

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 1943] NEW SERIES Vol. XLVI. No. 5. THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1929. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	49	MUSIC. By Kaikhosru Sorabji	56
Mr. Tom Shaw on War-Loan interest—the recipients have "no right to one-third of it." Our reaction to abortionism.		The Labour Government's Copyright Bill. Rachmaninov. Courtald Concert.	
A MODERNIST OF SOCIALISM. By Maurice B. Reckitt	52	THE SCREEN PLAY. By David Ockham	57
<i>The Next Ten Years in British Social and Economic Policy.</i> (Cole.)		<i>Drifters. En Rade.</i>	
THE JEWS AND CHRISTIAN CIVILISATION. By S. P. Abrams	54	THE UNWANTED CHILD (Jonathan Swift, 1729)	57
<i>The Jews in the Christian era from the First to the Eighteenth Centuries.</i> (Magnus.)		LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	58
DRAMA. By Paul Banks	55	From "First Nighter," W.S., "Science Student," F. J. Gould, Kaikhosru Sorabji, George Ryley Scott, and Roger Anderton.	
<i>Tunnel Trench. The School for Scandal. The Comic Artist.</i>		ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT	59
		To J. F. J. (Safeguarding Exporting).	

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Mr. Tom Shaw's reference to War-Loan interest in the House of Commons last week evidently touched a nerve somewhere. His speech was made on the Monday evening, and on the opening of the market on Tuesday morning several gilt-edged securities were marked down. The explanation given by writers in the newspapers was that the Stock Exchange anticipated some nervousness among the investing public, and therefore wrote down prices to forestall a possible selling-movement. This does not sound at all probable. We should say that there is practically no such animal as the "investing public" where gilt-edged securities are concerned. The holdings of private individuals would account for such a tiny fraction of the total of all holdings that the market need not have been affected had they all unloaded them. The bulk of the securities are mass-holdings belonging to the banks, insurance companies, and other financial and commercial institutions strong enough to accumulate reserves in this readily-negotiable form. The reason for the writing-down in this case was the same as that for the writing-down of the sterling-exchange when Sir Montagu Barlow hinted, a year or two ago, that the Conservative Government were intending to put something like £200,000,000 at the disposal of British industrialists for reconstruction purposes. That is to say that these fluctuations in money-values and stock-values are not caused by public nervousness, but are deliberately manipulated for the purpose of creating public nervousness, the appearance of which is then utilised to point the moral that it is dangerous for politicians to interfere in the money-business. It is because financial interests possess the power of doing this that a London financial newspaper was able to threaten Mr. Lloyd George some years ago that the City could destroy any Government which meddled with credit-policy.

THE NEW AGE represents instructed opinion on finance, but only a layman's opinion on all other things. Major Douglas once said: "You can't af-

ford to run more than one stunt at a time." One bee in the bonnet is enough for one journal. We have given the abortionists a good show for three weeks, and between them they have, we presume, covered the main grounds of their advocacy.

We must confess that the only enlightenment that we have received on the subject is the evidence it reveals of the intensity with which its advocates write about it. Evidently its importance assumes such dimensions in their minds that they—though all of them with the possible exception of Mrs. Megroz are familiar with the Social Credit analysis and proposals—think that THE NEW AGE ought to assist them in breaking down opposition to the legislation of abortion. We do not admit this. Life is short, and we have quite enough to do to maintain our challenge of financial axioms without fathering crusades against any others, or, conversely, identifying ourselves with every tendency of thought that may run parallel to our own. We have, at various times, been reproved by various readers for belittling the importance of (a) Christian sentiment; (b) Freethought sentiment; (c) Anti-feminism (we were offered a regular substantial subsidy on one occasion to allow the conduct of an anti-feminist campaign in THE NEW AGE); (d) Feminism; (e) Anti-Semitism; (f) Psycho-analysis; (g) Christian Science; (h) Spiritualism—not to speak of suggested stimulants to our effectiveness as "the abolition of interest," the "single tax," "anti-profiteering," etc., etc. In all these cases the people who offered us their advice on what our policy should be were, we have every reason to believe, moved by the best intentions; but if we had adopted any one of the proposals we should have been creating disunion among our supporters, while if we had adopted the lot (if that were conceivable) we do not care to think what would have happened to us. We might even have received the Freedom of the City of London.

We freely concede that there are groups of evils or anomalies in every direction, each of which needs

special investigation with the object of finding its remedy. But these are too many and diverse to be treated, with the necessary thoroughness, by one journal or one group of students. It has been necessary, as a practical proposition, to decide in what order of priority these evils ought to be attended to. For good or evil THE NEW AGE was led to concentrate on the financial flaw in the economic system. We need not enumerate the reasons: we gave some last week, and many others are only too familiar to those who have followed our comments on public affairs for the last six years. Now, it is impossible to concentrate intently on one group of evils without appearing to be callous towards others, especially those which appear to be outside the orbit of our chosen constructive reform. Notwithstanding this disadvantage it will be generally conceded that there is no reform which denies direct mitigation to so few of the evils that agitate reformers in general as does Social Credit. Its horizon visibly encircles most of the pain of the world. And we believe that it is only because of the convexity of the field of survey that the whole of the pain is not within the orbit of our vision.

We have said that on all subjects of reform or knowledge outside our own we speak as laymen. Representing, as we do, a mixed body of readers we cannot do more. To us all the ingenious analysis of what constitutes "nature" or "human nature" that appears in the abortionist theses is confusing, which is the same as saying that it is not convincing. It tends to foster rather than dissipate "prejudice" because it makes people feel that the unanswerable logic of the abortionists is a matter of clever dialectics. It throws upon people the onus of studying biology, obstetrics, psychology and other branches of science before they can say yes or no to the proposition. The alternative is for them to take the evidence on faith. But before people will take up the study which is to change their prejudices they must already have abandoned them, at least in part. And before they will take evidence on trust they must have abandoned them wholly. So, quite irrespective of the intrinsic validity of the proposition, the tactics of the abortionists in addressing themselves to the public along this line seem to be misdirected.

Moreover, be the case for abortion ever so convincing, we see no prospect of its being legalised under the present financial system against the assent of the financial government. But if with its consent the law will be so drafted and administered as to frustrate the humane intentions of the abortionists. No regular reader of this journal, we hope, is so innocent as to suppose that the object of the legislation would be to abolish hardships and save life: the object would be to abolish expense and save money. It is all very well for our correspondents to talk about the right of every woman to avoid bearing a child when she does not want to do so, but one has to consider the right of every woman to have a child when she does not object to bearing it. If abortion were legalised at present, administrators of Unemployment Insurance Funds would be able to require that the wives of men on the dole who became pregnant should submit to the operation in order to keep the dependants' allowances within certain limits. To any abortionist who objects that they would not dare to make such scandalous conditions for relief we answer that the one thing which could scare them off would be public sentiment, that is to say, the very "prejudice" which the abortionist now derides as an obstacle to the reform. If one conceived such prejudice to have been dissipated, and the public to have assented without instinctive repugnance to the practice, there would be no logical

answer to the case which the custodians of the Insurance Fund could state for imposing the condition. They could plead almost every sentence in the pro-abortionist correspondence which appears in this issue of THE NEW AGE—they could urge that the operation was harmless (in the first three months); that it was short, simple and painless; that it obviated overcrowding; that it reduced the financial strain on the parents (the dole allowed for a baby being so much less than the cost of rearing a baby); that in most cases the expectant mother might be, for all anybody knew to the contrary, a narcissist, or perhaps organically or automatically unfitted to bear the child; and so on and so on with such effect as to bring on the resistant mother the same weight of public contempt as was borne by the "conscientious objector" during the war.

Again, with respect to the freedom of the mother to please herself about bearing a child, would she be free from coercion by her own relatives? We ask any experienced woman to reflect on the number of cases where, at present, these relatives say "What a pity; you can't afford it," and depressing things like that—all of which would tend, under a system of legalised abortion, to worry the expectant mother towards resorting to this expedient when she would otherwise prefer to bear the ill she knew rather than risk those that might lurk in the cure. And if, in addition it so happened that her relatives were rendering a little financial assistance to her home, as occurs in a tremendous number of cases, frequently at some real sacrifice on their part, she would feel it her duty to resort to abortion. In doing so she would in most cases labour under the panic which most people suffer at the thought of any operation at all, not to speak of the outraging of modesty involved in the contemplation of this one.

We are not straining our objections when we relate them to cases of poor or comparatively poor mothers, for it is only these who would be exposed to coercion of this kind. Rich women would be able to exercise their choice in accordance with their instinct. In fact, they can do so now; it is only a question of their going to Holland or Belgium, which means that they can get what they want by paying for it. Nobody would legalise abortion here to save them expense.

On the question of expense there is one statement in the correspondence* which deserves notice. It is that the operation involves "profound disturbance of the psyche" and that therefore the patient ought to have psychological treatment for the whole period from its date until the date when parturition would have been due. Since, according to the same writer, the operation should take place in the first three months to avoid physical danger, the psychological treatment must last for at least six months. If this is so it raises two questions: Are all patients to pay the benefit of the treatment? If so who is to pay the practitioners? The answer to the first involves consideration of the nature of the psyche. If it is a property of human nature which does not manifest itself below, let us say, the £1,000-a-year income level, the problem is simple. The patient pays. And so it is if poverty renders the psyche immune from disturbance. But assuming that the risk of psychological disturbance is a common one, and assuming agreement that every woman has the right to be protected from it, then undoubtedly the State would have to find a substantial amount of money to finance the abortionist reform. The expense for the initial operation, too, would not be so negligible as it may

*In a long article by Mr. T. J. Faithfull for which we cannot afford space.

appear, provided that the policy was to make it as little repugnant as possible to the patient. There would probably be a large demand for the services of women anaesthetists and women doctors in addition to (possibly) women psychologists. It would of course be a very pleasant experience for these women to be presented with new opportunities of making an income and at the same time performing a social service, and if we met with any evidence that they were at the bottom of the agitation for legalising abortion we should be trifling with the truth to express any surprise. This, however, is a digression from the important point of where the money is to come from to pay them.

We think that even if the Government were neutral on the proposal as such, this financial consideration alone would decide it against. It would reflect that the taxable capacity of the country was fully engaged by current expenses, and would therefore only sponsor what it called a self-supporting scheme. Abortion may be a paying proposition—in fact, we showed last week how the immediate monetary benefits accruing to parents by family-limitation must ultimately be diverted to the State—but it is not anywhere near the top of the list. Even if we thoroughly accepted all the arguments of the abortionists we should grudge every ounce of energy and every penny expended in pressing for legislation while the present financial system lasts. And certainly we should not press it on the lay public, however intelligent, without first having secured the support of recognised authoritative medical opinion. It is difficult enough to convert lay opinion in the teeth of authoritative opinion when—as in the case of financial reform—the public's initial attitude is one of cold incredulity: but the attempt is hopeless in the case of a proposal whose first mention evokes emotional hostility. We have not an earthly idea of what our correspondents hope to effect by talking at such length in THE NEW AGE. Many of their conclusions will naturally not be accepted merely on their authority. And too much of their argument is adduced simply to prove that their opponents are unable to rationalise their repugnance. One correspondent has suggested that if we print his opinions we should send copies of THE NEW AGE to certain scientific authorities and to the medical press—evidently appointing us the advertising agents of a "Society for the Promotion of Abortion." We do not fancy ourselves in that role. Our correspondents should do what other groups of our readers have done, and form a society of people who care about investigating the matters in question.

The same correspondent states that the law already allows a medical practitioner to perform the operation in any case where he considers that the welfare of the mother requires it. So things are not so bad after all. The law having reposed the responsibility of judgment in the doctors it is pretty clear that the logical course for the abortionists is to direct their propaganda on them. Doctors are the first people who ought to be consulted because it is their profession that would be called upon to function under a wider scheme. If the medical journals and other publications boycott the wider proposals when brought before them, we are not able to see how the obstacle can be overcome by their occasional appearance in a lay journal. At least, supposing it did something in that direction, the rate of progress would be even slower than that of the Social Credit proposals.

There is a disposition in some quarters to urge that because THE NEW AGE stands for individual

freedom in the economic field it should stand for other freedoms as well. The "freedom" we stand for is not a freedom comparable to "the freedom of a woman to do what she likes with her body": it is not specifically a freedom at all. We are advocating the removal of economic restrictions on "freedoms" however and wherever exercised. We have never believed in unconditional freedom for anybody. We believe in changing the principle on which the freedom of the individual is conditioned. We cordially agree that Social Credit will not necessarily abolish every limitation of freedom in every direction. All it does is to enable the individual freedom of everybody to be conditioned by the individual freedoms of everybody else, without the general restriction on all freedoms now imposed from above by a section of society who have no right to the power they exercise. Under the present system of super-restriction few individuals are able to realise what it is that they really wish to do. The question of the freedom of a woman to do what she likes about abortion is very remote from the freedom that we advocate. So remote that, as formulated, we deny it. The freedom of the individual, practically applied, includes the freedom to impose restraints on others as well as the freedom to resist restraints upon himself. Just as, in economics, the desires of the consumers will decide the general character of production, so in politics the desires of individual subjects will decide the general character of legislation. But just as an individual will not always necessarily get exactly what he wants in the economic field, neither will he necessarily always be able to do exactly what he wishes in the social field. The difference will be that citizens will shut the bankers out and decide these matters according to their prejudices. What they will do is unknown. We can say what we think they ought to do, but what we say amounts in the end to much the same thing as speculations about the Hereafter. To quarrel about how freedom shall be shared out as between citizens before we have got it is as senseless as to quarrel over the dividing up of money before we have got it. Freedom, in the mystico-moral sense in which reformers use the word, is the bud of a plant whose roots are purchasing-power. The bud is not open yet. It might open if you pick it and put it in water; but it might wither first, and it would certainly wither afterwards. The policy of Social Credit is to lift the complete plant.

If we were pre-occupied with sex-matters we should concentrate on investigating the predisposing causes of the "hard cases" on which the advocacy of abortion is based. Most of them, it is commonly agreed, will disappear at the coming of economic security for the individual. As for the remainder we have not seen one item enumerated which cannot be shown to be a derivative, in some aspect, from economic insecurity. Rape, incest, organic and anatomical derangements, "narcissism" and all the rest are in this category. But there is no object in further elaborating our views in this journal. In our experience most people who go in for sex-reform are obsessed with it—they cannot get away from it. They can, of course, say the same thing about us. And we admit it. We have already stated that we have chosen Social Credit as our prime objective, and we are only concerned with other people's objectives insofar as we can exploit their facts and arguments for our own purposes. That is to say, we are prejudiced. We are opposed to the legalisation of abortion, right or wrong, before the adoption of a Social-Credit financial policy. Whether we shall be opposed to it or not afterwards depends upon circumstances which are unpredictable. As a matter of fact there will not be a "we" to decide "our" attitude. "We"

shall retire and mind our own business. THE NEW AGE will pass into the hands of youngsters who want to put a divine shape to our rough-hewing. ("Give me the wings of a dove. . . Far away, far away would I roam. . . In the wilderness build me a nest. . . And there be for ever at rest.") We shall have had enough of the job.

The heart of the "Notes" has missed a beat this week. Let the abortionists answer for it.

A Modernist of Socialism.

By Maurice B. Reckitt.

I have observed that when I have asked my friends, "Have you seen Cole's new book?"* they have replied more often "I've got it" than "I've read it." The form of the reply is significant, and the grounds for it must provide some justification for the tardy appearance of this review. Mr. Cole has attempted a large—some will think an impossible—task, the revision of Socialist theory and policy to meet the new situation, political, economic, intellectual and psychological, of the post-war world. The result is naturally a trifle formidable; well over 400 closely printed and closely reasoned pages, encyclopaedic in range, if a shade monotonous in style. It is one thing to command the respect of one's readers, as Mr. Cole's conscientiousness of purpose and astonishing scope and volume of information must do; it is another to secure their attention. And one student certainly, on reaching the middle of this book and finding a chapter beginning "It is perhaps time to pause and consider . . ." obeyed at any rate the first part of this injunction so literally that "three months elapsed" (as they say in the theatre) before he resumed his task.

It was a dereliction of duty in which stronger spirits will not follow him—and should not. For the book demands to be read as a whole since it is conceived and executed as a whole, and upon this fact and the success with which it has been carried out Mr. Cole is to be particularly congratulated. The very attempt to envisage the social problem as a single whole is a testimony to that honesty which the author, not only in his naïve and self-revealing preface, but with rather unnecessary insistence in other parts of the book, claims for himself. Mr. Cole had spent so much of his life in correcting what he felt to be this or that false emphasis of another with an often disproportionate emphasis of his own, that his name had become something of a synonym for idiosyncrasy in the movement to which he has always been at heart so passionately and even irrationally attached. "Good-bye to all that," says Mr. Cole in effect, "it is time to grow up"; and this book is put forward "as a contribution that has suffered from the isolation of its author, and in the belief that this isolation must be broken down if good thinking is to be done." Or good action either, we may add, since this book seems clearly to presage the plunge into a political career. For all its boldness—and in some respects, notably in the scale upon which policy is envisaged, the book really is bold—there lies heavy over it the "responsibility" of the practical politician. "Suppose I were in power, what then?"—that is the question Mr. Cole is really answering to that "inner voice" to which he refers in his Preface. It is a perfectly reasonable question; Mr. Cole has at any rate more knowledge and ability than ninety per cent. of those who rule in the councils of his party. He is clearly the Elisha of British Socialism now that its Fabian Elijah has ascended to the political Nirvana of the House of Lords. But "responsibility," while often a salutary, is seldom an emancipating influence; it is too close to respectability for that. And the spirit of our English

*The Next Ten Years in British Social and Economic Policy. By G. D. H. Cole. (Macmillan.) 15s.

economic opposition, so primly nourished at Cambridge and the London School of Economics, is very respectable indeed, and without aligning oneself therewith no man may hope for the favour of contemporary Labourism, none can expect a finger in the pie in "the next ten years."

Perhaps for this reason, then, this book, despite much that is original in it, reads more than any previous book of its author's like the work of an imprisoned mind. Conscience has not made a coward of Mr. Cole, but it has gone far to make a Fabian of him. His intelligence is subdued by the mould of the economic system he would fain be at work upon. In devotion to what is conceived to be practical, Mr. Cole displays an almost morbid horror of "cranks." He draws back the skirts of his clothing from Communist cranks; Distributist cranks (the whole book assumes an abridgement of discretion for the individual at the hands of centralised "commissions" and National Boards); craftsmanship cranks (there is not a hint from beginning to end that the technique of modern industrialism places an intolerable strain upon many of those condemned to become the tools of it); anti-imperialist cranks; "rural restoration" cranks, and—most conspicuously, of course—currency cranks. It is a strange development for the guild idealist, the protagonist of "industrial freedom," the arch-enemy of those Collectivist Webbs, whom we now find among those who "have helped me greatly." No book written in this spirit of disdainful exclusiveness can provide us with that social synthesis of which the next ten years are plainly in need. To be practical does not mean leaving all the heavy stones unturned for fear of what we may find under them; without large changes of orientation and organisation small reforms will give us, as Mill rightly declared, "not small results, but no results." Mr. Cole will naturally deny that it is small changes which he is content to propose, and some of his suggestions are certainly widespread enough in their scope—perhaps sometimes needlessly so. But is he proposing to dig his foundations deeply enough in these next ten years? "I did feel the need to start thinking again as near as I could to fundamentals." It is, indeed, much to find that need recognised by one of the calibre of Mr. Cole. But the task seems to have been but half done; our author has not got near enough.

None the less, there is very much in the book which one does not need to be a Labourite of any shade to welcome and applaud. For example, the thoroughness with which Mr. Cole demonstrates how the pre-war interpretations of Socialism fail to meet the post-war situation. After the war, he says, the "Labour conception of a new world was that of a world that should satisfy pre-war claims." But "even revolutionaries in pre-war days really took the stability of the capitalist order for granted," and to-day "the Socialists are not encouraged by the growing difficulties of capitalism; they are frightened of them," since "the campaign for social ownership was waged on the assumption of capitalist prosperity." The opposite assumption not having been foreseen in the "boom of prices" that followed the war, with its extinction, "many of the new recruits dropped away . . . because they ceased to believe that in the world of politics anything of importance was being prepared," and little enough has happened since to destroy that impression. Mr. Cole accepts "rationalisation," perhaps a little too unquestioningly, as the right programme from the point of view of production; but refuses, in some of the best pages in his book, to credit its promises in the sphere of distribution, where, as he convincingly shows, its effect, as things are, must, on the whole, make matters worse rather than better. American industry, he declares, "is squeezing out redundant labour 50

fast as to restrict more and more the market which it sets out to satisfy," and "so we may easily find that the increase of our capacity to produce wealth actually creates unemployment and thereby defeats its own object." But what is its object—to multiply jobs or to fulfil needs? Mr. Cole "gets very warm" here, as we used to say in the nursery, even if he does not actually discover the hidden thimble. He declares that "we have so to arrange our social system that there exists an effective demand big enough to exhaust our ability to supply" (we have indeed, but Mr. Cole's subsequent chapter on "Banks and Credit" hardly encourages us to hope that he will be able to arrange this for us). Moreover, he argues that "it is fatal in the modern world to make the possession of purchasing power conditional on the finding of employment." But in the next sentence the authentic accent of Socialism returns. "The only possible course for a well-ordered society is to begin with the decision that all shall be employed in useful work. . . ." We may begin with that "decision"; the capitalist would profess his readiness to "begin" in the same way. But we should not be long before we fell to quarrelling with those of "us" who took upon themselves to define "useful" in this highly controversial connection. And if we ever came to agree about that, we should in a decade or so, perhaps in a few years, find it technically impracticable to secure that the bulk of our population "be employed" thus, as distinct from employing themselves in occupations that called forth their interest and individual talents, whether "useful" in someone else's opinion or not. All these considerations will rise to the NEW AGE reader's mind before he has time to go on to the rest of the sentences just quoted, ". . . and that all shall enjoy the purchasing power wherewith to buy the entire product of which their associated labour is capable."

But we are certainly getting on when so prominent a Socialist as Mr. Cole can state plainly that "the vital thing is that the purchasing power distributed in society should be measured in accordance with the productive capacity of the community," even if he must hasten to add, "I do not pretend that it is easy to work this principle out in practice." A very important feature of Mr. Cole's proposals is his scheme for Family Allowances, and in his chapter on this subject he has much to say which all readers of this paper will welcome, though they will surely perceive the grave inadequacy of his proposals for "redistribution of income" (100 million £ to start with) to meet the economic (as apart from any moral) problem. His optimism on this head seems wholly extravagant; but it is refreshing to find him declare that we shall get the idea of family allowances "hopelessly wrong if we think of them as additions to wages or as having anything to do with wages as such," and laying out the "over-population" bogey with the common-sense remark that "if men have mouths they have hands as well, and on the whole the increase in the national wealth is evidence that they produce more than their keep."

Again, Mr. Cole is on sound lines when he refuses to see the economic fate of Britain as bound up with the expansion of her export trade, but argues rather for "the expansion of purchasing power in the home market." He implies what he seemed for so long to deny, or be content to evade, the primacy of Finance, when he says that "to leave either the Bank of England or the joint-stock banker in private hands would be to jeopardise the success of the entire policy outlined in this book." But though he declares that "the essential change would be not the change of ownership but the change of control," he cannot show that such a change would involve any change of policy on a scale adequate to the crisis that has to be faced. It is assuredly not merely to

"put big industrialists firmly in their place" that we need to lay afresh the foundations of our banking system. Mr. Cole naïvely suggests that there cannot be "some quite simple flaw in the price system," or someone would have pointed it out before! His treatment of the whole subject gives the impression that he does not feel comfortable with it, and is in contrast to the air of confidence that pervades the rest of the book.

An excellent chapter on Socialisation (and if, or in so far as, we need socialisation, we should certainly seek it "in the main"—as Mr. Cole would say—on the lines he suggests) is followed by one upon "Workers' Control." Here the famous guildsman announces "a substantial recantation, but not a repudiation of the Guild Socialist view as a whole." He throws over not only the elaborate complex of "committees" upon which he was for long so prone to insist, but the whole idea of guild monopoly. There are other guildsmen who did this eight years ago and were severely admonished for their heresy. Mr. Cole gives a highly significant reason for his change of front. "When I look back at my earlier books they seem to me to be dominated by the idea of government as a moral discipline," with the result that "I constructed a politically-minded person's Utopia." The admission is interesting, and the fallacy is certainly one to be abandoned; though some of us may prefer the guildsman of 1919 to the Socialist statesman of 1929, who writes that "the worker must be treated . . . must be given every chance. . . ." These are the very accents that once—and rightly—made Mr. Cole's blood boil, so that he spoke hastily with his tongue. We are not at all sure that our former guildsman has got rid of "the idea of government as a moral discipline" yet, though he places its authority elsewhere than he did. The profoundest sentence in this book is that in which its author declares that "any healthy society in the future . . . must be largely self-acting," and the elaboration of social administration which Mr. Cole provides for does not convince us that his social principles are so near to fundamental truth that he can bring closer to us the "self-acting" order which can only be founded upon economic reality in an age of plenty.

The Economic Party's Propaganda.

We are informed that the Economic Party has addressed a letter to about 600 business men and concerns reciting certain grievances which are common to all of them, and continuing as follows:

"Recognising these facts, the United Farmers of Canada (Saskatchewan Section), one of the greatest Wheat Producers' Organisations in the World, has given a lead to Producers everywhere by adopting the following four points as their financial programme:

1. That the Credit Power of the Community belongs to the Community as a whole, and may not be restricted or withheld by any private individual or group whatsoever.
 2. That the cash credits of the population of this country shall at any moment be collectively equal to the collective cash prices for consumable goods for sale.
 3. That the sole function of Finance is to make available for consumption and use the total goods and services produced.
 4. That banking organisations shall act as the Public Accountants and Book-keepers of the people of Canada and not as their private moneylenders.
- "This resolution was passed at the Annual Convention of the United Farmers of Canada, held at Regina, Sask., in February, 1929. Its importance, as coming from so influential a body, can scarcely be exaggerated. We therefore venture to assert that it is a matter which vitally concerns your own Organisation, and suggest that a similar Resolution be tabled for discussion and approval at your next Annual General Meeting, Conference, or Convention."

The Jews and Christian Civilization.

St. Jerome, apparently unmindful of his debt to the Jews for his translation of the Vulgate, professes an "unspeakable hatred" for them, and yet finds himself compelled to say that "the Jews are divinely preserved for some purpose worthy of God." Fifteen centuries have since passed, and many to-day, as then, do not acknowledge their debt, but admit their hatred, and profess to believe in a Jewish mission. If the Jews exist for a divine purpose, then the poet may be able to say what that purpose is, and the Saint interpret the vision, but the task lies outside the scope of history, and if anyone should, because of the title of this book,* be led to believe that Mr. Laurie Magnus has attempted any such blasphemous task, then disappointment awaits him; if, however, he desires to obtain an insight into the factors which have made it possible for the Jewish identity to survive and develop, and an account of the manner in which the Jews have repaid the attentions they have received during the Christian era, then he will be satisfied.

Inevitably, Jewish history is the record of a series of oppressions and processions, forced processions, of which it may be said that only the dates are public property, while the causes of the festivities, for which the Jews provided the sport, lie buried under layers of prejudice, hatred, fear and ignorance, or are distorted by these incomparable breeders of perversion and falsehood. These events, however, are but the background or thunderous accompaniment of the movement of the Jewish spirit through the ages, and to relegate them to their proper sphere is the first task of anyone who attempts to trace the history, not merely of the Jews, but of Judaism. In spite of the title of the book, it is to the history of Judaism that Mr. Magnus has applied himself, and his attitude is expressed in the phrase that "we bring no indictment against history, it would be both futile and unseemly."

We cannot expect to find in the history of the Jews the political and economic movements which make up the history of a people developing its ethos on one soil. The bond uniting the Jews was both more concrete and less formal. It was a more concrete bond in that it consisted of a definite code of conduct and the individual personal possession of a common literary stock, consisting of the Bible, the Mishnah and the Talmud. It was less formal in that the urge to keep up this mode of life or to neglect it, to assimilate the contents of those books or to refuse to do so, was, and still is, ultimately an individual obligation.

The conception that emerges from every phase of this history is one of a fierce intellectual life burning round these books and the implications of their codes. No sooner is Jerusalem destroyed than the intellect of the Jews is bent upon the extraction of permanent values from the Bible and their formulation in the Talmud, and throughout the centuries this study continues, alike in periods of emancipation, as of persecution. Emancipation may have extended the study of and contribution to general philosophy, literature, and science, as it did in the Golden Age of Spain, where freedom lasted for a longer period than that from the date of the expulsion to the present day; but in less happy conditions, the fierce intellectual joy of biblical study, not only not forbidden, but enjoined and thirsted for, was not less strong and provided the refuge of the spirit from Ghetto conditions. In this study there was found the freedom denied in the real

world, a freedom bounded only by the limits of imaginative intellect and will. Perhaps here is the explanation of the outstanding brilliance of Jewish contributors to civilisation, and the basis of the general view that the Jews are far from being a race of dolts and dullards. Many have been called by birth to be Jews, but few chosen; a large proportion have been either wiped out or assimilated; in the one case, disabled from, and in the other, incapable of, coping with the intellectual obligations or unable to withstand the emotional stresses incumbent upon a thorough-going Jewishness, the only kind that has endured.

Followers of Social Credit may find here confirmation for their belief that in the present circumstances individual initiative and responsibility rather than formal organisation are the best means of preserving alive the spirit that is in them.

Mr. Magnus traces the flow of the intellectual urge as it glowed in the common man and flared up in the beacon light of genius, and uses it as a common denominator of Jewish history. He condenses in one volume the essential synthesis of Jewish life down the ages, ploughing through the mass of detail in order to attain a conceptual outline of the period.

Refusal to dilate upon the persecution of the Jews in the Christian era or any other reason does not necessitate the dictum that "It is by the Jews' contribution to the civilisation of the Christian era that they are finally to be judged." Final judgment on an existing people is by the nature of things impossible, but accepting even a limited meaning of the phrase, it seems almost indecent to enquire into the cultural contribution of the Jews to a period during which they have been the objects of historical cannibalism, and very nearly an outrage to make that contribution the basis of a final judgment upon them. Such a judgment is also hardly possible by reason of these same circumstances. The Greek and Roman civilisations are fortunate in that only their literary remains have come up for judgment; the Jews have not only their literary remains but throughout the period they have also been present in person *persona non grata* chiefly, and this has proved a shattering complication.

Mr. Magnus's aim is literary and philosophical, and in spite of the difficulties and inevitable lack of evidence, he is able to work out a connected whole by availing himself of his resources as the author of the "Dictionary of European Literature," and of the "Dictionary of Jewish Literature." The result is both Jewish and Gentile research. The result is that the process of cultural development through the Dark Ages, Scholasticism, the Renaissance and Reformation, and the progressive freedom of thought are seen to have been preserved and stimulated in almost every country in Europe and every age, by Jewish contributions. Commencing with the preservation and study of Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus by Philo, Miamonides, Avicbron, and their followers, the contribution is continuous down to Spinoza, and Jewish scholarship and achievement whether literary, philosophical, cabalistic, or scientific, played an unexpectedly large part in the development of the human spirit.

Mr. Magnus moves easily over the centuries, though at times with startling suddenness; there is much literary allusion and a mine of authorities, and the work is done with spirit and a light touch. His treatment of money-lending and tax-gathering is realistic and sensible; there are the facts and the explanation, and his attitude may be seen in the following quotation, "a hateful obligation, to do the dirty work and to lose the proceeds, and to be kicked while doing it, and kicked out when it was done."

S. P. ABRAMS.

Drama.

Tunnel Trench: Duchess.

What Mr. Hubert Griffith tried to do in his play on the Russian Revolution, "Red Sunday," with regard to time, he has attempted in "Tunnel Trench" in regard to space. The seven scenes move hither and thither among a Flying Corps Mess in France, a men's dug-out, a shell-hole between the lines, and the Army Headquarters. The play deals mainly with the contribution of the Air Force to an attack in 1918, the key of which was "Tunnel Trench," and the continuity of human interest is sustained by Lieut. St. Aubyn, whose experiences the scenes follow. It would be impossible, of course, on the stage to follow individual airmen without arriving at each landing-place about the same time as they. But Mr. Griffith was not satisfied with the hefty task of dramatising the air-force. He was determined to bring within the sphere of his Hamilton's Panorama the relations of the whole army to the attack. The play embraces a whole sector of front, including the Heavens above, the earth below, and the warrens, if not the waters, under the earth.

The more successful war plays have concentrated the emotions of the audience on a few characters in a particular place. "Journey's End," for example, goes through in one dug-out. "The Unknown Warrior" has only three representative persons for a few hours in one house. Although the method of "The Silver Tassie" is more romantic, it nevertheless concentrates interest on human beings, and does not waste it on army manœuvres. In "Tunnel Trench" Mr. Griffith seems to have worked deliberately in places to sweep the audience's mind into the air rather than to concentrate it on the stage. Precisely as the dispersal of interest over time in "Red Sunday" reduced the stature of the characters, so in "Tunnel Trench" the disposal of interest over space reduces the emotional force of the situations. In the one place where the audience is not in imagination flying about in the empyrean beyond the back-cloth, that is, in the dug-out, Mr. Griffith has produced one of the most moving in preparation for the plunge over the top at five-thirty next morning discusses the war with German soldiers who have mysteriously appeared in the dug-out, and who say that they also are resting until the same time in preparation for the defence. At the end Ol' Bill contends that he has been dreaming, and, in spite of his—and Mr. Griffith's—conclusion that war is a mug's game, once more puts himself into the state of mind necessary for carrying it on according to somebody else's plan.

With the imaginary stage stretching to the hiding places of the four winds, Mr. Griffith had difficulty in knitting his characters together. Indeed, it seems as though the characters most completely portrayed are those of the men in the single dug-out rather than those of the officers, who, appearing throughout the play, thread it together. The "dream" German soldier, in addition to "Old Bill" and Private St. Aubyn, has definite shape, more so, it seems to me, than even the full-length portrait of Lieut. St. Aubyn. A character who ought to have been fully revealed, to give another example, was Smith, who, in spite of Lieut. St. Aubyn holding him "dearer than brother," was hardly more than vaguely sketched. Smith was given no opportunity of justifying by his own presence St. Aubyn's love for him, since Smith's virtues were manifest in the air, and only to St. Aubyn, and certainly not communicated to the audience in St. Aubyn's narrative. The revelation of mind and character at tension can alone magnetise an audience from the stage. Mr. Griffith has for the second time attempted a noble piece of work, but for the second time "events" have tended

to submerge the revelation of mind and character. Mr. Griffith neither dwarfs events to give character at tension primary significance, nor, as O'Casey, does he dwarf men to give Fate primary significance.

Apart from the parts of St. Aubyn and "Old Bill," the acting was too impersonal. These parts, the former by Brian Aherne and the latter by Reginald Bach, were magnificently performed. Mr. Aherne's acting was distinguished by great sincerity and flexibility. The play is the first at a new theatre in Catherine Street, Strand, which has a fine stage and auditorium, and promises to be a worthy addition to the home of London drama.

The School for Scandal: Kingsway.

About "The School for Scandal" no more is to be written. Every critic of every age testifies to its brilliance, and will go on doing so. It is in nature so near the root of the English character that it can never grow old, for its theme is the difference between conduct as seen by outsiders and pretensions as seen by one's self, a difference which has gained for the Englishman a world-wide reputation for hypocrisy. Shaw has ridiculed the English for putting forward moral codes where standards of efficiency should rule. Wilde censored English prudery. Sheridan unmasked hypocrisy and pretension. "The School for Scandal" is full of lines that would have needed Shaw and Wilde to cooperate; and as Hazlitt and Archer agreed, the "screen" scene is possibly as brilliant as anything in the English theatre. The present production is worthy, for team work and individuality are excellently balanced. Miss Angela Baddeley's Lady Teazle has little of the ex-country-woman and much of the city quick-wittedness. But it is nevertheless brilliant in air and deportment. Mr. Frank Cellier's Sir Peter was good throughout, and from the screen scene forward a masterpiece. Crabtree, by Mr. Stanley Lathbury, Charles Surface, by Mr. Henry Hewitt, Joseph Surface, by Mr. Ian Fleming, and Sir Oliver, by Mr. Edgar K. Bruce, were also excellently performed.

The Comic Artist: Player's.

"The Comic Artist," by Miss Susan Glaspell and Mr. Norman Matson, is an exceedingly interesting psychological study of two brothers, the younger of whom married the mistress of the elder. Two characters, that of the comic artist himself and that of the wife of his brother, are fully and sympathetically drawn, and the scene between these two, in which they practically deny their love for one another out of loyalty to a worthless partner in each case, is magnificent. The plot of the play is in no way novel, the interest depending entirely on the fine lights and shades of character possible in intimate theatre production. The chief weakness of the play is one that I have several times mentioned in writing of plays by women. Luella, who moved from man to man for a living, and valued the world in terms of the art of holding a man until a better was available, was a worthless character, as was her financially ambitious daughter, who dragged her consumptive comic artist husband to New York for her own reasons. In both cases the authors show no love or sympathy for the character. We are given not an inside revelation of them but only an outside judgment. The authors, on the other hand, approved so strongly of Eleanor and Karl that these are drawn too good to be human. Wherever the hand of woman in art appears the sheep are divided from the goats not at the judgment but at creation. Miss Norah Balfour and Peter Ridgeway, as Eleanor and Karl, were both excellent in their sincerity and self-accommodation to the very intimate theatre. The husband of Eleanor, who really wanted his mistress back, but could take her only to pretend to himself that he was thereby exposing her worthlessness, for his brother's sake,

* "The Jews in the Christian Era from the 1st to the 18th Centuries, and their contribution to its civilisation." By Laurie Magnus. Benn, pp. 425. 15s.

was a difficult part because the authors had apparently disagreed as to whether to make him a goat or a human. Mr. Torin Thatcher did not succeed in getting inside the part; he appeared to have learned his poetical efforts beforehand instead of giving the impression of inspiration. Miss Rita Daniel, as Luella, failed to convince me that she had ever successfully vamped any man. As Nina, the comic artist's mercenary and doll-like wife, Miss Stephanie Rivers gave quite a good performance. Indeed, the whole production encouraged me to believe that Mr. Fernald will adapt himself to the small stage and the intimate theatre very rapidly.

PAUL BANKS.

Music.

A startling proof of the essential unity of mind of all Governments where the plundering of some helpless person or class is concerned (especially the class that creates things), is afforded by our present Labour Government's Copyright Bill. Under the terms of this blackguardly measure composers are to be legally restricted to a charge, a maximum charge mind you, of two whole pennies as a performing fee for a work of theirs, no matter what its size or nature. For shameless rascality, for infamous disregard of the most rudimentary elements of common honesty, one would have to go to one of the fraudulent "contracts" foisted upon unwary composers by certain notorious and shady publishing concerns for its equal. I have no hope or anticipation at all that the Bill will fail to pass. Its dishonesty, its scoundrelly provisions guarantee its success, for it is in the true royal line of succession of all the other precious measures which rob the creators in the interests of the exploiters and middlemen, of those, that is to say, who buy the soft cushions that repose under the bottoms of our bureaucrat jacks-in-office to which (i.e., the said bottoms) forceful application of stinging-nettles and well-pickled osier rods is a great deal more indicated by the symptoms. As, however, under the terms of the Bill no more than twopence may be charged for the performance of any copyright work, I invite my readers to wonder with me what the future concert and opera programmes are going to look like with the disappearance of all copyright French, German, Italian, etc., works; for one cannot imagine Messrs. Universal of Vienna, Peters of Leipzig, Schott of Mainz, Ricordi of Milan, nor the composers whose works they control, consenting to twopence a time for a performing fee on the works they publish, even in consideration of the questionable honour of performances à l'anglaise as we mostly get them nowadays.

The Bill further is calculated diabolically to set musicians at loggerheads among themselves, since it robs a few of the composers in favour of large masses, bodies, and corporations of performers; thus following the hallowed, age-honoured, maxim, *Divide et impera*. It also clears the ground and opens our eyes to the essential fact that in rascality one political party is the reflection, as in a mirror, of the others, and shows that if musicians are big enough fools, through their own organic weakness and disunion, to acquiesce quietly in a tyrannous plundering of themselves that no Government would dare even to dream of attempting on, say, doctors, lawyers, or artisans, they deserve it.

Rachmaninoff. Albert Hall: Nov. 24.

We have been treated to a rare orgy of imbecility on the part of the critics over this great artist's new piano concerto, and we are now being regaled *ad nauseam* with the fact of the prodigiously brilliant discovery that *three notes* in the work can be made to bear some sort of superficial resemblance to a nursery song, according to some, or a one-time popular song according to others. It speaks volumes

for the standard of intelligence of the "musical" readers of our "leading" newspapers that the latter can sling this sort of balderdash at them with impunity. There is a certain downward melodic sequence of three notes that can be found by any feeble mind in practically every composition ever written. I present this "discovery" to our posse of critics; it may come in useful. Others have "discovered," on the strength of a phenomenally execrable playing of the orchestral accompaniment that the work is scrappy, and that the orchestra was added haphazard after the piano part was written—when one glance at a score will show the very close interweaving and organic coherence of orchestra with piano. To turn, however, from this introductory to Rachmaninoff's recital. First of all a contrasting comparison with Egon Petri—he lacks the majestic grandeur and immensity of style of Petri, whose art has something of the indestructible qualities of Egyptian architecture—transcendental and philosophic, definitely of another order of feeling from the mundane. Rachmaninoff moves by the supremely poetical quality of his playing, its exalted and rarefied humanity of feeling: "humanity" is a word that in connection with art I particularly dislike by reason of the sloppy and maudlin implications that crowd up when it is written or uttered, but used in the sense in which *humane* is used as applied to letters, and "humanities" in the same sense expresses adequately what I am trying to say. It is in Rachmaninoff a rare beauty and distinction of mind, a sensitive and highly strung *haute poésie*, a subtle and vivid imagination, a marvellous sense of gradation and values, an exquisite fineness and variety of tone-colour, a firmness and delicacy of phrase, an elasticity yet finely tempered quality of rhythm, that combine to place him, with his strongly magnetic and compelling personality and its most attractive combination of restraint and dignity, in the highest rank of living pianists. In a very finely balanced programme, of which each constituent work was so beautifully played, it is difficult to pitch on one work rather than another, but attention may be drawn to the interesting new Medtner, "Three Hymns in Praise of Toil," which was very fine and too-little-known set of *Etudes Tableaux*, Op. 39, played in a most masterly manner. Attention should also be drawn to the exquisite playing, among the "extras," of the pianist's own delightful and clever transcription of the much-mauled *L'Arlésienne* of Bizet, and of the Chopin Nocturne, Op. 9, No. 2, in E flat, which emerged a new creature, rejuvenated and purified, by the artist's playing.

Courtauld Concert. Nov. 20.

None of the manifold and much-advertised excellences of performance we were led to expect from these concerts were greatly in evidence on this occasion. The L.S.O. sounded its usual disorderly, ragged, self; there were plenty of faulty entries, and the playing of the Bach trumpets in the Bach D major Suite was as often as not distressing. The heavy-foot dullness of the performance astonished one coming from Otto Klemperer, from whom some vivid and brilliant records (Polydor) had led one to expect something quite other. His attitude of laborious and pedantic respectfulness towards Bach was all the more surprising, therefore, especially with what followed, in his vital and living direction of the Bruckner 8th Symphony. Without being one of the peaks of music this work is far above the foothills. Of the much-belaboured Wagnerianism of Bruckner I do not think anyone could see anything considerable whose idea for criticism is something higher than hunting for imagined resemblances, as one who should say, the Emperor Genghis Khan is just like President

Hoover, because they've both got two eyes, a nose and a mouth, or *had*, since his Imperial Tartarian Majesty, alas! is no more. It is very interesting and attractive music, although Bruckner has not the Mahlerian sweep and power successfully to sustain extended flights like the 8th Symphony. His deficiencies in larger forms are largely, it seems to me, those of Schubert, though in a less degree, for Bruckner is not anything like as lacking in architectonic as Schubert. On the other hand, he was not a sufficiently big or powerful personality to melt and dissolve the older musical forms—very few indeed have been or are—as, for instance, Delius almost alone has been able to do. But in spite of all this and the duration of the work of over an hour (75 minutes), one was never wearied or bored, and this surely indicates a mind of no common quality in the composer. But one wishes to hear more Bruckner before one can presume to crystallise one's opinions about him.

KAIKHOSRU SORABJI.

The Screen Play.

Drifters.

Last week I recommended my readers to take the first available opportunity of seeing this film, which, at the time of writing, had only been privately shown. I am informed that it will be presented at the Stoll Picture Theatre, which is exhibiting it exclusively, during the week beginning next Monday, and I repeat my recommendation.

En Rade.

To see "En Rade" (Avenue Pavilion) is an exciting adventure. And not merely an æsthetic adventure, since it is one of the dominant characteristics of this marvellously directed film that the spectator is not so much an onlooker as a participant. Another outstanding quality is that Cavalcanti, who is an expert in the handling of "expressive plastic material," to quote Pudovkin, has the gift of endowing the most commonplace objects with a new significance and beauty. Linen drying in the sun, the weighing of an anchor, an unlovely group of factory chimneys silhouetted against the sky, an iron bollard on a quayside, the interior of a dry dock, these not only assume a compelling individuality, but become part of the drama.

As drama, "En Rade" is in the Russian tradition. Very little happens, but everything happens. A Marseilles youth, with the desire for travel in his blood, manages to save up enough money to buy tickets to South America for his sweetheart and himself, and then watches the liner leave port with neither of the two on board. But in this wisp of plot there is embodied a whole psychological gamut of emotions. The acting is superb, notably that of Catherine Hessling, who has the rare capacity of combining the ability to creep into the very skin of a part with a very remarkable versatility. Cavalcanti has no superior in the difficult art of casting, and all the numerous minor roles are played with such consummate artistry, and are so definitely in keeping with the atmosphere, that it is impossible to say whether their impersonators are really sailors and dock workers, and laundry-women, or uncommonly clever character actors and actresses. This characteristic serves to explain why, as I have said, the spectator himself becomes one of the actors in a drama of real life.

The photography is by a young Englishman, James Rogers, who was also responsible for the same director's "Rien Que Les Heures." Mr. Rogers handles his camera as if it were a paint brush, and I am glad to know that he has lately been induced to work at Elstree. It is to be hoped that he will permanently settle there.

DAVID OCKHAM.

The Unwanted Child: A Proposal.

It is a melancholy object to those who walk through this great town or travel in the country when they see the streets, the roads, and doorways crowded with beggars of the female sex, followed by three, four, or six children, all in rags and importuning every passer for alms. These mothers, instead of being able to work for their honest livelihood, are forced to employ all their time in strolling to beg sustenance for their helpless infants who, as they grow up, either turn thieves for want of work, or must leave their native country. I think it is agreed by all parties that this prodigious number of children in the arms, or on the backs, or at the heels of their mothers, and frequently of their fathers, is in the present deplorable state of the kingdom a very great additional grievance; and, therefore, whoever could find out a fair, cheap and easy method of making those children sound, useful members of the commonwealth would deserve so well of the public as to have his statue set up as a preserver of the nation.

But my intention is very far from being confined to provide only for the children of professed beggars; it is of a much greater extent, and shall take in the whole number of infants at a certain age, who are born of parents in effect as little able to support them as those who demand our charity in the streets.

Having turned my thoughts for many years upon this important subject, and maturely weighed the several schemes of our projectors, I have always found them grossly mistaken in their computation. It is true a child dropped from its dam may be supported by her milk for a solar year, with little other nourishment; at most, not above the value of five shillings, which the mother may certainly get, or the value in scraps, by her lawful occupation of begging; and it is at one year old that I propose to provide for them in such a manner as, instead of being a charge upon their parents or the parish, or wanting food and raiment for the rest of their lives, they shall, on the contrary, contribute to the feeding, and partly to the clothing, of many thousands.

There is likewise another great advantage in my scheme that it will prevent those voluntary abortions, and that horrid practice of women murdering their bastard children, alas! too frequent among us! sacrificing the poor innocent babes, I doubt, more to avoid the expense than the shame, which would move tears and pity in the most savage and inhuman breast.

The number of souls in this kingdom being usually reckoned one million and a half, of these I calculate there may be about 200,000 couples whose wives are breeders; from which I subtract 30,000 couples who are able to maintain their own children (although I apprehend there cannot be so many, under the present distresses of the kingdom); but this being granted there will remain 170,000 breeders. I again subtract 30,000 for those women who miscarry, or whose children die by accident or disease within the year. There only remain 120,000 children of poor parents annually born. The question, therefore, is, how shall this number be reared and provided for? which, as I have already said, is utterly impossible by all the methods hitherto proposed. For we can neither employ them in handicraft or agriculture; and they can very seldom pick up a livelihood by stealth; and they are till they arrive at six years old, except where they are of unusual parts; although I confess they learn the rudiments much earlier; during which time they can, however, be properly looked on only as probationers.

I am assured by our merchants that a boy or a girl before twelve years old is no saleable commodity; and even when they come to this age they will not yield above seven or eight pounds at most on the exchange; which cannot reimburse either the parents or the kingdom, the charge of nutriment and rags having been at least four times that value. I shall, therefore, humbly propose my own thoughts, which, I hope, will not be liable to the least objection.

I have been assured by a very knowing American of my acquaintance in London that a young, healthy child, well nursed, is at a year old a most delicious, nourishing, and wholesome food, whether stewed, roasted, baked, or boiled; and I make no doubt that it will equally serve in a fricasse or a ragout.

I therefore humbly offer it to public consideration that of the 120,000 children already computed, 20,000 may be reared for breed, whereof only one-fourth part to be males, or which is more than we allow to sheep, black cattle, or swine; and my reason is that since these children are not always the fruit of marriage, one male will be sufficient to serve four females. That the remaining 100,000 may, at a year old, be offered in sale to the persons of quality and fortune throughout the kingdom, always advising the mother

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

DRAMA.

Sir,—Mr. Paul Banks is not a good journalist, whatever his qualifications may be as dramatic critic. If he had even looked at his programme carefully he would have seen that the first item in the present entertainment at the Lyric, Hammersmith, had nothing to do with the Scottish Amateurs. His anger was therefore mis-directed, if not unnecessary.

Furthermore, anyone *au fait* with London theatres should surely have known that the silly sketch he complained of—"Doorsteps"—has been seen on the music-halls, for which it is fitted; and that Miss Christine Silver, who took the woman's part, is fairly well known as a professional actress, and therefore could not belong to the company from Ardrossan and Saltcoats. That she is a very bad actress provided those present on the first night with a joke which went the round of the stalls. It was to the effect that Sir Nigel, in excess of zeal for the amateurs, had provided Miss Silver for the sole purpose of proving to the audience how bad bad professionals can be.

FIRST NIGHTER.

THE NATIONAL EYESORE TRUST.

Sir,—Friends of mine who live in the country near a large tract of pines and heather belonging to the National Trust are much agitated by the erection of electric power standards which disfigure the landscape considerably, and the only justification pleaded is that underground cables cost more. They wonder whether you would air the grievance in *THE NEW AGE*, since it seems scandalous that a body set up solely for the purpose of preserving the countryside for the public should make such a plea to excuse themselves for giving in to the Electricity Authority's silly argument.

W. S.

LEGALISED ABORTION.

Sir,—I seldom trouble you with letters, but this one is to express great appreciation of the style in which you deal with the Mergroz topic. Some times I have disliked the mere medley of eccentric ideas which have had a big place in occasional issues of the *N.A.* This is not because I object to freedom of utterance, but because I object to un-related and higgledy-piggledy utterance. But the way you first accord freedom of speech, and then link the difficult abortion topic with the Soc. Credit Way Out is pat and rational. So please have my compliments.

F. J. GOULD.

Sir,—It is not a little disconcerting to find one of our esteemed colleagues of a periodical so distinguished and generally so free from any suspicion of being *addictus* *jurare in verba magistri* as *THE NEW AGE* reacting with such very conventional violence to a tabooed topic as Mr. W. T. Symons to Mrs. Mergroz's remarks on abortion and birth control. I am sure I speak not only for myself when I say that you, sir, in allowing publication and discussion of Mrs. Mergroz's views not only deserve the highest praise for your courage and fair-mindedness, but are acting according to the best traditions of our paper.

While admitting (as, indeed, who could do otherwise?) the complete invalidation of economic arguments for birth control and abortion consequent upon the establishment of Social Credit, I think that any of your readers who have heard what I have would recognise the immediate and appalling urgency of the question. Here are a few facts as I have received them from unquestionable sources of thousands of women die annually in circumstances of the utmost horror of mental anguish and physical agony as a result of abortion unsuccessfully attempted either by some quack or by the unhappy women themselves, driven distracted at the prospect of an unwanted child. Tens of thousands more are permanently and gravely injured in health after appalling sufferings. Again, the activities of the blackmailer have a fertile field in this matter—he often works in concealed partnership with the abortionist—women being bled years on end in dread of injurious and entirely ineffectual nostrums as abortifacients at monstrous prices. Certain pills sold as infallible abortifacients have been found to contain nothing but bread-crumbs in the box therewith is a printed slip saying that if these are not successful stronger and absolutely infallible ones may be had at thirty shillings or two pounds a box, which is actually extorted from working women for this worthless rubbish. The "absolutely infallible" pills have been found on examination to consist of identically the same ingredients as the cheaper sort!

Now, while, as I have already said, admitting the complete refutation of the economic case for birth

control or abortion when Social Credit arrives, it seems to me that plenty of justification for them will remain on other grounds. No woman with any knowledge of contraception, at this time of day, and whether she can afford it or not, is going to be forced into childbirth against her will, and it is monstrous that she should be. She may not be physically nor temperamentally fitted for motherhood, hereditary defects on her or the husband's side may make it still further undesirable. Abortion will presumably remain as it is now, occasionally medically necessary when childbirth would kill the mother. Further, there are cases of forced pregnancy resulting from rape, especially in the case of young creatures. Even the most implacably orthodox moralitarian will scarcely deny that the violation of a child of twelve or fourteen by a stepfather or elder male relative perhaps, with resulting pregnancy (and such cases are by no means as rare as might be thought), is emphatically a case for abortion properly carried out by a skilled and qualified medical man.

The intense aversion which the suggestion of abortion legally sanctioned, with every precaution and safeguard against abuse or misuse, arouses is, I think, largely due to the backwash of theological prejudice, complicated by some vague overhearing of the horrors associated with it in clandestine and unskilled practice. Responsible medical opinion asserts that in properly qualified and skilled hands, and performed within a certain limit of time, there is practically no danger nor suffering connected with the operation.

KAIKHOSRU SORABJI.

Sir,—The one justification for the legalisation of abortion is the freedom of the individual woman to do what she wishes with her own body. Granted this, the woman's right to destroy the foetus before viability coexists with her right to prevent impregnation. The admitted fact that any extended pursuance of this policy is opposed to the interests of the race is no argument against its validity. Policies advocated "for the good of the race or of the country" may, and often do, penalise certain sections of society to an intolerable degree.

To argue by analogy from abortion to infanticide is in my opinion unwarranted and indefensible. No one has the right to infer that the advocate of abortion is or ever will be an advocate of infanticide or murder. No argument can justifiably be brought against abortion that cannot with equal justification be brought against contraception.

The fact that the Malthusians and the eugenisists are busy providing a remedy for an inexistent disease, and the further fact that much of the sterility that opponents and supporters of birth control alike attribute to contraceptive methods is in reality due to other causes, do not affect the issue. Birth control has come to stay. Because of this the refusal to legalise abortion on the ground that it is dangerous to the race is as pointless and futile as is the advocacy of abortion as a means of preventing or reducing poverty. For although I am thoroughly convinced that present-day birth-control methods are credited with greatly exaggerated successes, it is idle to deny that sooner or later one may with confidence expect the evolution of a fool-sterilisation method, or, failing this, the wholesale recourse to self-abortions, with the consequent reduction of the number of abortions to a negligible quantity. When that time comes no patriotic, economic, humanitarian, or other ideal will prevent the extermination of the race: only some method of making motherhood pecuniarily or otherwise vastly more attractive than it is or ever has been will suffice.

If this is admitted, the need for the legalisation of abortion is conceded, for it becomes difficult to see how the present attitude towards induced abortion can be maintained without penalising to a monstrous degree those women who are raped, whether the rape be one of the numerous instances against which there is no legal redress or one of the rarer criminal cases.

GEORGE RILEY SCOTT.

Sir,—Mr. Symons's reaction to Mrs. Mergroz's article shows, I think, how emotions evoked by arousing prejudices engendered by "moral" ideas absorbed early in life, may suspend the reasoning powers of persons otherwise particularly enlightened. Why all this horror? If Mr. Symons had been brought up in Holland I doubt if he would have felt it.

While I agree with a great deal of your Notes on the subject, I think you miss one of the salient features. Full economic freedom may lessen the demand for legalising the performance of operations by qualified doctors to procure abortion, but it is improbable that it will do away with the demand altogether. This measure is advocated for other reasons besides the economic implication of the sexual act is childbirth, yet the sex instincts with which Nature has endowed us are quite independent of our desire for offspring. She has endowed us with certain instincts, those instincts tends to have bad results physiologically. Civilised man and woman have many outlets for their physical and mental energy which minimise to some extent the scope of the sex instinct, but even then some women are so constituted that their lives would be one long series of confinements and nursings, to the detriment of themselves and their children, unless

some method of birth control were resorted to. Again, there are people who know they are not physically fit and proper persons to be parents, and there are youthful members of the community who have made mistakes. Now for full physical, mental, and emotional development it is arguable that the sex instinct should not be totally suppressed. No harmless method of birth control has yet been discovered that is an absolutely certain preventive. Is it right, then, to insist that where the preventive has failed an unwanted child must always be born? The mother whose health has been broken by continual child-bearing has a right to say no. The woman who feels she is not constituted or willing to give her care and attention to children also has a right to say no—so has the young girl who has had the unfortunate experience. This apart from the question of disease of body and mind.

No, the demand springs from the desire of a woman to control her own life and destiny—to have her child when she wants to and at no other time. Her plea is that abortion should be a skilled operation performed only where previous preventive methods have failed, or where through ignorance or some other cause an unwanted child is actually on the way. No amount of economic freedom and plenty will do away with that demand.

When Social Credit arrives we may have very great scope for our creative energy, but we shall not go blindly producing goods in excess of our wants. Why should women do such a thing in the case of children?

ROGER ANDERTON.

Sir,—May I, as a regular, though insignificant, reader of *THE NEW AGE*, ask (i) what possible connection Progressive Birth Control has with Social Credit; and (ii) what justification, if any, exists for printing entirely unsubstantiated statements in a paper which supposedly caters for responsible, intelligent and informed readers?

The article in your last week's issue under this heading breathes such an air of defeatism that it is difficult to see why it should appear in a paper which professes to attack orthodox social theories. (For Miss Mergroz does wrong to talk of the "horrified outcries of the orthodox." It is she who is orthodox, and the outcries come only from that insignificant minority which still believes in human dignity, and other simple and natural things.) Her implicit rejection of man's power to find the solution of his personal and social problems ("we live in a world of many ineradicable evils," says the article), in favour of what can only be described as a doctrine of despair ill suits a journal dedicated to the destruction of that same defeatism in the economic sphere.

Her gospel of defeat is not surprising in that it proceeds from the determinist statement quoted. Nor is it surprising to find her argument built upon deductions wholly false and misleading (for instance, that *maisons tolérées* mitigate prostitution's attendant catastrophes—this is not so, as anyone but faintly familiar with the recent investigations made under League of Nations auspices is aware), to match her general outlook of falsity. For man was built not to despair but to hope, and to deny hope is to become something less than human. But then, of course, that is the very state to which the faddists and mongers wish to reduce us all. They think of human beings as so much more *manageable* when certain characteristics which make them human, among them a sense of shame, have been removed.

As I have already said, this sort of thing is in place in a journal which has no doctrine but that of the Servile State. In *THE NEW AGE* it is an offence. Let's have no more of it.

SCIENCE STUDENT.

[This letter arrived too late for inclusion last week.—Ed.]

ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT.

SAFEGUARDING EXPORTING.

J. F. J.—There would be no useful purpose served by permitting a discussion of your financial proposals in this journal. You state that your objective is to "take away the risk of loss connected with exporting." We consider this unsound in principle. What we want to remove is the risk of loss connected with *importing*. But admitting your objective, your proposals would not eliminate the risk, they would only transfer it to the Government, who would in turn lay it on the shoulders of the taxpayers. You propose that, e.g., the British Government should pay to British exporters the total value of their exports, and should charge the amount to the Governments of the countries where the goods were delivered. But in essence this process is in operation already; only, instead of Governments, the banks are the plenipotentiaries. You do not define what you mean by "risk," but if you mean risk of default on the part of foreign importers, we say that Governments have less power to prevent it than have the banks. The national banking system of every country is really the Government of that country, and particularly so in respect of international financial obligations. Bankers are expert collectors of debts,

to let them suck plentifully in the last month, so as to render them plump and fat for a good table. A child will make two dishes at an entertainment of friends; and, when the family dines alone, the fore or hind quarter will make a reasonable dish, and, seasoned with a little pepper and salt, will be very good boiled on the fourth day, especially in winter.

I have reckoned that a medium child, just born, will weigh 12 pounds, and in a solar year, if tolerably nursed, will increase to 28 pounds. Infants' flesh will be in season throughout the year. I have already computed the charge of nursing a beggar's child (in which class I include all cottagers, labourers, and four-fifths of the farmers) to be about five shillings per annum, rags included; and I believe no gentleman would repine to give twenty-five shillings for the carcass of a good fat child, which, as I said, will make four dishes of excellent nutritive meat, when he has some particular friend or his own family to dine with him. Thus the squire will learn to be a good landlord, and grow popular among the tenants; the mother will have a pound net profit, and be fit to work until she produces another child.

Those who are more thrifty (as, I must confess, the times require) may flay the carcass, the skin of which, artificially dressed, will make admirable gloves for ladies and summer boots for fine gentlemen.

As to the City of Dublin, from which I write, shambles may be appointed for this purpose in the most convenient parts of it, and butchers, we may be assured, will not be found wanting, although I rather recommend buying the children alive than dressing them hot from the knife, as we do roasting pigs.

Among its several other advantages, this scheme would be a great inducement to marriage, which all wise nations have either encouraged by rewards or enforced by laws and penalties. It would increase the care and tenderness of mothers toward their children when they were sure of a settlement for life to the poor babes, provided in some sort by the public, to their annual profit or expense. We should see an honest emulation among the married women which of them could bring the fattest child to the market. Men would become as fond of their wives during the time of their pregnancy as they are now of their mares in foal, their cows in calf, their sows when they are ready to farrow; nor offer to beat or kick them, for fear of a miscarriage.

I can think of no objection that will possibly be raised against this proposal, unless it should be urged that the number of people will be thereby much lessened in the kingdom. This I freely own, and it was, indeed, one principal design in offering it to the world. I desire those politicians who dislike my overture, and may perhaps be so bold as to attempt an answer, that they will first ask some of these farmers, cottagers, and labourers, who, with their wives and children, are beggars in effect, whether they would not this day think it a great happiness to have been sold for food at a year old in the manner I prescribe, and thereby have avoided such a perpetual scene of misfortunes as they have since gone through by the oppression of landlords, the impossibility of paying rent without money or trade, the want of common sustenance, with neither house nor clothes to cover them from the inclemencies of the weather, and the most inevitable prospect of entailing the like or greater miseries upon their breed for ever.

I profess, in the sincerity of my heart, that I have not the least personal interest in endeavouring to promote this good of my country, by advancing our trade, providing for the rich. I have no children by which I can propose to get a single penny, the youngest being nine years old, and my wife past child-bearing.

Jonathan Swift (1729).

Some persons of a desponding spirit are in great concern about that vast number of poor people who are aged, diseased, or maimed; and I have been desired to employ my thoughts what course may be taken to ease the nation of so grievous an encumbrance. But I am not in the least pain upon the matter, because it is very well known that they are every day dying and rotting by cold and famine, and filth and vermin, as fast as can be reasonably expected. And as to the young labourers, they are now in as hopeful a condition; they cannot get work, and consequently pine away for lack of nourishment, to a degree that if at any time they are accidentally hired to common labour, they have not strength to perform it; and thus the country and themselves are happily delivered from the evils to come.

Dean Swift (1729).

and any legislation which they require to facilitate the collecting process have been adopted by political Governments on their advice. Therefore, unless you can bring reasons to show that Governments are now prepared to control international trading on a different principle than do the banks, there is no object in making any change in administration.

Now the principle which is operative at present is to promote exports so as to secure what is called a "favourable balance of trade." You implicitly accept this principle. We oppose it. Prosperity is meaningless if it does not involve the consumption of goods and services by individuals. The act of consumption can only take place in the country where these individuals live. The volume of consumption is therefore limited by the store of goods available inside the country. This store is made up of (a) home production and (b) imports; and is depleted by exports. If the exports are exchanged for equivalent imports, the store of goods is equal in amount to that of the home production—the only difference being that there is a greater variety in the goods constituting the store. In such circumstances it is theoretically possible for a population to consume goods at the same rate as it makes goods. But when there is a "favourable balance of trade"—i.e., a net depletion of the store—the rate of consumption must be less than the rate of production. The more "favourable" the balance of trade the smaller the store of goods available for home consumption.

The dictum: "We live by our exports" must be tested by its physical implications as well as by its financial implications. It means that the larger the proportion of our production that we send out of the country without replacing it by imports the more money we get to spend on what is left. The fewer the goods in the shop the more money we have to buy them with. If we were all goats and could eat paper there would be some sense in our exporting, e.g., a British bullock to get fifty one-pound notes, and importing a German lamb at the price of three one-pound notes. But since the money is only the means of buying meat, and this meat is the basis of our "living," we must consider where the meat goes. What is the use of our having the price of a bullock in our pockets if the total meat in our market is one lamb?

So, as we have already said, if anybody comes along with suggestions for facilitating this one-sided system of exchange, our answer is that we are not interested in them. If we can get three birds in the hand we do not want to be told how to get two of them in the bush.—ED.

"THE CONFESSION OF THE KIBBO KIFT"

By JOHN HARGRAVE (Duckworth, 7/6 net)

should be read by all students of Social Credit who wish to understand the outlook and position of a movement which, basing its activities upon the New Economic teaching, has already attracted widespread attention both in this country and abroad.

The Monmark Address of the K.K. is
BM/KIFT, LONDON, W.C.1.

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

The Subscription Rates for "The New Age," to any address in Great Britain or Abroad, are 30s. for 12 months; 15s. for 6 months; 7s. 6d. for 3 months.

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY

Books and Pamphlets on Social Credit.

- 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.
- COLBOURNE, M.
Unemployment or War. 12s. 6d. (Procured from New York to order.)
- 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.
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.
- DUNN, E. M.
The New Economics. 4d.
Social Credit Chart. 1d.
- H. M. M.
An Outline of Social Credit. 6d.
- HATTERSLEY, C. MARSHALL.
This Age of Plenty. 3s. 6d. and 6s.
Men, Money and Machines. 6d.
- POWELL, A. E.
The Deadlock in Finance. 5s.
- SHORT, N. DUDLEY.
It's Like This. 6d.
- TUKE, J. E.
Outside Eldorado. 3d.

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

- CONNOR SMITH.
Where Does Money Come From? 1s. 6d.
- DARLING, J. F.
Economic Unity of the Empire: Gold and Credit. 1s.
- FOSTER, W. T., and CATCHINGS, W.
Profits. 17s.
- HEWART (LORD).
The New Despotism. 21s.
- 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. 3s.
- 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, LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London, E.C.4.