

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER"

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND ART

No. 1768] NEW SERIES Vol. XXXIX. No. 13. THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1926. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SIXPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	137	THE TESTAMENT OF WORDSWORTH.—II. By Richard Church	144
THE NEW COINAGE. M. Poincaré's Vote of Confidence. The raid on cricket clubs. The Turvey Treatment and alcoholism. Mr. Churchill at the Mansion House. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and the Cleophas Script. The American debt—annexation of Canada—all-round cancellation idea inspired by Wall Street.		VERSE.	
THE JEWISH QUESTION (Editorial)	139	Rhymes from the Spanish of Becquer. By Rupert Croft-Cooke (140). <i>Be Bold O Heart.</i> By A. Newberry Choyce (140).	
A HERETIC'S WORD-BOOK. By A. N.—V.	140	DRAMA. By Paul Banks.	145
ANTHROPOLOGICAL ECONOMICS.—III. Revolution.—II. By V. A. Demant	141	<i>Distinguished Villa. Cock o' the Roost. There's No Fool.</i>	
THE TRUE INWARDNESS OF CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGY.—VI. By N. E. Egerton Swann	142	OF CHRISTIANITY FOR PRIME MINISTERS. By N. E. E. S.	146
SOLITARIA. By V. Rosanov	143	LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	146
D. H. LAWRENCE. By P. M.	143	From William Repton, S. P. Abrams, and P. T. Kenway.	
<i>Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine.</i>		REVIEWS	146
		<i>The Religion of Yesterday and To-morrow. The Human Element.</i>	
		CARICATURES by "Cyrano"	148
		VI.—Lord Reading.	

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The *Observer* is anxious about the new coinage said to be in contemplation. "Too close a watch," it says,

"cannot be set against the aberrations to which the Mint has shown itself liable in the past. There can be no tolerance for anything which comes short of the highest technical and artistic skill. The credit of a community is particularly bound up in its coins and in its stamps—almost as much as in its architecture. And these are an influence upon public taste as much as they are an index of its quality."

This is a typical example of misplaced emphasis. There is nothing to be said against the idea presented here as an idea, but everything to be said against its being insinuated into the forefront of the queue of public questions. Let us have a handsome shilling by all means, but let us remember first that handsome is as handsome does. "What will my shilling buy?" not "How does my shilling look?" is the prime consideration when one thinks in terms of "the credit of a community."

The *Observer's* Correspondent in Paris announces that M. Poincaré is "pretty certain of a vote of confidence" from the Chamber when he comes before it, "whatever may be his ultimate fate when once his policy is known" (!) He had better have written "a vote of sympathy." All the world loves a lover, and none more than the French. So when yet one more of them risks his life to cure the languishing princess and win her to his bed, even the ranks of Tuscan can scarce forbear to cheer. We apologise for thus entangling Hans Andersen with Lord Macaulay; but our excuse is that we are dealing with a situation of which few people can tell whether it is a fairy tale or history.

In its frantic search for shillings (artistic or otherwise) the Office of Works is pouncing down on the cricket clubs using the Royal Parks. It is demanding rents—rents which are in some cases quite prohibitive. This immediately threatens the survival of junior clubs, and tends to extinguish all clubs which are not subsidised by business organisations. Centre

itches look like following corner sites in becoming the monopoly of the banks and their staffs. Probably the test matches of the future will be between the Federal Reserve Board and the Bank of England.

The advertisers of the Turvey Treatment for alcoholism are dogged fellows. Week after week their announcements appear in the *Observer*.

"The tired brain or overworked system are alternatively whipped and deadened by alcohol . . . until the consumer comes to regard what was once an occasional luxury as a necessity, as the only means of recovering what he or she thinks is a normal feeling of well-being."

That is plausible enough so far as it goes. But it is not so much the tired brain as the tied brain that resorts to the drug. Under the benign influence of alcohol the senseless cog in the industrial machine becomes a living soul. As the proprietors of the Turvey Treatment themselves put it: "A glow of well-being pervades the system, and the mind works with unaccustomed and pleasurable elasticity—for alcohol never fails" (their italics). Alcohol is, in short, the antithesis and antidote to the financial system. The addict can say—after the pattern of the old philosophic tag: "I think. Therefore I AM"—"I drink. And while I drink, I AM." In their respective planes the saloon bar, the spiritualist seance, and the communion table are alike in this, that they rekindle in the communicant a realisation of his own importance in the stupendous and impenetrable scheme of things. The effective cure for alcoholism is not the Turvey Treatment, which is merely a "revivifying tonic, building up the wasted tissues and invigorating the whole nervous system." It is to precipitate into man's present experience the visions he seeks through drink; to bring him face to face with that which he sees darkly in his glass of beer. Give him economic security for himself, assure him of economic security for his children after him, and thenceforward he will drink, if he drink at all, moderately, to beckon a supplement to the happiness he has, and not immoderately to grasp after a substitute for the happiness he has not. The economic death of countless generations of his kind has by now made possible for him a distribution of wealth almost beyond his computa-

tion. There was a crucifixion of penury. There will be a resurrection of plenty. And so, as the communicant at the Church altar, by eating bread and drinking wine, doth "shew the Lord's death till He come," so do the congregation in the tap-room mystically remembrance their dead and wait for their coming. No "Turvey" tonics must trample on this ritual of the under-dog at the bidding of moralists.

"Maitre Léonard," said the Abbé, "philosophy is conducive to clemency. For my part I freely absolve ragamuffins, rogues, and all miscreants. And I bear no ill will even to the wealthy, although in their case is much frowardness. And if you had mixed as I have done with people of repute, Maitre Léonard, you would know they are worth no more than others, and that they are often less agreeable to meet. . . . It is true that certain people easily accommodate themselves to the drawbacks of living among the great. At the second table of the Bishop of Séz sat a certain Canon, a very polite man, who remained on a formal footing until the day of his death. Learning that he was gravely ill, Monsignor went to see him in his extremity. 'I ask pardon of Your Grace,' pleaded the Canon, 'for presuming to die in your presence; but, alas, it is unavoidable.' 'Go on, go on,' replied Monsignor kindly, 'do not mind me.'"—(At the Sign of the Reine Pédagogue.)

Mr. Churchill, in his recent speech to the bankers and merchants of the City at the Mansion House, said that an infallible test to apply to the question of whether a particular measure of finance is sound or not, is first to find out whether it is disagreeable. The remark evoked great hilarity—among the bankers and merchants of the City. That Mr. Churchill intended to raise a laugh in no way abates the significance of the formula. In it is seen in all its nakedness the policy of economic scarcity underlying "sound" financial practice. More than that. In it is implied the power of finance to impose its policy on a protesting community. In what other profession or trade could its representatives safely boast of the fact that their policy automatically provoked general dissent, and that the greater the dissent the more confident they would be that their policy was sound? Only the bankers can thus giggle while Rome is burning. But even a worse feature of the situation than this is the insolence with which they toss out blatantly self-contradictory arguments, and take conviction for granted, as if it did not really matter whether the argument was sound, or, as if it were a quite sufficient compliment to the public for them to argue at all. Thus, with reference to inflation:

"As Mr. Churchill explained" (we quote *The Times*), "in cases where unsound methods of finance are adopted, the pleasure is derived at the time and the price paid afterwards. In sound finance the price is paid first and the reward obtained later."

This—to a people who have been getting continuously more and more impoverished exactly in the same measure as the bankers have been edging them back during the last six years to the gold standard. Again:

"For a time the working classes in a period of inflation may benefit, but in the long run they lose heavily, since while they obtain constantly rising wages in terms of the number of francs they may receive, the purchasing power of each franc . . . diminishes at a greater rate than the multiplication of francs."

This is presented as an automatic law, in entire disregard of a fact which finally discredits it, namely, that it does not work in the opposite direction. If the purchasing power of the franc is automatically going down faster than the number of francs is increasing, the purchasing power of the pound ought just as automatically to have gone up faster than the number of pounds have decreased—in which case the people of this country should now be living at a higher level of comfort than they were at the end of the war. Are they? *Si mausoleum vis, circumspice.*

Mr. Justice Eve was called upon to decide the ownership of the copyright of some spirit communications recorded by a Miss Cummings under the title

of *The Script of Cleophas*. She and a Mr. Bond both claimed ownership. His Lordship, in giving judgment, said that

"It would seem as though the original authors of the documents were the individual who had been dead and buried for something like two thousand years, and the lady, . . . but as he was incapable of making any declaration which would include that individual—he had no jurisdiction extending beyond this country—he must confine himself to the present time. . . . He looked on this matter as a terrestrial one, of the earth earthy, and he would deal with it on that footing. The plaintiff was entitled to a declaration that she was the owner of the copyright in the script, and he gave judgment accordingly, with costs."

Mr. Bond's case was that he was the person to whom Cleophas addressed the script, and that the messages were elicited by his (Mr. Bond's) questions. Among his Lordship's questions to Mr. Bond was—"How did Cleophas come to speak in archaic English? I would have supposed he spoke Hebrew or Latin." Mr. Bond's reply was that such messages are conveyed in thought form, the words being found in the brain of the medium. On which his Lordship commented, "The authorship, therefore, is in the medium, because the medium converts the dog Latin or Hebrew into English." So the terrestrial issue was decided accordingly. On the celestial issue Sir Arthur Conan Doyle comments in the *Morning Post* of last Saturday. He says that Miss Cummins has no more knowledge of scriptural matters than an ordinary lady might, but that the document is an account of doings in the early Christian Church immediately after the death of Jesus. As Sir Arthur could not check its accuracy from his own knowledge he submitted the script to Dr. Osterley, examining Chaplain of the Bishop of London, who "commented on its general accuracy, and upon the wealth of allusions within it which pointed to a deep knowledge of those times." Sir Arthur Conan Doyle gives one instance—the martyrdom of Stephen as narrated in the Acts of the Apostles. The murderers are there said to have laid their clothes at the feet of Saul. "There seemed no sense in this," he says, until, on consulting the Cleophas script, he saw the statement that these murderers were paid for their work partly in articles of attire, and that, being overcome by the beauty of the martyr's death, they cast down their wages (their clothes) at the feet of Saul. "This, at least," he concludes, "was logical and intelligible." Quite so. But to render Biblical narratives (other than miracles) logical and intelligible is not beyond the ability of any person of imagination. In the present instance the precedent of handing back wages under a feeling of remorse already occurs in the case of Judas. Again, there is something humorous in the idea of Dr. Osterley giving a certificate of substantial veracity to Cleophas. How can he presume to do this unless he is either aware of all the information Cleophas gives or sufficient of it to be able to estimate the credibility of the rest? We wish these spirits would say something in startling contradiction to current beliefs about the past. If Cleophas had, for instance, told us that no such event happened as the martyrdom of Stephen, everyone, Christian and Freethinker alike, would feel that these spirit messages were worth looking into. But the spirits only elaborate things people have learned already—and *do not want to unlearn*. Whether there be disembodied spirits or not, we are entitled to conclude either that they do not know anything worth hearing or that mediums censor their revelations. Even Sir Arthur Conan Doyle observes that no inspired writing is ever quite free from the writer's personality. "Even in the best cases there is ten or twenty per cent. of the medium—in the worst there is more medium than inspiration." Everything that the spirits have spoken hitherto will not compare for a moment with, for instance, the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. We advise Sir Arthur to investigate the mystery of the authorship of this book of

political and economic prophecy. If he could establish that it was written in a trance he would do more by that act alone than all he has yet done to substantiate his case.

The wrangle about the American debt is developing on both sides of the Atlantic. The London Press in guarded language follows the *Daily Mail's* lead for cancellation all round. Senator Borah endorses Mr. Mellon's hostile attitude to the idea in very frank terms. One American newspaper is beginning to ventilate the question of the annexation of Canada as a quid pro quo for cancelling Britain's debt, suggesting to Canada that Mr. Lloyd George's and Lord Reading's interest in her is dictated chiefly by the consideration of what man-power she could provide in the event of another war. In Paris there have been ugly demonstrations against British and American tourists, personal violence having been resorted to on two or three occasions. It is a significant feature of these brawls that the catchwords of the crowd are directly linked up with financial policy. "Down with the American debt" is an advance on any previous herd cry. The *Daily Mail* is reminding America that the British debt can only be repaid in goods, and hints at a British tariff to discourage the importation of American goods. Quite logical—but four years late. Mr. Hartley Withers, in the *Referee*, reminds America of the same truth, and points out the inconsistency of the American tariff which impedes Britain's settlement of the debt she is required so insistently to repay. We have good reason for believing that the agitation for debt cancellation was initiated by Wall Street and is being resisted, for the moment, by Washington. The financier responds to logic more readily than the politician; and Wall Street realises that it is the lending of money, not the receiving of repayment, that will keep the American population in work and good temper. It is easy to realise that a country which has been obliged to advance money to its population to keep its industries at work is not in a position to receive goods manufactured by its debtors in repayment of debt. The politicians, of course, cannot act immediately upon this logic: they must have a little time to educate their constituents. But Washington will come to heel in due course. The annexation of Canada would be a good way out of the muddle. America would get a field of investment all her own—a dumping place for loans. She would be one step further towards the Pan-American ideal with which she is credited by Sir Oswald Stoll. Already she holds a preponderance of the external mortgages on that Dominion, and militarily is able at any moment to occupy the mortgaged territory. The only obstacle is a moral one; and that would, of course, disappear if America forgave Britain the debt. Senator Borah reminds Europe that America did not demand any territory at Versailles. She was wise. Power resides not in the ownership of territory, but in the ability to exploit it financially. By insisting on dollars from Europe America was in effect making Europe powerless to develop her territorial gains without borrowing dollars. To all intents and purposes, Europe only occupied her new territories as financial agents of America. America, in renouncing territory and exacting dollars, virtually secured the territory. This is becoming clear to Europe, and to that extent the risks of war are perceptibly increasing.

PRESS EXTRACTS.

(Selected by the Economic Research Council.)
"The labour situation in Rhineland and Westphalia is rapidly approaching a climax. Official figures just published show that in Westphalia there are five times the number of workless as in April last year. Owing to the general shortage of capital no elaborate scheme of emergency work can be considered, and the greatest misery is being experienced in all branches of labour."—*Manchester Guardian*, May 31.

The Jewish Question.

We are concluding the correspondence on "The Jewish Question" in this issue. Excepting one letter (which only expressed agreement with Major Douglas's), all the correspondence received has appeared. The conclusion to be drawn is that if we have tried to stir up anti-Semitic enthusiasm we have been conspicuously unsuccessful. This reflection should allay Mr. Abram's feelings. It should have been obvious that in referring to the Jewish question we have no more reflected on the ordinary Jew than we have disparaged the ordinary American in our references to his Government's policy. If all Jews had been living in Palestine there would have been no possible opening for Mr. Abram's complaint. Conversely, if to-day Americans were settled as coherent bodies in every civilised country of the world, no doubt we should receive similar complaints from such of them as read THE NEW AGE. We will not go into all the issues raised in the correspondence. We can make our general attitude fairly clear by an illustration.

If we had a piece of land, and a careful analysis of the soil convinced us that it tended to impede the growth of the more desirable products of the field and accelerate that of the less; and if, thereafter, we noticed that a certain plant flourished on that land more luxuriously than any others, we should be obliged, on our premise, to feel some "prejudice" towards that particular plant. The land, here, is the present international governmental system, the noxious elements in it being centralisation—repression of individuality—and economic scarcity. Surely we are entitled to watch and see to what proportionate extent members of different races find their way to places of power in such a system. And if we see one race contributing more than its quota, there can be no prejudice if we single out that race for attention and criticism, for our general principle would be that, other things equal, whatever finds a bad system most congenial to itself is itself suspect.

To those critics who deny our premise and say that the existing system is the best possible we have no answer. But of those who accept the premise we are entitled at least to expect acquittance on the score of race prejudice in our public policy. Taking the whole world to contain 1,300 millions, and accepting Mr. Abram's estimate that 13 millions of these are Jews, we get a ratio of one to 100. The question is: What proportion of total power over world policy is exercised by Jews? We cannot answer, but we believe that they stand at the top. We may be wrong.

But if not, the next two questions might be: What does it matter if they do? What are you going to do about it? The answer to the first is simply this, that by watching as far as we can the activities of Jews and listening as best we can to the words of Jews, we may be better able to estimate what changes, if any, in the present system are about to take place. For instance, the return to England of Lord Reading and Sir Herbert Samuel, so far as it went, was a hopeful sign. It was partly blotted out by Sir Herbert's subsequent appointment to the chairmanship of the Coal Commission. It will be entirely blotted out if Lord Reading is appointed to any fresh position of influence.

The answer to the second question—What are you going to do about it?—is certainly not that we want to extirpate the rank and file of Jewry, nor even to agitate for the removal of Jews from public positions. Because the seed of Abraham may sprout readily in bad soil, you do not clean the soil by destroying the seed. We are hoping for the governmental system of this nation to clean itself. It need not necessarily exclude its Jews to do this. It is at least conceivable that its Jews might take the first step to invert the

old policy, and thus establish the new. At any rate the Jew is, as we believe, in a stronger position than the Gentile to take that step. Will he? We shall watch for any sign he may give of such an intention. The honour is open to men of all races.

In discussing Jews as Jews we are leaving open the question of how far Jews domiciled in any country absorb the traditions of that country; of how far, for instance, men like Reading, Samuel, and Mond, are British Masons or Jewish; how far they are national, or international. The Dearborn Independent asserted that New York Jewry successfully opposed the registration of Jewish immigrants into America as Jews; these had to be tabulated as Italians, French, Russians, and so on, according to the countries they came from. The argument was, if we remember rightly, that the term "Jew" connoted a religion, not a race.

But whether the cement that binds Jews together be religious or racial, they are bound together, and sufficiently so to influence world affairs. One may reasonably assume that the policy of their leaders is to make the world safe for Jewry. Such a policy was implicitly recognised by Lord Robert Cecil on that famous occasion when he announced in America on behalf of Great Britain that "we will never let the Jews down." And the power of the Jews to look after themselves was implicitly admitted even by such a newspaper as the Observer, when it warned Austria not to permit anti-Semitic agitations among her people because she was in need of financial assistance, and would not get it if she offended the Jews. We commented on both these incidents in our Notes when they occurred. They show that the division between Jew and Gentile in every country is so clear cut as to necessitate supernatural arrangements to protect the Jew from being discriminated against. Whatever prejudice there is against the Jew seems to come from below, not above. While the political Press in this country for generations past has practically unanimously set its face against such discrimination, all the popular comics, from Punch downwards, have maintained it. Only last week a widely-read popular weekly journal published a picture showing a man struggling in the water under a pier on which a Jew stood with a life-belt asking the drowning man how much he would offer for it. Presumably the public still like this sort of thing in despite of all these years of authoritative exhortation to the contrary.

It is not worth our while to discuss whether the average Jew deserves this, or whether he can be differentiated from the average Gentile in regard to his personal aspirations and activities. It would be as futile as arguing that copper and gold were different things against someone who regarded them both in terms of electrons. We prefer to look at these matters practically. If red-headed men were the most powerful of the agents running the existing economic system, we should have to notice the association of red-hair with economic scarcity, even if our doing so caused pain to innocuous red-haired individuals. To us, therefore, the Jewish Question turns upon whether the power of the Jew is disproportionately greater than that of the Gentile in world affairs. We believe that it is.

BE BOLD, O HEART!

When Winter hatred is outworn, And wild birds with sweet insolence Wing back and perch upon the thorn. . . . Then is the time of no pretence. Be bold, O Heart, and take thy stand Beside the blossom-laden tree As one for whose proud sake the land Were honeyed with such minstrelsy. For Beauty friends the eyes that most Do hunger for her, and she rings His feet that find her with a host Of unaccountable bright things.

A. NEWBERRY CHOYCE.

A Heretic's Word-Book.

PRIDE.—The vice that makes a person with something important to say keep quiet.

PURITANISM.—The belief that self-denial is entitled to usury, combined with wholly unwarranted faith in the business principles of God, and the ready-reckoners of the Recording Angel.

REPUBLIC.—A revolt against despotism which enables demagogues to take turns at being King, and ensures their periodical abdication.

REPUBLICANISM.—A system for arranging that grocers, soap-boilers, meat-canners, and lawyers take turns at being king.

REPENTANCE.—An irresistible temptation felt upon drawing income already spent.

RAGE.—A coward under the impulse to murder: contrasted with anger, which is a brave man restraining himself from murder.

SCHOOL.—A means provided by providence for the working-classes to prevent their children's boots wearing out faster than they can buy leather.

SCULPTURE.—The obsession to make a woman who will not change.

SEX-EQUALITY.—Women first; children never.

SUNDAY.—In England a day on which the working-classes are on ticket-of-leave, the middle-classes on probation, and the upper-classes on show.

In America a day on which men spend their time feeling miserable because they failed to earn more last week, and desperate because they may not earn more next.

THEOLOGY.—Infinite talk.

TROUSERS.—A feminine garment signifying divided aims.

UTOPIA.—An ideal which nice children are taught to disbelieve in for fear it might come true.

VIRTUE.—The quantum of vice we are prepared to tolerate in others because we can support it ourselves.

WOMAN.—The shipwreck of all philosophy perpetually demonstrating that the ability to manage surpasses the capacity to understand. That is no doubt why women get on so well with sailors.

RHYMES FROM THE SPANISH OF BECQUER.

Rima XXIII. For one look . . . I would give my world, For one smile . . . give all my bliss, For one kiss . . . I do not know What I would give for one kiss!

Rima XXX. On her eye-lids there trembled a tear, On my lips hung a pardoning phrase, But pride caught them wavering there And killed them. Now we go our ways.

But sometimes, remembering all, "Why did I not speak?" question I, And, should she our loving recall, She will wonder, "Why did not I cry?"

Rima XLIV. I read from your eyes, Why feign with your lips, And gainsay with your eyes? Weep—and be not ashamed To confess that you cared; oh you may weep, for no one is watching. I am a man. I am weeping, too.

RUPERT CROFT-COOKER.

Anthropological Economics.

By V. A. Demant, B.Litt., B.Sc.

III.—REVOLUTION—ITS CAUSE AND CURE.

II.

The difficulty which gives rise to this emotional state of mind is that of seeing how it is that individual poverty and shortage should be present in nations whose main problems arise from the overwhelming productive power of their peoples. Men see, on the one hand, manufacturers forming trusts for restriction of output, keeping up prices by avoiding competition, and, on the other, labour practising "ca'canny" to postpone a stoppage owing to the financial inadequacy of the market. Governments and economists are distracted in the search for purchasers at home and abroad, and it is obvious to all that the enormous release of human effort due to the use of steam and electricity has not brought about the standard of prosperity and security which it promised. All the actual facts reveal a desperate situation due, not to scarcity, but to abundance of wealth. There is naturally an increasing number of individuals who have lost all trust and confidence in Society and tend to lay the blame on the method of administering the industrial system. Hence the revolt against "capitalism," private property, and individual enterprise. This revolt is blindly encouraged by politicians and economists of all political parties who issue frantic exhortations that the only remedy is "increased production." This is clearly an emotional reaction, and not a reasoned statement, for the same people, in practically the same breath, tell us that the difficulty is to find buyers for production. Not until it is realised that the only shortage in the world to-day is a shortage of money in relation to prices, will the blind reaction known as revolution cease to be a menace to civilisation. But, in fact, the programmes of all political parties seem designed to conceal this shortage. They all attempt in some way to re-distribute the existing inadequate volume of purchasing power, believing that some class of the community has got too much of it. Capital, in England at any rate, says that goods cannot be sold because labour costs are too high; labour is equally emphatic that enormous profits are what keep up prices; then manufacturers want their taxes reduced by the Government, who can only do this by curtailing expenditure on State services, such as Education, Army and Navy, Civil Services, etc. It is clear that any of these proposals means lowering prices by lowering somebody's income by exactly the same amount. The purchasing power of the community is in no way increased. Ignorance of the reason why there should not be enough purchasing power to effect the sale of the wealth produced leads to ill-feeling, irritation, and revolt of one section of the community against the others. It is this atmosphere of suspicion that is the psychological seed-ground of the revolutionary attitude and propaganda. It can only be cured, as Rivers points out, by knowledge and courage. So long as the purely financial cause of civilisation's deadlock is repressed and kept out of sight, so long shall we have a smouldering of revolutionary fires which are liable to flare up at any moment, unless the tension is relieved by the still greater revolution of war. Just as danger of war is a chronic disease of industrial civilisation with an inadequate mechanism of distribution, so revolution is an internal and irrational reaction to throw off the disease at considerable risk to the patient's life.

Only knowledge of the one flaw in modern society will relieve this growing emotional tension, but the reluctance to see in financial theory the fallacy which is wrecking the safety of civilisation is the most glaring instance of social repression that the world has ever known. Wherever we are to apportion the

blame for this, it is obvious that the economic superstition that Finance reflects Wealth in the modern world is maintained in the public mind by trading on two acquired instincts in the mind of civilised man. The first of these we have already referred to as the Commodity theory of Money, and it is the uncritical acceptance of this theory that prevents the majority of men and women from seeing accurately the historic cause of the social evils which confront them. Money in the modern world is predominantly in the form of Credit, mere book-keeping money, and is issued and recalled, with the public's acquiescence, precisely as though it were a commodity like gold or shells or oxen, the property of its dealers. That is the psychological basis for treating all issues of money (credit) as "loans." We have seen that this principle makes it impossible for the whole of production to be sold, because a loan repaid is the cancellation of credit. As a result, when the output of the capital development for which the "loan" was made has been sold and the "loan" repaid, the public has no extra purchasing power left with which to buy the increased production made possible by the capital development which remains. This is the ultimate cause of the financial inadequacy of the market. If the public is to buy all it can produce, credit must only be cancelled at the rate at which the output is consumed and the capital depreciated. This is only possible by treating money, no longer as a commodity, the property of finance, but as merely an efficient mechanism administered to effect the production and distribution of goods.

The inherent defect in the money systems of the modern world is therefore largely due to the fact that statesmen and economists have not revised their financial theories in consequence of the tremendous change which took place with the invention of "loan credit," a necessary accompaniment of increased productivity made possible by the industrial revolution of the last century. The inherent error of administering credit as though it were a commodity, with its result in keeping the public short of purchasing power, has been further obscured because its calamitous results have been postponed by the intervention of purchasing power from abroad until the shrinkage of the foreign market is now forcing it upon the world's attention. It is the still widespread ignorance of the historical and technical reason why the people in each industrial country cannot enjoy the wealth they produce, that creates the atmosphere of emotional stress which nurtures revolution.

It is also clear to the anthropologist that the sections of the community who have not reached this pitch of blind revolt acquiesce in the absurdity of going short of goods far below the standard which industry could afford because of an induced instinct that there is a scarcity of wealth. The human mind is essentially a practical instrument whose structure is mainly determined by the urgency of the problems of life. Thus the mind of civilised man is the result of a definite historic process which has been, in its economic aspect, a struggle with the problem of production. Scarcity has been the economic enemy. That the fear of scarcity is deep rooted and instinctive rather than rational is seen in the insistent cry for more production on the part of people who rationally know that the problem is to get the results of production sold. So long as this instinct is not eradicated by "knowledge and courage," it will lend support to the anomalous commodity theory of money which gives people a totally inadequate idea of the real wealth of the world in which we live. Until the light is shed on this gravest of human problems, we shall have an increasing number of men with more courage than knowledge who despair of the whole structure of modern society and seek to lay it in ruins by revolution.

Caricatures by "Cyrano."



VI.—LORD READING.