

# THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 1945] NEW SERIES Vol. XLVI. No. 7. THURSDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1929. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK . . . . .	73	BRAIN, WILL AND CHARACTER. By John Grimm	79
Mr. A. M. Samuel's speech at Leeds—his criticism of overseas lending policy—advocates home-investments. Social Credit and the conservation of resources.		<i>Mind and Brain: Phrenology for Beginners.</i> (Amy B. Barnard.)	
WALTHER RATHENAU. By J. S. K. . . . .	75	DRAMA. By Paul Banks . . . . .	80
<i>Walther Rathenau</i> (Kessler).		<i>Typhoon. The Duchess of Malfi.</i>	
THE SCREEN PLAY. By David Ockham . . . . .	77	REVIEWS . . . . .	82
<i>A Perfect Day. Wonder of Women.</i>		<i>Jane Austen: A Survey. Writing For Children. Memoirs of James Melville.</i>	
CURRENT POLITICAL ECONOMY. By Ben Wilson	78	LETTERS TO THE EDITOR . . . . .	82
Lord Beaverbrook's closed Empire.		From "Quits," May Eiloart, J. R. Donald, E. H. Barwood, and Jas. E. Tuke.	
		ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS . . . . .	83
		To P. S. and D. L. O.	

## NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The admonition which all Governments address to their subjects can be expressed in the formula: If you wish to become more so you must first be less so. What is it you want? More wealth? more security? — comprehensively, more happiness? Very well, then you must put up for the moment with less wealth, less security, less happiness; you must pay taxes, accept wage-cuts, acquiesce in the substitution of machine labour for your personal labour—comprehensively, you must be content to be discontented. If you find it difficult, there are the consolations of religion to help you, or there are moral compensations to encourage you. Dean Inge will tell you that your discontent is a danger to the State; or Mr. Snowden will assure you that your contentment makes you "heroes." The only jam worth eating is to-morrow's jam. Health culturalists, when prescribing fasting, say that for an initial period one's feeling of hunger increases in intensity, but that afterwards the feeling subsides. And it has been known immemorially that fasting, when persisted in, produces extacies. In this way abstinence from material pleasures lifts us up to Heaven. It seems not to have occurred to our mentors that a generous partaking of material pleasures might bring Heaven down to us.

Nevertheless there have been, here and there, signs that this truth is beginning to be apprehended. Last week there was one which we regard as more than ordinarily significant. It was afforded by a speech made by Mr. Arthur Michael Samuel, M.P., on December 11, at the annual dinner of the Yorkshire District Society of Incorporated Accountants at Leeds. A long report of it appears in the *Eastern Daily Press*, and a shorter one in the *Daily Telegraph*, both of December 12. There are probably others; but these are all that we have seen. We remember that there was an occasion some year or two ago when we were able to comment appreciatively on a speech by Mr. A. M. Samuel; and we

are not altogether surprised that it should be by him that the speech to which we refer was delivered. As he was Financial Secretary to the Treasury in Mr. Baldwin's last Administration, his sentiments carry the weight of authority; and on that account they are the better suited for quotation and reference by advocates of Social Credit policy.

In propaganda work, particularly public propaganda, one cannot argue convincingly much ahead of some recognised authority or other. So, as and when certain authorities detach themselves from the orthodox body, the fact of their heterodoxy should be exploited for all it is worth. It does not matter a scrap, in propaganda-work, to tell the public who "thought of a thing" first; but it matters a great deal to be able to tell them what sort of a name and reputation has been staked on it since. Members of the Social Credit Movement are of all people the most free to apply this truth, because Major Douglas has no political ambitions, and stands above all political rivalry. Much as he might be gratified at being identified with the discovery he has made, he has repeatedly expressed the sentiment: Whoever puts it into action, let him have the credit. Contrast this attitude with those of the three political parties and of most reformist movements. Their main concern is to devise a policy that their rivals cannot accept, their ulterior object being to make themselves the indispensable administrators of the policy. On occasions when sections of their policies have been adopted by rival bodies their reactions have invariably been bad-tempered; they have displayed jealousy. Because of this long-standing manifestation of the monopoly-spirit there has arisen a corresponding curious mentality in public audiences. In questioning speakers their formula is generally in the form of: "How will you do this, or deal with that? There is always the antecedent assumption that the adoption of the given policy or reform must necessitate putting its sponsors in Office. The mere idea that there might be a beneficial policy which would command the co-operation of the various political leaders would be



regarded by them as fantastic. They feel that there is a catch in any scheme which fails to create a row. They measure the efficacy of a proposal by the heat it engenders. This attitude is the reflection of the abstinence doctrine to which we have referred. It can be formulated in the phrase: "If you want orderly progress to-morrow you must have disorderly progress to-day." You cannot shake hands if you don't have a fight first. Now, everything that is said or done that tends towards the destruction of this illusion is something to be noticed and emphasised by public-spirited leaders of opinion. So now we return to Mr. Samuel's speech.

He has discovered that one of the reasons why we are always waiting for to-morrow's jam is because we are always giving away to-day's. England has overdone the exporting business. She has sent away many million pounds' worth of goods and never received payment for them.

"Let me give you an example of what I mean. Many U.S. railroads after 1868 borrowed in Britain large sums for development. Most of those same railroads went into the hands of a receiver, with the result that those British investors who held the relative U.S. railroad securities lost their money. Remember that while Britain was investing money in those days in U.S. railroads our exports increased greatly. Exports were created by the loans. We rubbed our hands in satisfaction at the Board of Trade returns showing yearly increases in exports. But did we realise that exports in such circumstances ultimately constituted private and public losses to Britain? Although, for example, our rail makers received payment for the rails they sold, the money came out of funds provided by British investors, and as the railroad securities received by our investors eventually became securities in bankrupt railroads Britain, as a whole, received no payment for those rails. Would it not have been better for Britain if we had not subscribed those particular loans? As many of the exports created by the loans were never paid for they became a gift to America from Britain. If our savings had been used in British home loans, and had extended home undertakings to increase our efficiency, and if there had then been a bankruptcy of those undertakings, the fixed assets upon which the money had been spent would at least have been possessed by us here in Britain. But as the savings were invested and lost in American railroads the result was that we lost our savings in the form of exported goods, although the railroads still exist in America. Thus America benefited, and not ourselves, who provided the money to build the railroads."

There is a new and welcome note of realism in this analysis. The reference to "buying securities in bankrupt stock" is one whose import affects domestic as well as overseas trade. Wherever money is invested, and for whatever industrial purpose, a large proportion of it is foredoomed to be lost as an automatic result of the very process of investing it under the present financial system. The fact was proved in Major Douglas's writings, and was subsequently singled out by Mr. P. W. Martin and Messrs. Foster and Catchings for elaboration and demonstration in a popular form. The measure of the loss in domestic trade is indicated in Mr. Herbert W. Jordan's book, *How To Form a Company*, the publishers of which presented us with the latest edition (1927) not long ago, having noticed that our previous quotations were from an out-of-date edition. In the section entitled Registration Statistics, the author states:

"The number of companies registered in England down to the end of 1926 was 218,938, the aggregate nominal capital being £9,407,723,650. More than half of the companies no longer exist, the number of survivors on the Register being about 92,320 (whereof 84,000 are private companies), with a paid-up capital of £4,250,000,000 (the nominal capital is larger, but the figure is not available)."

"We lost our savings in exported goods" is one of Mr. Samuel's conclusions. This will recall to our

\* Jordan and Sons, Ltd., Chancery Lane. 1s. 6d. net.

readers' minds Mr. Baldwin's remark in the House of Commons some years ago that we must limit our exports. The principle is the same, namely the conservation of natural resources. Any attempts to achieve this is a step in the right direction; and that Mr. Samuel should advocate such a step is about as much as we can reasonably expect from anyone in his position at the present time. The strength of a chain is no greater than that of its weakest link; similarly the publicly expressed opinion of any potential Minister of State has to be kept within reasonable distance of the least enterprising and independent opinion among the other potential Ministers. We assume that Mr. Samuel intends to pursue his political career, and that therefore he does not consider his present sentiments likely to raise obstacles to his progress—from which we are entitled to infer that his attitude reflects more opinions than his own among his colleagues. Let us hope so at any rate.

At the same time it is important that before a first step in the right direction is taken there should be more knowledge of the reason *why* the direction is right than is apparent in Mr. Samuel's arguments. By all means let us stop making presents of free goods to foreign countries, but do not let us assume that this alone will solve the economic problem. He says that if instead of presenting America with railway equipment for nothing, we had "extended home undertakings" we should, even if they went bankrupt, have the "fixed assets" to show for our lost savings, and if they did not go bankrupt we should have increased our efficiency. That is true so far. But the important question arises: efficiency for what end? "Increased production of goods" would be the immediate answer. But that is not the end: the end is the destination of the goods. Are they to be distributed at home or exported abroad? Mr. Samuel is not at all clear about it. He has not thought so far as the ultimate consumer. Yet, having commenced by applying the test of physical reality to overseas trade-policy, he should go on to apply it to domestic trade-policy. If so he must necessarily reach the conclusion that no matter to what degree you increase domestic powers of production, the actual rate of production must in the end be limited by the actual rate of private consumption by members of the community. Does then, the expansion of productive power commensurately expand that of sumptive power? There is practical evidence that it does not, and it is to be seen in the spectacle of Lord Melchett's rationalisation policy, which consists in lowering production down to coequality with present demand. Moreover the insufficient demand which is impelling Lord Melchett to close down some of the "fixed assets" which Mr. Samuel wants to see increased is not domestic demand alone, but domestic-plus-overseas demand. The more that Mr. Samuel limits exports to conserve our physical assets the more of these assets Lord Melchett will have to put out of action for financial reasons. The unemployed assets might just as well have been exported in the first place to some foreign country for all the good they will be to the inhabitants of this country. Conservation without Distribution cuts no ice. The proper place in which to conserve what you cannot distribute is where God originally put it. Why trouble to invert a coal-mine already a coal-mountain? It is a coal-mountain already if you will stand on your head to contemplate it. You might just as well play about with a sandless hour-glass.

In another passage Mr. Samuel says:

"You cannot dictate to the British investor where or how he should invest his money. But if our haphazard overseas lending policy in the past has in some degree been wasteful from lack of expert guidance as to which is the

direction of investment most beneficial to us, then a team of expert economists should analyse the facts and lay the result before public opinion. Public opinion can then be left to do the rest without interference."

It can do the rest without interference if it is not interfered with. But, on all vital matters, what the public think is the result of interference. More than that, what the investing public have done in the past has equally been the result of interference. "You cannot dictate to the British investor," says Mr. Samuel. But if "you" are a banker you can, and you can do so in such a way that he does not know it. It is a commonplace in post-war history that Mr. Montagu Norman, in pursuance of his concerted arrangements with Mr. Benjamin Strong, put an embargo on British foreign loans for a considerable period. It was openly spoken of in the Press of New York and London. And even with regard to domestic loans their success or otherwise is almost entirely dependent on the attitude of the banks, insurance companies, and investment trusts, etc., which are all interlocked at the top. Besides that, Mr. Samuel appears to ignore the fact that the bulk of investing is carried out by these financial concerns. The "British investor" is a myth when considered in the sense of a private, independent member of the public who sets the direction of financial policy. When Mr. Samuel points out that "we have preferred to accept 7 per cent. abroad instead of 5 per cent. at home," and suggests that "we" were shortsighted to do so, we suggest that a much more important question is to inquire who were the long-sighted people ultimately responsible for the offer of the 2 per cent. extra inducement. Ordinary private investors are antecedently averse from putting money into foreign enterprises, and it is safe to say that they would not have done so if the example had not been set by powerful financial interests, not to speak of the eminent names advertised on prospectuses to inspire them with confidence. We know, too, as concerns America, there had to be a tremendous national advertising campaign there to get investors to form the habit of lending dollars overseas. It is the controllers of the banking systems who are responsible for "our haphazard overseas lending policy," and if there is to be any change it will have to be by their initiative. It is a matter for speculation whether they have decided to make a change. So long as the Court of the Bank of England continues to represent cosmopolitan interests it seems unlikely that it will be moved to action out of consideration for essentially British interests.

However this may be, we are glad that Mr. Samuel has set the fashion of discussing economics in terms of things as well as money; and we hope that his influence will suffice to extend it and even to establish it. For one thing it will go a long way toward strangling all this mewling about our being an "island nation" with inadequate internal food supplies, "dependent on the foreigner," "needing to export to live" and so forth. Under peace conditions this country is assured of adequate food supplies without pressing the supplying countries to accept goods in return. Human nature is the same the world over, and its reactions to the rules of the financial system, which also are the same the world over, take the same form elsewhere as they do here, namely the urge to export a surplus of goods without immediate payment. There is no country in the world which, as a country, would not much rather take our I.O.U. for its supplies to us than take our goods in exchange. To hear some of our scare-mongers talk you would think that there was an external plot to make Britain deliver, say, a motor-car costing £1,000 in exchange for the quantity of food consumed by the people who made the car—probably not more than £5. The American farmers would like to do it, but the American motor

manufacturers would take good care that they didn't. Again, if there was a possibility of squeezing Britain in this way, and a desire to do it, it would have been done long since. Britain has been a "dependent" island for a few years now. She has got her food (1) because it suited the supplying countries to send it to her; and (2) because she would promptly go to war if she were threatened with a hold-up.

Mr. Samuel's doctrine of conservation is important because, whether he would carry it so far or not, it is consistent with the policy which we recently indicated as being applicable to both Britain and her European neighbours apropos of the American trade-invasion. That policy is to adopt the Social-Credit scheme for financing the consumption of all home production plus imports; whereupon we can all go in for buying everything that America has to sell until she sees the catch. The principle is beautifully simple. America leaves her exports in Europe as an investment. Europe gives I.O.U.s, or delivers bonds, for some hundreds of thousands of millions of dollars. Having (by hypothesis) sold nothing to America Europe would not command any dollar credits. Therefore, when interest became due America would be limited to the option of either taking it in goods or letting it remain as an increase of her investment. If America would not take the goods Europe would have so much more to consume, and the "cost" would simply be another signing of another paper—the more the merrier, as Mussolini said about pacifist pacts and agreements. It is true that America might eventually claim as creditor to occupy Europe or otherwise impose political policy on her. That, of course, is where armaments would come on the scene. This consideration would suggest the advisability for Europe's earliest orders to America to include a generous naval and military equipment. Then we could all live like fighting-cocks. This sounds ridiculous; but seriously it is no more ridiculous than, for example, Britain's having stuffed India with cotton-spinning equipment, thus creating a powerful competitor against herself in the world's markets for cotton goods.

### Walther Rathenau.

"We know not the complexities of personality, the smouldering emotional fires, the other facets of the character-polyhedron, the resources of the subliminal region. St. Paul long ago made our ancestors familiar with the idea that every soul is virtually sacred."—W. James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*.

"Only those who know the supremacy of the intellectual life—the life which has a seed of ennobling thought and purpose within it—can understand the grief of one who purpose falls from that serene activity into the absorbing, soul-wasting struggle with worldly annoyances."—George Eliot, *Middlemarch*.

It has been cynically said that every country gets the Jew it deserves—but is it equally true that every country deserves the Jew it gets? When one considers the immensity of the debt Germany owed to Walther Rathenau it cannot be pleaded that she acquitted herself of her obligations by doing him to death, most brutally, in the fifty-fifth year of his age. Perhaps it is only another addition to that long, long list of fatal misunderstandings of which it is said that "tout savoir c'est tout pardonner," and it is certain that Germany no more understood Rathenau than she did Heine, until it was too late; yet both served her beyond praise, for did not the one save the Reich from dismemberment and the other make her clumsy tongue melodious?

Count Kessler's book, dedicated to Gerhart Hauptmann, "in memory of our common friendship

"Walther Rathenau." His life and work by Count Harry Kessler. Translated by W. D. Robson-Scott and Lawrence Hyde. (Gerald Howe, Ltd., London. 16s. net.)



for Walther Rathenau," is of absorbing interest, and is, moreover, doubly valuable; first, as a portrait of an exceptionally complex character, and, secondly, as a contribution to the history of Germany's rehabilitation. But it is the story of the man himself rather than the account of his multifarious activities that will endow this work with long life. Of Rathenau's superb intellectual powers, Dr. Gooch, who speaks with authority, says:—

"No man of his time was a master in so many fields—science, invention, business, public administration, statesmanship, philosophy, economics, sociology, literature, art."

The son of a millionaire and a millionaire by his own efforts, he was, despite his wealth and his commanding position, a ruthless critic of the whole capitalistic order. No wonder he was foredoomed to a violent death—as his friends predicted—and that he knew during his years of demoniac activity but few moments of the peace granted to meaner souls. There was in him

"A sort of dual personality, a conflict which never ceased raging in him between an unquenchable desire for the pure life of the spirit and a mysterious, irresistible urge towards commercial and technical activity and outward material success."

Now the mischief with Rathenau was that, like Malvolio, he thought nobly of the soul, but had the misfortune to live in an age that saw the birth of the robot. The sordid doom of a mechanised proletariat filled him with horror.

"It is incompatible," he said in his book, 'In Days to Come,' "with the claim to the liberty of the soul and its development that one half of mankind should condemn the other half, which is endowed by God with the same features and gifts, to be its drudge for all eternity."

"The man who, in a factory with a thousand other men, makes the same movement of the hand twenty times a minute is not an image of God, not even truly a man, but just a machine, a soulless piece of clockwork of which the artificial men of the Capeks, the 'robots,' are not even caricatures."

And who are responsible for this defacement of the image of God? Well, in an article which appeared in the Christmas number of the "Neue Freie Presse" in 1909 Rathenau wrote:—

"Three hundred men, all acquainted with each other, control the economic destiny of the Continent." He himself was one of the three hundred. According to Count Kessler

"in the course of about ten years he played a leading part in the direction of eighty-six German and twenty-one foreign enterprises."

Amongst these was the gigantic A.E.G. (Allgemeine Elektrizitäts Gesellschaft) with ramifications all over the world; a little business that alone would provide the average city man with a full-time job, but he took it in his stride, and it can truthfully be said that in no single instance was he a mere guinea-pig.

"He got to know the whole European machinery of production and distribution, as a racing motorist knows the machine which he has dismantled and assembled piece by piece, tested on good and bad roads, and driven in every kind of weather. He knew every little wheel, every spring, every tube, the conditions under which it worked most safely and economically, the demands which one could and could not put upon it."

But "he knew its failings," too—and knowing them it is somewhat of a mystery why he never put his finger on the weak spot, why he was so pessimistic regarding the future, and why he failed to realise that the transference of labour from man to the machine need not necessarily turn the worker into a robot, but might bring him economic security and that larger freedom in which he could call his soul his own.

A glance at some of the concerns he controlled may provide a clue. Amongst them were five banks and trust companies. Rathenau, in addition to being an eminent physicist and an organising

genius, was a skilled financier, and an orthodox one to boot. Perhaps he foresaw or, maybe, had an intuitive suspicion of the inevitable consequences to a mechanised society run by orthodox finance; for in his last important book, "The New Society,"

"he draws a gruesome picture or, perhaps, rather caricature, of this 'new society,' in which the disappearance of the proletariat class is followed, not, as had been hoped, by a society where everyone is rich, but, on the contrary, 'by one where everyone is very, very poor.'"

Lord Melchett and his brother rationalisers might make a note of that. If they retort that Rathenau was himself the inspirer of rationalisation they must not forget that he was also its most merciless critic; they in their turn must learn "to think nobly of the soul."

How deeply Rathenau had pondered on the soul and its mysteries is set forth in "The Realm of the Soul," the most fascinating chapter of a most enthralling book. It relates how, during a journey to Greece, in May, 1906, he made a brief entry in his sketch-book

"under the title of 'Breviarium Mysticum,' which records a decisive moment in the development of his philosophy. It is so typical of the man that it must be given in full:—

1. The picture which each man has of the world is the measure of his soul.
2. Many are born with a soul; all can attain to one.
3. Everyone who is *bonae voluntatis* is vouchsafed a soul.
4. The soul is the image of God.
5. The powers of the soul are threefold: Imagination, Love, Awe.
6. With the Imagination the soul comprehends the world, with Imagination and Love God's creatures, with all three powers God.
7. The soul is disinterested, the intellect is the slave of purpose.
8. In its conflict with the intellect the soul attains to victory, because the intellect defeats its own ends.
9. Art and unconscious creation are the expression of the soul, science and conscious creation the expression of the intellect.
10. The soul derives its nourishment from the urge to life, the intellect from fear of death.

And what of Rathenau the public servant and statesman?—for he was something greater than the self-advertising careerist with whom we are so wearily familiar. If ever office was thrust on a man it was thrust on Walther Rathenau. In the early days of the war he was called in to save Germany from pending collapse on all fronts by organising the supply and consumption of raw materials—an essential factor in modern warfare that had been overlooked by the General Staff. Whether the resulting prolongation of the war was desirable is not the point, but the fact that he did serve his country in her hour of need even his bitterest enemies must admit.

When it was all over and the fate of Germany hung in the balance it was "this Jew" who proved himself a truer patriot than the most fervent "nationalist."

It was his outstanding merit to realise that Germany's only hope of retaining her unity and regaining her position amongst the great Powers was to convince the world of her sincere desire to live at peace with her neighbours by fulfilling her obligations. The "Policy of Fulfilment" initiated by Rathenau made Stresemann's final achievement possible—but he had to pay the price. When at last he accepted the thankless position of Foreign Minister he knew full well the risks he ran.

"In the imagination of millions of impoverished and famished Germans, Rathenau became a sort of arch-traitor, in league with the Jews, the Bolsheviks, and the Entente to give the death-blow to Germany."

and as Germans must sing on all occasions they

concocted a special hymn of hate for him with this appropriate chorus:

"God damn Walther Rathenau.  
Shoot him down, the dirty Jew."

In his last letter from Genoa, dated "17.v.22 Sunday night," he seems to have made his account with life:

"I often think," he wrote, "and it is my greatest comfort: What a wretched sort of life is that which merely runs its even course untroubled! The wonderful thing is that all true sorrow is beautiful. Only the stupidly awry and the arbitrarily distorted is ugly. In our life everything has been Law; thus were the facts, and thus their predestined course. Nothing has been in vain, nothing can now be thought away or given up."

Before he returned home from Genoa to meet his fate he was accorded a personal triumph which, one likes to think, comforted him on his *via dolorosa*. The peroration of his last speech, "Rathenau's Swan Song," swept the assembly of statesmen and diplomats off its feet—but, as his friend and biographer says, it was the man rather than the words that gripped the audience.

"The history of Italy," he said, "is more ancient than that of most European nations. More than one great world movement has originated in this soil. Once more, and let us hope, not in vain, the peoples of the earth have lifted up their eyes and their hearts to Italy out of the depths of that feeling which has been expressed for all time in Petrarch's words: *c'è un gridando*: Pace, Pace, Pace!"

—and so he passed, crying Peace, Peace, Peace to a world that has not yet learned even to spell the word.

J. S. K.

## The Screen Play.

### A Perfect Day.

Stan Laurel and Oliver Hardy are two comedians who were born to act as mutual foils. Stan is thin, lugubrious, nervous, and of the Chaplin school, while Oliver runs to flesh and irascibility. The partners still carry on the custard-pie tradition, to which the art of the screen owes so much, and they have so firmly established themselves in the public favour, that whereas a few months ago their "comedy shorts" were more or less thrown in as makeweights, they are now "featured."

It is regrettable that these admirable mimes, who can convey the subtlest shades of meaning by a gesture, should have been sacrificed to Hollywood's lust for sound at all costs. In "A Perfect Day" (Empire) they appear in an all-talking production in which the quickness of action necessary for the full flavour of this type of farce is diminished by the introduction of dialogue, and although the voices of Stan and Laurel are agreeable enough, and are, indeed, exactly what one might have expected them to be, those of the remainder of the cast are of the more distressing American variety. This piece of ingenious fooling would have been so much better in silent form, that I beg the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer organisation to revert to silent productions for the further exploitation of Laurel and Hardy.

### Wonder of Women.

It is more than a coincidence that the major item in the present Empire programme would also have been much better if it had been presented in silent form. This is "Wonder of Women"—a misleading and inappropriate title—which is based on Sudermann's "The Wife of Stephan Tromholt," and is incidentally notable for the film debut of Peggy Wood, who is now starring in "Bitter Sweet" at His Majesty's. It is to be hoped that a British producer will induce Miss Wood, who is a most distinguished actress and has a charming voice, to come to Elstree.

The first half of "Wonder of Women" is silent and the second all-talking. Had it been all-silent

it would have been very nearly a great film. It tells a human and dramatic story, is admirably acted, is on the whole very well directed by Clarence Brown, who made "The Trail of '98," and if, as I am told, the German scenes were actually studio settings, I take off my hat to the efficient artistry of Hollywood. But directly dialogue is introduced the whole atmosphere, and above all the Continental atmosphere, is rudely shattered. This is bad direction, since the shattering would not have been so abrupt if the initial dialogue had been between Stephan and Brigitte, whose cultured voices would have partially preserved the illusion. Instead, we have a babble of shrill and nasal American voices of both sexes chattering in the foyer of a concert hall. The effect is as though one came out of a quiet wood into the roar of the Edgware Road.

One does not attach overmuch importance to such blemishes when they occur in the ordinary commercial sound film, but here dialogue, if used at all, should have been used sparingly. I say if used at all, because in some scenes the employment of speech eliminated the necessity for a considerable number of titles in a brief period. But that is a matter of direction and editing, and although I admit that some of the spoken sequences were extremely effective, I have seen too many silent films of the first class not to assert that capable acting and direction would have secured equal effectiveness without the spoken word.

Peggy Wood's performance is beautiful and sincere. Lewis Stone is always capable, but is here a trifle too obviously finished, and it was another error of direction to make him age so rapidly in a few years during which his mistress had apparently not become a day older. Blanche Frederici is admirable as the housekeeper, and Wally Albright, Jr., is the most pleasing and the cleverest child actor I have yet seen on the films; his impersonation is that of the real child and not that of the sentimental and sugary stickiness of the nauseating Sonny Boy tribe. The film is rather too long, and the ending is marred by the interjection of terribly saccharine sob-stuff in the shape of the materialisation of Brigitte's spirit form, which should not be inflicted on English audiences, however much it may please the tired business man of New York or the lady stenographer of Main Street. But with all its faults this is a notable and outstanding film.

DAVID OCKHAM.

### MR. MACDONALD IN AMERICA.

*Axmen Hoover and Dawes.* Teatotaler MacDonald grinned and did not deny a story told to 2,500 tea guests of the Foreign Policy Association at Hotel Commodore by the Association's founder, Paul U. Kellogg. According to Mr. Kellogg three bottles of vintage stimulants were supplied by Art Tycoon Sir Joseph Duveen when it was a question of saving Scot MacDonald's life in Philadelphia. "One bottle bore the crest of the Bonapartes," cried waggish Emperor himself! "It was from the cellars of the great Emperor himself!"

Eschewing mention of Napoleon brandy, Teatotaler MacDonald harked back to Peace. He told history very much in the Alfred Emanuel Smith manner. "President Hoover came into office in March," he reminded. "I came into office in June. . . . I found a man working in front of me with his coat off. I said, 'Hello! What are you doing?' "He said, 'I am blazing a trail for peace.' "And I said, 'Who are you?' "He said, 'My name is Hoover.' "And he said, 'Who are you?' "Deafening applause drowned many another I-said-he-said. The third axman on the peace-blazing trail Mr. MacDonald described as "that delightful personality, that thoroughly genial personality, that extraordinary example of fine human nature whom you have sent to London. . . . We were informal. . . . You can imagine the language that General Dawes occasionally uses."—*Time* (New York).



## Current Political Economy.

The Labour Government's imperialism and Lord Beaverbrook's campaign on the policy of the Empire for England make an interesting coincidence. The three avenues of British foreign policy appear to be narrowing down to two. Those avenues are, of course, first, entente with the Continent as a whole destined for federal union, second, first fiddle in a world orchestra conducted by the United States for her own power and glory, and, third, the Empire as a close corporation exclusive of the rest of the world. The idea of free trade within the Empire carries, in spite of its being kept temporarily in the background, the implication—in many speeches a month or so back it was explicit—that protective tariffs should be levied by the Empire against commodities available for export by foreign manufacturing countries. There are and have been many signs that the less imaginative, and therefore more popular, Labour leaders would not regret the provision of an excuse for adopting protective tariffs as a device for reducing unemployment and pleasing English manufacturers at the same time.

There is at least some virtue in the idea of a United States of Europe, financially and politically one State and one community. The inauguration of a sane financial system—the existing one is judged and condemned by the very appointment of a committee of enquiry, whatever the findings—would be easier the wider the area, provided, naturally, that sufficient drive could be forthcoming over the wider field. Europe has too long been subject to civil wars which, whatever growth they may have rendered possible in the past, merely threaten to destroy her in the future, especially in view of the power and eagerness of the United States to control the world. European culture, founded in the combination of Greek and Roman civilisation, the Christian Church, and humane science and invention, is too valuable to be lost; and as a tradition it is alone capable of humanising the efficiency and King Solomon's Mines civilisations which threaten to spring up. In Europe we still ask of a man what occupation he follows, whereas in America one merely enquires what his income is. It is obvious that the campaign for free trade within the Empire implies that Great Britain's association with Europe should preserve the insularity of the past.

The idea of the Empire for England is as dangerous in view of her relations with America as it proved in the days of George III.; it is, indeed, an anachronism that was given up once before because the Empire preferred to break up rather than stand it. In view, however, of the hold which the United States has financially over England, and which is destined to grow stronger unless our economic system is vitalised by a new idea, the Empire for England merely converts England into a funnel neck for the flow of tribute from the Empire to the United States. The favoured treatment for English exports to the colonies which an imperial versus foreign tariff would confer, could merely render England, as things stand, a happier hunting ground than ever for American manufacturers and investors. As long as the dollar standard, the American debt, and the present credit system in England remains, the Empire for England must largely become the Empire for America. That the idea is the Empire for England there can be no doubt. The present practice of the colonies, as well as past experience of similar propaganda, indicates the attitude of the Mother Country in a way that resembles, in all but form, the old tea duties and stamp duties. The colonies are still, it

is assumed, capable as a whole of absorbing surplus products, and, therefore, of paying in the form of investment debt the uncollectable portion of the cost of England's manufactures. By doing so they would enable the inefficient English credit system to hobble on a few years longer while the rest of the world was left to solve its own problems as best it could.

By her policy of tariffs designed to keep her debtor's goods from sale in her shops, America is certain, if her own exports are maintained as she intends, to render her debtors both defaulters, and in the wrong. She is thereby doing more to ruin the peace she prays for than all non-aggression pacts and leagues can do to create it. The debtor countries must fight for markets like the Kilkenny cats, and when they have destroyed themselves, leave America with the tails. A free trade within the Empire policy, combined with an imperial versus foreign tariff—anything else would be meaningless—would put the British Empire into a position similar to that of America as regards the rest of the world. The British Empire, considerably augmented at the close of the last war, is too large a portion of the world's area, territorially, politically and economically, to become a closed unit against the rest of the world without provoking the most violent hate and antagonism, which it would deserve. There is no alternative to a complete revision of the whole policy of distribution and the whole purpose of production. Since the American revolution England has apologised for her Empire and justified its extension on the ground that it existed for the world and not for England alone. Either she must resolve to live that faith or its loose bonds will break; for they will not bear any foolish, world-ignoring, tightening.

*The Sunday Express* exhibits as ironic a commentary on English civilisation as one could hope to find. Taking up a whole page, the four columns on the left summarise in a few lines each how a host of the millionaires started life mostly in poverty. The three columns on the right are devoted to an SOS sent out by St. Bartholomew's Hospital for one million pounds to bring the hospital's healing service up to date. The left half records the successes of civilisation; the right advertises that the civilisation cannot deal with the wreckage caused in the making of successes. In a speech of appeal for this miserable sum for so necessary a purpose, the collection of which requires that medical students become street-beggars, the Prince of Wales spoke of the Greek ideal of physical fitness for the whole race. His reasons for wanting to revive this ideal were not, however, Greek, though they certainly were a further commentary on our industrial civilisation. "It seems," he said, "we are beginning to recognise the immense economic value of health." Perfect health for the whole nation would merely destroy the occupations, and thus their access to financial credit, of many doctors, nurses, chemists, and dispensers, and if they were to obtain other jobs, it would merely be to put somebody into the queue outside the Labour Exchange. Given that the patients would spend what they now spend on doctoring on something else, it still remains that health would at present throw the economic system out of gear. It has no means of absorbing any boon. Apart from this, however, the idea that the economic value of health should be stressed, and not the value of health for the pure enjoyment of life, is a penalty that apparently even princes must pay for living in a civilisation where sickness is defined as incapacity for work, and where life itself is for work's sake instead of work for leisure, life and enjoyment's sake.

BEN WILSON.

## Brain, Will, and Character.

"Localisation of function is the law of all organisations whatever: separateness of duty is invariably accompanied with separateness of structure, and it would be marvellous were an exception to exist in the cerebral hemispheres." — Herbert Spencer, *Principles of Psychology*.

"The brain and its house, the skull, grow and expand together; the developing brain, as a whole, and also each of its individual compartments, have the power to enlarge and modify its containing walls of bone, according to needs." — Sir Arthur Keith, Henderson Trust Lectures, No. 3.

"I have shown you that the evolution of the brain is in harmony with the evolution of the mind. They developed concurrently, and this is one of the most important proofs of the truth of phrenology." — Dr. Bernard Hollander, *Phrenology*, No. 7.

"So precise is cerebral localisation, and so trustworthy the correspondence between the cranium and the convolutions beneath, that surgical procedure is constantly founded on them." — Sir John Crichton-Browne, Henderson Trust Lectures, No. 2.

"Phrenology is a true science—step by step, the result of observation upon the connection between development and function. In the coming century phrenology will assuredly attain general importance." — Alfred Russel Wallace, *The Wonderful Century*.

"I never knew I had an inventive talent until phrenology told me so. I was a stranger to myself until then." — Thomas A. Edison.

When the discoverer of the science of phrenology, Dr. Gall, was a little boy at school he was much perturbed because other boys so greatly excelled him in the memorising and reciting of their lessons. "If they can do it why can't I?" was the question that worried him. Evidently he did not take much stock of the prevalent notion that the trouble was a moral one such as lack of application, for he ignored considerations of how much time these smart boys spent on their lessons, and set himself to notice what they looked like. In a short time he discovered that those who excelled the best were all distinguishable by the prominence of their eyeballs. That discovery started him along the line of research which culminated in the establishment of the science. He had seen the clue which was later to lead him to the location of what is now called the faculty of Language—the first of the forty odd faculties which phrenologists can now assign to definite positions in the cranium. As will be guessed, the faculty lies behind and above the eyeball, and, when well developed, that enlarged part of the brain bears against the orbital plate at the top of the orbital cavity and depresses it, with the result that the eyeball comes downwards and forwards.

This typical example of the inductive method of reasoning occurs in Miss Amy B. Barnard's "elementary text-book of practical psychology based on physiology of the brain."\* Phrenology as a science has been gradually built up on the basis of innumerable observations extending over more than a century. Its generalisations and classifications are referable—as all scientific "laws" should be—to repetition of experience. The validity and dependability of any theory varies according to the ease with which it can be tested by experiment. The surest law is that which everyone may test for himself, such as the law that if you toss a ball in the air it will fall again. The next surest is that on which

\* "Mind and Brain: Phrenology for Beginners." By Amy B. Barnard. (L. N. Fowler and Co. 288 pp. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.)

its sponsors are able to base accurate predictions of phenomena, such as the astronomer's announcement of an eclipse.

Miss Barnard provides ample material by which the ordinary reader can test the laws of phrenology. Her book is an admirable example of orderly arrangement and lucid exposition. It is equally suitable for the reader who wants to commence a close systematic study of the subject and for one who merely wants to obtain in an easy and pleasant manner a general knowledge of its teaching. Those readers of this journal who have appreciated the masterly and painstaking work which Mr. Hattersley has put into the planning of his book, *This Age of Plenty*, on the subject of credit, will find that the planning of Miss Barnard's book is much like it. There is an introductory synopsis to every chapter; there are numerous cross-heads to chapter-sections; there are diagrams, tables and illustrations; there is a series of questions, after the "examination" style, at the end of each chapter; and at the end of the book there is a detailed index covering ten pages.

Each of the faculties and propensities is discussed, in the following order: its function; its location; the method of cultivating it; also of restraining it; the name of its discoverer. They are arranged in groupings for consideration as follows:—intellectual faculties (the perceptive and reflective); self-perfecting or semi-intellectual group; moral, ethical and religious sentiments; egoistic or self-regarding sentiments; selfish propensities; domestic and social feelings. Then follows a chapter on the combination and interaction of faculties, illustrated by a long table of hypothetical combinations together with their psychological manifestations. In this chapter one begins to see how it is that there is in human nature an almost illimitable variation of character. In the next chapter, which deals with the "temperaments" (defined as the reactions of bodily constitution on the manifestations of mental faculties) the scope for variation is shown to be wider still.

"The leading or predominating organic influence... determines the kind of temperament. This can retard or urge on the mental powers, make them active or sluggish. It can change with the age of an individual."

Thus, a person's predominant bodily characteristic may be (a) his muscle and bone ("Act, and do"), (b) his arterial, respiratory and alimentary organs—blood, air, food ("Live"), or (c) his nerval system ("Think"). Everyone of course is scope for a large number of differentiations in, so to speak, *non-mental* balance, each of which has its specific effect on the collective functioning of the forty-two essentially mental faculties. It is thus no mystery why the population of the world, as Carlisle might say, consists of fifteen hundred million people, *all different*.

"Students of human nature," to whom Miss Barnard explicitly recommends the study of phrenology, cannot afford to neglect any knowledge which bears on behaviour. Moreover, no one who has to live his life in a community can afford to neglect studying behaviour (and its causes), as observed in others, and, most important, in himself. Such study is generally called by the name of psychology. But psychology rests in the last analysis on physiology, and more immediately on the physiology of the brain. Readers of this journal will agree that to resolve the credit mystery will agree that economics may be regarded as the "physiology" on which is based the "psychology" of politics. They realise the impossibility of understanding national behaviour apart from an understanding of the physical conditions behind it. Even those who affirm that not every political phenomenon can be related to an economic cause will nevertheless agree that many of them are so related, and that the verification of the economic causes is vitally necessary for eliminat-



ing the complexities of political analyses and revealing the true direction of constructive reform. Hence it will be conceded that Miss Barnard has justification for calling her work a "text-book of practical psychology." She would probably agree that phrenology is the science of physio-psychology or psycho-physiology. In a corresponding sense, advocates of Social Credit may describe it as physico-politics or politico-physics, and themselves as students of *practical* politics in the strictly literal meaning of the term.

It is important to observe that Freud, Jung and Adler, though they would not consider themselves flattered by being called phrenologists (for the term carries a derisory signification—for reasons which have more to do with craftiness on the part of political authorities than with incredulity on the part of scientific authorities) are trained physiologists, and as such would generally agree with the phrenologist's differentiations and classifications of localised functions in the brain. In these days when their systems of psychology are being taken up by the public, there is much danger of misunderstanding arising from the fact that the new students have as a rule no initial qualification for comprehending and judging the teaching. They are much in the position of a schoolboy who starts to learn Euclid at the Forty-Seventh Proposition. They merely become adepts in the use of a new jargon, which they use indiscriminately, bringing no enlightenment to the people whom they in turn wish to attract to the subject. A fair knowledge of the main facts and reasoning on which phrenology is based would make ever so much difference to their power of apprehending psycho-analytic teaching. And teachers of psycho-analysis would "put it across" much more fruitfully if they chose, for instance, to notice and discuss the superficially incompatible elements and hypotheses in the two theories.

Psychologists claim to help people to know themselves. Phrenologists claim to show them how to *foreknow* themselves. For those who can reflect, there is plenty of evidence in Miss Barnard's book which proves that there are certain combinations of faculties and propensities whose possessor ought certainly not to take up the study of psychology at all, much less put himself under psychological treatment. These combinations are ascertainable by cranial measurements, and their interpretation arrived at without any questions being addressed to the subject. Dr. Gall was put to a test by the Governor of a German prison on one occasion. All the prisoners were paraded, and he was told to pick out those whom he considered likely to have been convicted of sexual crimes. He was not to address a word to any one of them. In the result he missed only two out of a total of about one hundred selections. On another occasion the prison authorities set a trap for him by getting a lady to disguise herself as a prisoner. Dr. Gall, as soon as he examined her, expressed his inability to account for why she was convicted, for she had a "good head." And there are practising phrenologists to-day who, simply by examining the heads of a group of people assembled in a room to listen to a lecture, would be able to make a pretty close guess at the general nature of the subject that had brought them there.

Whether one proposes to study psychology as a cultural exercise or as an instrument for self-perfection it is obviously necessary that he should first learn how the brain functions. It must make an enormous difference to a sound interpretation of psychic phenomena whether the brain is conceived of as a homogeneous jack-of-all-trades, or as an assemblage of forty-two distinct functionaries; or as something in between these extremes. Have individuals one "ego" or a multiplicity of "egos"? When is a "complex" or a "neurosis" an unhealthy con-

dition of mind, and when is it the manifestation of a struggle between two or more healthy organs of the mind? Is there one "subconscious," or has every mental faculty a distinct "subconscious" of its own? Again, and comprehensively, to what extent are so-called neuroses an impediment to the realisation of one's own personality, and to what extent are they the essential components of personality? There is a case for the view that supposing all the "complexes" so designated by over-zealous students of psychology could be resolved, the result of the "cure" would be to reduce man to the stressless and placid condition of the jellyfish.

Again, to enter the field of philosophy, the research work of phrenologists goes a long way to eliminate misunderstandings between the "vitalist" and the "mechanist" schools of thought—between Free Will and the Determinist controversialists. Is what we call the power of *choice* possessed by the "I" a super-power reigning over all the mental propensities, or do these propensities themselves create the "choice" as the product of their distinct, various (convergent and divergent) *automatic reactions* to external stimuli? In short, is "Free Will" the product of many "Determinisms"? Is one's consciousness of "making" a decision merely a general awareness that a decision has emerged out of the struggles of his propensities?

In a recent lecture Mr. Mitrinovic\* made an assertion of which the following is an approximate paraphrase: You are more intensely *you* this year than next year; and still more intensely this week than next; still more, at this hour than at the next . . . and so on until at last you reach the apotheosis of your personality, which occurs at that vanishing fraction of time when your *will* flashes into existence.

It is impossible for anybody but the speaker himself to get the full meaning of this statement, but the picture as presented is not incomprehensible. In one direction it suggests that consciousness is not quick enough to "will"—that one's personality changes in such infinitesimal fractions of time that the *consciousness* of willing lags behind the *act* (intuitive?) of willing. At every instant of time one's consciousness registers the "will" of the *different* personality that *was* himself at the *instant before*. He is at every instant in the position of having "willed" a predetermined thing.

The idea of an incessant succession of instantaneous changes in personality (or the "ego") is easily conceived if the phrenological teaching of the subdivision of mental functioning is accepted. When one contemplates forty odd functions, differentiated in character, each reacting at its own speed, and all dependent for their functioning on the contacts made between the five senses and an environment, which is always changing (for this environment, of course, includes all other changing personalities), he may have to conclude that there is no final answer in them to the enigma of life, but he is at least able to get a clearer idea of the nature of the mystery.

JOHN GRIMM.

## Drama.

### Typhoon: Duchess.

Stage orientals consist by Western convention of diabolical poisoners with hypnotic power over women and cats. It is good to see a play about Japanese in which they have been observed from the inside. Stage Japanese differ, of course, from Japanese, as stage Irishmen and Scots from Irishmen and Scots. Just as stage more Irishmen and Scots are more consciously comic and stage Scots more educated, more larconic, and less ambitious, so stage Japanese appear to be even

\* International Society for Individual Psychology.

more disciplined and self-consciously sure of their world-purpose than real ones. The characterisation of a people that any national creates on the stage may be more illuminating to observe than the actual people. Such a stage character either represents in ridiculous light something in one's people which tends to belittle them, and should be burned out, or it represents the pose faith in which is believed to choose them as the future rulers of the world.

Mr. Melchior Lengyel's "Typhoon," in the excellent English version by Mr. Laurence Irving, was first produced before the war. Although written by a Hungarian, it gives the impression of being as truly an inside view of the Japanese as Emerson's "English Traits" is truly an inside view of the English. Its only noticeable pre-war characteristic is that, while it is a character-play and not a thriller, it has a plot whose many highways and byways create both interests and thrills. The nineteenth-century—which really dragged on as far as 1914—was full of plot. Novels and plays twisted and turned into complicated spirals of plots, probably because life itself, on the car of progress, seemed to offer more scope than it was possible to take. The character novel or play of to-day has no room for plot, as if life were marooned in a desert with neither path nor goal. But "Typhoon" has much of interest besides a plot which, possibly somewhat irrationally, recalled to me the novels I read with Valentine Vox. When Fluther Good, having refused to be generous with the looted potheen, was begged at least to save a little for to-morrow, he asked who the hell knew there was going to be any to-morrow; which seems to have been the mood of Europe for fourteen years or so (Shaw, Mussolini, and the Labour Party excepted, of course, since for these there is only sometime). In "Typhoon" there is presented, if somewhat ingenuously at times, a clear view of a "primacy of things" morality according to which life, including one's own life, has no value apart from the fulfilment of its divinely appointed tasks. Belief in re-incarnation, Orage once wrote, was bound to prevail since it was a necessity to a gentleman, a dictum only in error, probably, because the writer had forgotten that the West no longer aspired to the code of gentleman. Even a suicide in the West tries to justify himself on the ground that he has the right to do what he likes with his own life; the Japanese, before corruption—or, if you like, education—by the West set in, did only what was appointed for him, whether life or harikari followed.

These reflections are, of course, extraneous to the play, which is excellent entertainment. All that accompanies the dramatisation of Tokeramo's two sacrifices, first of his beloved for his work's sake, and, second, of his life when the work was done, is good theatre. This Japanese masked politeness of manners, the smooth time-despising gestures, the dignified conversation and anecdote, illustrating so leisurely over tea, absolute morality, constitute a restorative against the nervous impulsiveness and haste of the present-day activity called life. Every Japanese, it is said, is two men, European out-of-doors and Japanese in his home, wherever it may be. To enjoy for a brief time the repose of the Japanese interior, since the conversion from our father's home of boredom to our own place of entertainment destroyed the repose of our own, a visit to "Typhoon" is worth while.

Mr. Dennis Neilson-Terry in a serious foreign character part is a welcome change from his familiar simpleton-crook-detective. His performance as the ascetic, though love-tormented, intellectual Japanese imperial missionary in Paris is saturated throughout with sincerity and understanding of the morality to which his actions conformed. The actor himself

must surely be glad of the change no matter how long the play may run. Mr. Evan John is to be congratulated on his production, and he—or Mr. Gonnoske Komai, or some unnamed person—on the stage settings. Mr. John has not quite succeeded, however, in carrying out the terms of his programme note that no accent among the Japanese would indicate that Japanese was being spoken, whereas an accent would indicate conversation with Europeans. Some of the actors, particularly Patrick Gover as the scapegoat for Tokeramo's murder, spoke with an accent when all the other indications were towards Japanese. As the investigating Parisian judge in the murder case Mr. George Merritt, a character actor of whom much more should be heard than is, gave a very fine performance indeed, with unconscious humour very cleverly presented; and as the French poet, consisting of woman-love, wine-love, panache, and innocent contempt for authority, the antithesis, in fact, to the Japanese character, Mr. Edgar Norfolk also contributed first-class work. The use of real Japanese as some of the students is not a commendable experiment. They are too real for the theatre, so real as Japanese, indeed, as to be incompatible with stage Japanese; and they tend to destroy part of the make-believe which is the stage's reality.

### The Duchess of Malfi: Players.

The attempt to produce Webster's "Duchess of Malfi" on so small a stage as that of the Players' Theatre indicates that England possesses heroism still. Mr. Fernald has certainly made the best possible use of his space; in fact, when the back curtain of the first scene rose and presented slightly more stage, I was agreeably surprised to see so much attempted with so little. But sweeping verse and aristocratic gestures demand a fair field, and often the actors were cramped for sheer space in which to perform the movements appropriate to their lines. Mr. Fernald very wisely attempted little in the way of turgidity, and drove directly at intimacy all the way through. The most effective performance, having in mind the difficulties, was that of Stephanie Rivers as the Duchess's "Woman." A very praiseworthy effort to render the part of Daniel de Bosola intimate enough was made by Mr. Roy Graham, whose only fault was that he rendered it too intimate. He speaks blank-verse excellently, but looks more like a poet than a plotting and self-seeking murderer. But the amount of atmosphere he conveyed into the auditorium considerably exceeded that of any of the other actors. The chief value of the production is that it causes Webster's verse to be recalled, either as previous production or as literature.

PAUL BANKS.

### MR. LAMONT'S FRIENDS.

Nor was there anything intangible about the man who steered the ship of U.S. prosperity through the storm, who at length felt the helm respond. More than most men, Thomas William Lamont can be touched, appraised. In obvious and literal ways, this right hand of John Pierpont Morgan is freely extended among men. . . . Because he is patient and urban, he is the Morgan diplomat. . . . Put him in the middle of a problem and he will begin to solve it.

To him came most of the overseas muddles into which its vast foreign interests plunged the Morgan house. In China (the Consortium), Mexico (International Committee), France (Anglo-French \$500,000,000 loan), Austria (1923 joint loan), he has been at one time or another the most important financial factor. When these and many another nation gather together, as at Versailles in 1919 and at Paris in 1929, Mr. Lamont is summoned to speak for U.S. finance. He himself considers his work at Paris last summer the most significant of his life.

Outstanding as a financier (and his chief is the only living banker who might conceivably be said to outrank him), he is scarcely less an intellectual. His friends include John Masefield, with whom he travels; H. G. Wells, who visits him; Ramsay MacDonald, who dined with him last month.—"Time" (New York).



## Reviews.

**Jane Austen: A Survey.** By C. L. Thomson. (Horace Marshall and Son. 10s. 6d.)

This is a scholarly criticism of the novels of Jane Austen, and is not one of those empty books written in a hurry to please the topical demand of a publisher. It is perhaps a little long and not very profound; but it is a sincere, carefully written study, likely to be of interest to those who admire Jane Austen's fiction and to persuade those who are not yet acquainted with it that much pleasure awaits them. The five important novels are each given a chapter in which the plot and construction is analysed, particular scenes are appreciated, and passages of notably good dialogue are quoted. The influences, literary and personal, which may be traced in the novels or discovered in her letters, and her first attempts at writing, receive attention; and the last two chapters consider her workmanship and summarise her characteristics as woman and as author. All notes and references are neatly gathered up at the end of the book; the pages of text are therefore pleasing to the eye, and one is not irritated by the footnote, which one hardly avoids reading, however often it disturbs the attention. There is also a bibliography and an index.

J. S.

**Writing for Children: A Manual for Writers of Juvenile Fiction.** By Arthur Groom. (A. and C. Black.)

If there be no end to the making of books, there is occasionally something new under the sun, and this interesting and practical volume comes into that category. I am not sure whether any kind of writing can really be taught, but the capable teacher can at least tell his pupils what to avoid, and this is well done by Mr. Groom, whose pages are packed with valuable hints, based on personal experience, as to the kind of stories and articles wanted by editors and publishers, and how contributions should be submitted. Of editors, Mr. Groom remarks, that "It is not so much what the writer thinks will interest children, but what the editor thinks will do so, which makes me understand why and how the juvenile features of some of our dailies achieve the dignity of print. Fairy stories are defined by the author as 'tales of any kind in which the action or setting is incredible,' which would also apply to the average newspaper serial. But in his chapter on 'Fairy and Dragon Stories' Mr. Groom succeeds in indicating the kind of story his pupils should write if they wish to sell them. I can recommend this practical manual to anyone desirous of 'breaking into' the juvenile fiction market: writers with experience will find it useful as well as the novice.

V. S.

**Memoirs of Sir James Melville.** (Routledge. 12s. 6d.)

The Laird of Halhill in "The Kingdom of Fife," who lived 1535-1617, wrote these Memoirs in his native tongue, "now really difficult to read," as Mr. Francis Steuart, apparently unconscious of the just indictment of Scottish culture conveyed in the admission, remarks in his editorial Introduction. The first edition was published in 1683 in English, sixty-six years after the death of Melville himself; and it was not until 1827 that the original Scots version was printed by the Bannatyne Club. The present text follows the first English edition, corrected in the light of later elucidation. Melville was a professionally-trained diplomatist, and after years of "lying abroad for his country," at the Court of France, in Germany and in Italy, he returned to the Scotland-long-protracted duel between his unfortunate Queen and Reform, Sir James succeeded in writing the story of his public life without even once mentioning the name of his great contemporary, John Knox—an act of oblivion that establishes our memoirist's gift for diplomacy. Few books give a clearer view of the political intrigues during the period immediately prior to the Union of the Crowns. Indeed, this book shows the Scottish nobility of that primitive age to have had scarce one redeeming feature in their character. To overthrow the prestige of a rival and thus to secure possession of his lands with the Royal approval was "the good old way," the simple plan," followed in those early days of the competitive system; just as in these more "advanced" times rival manufacturers and jealous politicians, with Financial sanction, "wangle" things in their favour in slightly more polite ways than of yore. Solomon is, indeed, as up-to-date as any post-warrior. It may be interesting to add that Herman "Moby Dick" Melville traced his paternal ancestry to the author of these Renaissance memoirs.

S. C.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

## MUSICAL COPYRIGHT BILL.

Sir,—The language in which Mr. Kaikhosru Sorabji curses Mr. Adamson's Bill is certainly very expressive, but mayhap it is no more colourful than that which some of the payers of fees to the Performing Right Society would like to use if only they had the chance.

Two wrongs, of course, do not make a right, and Mr. Sorabji was only concerned with one; but there is another, and it is that other which has culminated in Mr. Adamson's Bill. The chief point about the whole business seems to be not that any fair-minded person wishes to be unjust to composers of music, but rather that the Performing Right Society demanded payment of fees which sometimes were unquestionably heavy and from which imposition there was no appeal whatever. It is only fair that this should be not only pointed out but stressed in any discussion of the subject. "Quits."

## NATIONAL EYESORE TRUST.

Sir,—It would be interesting to many in my locality if you could show any relationship between the great Financial Octopus—that mystery worshipped by all classes and creeds in this country—and the recent developments of the National Trust Delusion.

One hesitates to credit the National Trust Council with the deliberate and wilful violation of their trust—the preservation of the amenities of lands bequeathed to the public for all time—but this seems to be happening in many parts of the country.

Is the Council actually in the power of electricity companies? If so, why? And why have not those supposed to benefit through the gifts of generous donors, who knew the value of natural beauty on a nation's soul, been publicly advised that the National Trust is now a farce.

To leave glorious scenery to be an inspiration for all time is one thing, to leave it to be utilised for commercial commodities is entirely another.

If it is too late to rescue our inheritance from the clutches of private companies, an airing of the subject would make possible future donors aware how things are trending, and the public may yet enjoy some land "of beauty—a joy for ever."

MAY EILOART.

## OVERSEAS INVESTMENTS.

Sir,—Enclosed herewith is a cutting from *Eastern Daily Press*, Thursday, December 12, giving a report of a speech by A. M. Samuel, M.P., at Leeds on the subject of "Exports as Gifts," in which he expresses concern at the loss experienced by investors as being a "dead loss to the nation" without apparently any consciousness of the fact that quite apart from and in addition to such loss—there were a gift from British consumers, who paid their wages and in the inflation of price level resulting from the wages and salaries distributed in the course of production without any increase in the consumable goods and services available in the home market as an equivalent.

E. H. BARWOOD.

[We comment on Mr. Samuel's speech in the Notes.—Ed.]

## THE STATE VERSUS THE FAMILY.

"Déterminer la trajectoire d'une force naturelle et s'abandonner à son courant, c'est tout le progrès." "Prévoir l'avenir signifie se soumettre aux lois de la nature."—Nevicour.

Sir,—As regards the Russian anti-religious campaign, we are "up against it." But semi-political and hysterical action and protest will not avail us.

Let us ask ourselves, "On what basic fact of life can the Russians now rely?" There is but one answer, "We the Russians are attacking that! We the Family as the Russians now rely?" There is but one answer, "We the Family, and the Russian Government is attacking that! We have always regarded, and still regard, the Family as the pillar both of the State and of religion. In fact, grant the Family, and neither State nor religion can perish. The question now rises: Can a State destroy the Family? A West European State could not, even with all the goodwill of the birth-controllers and divorce-mongers. But the Russians are peculiar, and if the Family as a human organism has reached its zenith and is moribund, they will win.

Spengler shows us pictures of human cultural organisms that are born, flourish, and die. If the Family comes into his picture (he himself does not omit it) as "past its prime," then, in Russia, its thread is spun. But the Family is an organism of very long standing. The facts of its being, from which its trajectory is to be measured, are rooted in the most persistent of human instincts—the demand for offspring. To imagine that "sex" stops short of that is an

error. In spite of so-called "perversions," "sex" consciously or unconsciously continues to make that demand. No law can prevent a man and a woman living together as man and wife, and caring for their offspring. *The Family* cannot be other than tolerated and recognised. The Russians must accept that, for *the Family* is yet a long way from the end of its trajectory. And then they will lose their battle.

J. R. DONALD.

## MR. SNOWDEN'S COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

Sir,—The terms of reference to this Committee have now been made public, and in view of the paramount importance of financial policy towards industrial undertakings, the present opportunity for a thorough investigation is extremely welcome.

Hitherto, all inquiries into trade depression have been confined to the administrative side of Industry, but now, for the first time, the financial aspect is to be called in question.

It seems necessary, however, to urge that the Terms of Reference shall be so interpreted as to include inquiry into the financial principles from which the credit policy of the Bank flows.

The tendency to blame bankers as such for our difficulties is to be deprecated. Rather should the basis of the policy they are called upon to carry out be questioned.

It is to be hoped that the findings of the Committee will point to a way of solving the great paradox of the Twentieth Century: poverty in the midst of potential plenty, and even amidst large-scale unemployment of those whose labour could supply the unsatisfied needs of their fellows. The obvious and primary human purpose of Industry, to deliver goods and services to consumers, should not be obscured by any secondary consideration, such as that of employment, important as this may be in its place.

The Inquiry should, of course, be held in public, and made as searching as possible.

It is probably not too much to say that upon the solution of the modern financial riddle depends the economic future of Great Britain.

This letter has the full approval of the signatories whose names appear on the enclosed list.

JAS. EDW. TUKE.

## LIST OF AGREED SIGNATURES TO PRESS LETTER RE SNOWDEN FINANCE INQUIRY.

G. Graham Anderson, Esq., Hoddesdon.  
G. Stafford Allen, Esq. (Stafford Allen and Sons, Ltd.), Long Melford.  
Walter H. Ayles, M.P., Bristol.  
Shirley N. Brayshaw, Esq. (Brayshaw Furnaces and Tools, Ltd.), Manchester.  
A. Fenner Brockway, M.P., East Leyton.  
Percy W. Bartlett, Esq., London.  
Wm. Bellows, Esq., Gloucester.  
G. Bloomfield, A.C.I.S. (General Treasurer, National Union of Clerks and A/W.), London.  
Charles Carter, Esq. (Carter and Co., Ltd.), Poole.  
J. A. Crabtree, Esq. (J. A. Crabtree and Co., Ltd.), Walsall.  
S. Alexander Fox, Esq. (Fox and Offord, Ltd.), Birmingham.  
George Garnett, Esq. (G. Garnett and Sons, Ltd.), Apperly Bridge.  
A. L. Gibson, Esq., F.C.A., Sheffield.  
Phillip Godlee, Esq. (Simpson and Godlee, Ltd.), Manchester.  
W. C. Goodbody, Esq. (C. A. and W. Goodbody, Ltd.), Plymouth.  
Dr. Alfred E. Garvie (Principal, Hackney New College), Hampstead.  
W. G. Hall, M.P., Central Portsmouth.  
Miss I. G. Hobart-Hampden, Folkestone.  
Sir Robt. Hadfield, London.  
Very Rev. Hewlett Johnson, The Deanery, Manchester.  
T. B. Johnston, Esq. (Man. Director, Pountney and Co., Ltd., The Bristol Pottery), Bristol.  
John S. Kirkbride, Esq., The Old Hall, Lowdham, Notts.  
Arthur Kitson, Esq., London.  
T. Alfred Kennion, Esq., Hoddesdon.  
H. E. B. Ludlam, Esq., Typographical Association, Coventry.  
Robert O. Mennell, Esq. (R. O. Mennell and Co.), London.  
Lord Meston, London.  
Sydney W. Pascall, Esq. (Jas. Pascall, Ltd.), London.  
Wm. Dent Priestman, Esq. (Priestman Bros., Ltd.), Hull.  
Maurice B. Reckitt, M.A., Guildford.  
Howard D. Rowntree, Esq. (Wm. Rowntree and Sons, Ltd.), Scarborough.  
Arthur Sisson, Esq., M.I.Mech.E., Gloucester.

Charles H. Smithson, Esq. (Joseph Smithson, Ltd.), Cravenedge Mills, Halifax.

Reginald Sorensen, M.P., Walthamstow.

Rev. Malcolm Spencer, M.A. (Hon. Sec., Christian Social Council), London.

W. H. Sturge (Sturge and Baker, Ltd.), Birmingham.

R. C. Wallhead, M.P., Merthyr-Tydfil.

Angus Watson, Esq. (Angus Watson and Co., Ltd.), Newcastle-on-Tyne.

R. Morley, M.P., Southampton.

Jas. Edw. Tuke, Hon. Secretary to the Group (Tuke and Bell, Ltd.).

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

## THE POLICY OF THE "NEW AGE."

P. S.—Thank you for your letter and friendly criticism. We are always anxious to understand our readers' points of view regarding our policy, but in most cases these are couched in such generalised terms that it is impossible to make practical use of them. You say that we ought to "welcome all efforts at free and original thinking on the matter"—the matter being, presumably, Social Credit—instead of assuming a "pontifical attitude" towards them. You then say that we must keep free from "mixing the idea up" with questions (you cite the "abortionist affair" as an example) which "cut across" general thought, sentiments, etc., in such a way as to "outrage" many potential supporters. To us, your two criticisms seem mutually contradictory. For instance, a good deal of "free and original thinking" on the credit question also "cuts across the general thought"; and though it may not "outrage" anybody it certainly obscures the problem. We are astonished to find that you see in the "abortionist affair" an example of our "mixing the (Social Credit) idea up." We were congratulating ourselves on having done exactly the opposite: that is to say, we were opposing the doctrine that the Social Credit idea had anything to do with family limitation proposals. We should not be surprised to hear that the advocates of those proposals (who, with the exception of Mrs. Megroz, are regular supporters of *THE NEW AGE*) regard our attitude as "pontifical." If by "pontifical" you mean that we claim to speak with authority on the economic question, we admit the truth. But the word is not happily chosen, because it connotes an unreasoned assumption of omniscience, whereas we base our conclusions on a body of intelligible evidence which everybody is invited to investigate. But in any case we cannot possibly get practical guidance from general criticisms. If critics will call our attention to definite instances where we have discouraged anything which they consider to be helpful thinking along the lines of our common objective we shall be only too pleased to hear from them.

## AMERICAN TAXES AND EUROPE'S DEBT.

D. L. O.—President Hoover's statement that American citizens have "to find annually about £95,000,000 interest, and, in addition, to redeem the principal of the sums borrowed by the United States Government," as a result of war-loan settlements, does not contradict the conclusions drawn by Mr. Brenton in *The Realist*. If it is granted that the existence of external debt keeps dollars in circulation in America which otherwise would not be circulating there, then the debt provides the fund out of which American citizens can pay the taxes. It is true that they "have to find them," but the point is that they are (presumably) able to find them. Mr. Brenton's point was not that Americans were not taxed, but that the repayment of debt from abroad would not lighten their net financial burden.

It must be remembered that though these debt-settlements, in a financial sense, involved "letting Europe off" a considerable proportion of the principal sums involved, they meant, in a physical sense, letting Europe off delivering goods into America. Very good. The taxes which Americans have to find are a sort of premium they are paying to insure their industries against the entry of debt-goods from Europe. The exclusion of these goods protects their markets and enables them to collect the dollars to pay the premiums. If this is what Mr. Hoover means, he is not contradicting the argument in *The Realist*. But if he means to suggest that, supposing America had not thus "let Europe off," American citizens would have been able to keep these premiums in their pockets, he is wrong. To the extent that Europe repaid debt (in the only effective way: i.e., entering American markets) to that extent American trade would decline, and American bankers would call in loans. That is to say the bankers would collect and destroy the fund at present available for taxes.



**"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 Monomark Address of the K.K. is

BM/KIFT, LONDON, W.C.1.

**CHEST DISEASES***"Umckaloabo acts as regards Tuberculosis as a real specific."*

(Dr. Sechehaye in the "Swiss Medical Review.")

*"It appears to me to have a specific destructive influence on the Tubercle Bacilli in the same way that Quinine has upon Malaria."*

(Dr. Grun in the King's Bench Division.)

If you are suffering from any disease of the chest or lungs—spasmodic or cardiac asthma excluded—ask your doctor about Umckaloabo, or send a postcard for particulars of it to Chas. H. Stevens, 204-206, Worple Road, Wimbledon, London, S.W.20, who will post same to you **Free of Charge**.

Readers, especially T.B.'s., will see in the above few lines more wonderful news than is to be found in many volumes on the same subject.

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, on 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.

**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.

TUCE, 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.