NOTICE.

Facts of the "Split."

Elsewhere is an announcement of the publication of a certain correspondence between the Secretariat and the Editor of The New Age and a statement of the reasons which led to the correspondence being published. The correspondence was written in an unexplained manner and was sent to the editor in the hope that he would print it.

Facts of the "Split."

The Editor's policy was clear and consistent, but he was convinced that the public was aware of the situation and that it had been handled properly. The Editor had the support of the people, and the correspondence was written to clarify the situation and to correct any misunderstandings that may have arisen.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The Caucus and the Law.

The Recorder of Liverpool, Mr. E. G. Hemmerde, K.C., caused a commotion on the occasion of the recent visit of the King and Queen to open the Queensway Tunnel by refusing to attend the ceremony. In an interview published in The Star of August 2 he defends his decision on the grounds that although he could not have proceeded in all places within the borough next to the Mayor, this provision had been ignored by the Corporation ever since 1921. He suggests that the reasons for what he calls the "discreditable policy" were mainly three:

1. Firstly, his defence in 1921 of the Sinn Fein prisoners when he discredited some of the evidence of the police.
2. Secondly, his action in the same year when unemployed leaders were convicted before him of riot and he refused to allow his judgment to be overruled by the political pressure which was exerted by the then Lord Chancellor.
3. Thirdly, he had felt it his duty to criticise the police methods adopted during the incidents which led to the cases of rioting by stating that unnecessary violence was used.

(Star Correspondent's report.)

Mr. Hemmerde proceeded to tell his interviewer:

"From the day I spoke those words I have never been briefed on behalf of the Corporation, and I have not been invited to record any civic function or ceremony other than the Lord Mayor's dinner to the Lord Chancellor."

For close on thirteen years I have had to put up with the professional boycott at the hands of the Corporation that has cost me thousands of pounds, merely because I have been accused of causing it.

We feel it our duty, in consideration of the feelings of our supporters, to ventilate our view as circumspectly as possible, but at the same time to make it known what our view is, and on what evidence it can be tested by those who wish to consider it.

Engelbert Dollfuß. From a Foreign Correspondent.

Ramsey Muir on Credit Reform.


Correspondence.

Vernon Sommersfield.
silent when I sit as Recorder when, in my opinion, my silence will cover up abuses which the Watch Committee does not wish to be disclosed."

Mr. Hemmerde’s own words as quoted by the Star’s Correspondent.

The report in the Star concludes with the announcement that Mr. Hemmerde is proposing to seek the opinion of the Home Secretary on these repeated breaches of conditions under which the City was permitted to hold a particular event at a particular session.

Mr. Hemmerde is to be congratulated upon his fight for the appropriate respect being paid to his official status. Also on the fact that there does exist an outside authority, and that the authority is an authority which can appeal over his head to the Corporation and Watch Committee. He is in the fortunate position of being able to make his gesture and defend it without affording anyone the opportunity of saying that he intended any disrespect either to the Royal Family or any Minister of the Crown.

He realizes the difficulty of making good some of his allegations, for they involve powers which can be colourfully explained as coincidences; and on this he contents himself with the remark that, assuming them to be such, they are "ugly coincidences." It would seem as if the adoption of Hitlerian methods is extending rapidly—or perhaps it is that recent exhibitions of those methods mean in Germany and Austria are inspiring victims of them elsewhere to rise and speak where there is yet time.

The Death of Hindenburg

The death of Hindenburg on August 2 was immediately followed by Hitler’s assumption of the Presidential office. In a formal sense he is, in his person, Defender of German Faith and Culture, Commander of all military and civil forces, and Director of financial and economic policies. In the same formal sense, represents a working model—or shall we say the design of one—of the world State contemplated by the bankers and outlined in the pamphlet "The Key to World Politics." Hindenburg took its place in Social Credit literature some years ago. But there is one thing missing: Hitler is not the effective Governor of the Reichsbank. Even if he were, he would not be, so to speak, the effective controller of the Social Credit Standing Consortium of Central Bankers. This last and fundamental condition of power over policy might not be necessary, but if not, the world-state would have to be such that Germany could act as a self-sufficing area of economic activity. A nation which is to stand alone, for example, finds itself obstructed or embarrassed by movements in the international exchange-markets is not a dictator, but deeply an agent (writingly or not) of an external dictatorship.

The exchanges—they are Myself "nor can I even say" "The exchanges—they do not affect Me." And because he cannot say these things, he may gain the whole world of German devotion or subservience, but lose the soul of his power to reward Germany in terms of economic and cultural renaissance. The blood of "mutineers" on the stumps of the courtyard has attested his power to rule the forces of house and garden. Seeking potatoes at the thresholds of the shops are the writing on the wall telling Belchazzar that he has been tried in the balances and found wanting. Empty vessels, we are told, make most sound; and when the empty vessel happens to be a stomach, then there will be the loudest sound of all. If Hitler could realise it, the greatest treachery to the Fatherland is the existence of parentless fathers of hungry children. It is a form of treachery which no penal treatment will extinguish. Death, which no penal treatment will extinguish. Well, blood may expiate crime, but it cannot destroy costs. You can stifle protests, but you cannot destroy the occasion of them. The inertia of the mass composes the day feet of the golden image, and decrees its downfall.

Twenty Years After

On August 4 The Times published a leading article entitled "1924-1934" in which of course reference is made to the outbreak of the Great War twenty years ago. The resemblance between the two events is that, as the state of tension in Europe now, and then, there are readers to whom, the popular Press is inviting up old war reminiscences, and in some cases calling up priorities for stories. Elsewhere, too, Mr. Baldwin has been known to talk about the British military force now being on the Rhine. Altogether the air is full of recollections of the war. Yet the writer in The Times thinks that to-day’s present turmoil will not have the same sequel as the last war. His only attempt to explain why has this confidence appears to lie in the "... fundamentally the peoples of the world are existing still from the exhaustion and disillusionment caused by the last war."

The reader is left to draw the inference that the people are conscious of this fundamental change in their distresses, and are, at bottom, avowed from other war. But is that true? The dead, who have died the last war, are the very ones who have had the best reason to protest against the policy of establishing conditions under which the waste of war would be directly felt by every individual in his home as well as in the field. No nation, in the sense of the last war, could exist to-day. Nor in that sense be the aspirant for peace, capable of adopting the idea that they owe the cost of the war to some one other than themselves. This is especially true of the democracies.

The Will To War

The "exhaustion" and "disillusion" attitudes of the last war were of a particular kind. The laborious fighting, the bitter conflict, the natural concomitant and distinctive characteristics of war—pain, disease, and death—were the destruction of physical welfare. And yet, enough, those who participated in the war, not only the physical but the mental, were unappreciated and unappreciating thebody, the public, and the world at large, were unappreciatory, by a generous measure of financial support and economic security. And it is a question to whether the people could not have been led to think through a memory of financial support and economic security. And it is a question to whether the people could remember more vividly the physical sacrifices they had undergone in a war which they had not to consider to have been one of which they had not been informed. We had a man explain the other day, "... What we want is another war."

In the context in which this man was speaking, it is plain to his mind that what he wants is a war that will re-establish the peaceful, undisturbed order of the world. And he is aware of the fact that all this was done while we were suffering exhaustion and disillusionation of the war. It is these impressions in our stride and are brought home to us by the post on Armistice Day with something in hand. Yet we are told that the people of the world today are still suffering from those impediments.

The "Exhaustion" of War

The writer in The Times is wrong to suggest that conditions of the last day result from the "exhaustion" and "disillusion" of the war. There is an exhaustion of economic and disillusion of buying and selling—in brief, there is a monetary shortage, and of dimensions threatening populous starvations. This is the direct relation in theory between the wholesale destruction of physical welfare, such as takes place in war, and the contraction of the available supply of physical means of life. If you wait for paychecks into which you ought, in a logical sense, to have less bread. You are acting as if what you are other than.

But—and this is highly important to note—on the contrary reasoning the deprivation ought to be experienced simultaneously with the destruction. In a sound economic system such a process would operate on Social Credit principles, that would undoubtedly take place in the event of an outbreak of war. Either there would be an absolute reduction in the standard of living (assuming productive capacity already engaged) or the destruction of a sizeable reserve capacity. Conversely, as soon as the war was over the standard of living would immediately rise and would continue to rise through the whole period of the peace.

We may hal at this juncture to address ourselves to the fact, the lessons for them being that the way to stop suffering exhaustion and disillusion of the last war. The writer is left to draw the inference that the people are conscious of this fundamental change in their distresses, and are, at bottom, avowed from other war. But is that true? The dead, who have died the last war, are the very ones who have had the best reason to protest against the policy of establishing conditions under which the war would be directly felt by every individual in his home as well as in the field. No nation, in the sense of the last war, could exist to-day. Nor in that sense be the aspirant for peace, capable of adopting the idea that they owe the cost of the war to some one other than themselves. This is especially true of the democracies.

The Last War Paid For

Leaving technicalities and legalities aside, and considering the situation in its natural economic reality, the people of the world paid for the war as it progressed. The fact, to which we have alluded, that the people became better off when the war broke out must not be taken as implying that they were "drawing on the future" or some like notion since spread abroad to get them accustomed to the idea that they owe the cost of the war to somebody or other. Fundamentally the war did not cost them to anybody; the money that the bankers put cost them nothing, so nobody owes anybody anything. The world can be written off at any time without infusing anybody. Holders of war-debt are merely bankers with masks on; or, if you like, men with mugs collecting interest from passing taxpayers which they have not possessed and, therefore, are not looking. Nor the reason the people's better living on the outbreak of war was due to the fact that they possessed a reserve capacity for production which, until the war, had not permitted them to utilize and draw on. Using token figures indicating things, not money, you may put it something like this:

1914 (Pre-War)
Total capacity to produce 
Output per day: 
Actual production:

1918 (War)
Total capacity to produce 
Output per day: 
Actual production:

Reserve capacity prohibited from use by bankers:

Here all the real costs are represented: they are the mental and muscular energy of the people—applied directly or through machines on the figures, their actual productive power in the productive capacity of the machines and the impact of the demand on the productivity. Here the central question comes out of the current extra production, which means that the people are not "drawing on the future" at posterity’s expense, but living and fighting for the products of their current energy. On the other hand, they are entitled to devote their full capacity to 150 to consumption purposes, which means to double their rate of consumption. The only precautionary consideration to keep in mind is, whether their natural resources were sufficient to allow of conversion.
Facts of the "Split."

Letters reaching The New Age office show that a majority of our readers are bewildered by the political complications of the internal conflict that has developed in the Social Credit Movement in this country, in which we are, willy-nilly, involved, and to which we referred in our article, "The Social Credit Constitution" in this issue, pages 75-76.

Our several attempts to build up a frame of reference in which to approach the New Age readers might be able to jump to correct conclusions as to what was taking place, and yet, at the same time, to avoid precipitating the conflict.

Under this notice there appeared a "First (Preliminary) List" of Affiliated Groups, being listed as "Attack," The New Age and "The New English Weekly." 1

4. In The New Age of October 19, 1933, appeared exactly the same notice, promising "A Short statement of the general policy... at an early date," and giving the "Second (Preliminary) List" of Affiliated Groups.

5. The New Age for October 26, 1934, contained exactly the same notice, promising "A short statement of the general policy... at an early date," and stating that "A Social Credit Constitution" had been voted for.


8. Major Douglas left this country for Australia and New Zealand on December 15 (See The New Age, December 8). The New Age was then the only Social Credit newspaper in the country.


10. The New Age for February 1, 1935, contained a signed, illustrated, letter by the Secretary of the Secretariat in which "All Social Credit Groups, Study Clubs, and Associations not yet affiliated" were invited to apply for affiliation in order that they may participate in the important constructive activities now taking place.

11. The New Age for March 15, 1935, appeared the Manifesto of the Social Credit Secretariat: Incorporating The National Credit Association. This Manifesto stated that the Secretariat was "entirely voluntary and functionally increasing demand... for some central body... for a connecting-house... for the collection of intelligence... and as a source of reference for technical questions..."

12. "Not a directive organisation except upon request."

13. "Major Douglas with his correspondence."

14. "The only organisation with which Major Douglas is actively associated."

15. The New Age was recently issued, containing an action based upon the belief that the Money Powers could be "combated" by any unconsidered attempt to fight money with credit; and that limiting "its initial appeal to money and beyond," the New Age was "less than the Advisory Council required of the Social Credit Movement as follows:"

16. "E. H. Holmes (Chairman), W. T. Symons (Vic."

17. "W. B. Tullio (Hon. Treasurer), C. G. M."

18. W. L. Bardeley (Secretary).

This first announcement explained that the Secretariat was formed for the purpose of propagating an economic and financial system based on the principles of the Social Credit in which the monetary system was reformed commensurately, and the last decision advocate has been demurring during the social credit period.

* * *

Well, the intervention took place, and an economic and political disposition of the scheme which had become the "Spínk propaganda." 1

The new era with the very heavy and worldwide correspondence and political and social aspects of the scheme has been in existence during the Social Credit period. Deal with correspondence addressed to Major Douglas and other members about such organization of the scheme. A "Controversy Committee: a Literature Committee; a Publications Committee; a Research Publications Committee." 1

1 The value of publications has been reprinted in cooperation with the Social Credit organizations, and in particular for the Edition of the New Age in any case or under any conditions which are the responsibility of the New Age.

Finally, it was stated that it was the wish of Major Douglas that the Secretariat should be firmly established.
and The New Age put on a secure fiscal basis by the time it returns from the Anti-Trust suit.

14. The New Age for March 22, 1934, contained some few Area Reports from the Secretariat, and in the "Notes of the Week" appeared certain observations regarding "The New Age for April 18: Prospects," in which we pointed out that The New Age "has been the official "vard" of the Movement, so its maintenance 'ought not to be the first charge on the Movement's resources." These "Notes of the Week" brought forth the letter from Mr. W. T. Symons (Vice-Chairman of the Secretariat) which we published in full in our issue of May 5, 1934. In that letter (dated March 23) we read:

"... It is sad to find the gallant Editor of The New Age of the despair described in the present "Notes of the Week," just at the moment when the Social Credit Proposals are catching the ear of the world, and the creed of his own intensive labors is beginning to be reappraised. Can it indeed be true that the resources of the Movement have any defensible limit?"

15. The New Age for March 29, 1934, published the second set of Area Reports from the Secretariat. There also appeared a Note in "Answers to Correspondents," referring to the present "Notes of the Week," in which we say:

"... Having made known our disquietude we consider it best to wait a little in the hope that the minister of the week will remedy the gaps."

16. In The New Age for April 19, 1934, appeared the third set of Area Reports from the Secretariat.

17. The New Age for April 26, 1934, contained a notice regarding the Club members of which "are assumed to be in agreement with the following propositions:"

"... The primary necessity for the Social Credit Movement is a Social Credit Press Service..."

18. An article entitled "A Social Credit Toast," which had been approved for publication by "all the persons named in the by-laws" was published in The New Age for May 17. We took this opportunity to publish this article, but did so under what we conceived at the time to be, and which in fact was, a form of indirect protest.

19. In The New Age for May 24, 1934, published on its own initiative the first notice of the "National Week of End Conference at Buxton. (Communication not handed.)"

20. In The New Age for June 3, 1934, appeared the account of what took place as regards the News-Chronicle articles, as set forth in a statement issued by the Secretariat, giving the full text of the letters, sent and received, following receipt of the articles.

21. In "Letters to the Editor," The New Age, June 7, 1934, we published a letter from a regular sub-scriber expressing "extreme disappointment" regarding the delay in which the News-Chronicle situation was handled.

22. The New Age for June 14, 1934, contained another letter on the above subject, this time from Buxton, in which the editor of the News-Chronicle was accused of "another malapportionment of the press."

23. In the "Notes of the Week," The New Age, June 21, 1934, we commented on the reply that appeared in the News-Chronicle (June 14) by Mr. Varley: "The New Age Spills A Balanced." We said that we were afraid that this reply would "give ordinary readers the impression of more or less empty abuse."

24. In The New Age for June 28, we had to inform our readers that we should be unable to re-print Major Douglas's Churchraff Oration in the form of a pamphlet as promised in a previous letter.

25. The New Age for July 18, 1934, published an article on "The New Age: An Intrepidity of the Week," in which the writer concluded:

"Summing all these matters up, a financial frame of reference seems to have been established which may underlie the New Age and desire to see it continue economically and efficiently is that the control of price and the safeguarding of the social credit system are well under present control."

26. In The New Age we came to the conclusion that the letter to the editor of July 17, 1934, "Parasite on the Movement," was sent to us, and on that same day we sent it to the other newspapers. We propose to take this letter, point by point, as follows:..."
ment, that you will accept our offer. I cannot help feeling that any other outcome will be a calamity.

20 Rectory Road, Barnes, S.W.13.
June 15, 1934.

Dear Mr. Tuke,

Thanks for your letter of the 13th inst., which I received this afternoon. You must have posted it just a little sooner than usual, as I was sending the letters to you which I told you of, the next batch of which was due yesterday. I now enclose you a copy* so that you may acquaint yourself with the terms of the letter.

As I told you on the telephone yesterday, and repeated to Mr. Bardsley at my office subsequently on the same day, I have no further feeling in any individual member of the Secretariat.

Arthur Brenton.

* The enclosed copy read as follows:

Private except to Secretaries and Executives of Social Credit Groups.
June 15, 1934.

Dear Sir,

The SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.

A proposal is being canvassed by a group containing members of the Advisory Council of the Secretariat to ask me to resign the editorship of The New Age in favour of an editorial committee to be appointed by the Secretariat.

I am not satisfied with the reasons (offenses) of my policy and of the make-up of the journal, which is the cause why I should resign. But as the Secretariat control the funds, their desire has the force of compulsion.

I want support for a proposal that a small Committee of Privileges* be formed to inquire into the circumstances attending the independence of the Secretariat, and into the action of some of its Councils since its inauguration. I am prepared to submit evidence to show that my support of the launching of the Secretariat was rendered under a material misrepresentation of the intended policy of this body and the threat of the withdrawal of support of "The New Age." I do not impose wrong motives to anyone; but I do impose a duty to correct such a false impression. I want to have an independent examined, and, if sustained, the damage repaired.

I am an adverse to publicity on such a matter as this one, and I suggest the Committee (say a tribunal of three) be selected by the subscribers of "The New Age," and I should value your opinion as the Executive as soon as convenient.

Arthur Brenton (Editor, "The New Age").
June 18, 1934.

Dear Brenton,

I am very sorry to hear your letter, and still more sorry to hear the follow-up letter, which you have sent to the Secretariat, and which I consider very unworthy. In view of this, I have been considering the request of Major Douglas to have a part in the committee to which the above letter was addressed. I am not, however, prepared to make a request of this kind, as I feel that the matter should be handled by the proper authorities.

June 20, 1934.

[In the interval before the next letter the editorship of The New Age advised a formal offer to become the editor, without raising questions of proprietorship or censorship.]

Wednesday, June 20, 1934.

My dear Tuke,

In reply to your letter of June 15 I hereby agree to resign from the editorship of The New Age in return for a paid-up annuity of £42 a week on [words following indicating the conditions to which Mr. Tuke is entitled to quote verbatim if he chooses to do so.]

Arthur Brenton.
June 21, 1934.

My dear Brenton,

Thank you for your letter of June 21. I am satisfied that I must have misunderstood the situation in your letter of June 21, in which you say that the Secretariat or the Movement should be responsible for a life pension of £42 per week, instead of giving a (word inexplicable) measure of economic security for life.

I understand from the conversation we had on Tuesday, June 12, in which you asked me again how I was, and I took you at face value. Write me this information and I shall be grateful.

June 24, 1934.

Engelbert Dollfuss
[Foreign Correspondent]

The daily papers contain much about the attack on Austria, about the Chancellor and about the chief victim that it would be expected that the Dollfuss movement would be destroyed. The Chancellor is Austria, but fresh evidence proving that the government of Vienna was being run by a group of Austrian Fascists. But the attitude of the Chancellor to the attack is that of a man who believes in the idea of Fascism and wants to see Austria a Fascist country.

At the time, it is understood that the Chancellor was split into three major, politically strong camps, one of which was the group of Fascists, led by Dr. Schuschnig, Dollfuss, and the other two were the moderate Socialists, led by Dr. von Grottendorf, and the Nationalists, led by Dr. von Linke. One of these camps must be destroyed to avoid civil war.

The Chancellor, who is the head of the group of Fascists, has been a diplomat and a political observer, and the Chancellor's speeches are based on his knowledge of Fascist ideas and practices. The Chancellor has repeatedly pleaded for the Fascist movement in Austria, and his speeches are based on the idea that Fascism is the only answer to the problems of Austria, and that Fascism is the only answer to the problems of the world.

Engelbert Dollfuss was a devout Roman Catholic and a man who believed in the idea of Fascism. He was one of the few Austrian politicians who believed in the idea of Fascism, and his speeches are based on the idea that Fascism is the only answer to the problems of Austria, and that Fascism is the only answer to the problems of the world.

But the Chancellor's speeches are based on the idea that Fascism is the only answer to the problems of Austria, and that Fascism is the only answer to the problems of the world.

However, Engelbert Dollfuss was a devout Roman Catholic and a man who believed in the idea of Fascism. He was one of the few Austrian politicians who believed in the idea of Fascism, and his speeches are based on the idea that Fascism is the only answer to the problems of Austria, and that Fascism is the only answer to the problems of the world.
Es hypothesis, the act of growing did not engender more value in the next group, nor has any authority to "day that when you produce goods you thereby increase money. Then does the act of exchanging goods increase money? Mr. Muir is bound to assume so to make good his proposition. But how? Whether the fruits are exchanged by barter or by money price can both groups fill up their deficient purses at the same time.

This is the only way in which that could be done would be to move the whole of the goods from the other group to the group A and B reciprocated. Then, would be all right, but for the". For, as Mr. McKenna has pointed out, "the value of money in existence at any given time depends upon the actions of the banker in creating and retiring credit—or, in creating, destroying money.

To come to another aspect of the argument. If there is no relation between the quantities of oranges and the money price, how is the value of money related to the total amount in existence? All of us, there is the sense in discussing whether the value of oranges or not? If the value of oranges is enough money to buy all the fruit we grew, our wanting or not wanting, oranges, or disposal, would not alter the quantity of money at our disposal.

If you have a penny and look in a shop window at a penny orange, but turn away saying, "No, I won't it your penny does not disappear. Mr. Muir's, like all other attacks on Social Credit, rests its plausibility on what may be called "the everywhere" theory as opposed to the other permanent. It is that the money representing the difference between the orange's price (at cost) and all incomes, does not exist as purchasing power, and therefore requires to be paid for by other income. All country income (and most must do so) is made to exist somewhere in the every where, and therefore purchasing power. Thus it is variously held to be paid for by different kinds of labor," "invest. other firms" (as in criticisms of the A-B "permanence" "country words" and so on. And when laborability is stunted, it is by stunted by the question, say, "should the money money-moving to-day be present to the any rate easy enough to meet costs when "the "that "B" expenditure (as defined in the "A" section) is, at any given time, in process of "A's" fulfillment."

We shall use up, the dogs experimented here and now and as being merely a temporary disadvantage to be resolved elsewhere or elsewhere: that is the dogs' plate the dogs' plate that on the "B" plate is on the "A" plate."

If Jackson can wait until Smith has fed, he must wait until he can and then feed. Some alchemy will change the dog of the "B" plate into two meals inside hereafter, or the dogs' plate to be on the "A" plate to be on the "B" plate."

If Jones can wait until Smith has fed, he must wait until he can and then feed. Some alchemy will change the dog of the "B" plate into two meals inside hereafter, or the dogs' plate to be on the "A" plate to be on the "B" plate."

If Jackson can wait until Smith has fed, he must wait until he can and then feed. Some alchemy will change the dog of the "B" plate into two meals inside hereafter, or the dogs' plate to be on the "A" plate to be on the "B" plate."

The smaller our families the better off we shall be. This can be true, or false. It is true if our " and " refer to the families of some people among other people, but false if all of the people and their families. For whereas the families of some people can be below the average for all people (in case some have money at the expense of the rest, and are thus better off than all of the people cannot be below the average of the families of all people,—in other words, no family can save out of the regulated income.

Bearing this in mind, and assuming Mr. Muir's inten-
The Films.

"Stand Up and Cheer!"

I commend this film to the particular notice of New Age readers as an example of Hollywood's politics-economic propaganda. The idea is good, and could have been made more amusing. The President of the United States creates a new Government Department—the Ministry of Amusement—which is allotted an initial budget of a hundred million dollars, in the belief that if the populace is given enough razzmatazz, the bread will follow. Big Business, which has staked its fortunes on the continuance of the depression, tries to wreck the Ministry by ridicule and an appeal to Puritanism, but the circus prevails, the depression is killed, and unemployment ceases to exist. The theme is overlaid by production numbers of excessive length and not excessive originality, and is in general unsuited to English audiences. But it is interesting as an example of propaganda that deals with starvation in the age of plenty without the slightest attempt at diagnosis. Will Rogers is partly responsible for the story, but that does not explain the failures to come so gripes with the problem.

Meet Mr. Mayer.

A few days ago I had lunch with Louis B. Mayer, vice-president of the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures Corporation. Mr. Mayer's post-cabinet speech may be summarised as follows:

"Whatever England wants, America wants. American successes are successes in England. Why not the other way about?"

"It's one thing to make a star, and another to keep stars up to the mark."

"I tell you, Ben Hur was the biggest picture ever made."

"Every had picture hurt the good ones."

"We hope to get good pictures from England to relieve the poor ones in America."

"There are too many films on the market, and too few attractions."

"(The last appears to be Mr. Mayer's favourite word.)"

"Save for the cuttings of Alexander Korda, the maker of "The Private Life of Henry VIII.""

"And his reference to "Ben Hur." I am largely in agreement with Mr. Mayer. Unfortunately no film studio, English or American, squares its practice with his theory."

"Lilies of the Field."

This is definitely not the sort of picture America wants. At least, I hardly think it would come up to Mr. Mayer's standard of desirable imports. A banal plot, characters devoid of reality, shoddy playing, the accents of West Kensington, and actors and actresses who for the greater part have no knowledge or understanding of screen technique, and a following of ideas in the 19th-century, are its main ingredients. But, apparently, this is the sort of thing that English audiences like. If Mr. Mayer were to run a dozen of his box-office successes in the United States, he might revise his opinion that "Whatever England wants, America wants.""

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

THIS AGE OF PLenty.

Sirs,—In your issue for July 25, you quote The Times as saying that the main obstacle to the success of the beef subsidy is "the difficulty of bringing the price of home-bred beef near enough to the prices of imported beef." On the same day on which you gave this extract, I made some inquiries with the following results:

(A) The highest market price for British cattle was £1.7s. 9d. per head per pound, according to figures provided by the Western Produce Company, and prices were probably higher.

(B) Beef prices have ranged from 15. 6d. to 24. 6d. per pound, according to figures from the Western Produce Company, and prices were probably higher.

Students of Social Credit do not require to have the implications outlined, but two things should be said—the retailer and the middleman make large profits while producers are on the verge of bankruptcy, and it is a notorious fact that most Western Produce Company and most restaurants serve us English beef, since the imported product is so much more profitable to sell. Subsidies cannot bridge a price gap for which the issue-producer is responsible.

V. W. S. Summerfield.

FACTS OF THE "SPLIT".

Correspondence between the Social-Credit Secretary and:

(a) The Editor of THE NEW AGE

(b) Social-Credit Groups and individual supporters on the relationship between the Secretary and the NEW AGE, together with comments by the Editor.

Copies have been sent gratis to respondents to the "Appeal" published on July 25, and certain other supporters.

Copies will be sent otherwise on application at the price of 2d. post free.

THE NEW AGE, 70, High Holborn, W.C.1.