

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."
A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 2203] NEW SERIES Vol. LVI. No. 5. THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1934. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	45	FINANCE AND SECESSION. (Editorial: Reprint)	51
Western Australia's secession-petition—discontent with Federalism—the Report of the Parliamentary Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform—recommends Federation—survey of developments in Australia since the Commonwealth Act of 1900.		Reprint of "Notes" of March 12, 1931, on the bankers' secessionist agitations in Australia.	
SOCIAL CREDIT AND ORGANISED RELIGION. (Editorial)	48	MUSIC. By Clinton Gray-Fisk	54
The Pope on national poverty as a preventive of war.		Royal Philharmonic Society.	
FIVE STEPS ON THE WAY. By S. R.	49	THE THEATRE. By Vernon Sommerfield	54
THE BANKERS' STATE. By Edwin Roscoe	49	<i>Ding and Co.</i>	
MONEY CONTROL. By T. R.	50	THE FILMS. By David Ockham	55
WHAT WILL REMAIN. II. By R. Laugier	50	<i>A Woman of the World. One Night of Love.</i>	
		CORRESPONDENCE	55
		A. K. Chesterton (British Union of Fascists), G. F. Bing.	

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The White Paper, India and Australia.

The joke of the week consists in the synchronisation of the following two events—(a) the announcement of the official proposal to bestow the blessings of Federal Government on India, and (b) the opening of the deliberations on Western Australia's petition to be allowed to contract out from the blessings of Federal Government in Australia. We invite our readers to study carefully the analysis—which we reproduce elsewhere (entitled "Finance and Secession") from our issue of March 12, 1931—of the motivation behind the secessionist and subdivisionist agitations which were then being carried on in Australia simultaneously with Mr. Lang's attempts, as Premier of New South Wales, to implement the decisive mandate that he had secured at the State election. When doing so they should bear in mind the important fact that the events described in that analysis all took place while Mr. Scullin's Labour Government were in power at Canberra. It is important for two reasons (a) that both the State and the Federal Governments were of the same political complexion, and (b) that both were leaning towards the adoption of an expansionist monetary policy (stigmatised by the banking community as "inflationist"). Both affirmed, by implication, the right of the political Executive to control credit, and what divided them was broadly the question of the tactics and methods to be employed in the process of assuming and exercising the right. Mr. Lang favoured militant tactics while Mr. Scullin favoured constitutional tactics. Thus Mr. Lang began by suspending interest-payments on his State's debt held in London, while Mr. Scullin inclined rather to take the line of compensating the burden of external interest-charges by providing new credits for domestic purposes. Fundamentally both policies were equally breaches of the axiomatic law of the World Money Monopoly which lays it down that for a Government to create the means of paying debt is virtually the same sort of cheating as is the repudiation of debt. But politically, of course,

Mr. Lang's policy of repudiation was much the more provocative in the eyes of the Money Monopoly, because it was a direct, visible challenge to International Finance, and had to be met as such, whereas the Scullin policy, being only an indirect and potential threat to the Monopoly, could be countered by the banking community more on the debating-ground of its technical unsoundness. Lang's policy invited an ultimatum, but Scullin's merely diplomatic representations. The outstanding feature of the whole affair, however, is that the Federal Labour Government gradually became joined, willy nilly, in the implementation of the bankers' plans for getting rid of a State Labour Government. Dog ate dog. The "Pinks" fed on the "Reds" until they were themselves in condition to be eaten by the "Whites"—the completion of the fattening process being marked by the resignation of the Scullin Administration, leading to the Labour débâcle at the ensuing general election.

Readers will remember that the Federal Constitution was hastily amended in such wise as to legalise Mr. Lang's policy, and thus to provide Sir Philip Game, the Governor of New South Wales, with an ostensibly legitimate reason for his summary dismissal of Mr. Lang's Government. For as soon as the Federal Government assumed responsibility for the service of the New-South-Wales debt it automatically thrust any State Government which might afterwards repudiate external obligations into the position of attempting to exact a subsidy from the taxpayers of the Commonwealth as a whole; so that even if such a policy were not formally illegalised by the Federal Government it would be hotly opposed by Commonwealth taxpayers resident outside the State in question.

The article previously mentioned shows the manner by which the banking interests brought pressure to bear on the Commonwealth Government, and if carefully will make it clear that if that Government not facilitated the intervention of Sir Philip Game

would have been an intensification of the agitations promoted in New South Wales for the detachment of vital portions from that State and their absorption in other States which were loyal to the bankers. There is no reason why these should not have succeeded, considering that all the monetary interests, together with all the brains which money can buy (not to speak of military equipment which it could surreptitiously provide for the agitators) would have been concentrated on New South Wales. If so the result would have been to reduce the size, and—of vital importance—to fractionise the Real Credit of the State, reducing it to the position of a community of not simply primary producers but even primitive producers. No Government, however secure its control of Financial Credit, and however sound its principles for administering it, can produce and distribute more wealth among its subjects than their Real-Credit resources allow. And, as students of Social Credit will realise, it needs only the detachment of one or two judiciously selected components of Real Credit to diminish it out of all proportion to the apparent isolated value of those components. Thus a comparatively trivial reduction in the territory governed by Mr. Lang might quite easily plunge the whole of the community into dependence on other States for their means of life. It would create a stern enough test even for a Social-Credit statesman, but in the case of Mr. Lang, who had no idea of how to administer the financial control that he claimed, there would have been no effective reply. His people would have been bled under the Federal Tariff for what they now had to "import" from other States in just the same way as to-day the proponents of West Australian secession show that their people are being penalised by the Eastern-State manufacturers. For example the protected price which they have to pay for Australian sugar is stated to be nearly six times that at which it stands in the "world market."

And now, with all these matters in mind, let us see what *The Times* has to say about the West Australian petition for the right to secede from the Commonwealth. The writer of a leading article in its issue of November 20 begins by saying that he does not see what the delegation now in this country can hope to achieve except to ventilate a grievance. He says that their claim is a matter for the consideration of the Australian Government, not the British Government, and goes into the history of the origin and development of the Federal Constitution in order to prove this statement. He also adduces the Statute of Westminster to support his thesis that it would be improper for the British Government to legislate for any Dominion except at the request of the Government and Parliament of that Dominion. It does not follow, he proceeds, that because the Commonwealth was created and the Constitution established by an Act of the British Parliament that this Act can be repealed or modified by the Parliament which passed it. If, he concludes, any Australian State now wishes to sever the "indissoluble partnership" contracted in 1900 (the Commonwealth Act was passed in that year) then its "only course is to approach the other partners and come to terms with them." In legal theory that is no doubt the proper procedure, but in actual practice it is much like advising a man legally bound to pay extortion-prices to a monopolistic body to persuade it to reduce the prices to a moderate level or to help him revoke the law under which the extortion is possible. What Nevertheless, to point out the impracticability of proposed negotiations is not sufficient to override

the contention that any other method would be a breach of the Constitution, in spirit if not in letter. The proper answer must be derived from an examination of the circumstances in which the "partnership" embodied in the Constitution was entered into. While it is right to say that a contract is a contract, and must not be repudiated just because one party finds that it does not suit him, yet it is a familiar fact that contractual obligations can be held void at law if the aggrieved party can show that he was induced to undertake them by methods of deception—by the withholding of material information appertaining to the meaning of the contract.

Assuming—and it is a far-fetched assumption—that the people of Australia actively desired a Federal Constitution in 1900, they did so under the impression that this change signified and implemented a devolution of representative government. Further, their idea of representative government was that it drew its inspiration as to policy from the people, and that it was free to carry out by any appropriate means, whatever mandate it chose to invite from the electorate. No doubt they realised that the Federal principle must mean some limitation on the powers of State Governments, but would naturally not trouble about that because the electorate who would choose the Federal Government were the sum of the electorates which chose the State Governments, with the consequence that any clash between the two would represent the need for reconciling different interests within the Commonwealth with the single aim of promoting the common good of the inhabitants thereof. They accepted the principle of Federation because, as they saw it, they were being made masters in their own household. Australia for the Australians.

Again, this supposed devolution of self-governmental power was offered them and was regarded by them as a reward for their loyal assistance in sending contingents to South Africa to help the Mother Country defeat the Boers and save the Empire. It is interesting to recall that Mr. Montagu Norman and Sir Philip Game both served in the South African War in 1901-2 and to reflect that just as they were then associated in rescuing the gold mines from the control of President Kruger so they were associated two generations later in beating off Premier Lang's attempt to control money. And this brings us a step towards the realistic interpretation of the feat of the Boers was a victory for the bankers, and the spoils of their victory consisted in the control of practically the whole gold-resources of the world camouflaged by the instituting of nominal owners in the form of the South African Government. Having got the gold, and having long previously got the gold-standard universally beatified as the patron saint of the reality of political dominion, and were ready to celebrate the event, as well as obscure it, by handing out semblances of political power in the shape of Dominion self-government. Old readers will recall with a smile how touching were the pictures drawn by the Liberal Press of the British Government's "magnanimous" admission of the Boers to share with the British the privileges and powers of enfranchisement under the Union. This was in 1909. The Liberal Party (the traditional bankers' party) were then in power under Asquith, assisted by Lloyd George (Chancellor of the Exchequer).

Unionists, who had suffered a crushing defeat by Campbell-Bannerman in 1906, professed as great alarm at the risks (!) undertaken by Mr. Asquith's Administration as their successors are doing at this moment over the proposed Indian Constitution. Later, their foremost spokesmen publicly and handsomely admitted that their fears had been ill founded—from which our sophisticated readers will doubtless guess that behind the scenes these ambitious gentlemen were warned that if they wanted to hold office again they had better accept the South African settlement as an immutable fact. It is significant to note that the control of ports, harbours, railways and customs was vested in "Union Commissioners for the benefit of a Consolidated Fund"—the State being "seized" of the other property. Nobody realised what this meant at that time, but many people will recognise the safeguarding value of the reserved control.

With all this as a background we can say of the Federal Constitution of Australia that it is not even remotely like the Constitution which the Australians thought they were getting in 1900. There was a devolution of government, but not of representative government. It was a devolution of secret super-government by financial autocrats in London to their counterparts in the Commonwealth. Who these may have been in 1900 does not matter, for something happened in 1912 which wipes it out, namely, the institution of the Commonwealth Bank. A State Bank—"our bank," as the Australians were taught to say. Well, they have had cause to learn since that this Bank is no more controllable by the politicians at Canberra than is the Bank of England by those at Westminster. Federalisation is the political shopfront of financial centralisation. And financial centralisation is based on the fact that it is easier for the bankers to deceive and defeat a massed group of electorates than any single electorate.

So the Western Australians are entitled to urge that the Constitution out of which they desire to contract is not the Constitution into which they once contracted—and that therefore the procedure laid down by the original draughtsmen of the Constitution—and especially any amendments to that procedure subsequently enacted—by which a State may seek the right of secession are void. To deny this is to affirm that the victims of a swindler may only seek redress in directions laid down by the swindler. It will be seen from our article previously referred to that for a State to secede under the provisions laid down it is necessary for it to get majority approval in every other State. One would like to know, to take the case cited earlier, how Western Australia could hope to gain Queensland's consent to her transferring her purchasing of sugar from that State to a foreign country.

The Times leader-writer says that if the British Parliament may revoke or modify the Commonwealth Act it would "put an end to all constitutional stability." Yes, but, stability of what—and for what? His warning is formulated in abstractions. But he throws a sidelight on it by going on to say:

"It would follow, for example, that the Constitution of Western Australia could also be revoked—a point which perhaps is not quite so academic as it may seem at first sight, since it is likely that, if Western Australia were separated from the Commonwealth, there would be an immediate demand from the im-

portant goldfields area to be separated from Western Australia and re-included in the Commonwealth."

We will take his word for it—for he ought to know. And our readers will see why. The goldfields are virtually the property of the bankers who run the Commonwealth and wish to preserve its integrity as an instrument of their policy. The demand for separation would no doubt be ingeniously promoted and generously financed; and in this connection it may be pointed out that the Constitutional procedure for such separation is much more easy than that for the secession of a whole State. At the same time we should like to be told the grounds upon which a commercial enterprise could, as such, sustain a case for transferring its allegiance from one State to another. It could produce no submissions parallel to those made, for instance, by the Western Australian delegates in their letter to *The Times* of November 22. The electorate of that State are solidly behind the secession-claim.

And now, turning to the Report of the Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform, it will be seen that the structure of the proposed Federal system is the same generally as that of the Australian system, and that wherever it differs it is in the direction of formally writing the bankers' safeguards and reservations into the new constitution instead of leaving them open to political debate or juridical confirmation. The Governor-General is to be legally invested with the powers of the Bank of England, the War Office, the Home Office, the Board of Trade, Somerset House, the Law Courts and Scotland Yard. For his major responsibility is to "safeguard the Federation's financial stability," and in order to do that he must be armed with power to suppress by force if necessary every form of revolt against the inevitable consequences of this safeguarding. He will be the Hitler of India.

He will delegate some of his powers to his Cabinet of Provincial Governors, and it is significant to notice that these are limited to the "collection of revenue" and the "preservation of law and order." He, in the name of the Federal Government, will deal with the creation and dispensing of financial credit, while they, in the names of the Provincial Governments, will deal with the recovery of that credit. As to the franchise, it will be noted that representation is indirect in the case of the Federal Government which (nominally) puts money out, and only direct in the case of the unit governments which get it back. The power of the average citizen's vote is fractionised insofar as it can affect the amount of money he can get hold of and can be called on to part with; but it is at full strength insofar as it affects the choice of machinery by which he shall be forced to pay up what is demanded. His vote only pulls its full weight within the Provincial system of self-bludgeonment, miscalled self-government.

The Federal Government will be nothing more than an Indian League of Nations with its Assembly and Council—and its major functions will be to legalise the policies of International Finance insofar as they affect India. The relation of any Indian Province to the Federal Government will be much the same as was that of Austria to the League during the last decade.

We do not say these things with any other motive than to point out the Social-Credit moral, namely, so long as the flaw in the cost-calculus is permitted

continue uncorrected it will be impossible to maintain law and order except by a progressive tightening of centralised, autocratic coercive repression of the individual in all sections of society. If the initiative in financial policy is left in the hands of the bankers it is impossible to leave any initiative in political policy in the hands of the people. Both must come under one control, and be directed to one end. And the crux not only of the Indian problem, but of all others, is—what control, and what end?

The Accounting of Unrecovered Overdrafts.

A correspondent wants to know what entries a bank makes when it fails to recover its loan (in part or wholly) from a borrower. The answer in principle is that since the loan ranks as an asset, non-recovery should necessitate the writing down of assets. But since the money lent has become someone else's deposit—i.e., a liability, assets can only be written down if some other liability than this is written down by the same amount. So the bank has the option of writing down "profits" as well as "advances" or of leaving profits to stand, writing down advances, and writing up investments. Or it could write down reserves and advances.

Forthcoming Meetings.

Green Shirt Movement For Social Credit.

National Headquarters: 44, Little Britain, London, E.C.1. Wednesday, December 12, 8 p.m.—A Lecture-Demonstration, *Generating Mass Emotion for Social Credit Logic*, will be given by John Hargrave, Founder and Leader of the Green Shirts.

Birmingham Douglas Social Credit Group.

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.

January 23.—The Common-sense of Social Credit.—L. D. Byrne, Esq.

February 13.—Resistances to Social Credit Propaganda.—P. R. Mason, Esq.

February 27.—Life or Money?—A. L. Gibson, Esq.

March 13.—World Affairs from the Social Credit standpoint.—E. H. Bill, Esq.

March 27.—The Emergent Order.—Dr. Tudor Jones.

April 10.—The Advance of Social Credit.—J. R. Morton, Esq.

London Social Credit Club.

Blewcoat Room, Caxton Street, S.W.1.

Nov. 30, 7.45 p.m.—What is this Social Credit? by Mr. A. L. Gibson, F.C.A., of Sheffield.

December 7, 7.45 p.m. "Organisation," by John Hargrave. Visitors are Welcome.

Friday nights, 5–11 p.m., Social Credit Library and Literature Stall.

Glasgow Douglas Social Credit Association.

Public Meeting in the Religious Rooms, 200, Buchanan-street, Glasgow, on Wednesday, December 5, at 8 o'clock. Speaker: Mr. P. McDevitt. Subject: "Social Credit Terms and Their Implications."

Cardiff Social Credit Association.

Until further notice, discussions and debates will be held every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m., at the Angel Hotel, Cardiff, beginning November 27. All are invited. Collection.

Hampstead Social Credit Study Group.

The next meeting will be held at 21, Fitzjohn's-avenue, Hampstead, N.W.3, on Tuesday, December 4, at 7.45 p.m. All seekers after Social Credit knowledge welcomed.

The New Age Club.

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

Social Credit and Organised Religion.

We congratulate *The New English Weekly* on finding itself in a position to carry on its task and to provide a platform for the exchange of ideas on problems not so much concerned with the technical soundness of the Social Credit Proposals as with the consequences of their adoption. We can express this congratulation without disguising the fact that we are not particularly enthusiastic about such a policy being pursued except under some more or less clearly defined code of standing orders. Time and time again we have seen issues raised, and debated at wearisome length, which would not have been raised had the persons raising them grasped the mechanics of the existing cost-system and of the essential adjustment shown to be necessary by the Social Credit Analysis. Unfortunately many stewards of cultural and spiritual values are averse from, and often incapable of, investigating the Analysis. In extreme instances they do not want it to be true—they cannot bring themselves to abandon the economic system as an instrument of moral discipline or training before they have satisfied themselves that there is some other instrument ready to take its place. Not infrequently they consider that they themselves have been ordained to design that instrument, and naturally look with hostile eyes on any proposition which would seem to render their talents superfluous.

We have been waiting for five weeks or so to see if anybody in the Movement noticed a pronouncement by the Pope that was reported in the Press under the headline: "Poverty a Safeguard against War." The report was only a paragraph of a few lines, and it attributed to the Pope the argument that the unsatisfactory financial condition of the nations of Europe made it impracticable for any of them to go to war. If this is true (and it should be easily verified by any member of the Roman Catholic Church) it should cause those upholders of Social Credit who threw their hats in the air over the sentiments about financiers in the famous Encyclical to reconsider their attitude. One such sentiment consisted, it will be remembered, of a denunciation of these financiers as holding the lives and souls of the peoples in the hollow of their hand. But of what worth is this if the author of it impliedly approves one of its logical consequences as guaranteeing what everybody approves—the preservation of Peace. It strips the Devil of his horns and cloven hoofs and invests him with a halo and white wings. It presents the Money Monopoly with a ready-made justification of the exercise of their power; or, if it does not, it leaves one to infer that the denunciation is directed not against the way in which the power is exercised, but against the group who now exercise it—and this seems to suggest that the real issue being raised is whether credit shall be controlled by a secular or a spiritual authority.

Mr. Belloc, we notice, points out with disapproval that under Social Credit the State, by reason of its power to dispense incomes, would also be able to withhold them. Disregarding the question of whether this statement is true or not, it appears that Mr. Belloc is concerned with the conditions on which the State may allow people to get their dividends. He does not take up the attitude that there ought to be no conditions; so one is left to conclude that his hesitancy is based on a question of who shall prescribe the conditions—a political authority is contending with temporal authority for the power to dispose of people's lives.

Five Steps On The Way.

If we are to value the work of Orage as we should, it is necessary to see clearly the five phases of his development as outlined in his own record of events entitled *An Editor's Progress*. These five phases may be summarised as follows:—

1. 19—? to 1907: The "anthological" period of Socialism—the Leeds Art Club.
2. 1907 to 1917: THE NEW AGE—National Guilds—doubts about the guild idea.
3. 1917 to 1922: Study of Douglas Social Credit—introducing Social Credit through THE NEW AGE.
4. 1922 to 1932: Editorship of THE NEW AGE given up—"a change of heart"—Fontainebleau—the Quest of God—American sojourn.
5. 1932 to 1934: *The New English Weekly*—expounding Douglas Social Credit.

Although phase 3 will always be the most important, phase 4 is undoubtedly the most remarkable, not because it happened, and happened as it did, but because it appeared to come to no definite end. Part IV. of *An Editor's Progress* is headed "The Quest of God," and this begins after a very definite full stop at the end of Part III.—"There was nothing to be done but to die with THE NEW AGE, or to hand it over to a fresher soul. After fifteen years of editorship I sold out and left England." Nothing could be more decisive. The last words of *An Editor's Progress* are—"It would be saying too much to affirm that I resigned from THE NEW AGE and from active participation in social reform in order to find God. I only wish that my motives could be as clearly conscious as that would imply. But at least I am clear now that no other end will end my search." That appeared in 1926.

Then, as it seemed, almost suddenly (but, of course, could not have been) the Editor resumed his *Progress*—not at all, in any ordinary sense, in search of God, but through the establishment of *The New English Weekly*, once more straight towards Douglas Social Credit in the form of the National Dividend and the Compensated Price.

That is so amazing (following phase 4) that one might almost say this final phase was the most breath-taking of them all. We may never know exactly how that "search," that could have "no other end" but one, developed from 1926 to 1930, or thereabouts; but I am fairly certain the information would show that final phase—*The New English Weekly* phase—as quite definitely part of The Way. Is not every step upon The Way the Beginning and the End? Some say so, and it may be so. Like Kim I have learned to say: "It may be so. I do not know." And those who know their *Kim* may hear the voice of the Lama saying:—

"So thus the Search is ended. For the merit that I have acquired, the River of the Arrow is here. It broke forth at our feet, as I have said. I have found it. . . Just is the Wheel! Certain is our deliverance. S. R.

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.

The Bankers' State.

By Edwin Roscoe.

The correct name for the State in which we shall be forced to live unless Social Credit is brought into operation is the Bankers' State. Unless every believer in Social Credit does his utmost to spread the movement we shall all be living in such a State within a very short time, a matter of some two or three dozen months at the most.

The Bankers' State will have as supreme philosophical doctrine the idea that "the State is more important than its individual members." This idea will be used to justify any action undertaken by the Oligarchy ruling the State (an Oligarchy that will, to all intents and purposes, identify itself with "the State"). Just as the phrase *le Roy le veult* justified murder and torture in the bad old days, so will the words "In the Name of the State" justify atrocities and repression in the worse days to come.

The composition of the Bankers' State will be as follows: at its head we shall find a small group of Oligarchs (a useful term used by Jack London), high-financiers who may admit amongst them a few large-industrialists. These master-financiers will be the real governors of the State, whether openly or hiddenly will not matter, since democracy will have been entirely discredited.

Round the Oligarchs will gravitate a court of industrialists, managers and governing directors of great combines (whether nationalised or not); certain of the Oligarchs may belong both to the banking and industrial groups, but their function as financiers will be their greater claim to power. Below these large industrialists will rank the lesser industrialists, men whose fortunes run into several hundreds of thousands of pounds.

There will be no middle-classes: they will be abolished much sooner than most people who fear their disappearance believe. The members of the higher (professional) middle-classes will become salaried (and liveried?) state-paid doctors, barristers, teachers, clergymen, etc. Shopkeepers will find themselves employed as clerks and assistants in the shops they formerly owned. Farmers will become mere agricultural foremen. All will be bound to the State by their wages.

The workers will remain such, possibly herded together in barracks (for economy's sake), and will be little more than wage-slaves of the State; their money wages will be very low, for the State will provide them with organised recreations and amusements. Since sick men are a source of loss, the health of the workers will be carefully attended to, with sanitary inspections once a week.

There will be no unemployed (after a short period of organisation following the Oligarchs coming to power). An unemployed man might be a source of trouble; even more than to-day, we shall be told, in Press and by Radio, that "Satan finds mischief for idle hands." No man would be allowed to go unemployed as a result of his savings, because only through employment (i.e., accepting the State's groat for obeying its orders) could the Oligarchs be sure of their ability to punish all by reducing wages. Work would be provided either by giving unproductive jobs, like digging holes and then filling them up, or by jobs destined to further the effort of the Oligarchs; there would be some sabotage machinery, where labour-power could replace mecha-

power; hours of work would be long, "to keep the people quiet."

The Law (the dictates of high finance) would be enforced by the troops (well-paid mercenary soldiers copiously salted with spies) and by heavily-armed police, a police created not to help and protect John Citizen, but to see that he "damn well did as he was told." The chiefs and officers of the troops and militarised police would form a caste coming between the lesser industrialists and the mass of the people (the wage-slaves, whether doctor or labourer). All attempts at insurrection would be repressed by armed force and all revolutionaries shot. The armed forces would be attached to the Oligarchs by the velvet-covered chains of high wages and a comfortable standard of living.

Each State would finally become an integral part of the financiers' World State, and just as individuals would have their rights curtailed by the Law of Eminent Authority of the State, so would individual States be submitted to the dictum that "the World-State is more important than the individual State."

Unless we are to find ourselves in the Bankers' State, each and every Social Credit advocate must put forward a clean-cut Social Credit policy, demanding the National Credit Office, the National Dividend, and the application of the Just Price. Since both Communism and Fascism admit the Eminent Authority of the State and the doctrine of "No work, no money," it may easily be seen that concessions to either of these groups are dangerous, since their members are putting forth policies that may easily be "wangled" by the Bankers' Combine. Concessions to other political groups should also be avoided inasmuch as these groups tend towards either Communism or Fascism.

Only by driving home the full Social Credit policy, backed by the idea that the individual should be allowed a full and happy life, may we successfully avoid being herded into the gloomy prison of the Bankers' State.

Money Control.

The glamour and romance of the Age of Elizabeth strikes the imagination of every schoolboy; and when Columbus added a continent to the map and the wealth of the Indies began to flow into Spain and the Empire, we might picture widespread economic betterment. But how unchanging is the history of money control!

The following is quoted from Ch. XXXII. "The Golden Century" of the recently published *History of Spain*, by Bertrand and Petrie.

"The gold of the New World flowed into Spain. The greatest wealth rubbed shoulders there with extreme poverty, and magnificence displayed itself in the midst of sordid wretchedness. The government was embarrassed in its finances, like governments of all periods and particularly those of that period. It was embarrassed in its finances because its fiscal regime was extremely lenient—positively paternal by contrast with our present-day regimes—and because taxes were imposed only upon the least rich part of the nation, with the result that their yield was very small.

"Driven to address itself to financiers who robbed it, the Spanish Government found the greatest part of the ingots which were brought to it by the galleons of America disappearing into the coffers of the bankers of Antwerp, Augsburg and Genoa. The dealers in gold, expelled from Spain; revenged themselves by emptying her purse and starving her people."

The closing sentence might very well have appeared in current news relating to the post-Nazi boycott of Germany.
T. R.

What Will Remain?

By R. Laugier.

II.

It is very obvious that the Asceticism, expressed so much in Christian literature; the teachings of unquestioning obedience to authority; and the artistic exploitation of suffering, endurance, renunciation, poverty, etc., cannot be attributed entirely to early Christian teaching. One might with equal justice attack Christianity for producing the horrors of the modern English sabbatarianism—which is approved of by the wise, lest the burden of our slaves be made heavier. Nevertheless, I think we shall not be far wrong if we say that the joyous Christ—the Jesus who broke the Sabbath, changed water to wine, etc.—has been neglected by Christian authors, who have for the most part concentrated upon the "Man of Sorrows." Every carved crucifix held up to the people will remind the rich that they must suffer, and the poor that they shall find release. It is the author who draws his cultural inspiration from pagan and pre-Christian sources who is more likely to give us themes of joy, rather than tribulation; revolt rather than obedience; pleasure rather than abnegation.

In these fugitive notes I am concerned, primarily, with our heritage of culture; and only with Christianity as it has affected modern literature. My aim is to throw out remarks that may possibly lead us towards some discernment of those cultural notions that will persist, and those that will perish, once poverty is abolished. I am not trying to suggest that the abolition of poverty will mean the passing of Christianity, or even of the Christian Church; but I do think that the teachings of the Christian Church will receive considerable modification. If fancy it will be almost impossible to arouse interest in suffering and renunciation among a happy and physically fit people living amid material abundance. Poverty should be an anachronism, and the anachronism is no material for either teaching or art. The Church's conflict with Science will certainly be sharpened if churchmen attempt to exalt mental or physical suffering, which any doctor will condemn; or try to perpetuate, romanticise, or sentimentalise a poverty which science has worked to eliminate, and which has now changed its character so much that the word "poverty" must be replaced by the word "dispossession."

Perhaps it was an indication of Christ's indifference to common life that he bade people, "render unto Cæsar," without caring to examine the things that were Cæsar's. The Chinese teachers knew better. To-day, by evulgarising the teachings of a joyous Christ, churchmen might turn the tables on the modern scientist, who in his ignorance of finance is rapidly becoming yet another teacher of woe.

If the human spirit is carried up to great heights of exultation and expectancy, and then disappointment follows, there will naturally ensue a literature of pessimism and gloom, based upon the unrealities of those twin emotions, sentimentality and cynicism. I think history shows us certain epochs in which the human soul appeared to be soaring to power and liberty, and then there followed frustration by Finance, and we find ages of dull, stupid occupation and servile cares.

Disillusion came to the liberated slaves of early

Christianity: and to the Elizabethans who found a new learning that gave them joy, and new worlds which, in their folly, they exploited chiefly for gold; also bitterness came to the Frenchmen who set their hopes upon the Revolution, leaving, even now, cynicism among those who do not appreciate that the Revolution was an end, not a beginning.

With regard to the early Christians the reaction of disappointment must have been sharp. They expected a second advent, and no doubt, in addition to glory and splendour, there would be the very human conception of revenge for sufferings. It was to some indigent fisher-folk, expecting the Christ immediately and declining to work when their poor brothers could keep them, that Saint Paul wrote his widely advertised epistle, dealing with working and eating. We may note in passing that any fragment of an author's writing, likely to harass the poor, and provide a "natural law" upholding the juxtaposition of wealth and poverty, will receive the widest possible publicity. Hence a quotation from Saint Paul is known to millions (even if misquoted), and to thousands who could repeat nothing else of the apostle's written work. (Compare, in this connection, the easiness and cheapness with which one may buy Malthus in England, against the comparative difficulty of finding Godwin's *A History of the Commonwealth*, an attack upon Malthus, or, in fact, anything of Godwin's at all.)

Vast numbers of early Christians were akin to our early Socialists, inasmuch as they dreamed of a new Heaven and a new Earth. In their disappointment the early Christians sought death, sometimes by provoking martyrdom, and sometimes by deliberate suicide. Saint Augustine describes the Circumcelliones as assembling in thousands, and leaping with paroxysms of frantic joy from overhanging cliffs, till the rocks below were reddened with their blood.

It will be appreciated that motives for suicide must have been strong to so act upon early Christians. When at prayer Saint Francis of Assisi once heard a voice which said: "Francis, there is no sinner in the world whom, if he be converted, God will not pardon; but he who kills himself by hard penances will find no mercy in eternity." The Saint attributed the voice to the Devil, and Francis continued with hard penances, but he would not—like the Albigenses of a later period—have deliberately accelerated death by semi-starvation.

Unlike Pagan philosophers, who taught that death was a law, but not a punishment, patristic and medieval Catholicism taught that death was a penal infliction introduced into the world on account of original sin—together with noxious plants, earthquakes, etc.

Note, Saint Francis's "voice" said that the converted might receive pardon. The unconverted, or the unbaptised did not go to Heaven: to this day, in cases of difficult birth, Roman Catholicism will sacrifice the mother, if such action seems necessary to preserve the child. A life with all its wealth of experience and association sacrificed in favour of a life which may be said to have only, technically-speaking, begun—this because an infant whose brow has not been sprinkled with water.

Somewhere or other I have seen it suggested (perhaps by Saint Augustine), that the Circumcelliones killed themselves—certainly in hundreds—because the bite of some insect rendered them insane. I doubt this. I pre-dashed; the more especially since history has recorded other "waves" of suicide, caused indubitably by dis-

appointment of hopes, principally "material." Our modern Socialists have not yet begun to take their own lives; but, in the case of Socialist artists, they have committed aesthetic suicide by turning from poetry to blue-books; by writing prefaces longer than their plays, and "Utopias" that certainly seem longer than their novels. They have mistaken moral earnestness for artistic talent, and have confused the authentic persuasiveness of art with the cheap appeal and disingenuous tricks of the popular debate. So have these leaders failed to lead. They have abandoned their legitimate consort, art, to toy with another's mistress, Pseudo-Science; but she is only a jade who will drag them through the divorce court, and leave their reputations in tatters. Better the woman you know, than the one that no decent person wants to know. The "culture" of the blue-books, the statistical records, the problem-play to end problems, the news from nowhere, and the invisible plan—this sciolism will quickly pass. It has brought the very name of culture into disrepute. It has reached its cloud-tipped heights of dizziest mania. *Ca ira!*
(To be continued.)

Finance and Secession.

[Reprinted from the "Notes" in THE NEW AGE of March 12, 1931.]

It is some time since we last dealt with the situation in Australia. This has been because we had analysed the technical financial issues pretty thoroughly, and, since nothing has happened to change them, there has been nothing more that could be usefully said about them. There have been political developments during the interval. The Federal Labour Caucus, after the manner of such bodies, has rejected the red and white policies represented by Mr. Lang on the one hand and Sir Otto Niemeyer on the other, and has endorsed a pink policy of which the white constituent is budget-balancing (but on a three-year instead of the one-year plan), and the red constituent, currency-printing. As a result Mr. Beasley and Mr. Anstey, the extreme anti-Niemeyer members of the Federal Cabinet, have been replaced by ministers who support the compromise. Mr. Lyons, the acting Federal Treasurer, has retired to where he belongs—into the bankers' camp; and his place is occupied by Mr. Theodore, who is now responsible for carrying through the agreed Labour policy.

The Opposition, after the manner of such bodies, is attacking the Government's policy without saying a word as to what its own is. By implication it can be identified with the Niemeyer programme of immediate salary and wage cuts, prompt budget-balancing, rigid loan-restriction and, of course, no currency-expansion. Nevertheless, following the example of Sir Otto Niemeyer himself, it is extremely careful not to commit itself to any intelligible scheme of administering its impeccable financial principles, or even to formulate these principles explicitly enough to be bound to any particular programme if and when it returns to power. It is out on a spoiling game, and, moreover, is not particular about what weapons it uses. One such weapon, used last week, was to exploit the, as yet, uninvestigated allegations against Mr. Theodore's personal integrity for which he was responsible. Another, which it hopes to use later on, is to get the Senate to throw out Mr. Theodore's currency-expansion Bill if and when it passes the lower House. In this object it will have every assistance from the bankers—not in the form of reasoned public criticism of Mr. Theodore's policy, but in the form of private wire-pulling designed to produce let us say, market-phenomena—disconcerting movements in prices, stock-values, discount-rates, overdraft-recall and so on, all of which will appear to the unsophisticated electorate to be natural consequences of Mr. Theodore's "inflationary policy." Even a strictly impartial

would give way before these "speaking facts," and would hasten to turn Mr. Theodore down in order to "restore public confidence." But the existing Senate is not impartial. Moreover, it contains a substantial number of gentlemen who are sophisticated enough to realise that to please the bankers is a certain way to make politics safe for themselves, and even if not, that the bankers have plenty of cosy bolt-holes for their loyal political agents to shelter in should anything unexpectedly go wrong and democracy start to open fire on them. Like the Devil, the bankers look after their own; and every armoured warrior who fights on their behalf against people in their shirts is fortified by the faith that if the impossible happens and some errant missile lays him low a cavalcade of Valkyries will snatch his honourable carcass from the field, and bear it triumphantly to enjoy eternal bliss in the Valhalla of the Money Monopolists. In addition to wire-pulling in financial and commercial spheres of activity, and thereby producing crises of different kinds, banks often proceed to inspire, organise, and finance so-called popular movements to enlighten the public on the causes of these crises and to promote agitation for their removal. These movements always appear to be spontaneous; and their visible leaders not only appear to be, but mostly are, free from affiliations with high-finance. The "Friends of Economy" who launched their national campaign in London last month are typical of such bodies, except that in their case some of the leaders are obviously affiliated to City interests. Nevertheless, all such leaders believe themselves to be public-spirited citizens who are really and truly disturbed by the sinister symptoms which confront them, and who believe that they know how to diagnose them. They are not conscious deceivers—they may not even be infected with deception—they are rather carriers of the infection.

* * *

The bearing of these remarks will now appear. In *The Times* of March 6 there appears a long letter from Lord Stanley of Alderley, entitled "Unity in Australia." In this letter he deals with the subject of secessionist movements in the Commonwealth, describing what he thinks are their causes and discussing their prospects of succeeding. The agitation in Western Australia, he says, is chiefly due to the unfair advantage alleged to be derived by the industrial East over the agricultural West under centralised Federal government. In Queensland the chief cause, he says, is "fear that the financial administration" of the present Commonwealth Government "will land Australia in an economic situation from which it will be difficult to extract her." It will be plain to readers of this journal that the reason assigned for the secessionist movement in Western Australia is much more compatible with the theory of spontaneous popular inception than that concerning the movement in Queensland. Moreover, Lord Stanley understates the grievance of Western Australia, which is not simply that the industrial East enjoys fiscal protection behind which it can bleed buyers in the unprotected West, but, comprehensively, that Western Australia cannot stand the burden of Federal taxation. Injuries caused by the Federal fiscal policy are an aggravating factor, but are not the crux of the grievance. If Australia went Free Trade to-morrow there is no evidence that Western Australia, which lives on primary production, would improve its position relatively to the industrial East. In Free Trade Britain the bankrupt condition of primary enterprises, such as coalmining and agriculture, raises a strong presumption to the contrary. But, all this apart, there is this vital difference between the cases of Western Australia and Queensland, namely, that whereas Western Australia's move towards secession is an impulsive reaction to a present, realised, burden (whether a burden of external price-charges or external tax-demands), that of Queensland is a calculated method of providing for a future, contingent burden. This, of course, is on the assumption that Lord Stanley's diagnosis of Queensland's attitude is correct. It is quite easy to believe the spontaneity of a popular movement to get rid of a definite and measurable burden, but very difficult to believe it of a movement on the anticipation of an indefinite burden such as

is indicated in the formula: "difficult Australian economic situation." The Queensland public are no more intelligent than any other public; and if it is true that they are agitating for secession because they are afraid of the consequences of the present Commonwealth Government's financial policy, somebody must have made them afraid. What do they know about finance? Nothing at all but what self-appointed mentors happen to tell them. Again, how is it possible that they can have any clear idea of how secession would rescue them from the dangers of this anticipated general economic debacle? In Western Australia the ordinary public are at least able to think for themselves and say: "Here is so much money being drained out of our State in cuts for the East and taxes for the Commonwealth: let us cut clear of the Federation and save it." But what comparable reasoning to support secession can one conceive the ordinary public of Queensland to think out unprompted? If Lord Stanley's story is true, then the secessionist movement there has been prompted by the bankers, and will be used to subserve their own ends. Further, reviewing the interests of the Australian public as a whole, and conceding for the sake of argument that they may be motivated, without prompting, by fear of what may happen to them, we still have to ask ourselves which policy would naturally frighten them more, the present Labour Government's policy of delaying the balance of budgets and of easing the general burden by expanding the currency, or the policy of Niemeyer, with its instant crash of wage-cuts and other imposts falling upon a community coincidentally with a rigid pegging of currency circulation at its present level? As our readers know, we have no particular admiration for Scullin's statecraft, but we have no hesitation in saying that anybody who professes at the present juncture to be more frightened of the Government's financial policy than of the Niemeyer alternative has been got at.

Sufficient has now been said to show that a popular demand for secession may proceed from either of two mutually hostile sources. It may reflect the natural impulse of individuals to break out of financial restraints, or it may represent a calculated scheme of bankers to rivet the restraints more firmly on those individuals. And it will be wise for our readers to adopt the second interpretation as their presumption when reviewing these movements, unless they see very clear evidence to the contrary. Our reason for giving this advice will become plainer as we proceed. For the second part of Lord Stanley's letter deals with a new kind of secessionist movement that has appeared in Australia—the secession not of a whole State from the Federal Union, but of part of a State from that State. Let us quote his own words:

"The meetings which have been held in various parts of New South Wales for setting up of New States to be carved out of the existing State, have a different object [from that of State secession] The aim here is not to leave the Federal Union, but to set up new States within the Federation. The avowed motive is a dislike of the policy which is associated with the Labour Party of New South Wales, and with Mr. Lang, the Premier of the State. . . . it is probable that a defeat of the present party in power in Sydney would bring these movements to an end."

We had been expecting during the previous three weeks that someone would soon discuss this development; for it was shortly alluded to in more than one cable to *The Times* during that period. And for much longer than that we had been waiting to see what the bankers' reply would be to the decisive mandate which New South Wales gave for Mr. Lang and against Sir Otto Niemeyer. Our readers will remember our remarking at that time that there was no earthly reason why Sir Otto Niemeyer need have gone in person to Canberra to advise the Government on its economic situation and to propose remedies. A private communication from the Bank of England would have been quite sufficient for the purpose. The probable explanation is that Sir Otto went out to make arrangements with Australian bankers for direct action against the Govern-

ment in case of necessity—to "upset the whole fabric of Government finance," as the *Financial Times* put it to Mr. Lloyd George on that famous occasion. The general strategy seems to have been that the City would hammer the Australian exchange, and that the City's agents in Australia (both financial and political) would exploit the resultant disturbance to Australian trade as an instrument for arousing disaffection against the Commonwealth Government. New South Wales having meanwhile become the storm-centre, it was antecedently inevitable that the disaffection would appear there first. This might have taken the form of an agitation for State secession; but Mr. Lang forestalled this by starting one himself, not merely a political secession from the Federal Union, but, what was much more vital, financial independence of the Loan Council. Apropos of this move of Mr. Lang's Lord Stanley comments:

"If Mr. Lang were to be successful in getting his policy adopted, the movement [i.e., the carving up of the State of New South Wales] would gain ground, but in view of recent events in the politics of Australia there seems little likelihood of such a triumph of the State Labour Party over that of the Commonwealth. Financially, since the Loan Council Agreement was entered on the power of the Commonwealth has been greatly enlarged, and though a State can gravely embarrass the Commonwealth by reckless finance, it is hardly in its power to impose a policy of repudiation on a reluctant Commonwealth Government." (Our italics.)

Is this not curious? A decisive majority of electors in New South Wales approved Mr. Lang's policy. Why, then, should his success in getting it adopted help the partition movement to gain ground? This movement is, in Lord Stanley's words,

"almost entirely derived from a feeling of distrust of the present Government of the State and a fear that it may disregard its obligations to its creditors."

Putting aside the question whether Mr. Lang's policy is right or wrong, a majority of the electorate decided to have it; and since the election this policy, insofar as it has altered at all, has assumed a less rather than a more "frightening" form. There is not a particle of evidence to show that the number of electors who dislike Mr. Lang's policy is greater than the number who disliked it, and voted against it, at the election. The partition movement is a minority movement: it is less than that—it represents a minority party within a minority party. It may, and probably will, gain ground; but if it does, the reason will not be Mr. Lang's policy as such, but the occurrence of certain disturbing events which the bankers are preparing to bring about by secret manoeuvring, and which their political agents are preparing to attribute directly to Mr. Lang's policy as and when they occur.

* * *

Lord Stanley's reference to the enlargement of the power of the Commonwealth resulting from the Loan Council Agreement is a useful endorsement of our case that when the Agreement was handed over to the bankers Council are nominees of the Commonwealth Bank and the trading banks; and the "power of the Commonwealth" is (supported from London) to dictate how much each State shall borrow, where it shall borrow, and on what conditions of interest and repayment. And underlying these detailed interferences with the prerogatives of State Governments is the fundamental denial of political sovereignty resident in the axiom that States must borrow from non-responsible manipulators of public credit, instead of creating credit themselves for public purposes.

* * *

Lord Stanley goes on unwittingly to show up the game in the following passage, which, we imagine, is what he has been leading up to all the time:

"The proposals to subdivide the State of New South

Wales have raised some questions in the minds of those who have invested in State loans. As the movement for subdivision is almost entirely derived from a feeling of distrust [about creditors' interests] . . . it follows that the inspiration of the proposed new States would be to show greater regard for contractual obligations than is supposed to be shown by those at present in power. It is to be presumed that the guarantee of the Commonwealth would be extended to loans created in substitution for those of the old State of New South Wales. So far as bondholders in New South Wales are concerned there need be no fear that the giving effect to the proposal suggested would be injurious." (Our italics.)

This is as good as explicitly reassuring ordinary investors: "Don't sell out: these partition proposals have nothing to do with party politics, they are a business scheme promoted by sound financiers."

* * *

It is interesting to learn from Lord Stanley's letter that in the Act of 1900 embodying the Federal Constitution both the secession and the sub-division of States was provided for. But the facilities for sub-division were made many times easier than those for State secession. For State secession it is necessary for a Bill approving it to pass both Houses of the Federal Parliament; after which it must be submitted to the electors of all the States; and the consent of a majority of electors in a majority of States is necessary before the Bill can be made law. In the case of State sub-division, all that is required is the approval of the Parliament of the State concerned and of the Federal Parliament—there need be no reference to the electors of the whole Commonwealth. Students of Social Credit will at once see why this distinction was made so wide. In 1900—and much more since—each State had accumulated productive assets which, at least potentially, were sufficient to afford subsistence to its population. To-day any one of the Australian States, if thrown on its own resources of materials and plant, and allowed to run its economic system under any financial policy it thought best, would be able to supply its people with the essentials of life in more than sufficient quantity, although in a limited variety, at least initially. In the technical Social Credit phrase, each State is self-sufficing in terms of Real Credit. But the things constituting that Real Credit—land, minerals, roads, railways, generating stations, factories, warehouses, etc.—have their geographical localities, and it is this their respective services to the community; and it is this co-ordination, more than the things co-ordinated, which constitutes the Real Credit of a State. Now the secession of a whole State would obviously not disturb this internal co-ordination. But the sub-division of a State would certainly do so, and could, if done in a certain way, render it as impotent as scrap metal. Nobody who reads this journal will be in any doubt about what the bankers would do in New South Wales. They would so fix the boundaries of the New State which they carved out of New South Wales as to leave Mr. Lang's territory bare of most, if not all, of the key constituents of the old State's Real Credit. In that event Mr. Lang, even if he understood how to run his State on Social Credit lines, and decided to do so, would be unable to achieve the results necessary to preserve contentment among his constituents, or at least could not achieve them in time to forestall discontent, disorder and revolt. The present proposals for sub-division will be recognised as proposals for the foreclosure by bankers on the Real Assets of New South Wales (or such of them as they want) to be carried out behind the smoke-screen of popular constitutional reform. As Lord Stanley says in his letter: "The aim here is not to leave the Federal Union, but to set up new States within the Federation." In other words the bankers' counter-plan to Mr. Lang's proposed detachment of New South Wales as a whole from the Union is to grab the best part of that State and attach it to the Union, leaving Mr. Lang with a cut-off patch to govern on Social-Credit lines if he likes.

Music.

Royal Philharmonic Society, Queen's Hall, November 8.

The Delius memorial concert, given by the London Philharmonic Orchestra, the London Select Choir, William Parsons, and Sir Thomas Beecham, in spite of its *raison d'être*, probably evoked the customary dissension as to the practicability of an all Delius programme.

If it is true that the temperamental reactions—one would prefer to say limitations—of some are such as to prevent them from obtaining much pleasure from any Delius, it naturally follows that such people must find it difficult, if not impossible, to perceive in his music variety in the broad sense of the term, let alone any finer shades of difference.

To others more fortunately constituted, however, this programme might have been expressly designed for the purpose of consolidating the effect that the "Mass" should have produced on an open-minded person, namely, exploding one and for all the ignorant and very naive belief that Delius is incapable of conveying anything except that state of ecstatic and transcendent rapture known in the East as *samādhi*, although this in itself is a sufficiently rare and remarkable phenomenon.

It may be freely admitted that too much of Delius in this mood can defeat its own object, and end by inducing in some listeners a condition of spiritual stupor; but a programme comprising such diverse works as the "Hassan" suite, "Eventyr," "Sea Drift," "Paris," "Cynara," and the closing scene from the opera "Koanga," revealed in gratifying fashion the exceptional variety, richness, and resource that is actually present in abundance throughout Delius's music for those who will take the trouble to listen attentively and without prejudice.

The suite from the incidental music to "Hassan" is not too often performed, and is probably best known by Lionel Tertis's superb record of the "Serenade." It should be heard more frequently, for, unlike much incidental music, it can safely stand on its own feet; an especially beautiful feature is the wordless, unaccompanied chorus—the sort of thing in which Delius is at his incomparable best—and in this instance it was sung "off" with excellent effect by means of an H.M.V. radiogram. "Eventyr" and "Paris," until comparatively recently, have not been regarded as first-rate Delius—doubtless on account of (ironically enough) their obvious "difference" in form and mood from the rest of his work—but the performances of Sir Thomas Beecham on his and other occasions have now made it amply apparent that they are first-rate music, though possibly not the quintessence of Delius, and reveal him quite at home in a Straussian opulence of orchestration.

"Eventyr" is a tone-poem, inspired by Norwegian folklore, and is a highly imaginative, rhapsodical work, distinguished by the rhythmic invention we are sometimes told Delius does not possess. Much of "Paris," again, written in 1899 after ten years in the city, is characterised by an unusual brilliance of scoring and an unexpected amount of contrapuntal writing—incidentally proving that Delius is quite capable of employing other than harmonic resources when it suits his purpose—but it also contains sections of that ineffable "wounding" beauty so characteristic of his maturity.

Under the force of Sir Thomas's white-hot enthusiasm the London Philharmonic Orchestra rose to the occasion and played with that unanimity, precision, power, and delicacy which only this conductor can produce from an English orchestra: "Eventyr" was admirably done, but "Paris" was superb, and is never likely to be heard to better advantage.

The beautiful "Sea Drift," too well known to need discussion, had its usual moving effect, and the performance for the most part was on a level with the rest of the evening, though slightly marred by an occasional overbalancing of the soloist by the London Select Choir. It must be confessed, however, that the baritone, Mr. William Parsons, in his possession of a voice of fine quality and power, inevitably invited comparison with his predecessor in the

part, and at no moment suggested that he is, or is ever likely to become, a Delius singer in the best sense of the term. "Cynara" (Ernest Dowson), for baritone and orchestra, commenced by Delius in 1906-7, and completed, with the assistance of Eric Fenby, in 1929, since when one cannot recollect having heard it, is another lovely production, but it again lost some effect through the same cause.

The concert concluded with the epilogue from the early opera, "Koanga" (also the name of Delius's domestic pet raven) which he latterly revised, its freshness and charm whetting one's appetite for the rest of the work.

The concert brought home to one forcibly Delius's absolute individuality as well as the fact that in its extraordinary evocative power and superphysical suggestion his music excels all other.

Such performances would have been unthinkable without the genius and inspiration of Sir Thomas Beecham and it is to be hoped that no one will ever judge Delius save by the standard of his only authentic and authoritative interpreter.

In the course of the evening Sir Thomas made a speech on behalf of the Delius Society of which he is President. He stated that the records of "Paris" made by himself and the L.P.O. were considered by competent critics to be the best orchestral records ever produced—modestly attributing this effect to the music—and urged all true music lovers to "assist in the worthy task of perpetuating the life labour of a great master by joining the Society at the earliest possible date."

Certainly no Delius enthusiast can afford to neglect this advice. The first album contains the programme of the concert, minus "Sea Drift" and "Cynara," the subscription is two guineas, and it should be sent to The Secretary, The Delius Society, 98, Clerkenwell-road, E.C.1.

CLINTON GRAY-FISK.

The Theatre.

"Ding and Co.; or, War, the Intruder." By G. K. Munro. (Embassy.)

There is a certain type of pretentious play—and film—that cannot be damned in a phrase. It is not enough to say that it is bad; justice demands the analysis of its defects. In the case of Mr. Munro's latest effort, the principal defect is that, although the author appears to have started out with a more or less definite conception, he completely fails to make it clear to the audience. That is due, not so much to inferior stagecraft, as to mental wooliness, which leaves one guessing whether the central theme is a personal episode—which has the kernel of strong drama—or certain aspects of war in general. Or it may be comparable to Mr. Munro, no doubt, knows; I do not.

"Ding and Co." has a first and second act of incomparable muddle-headedness, a third act of superbly missed opportunities for both irony and drama, and an epilogue of quite epic claptrap. In the third act, Fritz, who was in love with Hope before the war and remains in love with her, returns to England as head of a chemical factory, and offers a job to Lion, Hope's maimed V.C. husband. There is room for superb satire in the situation; no one in England is willing to give employment to the disabled thousands of German, whose poison gas killed and injured thousands of British soldiers. Yet, after handing himself this delicious picture of a Country Fit For Heroes To Live In, the author can do nothing with it save evoke a windy discussion, sauced with a few platitudes on the art of governing, as to whether Hope will break her marriage vows; his play is of that Munro shirks even this banal issue; his play is of that "clean" type of which the English stage has, fortunately, a monopoly. The epilogue shows us the bridal procession of Hope and Fritz, emerging from a churchyard containing Lion's tombstone, apparently situated for remembrance in the drawing-room in which the previous scenes have been laid. A young man pats the tombstone. Fortunately, Mr. Munro allows him to do so in silence. At your choice, you

can regard this outburst of mawkishness as either a burlesque or a sedulous imitation of the epilogue to "Miracle at Verdun." If the author intended it as burlesque, he thereby gives solitary proof of a sense of humour absent from the rest of the play.

There are some sufficiently serious defects in the characterisation. It is typical of the British stage and screen that members of the aristocratic and upper-middle classes shall exhibit a certain caddishness, but that is merely a form of snobbishness at the expense of people of lower social status. The caddishness of Mr. Munro's young man is at the expense of equals; and one feels that Ding, a middle-aged Cabinet Minister of the greatest decorum, would have made some attempt to check it, at least in the presence of a young woman. What is incredible is that another of the characters, who bores us throughout with his efforts to stop poultry from straying through a gap in a fence, should in the epilogue delightedly explain that Lion's grave-stone has been placed at the precise spot where it will solve the problem. "Imperial Caesar, dead and turn'd to clay, Did stop a gap to keep the hens away."

With the admirable exception of Torin Thatcher, the acting was in general no better than the author deserved. Catherine Lacey must be cautioned against her habit of impersonating Hecuba on the slightest provocation. Eileen Thorndike produced; her work has a certain competence, but one again regrets that André van Gysegem should have abandoned production at the Embassy.

VERNON SOMMERFIELD.

The Films.

"A Woman of the World." Empire.

After buying the rights of "The Green Hat," a novel whose title has a very definite commercial value, the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer organisation decided to call the film version "A Woman of the World," a choice not characterised by striking originality. Nor is the picture characterised by any striking merit. It is a mediocre production, in which the principal players appear to have been over-rehearsed to the point of losing all spontaneity, which is lacking throughout the film. As Iris March, Constance Bennett is finished, but uninspired. Herbert Marshall also gives a finished performance, but is badly miscast as Napier; he always lacks fire, and it was ridiculous to make so obviously middle-aged a man play the part of a contemporary of Iris and her brother. In the latter role, Hugh Williams walks off with the acting honours. The dry bones of Michael Arlen's novel are reconstructed with reasonable fidelity, but there is not a trace of the Arlenesque sparkle or wit, whose flavour has evaporated as completely as that of a bottle of champagne after a week's uncorking.

"One Night of Love." Carlton.

If we must have "musicals," it would be excellent if half of them were half as good as this picture, now in its second month at the Carlton, and the year's most intelligently produced affair of its kind. It is also noteworthy for introducing Grace Moore to the screen. Miss Moore has charm and acting ability; her voice deserves all the praise of the critics, and she sings with her brain. The film is first-class entertainment, admirably acted by the whole cast, which includes Tullio Carminati, who succeeds in the rare feat of making the role of a musician convincing. Other good features are that Miss Moore's songs are introduced with an appearance of spontaneity, that the incidental music is distinctly above the average, and that close-ups are used with economy. One takes it as a matter of course that the title is completely inappropriate, and that the operatic arias sung by Miss Moore are from "Carmen" and "Madame Butterfly"; the cinema industry has yet to hear of twentieth-century music. The direction is by Victor Schemtzing, and credit for the production belongs to the Columbia Studios.

In the same programme is "La Cucaracha," an entertaining short film that marks a further advance in colour

cinematography. On the night of my visit last week there was also a news reel, which (Believe It or Not) was a news reel. DAVID OCKHAM.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

SOCIAL CREDIT AND FASCISM.

Dear Sir,—Mr. Frank Griffiths is entitled to his advocacy of Douglas Social Credit, but he does not strengthen his cause by referring to the Fascist economic policy as "Planned Poverty." That is a ludicrous statement.

In the Corporate State of Fascism, where both wages and prices are controlled, it is only a matter of common sense that purchasing power can be equated with the power to produce. This Fascism proposes to do by raising the standard of living by means of higher wages, as science enables us progressively to increase our wealth.

The only outstanding factors are raw materials and finance. No serious economist disputes the fact that there is an abundance of every kind of raw material required for our use within the Empire, while nobody should know better than Mr. Griffiths that finance presents no difficulty whatsoever insofar as sufficient money can be created to enable the people to purchase the goods which they could create under a planned economy.—Yours, etc.,

A. K. CHESTERTON.

For the British Union of Fascists.

"WOMEN AND SOCIAL CREDIT."

Sir,—It is unfair of S. M. W. to blame nature for women, even if it could be assumed by the wildest stretch of idealism that women are the result of any "plan"!

A plan, in essence, is the positive indication of an intention, whereas the race of women are the result of a negative toleration steadily maintained since the day Moses ordained them as individuals only in relation to men.

The policy of Social Credit propaganda rests on the decision whether men will ever implement Social Credit without the positive urge of the female voice either beseeching or badgering.

One needs to consider the welter of ancient classic philosophy which has, without question, adopted Moses' view of women's status; the mountains of religious dogma wobbling on the same misconception; the whole length of legal ordinances stretching throughout history clustered round the same race-war idea, in order to glimpse the warning glowing red before us now of men's disregard of their function as providers and protectors of women and the race.

At the moment high finance has only to wait until all the spurious argument, based on what R. Laugier calls the "whorish" logic of the male mind, shall drive the women into incoherent struggle. High finance, whose intelligence is considerable, can then step up and stop the mouths of women as it stopped them with a vote and the "right" to dilute trade union resistance to high finance. Already maternal mortality and malnutrition are off to chase some taxpayer or other. And the sight of a struggling woman being, to man, the culmination of all anathema, he will gladly help high finance—as he did before.

As S. M. W. says, we can leave it in a glad new age "to each individual to develop her own personality"—but the glad new age can never come while women bear both the burden of the race and the inert indifference of mankind to the fate of his race.

Men have achieved the part of the job that shall set the race free. There are the goods. What in heaven or hell is it that so bemuses them that they do not deliver those goods?

I, therefore, urge the woman's voice, insistent and unremitting, beseeching and demanding; not splitting the race into male and female factions as high finance would have us do; not wrestling against men for that dividend they have not yet the sense to take for themselves; but insisting that the hoard which is men's creation be men's responsibility, and the sickness of the babes and despair of the women be laid at man's door to trouble his conscience until his wit be awakened.

G. F. B.

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.

Exclusive Presentation. RENE CLAIR'S latest satirical fantasy
"LE DERNIER MILLIARDAIRE" (U)

with all the old Clair favourites.

Special Children's Performances every Saturday Continuous 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.

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 has given rise to a defective system of national loan accountancy, resulting in the reduction of the community to a condition of perpetual scarcity, and bringing them face to face with the alternatives of widespread unemployment of men and machines, as at present, or of international complications arising from the struggle for foreign markets.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

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

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY

Books and Pamphlets on Social Credit.

BRENTON, ARTHUR.

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

C. G. M.

- The Nation's Credit. 4d.

DEMANT, V. A.

- This Unemployment. 2s. 6d.
- God, Man and Society. 6s.

DOUGLAS, C. H.

- Social Credit. 3s. 6d.
- The Douglas Manual. 5s.
- The Breakdown of the Employment System. 1d.
- Canada's Bankers. (Evidence at Ottawa.) 2s. 6d.
- The Nature of Democracy. 6d.
- The Monopoly of Credit. 3s. 6d.
- These Present Discontents: The Labour Party and Social Credit. 1s.
- The Use of Money. 6d.
- The World After Washington. 6d.
- Social Credit Principles. 1d.

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.

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.

TANKERVILLE, EARL OF.

- Poverty Amidst Plenty. 6d.

TAVISTOCK, MARQUIS OF.

- Short Papers on Money. 6d.

YOUNG, W. ALLEN.

- Ordeal by Banking. 2s.

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

HORRABIN, J. F.

- An Outline of Economic Geography. 2s. 6d.

LUDOVICI, A. M.

- A Defence of Aristocracy. 7s. 6d.

Instructional Works on Finance and Economics.

BARKER, D. A.

- Cash and Credit. 3s.

CLARKE, J. J.

- Outline of Central Government. 5s.

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

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