

# THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER"

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND ART

No. 1887] NEW SERIES Vol. XLIV. No. 2. THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1928. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE	PAGE	
NOTES OF THE WEEK . . . . .	13	ART SHOWS. By Leopold Spero . . . . .	20
The <i>Evening News</i> on Lord Melchett as the saviour of British capitalism in the world economy. THE NEW AGE as "inspirer" of policies. Mr. Auld in the <i>English Review</i> on the "Keynes school"—American exports and European debts.		Leicester Galleries. Goupil.	
THE CARLYLE TANGLE. By Scott Curfew . . . . .	17	THE SCREEN-PLAY. By David Ockham . . . . .	20
<i>Jane Welsh and Jane Carlyle</i> (Elizabeth Drew).		<i>The Wheel of Chance</i> . "The Talkies."	
THE DELINQUENT AS A PROBLEM IN ETHNOLOGY. By Neil Montgomery, D.P.M. . . . .	18	DRAMA. By Paul Banks . . . . .	21
<i>Autolycus, or the Future for Miscreant Youth</i> .		<i>To What Red Hell</i> . 77, Park Lane.	
VIEWS AND REVIEWS. Individuation. By R. M. . . . .	19	EASY PAYMENTS. By Gladys Boone, M.A. . . . .	22
<i>Two Contributions to Analytical Psychology</i> (Jung).		REVIEWS . . . . .	23
		<i>The Truth About Birth Control</i> (Scott). <i>Heraclitus, or the Future of Films</i> . <i>Solo</i> . <i>Giants in the Earth</i> . <i>Cagliostro</i> . <i>The Sink of Solitude</i> . <i>Circus Parade</i> . <i>The Mashona</i> .	
		LETTER TO THE EDITOR . . . . .	23
		From J. S.	

## NOTES OF THE WEEK.

In the concluding paragraphs of last week's Notes we described the *Daily Mail's* appreciation of Mr. McKenna, and also referred to Lord Melchett as belonging to the McKenna school of thought—both of them standing primarily for the maintenance of British industrial interests in the world's economy. It is therefore appropriate to commence this week's Notes by a reference to an appreciation of Lord Melchett by the *Evening News*. It appears in a leading article on November 1; and begins:—

"Lord Melchett is coming to be regarded in this country as the man who may yet lead us out of the financial wilderness. For that reason his every utterance dealing with the economic prosperity of our neighbours and our own lack of it commands the closest attention."

The rest of the article is a summary of views expressed by Lord Melchett in an interview given on the previous day when he arrived home from his tour in America. No verbatim quotations occur, so it is not certain how far Lord Melchett would endorse the leader writer's manner of presenting his views; but we should ourselves judge that the article conveys an accurate impression of their content. Even, if not, the article would be worth noticing, because the *Evening News* evidently endorses the point of view expressed in it. Let us assemble the facts first.

"Where the United States uses sixteen units of mechanical power, we in Britain use only one."

"America's population is two-and-a-half times that of Britain."

"The per capita production of the United States' worker is very much greater than that of the corresponding Briton. . . . It is known, for instance, that an American boot-machine operator's output is approximately three times that of a British operator using the same machine."

"In the United States £2,000,000,000 worth of goods are being permanently enjoyed on the hire-purchase system."

Discussing these facts; the *Evening News* explains that "the difference is not, of course, one of skill and

capacity," but that it rests on the "fundamentally different economic outlook of the two communities." The nature of the difference it indicates in this sentence: "Americans are not going to let production power stand idle for want of consumers. (Our italics.) In this country, it proceeds, "consumption, . . . still vigorously curtailed by Victorian traditions of thrift, sets the pace to production." (Our italics.) The concluding paragraph of the article is as follows:—

"It may be that competition in the world's markets will compel us to change our methods at home and make production power and not consumption power the test of our domestic industrial activities. It is not a change that will be made without much heart burning, and many prophecies of evil. For we are by temperament a nation of specialists, not mass producers, in all matters save the production of Britons; and to advise one generation to overspend its income in order that the next may have more to spend is to bring the whole hierarchy of the Golden Calf about our ears."

When we said, in a footnote to a correspondent's letter recently, that THE NEW AGE "inspires all policies having a Social Credit objective," some readers hastily gave this phrase a much too narrow interpretation: they assumed that the policies so inspired were policies to be devised and carried out by our own immediate supporters. But we intended to claim a much higher function than that. The above article is an illustration. In spite of its incomplete understanding of the fundamental issue there is no mistaking the objective toward which it is tending. Its ideas may not have been immediately or directly conveyed by THE NEW AGE, but that the inspiration is ours we cannot doubt. Fleet Street hears everything. What it lets out depends on circumstances. For ten years we have been insisting on the Social Credit interpretation of economics without producing any visible effect: for the same ten years we have been prophesying that the situation must produce the visible effect sooner or later. Fleet Street would have let it out. If publicists and leader-writers wish today to claim independent discovery of the truths we

have affirmed, good luck to them. What we are after is not the credit of converting them, but the gratification of seeing concrete results.

The function of THE NEW AGE is to deliver the current of Social Credit in bulk. After that, it is for every man and woman, according to kind, power, and opportunity, to transform it and transmit it on lower voltages suited to the needs of "consumers." That is why we adopt the sometimes irritating policy of "sticking to our last," of resisting doctrinal alliances or dilutions at the top. Down below—i.e., outside the generating station—the breaking-down of the current is permissible and helpful. Our uncompromising rigidity often creates misunderstandings; it probably suggests contempt for, or perhaps jealousy of, other reformers and teachers who are working along parallel lines. But we must risk this, because we feel more strongly than ever that the economic problem is the first that must be solved, and that the Social Credit proposals alone embrace all the factors necessary for its complete solution. This faith, we are confident, is shared by the majority of our readers, and all of these are speaking and working patiently under its inspiration. The Apostle Paul (nobody reads the Bible now) declared to Timothy:—

"For the which cause I also suffer these things: nevertheless I am not ashamed: for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him against that day."

"Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard from me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus."

"That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us."

This declaration and exhortation have their terrestrial application. They were uttered at the birth of an epoch. We live at the birth of another.

By this interlude we do not intend to imply that the *Evening News* article is the "finished goods." It is a sort of semi-manufacture, and its merit being that it is susceptible of completion in the right direction. As an illustration, take the statement that Americans are not going to let productive power stand idle for want of customers. What customers? If American operatives can turn out goods at a higher rate *per capita* than British operatives, that will be found in practice to mean that American operatives can create price-values more in excess of their incomes. By so doing they are creating the necessity for more consumers to be found outside America. Under the present financial system Lord Melchett's policy of getting Britain to follow America's example is only a patchwork policy. So far as it is successful on the economic plane it will precipitate a crash on the military plane. The reason is that while the banks might finance Lord Melchett's production scheme, they will do nothing to increase the external market for the surplus which will inevitably appear. So the ultimate result will be that troops and battleships must intervene to decide which nation shall monopolise the external markets that do exist. War is here seen to be a device used by capitalism to solve problems arising from the inefficiency or neglect of the financial system.

Lord Melchett and the *Evening News* will do well to go a step further and insist on the necessity for internal consumption to be increased at least at the same rate as they want to increase internal production. They ought to see quite clearly that the lower the proportion of total production that is consumed within a country the worse risks of war it runs when it increases its production; because the quantity of the surplus which seeks an outside market is *actually* greater. And what heightens the

risk is the well-established fact that the more greatly production is increased the less the proportion of it that is purchasable by the community who made it. This happens because the increased programme is not fulfilled by hiring more persons and remunerating them with incomes proportionately, but by employing machines and refraining from remunerating anybody for the work the machines do. Machines, by eliminating labourers, eliminate customers. That is a universal truth, but it is obscured by the fact that nations still hold the obsolete economic notion that if only they work hard enough, and pay their own people little enough, God will provide them with foreign customers. It is not a bad concept in itself that abstinence should be remunerated. But to leave the job to God in theory is to leave it to the banking system in practice. The result is that abstinence never is remunerated. The less you consume the less you may.

Again, the American hire purchase system is a patchwork policy. It does not mean, as the *Evening News* declares, that £2,000 millions worth of goods are being permanently enjoyed by American citizens. The only thing that might be permanent in the situation is the debt they have incurred. While the debt is being incurred all goes well; but "permanent" enjoyment of goods requires continuous increase of debt. That is not likely to happen even in America; and we should judge that the limit of debt on hire-purchase account has just about been reached. It may interest some of our readers to investigate the connection between the hire-purchase system and the enormous amount of American bank-credit tied up in brokers' loans. It would seem as though industrial securities based on being exchanged or held at nominal values based on the assumption that the profits earned during the building up of the hire-purchase consumer-debt represented an expectation of normal permanent future profit of the same dimensions. If so, such an expectation is doomed to be exploded, unless one can conceive the banks, having allowed consumers to anticipate next year's incomes in this year's purchasing, continuously to extend the point of spending until these consumers reach the point of earning this year the money they might be earning ten, twenty, or a hundred years later. Of course, it could be done, but not in that particular way. Once given that American industry were in a position to supply home consumers with goods equal in quantity to ten years of normal consumption, it could be maintained in that position; in which case the consumers could have ten times the usual quantity every year for ever. Under the present rules of finance this would mean an astronomical figure of debt; but, after all, it would only be a figure: and if, for any reason, it was held advisable not to account figures of such dimensions, the adoption of Social Credit price-regulation would meet that objection.

In normal times the deposits in banks do not materially fluctuate from year to year. That means that their loans and repayments during the year are roughly equal. One may picture them as pumping into productive industry, say, £100 a minute, and pumping it out again. Each £100 is created when pumped in, and destroyed when pumped out—leaving no evidence of its existence in the annual records of the banks. During the year the industrial borrowers make a certain quantity of goods, part of which they sell to their employees, and the rest of the retained portion they consume so much. The balance is their property, and consists chiefly in new factories and plant. Industry, as a whole, does not make a money profit. It cannot collect more money than it distributes. Industrial organisations can declare profits, but the figures they present in their

Profit and Loss Accounts always include valuations of stock, which are not money, but merely an estimate of future receipts of money—a totally different thing. Even so, Foster and Cutchings published (*Profits*) statistics for America showing that the aggregate reported profits of successful U.S. corporations in a year were counterbalanced by the aggregate reported losses of the unsuccessful. The real profit of industrialists is in terms of factories, plant, and stock. Whatever monetary value their accountants assign to this property, the equivalent money itself does not exist. Now the economic problem of to-day is that of how industrialists are going to dispose of their property. Productive plant has ultimately to be "delivered" to consumers (in the form of wear and tear) and the industrialists themselves are also consumers waiting to take their share. But under a money-economy this transference must be carried out by the use of money. So the problem is one of where the money is to come from and on what conditions. It must come from the banks. But not as loans for further production, because that would only initiate a repetition of the same process which led to the problem now to be solved. The alternative is a gift of bank-credit—and in practice a repetition of such gifts at regular intervals.

There are two orthodox objections to this; both fallacious. One is that the free credits would cause a continuous rise in prices. Alternatively, that if they did not raise prices, they would accumulate indefinitely, because they were free. But suppose the producers have a surplus of property valued at £1,000 (at cost; no profit added) and suppose also that this property is in consumable form (a supposition which does not affect the factors of price and money which are being examined). Now, since the producers are (ex hypothesi) unable to consume any portion at all of this property, but (together with consumers in general) are wishful to do so, and since the fulfilment of their wish is dependent on their receiving new gratuitous credit, and since the dispensing of such credit is at the discretion of the banking system; it is clear that the elements of a practical business deal are all present. The banking system might say to the producers for instance: "We will let your customers have £1,000. We will cause them to spend all the money with you. But first we want an understanding about what proportion of the property you will sell them for that money." The industrialists might say, for instance, three-quarters. Upon that, the banking system could create and issue the money to the community, and raise a debit against the producers. The producers would part with three-quarters of their property, retain one-quarter for their own consumption, and collect £1,000. They would repay the banking system and cancel the debit; whereupon the £1,000 would disappear. There would be no surplus goods and no surplus credit, and general consumption would have increased. For all practical purposes the effect would be as though a greater volume of production and consumption had been brought within the compass of the pre-existing credit, whatever it may have been.

This hypothetical case is not a description of a proposed working plan. Its object is to illustrate a principle, and to show that it is a psychologically workable principle as well as being adaptable, if necessary, to the banker's rigid idea that if he parts with any credit he must necessarily debit somebody with it and get it back again. It reveals incidentally the useful fact that consumer-credit is not a gift in the accepted connotation of the term; so that if any reader encounters psychological resistance when he speaks of it in that way, he can speak of it in the debit-credit way. The real "gift" is not the emission of the credit, but the economic consequences

resulting from its use. The desired consequences can be produced directly the Government and the banks decide to produce them. Whether they will do so from humane or prudential reasons remains to be seen: but that they will have to do so is certain.

The industrial system has one creditor—the banking system; and one customer—the consumer. These three: and the greatest of them is the consumer. He is a living creature with human needs: the other two are mechanisms. Whether it be a machine-mechanism, or an accounting-mechanism, he is properly the master and they the servants.

Mr. George P. Auld is allowed space in this month's *English Review* to present the American point of view on the Reparations problem. Mr. Auld was formerly Accountant-General of the Reparations Commission, and is the author of *The Dawes Plan and the New Economics* (not our "New Economics"—we cannot copyright our designations), so what he says must be taken as representing high authoritative opinion in the United States. He defends the Dawes Plan as being "morally well founded," and proceeds to attack the "Keynes school" for spreading the idea that the Plan cannot continue to work when the period of maximum payments arrives this autumn.

They tell us of a new economic something recently come into the laws of international exchange, called the transfer problem, which prevents a willing and solvent debtor from paying, or a willing and needy creditor from receiving, without harm to himself, the instalments on any international debt as large as the reparation debt."

He goes on to warn his readers that the "discoverers" of the transfer problem "are playing with forces of a highly explosive nature, both economic and political," and their ideas are a "body of doctrinaire theory possessing no solid foundation." (Our italics.)

Mr. Auld concentrates on the central issue, denying absolutely that exports from debtor nations are a necessary accompaniment of debt repayment, and that creditor nations have anything to fear from them. How is it, he challenges, that in pre-war days when England was creditor on world account in nearly twice the amount of the present position of the United States, that this mysterious new economic law did not operate? Then he gets down to his argument:—

"The fact is that international debts normally never have been paid by means of an export surplus. International debts arise solely as a consequence of the fact that the debtor countries possess no export surplus; and over long periods of years they are paid, as they mature, by the creation of fresh debt. Nothing could be more natural, healthy or profitable for all concerned than this cycle of world distribution of capital." (Our italics.)

It is misleading to call this process a cycle. A cycle may begin anywhere, but it ends up where it begins. Mr. Auld presents us with a half-cycle—capital flowing out, but never back.

"The world is divided at any given time into natural debtor countries and natural creditor countries. A natural debtor country is one whose current needs for capital for internal development or reconstruction exceed its annual savings—like the United States before the war, and Europe to-day. A natural creditor country is one whose current needs for capital at home are less than its annual savings—like Europe before the war, and the United States to-day. And the index of these needs lies in interest rates. Capital follows interest rates as the tides follow the moon. It is obedient to the law of supply and demand; and so to-day our surplus capital, the product of our industries, lent abroad by our investors, is flowing across the Atlantic in a steady stream.

Mr. Auld accordingly asserts that the "authentic export surplus" moves not from, but to, the debtor



## The Delinquent as a Problem in Ethnology.

After reading Dr. Gordon's excellent little book\* in the "To-day and To-morrow" series, I was left with the dispirited feeling that few of the reforms he suggests are likely to be carried out in this age of economy. Yet apart from such reforms in the social, medical, and educational environment of the delinquent, the author sees little hope. The main factor, the personality of the delinquent, he leaves to be eliminated by the "slow process of eugenic education."

One can hardly quarrel with this conclusion. On the contrary, one must even be grateful to Dr. Gordon for a useful definition of the delinquent personality, as compared with that of the neurotic.

"The neurotic is characterised by conflict within the ego, of the various impulses which go to make up the individual himself, while the delinquent is characterised by conflict between the ego and the environment."

Now the environment means the social conditions (in the widest sense) under which the individual lives, so that we may say that while the neurotic has a representative of the social order within his own ego, which is at war with his other personalities, such a social representative is entirely lacking in the delinquent. In searching for a possible explanation of this lack, the future of the delinquent becomes, for the moment, of less importance than his past.

There is another book in the same series, which, if read along with the present one, opens up an interesting, and possibly fruitful, line of speculation. I refer to Dr. F. G. Crookshank's "The Mongol in Our Midst." While primarily concerned with the subject of Mongolism, this book embodies a brilliant and ably defended ethnological thesis, which is briefly as follows: In every nation of Europe individuals may be found whose facial expression and posture, along with certain morphological and psychological peculiarities, show them to be allied to one of three non-European races. These may be called the White, the Yellow, and the Black, or, more correctly, the Semitic, the Mongolian, and the Negro races. Thus we find in Europe definitely Semitic, Mongoloid, or Negroid types. Further, these peculiarities are faithfully reflected in the differences among three of the anthropoid apes, viz., the chimpanzee, the orang, and the gorilla respectively. Lastly, the same peculiar differences are found in exaggerated form in certain inmates of European asylums, viz., the Praecox, Dement, the Mongolian idiot, and the (rare) Ethiopian idiot—again in the same order. Thus Dr. Crookshank concludes that man has a polyphyletic origin from chimpanzoid, orangoid, and gorilloid stems, and that the types of "idiot" mentioned represent reversions towards one or other of these ancestral types. If so, the possibility of an ethnic classification of amentia, so long scouted by the authorities, would appear to be coming into its own at last.

Possibly, too, the delinquent may be in a similar position. He, too, may be an evolutionary throw-back, not so marked, of course, as the asylum types, but sufficiently so to explain his inability to adapt himself to a society whose standards are simply incomprehensible to him.

From this point of view it is significant that Dr. Crookshank finds the morphological variations of the three great apes closely associated with differences in their endocrine gland-balance, while Dr.

\* "Autolycus, or the Future for Miscreant Youth." By R. G. Gordon, M.D., D.Sc., F.R.C.P.Ed. (Kegan Paul 2s. 6d.)

Grimberg (Emotion and Delinquency) traces the instability of the delinquent also to malfunctioning of the endocrine system, and further the latter author is struck by the large proportion of delinquents who spring from Jewish and other non-Anglo-Saxon stocks.

In seeking for the immediate cause of the evolutionary throw-back, we naturally look for some factor which has caused the developing organism to hesitate in its growth—to stammer, so to speak, in its self-expression. Thus, for example, with regard to mongolism, we can still agree with those authorities who emphatically deny the ethnic view, and attribute the condition to such factors as parental syphilis and debility.

We should, indeed, expect such intra-uterine factors to be the more numerous, since the embryo is more susceptible to developmental checks than is the organism at any time after birth. Nevertheless, we must not lose sight of the possibility of post-natal factors. Take, for instance, one of Dr. Gordon's types of delinquent—that which suffers from the after-effects of that protean disease, lethargic encephalitis, and whose delinquency subsequently marked—only makes its appearance subsequent to the disease. It seems natural, at first sight, to attribute the delinquency wholly to the disease, yet even here it may yet turn out that the latter is not the only factor, although it may be the determining one. At any rate, apart from the clinical history, I have found great difficulty in distinguishing between certain forms of post-encephalitis on the one hand and catatonic dementia praecox on the other, and I well remember hearing, when a student, three eminent specialists diagnose a case variously as (a) post-encephalitic parkinsonism; (b) dementia praecox, and (c) thyroid insufficiency.

There is also another special class of delinquent which Dr. Gordon notices, namely, the juvenile general paralytic. The overwhelming tendency of modern psychiatry is to regard general paralysis as simply cerebral syphilis. Yet Dr. J. S. Bolton, of Wakefield, has shown in a series of masterly researches that

"the normal person, or the non-dementable lunatic, may suffer from cerebral syphilis with impunity so far as general paralysis is concerned."

So that even in this, the stronghold of materialist psychiatry, we see that the syphilis alone is not sufficient to produce the disease, which only occurs in the presence of another and inborn factor, viz., the tendency towards dementia.

Let us, by all means, therefore, study these "external" immediate factors, and where possible avoid them. But it would seem that if we are really to help the delinquent substantially we must also gain sympathetic understanding of the biological laws of his being, and I submit that ethnology presents a hopeful means to this end. Knowledge so gained ought to prevent haphazard and foolish attempts either in education or correction. To misquote Blake, "One law for the chimpanzoid and the orangoid is, oppression."

Yet, when (if ever) Autolycus has been thoroughly "psychoed," when his ale has been properly doped with hormotone, and he has been restrained by the fear of God and a starched collar from "snapping up our unconsidered trifles," we may perhaps be forgiven a sigh for the Winter's Tales which will have lost their savour.

NEIL MONTGOMERY, D.P.M.

"New York is now the money centre of the world. The Federal Reserve system is the most potential influence in the world to-day."—Louis T. McFadden, Chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, reported in the *Financial Chronicle*, October 6, 1928.

## Views and Reviews.

### INDIVIDUATION.

This book\*, written over twelve years ago, has been revised and re-written. For this reason it is as clear an exposition of analytical psychology as is conceivably possible. When an explorer on a growing branch of discovery takes his expression of ten years ago, and hews and mends until it is true for today, he inevitably creates a work where no word is wasted and none short. The English translation by H. C. and E. F. Baynes is a testimony to the worth of co-operative effort in such an undertaking. The only doubt which assails one while reading the book is whether it is possible for any student to grasp Jung without first having grasped Freud. Jung was steeped in psycho-analysis before he arrived at his own characteristic viewpoint. He was for a long time, so to speak, Freud before he became Jung. In these two essays he gives the student the best of help by taking a dream and analysing it first as Freud would do it, next as Adler would do it, and finally as he, Jung, would do it. He concludes:—

"In the neurosis of a youthful introvert, the psychological theory of Adler seldom fails, and in the treatment of the youthful extravert it is always advisable, indispensable indeed, to take full account of the Freudian standpoint, especially of the sexual theory."

His fairness to the men who are regarded as his rivals, evident here, distinguishes his work as a whole. On this ground alone Jung would seem to be the nearest to personal "detachment." He is least dominated by the atmosphere of rivalry.

It is a common misunderstanding among persons for whom Jung's method of exposition is apparently too concentrated, and some of his views too subjective, to regard him as a mystic. His protest against this on the ground that he deals only with phenomena which anyone may observe is justified. "God is a fact in the mind whether existing in the Heavens or not." It is natural, however, that those who have not adventured so far into the human psyche should regard some of Jung's accounts of it as travellers' tales. Indeed, his psychology is for explorers only. Any one who needs a final, closed, system of psychology, leaving no further questions to solve, and, indeed, no further growth to be accomplished by the object of inquiry itself, had better avoid Jung. As he says with some vehemence, he is not merely a pathologist, he is a psychologist, interested in both the knowledge and the development of the mind, conscious no less than unconscious. This would be Jung's danger—that he might be tempted to regard patients as material for the advancement of psychology rather than as sick persons to be cured at the earliest possible moment. He would, in fact, judging from his work, be more attracted by patients intelligent enough to take an interest in what was going on than by the incapacitated who merely wanted to get back to their jobs. Those would be Adler's patients by right.

Giving a critical account of the Freudian attitude Jung truly says:—

"The Freudian doctrine of repression does indeed seem to apply only to men who are too moral, and who suppress their instinctive, unmoral natures. The unmoral man who lives his instincts without restraint should accordingly be quite immune to neurosis. . . . Such a man may be quite as neurotic as the other type. If we analyse him we find that it is simply decency that has come under repression. When an unmoral man is neurotic he presents, in Nietzsche's striking phrase, the picture of the 'pale felon' who does not stand upon the same level as his deed."

\* "Two Contributions to Analytical Psychology." By C. E. Jung, M.D., LL.D. (Baillere, Tindall and Cox. 10s. 6d.)

Thus, while the excessively moral may be diagnosed as neurotic both in behaviour and in trying to impose his harsh fear-discipline on all around him, the non-moral is equally neurotic if he wishes in private that he could sustain some of the self-laceration of spirit which the over-moral one bears. Certainly the Adler attitude for dealing with either of them is likely to produce far more immediate resistance—and therefore ultimate benefit—than the Freudian, necessary as the Freudian is for the young self-righteous prig who makes himself ill by fleeing from the sexuality of the world and at the same time heaping it up in his unconscious. In either case, as Adler contends, the craving for a joy-destroying power is the drawing force of the neurotic. In the case of the self-righteous one it is obvious that he is congratulating the god within him that he is not as other men are. So is the non-moral one—only the other men are the harshly moral ones. Who has not met "un-morality" which was a mere gesture of exuberance of spirit which the maker could not afford to keep up? And who has not met the superior critic of the wickedness of the world who obviously envied it in the dark? Thus the Freudian technique is liable to produce a misunderstanding. The sympathy of the analyst, and his interest in the scandal dragged out of the unconscious, creates in the patient that sense of being the focus of attention so detrimental to him. Freudian analysis can easily become that form of confession nearest to boasting. No wonder breaking the transference—the fixation of the patient on the physician developed during analysis—is such a problem for the Freudians.

Jung considers both the methods of Freud and Adler "reductive," and contrasts them with the "constructive." By the Freudian method all that dream association can drag out is brought to consciousness, until the patient sees for himself that his fear, obsession, or compulsion is traceable to wish-fulfilment, generally to wish-fulfilment of incest relationship with the parent of opposite sex. Adler "reduces" until the "fictive power-goal" of the patient is laid bare, and the patient perceives that he is making demands which a world also possessing rights cannot be expected to satisfy. Afterwards, of course, by Adler's method, the patient is, as far as possible, re-educated so as to gain a necessary self-esteem from the development of a more sociable attitude of mind, a justified self-esteem, reasonable, moderate, and in accordance with social common-sense. Jung's method is subjective in that it aims at diagnosing round what images in the unconscious the "libido"—that is, the vital psychic energy—is imprisoned. If a person is neurotic, and if vitality is conceivably present at all, that vitality must be "constructive" object of analysis is to set it free so that it can be utilised for the deliberately chosen and conscious purposes of the patient. It may, in the unconscious, be misappropriated by the mother image, or the father-image. It may be misappropriated by the collective unconscious, re-animating myths, and thus producing archaic thoughts or conduct. In the personal unconscious it may produce morbid fears. Wherever it is, the analyst must release it, and his progress can be gauged by the changing character of the patient's dreams as revealed under analysis.

From this very brief and very concentrated account, it will be evident that Jung looks upon the unconscious differently from either Freud or Adler. For Freudians the unconscious contains all the unpleasant and morally reprehensible memories of the individual. Whether it may contain even womb-memories is not negated. It ceaselessly stimulates the consciousness with infantile repressed longings, the repressions of the day reinforcing the associated





**BRITISH SONG WRITERS.**

We are prepared to consider Lyrics, Songs, and Musical Compositions of every description with a view to publication. Send MSS. Dept. 2029, Peter Derek, Ltd., 106, Charing Cross Road, London, W.C.2.

**"THE AGE OF PLENTY**

and New Economist Review."

NOVEMBER NUMBER ON SALE  
INCLUDES

**'YOUR MONEY AND YOUR LIFE!'**

By JOHN HARGRAVE.

A Brilliant Presentation of Social Credit Economics.

Price 2d. (post free). Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d.  
Obtainable direct from THE PUBLISHER,  
12, GRANTHAM ST., COVENTRY.

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

**SET A.**

Comprising:—

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

Post free 6d. the set.

**SET B.**

Comprising:—

Set "A" above.  
The Veil of Finance (6d.).

Post free 1s. the set.

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

**The Social Credit Movement.**

Supporters of the Social Credit Movement contend that under present conditions the purchasing power in the hands of the community is chronically insufficient to buy the whole product of industry. This is because the money required to finance capital production, and created by the banks for that purpose, is regarded as borrowed from them, and, therefore, in order that it may be repaid, is charged into the price of consumers' goods. It is a vital fallacy to treat new money thus created by the banks as a repayable loan, without crediting the community, or the strength of whose resources the money was created, with the value of the resulting new capital resources. This has given rise to a defective system of national loan accountancy, resulting in the reduction of the community to a condition of perpetual scarcity, and bringing them face to face with the alternatives of widespread unemployment of men and machines, as at present, or of international complications arising from the struggle for foreign markets.

The Douglas Social Credit Proposals would remedy this defect by increasing the purchasing power in the hands of the community to an amount sufficient to provide effective demand for the whole product of industry. This, of course, cannot be done by the orthodox method of creating new money, prevalent during the war, which necessarily gives rise to the "vicious spiral" of increased currency, higher prices, higher wages, higher costs, still higher prices, and so on. The essentials of the scheme are the simultaneous creation of new money and the regulation of the price of consumers' goods at their real cost of production (as distinct from their apparent financial cost under the present system). The technique for effecting this is fully described in Major Douglas's books.

Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to "THE NEW AGE PRESS."

**CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY****Books and Pamphlets on Social Credit.**

- ADAMS, W.  
Real Wealth and Financial Poverty. 7s. 6d.
- BRENTON, ARTHUR.  
Social Credit in Summary. 1d.  
The Key to World Politics. 1d.  
Through Consumption to Prosperity. 2d.  
The Veil of Finance. 6d.
- DOUGLAS, C. H.  
Economic Democracy. 6s.  
Credit Power and Democracy. 7s. 6d.  
The Control and Distribution of Production. 7s. 6d.  
Social Credit. 7s. 6d.  
These Present Discontents: The Labour Party and Social Credit. 1s.  
The Engineering of Distribution. 6d.  
Unemployment and Waste. 1d.  
Canada's Bankers and Canada's Credit (Reprint of Major Douglas's Evidence at the Government Enquiry in Ottawa). 2s. 6d.  
The World After Washington. 6d.  
Great Britain's Debt to America: Method for Repayment. (A reprint of Major Douglas's suggestions to the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, in 1922.) 1/2d.
- DUNN, E. M.  
The New Economics. 4d.  
Social Credit Chart. 1d.
- GALLOWAY, C. F. J.  
Poverty Amidst Plenty. 6d.
- HATTERSLEY, C. MARSHALL.  
The Community's Credit. 5s.  
Men, Money and Machines. 6d.
- POWELL, A. E.  
The Deadlock in Finance. 5s.
- SHORT, N. DUDLEY.  
It's Like This. 6d.
- SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT (Symposium by members).  
Social Credit and Economic Democracy. 6d.
- TUKE, J. E.  
Outside Eldorado. 3d.
- YOUNG, W. ALLEN  
Dividends for All. 6d.

**Critical and Constructive Works on Finance and Economics.**

- CHASTENET, J. L.  
The Bankers' Republic. 6s. [Translated by C.H. Douglas.]
- DARLING, J. F.  
Economic Unity of the Empire: Gold and Credit. 1s.
- FOSTER, W. T., and CATCHINGS, W.  
Profits. 17s.  
Business Without a Buyer. 10s.
- HORRABIN, J. F.  
The Plebs Atlas. 1s.  
An Outline of Economic Geography. 2s. 6d.
- MARTIN, P. W.  
The Flaw in the Price System. 4s. 6d.  
The Limited Market. 4s. 6d.
- MCKENNA, RT. HON. REGINALD.  
Post-War Banking Policy. 7s. 6d.
- SODDY, Professor F., M.A.  
Cartesian Economics. 6d.  
The Inversion of Science. 6d.

**Instructional Works on Finance and Economics.**

- BARKER, D. A.  
Cash and Credit. 3s.
- COUSENS, HILDERIC (Editor).  
Pros and Cons. A Guide to the Controversies of the Day. 2s. 6d.
- HILTON, J.P.  
Britain's First Municipal Savings Bank. 1s. 6d.

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

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70 High Holborn, London, W.C.1, and printed for him by THE ARGUS PRESS, Temple Avenue and Tudor Street, London, E.C.4