

THE
NEW AGE

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS,
LITERATURE AND ART - - -

EDITED BY ARTHUR BRENTON.

VOLUME XXXV (NEW SERIES).

MAY 2ND, 1924, TO OCTOBER 23RD, 1924.



LONDON :
THE NEW AGE PRESS, 70, HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.1.

1924

INDEX.

VOLUME XXXV (New Series).

- A**
"A + B" Again. 280.
Abracadabra Plus X. 6, 30, 53.
Adversity and Advertising. 147.
All on a Summer's Day. 235.
At a Venture. 28, 113.
- B**
Bankers and Credit. 77, 89.
Banking that Beggared Britain. 208.
Byron, Shelley and the Bishop. 114.
- C**
"Ceylon Observer" on Social Credit. 196.
Civilisation, The Price of. 165.
Contemporaries on Three Continents. 174, 211.
Contemporary Criticism. 65, 78, 92, 151, 247, 284, 296.
Correction, A. 164.
Correspondence. 9, 21, 33, 47, 58, 68, 83, 94, 107, 130, 142, 154, 178, 202, 215, 225, 238, 249, 262, 273, 287, 298, 309.
Cuckold Conference, The. 171.
Current Conflux, The. 89, 100, 112, 125, 150, 162, 195, 295.
Current Financial Policy. 160.
Current Sense. 232.
- D**
"Daily Mail's" Financial Spokesman, The. 244, 258, 270.
Deadlock in Finance, The. 135.
Depositors and Bank Failures. 15, 27, 39.
Desert Family, A. 43.
Devastated Area, The. 116.
Dominion of the Dollar. 88.
- E**
Election, The. 304.
- F**
First Blood. 187, 198.
Flaw in the Price System. 4.
Fog in the Channel. 104.
Funiculi-Funicula. 127.
- G**
Garnsey, Mr. 19.
- H**
Hassan. 68.
Helping Hand and Modern Novels, The. 177.
Horse-Dealers, The. 176.
- I**
Inflation and Slump. 161.
Insidious Campaign, The. 220.
Ivybridge and Dolab Deressi. 212.
- K**
Keynes versus Cannan. 41.
- L**
Labour Stripped Naked! 210.
Les Affaires Sont Les Affaires. 165.
Life and Letters. 295.
Loans and War Risks. 51.
- M**
Mannigfaltig. 18, 44, 102, 115, 126, 138, 162, 185, 196, 222, 234.
Mr. Keynes among the Prophets. 207.
Music. 31, 54, 79, 103, 140, 189, 260, 271, 286, 308.
- N**
New Brains for Old. 124.
New Verse. 105, 140, 307.
Nihilist's Widow, The. 54.
Notes of the Week. 1, 13, 25, 37, 49, 61, 73, 85, 97, 109, 121, 133, 145, 157, 160, 181, 193, 205, 217, 229, 241, 253, 265, 277, 289, 301.
Notes on the New Philosophy. 283.
- P**
Pastiche. 11, 23, 35, 41, 47, 60, 64, 71, 83, 88, 91, 95, 107, 113, 119, 132, 142, 153, 155, 167, 172, 179, 184, 188, 191, 203, 226, 251, 263, 275, 282, 287, 299, 309.
Pause. 78.
Poplar Wage Surcharges. 137.
Psychology of Plays, The. 297.
- Q**
Question Time. 74, 100, 112, 149, 159, 173, 184.
- R**
Reductio Ad Nauseam: A Causerie. 223.
Regeneration in Organisation. 232.
Religion, Morality and Revolution. 221.
Reviews. 20, 32, 46, 57, 69, 82, 93, 106, 119, 129, 141, 154, 166, 178, 186, 203, 226, 251, 287, 298.
Russian Harvest, The. 195.
- S**
Science, A Barnum of. 42.
Science of Advertisement. 200.
Social Credit. 101.
Social Credit Movement. 147, 256, 267, 280, 291, 304.
Spiritual Basis of Fascism. 305.
- T**
Taxation. 3.
Theatre, The. 8, 17, 29, 45, 56, 67, 81, 90, 118, 128, 139, 152, 163, 175, 190, 201, 213, 224, 237, 261, 273, 285.
Through Consumption to Prosperity. 292.
- U**
U.S.E., The. 76.
- W**
Wilfrid Blunt and Egypt. 233, 246, 257, 268, 281.
Willow Pattern. 248.
Women's Interests. 6.

INDEX TO AUTHORS.

<p>A</p> <p>Allott, Percy. 165.</p> <p>B</p> <p>Barbor, H. R. 8, 17, 29, 43, 45, 56, 67, 78, 81, 99, 118, 128, 139, 152, 163, 164, 187, 190, 198, 201, 213, 224, 237, 261, 273, 285.</p> <p>Barfield, Owen. 118.</p> <p>Biddulph, G. 41, 161, 207.</p> <p>C</p> <p>Causton, Bernard. 223.</p> <p>Choyce, Newberry. 188, 237, 272, 286.</p> <p>Crafter, A. G. 210, 232.</p> <p>Cumberland, Martin. 104, 127.</p> <p>Curfew, Scott. 42, 166, 200.</p> <p>D</p> <p>Dickens, Rene Charles. 208, 220, 244, 258, 270.</p> <p>Douglas, C. H. 3, 280, 304.</p> <p>E</p> <p>Eiloart, Arnold. 114.</p> <p>G</p> <p>G. B. 233, 246, 257, 268, 281.</p> <p>Glenn, K. O. 161.</p> <p>Grieve, C. M. 7, 19, 30, 44, 53, 65, 78, 92, 102, 115, 126, 138, 151, 162, 185, 196, 211, 222, 234, 247, 257, 266, 271, 284, 296, 297.</p>	<p>H</p> <p>Harris, G. W. 28, 113.</p> <p>Harwood, Cecil. 19.</p> <p>Hiller, Croft. 221.</p> <p>H. McD. 105, 140, 307.</p> <p>I</p> <p>Isaac, C. P. 88.</p> <p>K</p> <p>Keith, Caroline. 248.</p> <p>Kitson, Arthur. 77, 89.</p> <p>Kosor, Josip. 282.</p> <p>L</p> <p>Levy, Dr. Oscar. 305.</p> <p>L. N. S. 54.</p> <p>M</p> <p>Meade, S. F. 283.</p> <p>N</p> <p>Norman, C. H. 137.</p>	<p>O</p> <p>O. K. 245.</p> <p>O. M. W. W. 295.</p> <p>S</p> <p>St. Bernard. 295.</p> <p>Somerville, Peter F. 297.</p> <p>Sorabji, Kaikhosru. 32, 56, 79, 104, 140, 189, 286, 308.</p> <p>Stevenson, John. 235.</p> <p>Stewart, Agnes. 68.</p> <p>T</p> <p>Tchelebi, Morton. 212.</p> <p>Tud, Morgan. 210.</p> <p>W</p> <p>Wallace, L. 124.</p> <p>Werth, Alexander. 195.</p> <p>Woman Worker. 6.</p> <p>X</p> <p>X. Y. Z. 77.</p>
--	---	--

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER"

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND ART.

No. 1651] NEW SERIES Vol. XXXV. No. 1. THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1924. [Registered at the G.P.O.] THREEPENCE as a Newspaper.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	1	THE THEATRE. By H. R. Barbor	8
TAXATION. By C. H. Douglas	3	LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: The Labour Govern- ment; Music; The Single-Tax Complex; Women in Industry; The Guild Idea; The Single Tax	9
THE FLAW IN THE PRICE SYSTEM	4	PASTICHE	11
WOMEN'S INTERESTS. By Woman Worker	6		
ABRACADABRA PLUS X. By C. M. Grieve	6		

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

RECENT developments in the political situation recall that famous luncheon party at Leatherhead. Our readers will remember that Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Winston Churchill, Mr. Austen Chamberlain and Lord Birkenhead were the guests on that occasion, and that Lord Beaverbrook was their host. Whatever expectations these gentlemen had as to the state of the parties after the Election (for the luncheon took place beforehand) we have no means of knowing. It may be that they planned for an excess of Liberal over Labour members in the new Parliament, or they may have contemplated as a probability what subsequently happened. However this may be, there is little doubt of their main plan, which was to break the Baldwin Government so as to clear the way for a new political combination. The time seems to be ripe enough for putting this plan into operation. Mr. Churchill's intervention in the Abbey Division Election, which nearly succeeded in displacing the official Conservative candidate, is being followed at the present time by Mr. Lloyd George's agitation against Mr. MacDonald. It appears that the Labour Government is not "consulting" Mr. Asquith in regard to its parliamentary programme. This complaint, regarded as the cause of all the bother, is very inadequate. Unless the Liberals want an alliance with Labour they ought to be content that there is always a place where Labour has to consult Liberalism—namely the division lobby. As Mr. Lloyd George is not content, one can only conclude that the real grievance is not that there is no consultation but that there is no *private* consultation. The Division List is too public: what is wanted is another luncheon. Then again, Mr. Lloyd George has further complaint, that Labour is attacking Liberalism in the constituencies. Well, why not? Anyone would suppose that there had been a bargain struck between Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Asquith before he took office, whereas the only evidence before us is that the Liberals for their own purposes allowed the Labour Government to come into being. If it tried to go too far, Mr. Asquith assured his followers, they could always turn it out. Upon the basis of that threat it seems exceedingly logical that Labour should be taking measures to defend its electoral position against the contingency of being forced to appeal to the electors. And this feature of the situ-

ation hints at the immediate cause of all this Lloyd George agitation about "consultation"—the required consultation is really to be a bargain about seats. Could a situation be more grotesque? Here is Labour with its own programme which it wishes to carry out. It cannot carry it out in the present Parliament: it can only hope to do so in the next. One of the reasons why it has thus to defer its programme is the opposition of the Liberal Party. Yet Labour is now being attacked because it is not entering into a contract to preserve the numerical strength of the Liberals in the next Parliament! Who said *gd.* for *4d.*?

Meanwhile Mr. MacDonald is sitting tight. He sees no reason why there should be a General Election for two or three years. Speaking at York on April 19th, he recalled how in December, after the last Election, "the Tories were looking out of their windows wondering if the heavens were still standing" and how the "newspapers then believed that by April grass would be growing in the streets of London"; and then contrasted these fears with what actually took place. "When we came in," he said, "sterling improved in its international value, trade in the City of London, which had been quaking on account of the rather extravagant speeches made by Tory Ministers about inflation, became quite calm, and the Labour Ministry began to be regarded as supermen." He was entitled to make this point against his critics, but the mere fact that an audience of Socialists greeted it with "Hear, hear and laughter" shows how much they still have to learn of the inwardness of the situation last December. Has it ever occurred to one of them that the "extravagant speeches about inflation" were the cause of the Tory dissolution, and that the present Government was handed the reins of office by the very City which Mr. MacDonald pictures as having been wondering how it would drive? They had better wake up quickly to the fact that Mr. Baldwin was Queenslanded out of office. And what happened to him is a thing that can happen to any of his successors directly the financiers decide so. All Prime Ministers are called "Theodore." Take this instance. Mr. MacDonald, claiming that not only was Labour in office but even in power, told his audience—"What have we done with Russia? We have decided on the recognition of Russia. Is not that evidence of power? (Hear, hear.)" Who would have thought that this claim was

made only five days after the Prime Minister was publicly instructed by the "leading London bankers" as to the terms upon which he was to "recognise" Russia? In form, of course, the Bankers' Memorandum was nothing more than a quotation of their conditions for underwriting the Recognition; but since, in practice, the underwriting is the Recognition, there is no point in stressing the verbal distinction.

However Socialists, in the roseate light of a Party Demonstration, may be blinded to the situation, there is no single indication that the Labour Government has any more independent power than was permitted to its predecessors. The "Daily News" Lobby Correspondent, writing about the forthcoming Budget, says—"Some people profess to be very nervous of what 'a Socialist like Mr. Snowden' may propose, but experienced politicians are not in the least alarmed. At Westminster neither Mr. Snowden nor his lieutenant, Mr. William Graham, is regarded as an irresponsible novice in financial affairs." Probably the "experienced politicians" have read in Mr. Snowden's "The Individual Under Socialism" that "Socialism will take away the desire for riches," that "honest labour will be a guarantee against want," that "self-sacrifice for the common good has in every age appealed to the highest admiration of men," that "Socialism . . . is a movement to subordinate materialism to the intellectual life," that "we must first establish the material base of life on a moral foundation before we can raise up a society of moral and intellectual men and women"—to take a few only of the many texts that might well be hung in bank parlours beside Kipling's "You'll be a man, my son." The fact that no experienced politician is nervous about Mr. Snowden should be ominous for the elements (apart from Trade Union money contributions) which take off their coats, and run, fetch and carry for Labour candidates at election times have been so doing in the expectation of a return which, in the nature of the case, must administer a nerve shock at Westminster if it is going to solve their problems. These people—especially the rank and file of the I.L.P. and the Communist Party—are at present undergoing a process of disillusionment. Firstly the Government's decision to build the five new cruisers has aroused a feeling of uneasiness which the temporary abandonment of the Singapore naval dock has not done much to mitigate. Secondly the general attitude of the Government towards the recent strikes—notably the Southampton shipyard strike—is being agitated by the "Workers' Weekly." Its one big chance of appeasing its supporters is provided by Mr. Wheatley's housing programme. But again here, as we pointed out last week, Mr. Snowden's attitude is likely to prove an obstacle. The Communist "Workers' Weekly" has this among other comments about the Budget: ". . . there are things urgently needed for the workers which Snowden is not budgeting for. A big start in housing needs far more cash than Snowden is allowing. The General Council of the T.U.C. has demanded conditions for the unemployed that Snowden says he has not the money for. Widows' pensions, he says, will have to wait." It recalls a speech of Mr. Wheatley's of last December wherein he said "I could understand a Labour Government being formed to promote a bold Socialist policy . . . Such a policy would include national control of the banking system as part of the first Budget" and comments "Dare you stand by your words, Wheatley? If not, the Labour Movement will go past government could turn credits away from the luxury trades into the building of houses, and the reconstruction in power. MacDonald says that he is in office banks or not?" We do not want to dwell on the de-

fects in this programme; we quote it as an illustration of how every failure of Labour to make good its promises is being loud-spoken throughout the chief industrial constituencies every week by the indefatigable broadcasters of the Communist movement. The cumulative effect of it is bound to be disastrous. There is just one consolation for Labour M.P.'s—if it is any consolation—and that is that if they are turned out their successors will have no better, and probably a worse, time than they did. It is not simply a question of the Labour Movement "going past" this or that Labour Minister, it is one of the economic movement going away from the control of politicians altogether—even beyond the reach of the financiers themselves. It is true that the voice of the people is the voice of a parrot, as Dean Inge remarks, but at any rate the wrath of the people is the wrath of God.

"New Standards," in its May issue, reviews the situation and finds no hope in the Labour movement. It has been "living on its own hump." Once the Fabians had something new to say, but "said it all long ago." The I.L.P. "contributes nothing for the solution of our present problems." "There was a time when Guild Socialists had something to say. They had barely half said it when the rival doctors of Douglasism, Communism and other cults prescribed doses of oil and water, which would not mix. The oil flared up and the water extinguished it. We, who are Guild Socialists, admit the eclipse of our movement, though we are fain to think it will live again." A little later, the remark occurs: "We can say these hard things of other sections of the movement because we say as hard things of ourselves." Then the writer goes on to say that there is "no body of men *thinking together* (his italics) about the great problems of the day, though there are many little coteries and many individuals thinking apart . . . Unless we can recreate the power of constructive thinking on a basis wide enough to touch our movement at every point, the movement will die of starvation . . ." Our own comment on this is that any basis of constructive thinking which does not include the process of consumption as well as that of production in its synthesis will ultimately prove untenable. Every one of the sections of the Labour movement enumerated by the writer proceeded on the assumption that the problems to be solved arose entirely out of defects in the productive organisation. Then appeared Major Douglas who declared that the real trouble was not anywhere along the entire chain of production from the mine to the shop counter; it was simply that the counter was, as it were, built too high for the shoppers' short arms. This, of itself, would not, of course, have disproved the earlier contentions, for if the lack of purchasing power among the consumers was due to the uneven allocation of money as between profits and wages (using both terms in the widest sense) then clearly the remedy would have been one for settlement somehow by the employers and employees. But this supposition, too, was attacked by Major Douglas. He said that even if all distributed profits were diverted to wages the essential disparity would remain between the price-values of products and the money-income of the community. This statement, if true, obviously directed the economic search parties somewhere else than to the capitalists' board-rooms. For, thoroughly apprehended, it implied an actual disappearance of money, as money, between the time when it was paid out and recorded as a cost in factory ledgers and the time when factory output came to be offered for sale. Accepting this implication, the next question was, who is destroying money? And the answer was, and is, the banking system. Now, whether you call your income "rent," "interest," "profit," "salary," "wages" or "pay" makes no difference to its buying power. What you can get

for it practically depends upon whether the financial system is creating new credit faster than it is destroying existing credit (i.e., is inflating), or vice versa (is deflating). And what you get for it matters everything: how much there is of it is merely of statistical interest, provided it brings you what you need.

As we see the situation it is as though a composer, a conductor and an orchestra had been quarrelling for a long time because they could not get more than a quarter of the concert hall occupied by an audience. The composer was called an ass, the conductor an individualist, the orchestra damned collectivists. Then one day someone approaches the gesticulating throng of artists and says "Look here; I just found nigh everybody in the town's hard of hearing. They'll have to have ear trumpets; so you'd better shut up till they got 'em." So if Douglasism and surgical instruments are temporarily shouldering aside Guild Socialism and Pastoral Symphonies, there is no need to postulate an antithesis between them. What's first to do, do first. That is all. All buyers would willingly answer the call of Price but that their cheques are hard of clearing.

The "Star" which had announced the publication of Major Douglas's article on the Reparations Report for April 17th deferred it until the 22nd. It was headed by an editorial paragraph to the effect that the article expressed the writer's personal opinions, and stated that "Major Douglas is the inventor of the famous Douglas Credit Theorem." Pointing out that "General Daves is the representative of Finance in the U.S.A. which has established a prior lien on the assets of every European country through the agency of the British debt," Maj. Douglas reviews the Reports of the Committees and concludes by asserting that they involve a policy, which, if allowed to function, means the "setting up of a super-State with powers far transcending those of any Parliament, and whose authority would be wielded by individuals whose names might be almost unknown and who would be as little amenable to public control as, for instance, the governing director of the Bank of England." He particularly emphasises the point that it is proposed to give internal control of credit to a private bank free from Government control; this bank to have the sole right to issue paper currency of any sort, which paper currency is to be on a "gold basis." This eventually means that whatever latitude in self-government the German people are allowed will be limited by the extent to which the new bank will finance their projects. "It is not without interest," he observes, "that a similar bank . . . which has been founded (under League of Nations auspices) in Vienna, charges interest on its loans at 104 per cent. per annum." In the last paragraph of his article Major Douglas raises the important question whether good and satisfactory relations between the peoples of America and Europe (especially the British) "can be consummated by establishing a world dictatorship in finance, centralised in Wall Street and Washington, with branches in Lombard Street and elsewhere" a "despotism" which, too, is arousing an "ever-growing resentment among the Americans themselves," and which is already "the prime issue in American politics." All this is opportunely said. For all practical purposes the situation is as though Europe had lost a military war with America, involving the payment of an indemnity, with the added complication that the proportions in which it was to be paid by the various European countries was left for them to decide by a sort of civil war. In terms of future world trade it means that somehow or other Europe has to compete with America to such a degree of success as to create a balance of dollar indebtedness on the part of America to the outside world. The debt to America has to be

paid in dollars, and there is no way of getting dollars to pay with except by either buying them with gold (an impossibility) or putting America in a position of owing dollars as a result of dumping more goods on to her markets than she exports from them. Does anyone suppose that American industrialists are going to sit down and be robbed of export trade just for the sake of watching Europe settle accounts with the Federal Reserve Board? And let it be especially noted that this deadlock from the financial point of view is not removed by even the most complete and cordial resettlement of Europe. The only hope of escape from the difficulty would be a European military alliance powerful enough to support the repudiation of the debt to America unless she agreed to accept payment in the form of goods and services instead of dollars. That is how Europe borrowed: it is how Europe must eventually repay.

Taxation.

By C. H. Douglas.

II.

THE central idea in regard to taxation which, it seems to me, it is necessary to grasp, is that taxation can only have one of two effects. It either (a) does, or (b) it does not, reduce the actual consumption of goods and services, by the persons taxed. Let us consider these alternatives separately.

(a) The case of reduced consumption: It is fair to say that until the advent of the New Economics, Political Economy was founded upon a scarcity theory; and in fact, official political economy is absolutely dominated by such a theory at the present time. The world is a hard, hard place; only with great difficulty can we maintain ourselves in it; in spite of the well-meant efforts of the Rev. Mr. Malthus, the rise of population tends to outrun the means of subsistence. In short, we must consume less, and produce more. That is the Law and the profits.

Now, it may be flogging a dead horse to expose the absurdity of this theory, and its absurdity is certainly familiar enough to New Economists. But it is worth while repeating, firstly, the fairly simple statement that reduced consumption means just as inevitably, reduced production, as does the converse; and secondly, that the distress arising from under-consumption, follows upon periods of over-production, so-called, and not upon periods of under-production. Or to put it another way, unemployment, which is synonymous with under-consumption at the present time, is a symptom of lack of incentive to produce, rather than lack of ability to produce.

This being so, it seems fairly obvious that reduced consumption, as a national policy, requires a good deal more reasoned justification than it has so far been able to adduce.

(b) The case of unreduced consumption: It might seem at first sight, that if taxation was ineffective in reducing consumption, on the part of those taxed, or alternatively, it became clear that reduced consumption was neither necessary nor desirable, then the whole case for taxation of any description would have vanished. The truth or otherwise of this contention, however, depends on the decision in regard to the proper source of orders in respect of future production.

This probably requires a little elaboration. As at present operated, the money system provides not only a method of purchasing, or transferring from the producer to the consumer, goods, which have been produced; but it also provides a method of deciding what goods shall be produced in the future both in respect of variety, quality, and quantity. It is quite possible to imagine a state of affairs in which prices might be "made" at such a level that individual incomes would buy all that was produced; and that production

was extensive enough to make it practically impossible to consume more than could be bought. But if the money required for future production did not proceed from individuals (and the state of affairs just outlined would involve a situation which would ensure that sufficient money would not be recovered in prices, to provide the costs of future production), then the position would be that the money, and the policy, of future production, would proceed from sources other than that represented by the consuming public. That, of course, is very much what happens to-day, quite apart from the restriction of consumption involved in defective purchasing-power.

It is possible to draw a conclusion of some interest from the foregoing considerations. Taxation which reduces consumption below the limits imposed by the physical capacity of production, is Economic Government, with a "moral" objective. We are familiar with this in the case of taxes on such articles as alcohol, etc. (and it is astonishing that we put up with it), but there is, in fact, no fundamental difference between such taxation and any other taxation which has the effect of reducing consumption.

Such taxation and the policy from which it proceeds, is, however, negative. But if we grasp clearly the fact that all programmes of production depend on the provision of money credits, it becomes obvious that any system, either of taxation or finance, or both together, which prevents the individual, as such, from exercising his share in the provision of such credits, and, therefore, silencing his views in regard to the desirability of such programme, is a positive inhibition.

The effects of this may be seen daily. Politician after politician grapples with the scarcity of houses, only to fall back defeated before the financial difficulties. But no politician finds it necessary to grapple with the difficulties of building palatial bank buildings on all the finest corner sites of the Empire. No difficulty is experienced in providing Members of Parliament with free first-class railway vouchers to enable them to travel to the seaside for the week-end, at a cost of probably a hundred thousand pounds or more per annum. But a London hospital, treating thousands of patients yearly, and alleviating much misery, which otherwise would find no remedy, is threatened by extinction for lack of one-third of that sum.

At the bottom of this difficulty undoubtedly lies the idea that although A, who controls large financial resources, is a thoroughly good judge of what is good for B, nothing could be more dangerous than to put B in the same position as A. It cannot have escaped notice that an almost disproportionate amount of anxiety is expressed by industrial and political leaders, that any methods which may be evolved for the alleviation of the distress, arising from unemployment or otherwise, shall be such as will not "undermine the independence and industrial morality" of the worker. Translated into plain English, this means that he must get nothing for nothing, and not much for sixpence, and that anything he does get, must be taken from someone else.

This brings us back, as in fact most fundamental economic examinations bring us back, to the eternal contest between freedom and authority. Without a doubt, this contest is not resolved by a wholesale condemnation of either of them. It is just as reasonable to ban the use of electric light because somebody has been struck by lightning, as it is to condemn anything without reference to the conditions under which it is used. After giving full weight to such considerations, however, it is difficult to deny that there is a great deal the matter with the programme of production, as well as with the distribution of it after it has been produced, and that the onus of proof in regard to the desirability of non-democratic control of credit for production, which is the present situation, rests with those persons and institutions at present in power.

The Flaw in the Price System.*

It was remarked of Major Douglas by a Canadian economist that a man who could compress his remarks within the compass of two hundred pages or less could not have anything of importance to say! On this reasoning Mr. Martin's book should be dismissed as impertinent trifling, for its runs only to a hundred pages. However, it just happens that he has something definite to say, says it clearly, and stops. There is a flaw in the price system, he asserts, the effect of which is "that under normal conditions of progress industry cannot sell all it produces at prices making production worth while." After explaining how the flaw "causes restriction of production, unemployment and war," describing "some previous attempts to locate the flaw" and showing where they fail, he enters upon the task of showing this flaw at work in a "simplified community." The community is imagined to be the Children of Israel in the Wilderness, who "decide to organise the picking up and distribution of manna on the price system. They form a company and collect from the Israelites a thousand shekels of silver—their total money wealth. Some of them are hired to pick up the manna and the rest to pack and retail it. The demonstration of what subsequently happens is carried out by a succession of fifteen simple arithmetical equations, each of which shows the analysis of the company's Cost on the one side and that of the Israelites' Purchasing Power on the other. At first, no flaw is apparent. Every day so many shekels' worth of manna is ready for sale, and an equal number of shekels is distributed in wages and dividends, "so that the necessary equilibrium between supply and effective demand is always maintained." But as soon as a certain element is introduced into the illustration there is shown to commence the accumulation of an unsaleable surplus. That element is the withholding of earned profit from the shareholders (to induce further production) instead of its distribution in full to them. Throughout the whole progression of equations, no variation in the total quantity of money in circulation are imagined: the flaw appears irrespective of either inflation or deflation of the currency; that is to say, Mr. Martin's permutations and combinations are based on a permanently fixed amount of 1,000 shekels of silver. He sums up his conclusions thus: "So long as the circulating medium of exchange is put to its two uses of (1) inducing production (i.e., paying wages and dividends) and (2) buying the production thus induced, alternately, industry can sell all it makes. But it must be alternately. When part of the community's purchasing power is used not to buy goods but to add to working capital, this necessary alternation is not being observed: purchasing power is being twice used for the same purpose. The circulating medium has short-circuited as it were. Money which should have been used to purchase goods is being used, for the second time in succession, to induce further production. As an inevitable consequence more production will be induced than there is purchasing power available with which to buy it." This any of the methods now familiar to present-day industry, such as the cutting down of wages and is worked out to be 300 shekels' worth, and, further, the existence of 300 shekels of working capital is shown to be redundant. He then points out that in some way or other this capital must be returned to the community or else the corresponding surplus cannot be disposed of. Alternatively, part of the surplus

* "The Flaw in the Price System." By P. W. Martin (P. S. King. 4s. 6d. net.)

might be "sold below cost, the idle working capital being used to make up the loss."

The author now comes to the complex processes of modern industry, and, speaking of the phenomenon of "the business cycle" which has engaged the attention of so many economists (and he reviews their various conclusions in a passage which is a model of précis writing) he invites the reader to conclude that, since the same causes are now at work as were described in his illustration, and the same phenomena are manifested, the flaw in the one case is the same as in the other. Further, he contends that this flaw is the chief cause. "The cycle set up by the flaw," he says, "is inevitable wherever industry is growing. It requires nothing to get out of order, no miscalculation to be made, no unjust demands by certain sections of the community, no unequal distribution of wealth or of the national dividend, no abrupt or sudden changes, nothing but the progress which is the object of every industrial nation. In this way it would seem to be the most fundamental of all causes." "The business cycle," he concludes, "is the outcome of a continual effort on the part of industry to produce to full capacity, invariably checked by the inevitable lack of effective demand long before this object has been attained."

Mr. Martin then proceeds to a consideration of "how the operation of the flaw is modified by variations of the quantity of money in circulation." In course of it he takes note of the time-lag in production, and of the inflationary effects of new credit, and concludes by saying: "Additions to the quantity of money in circulation, therefore, do not counteract the operation of the flaw in the price system, but they give it a peculiar twist. By reinforcing the community's effective demand they prevent these consequences [unsaleable surpluses] from becoming apparent . . . but by increasing the volume of unsaleable goods in progress through the intermediate stage of industry they cause the crisis [the business slump] when it does come, to be so much the more severe." He devotes a chapter to showing the "material waste, physical deterioration and moral degradation due to the flaw," quoting chiefly from the U.S.A. National Bureau of Economic Research, and referring once by name to Major Douglas's "Credit Power and Democracy." All his references are well worth their place in this section. For instance, Professor David Friday (in "Profits, Wages and Prices") is quoted thus: "If we can discover the secret of war's effect [i.e., production to full plant-capacity] on industry we may indulge the hope of institutionalising it and adding permanently to our annual national output." And this passage from H. L. Gantt, the well-known American industrial engineer: "Only about fifty per cent of our [U.S.A.] industrial machines are actually operating during the time they are expected to operate; and on the whole the machines during the time they are being operated are producing only about fifty per cent. of what they are expected to produce. This brings out production results down to about one-fourth of what they might be if our machines were run all the time at their highest capacity." [Quoted from "Current Social and Industrial Forces," Lionel T. Edie, page 32.]

The author then concludes with "a tentative suggestion as to how the flaw might be mended." This suggestion turns out to be very much on the lines of the "stabilisers," with whose ideas readers of THE NEW AGE are familiar. If the price level shows a tendency to decline money must be issued faster; if to advance, the rate of issue must be slowed down. In the author's own words, "It is now proposed to regulate the issue of bank credit and hence the quantity of money in use by one criterion only, the price level." Quite apart from the intrinsic merits or demerits of this procedure we are at a loss to understand how it logically arises in the author's mind from his analysis.

He claims to have demonstrated that the flaw itself is in the price system, and that the effect of variations in the quantity of circulating money is only to "modify" the "operation of the flaw." How, then, can the flaw be "mended" by a process which does no more than control the variations in circulating money? On Mr. Martin's own showing it cannot conceivably do more than modify the operation of the flaw—which is a very different result from that of removing it. Go back to that unsaleable surplus of 300 shekels' worth of manna which he showed to exist. He remarked that it might be rendered saleable by marking the price down below cost. Supposing the Manna Corporation began to lower its price; then there would appear "business conditions pointing to a depression," and, under the author's scheme, "it would be necessary to increase the rate of issue of the quantity of money." Supposing then that 300 shekels (for instance) of new silver were struck out of a rock by Moses and issued to the Israelites. If he gave them the money all well and good; we can see that surplus disappear. But if he lent the money it would be a new cost and would inevitably go to swell the price of future production of manna. Since Mr. Martin relies very definitely on his illustration to prove the flaw, it is a pity that he did not extend his series of equations to show how his remedy would remove it. If the world of to-day could start off by consuming goods up to its full productive capacity there would possibly be some plausibility about a scheme which purported to "stabilise" that situation, whatever the precise means of doing so happened to be. But the world has got to get there first. Taking Mr. Gantt's assertion (quoted above) as typical, the problem is how to bring the actual production of existing plant up from 25 per cent. to 100 per cent. of its potential capacity of output. How do you even begin to do this if you restrict your action simply to that of waving the existing price level back to its place? Even the Federation of British Industries can see that. "Stabilisation! Yes," they say in effect, "but not until prices have first been brought up to a remunerative level." Then the consumers—"Stabilisation! Yes: but not until prices have first been brought down within reach of our incomes." After all, does not the present banking system itself apply the "stabilisation" principle? A rising price-level entails a rising wage-level; higher wages mean a higher demand for currency; a higher demand for currency restricts the power of the banks to maintain their superstructure of loaned credit, which rests upon currency. Hence a rising price level leads to a lessening in the rate of issue of credit. And so conversely. The only difference is that the tether rope is longer; there is a wider scope of fluctuation permitted than the "stabilisers" want to allow. But fluctuations in themselves, however inconvenient, are not the evil to be remedied. If your head is under water, it doesn't matter a bit whether the surface is smooth or rough. To the hungry ass it is the same thing whether the carrot hangs still or dangles about. For the community to get their heads above water, or their noses against the carrot, the ratio of Price to private Income has got to come down. No mere regulating of the issue of credit is alone going to do this. The question is not one of how fast or how slow may be the speed at which you feed industry with money, it is one of how you use the power which the control of the speed gives you—in short, what bargain you can strike with the price-fixers. And once you can offer the latter a fund of revenue which has not been through their price-system, the striking of a bargain with them will be no more difficult than the ten thousand transactions which occur in industry every moment of every day. Sooner or later the principle of giving the public, as opposed to lending them, the means to buy the "surplus" arising from their own past labour will have to be embodied in a practical plan. Until then the surplus will remain "stabilised."

Women's Interests.

By Woman Worker.

LEGAL CHILD ADOPTION—II.

Now we are thankful to see that the Government has ordered a New Committee of Inquiry, and we hope will widen its *personnel* and endeavour to get the feeling and sentiments of those most intimately concerned, namely the mothers of the children, and those children themselves who in orphanages, etc., have grown into manhood and womanhood without their mothers' love and care. A Mr. Archibald Allen in a recent issue of the "Times" seems vexed that this question has not been settled, and the "matter," sweeping away the sacred rights of helpless mothers and children, put through and fixed once and for all. According to this gentleman a Committee under the chairmanship of Sir Alfred Hopkinson went into it all, examined a number of the official and organised societies, and came to the conclusion that legal adoption should be made part of the law of the land.

Now those of us who followed and impartially investigated the conduct and activities of numberless "Organised Societies" when it was a question of hounding out of public life an Englishwoman, who for stainless disinterestedness and courage has not been surpassed by Florence Nightingale—we mean, of course, Violet Douglas Pennant—can have little faith in the fairness and integrity of many "Societies," and we would not give a sixpence for their testimony. Moreover, we are unable to understand upon what ground some of the members of the Committee were selected at all. Why, for instance, should Lady Norman have been put upon it? We are not aware that she has ever shown the slightest interest in the welfare of children. Most of us who have quietly tried to do something to ease the burden of the woman-struggle-for-life, were greatly astonished that she should have been asked to organise the woman's side of the War Museum—in our opinion one of the most barbaric growths of the War, which ought to be instantly destroyed. But even if the members of the Committee were carefully chosen we should still beg, nay implore, every woman reader of THE NEW AGE to insist that this iniquitous legislation shall never disgrace our Statute Book. And we speak from the deep experience of having made the experiment. Had we known what we now know, had we ever for one moment realised the effect of this eternal severance of mother and child, we would never have taken any part in it.

Why should there be this dread that the child will be brought up in a little home so long as we can ensure that the services of the mother are consecrated to keeping it clean and attractive and that the earnings of the father are regular and sufficient? Why should any human being consider it an advantage that a child born in humble conditions should be transferred to luxurious surroundings and have a host of superfluous wants created and filled by those upon whom it has no claim.

But there are other tendencies and elements and phenomena that enter into the adoption of a child that we have never even seen so much as hinted at, and it is these that create the most cruel problems of the future. Examine the situation as it occurs in an overwhelming number of cases. Let us presume the fragile, depressed mother has got a job. Rarely is the money sufficient for the maintenance of the child and herself. Then there is the difficulty of the home for the infant. Little as many people believe, the "Baby Farm" exists and flourishes to-day. Where is the mother to find anything approaching an ideal foster-mother and kindly home for the small amount she can pay? She may have the luck to get the little creature taken at a Home in which kindness is the keynote. Here her few shillings weekly are taken; she is encouraged to take the greatest interest in her baby, to come and see it

as often as possible, to take it out, buy it and make it clothes; and the bond of tenderness and affection is preserved. But the lady who does this loving work can only take a handful of babies. Then there are the Orphanages for the legitimate little orphan, and there, even under the kindest of management, the child is in an "institution"; there is the horrible "Foster-home," otherwise Baby Farm; there are some L.C.C. inspected Homes better managed, of course. We do not know if the Foundling Hospital, which twenty years ago we denounced, still makes it as a condition of admission that the mother entirely surrenders her child, who is thus not only fatherless but is at once in addition deprived of its mother. That is precisely what the Bill for Legal Adoption would do. We believe there exists not a woman whose heart has known mother hunger who will not agree that this bill ought never to be allowed to pass.

Abracadabra Plus X.

PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND ÆSTHETICS.

The translators (Eden and Cedar Paul) of Professor Charles Baudouin's "Psycho-analysis and Æsthetics" (Messrs. Allen and Unwin, 16s. net) quote with approval the following paragraph from a review of F. C. Prescott's "The Poetic Mind," which appeared, appropriately, in the green pages of the "Saturday Westminster Gazette": "To be complete, such a book should be written, as it were, by spiritual Siamese twins, one a poet and the other a psychologist, in vital union and complete sympathy of soul. Where Professor Prescott fails, he does so because of an almost inevitable limitation in such imaginative sympathy: because he doesn't really know what it feels like to be a poet! . . . He throws a new and interesting light on many phases and peculiarities of poetic creation; yet its concrete reality escapes him still." (It could not be otherwise in such a light! A more unearthly effluence of radical incomprehension was never shed athwart any field of literature. The most juxta-positions as to be quite unrecognisable; astounding instances of the power of environment. The tome, in fact, is one gigantic malapropism.)

"Now," continue our translators, with a seriousness the full flavour of which can only be enjoyed by those whose ribald appreciation even Prescott has left unsated, "Charles Baudouin has not merely 'in some degree' but in a high degree that poetry of soul which confers on us the power of sympathetic communion with the spirit of the poet." (Surely this is Mid-Victorianism in the most advanced stage of decomposition!) "There is no need, as far as he is concerned, to search for 'spiritual Siamese twins' since he is himself, in one and the same person, both poet and psychologist. As the latter, the author of 'Suggestion and Auto-suggestion,' 'Studies in Psycho-analysis,' and 'The Power Within Us,' is sufficiently well known to English and American readers. But his reputation as a poet can hardly be supposed to have crossed the Channel and the Atlantic, for neither 'Ecce Homo' nor 'L'arche flottante,' nor any other of his poems and logical dramas, has yet appeared in English translation."

When they do it is to be hoped that the self-same translators, or some other "introducer" of similar quality, will be available to emphasise in like fashion the advantage that such a psychologist has, when it comes to actual poetical creation, over those who have not really fathomed this poet business in the way that he has done. (It may otherwise pass unobserved.) We assume that since only a fellow-poet can profitably address himself to the elucidation of the creative processes of such a poet as Verhaeren (for that, despite the title, is what is attempted in this volume) the nearer the poet's stature to Verhaeren the better! Our

logicians surely do not imply that doggerel-mongers and world-poets can be lumped together as of one kind?—Milton and Ella Wheeler Wilcox! They cannot ask us to believe that any little versifier has, *ipso facto*, some sort of rapport with any great poet, from which all non-poets (however able otherwise) are perforce excluded? And yet, "because he does not know what it feels like to be a poet" is a phrase which suggests that there is some sort of relation between what it feels like to be, for example, a Baudelaire and a Burns, a Verhaeren and a . . . (we give it up—where are we?) a Baudouin?

Professor Baudouin's qualifications for the rôle of literary critic may be amply gauged from his claim that "whereas we had been inclined to regard the imagination as blooming capriciously on the very surface of the mind, and as having no more significance than wreaths of cigarette smoke, we now perceive that it springs from the very depths of our being." We must confess that the works of Homer, Shakespeare, Dante, Milton, Shelley, and all the others always struck us, in common with everybody else, as the merest child's play, unrelated to the great realities of life; and no doubt these gentlemen themselves never imagined that they were doing more than amusing themselves when they indited their various works. Professor Baudouin's momentous discovery places the whole matter in a new light, immeasurably enhancing the dignity and value of our mental processes. Thought is of importance, after all, it appears, and literature is no mere aggregation of idle fancies but is actually replete with real human significances.

"How has this knowledge been secured?" proceeds the Professor, with admirable directness. "As long as we tried to explain the imagination in terms of the imagination alone, we could get no further. At length, however, we have become aware that the imagination is wholly guided by the affective life: by the sentiments, the motions, that accompany the images. These are the poles round which the images crystallise. Thus the images disclose the affective kernel around which they have been aggregated; and the affective kernel, in its turn, accounts for the formation of the images. We instantly perceive that this reciprocal illumination of inner sensibility by the imagination, on the one hand, and of the laws of the imagination by sensibility on the other, must be peculiarly typical in the poet, who is at one and the same time a great affective and a great imaginative. The new psychology would almost seem to have been specially designed to explain the poet. . . ." But we have quoted quite enough to indicate the intellectual plane along which Professor Baudouin's analysis advances.

The obliging translators instantly give us the essence of what happens when one "instantly perceives" this polysyllabic inter-relation of poetic cause and effect. "The author," we learn, "expounds the principles that guide him throughout the subsequent analysis of Verhaeren's life and works, illustrating the way in which the newer psychological outlooks are gradually modifying the canons of 'literary' criticism. This modification has hitherto been in large measure unconscious, but in "Psycho-analysis and Æsthetics" at one stride it becomes aware of itself. Take, for instance, the passage at the close of Chapter One, which shows how phrases which critics of the old school would have pilloried as examples of literary inelegance, acquire a profound poetical significance from their bearing on Verhaeren's most intimate personal experiences. The literary 'inelegancies' are psychologically vital."

We hasten to examine this passage. The author quotes from Verhaeren's poem, *Mon Village*, in which speaking of the clock-tower (the stupendous importance

of the clock-tower symbol in Verhaeren's poetry has already been demonstrated), he writes:—

Il lui fallut trois ans pour ressurgir au jour!
Trois ans pour se dresser vainqueur de sa ruine!
Trois ans que je gardai, dans ma poitrine,
La blessure portée à mon naïf amour.

"From a literary point of view," says Baudouin, "this repetition of 'three years' might be considered inelegant. But if it be the outcome of a spontaneous need for expression, we shall do well to search for the subconscious cause of the poet's insistence. However intense a fondness the child may have felt for the village tower, his love cannot justify the importance given to the fact that three years were needed for its rebuilding. It seems unlike Verhaeren to conclude a beautiful poem by stressing a minor detail. We have, therefore, to ask whether the term of 'three years' has a personal significance. In fact, the only way in which it can possess such a significance is by way of condensation, so that the rebuilding of the clock-tower is not the only matter at stake. If we recall that the destruction of the clock-tower by fire has been condensed with the moral crisis in the poet's own life, that this crisis apparently lasted three years (1887-1890), and that it secured literary expression in the three stages of *les soirs*, *les débâcles*, and *les flambeaux noirs*, we shall understand why the term three years is so important—the three years that were requisite for Verhaeren himself to 'rise again.' Moreover, we can hardly avoid thinking of how Christ rose again on the third day, and how three days were needed to 're-build this temple.' Such a train of thought is im-pressed on us all the more, seeing that Verhaeren, at the time of the crisis, imagines himself crowned with thorns and bleeding on the cross. It is verily the Christ who is dead in him, and who must be resurrected in the form of a new faith."

It will not escape the intelligent reader, either, that this happens to be my third article in this series.

Professor Baudouin is a worthy successor of all the professors who have ever professed to write on literary subjects. His book has the two essential merits of having nothing whatever to do with literature and as little resemblance to literature as the necessity to use a common syntax and (to a large extent) the same vocabulary permits. This book will no doubt be but the first of an interminable series in which every writer of consequence the world has ever known will be re-examined along similar lines. By that time, possibly, it will be appreciated that psychological and pathological criticism must go hand in hand. It is difficult to understand why Professor Baudouin hesitates to anticipate that conclusion. They are obviously complementary and indispensable to each other. Literature is largely a resultant of the state of the stomach. The psyche is indeed to a great extent merely the effect of which the physical condition of its possessor is the cause. Before one can properly appreciate a work of genius one will ultimately have to know exactly what the physical condition of the author at the moment of composition was—whether he sat with his legs crossed (thus compressing his abdomen in a fashion inevitably responsible for otherwise unaccountable intricacies of style) or uncrossed (thus securing that invigorating effect of amplitude. . . .)

But science has not advanced far enough yet. We only see through a library of text-books darkly. It is satisfactory at any rate to have it established at last by a poet of Professor Baudouin's standing that the familiar and all-too-often misprized scribbles on the walls of public urinals, for example, may well, as the outcome of a spontaneous need for expression, be psychologically far more vital despite their literary inelegance, and so have a much more profound significance

than the anæmic productions which have hitherto been esteemed, it would appear almost in proportion to the extent in which the lively consequence of these super-descriptions has been sacrificed to merely "literary" considerations. All that we could have wished, indeed, is that the Professor should have had the courage of his convictions and devoted his analysis to such rather than to Verhaeren (although, to be sure, he has selected the most suitable passages from the latter, and his book may justify itself by his own criterion, if by no other, to those who deem the writer's psychology of interest).

Baud is a significant first syllable: it is a compound combining in equal measure the essential qualities of bad and bawdy. . . . One of these days, if people will persist, confusing life and literature, in telling me that "psychological content" is the main consideration, I will write an epoch-making book on the effects that "word-forming" discovery has had on my suffering but undaunted psyche.

C. M. GRIEVE.

The Theatre.

By H. R. BARBOR.

THE FINANCE AND THE ART.—I.

PATENZA, good reader, if for a week we turn from consideration of individual plays and players to contemplate certain aspects of the theatre as a whole. The gulf between theatrical economics and theatrical art is not, as many good easy critics would have us believe, so real as apparent. Unfortunately, however, many players as well as those more or less completely metamorphosed players, the actor-managers, have sacrificed much useful time and talent because, like the rest of the world of men, they were reluctant when not unschooled to envisage the financial and economic factors which condition their livelihood.

This neglect of the study of economics is perfectly understandable. Art is long and the art of acting is—contrary to general belief—no shorter than any other art. Economics, too, is long. And there is always one's golf handicap to reduce, of course. So while the actor is developing from a dancing partner into a Hamlet, or evolving from the R.A.D.A. to the up-stage centre position at His Majesty's, there is little time and less inclination probably for a nice discrimination of the more abstract commercial issues. These economic elements, too, seem so sordid by comparison with the ebullitions of histrionic fervour which are the actor's main stock-in-trade. So the actor seldom thinks further than Friday's "treasury" when a welcome ghost "walks" the passages behind the proscenium arch. And while the artists talk with glib laziness of the impossibility of reconciling art and commerce, the non-artistic syndicates steadily dig themselves into a prosperous industrial province, turn the artist more and more into an irresponsible bond-slave and debase the currency of the stage.

The art of the theatre differs from that of the painter and writer in that it demands the immediate co-operation of a number of people. The sculptor can work so long as he has clay and a model (granted also that he has clothes, shelter, food and the festive etceteras). The writer can manage at a pinch with ink and paper (and those same etceteras) to express himself. At worst the most straitened community may be enriched by a spare-time æsthetic output. Some of the finest lyric poetry has been coined from the penurious leisure of Society's (usually temporary) outcasts. Orchestral music and the theatre need a different social organisation. The Stage can only exist by consent, support and co-operation of diverse social elements. Dramas may be written in the void as it were (though without a developed stage the urge to create in this form is unlikely, and the technical tests necessary to effective dramatic creation are impossible). But the presentation

of drama requires actors, producer, staff, suitable buildings, more or less elaborate technical equipment. All these demand in turn capitalisation; the capitalisation that presupposes the explicit good will and good shillings of an audience for the finished product. The actor cannot exist or practise in *nubibus*, for his theatric art is a communal endeavour.

From the days of the strolling player to the present more or less syndicated theatre, the history of the English stage has been that of the steady usurpation of artist by non-artist. The star performer, the man or woman with "drawing power" exploited his commercial value at the expense of his fellow-workers, and out of that exploitation arose the "star system" and actor-managerial control of the theatre. Ensemble and the good-fellowship of the green room gave place to up-staginess, *carrierisme*. The dramatist ceased to write plays and began to write parts for So-and-So. But actor-managers (many of them at any rate) working on the facile heresy that art and economics did not go hand in hand, thought most of their own kudos and last and least of the business side of their profession. They played into the skilled hands of the financiers, who saw what a good thing theatrical investment proved when artists knew their jobs. Finance offered the helping hand and Art greased it with golden unguent.

But the palm, well-oiled though it was, still itched as only the palm of Finance can itch. Having grasped opportunity in the form of its interpretative artist-asset, Finance decided not merely to assist but to control. The result is disastrously apparent in Shaftesbury Avenue to-day. During the war, when Germany was stirring the national consciousness with the supreme works of the great world-masters through the theatres of every big and small provincial town, the London theatre was as barren of drama as a sucked orange is of juice. Finance had the theatre just where it wanted it: the drama was nowhere.

Fortunately, however, Finance cannot run the theatre on the good old bucket-shop lines indefinitely. The Theatre is a living entity; take away its life-breath, the creative impulse of artistry, and you have only bricks and mortar. Exploit drama on a strictly commercial mail-order campaign and the game is up, the public thumbs are down. This has been proved in London during the last few years. The theatre-going crowds, having been lured theatrewards for years to see more or less sound plays, better acted than most deserved, continued its patronage of the playhouses. As, however, the goods offered steadily deteriorated; as the bespoke-tailored play replaced the individual creation; as one standardised lifeless comedy succeeded another, and as one dreary alleged musical show followed its inept predecessor, the public smelt a rat. Several rats. The more the smellier. And the public stayed at home or went up-river, or played tennis, or billiards, or bowls, or went to the movies, or sat by the fire and moped. Anyhow it stayed away from the syndicated theatre like a good, sensible public. And the syndicates held board-meetings and decided nothing. Some, praise Thespis, filed their petitions. But being only commercial gents who knew all about business, though little about other people's business (dramatic authors', producers' and actors', for example), it never struck them to file a petition to people like Harley Granville Barker, or Basil Dean, or Matheson Lang, or Nigel Playfair, or Miss Horniman, or any of the other practical folk of the theatre who apparently realise that the art of the theatre is too long for short-sighted, get-rich-quick, commercial gentry.

For the whole truth of the matter is that, flukes apart, initiative, originality, hard work, unremitting application and responsible zeal for the work in hand pave the hard highway to theatrical success. And short cuts lead only to the quagmire.

The financiers did not realise this. Probably, if they did realise it, they would have little further interest in

the theatre. The practical people of the stage know that the theatre is not a gambling den. It is a workshop. Like any other workshop, if properly organised, equipped and staffed, it can be made to pay an eventual dividend. If it is used, as it has been of late, as a bull and bear garden, it will not pay at all. A notorious soap-boiler, not so long ago, thought he could improve on the composition of a great painter by cutting the head from a portrait and doing away with the tale-bearing paunch. He earned the ridicule of a generation and the contempt of the *cognoscenti* of ten. But the theatrical stock boomster has made an even worse *gaffe*. He has sought to preserve the paunch (the box-office) while doing away with the head (the author and actor). That he has made a bad investment is no matter for pity. But that he has temporarily robbed us all of intelligent and amusing recreation is a matter for us to help the practising craftsmen of the theatre to put right as quickly as possible.

Indications of how this is to be accomplished will be suggested in later articles.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

The Labour Government.

SIR,—The Cabinet of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, "the War Commissary of the Russian Government," has absolutely no principles; while, about the same time, the friendly "Manchester Guardian," corroborating this, describes it as "a capitalist Government."

The writer of "Notes of the Week" in your last issue, seems rather disappointed that the N.A.C. (Executive) of the I.L.P. have issued to their members an adverse report on the Douglas Credit Scheme. Give them time. The official organ of this party or party of the Labour Party has for some time been speaking of "our Guild idea." To expect the Executive of this Party, itself an institution of the old order, to endorse any positive policy or anything that matters is to forget experience, that they always do if possible shelve everything of the kind, and that that indeed is of the very essence of the old order. In my opinion, the Labour Party, the Executive, leaders, not followers, in reality are now pledged to the hilt to an imperialistic policy. They cannot have things both ways. They are one thing or the other. There are only two sides to the present world movement, and they deliberately have chosen the other. That is to say, casting their old professed principles aside altogether, they have plumped now, not for the old order,* for that since it has ceased to function and exist would be impossible, but for the existing (since 1914) imperialistic order of unreason and, *pari passu*, brute force. We have thus, in my opinion, an apparent pacifist party pledged in effect to unreason, pledged therefore to war.

Even in the current "Socialist Review" we read—"the Government can move no faster than the intelligence of the community"; which could only mean, if all experience and history were not a contradiction of this dictum, that the Government, guided now by massed ignorance, could only regress, move back, not forward, and that there is no way out.

In short, Labour is no longer an alternative Government. There is no alternative Government. Briffault's description of "power thought," expressed by modern leaders; "custom-thought" by the led; and "rational-thought" expressed in politics by none, is not only true of the Labour Party and the I.L.P., as of every other institution of the old, dead and damned, order, but is very much like my own description (THE NEW AGE, July 21st and 28th, 1921) of positive, negative, and passive men, thought, and force.

In my opinion, and I have said this to men who

* They say they have "inherited" this—and what else can a fellow do?

should matter since 1917, there is no way out till the spirit contained in the demand for "status and control" is materialised in new institutions; and the principle here is not as hitherto "duty to," but a very different thing, "responsibility for" authority, the State, the Government, the Party, and so on. Reform must start at home. And so it has. The people are ready. But these old institutions, expressing still the spirit of the old order, stand in the way—these old institutions and old leaders, with power-thought on the one side, custom-thought on the other, and rational-thought nowhere.

Yours faithfully,
A. G. CRAFTER.

Worcester, April 16th.

Music.

SIR,—It is quite unnecessary for Mr. Judges to tell us that he does not possess the "so important a desideratum" of a cultured ear. If he did he would understand my strictures upon the average contemporary singer, on whom, by the way, I have often noticed that distinguished authority and teacher, Mr. Herman Klein, is as, or even more, severe.

When a "singer" cuts up a phrase into three or four that should be sung in one breath, changes quality on every note so that he or she appears to possess a different voice for each degree of the scale, wobbles so that it is difficult, or impossible, to determine what note he or she is supposed to be singing, crows and wheezes in breathing like a leaking gas-pipe, yells and barks at high notes like a street hawker, and for a shake makes an indeterminate guggling noise quite innocent of accurate musical pitch, he or she is an execrable singer, and there's an end. If Mr. Judges cannot hear this sort of thing being done all over the place by all sorts of leading and reputed singers, no apology is necessary for asserting that his opinions in the matter are negligible.

The proof that the singers of the XVIIIth Century possessed a technique and control that, as I said in my first letter, is beyond the wildest dreams of 999 out of 1,000 singers of to-day, is to be found all over the music written for them—in the vocal writing of the two Broschi (of whom Carlo was the great Farinelli), Hasse, Porpora, Veracini, and in the operas of Händel, which teem with passages which, as Dr. Rockstro said some 30 years ago and which is even truer to-day, no singer living could execute.

Even those works of Bach and Händel, which may reasonably be regarded as being addressed rather to the singer of average capacity than to the great vocal virtuosi (as were those of the composers above mentioned) such as the oratorios, the cantatas and church music, contain passages after passage which is almost never sung as it is written even when so-called "leading" singers take part, for the simple and palpably obvious reason that they lack the necessary technique. This is no matter of opinion—it is a fact capable of being verified by anyone who knows the music, possesses an ear, and listens with intelligence.

After reading THE NEW AGE for at least nine years I have yet to discover that it is a tradition in that periodical to be butter-mouthed over exhibitions of ignorance or to suffer fools anyhow.

KAIKHOSRU SORABJI.

The Single-Tax Complex.

SIR,—Your correspondent, J.S., has very convincingly proved a fact which I have never disputed, viz., that there is such a thing as rent. But it is a far cry from this simple origin to the full-blooded Georgian theory of a land monopoly which can and does skim all the cream from economic activities. When that is convincingly established in fact and theory we shall

appreciate that Social Credit will be defeated unless accompanied by the Single Tax. Moreover (*pace* your correspondent), it matters a very great deal to the situation "whether the landlords do extract all the rent."

Against the general argument, however, I have suggested some practical considerations to show that the land monopoly exercises only a circumscribed power and that these same practical considerations will be equally operative under Social Credit conditions. The Single-Taxers certainly establish their case on the law of supply and demand, but their assumption that that law will be modified when rent becomes taxation is still open to serious objection. Consequently there is no room for a difference of opinion as to the priority of Social Credit, which, as I have said, will effectively show up whatever there is (or is not) in the depredations of the land monopoly.

Yours faithfully,

A.

Women in Industry.

SIR,—Woman Worker replies to my letter chiefly by controverting statements which I did not make, and illustrating her remarks by a detailed elaboration of an infantile illustration of the self-evident fact that a table "entirely covered" with bottles cannot hold another.

I am accused of saying that "if all the superfluous women making money disappeared from the money-getting world . . . it would not make the smallest difference in the world." Hence these—bottles. Apart from the fact that I should never dream of applying the word "superfluous" in a general sense, to human beings, I contended that even if those women whom your contributor regards as "supported" were banished from wage-earning occupations, the *problem* of the unemployed self-supported woman, being only a part of the general problem of unemployment, would be no nearer solution so long as the present financial system remained unchanged. To advocate as a means of solving the economic problem or even of appreciably mitigating its pressure, that one small section of the community should adopt a self-denying ordinance, is to offer an example of muddled thinking that it would be hard to beat. Why not beseech the real sinners to make sacrifices? Why not beseech the financiers, to whom the whole world is in pawn, to see the error of their ways, and not to wait for "Parliament or Policeman" to force them to do so?

The bitter cry of the average young man to-day is that his income is inadequate to support a wife and family, even if he were not always working in the shadow of unemployment. Many a married woman is working to supplement her husband's income, not necessarily because she prefers to do so, but in order to help to provide a decent education for her children.

Mr. Cooke Taylor is evidently one of those gentlemen whose heart is in the right place. Nevertheless, who could put seriously such a fatuous question to the "prominent Feminist" as the one quoted: "Would the lady tell him roughly speaking what was the number of women supporting dependents?"! and Woman Worker adds "Will it be believed that the speaker did not know?" It would be odd if she did know in the absence of official statistics on the subject. It would be just as pertinent and just as futile to ask your contributor for statistics as to the number of married women with husbands able to support them, who are working for wages. She does not know.

It is difficult to be civil to Woman Worker when she says: "As regards the further question 'Why we do not ask men occupying the same position to withdraw,' for the simple reason that I did not ask such a question at all. I made a statement of a different character altogether, and consequently I hardly deserve the heavy sarcasm conveyed

in the sentence "we have not inquired whether there are rich men writing gossip or fashions, the Stage, etc., etc. But even if men were doing this we fail to understand how any self-respecting woman could hold up this activity as an example for women to follow." (Why the editorial "we"?) This sort of thing makes me gasp. Woman Worker should study the Douglas social credit proposals. The mental exertion involved might help to clear her mind of cant.

F. CHAMBERS.

The Guild Idea.

SIR,—Mr. Reckitt despite his good intentions has evident difficulty in finding anything worth saving in the Guild Idea. Many attempts have already been made to reach a higher synthesis of National Guilds and Social Credit, but without success,—and, I am persuaded, because there is a fundamental incompatibility between the nature of the two ideas. Consequently I am off with the old love. It was not without careful consideration that I stressed the essentially moral outlook of the Guildsmen; I am convinced that that is the defect. Natural Economics has reminded us, amongst other things, that the work of the world is a technical process in which moral considerations are dormant. The work done has a moral significance, maybe; but the doing of it is neither a moral nor an immoral activity. The endeavour to mould society on the basis of moral principles is the essential characteristic of Socialism of whatever variety, and National Guilds offers only a clearer and more direct method of achieving a society established on such bases as abstract Justice and Freedom. It differs from the rest principally in postulating that not only in leisure but in work these moral concepts shall prevail. But houses are not built, aeroplanes are not constructed, nor are crops brought to harvest with any such considerations in mind. On the contrary the qualities called for are of a wholly technical character, and it is for this reason that I have concluded that the attempt to reorganise a co-operative technique such as industry is, to express human will and personality cannot be achieved by Guilds of producers who are obliged to produce what is wanted. Human will and personality so far as industry is concerned can only find expression in an order, and the consumer is in charge of that department. Craftsmanship could offer pungent criticism of some of the products of even the Building Guilds in this day and generation, but craftsmanship is paid to obey economic orders to the exclusion of moral aspirations. Guilds or no guilds the best work that can be done will be done when it is called for, and there is very little reason to suppose that it will not be well done even though it pays a dividend. On that score, indeed, the objection to "production for profit," besides being a misconception, is only current because the objectors mistakenly suppose that poverty is the negative aspect of profit-making.

It is characteristic of the Guildsman that M. Penty, whom I have described as an obscurantist (meaning that he sees the future behind him), should have suggested as an important objection to Social Credit, that it is the product of the engineering workshop. To the Guild of New Presbyters the engineering workshop is indeed a veritable capitalist brothel wherein are fashioned creatures of cast-iron and steel in the image of man; but a more—shall I say rational—view of reality recognises such appliances as the chief aid of man to civilisation. Better work can be done with the aid of engineering equipment than was ever possible without it, including "an inquiry into the wage-system, and the way out"!

I concur in Mr. Reckitt's expression—consumer control of credit and producer control of work;—but this leaves only Social Credit wanting, because work always has been and always will be controlled by producers.

But the kind of producer control postulated by the Guildsmen wherein each operative lends his voice to the discussion of method can only result in a futile din. Modern production must necessarily follow a well-defined procedure involving (1) designs, (2) scheme of operations, (3) schedule of quantities; and it is absurd to suppose that such a system can ever be so moulded, without disaster, in order to permit the nth operative an effective voice in control. Moreover, a consideration of the working of such democratically-controlled institutions as trade unions is sufficient to show that control is always and automatically located at the centre of information.

From these few considerations I think it must be agreed that Social Credit and National Guilds involve a choice, and—that stumbling block—a decision, rather than a synthesis. Further, however, even the Guildsmen admit that the economics of National Guilds are only half-baked; that granting the successful issue of industrial democracy the primary problem of economic democracy would still remain. Surely then that is sufficient reason in itself for taking leave of Guildism. The "saving" of £175 per house by Guild methods, apart from its ambiguity, would be impressive if the actual cost of the houses was not to be charged to the public two or three times over. Even Mr. Ramsay MacDonald has a better focus of the situation, for he says "The problem of housing is fundamentally how to build houses for people who can no more buy the houses than I can buy the crown jewels." But, as I have said, for such ambiguous advantages as the above, the National Guilds League is very valiantly urging trade unionists to hazard even the paltry subsistence they receive from finance capitalism, and deliberately ignoring the repeated warnings that they are leading trades unionism into an ambush.

F. H. A.

The Single Tax.

SIR,—Your footnote to Mr. Jones's letter may rightly define the original issue in this correspondence, but naturally included in this issue is the opposing contention of many Land Value Taxers that the Single Tax would render "Douglas" a superfluity, as well as everyone else with a scheme. Mr. Jones, however, unlike many of his Henry Georgian confrères, does not push this all-in land policy, and his one reference to the Douglas scheme—that it cannot in itself remedy the land question—is not definitely antagonistic.

When Mr. J. A. Hobson examined the Social Credit proposals, he declared, in contradiction to Major Douglas, that the great disparity between large and small incomes was the main cause of the excessive investment and capital expenditure, and that if incomes were more equal a correspondingly greater portion of the aggregate income would be spent on ultimate products.

A similar straining at the gnat and swallowing the camel seems to be the attitude of the Land Taxers. Their proposals would probably achieve some approach to equalisation of incomes, and the effect might for a time be seen—with a microscope—in a higher standard of living on the plane of necessities, but the subtle alchemy of finance would still operate to thrust its victims to the subsistence level, and such land reform by taxation, unsupported by a Social Credit policy, would merely mean that there would be fewer able to retain their economic independence during the dark days of tight money. All of us would be in the hole instead of most of us.

A little more thought, and Mr. Jones will surely see that the socialisation of credit must precede or synchronise with the taxation of Land Values, not only as a matter of urgency, but to give full effect to each reform.

Jo. S.

Pastiche.

NEW WINE IN OLD BOTTLES.

By Old and Crusted.

"THE BIRETTA."

"To them as likes" a high flavour the "Biretta" is far and away the best weekly of its kind. Miles beyond its ruridecanal contemporary, the "Erastian." It really is a good twopenn'orth and the folk who waste a similar sum on the "Sunday Frasorial" might do worse than try the "Biretta" for a change. By the way, is it possible for any human being to be quite so stupid as the star turn of the "Sunday Frasorial" looks in the inset which appears week by week in its banaisic columns? But to return to our cassocks. There appeared in a late issue of the "Biretta" an article entitled "Chaos—and Hope." No, it had nothing to do with the conference, or the super secretary—much of which might have adorned the "Notes of the Week." For example, this sort of thing sounds quite familiar:—"The amount of wages to be paid to a man rests not only on the question, 'What can the business afford?' but 'What is the standard of life that ought to be permitted in a Christian community?' . . . and . . . It may be that the just solution of the question lies rather in reforms that may cheapen necessities or solve the housing problem than in a mere increase of wages which may be reduced again by an automatic rise in prices or rent."

And your Reverence is not far wrong. I would suggest you keep on this tack and make a study of the just price and the potentialities of social credit, which, if approached with an open mind and in the right spirit will certainly lead to a solution of these problems quicker than waiting for that change of heart which at present appears to be the only remedy of the orthodox. May I add that if this much vaunted "change of heart" is to be efficacious why not try to get it going in quarters that really matter? A mission to Bankers, for example, or a new Society for the Propagation of Economic Heresy amongst Sound Financiers! Suggest to these smug supporters of diocesan subscription lists that they might stop building marble palaces for money-mongers and try their hands at a row of cottages—and see what answer you will get.

Change of heart, oh, "Right Reverends and Wrong Reverends of every order"—by all means—but how long shall we have to wait for it? Why not try a change of financial policy to begin with? And just try to imagine how much easier the work of the heart changers would be if they were released from all money worries! No more bazaars, jumble sales, bean tubs and honp-la's to raise the wind, but "Dividends for all," including the poor dear Vicar. It is worth thinking of, my Lord Bishop.

"VALE."

The Countess Bathurst relinquishes the ownership of the "Morning Post."

So Boadicea steps down from her chariot and will lead no more her faithful Troglodytes in defence of "British Power and British Prestige."

Let us congratulate this great lady and "bonny fechter" that she has not been swallowed up like so many others, in the Morass of the Syndicated, but lives to hand over her great charge to a worthy successor.

We had good hunting under the great Queen. Shall we not see equally fine sport under Hotspur? There are evil days in store for the Welsh Wizard and his "skimble-skamble stuff" when the new leader of the Troglodytes deals with him as Cousin Percy did with Owen Glendower.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

The Subscription Rates for "The New Age," to any address in Great Britain or Abroad, are 15s. for 12 months; 7s. 6d. for 6 months; 3s. 9d. for 3 months.

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

The Social Credit Movement

- ABERDEEN.—J. Crombie Christie, 12, Pitstruan-place.
 * BRIGHTON.—J. E. Whitton, Stanford House, Stanford-avenue.
 BRISTOL.—W. Arthur Evers, 12, Aberdeen-road, Clifton, Bristol.
 CAMBRIDGE.—Rolf Gardiner, St. John's College.
 CARDIFF.—C. H. Williams, 47, Whitchurch Road.
 COVENTRY.—H. E. B. Ludlam, 12, Grantham-street, Coventry.
 CROYDON.—T. Gillis, 66, Southbridge-road.
 EDINBURGH.—Lawrence McEwen, 9, Douglas-crescent.
 GLASGOW.—H. M. Murray, 73, Ingleby-drive, Dennistoun, Glasgow.
 * GOLDERS GREEN (The Hampstead Garden Suburb).—Mrs. K Roche, 32, Hogarth Hill, N.W. 11.
 HAMPSTEAD.—Arthur V. Judges, 29, Upper Bedford-place, London, W.C.
 * HIGHBURY.—S. A. Potts, 116, St. Paul's-road, N. 1.
 * KENILWORTH.—W. F. Alty, Windy Arbour.
 LARKHALL.—W. McPheaf, Laurel Villa.
 LEAMINGTON SPA.—John Willows, Arno Villa, 63, Willes-road.
 LEEDS.—Geo. Kay, 7, Wyther Park-avenue, Armley, Leeds.
 * LEICESTER.—Chas. Crisp, "Edyson," Hobson-road.
 LIVERPOOL.—E. J. Pankhurst, 22, Beckenham-avenue; F. H. Auger, 45, Fieldway, Wavertree, Liverpool.
 * LONGTON, STAFFS.—D. Amyas Ross, 66, Trentham-road.
 LONDON, CENTRAL.—W. R. M. Stevens, 6, Palgrave-road, Stamford Brook, W. 12.
 * LONDON, S.E.—R. Edwards, 23, Westmount-road, Eltham, S.E. 9.
 * LONDON, S.W.—William Repton, 5, Pentland-gardens, Wandsworth, S.W. 18.
 MANCHESTER.—F. Gardner, Pike Fold, Blackley, Manchester.
 MIDDLESBROUGH.—Mrs. Ella M. Dunn, 2, Linden-grove, Linthorpe, Middlesbrough.
 NELSON (LANCS.).—M. Harrison, 11, Lane Ends.
 NEWBURY, READING.—Leslie Forrest, Rosedale, Thatcham.
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.—Arthur Bartram, 107, Morley-st.
 OXFORD.—Rev. V. A. Demant, 5, South Parade.
 PAISLEY.—R. K. Reid, 47, Oakshaw-street.
 PLYMOUTH.—F. R. Crowe, 1, Beaumont Road.
 PUDSEY.—Joseph Smith, Smalewell Hall, Pudsey, Yorks.
 PORTSMOUTH.—Thos. K. Justice, 34, Dunbar-road.
 RICHMOND, SURREY.—N. Dudley Short, 32, Marlborough-road.
 RUGBY.—W. Bramwell Bridges, Frowlesworth, Rugby.
 SHEFFIELD.—A. L. Gibson, 9, Paradise-square; (Theosophical Society's Group), W. H. Bolton, 8, St. Paul's-parade.
 STOCKPORT.—Alex. Gordon, 86, Kennesley-road.
 * STRATFORD-ON-AVON.—W. H. J. Woodward, Arden-street.
 SUDBURY (Suffolk).—J. Rimmer, Station Road, Sudbury.
 SUFFOLK.—T. J. Faithfull, The Hall, Walsham le Willows.
 SWANSEA.—J. A. Rees, 23, Hanover-street.
 SWINTON, ROTHERHAM.—E. G. Trowbridge, Glenholme, Station-street.
 * WATFORD.—W. Coles, 16, Queen's-road.
 WESTERTON (Near Glasgow).—Jas. Gilben, 5, North View.
 WORCESTER.—F. G. Davies, 47, Hill-avenue.
 * YORK.—W. M. Surtees, Elmfield College; W. Hallaways, 38, Lindley-street.
 BELFAST.—Miss Alexander, Summer Hill, Stranmillis-road.
 DUBLIN.—T. Kennedy, 43, Dawson-street.
 * No group yet formed, but correspondence invited.
 Acting Secretary of the Central (London) Committee:
 ARTHUR BRENTON, 70, HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.1.

- SOUTH AFRICA.—A. Stedman, Hon. Sec., South Africa Social Credit Movement, P.O. Box 37, Johannesburg.
 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.—H. B. Brougham, Century Club, 7, West Forty-third Street, New York (lately connected with "The Credit Crusade," in the United States), would like to hear from members of the Movement on this side at any time.
 CANADA.—The United Farmers of Alberta, of Longhead Building, Calgary, Alberta, are willing to accept subscriptions for THE NEW AGE, and may sometimes be able to put inquirers into touch with people interested in the Social Credit Proposals. In this last connection the Editor of the Ottawa "Citizen," Ottawa, would doubtless advise correspondents.

DIRECTORY

Names and addresses of Social Credit Advocates or Adherents who are willing to (*) answer queries on the subject or who would be pleased to (†) exchange views with others similarly interested. (This list is supplementary to that of the local Secretaries of the Movement given on this page.)

- * DOUGLAS, Major C. H., 8, Fig Tree-court, Temple, E.C. 4.
 * DALKIN, R. G. S., 9, Morthen Rd., Wickersley, Yorks.
 † McINTYRE, A. HAMILTON, 9, Townhead-terrace, Paisley.
 † MEADE, Miss S. F., Sandpit, Horsington, Templecombe.
 * O'NEILL, JOSEPH, 31, Hayfield-road, Claremont Estate, Pendleton.
 † KIRKBRIDE, J. S., The Old Hall, Lowdham, Notts.
 * GALLOWAY, C. F. J., 37, Cale Street, S.W. 3.

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY

During February and March the following books on finance or economics have been published.

SOCIAL CREDIT. By C. H. DOUGLAS. 7s. 6d

THE FLAW IN THE PRICE SYSTEM. By P. W. MARTIN. 4s. 6d.

THE DEADLOCK IN FINANCE: A Simplified Explanation of the Famous Credit Theorem of Major C. H. Douglas. By MAJOR ARTHUR E. POWELL. 5s.

BANKERS AND CREDIT. By HARTLEY WITHERS. 6s.

They are all worthy of attention. The first three should be read by all students of the new economics.

"The Community's Credit."

A reasoned consideration of the theoretical content and practical implications of the DOUGLAS CREDIT PROPOSALS.

By C. MARSHALL HATTERSLEY, M.A., LL.B.

"It is interesting to record the publication of books like this: they are evidence of careful thought, and serve to guide men into the ways of clear thinking. Original thought is all to the good, and the perfect galaxy of it in "The Community's Credit" is an earnest of future advancement. . . . The work will form a useful comparative volume to read alongside some of the more academic economic treatises."—*The Bank Officers' Guild*, June, 1923.

"Here, then, is a book for those who wish to grasp the essentials of the problem, the very primer of credit-economics wherein the lesson is made plain. There is no excuse now for the criticism so often urged that Douglas was "obscure" . . . Mr. Hattersley is a splendid guide, and his book is a triumph."—*The Fellowship*, June, 1923.

" . . . Should prove helpful to the Social Credit student who wants a bird's-eye view of what has been thought and said on the subject to the present time. . . . Mr. Hattersley's quotations from orthodox economists, financial leaders and writers on Social Credit are well chosen. . . . In the chapters dealing with constructive credit in principle and practice, Mr. Hattersley offers a good deal of thought-stimulating comment, particularly while dealing with international relations."—*Credit Power*, April, 1923.

"To any of my readers who are interested in the Social Credit Movement (and they should be many) I heartily commend this volume . . . very clear and lucid explanation of the Social Credit Proposals."—*The Commercial Monthly*, June, 1923.

" . . . simplicity of diction and clear logical reasoning . . . An interesting supplementary chapter on National Dividends merits the close attention of students of economics."—*Rand Daily Mail*, May 31st, 1923.

" . . . the best book, as distinct from pamphlets, expounding the Douglas proposals. Social Credit . . . The author's exposition is, on the whole, eminently clear . . ."—*The Commonwealth*, September, 1923.

" . . . the form of the book certainly lends itself to as clear a treatment of the subject as is possible."—*The Draughtsman*, July, 1923.

Crown 8vo, 165 pp. Price 5/- Nett (Postage 2d.)

Catalogue of other books and pamphlets free on application.

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

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70, High Holborn, London, W.C.1, and printed for him by BONNER & CO., The Chancery Lane Press, 1, 2, & 3, Rolls Passage, E.C.4.