

# THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 2116] NEW SERIES Vol. LII. No. 22. THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 1933. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	253	THE THREE-PHASE IDEOPRACTIC. By John Hargrave	258
The Birmingham Debate—impressions and reflections. (By Arthur Brenton.)		Analysis of principles governing methods of Social-Credit propaganda.	
BARTER AND BANKERS. (Editorial)	256	THE GREEN SHIRTS	259
The U.S.A. barter-habit—bankers intervene to organise it!		Notes from the General Secretary.	
BANKERS IN ERMINE. (Editorial)	256	THEATRE NOTES. By Richard Carroll	260
Cheating "the Revenue"—Mr. Justice Horridge's remarks when sentencing Spiro Morris.		<i>Francis Thompson. Cecilia.</i>	
THE "A" THEOREM. II. (Editorial)	257	THE FILMS. By David Ockham	261
REVIEW	257	<i>Hard to Handle. The programme at the Empire.</i>	
<i>Moral Man and Immoral Society.</i>		CORRESPONDENCE	261
		A. J. B. and Norman Mickle.	

## NOTES OF THE WEEK.

We publish here certain impressions and reflections on the Birmingham Debate. As they are, in some parts, personal reactions of the writer, they are published as by him, and over his signature.

### The Birmingham Debate.

#### I.

Two features of the proceedings at the Central Hall on March 22 are unique. As Mr. Abrams, the Chairman remarked at the close of the debate, no one present had probably attended any debate in which the demeanour of the two protagonists and the audience were so conspicuously free from bias.

There seemed to be an atmosphere of the school rather than of the political meeting. I was glad of this because the debate having been organised by the Birmingham Social Credit Group, and, of course, being attended in considerable numbers by convinced advocates of Social Credit, it was antecedently certain that Mr. Hawtrey, in criticising Social Credit, would sense himself arguing with a psychological resistance. If this resistance had become unduly vocal—as would have been the case in an ordinary debate—I should have regretted it. Happily, apart from a slight over-emphasis of the acclamation of Major Douglas in comparison with that accorded to Mr. Hawtrey on their joint appearance on the platform, there was nothing said or done throughout the debate which would exaggerate the handicap under which Mr. Hawtrey conducted his case.

Another feature of the proceedings was that the Birmingham Social Credit Group had gone to the trouble of preparing two excellent diagrams which, when unrolled and suspended, stretched across the whole of the platform, and were conspicuous in all essential detail in the farthest corners of the hall. Again, here there was no attempt to score debating points against Mr. Hawtrey; the design of the diagrams being intended simply to make precise the frame of reference in which the nature of the crucial issue of the debate (namely the truth or otherwise of the A plus B Theorem) should logically be elucidated. It was not so much to win an argument either way as to put in a sort of picture form the respective axioms on which the present system and the Social Credit system are based. I think, myself, that Mr. Hawtrey found his task easier by reason of the diagrams, in the sense that he was better able to understand the point of Major Douglas's arguments, and therefore to give more precision to his replies than would have been the case otherwise. In any case, every neutral

member of the audience must have felt grateful to those who carried out this idea; for it at least ensured that the debate kept within certain definite limits, so that whether anyone went away convinced or not by either speaker, he certainly had no excuse for uncertainty as to what the fundamental issue was, or the practical implications depending upon which case was correct.

#### II.

The hall in which the debate took place seated about 450; but I was told that over 1,200 applications for tickets had been received. The small hall and audience were an advantage, however, because the nature of the arguments demanded careful attention—which is always easier to bestow when there is no strain on the sight and hearing of anyone. Always, when the fundamental issue posed by the Social Credit Analysis is being closely and squarely argued, every word is a key word, and the slightest mishearing may cause gross misunderstanding. On the other hand, it is a pity that so many as 750 people had to be excluded, for the wider reason that, irrespective of which side put up the better case, the audience would have undoubtedly been impressed by the unique character of the issue—one as far distant as the Poles from such matters as Free Trade v. Protection—Socialism v. Communism—and other subjects on which the average listener is probably as well-informed as the speakers, and the best probably better. The more thoughtful a listener on this occasion the more likely he would have been to sav to himself:

"I can see that the vital issue in this debate is one on which no one can form a final judgment without systematic, private study." And even the least thoughtful would have realised—probably for the first time—that there can be another side to the most "self-evident" proposition. For this reason I should have liked to see those missing 750 people there.

I should have liked it for a second reason—this time a political one. Any member of the audience must have realised, from the very demand made on his reasoning faculties—which he had voluntarily brought to bear on the issue—how unsuitable that issue was for intruding indiscriminately upon the notice of an inert public along lines familiar in electoral campaigns. Imagine a snap plebescite taken on

the question: "Do you accept the 'A' Theorem or the 'A + B' Theorem?"

But, as has been pointed out in this journal, this is the kind of ramp that the bankers' intelligence-organisations are ready to launch on the sea of political controversy directly the name and objective of Major Douglas's policy attract a given amount of public attention. In fact, they are doing it already in Australia. Electors in the mass, particularly at election times, would unthinkingly regard it as a self-evident truth that they were not entitled to demand any economic policy unless they thoroughly understood the financial principles underlying it, and their applicability to a given method of administering it. That is to say: "You must not vote for a change in financial policy without first becoming a financial expert." And even then, the examiners of expertness would probably be the people who objected to the change—with the consequence that only "no-change" candidates would win a certificate.

The bankers have sighed over Major Douglas's "unintelligibility" for fourteen years, infecting Treasury officials, politicians, and professors of economics with the same habit. This unintelligibility, however true the allegation might be, is irrelevant so far as the electorate is concerned—it applies to something which no electorate is competent, nor is called upon to make itself competent, to pronounce upon: namely, the *how* of instrumenting a *what*. It is for the public to decide the *what*, according to their desires—backed, of course, by a more or less definite realisation of the inherent possibility of the *what* (they would not vote, for example, for the capital development of the backward countries of the moon!) And it is for experts to decide the *how*, a duty which includes the responsibility of submitting themselves to examination by people competent to check their reasoning in the event of their confessing or professing inability to discover a *how*.

This is not to argue that the public should not be encouraged to listen in to discussions on technique. On the contrary, the more who do so the better—not with the idea of educating a majority of the electorate in that aspect of the subject, but rather of training a team of Gentlemen to meet the Players on the field of technical elucidation. No disparagement of individuals is involved in this distinction—as every follower of the game of cricket will recognise. Secondly, every person who grasps the technical principles and means of realising the Social-Credit objective is better able to inspire others with faith in its feasibility—to confirm their resistance to the temptation to doubt whether a thing is true because it is good. Thirdly, his knowledge will give him presence of mind in an emergency. It will generate in him an instinct to be in the right place, to say the right word, and do the right thing to rally the disordered forces around him—assuaging fears on the one hand, and abating foolishness on the other. These were among the reflections which the proceedings in Birmingham inspired in me. I felt that I was present in an assemblage of personalities, each earnestly searching for knowledge, and each a potential officer in a political army. I contrasted them against other assemblies which all of us have seen—mesmerised victims of muddled magniloquence—grist for the polling-mill.

People have since asked me "how did Douglas get on" in the sense of "how did he score off Hawtrey." I have not been in the mood to look at it that way, nor am I now. Douglas won louder and more frequent applause, but since, in the nature of the case, a numerous Social-Credit claue were present (I mean this without offence) these manifestations of approval did not give me what I wanted—namely, what were the reactions of the people who had come there to learn what they did not know, not to hear what they both knew and liked?

I think I got most of what I wanted through observing Mr. Hawtrey's demeanour. He is a man, I should say, with a well-developed faculty of sensing "atmosphere"; and to my mind he was conscious throughout the evening of psychological resistance to the conclusions he was endeavouring to reach. "If Christ be not raised," said St. Paul, "then are we of all men most miserable." And it seemed as if, in the background of the audience's endeavour to grasp arguments from either speaker on their logical merits, there was an instinctive feeling that if the Social-Credit way of escape from the "wrath to come" were proved illusory, all hope had departed. Those who know Major Douglas's powers of rising superior to hostile influences will yet agree that if he were set to prove a gloomy philosophy in terms of intrinsically difficult language to an untrained audience of people thirsting for a drop of hope, he would be put to a test which would call for the liquidation of the last reserves of his resolution, "If I'm right, God help me," would be the thought of any man of human feeling in such circumstances; and I cannot help thinking that Mr. Hawtrey, at moments, envied Major Douglas the serenity with which he could endeavour to substantiate his case.

The term "frame of reference" is often used in this journal as, for example, in a saying such as "Arguing in this or that frame of reference." This can be expressed in less material forms, such as "atmosphere of reference" or "less material still—spirit of reference." There are three groups of faculties in the human brain: those of perception and comparison, those of reflection and co-ordination, and those of idealisation, veneration, and sublimation. Thus, you *perceive* in a *frame* of reference; you *reflect* in an *atmosphere* of reference; and you *elucidate* in a *spirit* of reference. This reflection is the nearest in approach that occurs to me to a logical elucidation of Major Douglas's reference at THE NEW AGE Dinner to the term "canon" as expressing what may be called the unknown factor in human judgment which is common to all humanity. In the present context we can use the term in a particular relationship and speak of the *canon of perfection in design*. In theology it has been laid down as a "canon" (the word has a narrower import here) of sound exegesis that events recorded in the Bible must not be ascribed to supernatural causes if they can be explained by natural causes—an injunction, by the way which bankers need to have brought to their attention; for they depart from it every time they ascribe to moral causation unpleasant economic phenomena which mechanical causation suffices to explain. As to the word "design," it is a perfectly appropriate one because it can be applied equally to the nature or quality of something and to an intention preceding and causing it. It embraces both the creation and the creator. Thus, in theology, the phrase "The argument from Design" is familiar, and refers to the method of inferring the existence of Nature. The Freethinkers meet this by asking what is the canon of perfection (the provision and adaptation of means to ends) in the divine design, pointing out, for instance, that if physical pain has been ordained to warn men of the presence of disease, every pain ought to be felt in that part of the body where the disease is situated, and then adducing cases where it occurs somewhere else—thence proceeding to the conclusion that insofar as the Divine intention is right the design is wrong, and insofar as the design is right the intention is wrong. Of course that argument never finishes, for the Theists argue that in the design a deeper perfection lies beneath the superficial imperfections. Here the subject of the controversy can be dropped, with the incidental comment that when the economic system is put right a great mass of evil formerly ascribed to superhuman

causes will be seen to have been extirpated by the act of man himself.

I come now, via this short apparent digression, to the consideration of Major Douglas's two diagrams. One was drawn to represent the principle governing the present system and the other to represent the futility of trying to get it to work without altering the principle. The one showed how production was held out of consumption, and the other showed the consequence of multiplying production to correct under-consumption. (No doubt the diagrams will be reproduced when the report of the debate is published.) The two of them together constituted a diagram of the bankers' design. This had the merit of helping the audience to ignore irrelevant facts, and of guiding them in drawing inferences from the relevant facts. "This design," as Major Douglas might put it, "shows you one of two things: either it is a perfect means for an end you object to; or else it is a useless means for an end you desire." In other words: "If the bankers mean you well they are incompetent; or, if they are competent they mean you ill." Of course, this dilemma could be escaped by the bankers if they chose to argue that there was a deeper "wellness" underlying the superficial "illness," and attainable through it, but, as I have suggested, the audience at the debate were in no need of direction as to what attitude to take up to that line of argument. Nor, indeed, did Mr. Hawtrey show the least disposition to dissent from the standard of perfection subtly indicated in their demeanour. On the contrary his case was precisely that there was no inherent obstruction in the mechanism of the existing design to frustrate its purpose of delivering goods according to physical capacity to do so.

Mr. Hawtrey's debating consisted, not so much of arguments for a counter-principle to that enunciated by Major Douglas, but of objections to the validity of Major Douglas's theorem. This forced Major Douglas into the rôle of chief expositor, and Mr. Hawtrey into that of, not by any means one of the audience, but as, shall I say, a barrister with a watching brief on their behalf. In that rôle he undoubtedly contributed, and most creditably, to the value of the debate, for he competently and relevantly raised objections and queries which the audience might have forgotten to put or might not have known how to express. In short, even if no time had been left for questions and discussion in the body of the hall the educational effect of the proceedings would have been only slightly less than it was.

Mr. Hawtrey manifested ability to recognise, and to confine his remarks within the frame of reference constituted by the essential facts relating to the diagrams, but what appeared to be the difficulty was that his undoubted intelligence was not sufficiently acclimatised to the Social-Credit atmosphere of reference to exercise itself freely. For a man trained and occupied in the administration of financial policy on existing principles it must require a conscious effort to exclude from his mind and the field of discussion facts and problems which are of practical relevance and significance in his daily work. It is a commonplace fact that in such cases as where you have men working in a compressed-air chamber you have to be careful to lighten the compression gradually back to natural pressure, or you will injure them. Likewise with the contrary process. The climbers in the Mount Kamet expedition had to stop and take three of four breaths at every step when they came into the attenuated air round the summit of that mountain. And so in the realm of psychology, one has to persist in the conscious un-thinking of irrelevant matters before he can unconsciously focus his thinking to relevant matters. And it is no count against a man's intelligence or his good faith that he cannot adapt himself suddenly to an unaccustomed conceptual atmosphere.

Accordingly, when the proceedings neared the conclusion of the main part of the debate, and I heard, in spirit, the sharpening of knives by implacable Social-Credit hecklers, my mood summoned me to acclimatise myself to a wet atmosphere across the road. Within five minutes I was listening to a young man (a motor-transport driver) telling me that he knew THE NEW AGE—"I had one in my hand last week"—and it appeared that a little knot of people in a firm at Stratford-on-Avon where he delivers goods club together to buy the paper every week. He knew all about the Debate, too—in fact it was my mentioning where I had wandered from that I learned what I did. Well, we toasted the bankers; and in order that our wishes for their immediate health and ultimate destination should be properly attended to by The Altogether, we toasted them some more in the same formula. This short interlude induced the reflection that whereas at the top there are people who can't see why the Social-Credit objective is attainable, there are people at the bottom who can't see why it isn't. The latter are in daily contact with the realities of economics, material, men, and machines and cannot see why, with a sufficiency of these, the two other desirable realities should not automatically follow—output and share-out.

One further reflection in conclusion. Somewhere within every man and woman is the true "spirit of reference." "Let us make man in our own image" may mean the implanting in man of the potentiality for realising truth or untruth in "design," as previously spoken of. Excluding consideration of man's relationship with a "Higher Being," and surveying his terrestrial relationships in all their variety, it would seem that the training of his faculties of the Social Credit technique and purpose is the surest way in which he can arrive at that complete conviction of "rightness" and "wrongness" which makes him the incarnation of the canon spoken of by Major Douglas.

If we picture the three "references" as three circles, the inner contained by the other two, we can call the outermost the spirit of reference, the next inside the atmosphere of reference, and the innermost the frame of reference. In this picture the conviction of rightness comes—the incarnation of the canon is achieved—when the three circles are concentric. The outermost may be considered as fixed, for it represents man's spiritual inheritance. Hence, concentricity comes through the movement of at least one and, in most cases, both the contained circles from positions of eccentricity into positions of concentricity. When the trinity of central points coincide, the work is perfected, and manifests itself in an experience which I have heard described, by friends who have known it, as spiritual exaltation.

I think particularly of one friend (I have never seen him), an old man, who, some years ago, was wearily and disconsolately composing himself to pass out in the sunset of this sad epoch. Then he heard of Social Credit. To-day my old friend is transfigured into a tireless teacher of truth and eloquent prophet of hope. And so to-day whenever I am in company where the teaching of Social Credit is taking place, I am conscious of influences set free which infinitely transcend in power the force of mere intellectual acceptance of a scientific proposition. And at none have I been made so acutely conscious of this as on the occasion of the debate at Birmingham.

ARTHUR BRENTON.

### Notice.

All communications requiring the Editor's attention should be addressed directly to him as follows:  
Mr. Arthur Brenton,  
20, Rectory Road,  
Barnes, S.W.13.

### Barter and Bankers.

The Times's chief contributed article of March 24 deals with barter in the United States. The author traces the extension of it and describes the methods. As a measure of its dimensions he says that in Seattle more than twenty organisations have a membership of 50,000, and that for the whole of the United States there are 140 organisations covering twenty-nine States. Then he goes on to explain that the system has "sprung up and developed locally too quickly for any central control to be organised." But centralisation is "in prospect." Last October the Emergency Exchange Association was formed under the leadership of Mr. J. K. Clark, president of the New York State Board of Law Examiners—the board of directors including "economists" and "consultants." Among their supporters are all sorts of people, including "bankers" and "business men." The association, he says, would co-ordinate the local systems

"so as to enable the unemployed to exchange goods and services from locality to locality without the use of money" and would act as a "clearing house" for the multiple local exchanges.

Another development took place, he says, on January 15 when a group of "economists" and "relief workers" issued a memorandum recommending State investigation and Presidential action; and specifically requested the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to "make advances to established exchanges." The article concludes with the statement that this memorandum has the support of a number of leading universities.

This is an object-lesson in bankers' strategy. Inside each locality separately they allowed exchanges to be conducted with "scrip" (as the barter-tokens are called) as well as with money; but have started to intervene now that the many local scrip-habits have extended far enough to threaten to coalesce into a single national scrip-habit. Students and speakers can adapt Major Douglas's diagram for illustrating the principles here involved, the one in which he pictured an "aristocracy of producers" operating within and serving a "democracy of consumers," by means of two triangles, the triangle of "producers" standing upright inside an inverted triangle of "consumers." The barter experiment in the U.S. is something which consumers have thought of for themselves, and reflects spontaneous co-operation. It answers to the inverted triangle where the power of direction inheres in the people. What the bankers are now doing is something which answers to the construction of an upright triangle of finance round the inverted triangle of barter. Economic democracy is being surrounded by financial oligarchy. As the old upright triangle of local finance in each locality becomes enveloped by the growing inverted triangle of local barter, an upright triangle of national finance is constructed to envelop both the others. It needs little reflection to see that the running of a barter-scrip system on advances of money will mean the division and failure of local barter-areas instead of the unity and success which it is held out to be promoting. The situation recalls the smash-up of the Stinnes Combine when it looked like taking the form of a "horizontal" trust which could make and supply to its own employees everything that they required, and could therefore become its own bank.

The bankers' strategy in the U.S. could, and probably would, be applied to the "municipal-currency-habit" if it took root and grew to any size in this country. The bankers do not want it, and will obstruct its dissemination; but they wouldn't worry at the sprouting of the seed: they have plenty of time to wangle a mortgage on the harvest.

### Bankers in Ermine.

Bankers pay all taxes.

This dictum, which Major Douglas let drop once in course of a discussion, may seem cryptic in isolation, but, with a hint as to the context, anyone who has matriculated in the science of finance\* will see that it is a statement of fundamental fact. The context required the word "pay" to be interpreted in the contingent sense expressed by the word "underwrite." If taxes are under-subscribed by the public, the bankers are left to fill the deficit. As every graduate knows, the fund on which they can draw for the purpose they can manufacture for that purpose at no cost to themselves, and to an extent which whatever the theoretical limit, could certainly defray the whole of our current annual Budget expenditure if necessary, without causing any difficulty if accompanied by the safeguards against inflation with which we are all familiar. So we can expand Major Douglas's dictum and say: "Bankers can pay all taxes." That is the technical side of the truth. The political side can be expressed in the addendum: "They won't until they're forced to." Their reason can be put in the phrase: "It would demoralise the public." They are possessed to a pitch of fanaticism by a passion for "Righteousness," with the consequence that opposition to their will, let alone obstruction of it, arouses in them the spirit of revenge. This malignant psychosis may not be discernible in any particular member of the banking group, but it literally glares through the policy and acts of the group as a whole and of its administrative agents.†

The latest concrete manifestation of the influence of this group-revenge-complex comes from Birmingham, where Mr. Justice Horridge on March 18, in all good faith, conceived it his duty to sentence one Spiro Morris, a jeweller, aged sixty-four, to two years' hard labour, plus a fine of £1,000, plus the full costs of the prosecution, for making false income-tax returns. According to the evidence (Sunday Express, March 19), the prisoner had, between 1925 and 1931, underpaid the Tax Underwriters (disguised under the personal designation, "The Revenue") £19,000. Of this he had restored £7,000, leaving £12,000 as yet unpaid. Further, he gave an assurance that he would pay the balance before or after proceedings were started against him. Presumably, at any rate, he did so before sentence was passed; and in that case his undertaking becomes an additional item of the penalty. In process of inflicting it Mr. Justice Horridge made some observations explicitly for the benefit

\*There was no science of finance before Douglas—or if there was the fact was successfully hidden from the public. He was the first to announce and explain it, and until someone comes forward with the claim to prior discovery, he must be accepted as the founder of the faculty of financial science and the head of the distinguished order of financial scientists.

†Note that The Times of March 14, in its leading article on Karl Marx, implicitly condones his revengeful attitude towards the "capitalist" by its sympathetic allusion to the "prophetic ideal of Righteousness" (sic—capital letter and all!) which inspired it. This article is crammed full of sentiments which underscore our present thesis; and we strongly urge readers to analyse it thoroughly.

‡Let us cite a few evidences. The £100 fine on two doctors for "excessive prescription." The penalty of flogging for robbery with (merely technical) violence. The ventilation by The Times of the suggestion of flogging for violence to persons or property! Mr. Hatry's appalling sentence to fit his "appalling crime." Any crime adversely affecting the banking, insurance, and investment systems—the three instruments of moral discipline in the hands of the high financiers, is punished revengefully, however dispassionately proved.

### The "A" Theorem.

II.

We broke off our article last week at the point where the subject of private investment was due to be related to the "A" Theorists' analysis of costs and incomes.

The conclusion of that analysis was that incomes distributed in respect of all production at any given time were sufficient to pay for the consumable portion of the production which was ready for sale at that time. We will reproduce the numerological illustration then used. We tabled nine stages of production, thus:—

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	J
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

and showed how the "A" Theorist could demonstrate an equilibrium between the cost at J (consumable articles ready for sale) and the total incomes distributed at the same period of time by the processes A—J: the figure for both being £9, and remaining at £9 through every successive period of time.

On the basis of that demonstration the "A" Theorist could advance the proposition that while it was true that the cost of all the production at any given time was £45, i.e., £36 more than the total incomes available at that time, this did not matter, because the people would only want to buy the articles on the consumption market, not the £36 worth of production behind the market. "What would be the use," the argument might run, "of providing them with additional money in respect of production which they couldn't make use of if they bought it?" And the argument could be extended in the following form: "Provided the quantity of consumable goods purchasable by the £9 were sufficient to maintain a fair general standard of comfort, the people's earned incomes of £9 would not require to be supplemented by 'dividends' such as Major Douglas suggests."

But in actual fact consumers are buying non-consumable goods which are behind the market. That is precisely what an investment means, whether made directly by a person, or indirectly by an institution on his behalf (e.g., an insurance company which invests his premiums). Investment is the rule in modern industry; and it is broadly true to say that the whole of the fixed capital of industry has been raised (a) by collecting money already distributed as personal incomes, and (b) by withholding profits from distribution and allocating them to "reserves."

In both cases the money reverts to the banks and is destroyed. Hence the general rate of money—destruction at any given time is equal to the rate of consumption (when goods disappear from industry) plus the rate of investment (when goods remain inside). The investors' property is now reflected by shares, but none of the money paid for those shares remains in existence on which these shares can be said to be "secured," or into which they are "convertible." That is the reason why any considerable pressure to sell shares causes such an inordinate fall in their value.

Applying this to the figures in the table, let us assume that at any given moment of time the people invest, say, £1 out of the £9. To save splitting this £1 up between the eight processes behind the market let us allot all of it to one of them. We start as before.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	J
Period 1.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

If no investment is made the next period would show these figures:—

Period 2.	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

But if £1 is invested in the H process in period 1 the figures are,

Period 2.	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	2
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

of the public, and hence laid himself open to challenge by, or on behalf of, the public. He said:—

I must warn the public that men cannot wickedly defraud the income-tax authorities. A debt for income tax is as much a debt as any other. Foolish persons who pride themselves in tricking the Revenue ought to know that if they do they will have appropriate punishment." (Our italics.)

According to this, Mr. Spiro's sentence was the "appropriate" punishment for taking pride in the fraud! The pride constituted the wickedness. Notice the absence of any allusion to the incidence of the fraud on the pockets of Mr. Spiro's fellow citizens. Yet, surely, that consideration should be the main criterion of just punishment. Assuming the truth of the popular notion that what Mr. Spiro did not pay, his neighbours did, and quantifying their loss (as Mr. Gavin Simons would say) it works out at only one-seventieth of a penny per annum per head of the population during the six years. This by no means excuses the fraud; but it places the damage in proper perspective. Punishment, of course, is intended to act as a deterrent to people generally as well as to exact retribution from any particular wrongdoer. But from what Mr. Justice Horridge said it would seem as if it was of no particular consequence for a man to cheat his neighbours, even if he were proud of it, but was a grave crime to cheat something called "the Revenue." "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," says the Scripture. "Who is my neighbour?" becomes the question. "The tax authority" is the answer of the Bench.

The emphasis laid by Mr. Justice Horridge on the spirit in which the crime is committed is deeply significant. It reflects (though he is unconscious of it) the nervousness of the bankers at the rapid spread of knowledge among the public of the tricks of the banking game—a knowledge which will show them that what is called cheating the Revenue is really an obstruction of the fraudulent exactions of the Money Monopoly, and is therefore, in one sense the fulfilment of a civic duty, and something to be proud of. We heard a good-living man the other day remark of a case where some high official of the Company in which he was employed was charged with misappropriating the Company's money: "I wish he had been at — branch: he could have touched them for more." Himself, that man wouldn't steal a penny: yet he could applaud someone who did. And why? Because that Company had been sacking his mates right and left with callous disregard of their competence and faithfulness. That was how he saw it. The truth is that the Company was in the grip of the Money Monopoly, and had to do it. And when men realise that taxation is a wanton levy on the means of life imposed by a private Money Monopoly for purposes of its own, "cheating the Revenue" will be seen as a crime to which the bankers are virtual inciters and accessories.

### Reviews.

Moral Man and Immoral Society. A Study in Ethics and Politics. By Reinhold Niebuhr. (Scribners. 8s. 6d.) An interesting study of the inevitable clash of internal groups in their search for power. Will come as something of a shock to the middle-classes and educationalists. Chapters on the ethical attitudes of privileged and proletarian classes are well written, the author realising that conflict is inevitable, and that in the conflict power must be challenged by power. Social Credit propagandists who realise that group action is essential will find the author's analysis useful. Unfortunately the interest is not sustained when the author attempts constructive thought; and the work tends to trail off into a third-rate sermon style. F. G.



end, and we may expect further developments in this district before long.

The meeting at H.O. on March 21, addressed by "Yaffle" on the subject of "Socialism and Social Credit" was crammed to overflowing, and people had to be turned away. Over 100 sat and stood in the lecture-room, that can only hold about 80 at a squeeze.

Another address (arising, as a matter of fact, out of "Yaffle's" meeting—and specially requested by that meeting) is to be given by John Hargrave, the founder and leader of the Green Shirts, on Tuesday, April 4th, on "Putting Social Credit Over," and as a very large attendance is expected—come early if you want a seat.

A green banner of the standard size (5ft. wide by 4ft. deep) is under construction for the 1st London Hundred. It will bear the following wording on one side, in bold white 6-inch letters:—

THE GREEN SHIRT MOVEMENT FOR SOCIAL CREDIT.  
NO FASCISM!  
NO COMMUNISM!

WE DEMAND  
"THE WAGES OF THE MACHINE."

and on the other side:—

THE GREEN SHIRT MOVEMENT FOR SOCIAL CREDIT.  
ISSUE

THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND  
TO  
EVERY CITIZEN!

Green Shirts in various parts of the country are in real need of such banners, and some sort of "banner-factory" is urgently required. This is work that can be done at home by any woman who is a fairly efficient machinist. The slogans for a whole series of banners have been approved, but we are now held up for lack of banner material and banner-makers. Anyone willing to help the cause by undertaking such work should write direct to: The Organising Secretary, Women's Section, Green Shirt Headquarters, 35, Old Jewry, London, E.C.2

Some hundreds (and, if the movement spreads at its present rate, some thousands) of green armlets are wanted as quickly as possible. These are made of bright emerald green casement cloth (15ins. long by 3½ins. deep). Volunteer armlet-makers are required for this work.

So strong is the dislike amongst all sections of the wage-earning masses and the unemployed for the Mosley (or any other) brand of Fascism that no headway can be made in any district without explicitly stating and demonstrating that the Green Shirts are not only not Fascist, but definitely against Fascism. Since this is the truth, it is not difficult to clear a path through the tangle that has been created by many and several forms of "British Fascism," all of which are heartily detested by the masses.

We overheard the following scrap of (rather heated) conversation at H.O. the other evening:—

"I see no difference between you and the Communists!"

"Well, then, you must be colour-blind."  
However, it is not merely a matter of colour. We maintain that Social Credit is a third Resolvent Factor—a positive catalytic agent that dissolves the basic doctrines of both Communism and Fascism (if Fascism has any basic doctrine, other than the idea of "the State" above the individual?).

The National Assembly of the Green Shirt Movement for Social Credit will be held in camp at Winch Bottom Farm, Nr. High Wycombe, Bucks, during Whitsuntide, from Saturday, June 3, to Monday, June 5.

London Green Shirts with their drums, flags and banners, will parade in force, and we hear that Green Shirt representatives from the provinces are already making arrangements to attend. Last year the Coventry Green Shirts attended, 40 strong, under the command of their leader, and this year we look forward to seeing them again (an even stronger contingent, if possible!), together with Green Shirts from Stockton, Gatheshead, Rochdale, Manchester, Sheffield, Liverpool, and many other places.

We expect to see all Associate Workers and Helpers, and Social Credit supporters and their friends can obtain Permit Cards to visit the camp from the General Secretary.

The proceedings of the Assembly dealing with the policy and internal affairs of the movement (to be held on Sunday, June 4) will not be open to visitors.

H. T. W.

## Theatre Notes.

### Francis Thompson: Royalty.

England rarely appreciates her poets, nor for that matter is ever particularly kind to them. The English prefer men of action, and poets are generally temperamental dreamers who despise the well-ordered and regulated existence of the "hearty" fellow. As a rule poets commence their lives by being misunderstood at home, and the process is often repeated with increasing painfulness in the brutal world outside. Avaunt, ye Philistines! Such a poet as this was Francis Joseph Thompson, whose life—or rather, to be precise, three years of it—has provided the basis for a new play which Sir Nigel Playfair is producing at the Royalty Theatre. The play consists of ten episodes, beginning with the flight of Francis Thompson from his father's house near Manchester one Sunday night in December, 1885, and terminating with the poet's fruitless search on the Thames Embankment in October, 1888, for the woman of the streets who had befriended him in his hour of need, but now generously left him when she discovered that other friends of greater consequence than herself had taken him up and recognised his genius.

Francis Thompson was the son of a Lancashire doctor who had been converted to Roman Catholicism. His father wished him to study medicine, and with this end in view he was sent to Owens College, Manchester, and later for a year to Glasgow. But Francis had no taste for dissecting rooms and operating theatres, and he failed on no fewer than three occasions to pass the necessary qualifying examinations. On the contrary, he liked to spend his time in the fields reading verse or listening to good music in a friend's room; but unfortunately in the hopes of escaping from the Manxman's dinginess which threatened to overwhelm him, he fell a victim to the joys of opium, and the craving for his never left him—in fact it was largely responsible for his death. He now determined to leave a home in which he was intensely unhappy, and he fulfilled his intention after a stormy parental interview, at which his strange appearance led his father to believe he had been drinking. And yet the home which he left for the squalor of the capital was by no means as strict as many which flourished in the twilight of Victorianism. Though it was one where the fugitive's ambitions had not been encouraged, and where he had received little sympathy. The trouble that children father, like many others, could not understand that children were childlike, and boys were boy-like, and he tried to raise them up to his level rather than stoop down to theirs. "Know you what it is to be a child?" asked Francis in his great essay on Shelley. "It is to be something very different from the man of to-day . . . It is

To see the world in a grain of sand  
And a heaven in a wild flower,  
Hold infinity in the palm of your hand  
And eternity in an hour."

And so Francis went to London "without hope and with the gloomiest forebodings, in the desperate spirit of an infant perdu." There he lived for months in the utmost poverty, losing jobs as quickly as he got them, and giving his last sixpence to starving folk like himself. "Anne," who his fortunes were at their nadir he met "Anne," who cherished him and nursed him back to a life which he had almost ended on the Embankment. He turned again to his writing, and sent an essay on "Paganism Old and New" together with a number of poems, to the offices of the "Merrie England" magazine. In due course the editor recognised their worth, and it was a fortunate chance that brought him into direct contact with the author. The subsequent friendship of the two men has become well known, and what of the poet's other friend? In passing so swiftly and silently out of his life the brave Anne made a sacrifice which she must have felt very keenly. And who knows what became of her? Night after night Francis searched "the mighty labyrinths of London" all in vain. She never returned to their old trysting-place by the river.

"She passed! O brave, sad, loveliest, tender thing!  
And of her own scant pittance did she give  
That I might eat and live;  
Then fled, a swift and trackless fugitive."

As an introduction to the life and works of a poet who deserves to be better known, I can recommend "Francis Thompson" most warmly. Mr. Ernest Milton as Francis, and Miss Mary Glynn as Anne, give splendid performances. The merits of the play are further enhanced by the fact that the producer has had the benefit of the advice of Mr. Winifred Meynall, the original Editor of "Merrie England," who is happily still with us.

### Cecilia: Arts.

The young people are in trouble again, and Mr. Allan Monkhouse in "Cecilia" gives them an object-lesson with an oh so happy ending? Thank you, Mr. Monkhouse! Guy Daunt, the young and apparently irresponsible son of a well-to-do country gentleman, sends papa the overdue telegram, instructing him to prepare the fatted calf for two. His companion at the anticipated feast is an attractive, but sharp-witted, film actress, whom he has had the folly to marry on the strength of a trifling acquaintance. Such is Cecilia, and when the couple duly appear to receive the parental benediction, she realises that she is not going to be popular in the Daunt ménage. A testy, but not unmerited paternal "jaw" for the young husband follows the preliminary introduction of his bride, to which Guy's sister and fiancé provide some light relief. Guy cannot make up his mind what to do, but Cecilia knows hers, and she announces with characteristic insolence that she proposes to continue with her theatrical work. Guy, with no sure grounds, objects, gets laughed at for his pains, and the matter is clinched by the arrival of Peter Bransome, a theatrical agent whose mistress Cecilia soon unblushingly confesses that she has been. Off she goes to America to make a film, but foolishly refuses to sign a contract. The result is that Mr. Bransome leaves her stranded for some other lady whom he imagines has more talents than Cecilia, and she collapses under the shock. Guy immediately comes to her rescue, and brings her home to a household which she had treated with such scant consideration before her departure. The young people finally fall into each other's arms in a joyful ecstasy as the curtain descends, and one really does not care what happens after that, as they are so happy, bless their little hearts! Full marks, Mr. Monkhouse, for a clever and amusing Act I. But why let the show drag so much in Act II, then spoil it completely with a dose of sentimental balderdash at the end. Miss Fabia Drake's performance as Cecilia was the most pleasing, and her appearance (except for a badly waisted dress which was too small for her in one of the scenes) equally charming. The play was preceded by a curtain-raiser, "The Grand Cham's Diamond," which is also the work of Mr. Monkhouse—and a thriller which provides unexpected excitement for the audience. "Ome's a place to come back to!" says Mrs. Perkins, who has an itch to see things outside the cloistered suburbia in which she lives. And, by Jove, she does see them, and nearer home than she thought possible. But, try again, Mr. Monkhouse!

RICHARD CARROLL.

## The Films.

### Hard to Handle: Regal.

Hollywood is turning to comedy. That is not entirely, I think, intended as a relief to the depression; it is also due to the American characteristic of seeking for humour in satirising national characteristics. We have already had films making fun of the film world; "Hard to Handle" laughs at various aspects of the universal American "hokum"—big business; the credulity of the public; and the swindle of "endorsing" proprietary articles by men and women in the public eye (which is a specialised aspect of the fraud known as truth in advertising). Such a picture actually becomes a social document of some importance; if it could be shown a hundred years hence, posterity would find it impossible to credit the present crudity and credulity of God's own country. The film is incidentally most amusing, makes first class entertainment, and has the special merit that its witticisms are not machine-made wisecracks but genuinely funny. The very capable cast includes Mary Brian, that feminine Peter Pan of the screen, Ruth Donnelly, Allen Jenkins, and James Cagney. Mr. Cagney, who has now made his peace with the Warner studios after striking for higher pay, has hitherto specialised in hard-boiled roles; in this picture he shows himself an admirable comedian, but he should be restrained from talking quite so fast. Credit for the direction belongs to Mervyn Le Roy, who made that outstanding film, "I Am a Fugitive from a Chain Gang."

### Laughter at the Emptre.

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer join hands with Warner Brothers in giving us something at which to laugh. This week's Empire programme includes "What! No Beer?" with Jimmy Durante and Buster Keaton; "Twice Two," a Laurel and Hardy film; and a Mickey Mouse cartoon. If none is deliciously funny, all are very amusing. "What! No Beer?" is particularly topical, since at the moment of writing thirteen of the American States have already legalised the sale of light beer and wines from next month,

while legislation to the same effect is pending in twenty-four others. It was an excellent idea to contrast two such comedians as Durante and Keaton, the one a cyclonic exuberance, and the other obtaining all his effects by immobility. "Twice Two" is remarkable for the fact that Messrs. Laurel and Hardy simultaneously impersonate both themselves and their wives. Both are excellent female impersonators, and there is some very clever double photography in the film. An undiluted "Laughter Parade" is perhaps too much of a good thing, but at least one can laugh at American films intended to be funny, which is one of the many and considerable differences between Hollywood and Elstree.

### Current Films.

"14 Juillet" and "Emil und die Detektive" continue at the Academy and Cinema House respectively. They should on no account be missed. Among general releases, should on no account be missed. Among general releases, "Blonde Venus," with Marlene Dietrich, is at Tassaud's and the Stoll until Sunday. I have not seen this picture, but pass on the information for the benefit of those who still appreciate Miss Dietrich since she went Hollywood. That superb film, "Mädchen in Uniform," will be shown at the Forum, Villiers Street, Charing Cross, for a week from Monday next. It should need neither introduction nor commendation from my readers, but I counsel those who have not seen it to pay a visit to the Forum.

DAVID OCKHAM.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

### THE CASE OF MR. Z.

Sir,—In your Notes of the Week (March 9 issue) you refer to a recent court case in which a well known writer was forced to give evidence by the Crown and was then subjected to a shameful and humiliating attack which had no connection with the case being tried. A more damnable example of sheer persecution for the purpose of ruining a man's public work and record has seldom been seen in this country. As one who knows the inside history of this affair will you permit me to throw a little more light on this case. I understand that the full story will soon be published. The recent court case is merely one incident of a conspiracy started years ago. It originated during the war. Mr. Z. was offered very tempting fees to write for the American Press recommending the advisability of the European—and especially this country—returning to the gold standard. As he had been denouncing this policy for many years prior to the war, he naturally declined the offer. He was then offered a very large annual income if he would merely abstain from attacking it. His articles in "The Times" and other journals had created widespread interest and all over the English-speaking world. Again he refused and was then threatened with ruin, both in business and socially. All sorts of traps were laid—such as sending orders to his factory for large supplies of goods, and before these could be completed they were cancelled. His war claims for goods destroyed during the war in France and other countries, were deliberately cut down by the officials from several thousands of pounds to £50! Finally his business was ruined. Again he was warned anonymously that his ruin would be made complete if he continued attacking the Money power. It would take a whole volume to record every detail of this diabolical plot. It seems almost incredible. The point of interest to Social Credit people is that this persecution is likely to be inflicted on any member. I have heard of another writer on this subject who is now going through a somewhat similar ordeal. I send this merely to enlighten your readers as to the real motive behind this crucifixion of a man who has given more to the cause of monetary reform in services and money than probably any other living person.—Yours, etc., A. J. B.

### SOCIAL CREDIT AND SOCIALISM.

Sir,—The last paragraph of Major Douglas's speech, as reported in THE NEW AGE, strengthens my previous opinion that his attitude to the Labour Party is not unconnected with its benediction to Social Credit principles. It is, I suppose, well in accord with the peculiarities of human psychology that he should reserve his greatest disdain for the party which has a financial programme for that, which, having no new ideas on financial questions, is prepared to allow the Modern Judas his choicest bouquets for that, which, having no new ideas to continue to hold the bag. I have met with considerable success in getting Social Credit principles accepted by a number of local Socialists. I have never succeeded in obtaining serious interest from a supporter of the Tory (call it

National if you prefer it) Government. If Major Douglas hopes to get a useful measure of support for his scheme from the conservative-minded I admire his optimism as much as I deplore his judgment. The very novelty of the ideas gives them palpitations, and as for "touching the banks" — Yours faithfully,  
NORMAN MICKLE.

**Forthcoming Meetings.**

Brighton and Hove.—Four lectures will be given by Mr. Frank Griffiths, of Kibbo Kift (Green Shirts), at 8, Powis-villas, Dyke-road (Clock Tower end), at 8.30 p.m.

Lecture 4.—Friday, March 31.—Breaking the Money Monopoly.  
Fee, single lectures, 1s.

N.B.—All students in this district, it is hoped, will endeavour to attend. Any further particulars may be obtained from the secretary, Mr. D. G. Phipps, 24, St. Aubyns, Hove.

At Newport Town Hall Assembly Rooms, under the auspices of the Newport Debating Society, Dr. J. E. Humphries, M.Sc., Ph.D., B.A., will meet Councillor A. E. Pugh in debate on a motion to the effect that the principles underlying Social Credit would solve the economic problem. Dr. Humphries will affirm and Councillor Pugh oppose. Date, March 29. Time, 7.30 p.m.

At the Public Hall, Ipswich, Major C. H. Douglas will speak on "Money—Servant or Master." Date, Tuesday, April 4. Time, 8 p.m. Admission by ticket, 1s. reserved, 6d. unreserved. Apply to Mrs. Harrison, The Ancient House, Butter Market, Ipswich.

The Belfast Douglas Credit Group are holding a further three meetings in the Grand Central Hotel, at 7.30 p.m. Admission 6d. each night. The dates are:—  
March 29.  
April 5.

**Southampton.**

The Marquis of Tavistock will address a public meeting to be held in Watts Hall, Above Bar, at 7.45, April 11. Tickets may be obtained from L. D. Byrne, Hon. Secretary, 38, Above Bar, Southampton. The rapid progress of Social Credit in Southampton has necessitated a policy of decentralisation, and groups are being formed in all the suburbs. A strong group has already started in the Shirley and Millbrook district.

**GREENSHIRTS IN FINCHLEY.**

"Owing to interest taken by local residents, a local group of the Kibbo Kift, the Green Shirt Movement for Social Credit, has been formed for Finchley, Barnet, and District. Group headquarters are at 25, Hollyfield Avenue, Friern Barnet."—Finchley Press, March 10, 1933.

**GLASGOW DOUGLAS CREDIT ASSOCIATION.**

Owing to the success of our last public meetings, we are running a further series in the Christian Institute, Bothwell Street, Glasgow, each meeting commencing at 8 p.m. Our fourth meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 4, our speaker being A. M'Lellan. His address will be on "Douglas Social Credit Aspects of Work and Leisure." Our class series will be run in conjunction with these meetings.

**"The New Age" Dinner.**

**Photograph.**

Copies of the photograph taken at the Dinner on March 18 can be obtained from the photographers, Photogeneral, 137, Edgware Road, London, W.2. The size of the picture itself is 15 in. by 9 in. The prices are: mounted 7s. 6d., unmounted 5s.—postage and secure packing inclusive in both cases. The specimen sent to us shows a successful piece of work whether regarded as an assemblage of individual likenesses or as a composite picture. This is due to a wonderful advance in the scope of indoor photography made possible by improvements in the sensitising of plates, which now permit the operator to dispense with the flashing light and to make the exposure by ordinary artificial lighting. The result is an evenness and roundness which were never attainable by the old procedure.

**The Boycott of Social Credit.**

In answer to enquiries, the issues of THE NEW AGE in which we assembled lists of instances of improper obstruction of Social-Credit publicity were those dated November 19, 1931, and November 26, 1931. Both lists were given in editorial footnotes to letters from correspondents.

**Events of the Week.**

(Compiled by M. A. Phillips.)

March 18.  
Wall Street relapse.  
Arrest of six Englishmen in Moscow: British Government stops trade talks with Russia.  
Germany and France give cold reception to MacDonald's disarmament plans.  
Higher pay for new police recruits.  
Australia to spend more on armaments.  
Bankers reported to be contemplating lowering deposit-rate interest in this country.  
New Conversion Loan (2½ per cent.) issued.  
Communist Party and I.L.P. agree to organise a drive against Fascism; T.U.C., Labour Party, and Co-operative Party refuse to co-operate.  
Dr. Luther, of Reichsbank, resigns, and becomes German Ambassador to U.S.A.  
French taxpayers plan more protests.  
Bank of England still buying gold. £ equals 3.46 dollars.

March 20.  
Mussolini's "disarmament" plan: new Four-Power Pact suggested.  
Talks of bigger British Navy.  
Opposition to present "Petition from Unemployed" to the Government.

March 21.  
France turns down MacDonald and Mussolini.  
Reflation to be tried in Austria.  
Coalition for British Columbia, Canada.  
Bank of England plans to stabilise £, probably on new gold basis.  
Nigel Gold Mining Co. to increase capital.  
Economy Bill signed by Roosevelt. (Note.—This Bill includes big cuts in war pensions.)  
Means Test: 250,000 unemployed affected (official figures).  
London Police: Committee of reorganisation set up.  
Tate and Lyle and beet sugar: Monopoly agreement.

March 22.  
Reichstag reopens; no Communist deputies present.  
Polish Government secures dictatorial powers.  
More U.S. bankers being charged with corruption, etc.  
New issue market now open for municipal and trustee stock, etc.  
U.S.A. insist on payment of June instalment of Great Britain's war debt.  
Budget: £57 M short of estimated receipts; two more weeks left only.  
Municipal expenditure: Minister of Health endorses Ray (Economy) Report.  
Civil Service protest at pay cuts—increases demanded.

March 23.  
Bigger C.I.D. talked of.  
Liverpool told by Minister of Health to reduce relief rates.  
U.S. Bill legalising beer sales (less than 3.2 per cent. alcohol) receives Presidential assent.  
East Ham Council restores wage cuts to employees.  
Russo-Japanese friction over Manchuria and Jehol war.  
Deptford to spend £200,000 on slum clearance.

March 24.  
Premier "explains" his Rome visit to Commons.  
Hitler welcomes Four-Power Pact.  
Bank Reserve again up: New high record of 54.6 per cent.; gold stock now £170 M. £ equals 3.42 dollars.  
Bank of England half-year profits to February, 1933: £656,000.  
Jewish ban on German goods.  
Distressed Areas Committee rebuffed by Premier.  
Means Test during 1932: 900,000 expelled from transitional benefit.  
Germany: Reichstag passes Enabling Bill, giving full dictatorial powers to Hitler (441-94, the latter Socialists). Reich fire alleged culprits to be publicly executed. More Socialist deputies arrested.  
Canadian Government to subsidise export of farm produce to England.  
Japan demands naval equality with U.S.A. and Great Britain.  
Silver price rising: now 17 11-16d. per ounce.  
First International Exporters' Congress to be held in Paris in April.  
British rail profits: 1931, £37 M.; 1932, £30 M.

**CARTOON**



**"FRAMES OF REFERENCE"**  
[We reproduce this cartoon by permission of the Glasgow "Forward," which printed it under the headlines "The Chaos of Capitalism—and the Man who Found a Way Out," on the eve of the General Election, 1931. The title used here is our own.]

## THE "NEW AGE" CIGARETTE

Premier grade Virginian tobacco filled by hand in cases made of the thinnest and purest paper, according to the specification described in this journal on January 23, 1930.

Large size (18 to the ounce). Non-smouldering.

Prices: 100's 7/6 (postage 3d.); 20's 1/6 (postage 2d.)

Price for Export ex English duty quoted on minimum quantity of 1,000.

FIELDCOVITCH & Co., 72, Chancery Lane, W.C.2

(Almost on the corner of Holborn and Chancery Lane.)

## Social Credit Reading Course

SET A.

Comprising:—

Social Credit in Summary (1d.).  
The Key to World Politics (1d.).  
Through Consumption to Prosperity (2d.).  
Great Britain's Debt to America.  
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.

### 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.

BRENTON, ARTHUR.

Social Credit in Summary. 1d.  
The Key to World Politics. 1d.  
The Veil of Finance. 6d.  
Through Consumption to Prosperity. 2d.

C. G. M.

The Nation's Credit. 4d.

DEMANT, V. A.

This Unemployment. 2s. 6d.

DOUGLAS, C. H.

Economic Democracy. 6s.  
Credit Power and Democracy. 7s. 6d.  
The Breakdown of the Employment System. 1d.  
The Control and Distribution of Production. 7s. 6d.  
Canada's Bankers. (Evidence at Ottawa.) 2s. 6d.  
The Monopoly of Credit. 3s. 6d.  
These Present Discontents: The Labour Party and Social Credit. 1s.  
The World After Washington. 6d.  
Social Credit Principles. 1d.  
Warning Democracy. 7s. 6d.  
The New and The Old Economics. (Answer to Professors Copland and Robbins.) 1s.

DUNN, E. M.

The New Economics. 4d.  
Social Credit Chart. 1d.

GORDON CUMMING, M.

Introduction to Social Credit. 6d.

H. M. M.

An Outline of Social Credit. 6d.

HATTERSLEY, C. MARSHALL.

This Age of Plenty. 3s. 6d. and 6s.  
Men, Machines and Money. 4d.

HICKLING, GEORGE. (Legion of Unemployed.)

The Coming Crisis. 2d.

POWELL, A. E.

The Deadlock in Finance. 3s. 6d.  
The Flow Theory of Economics. 5s.

TAIT, F.

The Douglas Theory and Its Communal Implications. 3d.

TUKE, J. E.

Outside Eldorado. 3d.

YOUNG, W. ALLEN.

Ordeal By Banking. 2s.

W. W.

More Purchasing Power. 25 for 6d.

### Critical and Constructive Works on

### Finance, Economics, and Politics.

DARLING, J. F.

Economic Unity of the Empire: Gold and Credit. 1s.

HORRABIN, J. F.

The Plebs Atlas. 1s.  
An Outline of Economic Geography. 2s. 6d.

LUDOVICI, A. M.

A Defence of Aristocracy. 7s. 6d.

MARTIN, P. W.

The Limited Market. 4s. 6d.

SYMONS, W. T., and TAIT, F.

The Just Price. 2d.

### Instructional Works on Finance and

### Economics.

BARKER, D. A.

Cash and Credit. 3s.

CLARKE, J. J.

Outline of Central Government. 5s.

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

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70 High Holborn, London, W.C. (Telephone: Chancery 8470), and printed for him by THE ARGUS PRESS LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London, E.C.4. (Telephone: Central 1571.)