by the French Chamber amounted to much the same thing as if the Governor of the Bank of France had openly said to the French people: "If you want to fight the Government's

Deflation policy you shall do so; but will you please wait until October, and in the meantime hand your weapons over to M. Laval as a token of good faith: and then, when October comes, if you do not like the results of the experiment, you will be free to deliver your attack on it!"

The bankers' raids on the people's means of resistance have been cleverly planned to take place in successive stages. M. Laval's retrenchment-decrees have come out in relays. First there were the wage-cuts announced in June. These, though expected to provoke resistance on the part of those who suffered from them, were calculated to secure the immediate and unthinking sympathy or tolerance of those who had to pay the wages, whether directly as employers or indirectly as tax-payers. Thus M. Laval interposed the non-victimised sections of the community like a buffer-state between his Government and the protesting victims, and localised their outbreaks of violence until the exhaustion of their means of life lowered the temperature of their revolt and drove them back to work. When this phase of the ramp had progressed towards its completion the second relay of decrees came into prominence, namely those enforcing price-cuts on shopkeepers. The effect of this timing of the two sets of decrees was of course to limit the danger of the shopkeepers making common cause with the wage-earners. Too late the shopkeepers discovered that the raid on their customers' purses was in itself a raid on their own revenues, and that in refraining from resisting that raid simultaneously with the wage-earners they were left with depleted resources with which to implement their resistance to the new imposition directed specifically against themselves. It was then no use seeking the assistance of the wage-earners, for these were still licking the wounds they had sustained in the first attempt to stem the onrush of the Bankster Huns. Again, the psychological factor had begun to operate, as the banksters had foreseen; the dispossessed workers were not in the mood to protect the shopkeepers from taking the same sort of medicine as they themselves had been obliged to swallow; on the contrary their own necessity to make their decreased earnings go further would impel them to hope for lower prices in the shops.

It is not clear yet how far the raid on the shopkeepers' prices can be enforced, for the full incidence of the first raid on shopkeepers' collective takings was probably not calculated beforehand nor has even yet been ascertained. But whatever happens it is easy to foresee that the manufacturers' turn will come next, and that when it does they will have the shopkeepers and the wage-earners making common cause in the demand for lower wholesale price. And so it will go on; "divide and conquer"—and the bankers look like getting away with it.

Now there is a third relay of decrees which, on the face of them, are designed to compensate for the retrenchment raids just described. These have not been promulgated yet, and all that is known about them is that they provide for more work and employment on something or other of national importance. This is characteristic of bankers' deflationary ramps at all times and in all places. You release the ooftish-bird-in-the-hand and then they will show you the oozlem-bird-in-the-bush. What you would like, of course, would be to see the new bird while you are still holding the old one; but the inscrutable laws of sound finance so operate that

this lack of faith on your part prevents the new bird from settling in the bush, or, it may be, darkens your eyes that you shall not see it. No; it is only through the voluntary acceptance of impoverishment that you are vouchsafed the vision of prosperity. As that profound scholar Hans Andersen revealed in one of his stories, the finest clothes are woven out of nakedness. Only that is real which is imperceptible.

Even so, our analogy is too kind to the bankers. For, as a matter of experience the bird in the bush has never yet been seen. In return for letting your bird fly up into the sky all you see is the bankers beating about the bush: you have to infer the presence of the bird from the whirling of the sticks. You can't see the bird in the bush because you can't see the bush for the sticks. And we expect to see this comedy re-enacted when the French Chamber meets in October. The deputies will meet with the vivid consciousness that four months' wage-cuts have taken flight from the pockets of their constituents into the unknown, but with only the foggiest notion about the form and the time in which the compensation is to appear. The form will be problematical and the time contingent. These deputies will be told that the results of the four months' experiment have not been sufficiently definite to enable the Government's advisers to decide exactly what kind and quantity of new work shall be put in hand, or when it shall commence. Hints will be dropped that perhaps the definition of the results would become sharpened by the perpetuation of the experiment. Excuses will be offered that the unforeseen concessions made to the poorer wage-earners (who were let off with a 3-per-cent. cut instead of the expected 10-per-cent.) and the equally unforeseen inability of traders to accept less collective revenue and charge lower price-rates at one and the same time, have combined to throw out the calculations of the Government's financial advisers, and to postpone the appearance of the bird of Prosperity with healing in its wings.

The writer in *The Times* to whom we have referred has something to say on this point. And what is said in *The Times* should receive special attention in view of the fact that the Bank of England and its financial satellites in the City are holding the ring of the international exchanges with the express object of freeing M. Laval from external embarrassments while he is disciplining his own countrymen.

"M. Laval has gallantly proclaimed his readiness to deal with the prices of everything 'from sardines to cement,' but too much interference with prices would certainly check the revival of confidence among business men and investors, which he rightly regards as a vital condition of recovery."

That phrase "too much" tells the whole story. Price-regulation must be selective. Knock down the price of sardines, or other items in the workers' fodder, because that will help to keep them quiet on their reduced wages. But for goodness sake don't discourage the business gentlemen who make cement, or the investors who lay up their treasures in cement; for cement creates abiding security values: it is a dominant constituent of mortgagable property: it is the protective armour-plate of strong-rooms and other repositories of bonds and bullion through which no thieves can break to steal. . . . On the seventh day God created cement.

In order to indicate the general tenour of this writer's remarks we will record the following passage:

"To induce the farmers to accept lower prices for their product is clearly impossible. They are already on the verge of ruin, since their total receipts have fallen by over 30 per cent. during the last two years."

Thus he recognises that opportunities for price-regulation are, in some instances, ruled out by circumstance; but this only goes to show that his earlier warning about "too much" interference is intended to apply in instances where the opportunity is not ruled out by circumstances. There are cases where raids on profits are not impossible, but inexpedient; and upon examination it would doubtless be found that in these cases the bankers themselves are involved as lenders and investors. If the profits of any enterprise are reduced the reduction is reflected in smaller distributions of dividend, though it may be reflected in reductions of allocations to reserves, or even in depletions of reserves. If smaller distributions of dividend, investors are prone to sell out and cause a slump in share-values. If reserves are adversely affected the bankers of the enterprises in question are as prone as anybody else to "lose confidence" and to call upon debtors to repay loans and overdrafts. It will be realised that just because an enterprise can afford to have its profits reduced it does not follow that a Government is at liberty to enforce the reduction. So M. Laval's "gallant" proclamation must be taken with a grain of salt (or cement) and must be construed to mean that he was ready to base his interference with prices on such a principle of selectivity as would safeguard the general stability of the investment market. He must protect at least certain classes of stock for reasons of State, so to speak, particularly those held abroad. The Bank of France is probably advising him where interference is safe, and where not.

In these circumstances it seems almost self-evident that at the time when M. Laval asked for his powers he had no idea at all of what the proceeds of his retrenchment measures would be, and that his financial advisers could only speculate on their amount within a wide margin. What the French Chamber should have done (if it could) was to bind M. Laval to an understanding that if he did not succeed in raising a certain sum in the four months the experiment should be declared a failure and discontinued. That would not have settled much, but at least it would have established one definite criterion of judgment for the Chamber to apply in October. As things are the deputies will enter upon a debate without any precise terms of reference, and without any guidance as to the cogency and relevancy of the figures and other data which may be supplied to them. They will be just as uncertain whether to stop the experiment or extend it as they were to initiate it last June. Dialectically they will be impotent to withstand the Government's interpretation of its own success (or failure); they will be intimidated by renewed hints of disaster if they do not assent to M. Laval's proposals as to what shall be done next; and, lastly, as we have endeavoured to explain, they will be representing constituents largely disarmed of their power to back up from outside the Chamber any attack on the Government delivered inside.

Here we must interpolate the reflection that it is a striking irony of fate that a people like the French who are the most anti-centralist in their Parliamentary pro-

cedure and the most ready to take the law into their own hands against the kind of ramps which are characteristic of centralism, should know less about the policy and technique of financial government than do the law-abiding citizens of the British Empire. The militant French citizen does not know where to direct his militancy; the British citizen does know where to direct it, but hasn't got any to direct. We speak here of citizens acquainted with the Social Credit analysis and its political significance. This tempts one to wish there could be a crossing of the characteristic qualities possessed by the two, not because militancy can necessarily achieve anything practical, but because it does command publicity. There is a lot of loose talk about what constitutes "action" or "inaction" insofar as the pushing of Social Credit is concerned, but when the frothy rhetoric which tops it is blown off you find that there is no kind of "action" open to the ordinary run of citizen which does more, or can do more, than achieve publicity for the subject. All lines of "action" are mutually complementary when they are directed to focussing the attention of the public on the Social-Credit signpost. The comparative efficacies of various publicity plans—to call them by their proper name—are a matter of divided opinion. To begin with, publicity is publicity whether it initially attracts people or repels them. The value of publicity depends as much on the degree to which it becomes fixed in the "prospect's" memory as on the attitude in which he receives it. It has been the attractions and repulsions evoked by the technical exposition of Social Credit which have made the subject the dynamic centre of intellectual discussion; and it will be the attractions and repulsions of various publicity plans which will make it the dynamic centre of political controversy.

The practical application of these remarks to the French situation is this, that supposing the Social-Credit idea had "caught on" among the civil servants and working-class organisations (not generally, but in, say, the cases of a few organisers) and that when these salary and wage earners came out on the streets, as they did recently, to demonstrate against the pay-cuts, they had coupled their negative protests with some of the positive Social-Credit slogans which the Green Shirts have made familiar to our own working classes, there would have been the widest and most impressive publicity for Social Credit (perhaps more potent than a capture of the wireless) with the minimum of monetary cost. Every man who is moved to "make an exhibition of himself," as the saying is, by the appeal of a common objective, becomes, as it were, a one-candle-power unit in a floodlight directed upon that objective. It does not matter a scrap whether, at first, neutral onlookers like or dislike the method of illumination or the object illuminated; the whole point is that they can't help seeing both and remembering both.

If such a thing could have happened in Paris at the time we speak about, is it not highly probable that the shopkeepers who watched the demonstrators go by would have realised at once what they have realised later, namely the necessity for them to make the very "common cause" with the demonstrators which it was the concern of the bankers to prevent? However, it was no use speculating about what could have happened, and it is probably too much to expect the wit to see what to do and the courage to do it at their maximum in one

particular race. We can only hope that there may yet be a cross-infection of the two qualities. "Justice with Courage are a Thousand Men."

Next October the French Chamber is certain to see the Laval Ministry behave according to the common nature of all centralised institutions, turning its failure into a reason for its own perpetuation. You see the same thing happen in all walks of life. The executive secure powers to attempt a given task, and the first thing they do is to use those powers to perfect their own immunity from effective attack and replacement when their failure to perform the task is made manifest. That done, they are in a position either to substitute another task for the one they first sought powers to accomplish, or, as in the case of M. Laval, to extend the time-limit for accomplishing the original task. All the time their over-riding objective is to remain in power. Hence they usually begin by setting themselves a task which can only be accomplished, if at all, in an indefinitely long period, knowing that when once they secure powers to begin it they can deprive the opposition of powers to interfere with it. The mechanism is always money, in which, as shown, resides the only effective right of constitutional action. Money loads the dice of constitutional law—in other words, to unload the loaded dice becomes unconstitutional.

The Chamber may or may not veto the experiment by a vote. We shall see. But the only hope of that signification of disapproval being effective seems to depend on how far disaffection is spreading among the official classes on whom the bankers must rely for the implementation of their deflationist policy.

## The Green Shirts.

### NOTES FROM THE GENERAL SECRETARY.

Three London Green Shirts were arrested a week or two ago while carrying out agitational activity. Nevertheless, and in spite of extremely difficult circumstances, they maintained the discipline of the Green Shirt Movement.

Not until they were put into what may be called the prisoners' detention room at the police station, to wait for twenty minutes or so, did they allow themselves a little "off parade" relaxation. Here they passed the time away by singing Green Shirt marching songs at the top of their voices. Outside in the street they could hear the "shouting-slogans" of their Section which had marched to the police station to offer "arrest en masse."

When the London G.S. Corps of Drums and a Colour Party at the head of the G.S. contingent marched into Trafalgar Square on Sunday, July 14, to attend a workers' demonstration, they were greeted with cheers and applause. The Green Shirts placed the following poster on the plinth of Nelson's column which formed the speakers' platform:—

The Green Shirt Movement for Social Credit.

DEMAND  
THE WAGES  
OF THE  
MACHINE!

Wages-earners' and unemployed workers' organisations officially invited the Green Shirts to attend the mass demonstration in Victoria Park on Sunday, July 28, and to parade with drums, flags, and banners.

Two years ago when Green Shirts attended a demonstration in Victoria Park they had to face stone-throwing and lumps of turf and dirt hurled at them by (so-called "Communist") hooligans.

Since then the rank-and-file wage-earners and unemployed have found out in action that Green Shirts are fighting against Poverty, Fascism, and War; and that the agitation for the National Dividend and the Price Adjustment is the only sane working-class objective.

F. G.

## Oliver Baldwin's Plan.

By John Grimm.

In the *Daily Mail* of August 7 Mr. Oliver Baldwin contributes an article on the money question. It is entitled "How I Would Soak the Rich." In some respects this article echoes the diagnosis of Mr. T. C. Warren Evans in the *Certified Accountants' Journal* (see THE NEW AGE, July 25). He says nothing about taxing idle deposits, but suggests that something ought to be done to prevent depositors taking money out of useful channels and putting it back at their own will and time irrespective of the effect on prices, etc. He is not too clear, but what he appears to believe is that money diverted from activity to idleness should be sterilised, in the sense that it should be isolated and treated as inconvertible to active uses. The object of so sterilising it appears to be this, that an equivalent sum of new money could then be put into active circulation without causing inflation of prices.

He hints that if incomes were evenly distributed the problem of idle hoards of money would disappear. For hoards represent money possessed in excess of a person's requirements for consumption: if the money were shared equally by all persons no one would be able to hoard any part of his share without the conscious experience of deprivation. Mr. Baldwin does not advocate even distribution, but advocates compensation of the consequences of uneven distribution. He differs from Mr. Evans in regard to method; for whereas Mr. Evans would apply a deposits-tax to force hoarders to convert their idle money to active uses, Mr. Baldwin would make this money inconvertible and inject more money into active circulation.

Mr. Evans and he are like two physicians in consultation over a patient suffering from clots of blood. Mr. Evans would dissolve the clots to restore the blood-stream, while Mr. Baldwin would make them insoluble and give the patient a blood-forming dietary so as to make the blood-stream large enough for the clots to float about in.

The alternative treatments suggested by these two diagnosticians are beautifully plausible, and disengage a pleasant odour of Social-Credit sentiment. But neither takes account of the root cause of the disease. The root cause lies in the compulsion laid on industry by the bankers to raise its fixed capital out of the industry it distributes to the community and thereafter comes it distributes to the community against the communitate that capital in prices charged against the community's incomes. Now the investment of income is, so to speak, a clotting of purchasing-power. Any remedy of the blood-clot type must, therefore, either convert investment-capital back into purchasing-power or compensate the community for unconverted investment-capital by the issue of new purchasing-power. The capital must be written off prices or incomes must be raised to the level of prices.

But Mr. Baldwin does not say that incomes are to be distributed gratuitously; he implies that they will be distributed by industry as earnings. If so, the whole amount will be entered into Price sooner or later. Nor is there anything to prevent the investment of this new income. If that happens the consequence of trying to keep the "spot" ratio (Price: Income) at unity must be to drive the "forward" ratio below unity.

Whatever the Price: Income "spot" ratio may be the "forward" ratio will be worse: it will be (Price + x) : (Income - x)—x being the amount invested.

It is a contradiction in terms to talk of compensating a deficiency of Income against Price by the issue of Cost-creating money. It is very much like lifting your fig-leaf to mask your blushes.

The final observation to be made is this: that attempts to solve the main problem by direct interference with hoarding or investment are irrelevant. If every penny of income paid out by industry were to be brought to the shops and spent as and when received, the proportion now being hoarded or invested would be abstracted from the community in the form of additional price-charges. The community would get no more for their money than they do now.

Assuming that industry is now producing 4 units of goods of which 1 unit is consumable, and that at present the community are spending £3 on investments and £1 on consumable goods; under the above change the community would be charged £4 for the one unit. In both cases the banker would get and confiscate, the £3 along with the £1.

There would be, however, one great advantage in the change, and it would lie in the spectacle of industry's piling up a mountain of physical assets at the progression-rate (using the figures just taken) of 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, etc., while delivering goods at the constant rate of 1, 1, 1, etc., and *without being able to show that anybody had a claim on the ownership* of these expanding assets in the sense of being entitled to receive the proceeds of selling them. There having been no investments, industry would have no legal creditors—no persons in whose interest it was necessary to charge anything to the community on account of these accumulating assets.\* But industry would have real creditors, and these would be, not one section of the community with legal claims for money to be returned to them, but the whole community with moral claims for these assets to be delivered to them without charge. Industry's accounts would show that they had paid the cost of the assets, and were now the owners of them.

So much for the technical significance of Mr. Oliver Baldwin's diagnosis and recommendations. They are unsound because they are based on an incomplete survey of the relevant facts. Nevertheless there are doubtless many people now coming into the Social Credit Movement who will not realise the nature and implications of this incomplete diagnosis, or, if they do, will acclaim Mr. Baldwin's contribution to the discussion as affording, in a certain degree, corroboration of the Social Credit diagnosis, and therefore as quickening the general political advance towards the adoption of the Social Credit remedy. "Mr. Baldwin goes a long way with us," they will be inclined to say to themselves, "which is most inspiring, because he is the son of the Prime Minister." If so, they will do well to pause a little, and ask themselves what this stimulating corroboration may portend. We will supply the answer. The corroboration may portend *co-operation with* Social Credit advocacy: but it may portend *competition against* Social Credit advocacy.

Social Credit, in its philosophy and ideology, is fast capturing the imagination of the progressive forces of the community. Its enemies cannot defeat it by trying to arrest this process; for, by openly doing so they

\* This must not be construed as suggesting that if the change were made now this result would happen; but that it would have happened if there had never been any investing out of income.

would instantly sacrifice any credentials they might have possessed for assuming leadership of progressive opinion. No, they must all commence by establishing their credentials as Social Credit philosophers and idealists: they must confess to a share in the vision of the New Economic Jerusalem descending out of the heavens. Then, later, having established themselves on the foundation of public confidence in respect of the distant objectives of Social Credit, they will be able to command respectful consideration of whatever "practical suggestions" they see fit to make for achieving those objectives. These practical suggestions might be seen to be side-tracking suggestions by Social Credit veterans, but their voices would be lost in the clamour of enthusiasm for the eminent and influential allies who were showing such clear evidence of their concern for the success of the Movement. To apply the words of the innocent Mrs. Lupin on Mr. Pecksniff: "I can't believe that such a noble-spoken gentleman could have gone and done wrong of his own accord." Addicts of noble-speaking are apt to fall victims to their own oratory along with their hearers, and do wrong things—ill-thought-out things—in a state of self-induced hypnosis which leads them to rely on "that altruistic feeling" to cover a multitude of technical errors, and to confuse moral fancies with material footholds in the ascent to prosperity.

## The Point of the Pen.

By R. Laugier.

XLIII (ii).—IRISH FREE STATE: IMPRESSIONS. One, three hundred years old, built by Huguenot refugees, Fine shaped rooms, fine carvings, space, cleanliness, everything restful. An old, walled garden with berries under nets; exotic trees that even their owner cannot name; plums, peaches, nectarines; spreading fruit-trees crucified against the walls. Outside, down the drive, the trees are full of owls. Do you know that they snore? They do, like a crowd of drunks sleeping off a thick night. Sometimes they take possession of a cabin, and have to be smoked out.

There are two kinds of tea-meals. One is The Tea (High Tea in Northern England), and this appears, ceremoniously, at any hour between six and nine of an evening. Then there is "a cup of tea out of your hand"; this never stops from the moment one is roused by cows or bells, to the moment one mounts the stairs to bed. A piece of "brack" may go with the cup out of your hand; and poor people pay 4s. 6d. a lb. for their tea. Hospitality here, unrivalled. People one has never heard of send one a dozen cigars, because they have heard one cannot procure one's brand of cigarette in the town. People one has met, once, for five minutes, organise teas in one's honour, preceded by the finest Spanish desert wines. The meals, composed of delicious salmon, salads, home-made bread, miraculous butter, home-made jams and cakes, and followed by dancing and innumerable "cups out of your hand," or whiskey.

On the flags of a farm-house kitchen they do "sets," reels, and jigs for the visitor. Mighty fitches of bacon hang overhead; a cricket sings; a fiddle goes continually, played by one after another untutored but skilled hand. Maureen dances, heel and toe. She plays the fiddle for the others. Mother plays the fiddle; so does Dan. There is much laughter, much stamping of feet. . . . The peculiar smell of peat fills the room. . . .

Hurling is a good, fast game, pretty to watch. Something between hockey, rugger, and lacrosse. Three points make a goal; one scores a goal by banging the ball into the net, a point by sending the ball over the cross-bar but between the tapering, elongated posts. Very pretty to see how the ball can travel the length of the field, from goal to goal, in three or even two hits. One may flick the ball up into one's hand, with a turn of the stick, then, pitching it into the air, drive towards the opponents' goal. Dangerous, but I have never seen a hand injured. Men are knocked out, however, and frequently. They are struck on the head, or wounded. It is one of the drawbacks to watching the game—this and the difficulty of following the small ball, under the quick strokes and deft catching. When a man is knocked out play is delayed until he recovers under medico's attention. Much delay. The business is sometimes a part of a team's strategy: hard-pressed, they gain time by individual players lying down to the doctor. If injuries are bad the player may be replaced by a substitute. The better the play the less there is of the knocking-out business. Limerick, Cork, and Kilkenny are good teams; Limerick very pleasant to watch. Leix are coming on, and are expected to be better next year. There seem to be certain mysteries connected with the gate-money taken at hurling matches; discrepancies between numbers of spectators and declared receipts.

Harry Lynton's travelling music-hall comes to Durrrow. Travelling Variety. A tent on the village green. Seats 1s. to 2s. Sixty in the company. Expenses £200 a week. Times bad. Harry stops only one night; where formerly he remained a week, playing to good money. The star turn is Dr. Walford Bodie, who, it is whispered, receives £50 a week. He has a ventriloquial act, and later does his electrical act assisted by Mlle. Electra. Dr. Walford Bodie, M.D.C.M., F.R.M.C., F.R.S.M., D.P.H. London, is the famous Bloodless Surgeon, and the Electric Wizard. He presents the World's Greatest Thrill, and if you listen to the audience you will be inclined to agree with the description. Dr. Bodie does stunts with an 18 in. induction coil, and takes a shock in an electric chair, the "original chair used in Sing-Sing." A metal cap on the doctor's head; pale green light; cold blue sparks, the doctor writhes but bears up manfully. Sparks fly from a carbon placed in his mouth. When the lights go up and the doctor rises to bow, assisted by attendant and uniformed nurse, one feels both relieved and gratified: there has been no accident, and one has had one's money's worth. The doctor is an imposing figure. Palish face, dark eyes, turned-up, black, Kaiser-like moustache. Full evening dress, a cross on a blue ribbon about the neck.

Also on the programme: "Lilian McEvoy, the Celebrated Violinist that was discovered playing in the streets of Dublin by Fritz Kreisler, and acknowledged to be the greatest Violinist that has ever been discovered in Ireland."

There is much virtue in that word "acknowledged"; and I secretly wonder what my friend Maud MacCarthy would say. However . . . a very good two bobs' worth. The 1935 Radio Follies dance determinedly; and the production goes in the slick "revue" manner, with scarcely a moment's pause. If there is a hitch, the band plays, or a crooner comes, through amplifiers, to soothe the impatient.

In the middle of the show a raffle. Tickets twopence

each, or twelve for a shilling. All sorts of prizes, mostly watches—for Harry Lynton was once a jeweller. But if you win the prize you can take £3 in cash. The prize is won. The lucky man does take £3 in cash. The show ends with Dr. Bodie and his induction coil. The instant the last curtain is down strong men hurl themselves on the seats and pack them ready for the lorries. Before we have left the tent half the seats are folded and stacked. Another town to-morrow night. A hard life, and the Radio Follies look as though their powers of endurance were considerable.

Outside the tent the night air is cool and the stars appear remote and icy-blue, like Dr. Bodie's electric sparks. What about a bottle of Guinness at Walsh's?

Dalkey is a fashionable seaside place, near Dublin and nearer Kingstown. Very fine houses, with magnificent views across Killiney Bay. A spotlessly clean place. Villas reminding one of Monaco. The Bay compared with Naples. And Italian names, like Sorrento prevail. Well-to-do people with big cars, good libraries, good wines; tennis and croquet on the lawns. The same hospitality and joviality as in the country farm-houses. Dinner takes the place of tea; and whiskey, sherry, or port deputises for the "cup of tea out of your hand."

Youth goes in for yachting, motoring, football, golf, no hurling. "We despise the Irish games," says one Irish youth.

From the windows of the house where I am staying I get a full view of Howth Head on one side, Killiney Bay on the other, and Dalkey Island straight ahead. This last is composed of a few rocks, given over to gulls and salt spray; nevertheless, the old fashion has been revived and a "king" of Dalkey Island is elected every year. The "king" is a noted character and "original" of Dublin. At his coronation he makes a speech—traditionally amusing—and reported verbatim in the *Irish Independent* and *Evening Herald*.

Around Dalkey beautiful country. At Kingstown there is bathing. Nothing else whatever, though fairy lamps are massed along the promenade at night, as though to promise unbridled joy and multitudinous diversion. To bathe, one undresses amid the rocks—there are no sands—and wireless music erupts under God's fair skies, and, amplified, to the nth degree, may not be escaped. (Life would be tolerable if it was not for its amusements.)

A few miles away is Bray (of singing vicar fame); another seaside resort, rather patronised by The Chosen. Here there are switchbacks and such delights.

Further south is Greystones, recently half destroyed by gales.

(To be continued.)

## Forthcoming Meetings.

Green Shirt Movement for Social Credit.  
Wednesday, September 4, at 8 p.m.—John Hargrave, Founder and Leader; Lecture at National Headquarters, 44, Little Britain, London, E.C.1. "Mass Pressure on Parliament."

Wednesday, September 11, at 8 p.m.—Speakers' Class, National Headquarters, 44, Little Britain, London, E.C.1.

Dewsbury D.S.C.A.  
Wednesday, September 4, Mr. E. Wright on "The National Dividend," at headquarters, 27, Wellington Road, Dewsbury.

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.]

## Methodology In Law.

By James Golder, M.I.Mech.E.

### III.

And what are the tools and techniques of our legal profession? Let George H. Jaffin answer for himself:—

"Litigation is fundamentally a form of combat wherein words are used as weapons. A suit can be appropriately characterised as a civil battle since the plaintiffs are armed with actions, and thus girt, as it were, with swords; whereas the defendants are fortified with pleas and defended, as it were, by shields. The arena for this battle is the court. . . Since litigation entailed logomachy, it was but natural that specialised forms of word weapons should be developed eventually, and their legitimate use be regulated."

We have already learned that the roots of law are oracula, i.e., verbal. Now we see that verbs have become weapons, the actions swords, and the pleas shields, with the courts as the arena. Laymen once upon a time presided over these courts, and the litigants fought for themselves, without any hired help. ("Unchampioned by lawyers" is the way Mr. Jaffin puts it.) It was not until the eighteenth century that the specialised practitioner became prominent, and his debut was heralded by the Reports which "laid a firm foundation for the doctrine of precedents and the lofty superstructure of the Anglo-American Common Law that was erected thereon."

We are not informed where the first practitioner came from, but we presume he arose from among the army of law reporters, and it is therefore not surprising to find that the reporters were soon dependent on what later became known as the Barristers, while reports for the enlightenment of litigants declined. Instead, anthologies of cases were prepared to provide the Bar with precedents (i.e., authorities) which became the *sources* for the development of judicial doctrine and the ultimate data for professional prophecy of judicial decision. Evidence that the anthologies were not intended for the litigants lies in what Mr. Jaffin describes as the "phenomenon" of publishing them in languages entirely unintelligible to laymen. Indeed, he notes, as though surprised, that the profession in other climes and times has cultivated this peculiar mode of discourse. His undoubted erudition in these matters does not seem to have included research into that most remarkable product of the legal mind entitled "The New Despotism," by the present English Lord Chief Justice, who therein reminds us that intelligibility in some quarters is the prelude to being "found out," or, as we say in cricket, "caught out."

We must, however, push on. We are almost still in the preface to this prologue. Listen, or read it aloud, it sounds better. "In the laboratory of legal research there are many techniques," says our author. The *arena* is now the *laboratory*! But we must run over the techniques before we come to the particular one Mr. Jaffin spreads himself upon. There are five thus:—

(1) *The Chronicular*. This technique involves the methodical résumé of cases in temporal sequence, he says in effect, and adds "the painstaking scribes . . . inspired by the desire to depict cases . . . for the enlightenment of posterity, unwittingly bequeathed a wealth of authentic case chronicles, etc." for the use of constructive lawyers. The cultural heritage, as we would say.

(2) *The Anecdotal*. This technique consists of snapshots of selected cases, in no sort of order. Almost one might say, the smoke room, or raconteur order of just popular interest or special taste. Cases such as our "Brides in the bath," or that of the proprietor of a Chicago sausage factory, who was charged with killing his wife and boiling away her body in the sausage vats. These come from case experiences by reminiscent judges, jurors, etc.

(3) *The Archetypical*. This technique depicts "the epic cases that make history," and here Mr. Jaffin's gift for epitome writing reveals itself. "A whole epoch may, in fact," he says, "be symbolised by a single case, an acid-engraved etching of the *cause célèbre*, bringing into high

relief the suggestive "Contrasts of light and shade." This section of the lawyers' many techniques constitutes "an ominous galaxy of historic cases," and among the star turns given we select, e.g., Socrates, Jesus, Galileo, Luther, Tom Paine, Zola, and Gandhi.

(4) *The Stereotypical*. Said to be a composite picture of the mass of cases. It is supposed to be an economical method of sifting the mass and summarising groups of cases having family resemblances, and cataloguing them into types. "It portrays the Many," he says "not the Man," and doubtless, if these writings should ever reach his eye, he will be offended if it be characterised here as the legal technique of mob law.

The fifth, and the most prosaic of all, is the statistical technique, and must be left to a final article, for, by reason of the value transferred from *verbs* to *numbers*, and the force of law given to the latter alone, Mr. Jaffin's brochure may be forged into a useful component of the social dynamics which Major Douglas is calling upon all to study.

(To be concluded.)

## The Green Shirt Movement for Social Credit.

LECTURES ON SOCIAL CREDIT POLITICS.

Mr. John Hargrave will give a series of lectures at Green Shirt National Headquarters, 44, Little Britain, London, E.C.1, dealing with the various aspects of the Politics of Social Credit and the Social Credit Agitation.

Admittance will be by ticket only, and tickets will only be issued to supporters who contribute to the Green Shirt Fighting Fund. Anyone can become a supporter by contributing not less than 10s. 6d.

Tickets will be in the nature of "season tickets" available for one year, and entitling the holders to attend every lecture delivered at Green Shirt Headquarters during that period. Tickets are not transferable.

No charge is made for tickets. Not more than fifty will be issued and these should be applied for immediately by those wishing to attend Mr. Hargrave's forthcoming series of lectures.

The first lecture "Mass Pressure on Parliament," will be given on Wednesday, September 4, 1935, at 8 p.m.

FRANK GRIFFITHS, General Secretary.  
The Green Shirt Movement for Social Credit.

## Petition to The King.

(From "The New Era.")

Mr. J. D. Bennett, Director of Overseas Relations, of the London Social Credit Secretariat, writes:—

"In view of the large number of inquiries we are receiving from overseas about a 'Petition to the King,' which is being circulated with the Marquis of Tavistock as 'Director of Petition,' we wish to dispel any misunderstanding that may arise.

"This petition does not come from the Social Credit Secretariat and Lord Tavistock is in no way connected with the Secretariat.

"Our official attitude in this matter is that, while not opposing such a petition, we do not support it.

"The Electoral Campaign for the National Dividend is the only course of action which Major Douglas and the Secretariat believe will lead to results as far as this country is concerned."

### NOTICE.

All communications requiring the Editor's attention should be addressed directly to him as follows:  
Mr. Arthur Brenton, 20, Rectory Road, Barnes, S.W.13.

ACADEMY CINEMA, Oxford Street.  
GER. 2931.

Delightful Friesian Legend  
"DER SCHIMMELREITER" (U)  
(THE RIDER ON THE WHITE HORSE)

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