

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 2196] NEW SERIES Vol. LV. No. 24. THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1934. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	265	MAJOR DOUGLAS AT ABERDEEN, 1932	271
Economic gold-standard zones. The Spanish revolt. Official documents called in. Retrenchment in France. Political interference with Law. Revenue returns. Food and man—the Anthroposophical Agricultural Foundation's theory. The balance of trade. The League to Abolish Poverty.		Verbatim report of speech at Aberdeen on April 28, 1932.	
POLITICAL ACTION. (Editorial)	270	LOOK BEFORE YOU LEAP. By John Hargrave	272
Note on articles in this issue on the question of pressure through the ballot-box.		A message to the Australian Green Shirts.	
		THE POINT OF THE PEN. XV. By R. Laugier	273
		THE SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY	274
		<i>The Use of Money</i> (Douglas), <i>The Nature of Democracy</i> (Douglas), <i>Short Papers on Money</i> (Lord Tavistock), <i>Poverty Amidst Plenty</i> (Earl of Tankerville).	
		HAIL, HOLY PROLETULT! By A. G. Norton	275

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Economic Zones.

The *Times* of October 1 contains a leading article on an announcement that representatives of countries on the gold standard have agreed to "explore means of expanding the similarity between their monetary policies into economic and financial co-operation." The gold countries, says the writer, "have not been exempt from the industrial depression." That remark is a beautiful model of under-statement. Co-operation is not going to be too easy. "All the former difficulties survive," and "They include all difficulties which have not a monetary origin." (Our italics.)

If you want examples here are two:—

"... such as the preference—called economic nationalism—shown by many countries for producing everything they require within their own borders, or the difficulty of making distribution keep pace with production."

We can only drop our hands and gape at the effrontery of this writer. Whether he is conscious of it or not it is hard to tell, but he takes the cake for the best joke we have read for many a month.

There are other "difficulties" which can be summed up by saying that if all currencies were valued in terms of gold it would still be necessary, as the resolutions passed at Geneva in 1921 point out, to secure a stable value for gold itself.

So we must not expect an "early disappearance" of our international trade troubles. That's a sound piece of advice at any rate. But what encouragement are people to derive from the announcement? Just this, that the new move "affords valuable evidence" that the world is slowly recognising "the necessity of economic co-operation."

Now whatever "economic co-operation" may mean in a commercial sense, it undoubtedly means in a political sense an imposed international system of rationing trade between the nations, as we foreshadowed in our

article several years ago and reprinted under the title "The Key to World Politics." Whether you believe that the international bankers are conspiring to do it, or whether you believe, as you reasonably may, that the policy is forced on them by the automatic consequences of the creeping error in the principles of costing governing domestic production and consumption, the end is the same. In our judgment there is much to be said for the theory that the design of the financial system creates the power-mania manifest in its controllers no less truly than that the power-mania guards the design. An automatic financial deficit in every individual country means an automatic world-deficit: and so long as the root cause of it is allowed to operate, the only possible thing to do about the situation is to redistribute the world-deficit as equitably as possible. But no country will, for long, regard as equitable an apportionment which leaves it with any deficit at all. Hence there will have to be a super-national criterion of equity, a super-national body to establish it, and a super-national force to impose it. Effective enforcement is a military problem in the last analysis, hence the reason for the campaign everywhere to internationalise and rationalise existing national armaments.

Turning to the two examples of difficulties adduced by the writer, they are really one, and their common relation to a monetary origin is almost as evident to the ordinary business man as it is to the student of Social Credit. For why do industrialists want to make everything they can except to keep money from leaving the country? And why do they want to distribute, that is, to sell, things as fast as they make them except to avert the monetary losses attendant on gluts and price-slumps? True, money does not leave a country in the sense that they imagine; and true also that falling prices need not necessarily deprive them of money-profits; yet it remains true that imports on the one

hand and over-production on the other do involve monetary consequences threatening their solvency. In both cases money does "leave the country," but not to another country: it is withdrawn from circulation. In a real sense imports are additions to home production, but under the present financial system these additions to home production are made the occasion for subtractions from home production-credits. If the financial system reflected reality, then, postulating that "imports balance exports" (the classical theory) at any given time the receipt of an import would justify and require the financing of extra home production to "pay for" it. But as the system works now, the arrival of the import has the opposite financial effect. Everybody can see that the import of a particular article may lessen the necessity for home industry to produce that article, or so much of it; but there is no sense in the process by which a particular import should, as it does, restrict production generally.

Back in the days of the Protection campaign of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain the Free Traders were able to argue that although imports might immediately cause unemployment they would ultimately cause re-employment. They said that if foreigners sold us more goods (in value) than they bought from us, our exchange would automatically fall relatively to theirs and reverse the flow of trade by giving us a competitive advantage in their markets. The gold-standard with its exchange-halo was a natural "governor" keeping the engine of trade working at the happy mean between too much importation and too much exportation. Since the time when these pundits spoke, this beautiful theory has been exploded by the known fact that imports do not automatically cause corresponding exports, that the movements of exchanges are not mechanically related to the activities of industrialists, but are consequential on political policy dominated by bankers. The mere expression: "competition in currency-depreciation" signifies that no longer do the prices and the flow of things decide the prices and flow of money, but just the opposite.

Hence, for *The Times* to talk of any economic difficulties at all as being divorced from monetary origins, is to fly in the face of reason and experience. We are obliged to get money to do things, we are obliged to do things to get money. In the vicious circle of this work-wage economy we are under monetary constraint in both directions. If we have time to do the things we really would do we have no money to do them with; and if we have money to do them with we have no time to do them. And it is just those things that we would do of our own proper impulse, which are necessary for our realisation of the full meaning of life. Machines have come, not to destroy the law of happiness, but to fulfil it. Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain thee. We are now to be saved, not by works, but by the grace of applied science. Our work to win economic security can now give place to work based on our conquest of that security—and this work will no longer be the condition of security but the vocational thanksgiving for it.

The Spanish Revolt.

In the *Star* on October 6 there is a reference to the formation of a "republic" by the revolutionaries in a

certain district. Among the edicts issued by them is one which is summarised by the *Star's* correspondent in the phrase "money is abolished." This is what you might call "going some." But humorous as it appears, it reflects the sound reaction to the anomalies which we know are created by, and associated with, the use of money. The humour really lies in the impracticability of destroying such a long-established custom as is the use of tokens to represent wealth. The joke lies against the bankers in the last analysis for the reason that ordinary people like these revolutionaries are able to see quite clearly how to run an economic system without money but are completely at a loss to see how it can be run by the use of the very instrument which, as all classical bankers have affirmed, was invented to expand and facilitate economic processes.

Official Documents.

A striking piece of news during last week was the announcement that the Prime Minister had called upon ex-Ministers of the Crown to return all official documents which they possessed. The rule up to now has been that Ministers on leaving office were entitled to retain duplicates of these documents. The reason for the Prime Minister's request is not difficult to guess. The newspapers themselves explain it up to a point, by reference, of course, to indiscretions in memoirs which have been brought to the notice of the public from time to time. But a deeper reason is that among the many documents in private possession there may be some which contain clues to the *supreme official secret*, namely, the autocratic powers exercised by the Money Monopoly by virtue of their prerogative. When the Labour Party were evicted from office in 1931 it will be remembered that (although there were no documents to corroborate the statement) Labour ex-Ministers talked freely about a "bankers' ramp," with special reference to the U.S.A. and Dr. Sprague, who was then the Federal Reserve Board's adviser to Mr. Norman. According to the disclosures made, it was from Dr. Sprague that the then Labour Cabinet received the intimation that their plea to be excused from cutting down the wages and relief of the workers in this country had been overruled.

Retrenchment in France.

M. Doumergue is entering upon the difficult part of his task, namely the imposition of retrenchment on the nation. According to *The Times* he has "had to reduce the pay" of State employees, including teachers and railwaymen, and has imposed "other severe sacrifices on the individual." He has twice expounded his proposals over the wireless. He wants to increase the power of the Prime Minister, to diminish that of the deputies, and, in the words of *The Times*, "to secure the independence of the judiciary from political influence." We have heard that sort of thing before. There are two sorts of political influence: that of the party caucus or Cabinet, and that of groups who cannot be said to seek personal benefits for anybody at all. It is true that in some countries there is a good deal of cleaning up to be done with regard to the protection of judges from the first sort of influence, but the necessity to protect them from the second is universal. The remedy logically should come first time when they hear the teacher advocate thrift they put their pennies in the money-box they are taking from mother-nature's breast and set sucking the bottom

of monetary philosophy. Eventually they come to regard its axioms as the foundation of the political constitution. *The Times* naturally refers to the Stavisky scandal as a ground for the President's new policy, but we anticipate that if and when the legislation to protect judges from improper pressure comes to light it will be seen by students of the credit question that nothing will have been done to hinder the procuring of judges by deceptive methods from pursuing their innocent administration of the policy of the financial dictatorship.

Politics and Law.

It will be useful to set down, in this context, instances of political interference with the independence of the judges in this country—interference which, far from being ended, is in course of being extended. We refer, in the first place, to the body of evidence in Lord Hewart's book, *The New Despotism*, showing how the prerogatives of the judges are being absorbed by departmental officials. However much one may feel inclined to reprobate such acts as the bribery of judges by politicians to turn a blind eye towards evidence involving them in company-promoting and market-rigging scandals of the Stavisky type, the social consequences are nowhere like so grave in nature and extent as those produced by bureaucratic usurpation of judicial prerogatives. In the second place we can adduce the episode where the British Government cut down the judges' salaries and provoked from them a challenge on constitutional grounds of the validity of their action. In the third place, there was the case long ago when two judges (one of them Mr. Justice Avory) publicly snubbed the Home Secretary who had instructed the police to withhold from the Court a certain statement taken from a victim of a motor accident, and to say that it was "not in the public interest" to disclose the contents. The judges countermanded the instruction on their own juridical responsibility and caused the document to be passed to the jury, remarking that there was nothing in it to support the Home Secretary's ground for suppressing it. In the fourth place, although it happened in a local court, we saw last week-end that during a skirmish at a Fascist meeting someone was arrested for a breach of public order. The arrested man was an anti-Fascist. At the police station certain documents were found on him. In court, when the defendant was remanded, he asked for his documents back. The police opposed the request, saying that these documents would be useful to them as throwing light on measures planned by Socialists (and/or Communists) to combat Fascism. The defendant protested; and the magistrates, after retiring, ordered the documents to be returned.

These instances severally illustrate four aspects of "interference," actual or intended.

1. By permanent Departmental officials
2. By the Cabinet
3. By a Minister of State
4. By officials of the police force

and they afford a general picture of the position of the judiciary, standing between the rights of the individual and the claims of the State.

The question arises: What is *political interference*? Is it only political when practised by Ministers of State, severally or collectively. Or is it also political when practised by administrative officers? We do not propose to discuss them specifically; we are concerned here to make one major point, namely, that administrative

policy is entirely and directly in the hands of the Bank of England, which, through the agency of the Treasury, employs and pays the whole personnel of officialdom from top to bottom. The King acts by the advice of his Ministers, each Minister acts by the advice of the permanent head of his Department, and each permanent head acts by the advice of technicians attached through the Treasury to the Bank. A vital feature of this arrangement is that the scope for personal judgment and advice progressively diminishes at every remove from the technician of the Bank who is nominally at the bottom of the scale, up to the Monarch of the Realm who is nominally at the top. It is something like the Manchukuo system of Government where every Minister is Chinese and his private secretary Japanese—the secretary "advises" the Minister what he can do.

* * *

Down in the technical laboratory, so to describe the habitat of the technicians of Bank and Treasury, they will prepare general schemes for the running of any type of Government you like—Communist, Fascist, Socialist, Liberal, Conservative. In each of those schemes they will embody overriding principles protecting the prerogatives of the Money Monopoly. That done, a selected scheme for a particular type of Government (which the people choose, or imagine that they like) is handed over in sections to the permanent heads (and staffs) of the Departments, who between them will prepare, within the scope allowed them by the aforesaid principles, alternative patterns of the particular type chosen and submit them to the new Ministry (or Dictator) for their approval. The pattern adopted by the Ministry will be that which is easiest to administer compatibly with their declared ideals. They are presented with alternative practical plans for the building on earth of their oratorical castles-in-the-air.

* * *

Now, as readers know full well, the overriding principles of finance are in direct conflict with personal liberty. Hence, in so far as Law safeguards personal liberty its own principles are bound to be involved in the conflict. As the scope for personal judgment diminishes towards the top of the legislative system so will the Money Monopoly go on impounding the discretion of the judiciary. This it is which constitutes the real "political interference" with the judges. Our present Prime Minister enjoys the distinction of having been the first representative politician in this country to *oppose in public the principle of giving pledges to the electorate*. Probably he did not mean that the people had no right to demand pledges, but only that they too often asked for wrong or impossible things. Nevertheless, he was repudiating the responsibility of Parliament for the fulfilment of the people's will. Law, that is, was to be something other than the expression of their will, whereas the fundamental concept of Law is that it implements that will. In practice it mostly does not, but that is because the bankers have captured the statute book and used it to override, instead of to clarify and fulfil, the personal rights embodied in common law. The problem of once more making the Law respected is the problem of breaking the Money Monopoly. Failure to do this is an invocation to lawlessness.

Revenue Returns.

The Press has recently been rejoicing over a boom in tax-collection. Revenue is coming in nicely. How it goes out below before it came in above is a question too deep

for the public to trouble about one supposes. The money is being yielded up, so why worry? However, that is not the immediate question. Taking the size of the Budget estimates as a whole the measure of the improvement in the rate of collection is nothing much to make a fuss about. The prospective amount is comparatively small, and is partly accounted for by improved profits accruing to certain industries (notably the building industries) as an indirect consequence of the issuance of the extra £300 millions of new credit alluded to by Mr. McKenna at the beginning of this year; although of course where three-year averaging of profits is practised the full effect of this inflation will be delayed. Secondly, it must be remembered that Somerset House had been nursing a lot of arrears, and some of these are now being paid in. Where it is possible to do it you may be sure that the banking community will influence the placing of major contracts with enterprises in arrears for taxes who will discharge them out of profits, leaving shareholders to cool their feet for a bit longer. Thirdly, and on another plane, there is no easy way of estimating how far the larger financial houses have been creating profits by writing up securities. Fourthly, the investment of idle balances may have contributed. But analysis of sources apart, there is no doubt that the banking community have the power to engineer improvements in revenue statistics when it suits their purpose. They would have one purpose, for instance, when a Government which they approved of, contemplated an appeal to the electorate for a renewal of office. Mr. Lyons in Australia was equipped with an imposing array of statistical material at the recent election; and who shall say how much of it was based on contrived phenomena? The banks can dress other windows as well as their own when their sympathies are engaged.

Food and Man.

Apropos of the articles published in THE NEW AGE under the title "The True Cost of Living" a correspondent sends us one or two copies of a publication entitled *Anthroposophical Agricultural Foundation*, which is issued to advocate the "biological dynamic" methods of Dr. Rudolph Steiner as applied to agriculture. We see that it contains frequent articles bearing upon the relation between food values and soil values. They collectively embody the same philosophy of the man-food power-cycle or health-cycle as did the articles we published. One contributor, for instance, makes the remark that the soil will not stand rough usage at the hands of man indefinitely, and that the "gentler methods" derived from Steiner's theories will have to be adopted. The logic of these theories appears watertight; but alas, their feasibility is hampered by the old, old snag—money. He who would nurse the soil back to health must be prepared to wait—"some years," says one writer. He must not be afraid to face initial increases in costs, says another. But how shall he exercise such patience and courage in the existing financial dispensation where banks and bailiffs wait for no man? "The heap of animal manure must be left to ripen for six months" is one instruction laid down. If used before it reaches maturity it may often do harm instead of good. But what if it be seized before maturity because something else matures first? That tithing charge—that rate demand-note—whose speed of ripening leaves nature toiling in the rear like a tortoise. Nevertheless it is good that we allow our-

selves to contemplate those truths which can be made manifest in the age of affluence and leisure if we are thereby stimulated to hasten its advent. And the teachings of the Anthroposophists on matters of potential practicability are valuable because they are a component part of that Real Credit which awaits transmutation and diffusion by the creation and distribution of Financial Credit. Merely to know what we could do in the absence of financial restrictions is to lay foundations of the will to remove them. But on those foundations must be built the knowledge of how to remove them. That is the urgent and vital knowledge of the present time. On it depends the solution of that apparently insoluble problem of deciding at what point in the static cycle of economic slavery we sever the ring and cause to emerge the dynamic spiral of economic emancipation. The substance of what men hope for in this life is to be peacefully attained only by the wise use of the symbols of faith in their powers of achievement. Those symbols are what men call Money, and the wisdom of its use begins with a realistic appreciation of what those symbols truly symbolise. The core of the economic mystery is Cost.

The Balance of Trade Again.

Have you ever seen a plus-minus-surplus? We have found one. In the Statement of Public Finances and Economic Situation of Austria No. 9, 1934, p. 3, we read:—

TRADE BALANCE.		\$ (millions).
(Money)		
Imports	85.4
Exports	68.0
Deficit	19.4
(Quantity)		Tons (thousands).
Imports	425.7
Exports	243.2

Possibly the compiler's pen went on strike when it got so far, for if it had written on it would have had to write: "Surplus 82.5 (thousand tons)"—a financial loss measuring a gain in real wealth. Of course the orthodox pundit can explain it away quite well; but never mind, it looks funny and one can laugh behind his back. It affords a good moral argument to the bankers for it shows that when you get something for nothing you lose by it.

The League to Abolish Poverty.

The League to Abolish Poverty (Sentinel House, Southampton Row, W.C.1) is appealing for funds in support of a "National Campaign" for a "National Dividend" to be issued to every family in the land. The appeal includes the following passage:

The League to Abolish Poverty, whilst working in hearty co-operation with organisations whose members are pledged to support a *National Dividend*, is identified with the actual technical methods of a particular system by which the Abolition of Poverty shall be implemented. There is ample evidence that the technical mechanism for putting a sane and sound financial system into operation can be devised, and the principle of financing consumption directly with new money, which is not issued as a debt and does not form part of costs or taxes, is accepted, it can be put into legislative and administrative effect by the Government acting in harmony with the will of the people.

The League's policy is to work through the electoral system: it "urges its members to vote for no candidate for Parliament who does not pledge himself to support

a Bill for the Abolition of Poverty by means of a National Dividend."

We presume that the phrase: "not identified with the actual technical methods of any particular system" is intended to mean no more than that the *public advocacy* of any given technical methods is not part of the League's programme. If so, this is in line with general Social-Credit opinion that the rightful function of the electorate is to give orders to technicians, not to instruct them in their business. At the same time it is necessary that the Executive of any body mobilising the people's will should be competent to detect, and determined to oppose, any suggested technique which will lead the people along a false trail. That this trick can be worked nobody who understands Social Credit will deny, and with all the more plausibility now that the ordinary Press is using Social-Credit terminology and allowing publicity to Social-Credit sentiments.

One form it can take is that of offering "something on account." The old tag: "Half a loaf is better than none" can be used with tremendous effect on the people, especially that section who are supporting Social Credit because they are in urgent need of bread. It is probable that in Australia the Douglas Credit Party put forward their "interim policy" with the object of countering this device—advocating a go-slow programme to forestall objections on the other side that they were going too fast. That would be good tactics if the question at issue were one on which the bankers were neutral, but it won't work with the Social-Credit issue. "Every little bit helps you to get a little bit more" is an argument that has been so manifestly true in past conflicts (in fact, the bankers' ascent to power was achieved that way, e.g., in their gradual wearing down of the power of landowners and protectionists) that the same notion retains all its power to-day. But on the Social-Credit issue it is almost true to affirm that to go slow is to go the other way.

The League seem to have formulated the technical principle of the dividend-policy with exactitude—namely that consumption shall be financed directly with "new money" which shall not be "debt," nor "form part of costs or taxes." It seems watertight—so watertight that it challenges the ingenuity of the bankers to find, or spring, a leak in it.

Whether they can we are not competent to say. But we think that there is a direction in which they might try. We can only outline it here, and leave it for others to consider. It depends on the fundamental proposition that bank-loans do not become costs until they are repaid. If you borrow £10,000 from a bank and pay it to people for building you a factory, you have not, at that point, incurred a cost in the sense that you are out of pocket. It is a *suspended*, or a *contingent*, cost, if you like, but is not an *actual* cost. It only becomes an actual cost when you have borrowed £10,000 from other people (say by floating your factory) and paying off the bank. Then, and only then, are you (or the investors) out of pocket and under the necessity to *recover* (note the significance of the word) your costs. The same thing holds true if you are a Government, and borrow from the Bank or "Money Market," say, £5,000,000 to build a battleship. You are not obliged to recover this suspended

cost in taxes unless or until the cost is made actual by the calling-in, or maturity, of the loan.

Now in this country we have what is called a *floating debt*. This debt represents outstanding bank-loans (at one or more removes). It therefore represents "new money." The Government's expenditure of the borrowed money represents a suspended cost which the Government is not obliged to recover, nor in fact attempts to. The people of this country have the handling of the money. Since all money distributed can be ultimately traced to persons as income, there is a subtle sense in which one might argue that a sort of "national dividend" has been diffused throughout the country. At any rate it is clear that the people have had "something for nothing," and that there is no technical difficulty in their getting more still through an expansion of this super-budgetary financial operation, either in the same, or some modified, form. Whether such a thing could be done so as to square, ostensibly, with the League's formula is a matter on which we are not prepared to offer an opinion. But we think that the "Exchange Equalisation Fund" technique might have a bearing on the subject.

The League proposes to pledge Parliamentary candidates to "support a Bill for the abolition of poverty by means of a National Dividend." What would be the nature of this Bill? And who would prepare it? So far as our memory serves us no reference was made by Major Douglas at Buxton to a "Bill." There can be two sorts of Bill, one simply giving orders to officials to produce a certain result, and the other embodying instructions how they shall do it. If the first kind is intended, it could be a very short Bill offering no difficulties in drafting; and there seems no reason why it should not be prepared now and incorporated in the pledge which candidates are to be required to take. If the second kind of Bill, the League appears to diverge from Major Douglas on the basic question of the true function of a representative Parliament. Again, at the very least the Bill would have to define "poverty," since its stated object is to "abolish poverty"—the National Dividend being the "means." Mark that we do not question the intentions of the League, we are only concerned with the ingenuity of the bankers. Although it is well understood among the ruling classes that in an electoral campaign it is permissible to use vote-winning slogans without regard to scientific exactitude, yet it has been no uncommon experience in the past for the mandates gained by successful candidates to be questioned on that account by their opponents. The bankers (through Ministers of the Crown) might plausibly say: "Yes, but you really got returned on your proposition to abolish poverty, not on your suggestion about national dividends." The very title of the League, admirably chosen so far as its electoral appeal is concerned, would lend plausibility to the bankers' interpretation of its mandate. Again a clever dialectician could advance the case that there was a contradiction between "national" dividends—in the sense that everybody got them—and "poverty," which only afflicts a smaller or larger section of the people, depending on how poverty is defined or measured. All this would tend to facilitate the artful insinuation that the abolition of poverty by any means

would smell as sweet. "Abolish poverty?—right," might the bankers say, "leave it to us how to do it." And we fancy we can scent Dr. Eisler round the corner with his "baskets of food."

* * *

The easiest way of identifying the principles essential to the sound distribution of dividends—that is the creation of higher purchasing power through the expansions of incomes, with safeguards against price-inflation—is of course to name the discoverer of the principles, or the book in which he first enunciated and explained them, or the statement he made and defended against the Macmillan Committee. This we have done ourselves for many years in spite of the advice of numerous Social Credit advocates in the earlier part of the period: "Don't mention Douglas's name: it puts people off." By slow degrees our policy was adopted by other Social Credit journals which came into existence. This was an important factor in bringing about the result that the name Douglas has become inseparable from the words Social Credit. For some time past veteran followers of Douglas have tested the propounders of financial reforms by the question: "Do you accept the Douglas Analysis," or words to that effect. Any hesitancy in the answer they interpreted as signifying that the propounders were trailing a red-herring, whether through lack of wit or presence of will. But this test becomes unreliable as applied to the new League, because they have a practical reason, which is that they are appealing for funds independently, and are thus, so to speak, in competition with the Social Credit Secretariat, of which Major Douglas is Chairman. Considering the wide expanse of soil remaining to be turned over there should be room for new activities provided that, as we advocated some years ago in commenting on the Sheffield Conference, the new public interested are made to defray the cost of educating them, and are not indiscriminately subsidised out of money put up inside the Movement.

* * *

The President of the League is Lord Tavistock, who is on the Council of the Social Credit Secretariat, whose Treasurer, Mr. J. E. Tuke, is on the Executive of the League; so it may be assumed that the two organisations will work in harmony for the common object of the Movement. It is certain that the whole field of political education and agitation will shortly be occupied by critics of banking policy; and sponsors of the right remedy do well get in ahead of the rest.

"Douglas Speaks."

A misprint crept into the notice of this book in last week's issue. The price, post free, was given as 1s. 2d.; it should have been 2s. 2d. The price of the book itself appeared as 2s. in an earlier part of the notice, but this correction is put in to exclude the possibility of misunderstanding.

Notice.

All communications concerning THE NEW AGE should be addressed directly to the Editor:

Mr. Arthur Brenton,
20, Rectory Road,
Barnes, S.W.13.

Renewals of subscriptions and orders for literature should be sent, as usual, to 70, High Holborn.

Political Action.

We print elsewhere an article by Mr. Hargrave stating the policy of the Green Shirt Movement. It should be read in conjunction with the other articles on the subject of Social Credit policy also included in this number, and with the announcement by Mr. Bardsley, of the Social Credit Secretariat, which we reproduce from their official organ, *Social Credit*, as follows:

In view of the predominating position that the idea of Social Credit is now taking in the politics of many countries, and the certainty that its major importance will become universally recognised, there is a real danger that, under cover of its highly successful label, proposals may be put forward for the consideration of the various communities concerned, which, however honest in intention, are technically unsound or else, in relation to the circumstances in which they are put forward, politically undesirable or both.

There is probably no satisfactory means of preventing this state of affairs, but its results, while perhaps only temporary, may easily be to discredit the fundamental principles which such plans claim to represent.

For this reason it is necessary to emphasise that there exists at the present time only one proposal, and that of an interim nature, which has received the attention of Major Douglas and the Social Credit Secretariat, and is therefore authoritative. This proposal is specifically designed, and put forward in relation to the situation in New Zealand as it existed in 1933.

Any proposals emanating from other sources in any part of the world, whatever their merits may be, are not entitled to any authority that may be derived from the use of the words "Douglas Social Credit"; and the use of these words, or of words intended to convey the same impression, is in fact both unjustified and without authority.

Changes in this situation will of course be notified from time to time either in the columns of this paper or by such methods as will admit of no misunderstanding.

We publish this material for purposes of record, not of argument; much less advice. Leading proponents of policies must be presumed to have a greater knowledge of the factors of the problem than they make public, and it is natural that they should observe reticence. And in the absence of exact definitions of words such as "agitation," "extra-constitutional," "constitutional," it is useless for the majority of Social-Credit supporters to make up their minds how far the pursuit of one policy may supplement another on the one hand or hamper it on the other. As the proof of the pudding is in the eating, so the interim proof of a policy not fully unfolded lies in watching its implementation. And it is only such interim proof that is available to us as we can see in the Movement. For the moment, so far as we can see, the four groupings now conducting political propaganda have this in common, (a) that they advocate the authoritative technique of Social Credit, (b) that their activities do not challenge the rule of law.

Forthcoming Meetings.

London.

London Social Credit Club, Blewcoat Room, Cannon Street, S.W.
October 12, 7.45 p.m.—"Economics of the Middle Ages," by Mr. C. Featherstone Hammond.

October 19, 7.45 p.m.—"Is Roosevelt Right?" by Dr. McNair Wilson, author of "Monarchy or Money Power?"
The club is open from 5 until 11 p.m. on these nights. Visitors are welcome.

Oxford.

On Friday, November 2, Major Douglas will address the New Era Club of Oxford at 8.15 p.m. As accommodation is limited, intending visitors are advised to write to the president of the club, at Oriel College, Oxford.

Major Douglas at Aberdeen.

[Verbatim report of address delivered on April 28, 1932. Now published for the first time.]

We all exist and only exist by virtue of bed, board and clothes; and it is a perfectly reasonable objective of every individual human being that he should have bed, board and clothes in a proper quantity and in sufficient luxury, always supposing that these exist in those quantities or can potentially be acquired. That, I think, is the starting point of any investigation of this kind; and I think you will agree that, as I put it, it is a perfectly simple proposition. But as a matter of fact this perfectly simple proposition is extraordinarily distorted at the present time in the discussions which go on as to the cause and nature and possible cure of the present so-called economic crisis. You would imagine, if you were to take for granted the orthodox popular jargon which is bandied about on this matter, that the provision and the distribution in sufficient quantity, and with the minimum of trouble, to everybody of bed, board and clothes was the very last thing which was at issue at the present time. The present crisis is referred to as a crisis of unemployment by some people, as though employment were the object of the industrial system. Other people will explain that it is a crisis of overproduction, without seeing, or going any further into the investigation of, the absurdity of suggesting that there can be over-production while at the same time there exists want and unemployment.

Finance fundamentally is a very simple thing indeed; it is essentially, or should be, nothing but a technical system by which the handing over of the goods from the producer to the consumer is conducted in an orderly, systematic and satisfactory manner. That handing over does not take place. Not only does it not take place, but if you will take the trouble to make efforts to put before those people who are primarily concerned the suggestion that it is ridiculous that the world should be involved in a state of crisis and chaos and greater dangers, as it is at the present time, while the only thing that stands between the solution of that crisis and the present state of affairs is a system of figures; if you put that forward with any energy and carry it as far as you can take it you will find a very definite resistance against what seems to be a fairly simple solution; and I want to direct your attention to the nature of that resistance. It is not at the present time in many ways so important to have a scheme for putting the world right as to find out why you cannot make that scheme effective; and to find some method by which you can make it effective. That is quite a different problem from the soundness or otherwise of your scheme. The scheme itself, and the putting of that scheme into operation against the forces which exist at the present time, are two quite separate things. Now, I am going to astonish you in what I say. The great bar to the setting right of the difficulties in the world at the present time is the idealist, the utopian—the man who is perfectly certain that he knows what the world ought to be and is determined that there should be that sort of a world, and that you shall live in it. That man, and there are many of them, is the most dangerous bar to the solution of the present difficulties. When I came to grapple, as I have been attempting to grapple for the last twelve years, with this situation (which if I may say so without wishing to be misunderstood I foresaw twelve years ago, when everybody was suggesting that the world was starting on a career of increasing and continuous prosperity), I found that as I got higher and higher, as you might say, up the ladder

of people in control, the less and less was the tendency to disagree with me as to the technical side of what I was saying: they passed over that. The people who really counted said: "Yes, but what you want to do is not what we want to do. What we want to do is to keep the world at work, and to see that everybody has to do certain things before he can live. We consider that this is good for the world." I am paraphrasing what has actually been said to me; but that is what it means. Now I do not myself believe for a single instant that the reason why the people who really control the world at the present time (and they are the great financiers) is that they want more money; they have got past that stage. They are idealists of a particularly vicious kind. There is probably no institution which exists in the world which is more directly responsible for the growing rate of suicides in this country, and in many other countries, than the Bank of England—(hear, hear)—and yet the present Viscount Snowden, in 1927, said that he regarded the Bank of England as being one of the greatest moral forces which had ever existed—and he meant it. What he meant was that it was a thing which was making people work, and he did not care how many people were driven to suicide and starvation so long as that ideal was realised. To those people who know the present Governor of the Bank of England, Mr. Montagu Norman, he is an earnest crusader in the cause of a World State, and that is exactly the same sort of thing. Most of these people have the idea of creating a World State which will be so tremendously powerful that no individual rebellion against it will be possible; and that is the idea which is behind all these suggestions that the real cause of war is nationality, which, as I said at Glasgow, is about as sensible as saying that the cause of quarrels between individuals is the existence of individuals, and that therefore the way to abolish quarrels is to abolish individuals. (Laughter.) Now I am taking you through this not because I wish to engage you in any sort of philosophical treatise or conception or anything of that kind, but because this thing is a deadly practical issue.

You cannot make a greater practical mistake in regard to this question of solving the difficulties of the world than by saying that if you can intellectually convert the people who are in a position to carry out the necessary methods of putting it into operation you will have achieved your object; you will not have achieved your object. Whatever the explanation of it may be, added to the reasonable objections of the human individual, there is in the case of a certain number of people an additional, *unreasonable* objection, and that is that they do not wish to be deprived of the power to lay out the lives of other people for them; and that is one of the things that you have to realise. Now the fundamental idea that is at the back of what we are trying to do in regard to this matter of Social Credit is just exactly the opposite of that. We have no ideas—certainly I have no ideas—as to what the world ought to be like. What I am perfectly certain about is that my particular picture of the world is not necessarily the same as that of my next-door neighbour. What I do say, and what I do see, is that the facilities potentially or actually exist to enable us to make our own utopia; that with the facilities which have been placed at our disposal by science and invention, and by the inherited administration and organising capacity that exists in the world now, we can obtain from this organisation that we call "society" all those fundamental things.

bed, board, and clothes, with a diminishing amount of time, exertion, worry, and risk. Therefore, we say we are merely concerned to put those facilities at the disposal of the individual without setting ourselves up as critics of his views or his objectives so long as they do not interfere with the objectives of other people. That, I may say, is the complete answer to anyone who suggests that we envisage a utopia. So far from being utopian, we are the most anti-utopian people in the world; we have no views as to the morals, virtues, or anything else, of any people. All we say is that the economic system at the present time will supply everybody with an easy living; and it is our business to put it at their disposal; but that is exactly what the powers who are ruling the financial system are absolutely determined shall not be the case. They are not in the least concerned that you could eventually get very good bed, board and clothes; that is perfectly possible and reasonable, as they say; but they are determined that you shall have them on terms which shall be *their* terms, not *your* terms. Our point of view is that, on the contrary you must have them on your own terms. Now there is a definite policy which is being pursued to prevent your getting these things on your own terms; that policy is important, and it is necessary to understand it, at any rate in its outlines; and I shall have to take you back for a short time to where I began. Whatever may be true or untrue about the present situation, it is certainly not true that the productive organisation as it exists, and as it is administered at the present time, cannot produce the goods. In fact, it is very often said that the present crisis is a crisis of over-production; I have never heard it called a crisis of under-production (I have heard it called a crisis of underconsumption, but that is a different thing), and yet the financiers, or rather the Bank of England, are saying that the crying need of this country is re-organisation of the productive system. Can there be anything more ridiculous than to suggest that a crisis which is on the one hand described as a crisis of unemployment, and is on the other hand described as a crisis of over-production, should be cured or could be cured by making industry more efficient, assuming that that were to be done? That would mean that you would be producing more things with less people—on the one hand intensifying your over-production, and on the other hand intensifying your unemployment. That is the only possible thing that can be done by improving the efficiency of industry by organising it in trusts—if that were the reason for doing it, which I am not at all sure about. But it does undoubtedly result from substituting centralised administration of industry in the place of decentralised private administration of industry, that necessary goods and services come under the control of the banking system. That undoubtedly is the fundamental idea behind it.

Now in regard to the re-organisation of the financial system itself. You will see in all the metropolitan papers, or you will hear it on the B.B.C., that nothing can be done in regard to the present economic crisis except by world agreement. If there is anybody in this room who supposes that there is any possibility of getting world agreement in this matter then he is much more sanguine than I am. It has never been done, and I do not think they want it to be done. They have only got to make the problem big enough and you will never get a solution. The situation is exactly the same as that which arises when 100 people are made heirs to a 10-acre farm. They have to put in an administrator, and the admini-

strator has the whole of the power; the more people you make heirs the more power will the administrator have, and that is exactly the idea behind the increasing of the franchise. When you have ten million people voting you can be perfectly sure that nine million people are twenty-five years behind the times, and therefore common agreement is impossible. So that, from the practical point of view, I have little doubt that every possible endeavour should be made to narrow the size of the issue in regard to this matter. I am certain, speaking as a practical man and as a man of experience of putting things through, that you never do get things done until some one person does them. No idea was ever invented by a committee. The public will never do anything; you, individually, have got to do it. I am certain that the solution of the world's difficulties at the present time will only be carried against the will of those people who control large organisations.

Look Before You Leap.

By John Hargrave.

A Message to the Australian Green Shirts.

"The Queensland Green Shirts, of which I have the honour to be the Head Man, have nothing to do with politics. Our present objective is to gain recruits for Social Credit by street-corner propaganda, thus making the Douglas principles and our movement known. At our first rally we mustered fifty-six members, forty in full uniform, with band and banner.—W. H. Rhys, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia."

(From a Letter to the Editor, THE NEW AGE, Sept. 20, 1934.)

In THE NEW AGE for October 15, 1931, will be found an article of mine entitled "Can the Kangaroo Jump?" and I should like to think that the Australian members of our Green Shirt Brotherhood will turn back to Vol. XLIX., No. 24, page 282, of THE NEW AGE, and read that article again. I have just done so myself, and I find that I not only do not have to "eat my words," but that the course of events since October, 1931, has strengthened the criticism put forward at that time. That criticism was contained in the following words:—

"If the Douglas Social Credit Association in Australia is proposing to introduce Social Credit by means of a Bill presented to Parliament backed by the Popular Vote canalised via the polls, the Banking Combine can sit back and rest content." Since those words were written we have seen the Australian Douglas Social Credit Movement attempting to "jump" in that direction.

In the recent Federal election it put up candidates in thirty-eight constituencies and polled 160,000 votes, thus creating (according to *The Observer's* Sydney Correspondent) "something like consternation in political circles." In our opinion this effort represents a first-class Publicity Campaign for Social Credit. But it would be surprising to learn that it had created the slightest consternation in high financial circles. We have been told in the past (not once, but many times) that "economic power precedes political power." It has been explained time and again that Social Credit cannot be "put through" by political methods using the mechanism of political democracy as we know it. It has been said that Social Credit is not an electioneering proposition, but that it is a technical proposition. There is no doubt whatever that, over the past fourteen years, leading exponents of Social Credit have taken up

this position and have stated it very clearly. For our part, we agree with them, and have always done so. That is why the Green Shirts have, from the beginning of their politico-economic propaganda, drawn a very definite line between:—

1. The Technique of Social Credit, and
2. The Politics of Social Credit.

It can be shown that the politics of Social Credit is not, and cannot be, the "politics of the parties"; and, therefore, Mr. Rhys is correct in guiding the Queensland Green Shirts to have "nothing to do with politics." To suppose, however, that "the street corner propaganda" of the Queensland Green Shirts—and of the Green Shirts in this country—is not *political* would be absurd. We are political, and our work is political—but it must not be confused with "the politics of the parties."

So far as we are aware, nothing has happened in Australia, nor in any other part of the world, to lead us to believe that (1) The Technique of Social Credit can be implemented by attempting to operate (2) the Mechanism of Political Democracy.

On the contrary, each day that passes makes it plainer that in order to introduce Social Credit it is necessary to develop the politics of Social Credit.

To make use of the machinery of political democracy in order to bring the question of Social Credit before the public mind is certainly part of the technique of the politics of Social Credit. But to hope to implement Social Credit via the ballot-box—without first of all generating and organising what might be called an "extra-constitutional" force, entirely free from all the accepted mechanism of the "committee ritual," and, therefore, able to act swiftly—is to move towards defeat. It may be argued that, within the present social-economic system, it is not possible to generate and organise any such "extra-constitutional" force. Such a view overlooks the existence of an ever-increasing resentment against "the present system" that is smouldering at the bottom, middle, and (here and there) near the apex of the pyramid.

I do not propose to go further with this point at the present time, because we have no desire to be at loggerheads with those who have made up their minds to take a path that (in our view) leads into a political morass from which escape will be extremely difficult. We merely desire not to be drawn in that direction.

In conclusion, I want to say something about the so-called "will of the people."

No group of people has a "will" until it is given a "will" by an individual direct, or by an individual operating through a band of followers.

(For example: as Green Shirts we are a band of followers, and we "will" to give a "will" to the wage-earning masses and the unemployed. We "will" them to begin to act in such a way as to demand the immediate issue of the National Dividend. This will-to-act we received ourselves from the logical reasoning of the mind of Douglas.)

A group of people—a crowd—a community—has desires, hopes, and fears, but no "will" to act in such a way as to achieve its desires until someone (some one person) says, "Look here, we all want this—let's do so—and-so in order to get what we want." Until then, even the desires may be so vague, or so confused, as to be almost unconscious. After they have been made conscious, and the will-to-act has been (as it were) given, the hopes and fears of the group, crowd, or community (i.e.,

of each individual acting and re-acting one upon the other) may be so conflicting as to slow down, sidetrack, or entirely evaporate the action-impulse.

(For example: in a modern political democracy all action-impulses that affect the community as a whole are slowed down, sidetracked, and frequently evaporated by means of the voting-paper. That is not to say that the ballot-box cannot be made use of in order to bring Social Credit before the public mind.)

As final proof that "the people" have no "will," we have only to point out that a people with a "will" would not tolerate the present social-economic system for a further twenty-four hours.

"Where there's a will there's a way"—and we have to give the people the will-to-Social-Credit before they can find the way. That the "way" may lead through the polling booth in the end does not conflict with our general assertion: that, just as Cromwell was forced to go direct to "the people" and to organise an extra-constitutional force outside Parliament (not because he was anti-democratic, but because Parliament lacked the power to deal with the Crown), so to-day it is necessary to go direct to "the people" and to generate and organise a Mass Demand for Social Credit so strong as to be able to sweep through and control the banker-ridden mechanism and procedure of so-called democratic Parliament.

It is not a wise plan, however, to begin by allowing agitational-energy to dribble away through the choked and broken pipelines of political democracy.

Australia has given such a magnificent lead in Social Credit Publicity that we now look for an equally effective lead towards the Politics of Social Credit as distinct from the "politics of the parties." Perhaps I may be allowed to give this general line of advice to the Australian Green Shirts: Do not attempt to develop a Social Credit (Voting) Party—bend all your energies towards the development of a Social Credit Agitational Instrument.

The Point of the Pen.

By R. Laugler.

No. 15.—THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING FRANK.

In his *Sex And Character*, Weininger suggested that there is no such thing as the 100 per cent. male or female. We taper off from "red-blooded he-men," right down the scale through the "fifty-fifty," to that not unneglected bloom of modern life, the simple "pansy." Nature is prolific and tolerant. She will turn out the sentimentalist's "womanly woman," all sighs and swoonings, on the one hand; and, on the other, she will produce a George Sand in whom, truly, *le style, c'est l'homme même*.

Weininger's views may assist us, should we have the curiosity to ask: "What will the woman of the future be like? How will 'advanced women' think and act? What part will women play in the life of the community?"

First of all, though perhaps the wish is father to the thought, it seems doubtful whether women will be content to imitate the grosser errors and the more imbecile activities of man, and call such procedure "a woman's movement." Women are essentially realists; they know that "the end of a thought is action"; they are not enamoured of vague speculations that continue, fatiguingly, without results. It seems improbable that women will be bluffed much longer. Modern Finance

and Trustified Industry have made, and are making, a most deadly attack upon marriage and the home. Women have been duped into aiding that assault—from the middle-class wife who closes her house and lives with her family at an hotel in order to "solve the servant problem," to the poor little typist who, despairing of marriage, carries on a dreary series of bedroom intrigues with "pick-ups." The suggestion that "woman's place is the home" may easily be ridiculed; but will anyone have the temerity to suggest that woman's place is the hotel smoke-room, the boarding-house "lounge," and the "hall-bedroom"? I do not believe that these "Homes from home," of our misery are either women's "place" or men's. The typical Male and Female both desire a real home, and they cannot have it without uniting. Our Mrs. Beams cater only for the stupid, and the defeated—with the exception of occasional young students. The dullest home I ever entered never descended to the Stygian depths of hopeless apathy such as is found among the great unburied dead who live in "private hotels." And let us face a particularly ugly fact—the rush of women into salaried slavery has resulted in the prostitute being driven from music-halls, cafés, and finally the streets, whilst her place is taken by "amateurs," who begin with a certain naive enthusiasm, but who very soon become more blasé than their old-time "professional" sisters. To-day men are tolerant. Unless they are very young, and marrying very young girls, they may not insist upon a virginity that they probably do not possess themselves: but all wise men will desire that the woman they marry possesses a certain fastidiousness and delicacy, for when women lose these qualities all other virtue goes from them. As Coleridge said, "We look for delicacy in a woman, strength in a man."

Before going further, let us examine the virtues of this age. If there is a tolerant deity, one may imagine him forgiving our vices, but scarcely our virtues. If we are extravagant, pleasure-loving, and vicious it is notable how forgiving an all-seeing Providence may be: it is when we are sober, industrious, and virtuous that capricious Fate frowns, and we ourselves come so bitterly to repentance.

Apart from an Efficiency—which quite recently reached the surprising and unscientific proportions of 100 per cent.—our great virtue is, we admit, Frankness. Especially is this so in our sexual relationship. We are not frightened of discussion, and we are prepared to turn our drawing-room conversations into debates of the clinic, and our plays and novels into treatises on pathology. Oh, happy age that can be so candid, and can fearlessly face the facts that marriages are made in Heaven and the pharmacist's; that genius is a pathological production due to faulty functioning of the pituitary gland; that the curse of Adam Smith is irrevocable, and he that *will* work, neither shall he eat!

One may almost hope that the woman of the future will be wicked enough, and bold enough, to turn from these virtues of Efficiency and Frankness. She may dare to dispute with those who have conferred upon us benefits, so easily confounded with misfortunes. Advanced women may distrust an Efficiency that burns wheat, and a Frankness so closely resembling mere brutality. And the woman of the future may look for better results than are to be observed around us to-day.

Can an epoch boast of its intellectual integrity when that epoch produces such confusion of thought in practical affairs—in matters verifiable and ascertainable—

that our very language becomes debased until it will hardly serve us as an instrument?

Perhaps it is because we have achieved frankness only in sexual matters that we assume that life is all Sex? We have "fearless" plays, books, films, lectures—all on Sex. On other subjects we are neither "audacious" nor "fearless." We accept the blathering of self-styled "experts"; and, accepting, we sigh that things should be thus.

Let Woman show us a new audacity and fearlessness, not by going naked of clothes and homes, but by demanding once again the full cupboard, the laden table, the warm, domestic hearth. The science of household management is, after all, primarily her concern, and Man has made a mess of it. Woman revolted once to become the equal of man; let her revolt again, and be his superior.

The Social Credit Library.

The Use of Money. By C. H. Douglas. (30 pp.)

The Nature of Democracy. By C. H. Douglas. (16 pp.)

Short Papers on Money. By the Marquis of Tavistock. (36 pp.)

Poverty Amidst Plenty. By the Earl of Tankerville. (22 pp.) Published by Stanley Nott, 69, Grafton Street, Fitzroy Square, W.C. Price, 6d. each.

The Use of Money is a new title for the address given by Major Douglas at Christchurch, N.Z. *The Nature of Democracy* is the title now given to his address at the recent Social Credit Conference at Buxton. *Short Papers on Money* contains six sections dealing with different aspects of Social Credit. Three of them are articles which have appeared in *The New English Weekly*. The Earl of Tankerville's title is that of a lecture which he gave in Stockholm last May, and which is reproduced in this pamphlet. The four pamphlets are the first of a series of publications which are announced to appear under the general heading of "The New Economics Library." They are produced in large, clear type, and convenient format; and will no doubt be welcomed by active members of the Movement.

The Nature of Democracy will attract most attention from advocates of Social Credit as it lays down the principles on which Major Douglas holds that political action can be most effectively taken. His views as to the attitude to be taken up by speakers, writers and canvassers engaged in moulding public opinion and directing its pressure are calculated to inspire confidence for two main reasons, (a) that they stand midway between the old way of working through the electoral machinery in the gutter; and (b) that they do not contemplate the running of Social-Credit candidates, but helping or hindering the progress of "party" or "independent" candidates who happen to come on the scene at election-time. The fact that certain Social-Credit candidates in the Australian election lost their deposits affords a sound practical reason for the new policy, not to speak of the successful cost of financing candidatures, even though successful.

A passage in Major Douglas's address at Christchurch has a bearing on this political policy. After analysing banker officialdom into 95 per cent. innocent and well-meaning functionaries, and 5 per cent. despotic directors of the financial system, he declared that the task of those who would alter that system on sound lines was to "drive a wedge between the 95 per cent. and the irrefragable 5 per cent." The latter will never see sense and "if they cannot be put out by the pressure of their

own associates and subordinates, backed up by an increasingly firm and powerful public opinion, then they have got to be put out by constitutional means"—that is, "by bringing the powers of politics to bear upon them. That I put second amongst the methods by which this matter can be achieved."

The theoretical possibility of driving such a wedge will be admitted; and as for the practical possibility it will be conceded, even by those who doubt it, that the Social-Credit case and proposals provide an immeasurably more promising basis for the attempt than has any political programme in the past. With the old programme, the more enlightenment people got on it the more they were disunited by it; but with Social Credit exactly the opposite effect is produced—initial incredulity becomes ultimate conviction. Given sufficient enlightenment, and the "firm public opinion" will follow. It is true that psychological resistances obstruct the search for truth and retard the spread of enlightenment, but that does not invalidate the proposition that to know the Social-Credit case is to approve it. And, so far as psychology is concerned, apart from the psychology of the despotic "5 per cent.," one can trust the mere development of events to drive more and more people into the position of choosing between the devil and the deep sea, when the terrors of the unknown will appear to them preferable to the terrors of the known.

Hail, Holy Proletcult!

Here's another god—hooray!
You remember them: the old ones?
Nile-gods and what-nots: swarms of them
The great Hep
"Thou waterest the fields that Rā hath made
Thou art the friend of bread and drink"
Use Less Water
"Thou givest strength to the grain
And maketh it to increase"
Eat Less Bread
"Thou fillest every place of work with work"
IF ANY WILL NOT WORK
NEITHER SHALL HE EAT
More Fruit—Drink More Milk
"Homage to thee, O Hāpi . . .
Thou art the creator of barley
... thou art the lord of the poor and needy"
The old godchant, the Nile-hymn
(Brit. Mus. Pap., Sallier II., No. 10,182.)
You remember? And all the others . . .
The seething godswarm
And tiny tiddling gods
And goddesses
Amen, and Amen of Amen
And Amen-Rā, Ptah, Set, Tet, Net
Osiris, Isis, Horus, Ptah-Seker
Qebhsennuf, Anubis, Sekhet, Mut
A regular spewforth of godfellows and godbeasts
Birds, beetles, basilisks, and bats
Too many to type out on one page
Welsh Coal Dispute: Provisional Agreement
... and the delegates left for their districts to place
the proposals before the lodges to-night with a strong
recommendation from the Executive Council for
acceptance (*Times*, Sept. 29, 1934)—hooray!
"Thou fillest every place of work with WORK"
Down on your knees, you Workerworms
And pray! (for Work)
Another god-by-God is born this day
Whose sign is hammersickle-swastika
Whose blood is sweat
Not a mass of gods this time
Who's afraid of The Big Bad Gods?
We're all "rationalists" now (sez you)
Not a spawning of gods
Not a litter of godlets—but MASSGOD
A god compounded of a hundred million workerworms
Brought forth in dialectic agony
From proletwomb
A Goddessgod

A Stalingod
(Any beetles, basilisks, or bats to-day, lady?
Not to-day, thank you
I s'pose you 'aven't an old suit of clothes that you could . . . ?
No, I'm sorry)
As I was saying (*Hep*) One Great Workgod
"Thou waterest the fields that Rā hath made"
With soursmelling workersweat—hooray!
In Classless Serfdom let us toil like hell
Because there's too much grub to fill our guts
It took close on 2,000 years to slay
Jehovah-Jah
The One Great I AM don't-you-dare-to-sneeze!
And here we are again
Hail, Holy Proletcult!—hooray!
Down on your knees, you hundred million Workerworms
And pray!—to PROLETMASS
(Who filleth every place of work with work)
And let us sing the Sacred Hymn of Toil
O, Holy Proletcult, we beg of thee
To let us Work; and if there is no Work
For us, thy humble little workerworms, to do
Make us some Work, that we may Work and Work
For our Communal Crust—we ask no more
Hail, Super-Robot, who art Us made Naught!
We worship thee—we worship God-is-Work
We worship Us—we are the Workermass
I AM the lord my god, whose work is Work
Set free at last from gods, and kings, and priests
All proletconscious at the Workhouse Door
We shout the Great Communal Shout—for WORK!
Let us dig holes, and fill them up again
Let us pick oakum
Make us drill—in Labour Squads
Now we are free to Work-or-Starve in Communistic Bliss
WE—MUST—HAVE—WORK!

But answer came there none
Except the quiet hum, the quiet drone
Of power-station dynamos . . .
Thou fillest every place of work with work . . .
A. G. NORTON.

Forthcoming Meetings.

The New Age Club.

[Open to visitors on Wednesdays from 6 to 9 p.m. at the Lincoln's Inn Restaurant (downstairs), 305, High Holborn, W.C. (south side), opposite the First Avenue Hotel and near to Chancery-lane and Holborn tube stations.]

The Green Shirt Movement for Social Credit.

National Headquarters: 44, Little Britain, London, E.C.1.

Wednesday, October 10th, 8 p.m. Lecture by John Hargrave, Founder and Leader of the Green Shirts, "Making Your Dreams Come True." A Lecture on Green Shirt Methods of Agitational Propaganda.

Saturday, October 20th, 3-11 p.m. Green Shirt Bazaar. Speakers: Lady Clare Annesley and John Hargrave. Refreshments. Kift Theatre. Dancing.

Wednesday, October 24th, 8 p.m. "Problems of Propagandists." (Questions invited).

Newcastle (Dinner).

The North-Eastern Area of the D.S.C. Movement will hold a dinner at the County Hotel, Neville Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne, on Saturday, November 3. Guest of the evening, A. L. Gilson, Esq., of Sheffield. Time, 7.15 for 7.30. Tickets, 3s 6d. Dress optional. Communications to R. P. Pearson, 32, Galloway Avenue, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Birmingham Douglas Social Credit Group.

October 10.—Inflation and the Dividend.—E. W. Harrison, Esq.

October 24.—The Machine and the Dividend.—C. Kenrick, Esq.

November 14.—Before Social Credit and After.—J. G. Milne, Esq.

November 28.—The Meaning of Democracy.—G. Hickling, Esq.

December 7.—ADDRESS BY MAJOR DOUGLAS IN THE TOWN HALL. CHAIRMAN, THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

December 12.—The Social aspect of the National Dividend.—T. F. Evans, Esq.

January 9.—Subject to be announced.—Dr. J. E. Purves.

In Course of Preparation.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT WHO'S WHO, DIRECTORY AND YEAR BOOK.

Editor pro tem, ARTHUR BRENTON.

Editorial Committee in process of formation.

Collaboration invited.

Readers are invited to submit:

1. Biographical items concerning leading figures (whether themselves or others) which ought to be recorded.
2. Names and addresses for the Directory section.
3. Suggestions as to what material (speeches, statistics, historical data, etc.) is best worth placing on permanent record in the Year Book section.
4. Information as to societies and organisations advocating Social Credit or other principles of financial reform. (Date of formation: objects: officers: structure: fees, etc., etc.)

Communications to Arthur Brenton, 20, Rectory Road, Barnes, S.W.13.

ACADEMY CINEMA, Oxford Street.
GER. 2981.

Film Hitler banned.

FRITZ LANG'S famous study of hypnotic power,
"DR. MABUSE" (A)

"PROSPERITY"

A MONTHLY SOCIAL CREDIT JOURNAL.
A call to Action in the language of Everyman.
Women actively interested in Social problems and the abolition of poverty should read the Women's Section, now featuring Edited by Francis Prewett. Order now.
PROSPERITY OFFICE, PAYNES LANE, COVENTRY.
Annual Subscription, 2/6. Single copies, 2½d. post free.

Social Credit Reading Course

SET A.

Comprising:—

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

Post free 6d. the set.

SET B.

Comprising:—

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

Post free, 1s. the set.

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

The Social Credit Movement.

Supporters of the Social Credit Movement contend that under present conditions the purchasing power in the hands of the community is chronically insufficient to buy the whole product of industry. This is because the money required to finance capital production, and created by the banks for that purpose, is regarded as borrowed from them, and, therefore, in order that it may be repaid, is charged into the price of consumers' goods. It is a vital fallacy to treat new money thus created by the banks as a repayable loan, without crediting the community, on the strength of whose resources the money was created, with the value of the resulting new capital resources. This, of course, cannot be done by the orthodox method of 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.

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.
God, Man and Society. 6s.
- DOUGLAS, C. H.
Credit Power and Democracy. 7s. 6d.
Social Credit. 3s. 6d.
The Breakdown of the Employment System. 1d.
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.
- DUNN, E. M.
The New Economics. 4d.
Social Credit Chart. 1d.
- GALLOWAY, C. F. J.
Poverty Amidst Plenty. 6d.
- GORDON CUMMING, M.
Introduction to Social Credit. 6d.
- GRIERSON, FRANK
A Study in Purchasing Power. 2d.
- H. M. M.
An Outline of Social Credit. 6d.
- HATTERSLEY, C. MARSHALL.
The Community's Credit. 1s.
This Age of Plenty. 3s. 6d. and 6s.
Men, Machines and Money. 3d.
- RANDS, R. S. J., B.A.
The Abolition of Poverty. A Brief Explanation of the Proposals of Major C. H. Douglas. 4d.
- POWELL, A. E.
The Deadlock in Finance. 3s. 6d.
The Flow Theory of Economics. 5s.
- TUKE, J. E.
Outside Eldorado. 3d.
- YOUNG, W. ALLEN.
Ordeal By Banking. 2s.
- W. W.
More Purchasing Power, 2s. 5 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.
An Outline of Economic Geography. 2s. 6d.
- LUDOVICI, A. M.
A Defence of Aristocracy. 7s. 6d.
- SYMONS, W. T., and TAIT, F.
The Just Price. 4d.

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

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

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70, High Holborn, W.C.1, England (Telephone: Chancery 8470), and printed for him by THE PRESS, LIMITED, Temple Avenue and Tudor Street, London, E.C.4. (Telephone: Central 3701).