

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 2205] NEW SERIES Vol. LVI. No. 7. THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1934. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	69	MUSIC. By Clinton Gray-Fisk	76
<i>The Listener</i> compared with <i>Hansard</i> —the Dean of St. Paul's (on evidences of God in the universe) appears in front of the series in which Major Douglas's address appears—danger of crossed frames of reference.		Schnabel. Mark Raphael.	
QUESTION TIME. By J. G.	73	THE THEATRE. By Vernon Sommerfield	77
A new "exposure" of the A + B Theorem.		<i>Journey's End. The Dominant Sex.</i>	
DISCIPLINE AND DIAMONDS. By Gladys F. Bing	73	THE FILMS. By David Ockham	77
COMMUNICATION. By I.61	74	<i>Transatlantic. Son of a Soldier.</i>	
"Social Credit and Action."		"MONEY POWER" (Reprint)	77
THE CASKET UNLOCKED. By John Hargrave	74	Editorial article and Government Notice from <i>The Irish Times.</i>	
WHAT WILL REMAIN. IV. By R. Laugier	75	CORRESPONDENCE	78
		E. E. Way, Gladys F. Bing, Alexander H. Hayes, David Ockham, V. A. Hyett, A. K. Chesterton (British Union of Fascists), E. L. R.	

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The People's Hansard.

The title of this commentary serves as a useful description of the purpose and function of the B.B.C.'s weekly publication, *The Listener*. If anyone likes to vary it and say: *The Poor Man's Hansard*, or *The Busy Man's Hansard*, or *Henry Dubbs' Hansard*, let him do so by all means. *The Listener*, like *Hansard*, caters for those members of the public who wish to refresh their memory of the speeches that they have heard or to read those that they have missed hearing. It would be interesting, by the way, to know what ratio the circulation of *The Listener* bears to the number of registered set-owners.

These set-owners constitute an auxiliary House of Commons, and it will be noted that, except for questions and divisions, the service of the wireless could supersede the assembling of Members of Parliament at Westminster instead of supplementing it—an economy in time and expense which should appeal to the Treasury; not to speak of the facilities for shifting the seat of Government (and its spokesmen) under conditions of war. It is a thrilling thought that, in an emergency, our Grand "Old Bills" of politics will be able, from the best bolt-holes, to summon Britons to face the worst dangers.

Pursuing the parallel, the B.B.C. can be regarded as representing the Banking Hierarchy, selecting talkers just as members of the Cabinet are selected, and deciding what shall be talked about just as subjects to be debated in the House are arranged. And just as a Member of Parliament who wants to speak has first to catch the Speaker's eye, so does the aspiring talker outside have to pull down the ear of the B.B.C. In both cases the opportunity to speak is a privilege extended by centralised authority on a selective principle which, like our Constitution, is largely an unwritten one.

At least this is so in respect of subjects which relate to political policy—the more direct their relationship the more careful the selection. In respect of other subjects, such as music, pictures, drama, and other kinds of edification or entertainment, aesthetic and otherwise, the selection is more or less guided by the qualification of the would-be exponents. In the orbit of politics comes, of course, finance at the centre, with economics, religion, education, etc., rotating round it.

It follows that anyone whose name, and speech, appears in the "People's Hansard" has to be regarded as one whose views, and method of expressing them, have been authoritatively adjudged appropriate for ventilation in the many homes which constitute the extended House of Commons. The set-owner has the option of tuning in or out of the oration just as the Member of Parliament can enter or leave the Chamber. The giver of the talk may thus be speaking to empty or full benches without knowing which. But, if empty, he has the consolation of knowing that his name and his wisdom will be duly recorded in the official report entitled *The Listener*, procurable for the trivial sum of threepence from any bookstall on the following Wednesday.

Excluding subjects which have only a remote political significance, *The Listener* corresponds exactly with the official *Hansard* in its function of education—but with the vital difference that whereas the official *Hansard* records debates in more or less serial form directed to the elicitation of a yes-or-no vote on definite lines of political policy and administration, the "People's Hansard" records an agglomeration of debates on all manner of subjects proceeding simultaneously. It follows the plan of so to speak, the parallel-column principle of conveying information and moulding opinion. Now, this principle can be most useful in one set of circumstances, but entirely mischievous in another. Mischievous is likely to occur when the subjects belong to different frames of reference, and

reader gets them crossed in his mind (or it may be in his feeling). This risk rises in proportion to the extent to which the *Hansard* is popularised, i.e., to which it takes the form of a journal to be scanned or read through more or less connectedly. People who read the Parliamentary *Hansard* usually know beforehand what they want to read, and in fact don't trouble to open it unless they are in want of the particular information in a particular issue. They use it like a dictionary or other work of reference. Readers of *The Listener*, on the other hand, take it as it comes much as they would a *table d'hôte* dinner.

This roughly outlines the background for a few comments that we wish to make on the issue of *The Listener* in which is recorded Major Douglas's address on the wireless—namely that dated December 5. By what is an amusing coincidence, on the first page the first item on the list of contents is as follows:—

"Does God Speak in the World Around Us?"

The gentleman deputed to give the answer is the Very Reverend W. R. Matthews, Dean of St. Paul's. The second item in the list of contents is as follows:—

"The World Yesterday and To-day."

The first (of seven) sub-sections is entitled:—

"How the Chaco War is Being Fought."

Then comes the second:—

"Causes of War—Is Our Money System to Blame?"

That is, Major Douglas's address. Afterwards follow sub-sections concerned with the "Simple Life," "Agriculture," "Poverty in Plenty—Restriction and Intervention," the "Unemployed," and "Freedom and Authority."

Readers will at once realise what a difference it makes whether this *menu* is dealt with by the hungry reader on the *table d'hôte*, or the *à la carte*, principle. And in this connexion the lay-out of the contents table certainly suggests the *table d'hôte* method, for there is a vein of logical coherence running through it. "Does God speak in the World Around Us?"—what is happening in the world (yesterday and) to-day?—the Chaco War is happening—what are the causes of war? God—The World—War—Causes of War (note the plural)—Money (is it one of the causes?). Well; isn't that suggestive of a planned meal by a *chef* who knows his job?

Hors d'oeuvre	God
Soup	World
Fish	War
Entrée	Causes
Joint	Money

We don't say that there is anything sinister about the designing of this sequence; but merely remark that it is a potentially mischievous sequence precisely because it invites sequential examination, and will be actually mischievous insofar as the innocent reader accepts the invitation.

To put the matter shortly, the mind of a reader who comes to study the Social-Credit analysis of the forces leading to war ought to be free from reflections which to confuse those forces with others belonging to a different order. For example, it hinders rather than helps understanding of the Social-Credit Theorem if it is prefaced with an account of how a particular war (the Chaco War—is being fought. Again, and

to go back another step in *The Listener's* reading course, his understanding is further fogged if he approaches war as a phenomenon needing to be reconciled with the concept of an omnipotent and benevolent deity. Yet the reading course as planned is likely to have that effect. Not only does the Dean of St. Paul's start off on the first page, but his discourse is printed in large type indicative of the traditional editorial summing-up. His thesis is placed in a class to itself. He takes the chair, so to speak, at a meeting in which the subject of Social Credit is simply one among seven items on the agenda concerning the "World Yesterday and To-day"; and, by implication, he imposes a moralo-theistic code of standing orders on the course of the counsels to follow.

This is not to dispute the fact that there are relationships and correspondences between the ideas clustering round the Social-Credit theories, and ideas concerning life and the universe in general. That fact is admitted; but what is open to criticism is the sequential order in which these ideas are presented and discussed. For whereas moralistic speculations do not directly contribute to an intellectual grasp of the mechanics of the money-system, such a grasp of the mechanics does directly contribute to a reassessment and reevaluation of morals and moral standards. The price of Liberty, so it is said, is eternal vigilance; and it is just as correct to say that the price of fruitful moral reflection is material perception. Before you can purposively prophesy what *ought to be* you must patiently verify what *is*. First that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual. You cannot improve the culture of roses by talking in terms of their perfume.

For these reasons, *The Listener's* reading course would have been as helpful *if reversed* as it is now unhelpful. The outer, and dominant, frame of reference should have been *Money*, and the inner and subordinate frames of reference those relating to morals and theology—assuming these are thought to be necessary. For if only the investigation begins with the *Flaw in the Costing-Principle*, and proceeds through the phenomena demonstrably emergent from it, it must lead to a profound modification, if not the elimination, of most of the moral and spiritual problems which are at present found in place in the curriculum. Certainly, as given pride of place in the curriculum, "in a given world divinely ordered, the man who has the least difficulty in reconciling it with the goodness of God is the man who has grasped the axioms of Social-Credit science. These constitute a revelation of a Pentecostal order, and the man who receives them "speaks with tongues" in every realm of intellectual and moral research. There are men and women—and we can name them—in whom the receiving of this revelation produced the same ecstatic exaltation of spirit as is expressed in the lines of Dr. Doddridge's hymn:

Now rest my long-divided heart;
Fixed on this blissful centre, rest;
Nor ever from thy Lord depart,
With Him of every good possessed.

—men and women of that rare type to whom the conviction of ignorance is as disastrous an experience as to others is the conviction of sin, and to whom the realised fulfilment of their knowledge comes with the same transfiguring force as to others comes the realised forgiveness of sin. "The whole creation groaneth, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God"—and who can doubt

that the temporal phase of that manifestation is present in the Social-Credit revelation and message?

There is a remark attributed to Jonathan Swift, who, on being told that the problem of providing wooden paving round St. Paul's was exercising the clergy, said that if the Deans in London all put their heads together no doubt they would solve it. Of course that disparaging pleasantry belongs to old times and circumstances; but the recent perfecting of bankster methods of concealed advertising calls for commensurate alertness on the part of representative Churchmen lest their wisdom and good intentions are insidiously employed to buttress up the bankstocratic policy and system which need to be defeated. (We apologise for our hybrid etymology—but, as veteran poachers will tell you, the lurcher was a more efficient ally in the fight against the game laws than his pure-bred relations.) The bearing of this lies in the fact that the discourse of the Dean of St. Paul's in *The Listener* confuses the issue not only by reason of its place of priority in that journal as described, but also by reason of its structure. Whether he has been studying the orations of Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler and General Smuts for the purpose of constructing his talk we cannot know, but it certainly reflects the tone and style of those gentlemen, particularly the latter, whose manner of applying his theory of Holism was adversely criticised by us in these columns a week or two ago. We do not need to emphasise the fact that both of them are *personae gratae* to the bankers, which is another way of saying that followers of their school of thought stand a good chance of being put on the wireless by the B.B.C. Now, whatever the intentions of the Dean of St. Paul's (and we should be the first to respect them) the general tenor of his argument lends itself to side-tracking conclusions—and will undoubtedly do so if the reader transfers them from the theological into the economic frame of reference. He asks two questions: (a) Can we infer the existence of God from an observation of what goes on in the universe around us; (b) If so, what can we infer as to the goodness or otherwise of God's character, assuming His omnipotence? In the course of answering he points out that the old idea of God as a magnified human being has been exploded. "We have learned," he says, "that God is a Spirit, not just humanity enlarged." That being so, he proceeds to say in so many words that "we" with our *personalised* minds cannot evaluate the *de-personalised* Mind ruling the universe. Here he introduces holism (without mentioning it) by pointing out the emergence principle of evolution, meaning that higher types of existence emerge from lower types and have properties which cannot be explained by the earlier and lower types of being from which they emerge. This leads him to his final conclusion that we must "judge the Creator by His highest productions." He refers to two of these "productions"—one being what he calls "subtle harmonies" in persons "who have achieved unity in themselves and with the Spirit which is the deepest reality of the Universe"; and the other, that quality which we call *beauty* in Nature. We cannot define beauty, nor analyse it. There it is; and we are either sensitive to it or we are not. Those who are "often feel impatient with arguments about God, because they have heard His voice in creation's loveliness."

Now the general effect of all this on the readers of *The Listener* is to give them a feeling of distrust in their

critical faculties. All through the piece the Dean is addressing himself to their human reason to prove the futility of their using it in an attempt to explain the working of the de-humanised Mind. God cannot be perceived by the intellect, He can only be sensed by certain emotional faculties or super-emotional sensibilities. We need not stop to discuss this conclusion; for whether people choose to praise or to blame God for His governance of the universe they cannot alter it or any of its effects. As Mr. Montagu Norman would say: The dogs bark, but the caravan passes on.

This leads us to the main purpose of these comments. It is to point out that if readers of *The Listener* proceed to examine the talk on Social Credit in the mood created by the Dean of St. Paul's they will be pretty thoroughly immunised against its appeal, which is, *fundamentally*, an appeal to the critical faculties of personalised minds founded on naturalistic data. To get hold of Social Credit it is essential that the reader shall trust his own proper reasoning against the counter-reasoning of bankstocratic authority. What, then, is likely to be the mental attitude of a reader who turns from the weighing up of the question: "Does God Speak in the World Around Us?" as answered by the Dean to another question which we will take the liberty to put in this way: "Do the Bankstocrats Speak in the Economic System Around Us?" We are not twisting the parallelism of the two issues in the slightest, for in no way else can the exposition of Social Credit be interpreted than as answering the two challenging questions: "Can we infer the existence of Financial Government from the facts of the Economic System?" and: "What can we infer from those facts as to the Goodness or Wisdom of that Government?" The comprehensive conclusion to which the exposition invites readers to come is that the economic system is misgoverned by Financial Autocrats who either intend the ills they do or are incompetent bunglers.

Now—and we mean no disrespect to the Dean of St. Paul's or to the faith he holds—if any reader of *THE NEW AGE* will take that gentleman's address as printed in *The Listener*, and will substitute for the word "God" the word "Banker" (symbolising the Super-bankstocracy)—and for the word "universe" the words "economic system" he will turn that discourse into such a close paraphrase of the bankstophile apologetics disseminated through the usual channels of publicity as to provoke loud laughter from all Social-Credit initiates.

Take the opening paragraph as so emended:

In many of the lower religions [read lower philosophies] of the economic system the idea of the Banker was simply that of a magnified man, Bankers were conceived as just like human beings, except that they were more powerful, and, as was sometimes thought, did not suffer or die. . . . But if we are . . . really civilised persons we have left these ideas behind. We have learned that the Banker is a Spirit, not just humanity enlarged, but the Creator and Sustainer of the whole Economic System. That is the only belief in the Banker which any modern, educated and intelligent man would consider worth discussing."

The next paragraph will appear thus:
"If the Banker exists at all, therefore, we should assume that he is the Spirit, the Creative Mind, which is behind and within all things. Where, then, should we expect to find signs of his presence and indica-

tions of his character? The answer is obvious—in the Economic System which he creates. Let me use a very simple illustration. Suppose we went into a room which had been lived in by one whom we had never seen . . .

Here follow several lines telling how we could infer something of his character by Sherlock-Holmes methods. "We" might be "puzzled sometimes" and wish "we" could "find something which he had written"—nevertheless "we" should learn something if "we" observed evidences and were "sensitive to their meaning."

"But there are two important differences between this room and the Economic System: the Banker is not absent from the System. . . . He is, so to speak, concealed behind it. He is still there, present in every part, though invisible to our bodily eyes. And the second difference is that the Economic System, unlike the room, is not finished. . . . While we look at it, it is changing and being created."

This second "difference" comes just in time to forestall some hypothetical "Voice" which is preparing to interject: "What about the graph of suicides and bankruptcies?" If everything is in a state of creative change the suffering is a symptom of the creative process.

Then follows a long section devoted to showing up the "ridiculous" theory that the Universe could be explained on mechanist lines, and suggesting the necessity for postulating a directive mind at work. All the same, the Dean confesses:

"I must admit that I do not think we can find in nature the basis for a conclusive argument that God exists and that He is good."

and prefers to say that "nature as a whole" affords a balance of support to the hypothesis of the existence of God. The reader, by changing the terms as before, will turn this section into an argument that the Economic System needs the constant direction of the Banker, but that, even so, one must not expect it to furnish conclusive proof of his existence and goodness, but just a balance of probability that, like Chevy Chylye, he is somewhere round the corner without disclosing any clue as to his character. So far we may all shout "Hear, hear!"

But just to nip irreverent crowing in the bud, there now follows the holist "emergence" of mind from matter and the higher type of mind from the lower. In other words we must not aspire, with our lower types of mind, to understand the clues disclosed in the economic system as to the existence and character of the Higher Type of Mind which is working behind it, within it, all round it, beneath it, and so on. It is a matter of super-emotional sensitiveness to, shall we say?—spiritual atmospheres; or—to formulate the idea in homely terms, a nose for smells, such as, in all probability enabled the curate in the story to infer God from the excellent parts of the egg.

Lord Snowden had the gift. From the heroism of the poor under their afflictions he inferred the goodness of the Banker, calling the Governor of the Bank of England the greatest moral factor in the body politic. And it is just at this point where the two parallel lines of composition under consideration bend in and converge. For the Dean's identification of beauty as a manifesta-

tion of God to those who appreciate it reminds us that there is a beauty of character as well as of persons and things; and who can doubt which of the two is the emergent, the higher, type? Have we not seen coroners transported to the verge of advocating the beatification of those saintly down-and-outs who took their own lives rather than draw the dole? Friends, was not the Banker behind the mortuary, and within it, beseeching us to discern in the figure of the corpse the existence of a wise Creative Mind? Let us therefore take care lest we are led away by false doctrines such as the Abolition of Poverty with its deceitful monetary symbols of material acquisitiveness and profligate indulgence!

A Social Credit Calendar.

We have received a specimen of a little calendar from Mr. Ernest E. Way, of 3, Woodlands Terrace, Charing Cross, Glasgow, C.3. It is in the form of a card measuring about 9 ins. x 4 ins., on which is mounted a miniature date pad (in months). On the card is a legend: "The Purpose of a True Economic System is to Deliver the Goods—Demand your Share through the National Dividend." It is priced at 3½d., or 3s. per dozen, post paid. Mr. Way suggests its use as a greeting-card.

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.
Wednesday, January 9, 8 p.m.—Lecture by John Hargrave, Founder and Leader of the Green Shirts.
Wednesday, January 30, 8 p.m.—Lecture by Edgar J. Saxon, Editor of *Health and Life*, "Why I Stand for Social Credit."

Birmingham Douglas Social Credit Group.
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.

Glasgow Douglas Social Credit Association.
Public Meeting in the Religious Rooms, 200, Buchanan Street, Glasgow, on Wednesday, December 19, at 8 o'clock. Speaker: Mr. A. F. Stewart (Falkirk). Subject: "How I would Issue the National Dividend."

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.

Manchester D.S.C. Association.
Public Meeting at the Milton Hall, Deansgate, Manchester, December 12, at 7.15 p.m. Address, by Miss F. Bunce, M.A.: "The World in Debt. Douglas Social Credit the Way Out."

London Social Credit Club.
Blewcoat Room, Caxton Street, S.W.1.
Meeting on Friday, December 14. Subject: "The League to Abolish Poverty." Speakers: Mr. William Ward, Mr. James E. Tukey, Mr. Eimar O'Duffy.
Visitors are Welcome.
Friday nights, 5—11 p.m., Social Credit Library and Literature Stall.

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.]

Question Time.

The latest exposure of the "fallacy" of the A + B Theorem is beautifully ingenious, and stands in a class by itself. If goes like this:—

Take a timber company. It hires, say, 100 men to fell trees, and pays them, say, £300 for their week's work. That sum is "A" expenditure—a payment to persons, which becomes purchasing power. Very good. But suppose these same men form a company, calling themselves Tree-fellers, Ltd., and contract to supply the same timber in the same way for the same money. The timber company's payment to them is now "B" expenditure—a payment to "another organisation" which does not become purchasing power. How about it? Nothing is changed in the figures, the time-lag, and the consumption-use of the money: the only change is in the legal status of the 100 men—which of course has nothing to do with the question of whether their money becomes purchasing power or not. What about it?

Not a bad little catch—what? And there are plenty of Social-Credit speakers who, if some heckler at a meeting shot it at them unexpectedly and for the first time, would be caught hesitating for a quick answer. Anyway, the authors of it believe it to be a "finisher," for it appeared in *The Mercury* (Tasmania) over the signatures of seven scientists and accountants a few months ago. The problem for the Social-Credit exponent is not how to expose the flaw in it, but to make his answer as short and plausible to a neutral audience as the criticism undoubtedly is. He who hesitates loses a trick—and, of course, in the propaganda game we don't want to lose any tricks. So what's the answer? J. G.

Discipline and Diamonds.

The farther one proceeds in Social Credit propaganda the more apparent does it become that the chief opposition to the idea does not arise from any fear of financial revolution, any firm faith in the present credit-monopoly or any complacency at poverty, food destruction, or imminent war. The commonest aversion to the Social Credit proposals arises after the convert has accepted the adjustment of the price system, admitted the need of the National Dividend, and, in fact, has abstractly concurred in the need for Social Credit to equate production and consumption.

But—and it is a huge, intangible, baffling But—the aversion to Social Credit begins when the average convert starts to exercise his imagination upon the effects of the system once it has become established. He will admit the inestimable convenience of electricity in his own home, but he doubts its value if it is going to free the coal-miner from toil, for what will the coal-miner do if he is not forced to toil? Awful thought! Ten, twenty, thirty thousand coal-miners are running loose upon the world, reinforced by similar thousands of dockers, riveters, and road-sweepers, etc., *ad inf.*

Now just as this objector would rejoice at labour-saving devices in his own sphere so he can, without alarm, easily visualise himself retiring upon a pension, a legacy, or a shock-absorbing directorship. We are each so very different from other men! In our little souls we resemble the lady who wrote to the Press lately protesting that any council-school fellow could

wear an old school tie, even a crack regimental tie. And her grief was that unless the school exercised a monopoly in its colours folk could not tell the difference between the genuine school man and the gate-crasher!

Thus the Social Credit opponent feels about the work-discipline problem and the easy-money problem. He should be laughed at as long and as loudly as the poor lady cited above. But he must be convinced that all the shibboleths hanging round the two words "vice" and "virtue" will be blown sky-high in the Social Credit State.

Social Credit betokens the supreme faith in absolute democracy; belief in the development, expansion, and liberty of the individual as an individual, and not as a member of a class; and if that faith cannot be engendered then the hope of Social Credit cannot cure the poor soul so possessed of devils that he fears to trust his fellow-men.

The reluctance to welcome leisure as part of humanity's right must be scouted on two counts: first, that it is as reasonable to deprecate leisure as Monday mornings, for both are inevitable and irrevocable; secondly, it is evidence of an anti-social unchristian attitude so to distrust humanity when its chains shall be struck off.

Work was a virtue only when it was a necessity in order to maintain life.

Extravagance and luxury were paths to hell when thrift was a virtuous necessity.

Women were either the prime luxury (if you could afford them) or a frustrating curse (if you couldn't). The extravagance of women was vice beyond expression, because the vices and virtues of women are always men's *in excelsis*. No man can save or stretch money as a woman can. No man can spend with a tithe of the wanton extravagance of a woman if she so chooses. The great shops of the great cities of the world are filled with women's things, spread out for women, lapped in luxury, hung around with silks, warmth, music, and perfume. Women's *milieu*, and rightly, Who dares deny it? If that be vice then women are vicious, and men, too, for aiding and abetting; the race is corrupt; Social Credit is subversive. Poverty, disease, crime, and war are blessings and benefits.

But we must choose. There is no compromise. And so shall we be able to choose if we assess luxury—pearls and perfumes—at their physical value. Their physical value is exotic, unreal, whimsical, not always even aesthetic. But the cost of luxury in terms of money—the sacred token—is its traditional value, and in ratio it is considered as reprehensible as it costs money. Consider a Press headline: "Champagne and Diamonds." In a half-starved world the mere words fill one with a sneaking guilt. But if we are assured the champagne was six-shilling stuff and the diamonds synthetic we are relieved. We are not so wicked, after all—though our bosoms glitter and our heads are fuddled. It is not wicked if it has not cost "money," and it is only reprehensible because it reflects the wickedness that "wastes money"—money, trash, ink-stained paper.

The Social Credit state can never come while we shirk this issue; while we endeavour to soothe objectors with soft promises that some expansion of production will no doubt provide more work; that the discipline of labour shall be imposed upon the younger men, and in various ways apologise for the leisure which is our heritage together with our wealth.

We have to debunk discipline. Discipline has been

lauded down the ages because it renders the individual amenable to tyranny. The idea that revolting labour is good for the soul is a relic of barbarism that no modern psychologist or educationalist would countenance. One cannot temper the most lascivious appetite by converting gratification to revulsion, one merely induces insanity.

Thereby hangs the tale of humanity's simple faith in tyranny.

Social Credit propaganda has frankly to rejoice that every day shall be a Saturday night, with best clothes and money to "blow," and leisure to "blow" it on incredible luxuries. There is no doubt of it, and if the picture inspires fear then it is the fear that must be cast out and not the picture.

As we toss contempt at the sacredness of money so must we upon those things whose value is measured only in money. Let them fall into their places as items inconsiderable so that the Good Life shall begin to be recognised as one of peace, beauty, love and creation, arts, sciences—the vital religions of a social progress which shall laugh from Olympus down upon discipline as upon diamonds.

GLADYS F. BING.

Communication.

SOCIAL-CREDIT LEADERSHIP.

Sir,—I am very interested in the letter from P.56 published this week, and hope that you will permit me to make a few remarks.

I consider that there is a selective process in operation. Douglas took his manuscript to several editors who refused it, and it was finally accepted by Orage. The publication of Social Credit articles in The New Age subjected the readers to the process of selection. Old members left and new members joined, and the engineers, scientists, and artists who were able to appreciate the new truth may not be the men desired by P.56, but they were the men with the quickest understanding of the Douglas analysis.

The selective process is continuous, and as economic and political situations change, both internationally and nationally, this will produce changes amongst the S.C. movement. For example, if the S.C. movement were declared illegal under the Sedition Bill (by no means improbable) then we should have a rapid change of membership, many worthy and respectable colleagues would leave us, and many new members would join. The best leaders are the men who can best analyse a given concrete situation, and can take the best course of action to suit the circumstances.

It may well be that the men who prove themselves equal to this task may be country men (live in the country), or they may live in cities or suburbs, in bungalows or in mansions. They will be individuals.

Under sound finance crisis, revolt, murder, and war are unavoidable. The practical steps to be taken under these rapidly changing conditions will be the cause of endless arguments, divisions, splits, etc., within all the various S.C. groupings. I, therefore, anticipate violent and rapid changes in the leadership and personnel in the immediate future.

Whilst there may be a change of name, and whilst the words "Economic Democracy" may be discarded, I do not think that any particular section of the population (such as those who live in the country) will be able to "divert the movement on to the right rails."

I.G.T.

The Casket Unlocked.

"—With some rare exceptions Mr. Hargrave produces flawless pearls hidden in a locked casquet, the key of which is hidden."—"P.56, New Zealand, in a letter to the Editor, THE NEW AGE, December 6, 1934.)

Come now, countryman, you are a friend of mine—just because you are a countryman—and you must walk with me, and we must talk together. Why not?

I was born and brought up in the country, and have lived there ever since. I think I know you. Certainly I know that countrymen ask straight questions of each other and get straight answers, as often as not. And should there be a twinkle in the eye of the questioner, that was never counted amiss in Sussex, or Westmorland, or Hertfordshire, or Bucks. So here is such a question, and such a questioner.

How do you come to know what is in "a locked casquet, the key of which is hidden"?

I knew of a plowman, once, who reckoned his wife was gifted with "second sight," but she was never able to see inside of a locked box: and all the "second sight" she ever had was of a bright angel with wings that was to take her up to heaven.

I have heard of countrymen, who, so they said, could find water by holding the forked hazel twig: but never one that could find pearls in a locked casquet—and know that they were flawless!

Maybe you took the "casquet" up and shook it? But how could you tell there were pearls in it? Might be dried peas.

Did you manage to get a squint through the keyhole? But no, that won't do—for you must have examined the peas (pearls, I mean) very carefully.

It beats me! I guess you must have found the key, unlocked the box-of-tricks, and looked inside?

And if I know my countryman, the reply will be (with a large grin spreading, wrinkle after wrinkle, like slowly outgoing ripples on a pond) —

"Ar, you'd like to know, wouldn't you?"

So there we are. No doubt about it, friend Countryman, you've been at my "casquet"—that I thought was all properly locked up—and, by hook or by crook, you've had it open. Not only that, you went rooting about inside of it, and there you found—*flawless pearls*, my boy!

"Yes, and what good are they?"—I can almost hear you say.

Just think of it—pearls! Necklaces, tiaras, bracelets, fine fandanglers—priceless geegaws—trinkets, toys—all given away free of charge! After all, "finding's keepings"—you might have made a present of them to the good wife, or some good-looking girl down the village.

They may be "cultured" pearls, but we should perhaps remember that it is the oyster that is frustrated, not the practising psychologist who deliberately introduces the irritant.

You think that if anybody is going to divert Social Credit on to the right rails it will be The Countryman? Personally, I don't care who does it, so long as it is done.

Are you quite sure that Social Credit advocates have been so very "bad at psychology"? Social Credit seems to have reached New Zealand (to mention only one of many countries in the world where the idea has seeded itself and taken root), and this result may not be in spite of making "every psychological blunder," but because of a policy that allowed people to make "blunders" that may turn out to be—just the opposite.

You never know, you know. —and show the bewildered townfolk how many psychological beans make five. For my part, I never met a countryman who talked about "the failure to understand the difference between regarding the problem with psychological braininess and with psychological knowledge." Things must have changed since I was a lad on the farm. But, there

you are, things *do* seem to change—even down at The Boot and Slipper.

"Ae? Gustave Le Bon—'oo's 'e?—never 'eard of 'im!—what price get fer yer taters, Dan?"

But I must have a Yale lock put on that "casquet."

JOHN HARGRAVE.

What Will Remain?

By R. Laugier.

IV.

Puritanism seems to me to have played such an important part in the perversion of English culture, that I propose to dwell upon these influences a little longer. I shall comment only upon the Puritanism that creeps into the ideology of authentic artists: it would be superfluous to point to the others! But, before examining the work of certain artists, I should like to suggest that these men were deceived by their early training and associations; they never, in spirit, betrayed their Art, as the bulk of their work clearly shows. Puritanism became so strong that, the artist who should leave it entirely out of his reckoning, would get no hearing. In the Theatre, for example, after Sheridan, the dramatist must either be "morally earnest," or turn out unworthy, trivial rubbish (spectacle and entertainment) for the stupid and ignorant vulgarian. Actually, among the bulk of the populace, what might legitimately be called "the best people," were Puritans: these had to be lured to the theatre by promise (and performance) of "uplift." Later we see the Puritan of genius, like Shaw, who hated and despising the Theatre, yet adopts its methods in order to preach his sermons the more effectively. He would cast out devils by Beelzebub, Prince of the Devils. But, despite Shaw's wit and amazing technique, he is fundamentally antagonistic to the pure art of the Theatre. A few more Ibsens, Shaws, Galsworthys, and the traditions of Elizabethans, Restoration Poets, the *commedie dell'arte*—these traditions are relegated to libraries and lumber-rooms. (Plays, of course, are not meant to be read—a growing modern habit.) Historically, the English Puritan is, I think, of the utmost importance, because England—with her law of primogeniture, her younger son, pirate Empire builders, etc.—began the racket called "Business," which the rest of the world followed. It is the Puritan who hopelessly entwined moral considerations with questions of efficiency and expediency; it is the Puritan who taught "duty" to the poor, whilst indulging a ruthless individuality amounting to megalomania, among the rich. Above all, it is the Puritan who helped to found the "science" of political economy upon that of Ethics, and so paved the way for those generally accepted illusions concerning rewards and punishments that run all through our social and economic life. Modern America merely presents English folly writ large.

One can judge the state of a civilisation by the condition of its theatrical art. The best theatre is produced by the finest culture: when nations become barbaric the art of subtle gesture and intonation gives way on a revolving stage. Culture gives us the catharsis of mimic death and blood; barbarism gives us the gladiatorial arena. The Chinese discover gunpowder and produce fireworks; the Germans "discover" it, and blow us to blazes. (Question: Did the Germans ever really discover anything—from printing, Shakespeare, and nudity, to aniline dyes, Relativity, and beer?)

The art of the Theatre has always been the deadliest

foe of Finance and despotism. With or without help from the church, the Theatre can convey, to a large collection of people, an apprehension of the most subtle ideas and most delicate satire: this is because an audience, with their emotions quickened by Art, is a very different entity to the isolated reader. In the Theatre things happen that are very mysterious to the cold intellectual: this type *reads* a play, and considers it "over the public's head"; so it would be, if they *read* it; but, in the theatre, behold, it is not above even the intellectual's brow.

The Theatre, then, is the enemy of despotism, not only because of its satire, but because the subtlest wits may here converse with an emotionally charged people. The Theatre is the enemy of Finance, because it is utterly lacking in thrift and "economy." The "intellectuals" of the Theatre are fond of talking of Shakespeare played before a blanket; of "crude simplicity" in production; of "four boards and a passion." Actually the earliest European theatres spent fabulous sums; and wealthy individuals and towns ruined themselves to produce plays, mysteries, masques, with as much realistic splendour as could be contrived. In one of the earliest play-productions a sum equivalent to about £200 is spent on one cloak for a single character. (Cf. Lee Simonson's "The Stage is Set.") The imagination does not wither and die when plays are produced realistically by artists. The imagination, and real morality die when actors advance to the footlights, strike their breasts, and say, "The man who lifts his hand against a woman, etc."

From earliest producers to Max Reinhardt the artist in the Theatre has been in opposition to Finance, in questions of economy, questions of "keeping dates" as per contract, questions of compromise with artistic integrity. But Theatrical Art is most deadly to Financial Despotism, because the Theatre may so profoundly move and truly educate the masses—a thing that Catholic Church and Despotism both know, and a thing that the business men in the Theatre do not know. At this moment the finest Theatre seen in England since Shakespeare, and in America at any time whatever, is fighting for its life against Finance. The Maughams, Cowards, Lonsdales, Sydney Howards, Elmer Rices, O'Neiles, Behrmans, Philip Barrys, etc., do not know what they are fighting; but, at any moment, they may learn. And some suspect now as was shown by Rice's "We, The People," which nearly won the Pulitzer Prize last year. The private "censorship" exercised upon the Press does not exist in the Theatre.

When Jeremy Collier attacked the Restoration stage, Congreve merely replied that the follies and vices of his characters were plainly revealed, and audiences could decide whether they would imitate such follies. It was the only answer demanded by artistic code; and anything further would have been equally misapprehended by Puritan minds. A gulf now yawns between Art and popular Religion.

The Restoration Theatre was practically made in France, and was a kind of club where young bloods went to be seen and heard, rather than to see and hear. One gallant was killed in a duel, during a somewhat interrupted performance of "Macbeth." Such a Theatre was the home of monarch, court, and lackeys; it had none of the popularity of the Elizabethan stage.

In *belles lettres* all is piety and moral zeal. The author is enormously concerned to teach behaviour, not only in "the nice conduct of a clouded cane," but in such trifles as how to blow one's nose—a lesson which,

though it may be needed, is scarcely the province of the artist. Briefly, poets, wits, essayists—all of them preach. And even if they do their preaching with more wit and refinement than later ages—it still remains a fact that a didactic "poet" is as uninspiring as non-alcoholic ale.

The habit of preaching, and taking advantage of every occasion to moralise, grows like a cancer among our English authors. Lay-preacher Coleridge says to Lamb, "You've never heard me preach?" And Lamb stutters: "I never heard you do anything else!" But "Saint Charles" for all his wit, for all his exquisite appreciation of the comedy of manners, can moralise strangely upon Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess*:—"If all parts of this delightful pastoral had been in unison with its many innocent scenes and sweet lyric intermissions, it had been a poem fit to vie with 'Comus' or the 'Arcadia,' to have been put in the hands of boys and virgins. . . ."

Yes, boys and virgins, have become critics and arbiters in England. The amoral attitude of Shakespeare, the scientific curiosity of Bacon, have deserted our *belles lettres*. The Tates and Colley Cibbers are working on Shakespeare. English critics moralise about Shakespeare, and hold his plays up as examples to boy scouts, or say it is a pity he did not "sympathise with the poor" (which he obviously did). Whilst Schlegel, Goethe, Lessing, Heine, Voltaire, St. Beuve, Renan, all criticise Shakespeare by artistic standards, until Frank Harris appears, no English critic can keep moral appraisal from his writings. (And Harris only created Shakespeare in his own image.)

Literary culture of the best kind becomes esoteric. Wit is now largely a matter of snobbery. Art leaves the soul of the people untouched, just as the modern Church does; and so both are open to attack from Finance, and have no backing from the people.

The Greeks and Egyptians produced fine statues because they could look at the human nude body without prurient thoughts. Lamb writes thus:

The error of supposing that because Othello's colour does not offend us in the reading, it should also not offend us in the seeing, is just such a fallacy as supposing that Adam and Eve in a picture shall affect us just as they do in the poem. But in the poem, we for a while, have Paradisaical senses given us, which vanish when we see a man and his wife without clothes in the picture. The painters themselves feel this, as is apparent by the awkward shifts they have recourse to, to make them look not quite naked. . . ."

In fact fig-leaves, awkward shifts, and original sin are everywhere. The innocence of the child and the artist has gone. All is agony and problems. A nation of shopkeepers arise who kill poetry, music, the Theatre, satire, plastic arts, magnificence in dress, etc. And they produce Adam Smith, who has a chair of moral philosophy at Glasgow, and who essays "to raise the study of human nature to a science."

Is there not something symbolic in this association of names, Adam and Smith? Adam, the first man; Paradise lost; an angel with a flaming sword, keeping from Heaven a poor wretch with the curse upon him that he shall work all his days in the sweat of his brow. There is at least, poetry in Adam. But Smith! Hardly a name at all. When the Smiths get on, they become Poulsonby-Smiths, "Gallopers" Smiths, and Smythes. They despise the smugness of their suburban origin. And rightly so. The modern Smith has left his forge, and become just someone, or "something" in the City.

(To be continued.)

Music.

Schnabel, Queen's, November 17.

One is still amazed at the phenomenal vogue enjoyed by this pianist. That he is, within his very obvious limits, an artist, cannot be denied; but how a pianist, who either cannot or will not play Bach, Chopin, Liszt, or a single modern composer, has become a cult, described by his disciples as the greatest musician, the only man who can play Beethoven, etc., etc., ad nauseam, is one of those strange anomalies possible only in the realm of music, and explicable only on the basis of mass suggestibility, pupils' pernicious propaganda, and general musical ignorance.

His programme included the Schumann Fantasie in C, Op. 17—that tediously repetitive and frequently commonplace composition which in company with its direct descendant, Brahms's F minor Sonata, is now going the trivial round of our concert halls on the follow-my-leader principle—Mozart's F major Sonata (K.332), and Schumann's G minor Sonata, Op. 22. All of these were played with precisely the same dreary portentous solemnity and complete insensibility to their differing moods and styles, plus a harshness and coarseness of tone in anything beyond mezzo-forte that one cannot believe any composer—with the possible exception of Schnabel himself—could have sanctioned, let alone indicated. He was much better in the Schubert posthumous A major Sonata, which was made to sound quite attractive, though one naturally pays little attention to the Schnabel pupil who tells us that if one is bored with Schubert's Sonatas the fault does not lie in the music, and who naively adds in his article, published, by the way, in a reputable daily, that "it is a rare, if not unique, fortune that Schubert's Sonatas may be heard in London this autumn perfectly played" (my italics).

It is difficult to withhold admiration for a man who has succeeded in collecting such a band of noisy, devoted, and industrious disciples who grasp any and every opportunity of booming their hero, to such an extent that to many people his name is as a red rag to a bull. Schnabel's case, one may imagine, is "save us from our friends"—or, worst, enemies—the two are frequently synonymous.

Mark Raphael, Aeolian, November 21.

Mr. Raphael's voice is not one that immediately impresses by reason of its unique quality or volume, but thanks to its skilful production, his easy manipulation, and the warmth of his musical feeling, the musical listener is captivated from first note to last.

He began with an enterprising selection of Alessandro Scarlatti, Falconieri (the latter a new name to most of us), and our own Thomas Campion and John Dowland. All of these were beautiful, and the two last made one regret the more how little of the work of the English Lutenists one hears in recital programmes. These are not museum pieces, but living music, and singers would do well to follow Mr. Raphael in the matter of musical exploration.

Two of Schubert's lesser known songs, "Abendstern" and "Versunken," and a Schumann group were most artistically done, as was also a selection of Hugo Wolf at his best.

Some Debussy and Roger Quilter ("Autumn Evening" and "When Daffodils Begin to Peer"—from the new set of "Four Shakespeare Songs," Op. 30) gave further opportunities for demonstrating Mr. Raphael's versatility, and, incidentally, his most effective mezza voce. A word must undoubtedly be added for the most capable accompanist, Miss Joan Singleton, who proved herself a thorough musician. In this connection I am glad to be in a position to state that the Roger Quilter Society, which I first suggested in THE NEW AGE, has, thanks to the generous co-operation of the Columbia Graphophone Company, at last come to fruition, the recording is well under way, and the records will be shortly available.

For the sum of 15s. one will obtain six double-sided ten-inch records containing about twenty of Mr. Quilter's songs, sung by Mr. Raphael, accompanied by the composer, and a portfolio autographed by Mr. Quilter. Subscriptions should be sent to The Secretary, Roger Quilter Society, 98, Clerkenwell Road, E.C.1.

CLINTON GRAY-FISK.

The Theatre.

"Journey's End." By R. C. Sherriff. Criterion.

From the box-office standpoint, it was not a bad idea to revive one of the most popular plays of the century. It is not a good play, and its values are to me entirely false, but it is not without merit as a study in trench hysteria. The present production is soundly acted, with H. G. Stoker, David Horne, and Geoffrey Wincott in their original parts, and Basil Gill as Osborne. Mr. Sherriff produced.

"The Dominant Sex." By Michael Egan. Embassy.

A good deal is to be forgiven to any author's first play, but Michael Egan's professional association with the theatre should have taught him that the ability to write natural dialogue does not alone make the dramatist. He should also have learnt to avoid being photographic; people repeat themselves *ad nauseam* in real life, but the playwright needs the skill to transpose the conversational key. "The Dominant Sex" contains nothing that has not been said with greater force by Ibsen and Shaw, and it is rather late in the century to get excited about sex equality. The characterisation is efficient, and Diana Churchill succeeds in making Angela as unpleasant a baggage as the author intended, but these people are not interesting.

Not for the first time have I had to complain of the inaudibility of Embassy players, a specially unpardonable fault in so small a theatre. Miss Churchill was the worst offender on the first night, when she appeared to disregard the existence of an audience beyond the first half-dozen rows of stalls. On the other hand, the elocution of Townsend Whiting, who was admirable in a small part, was perfect. John Fernald produced, and, as usual, special praise is due to the settings of Bagnall Harris. VERNON SOMMERFIELD.

The Films.

"Transatlantic Merry-go-Round." Directed by Benjamin Stoloff. Leicester Square.

Officially, this picture represents the newest formula—that of the "musical" wedded to murder. The drawback of the combination is that it is impossible to take the murder very seriously, and this species of maritime "Grand Hotel" would have been more convincing if the song and dance element had been drastically pruned. The process would also have added to the entertainment value of the film, whose numbers of no originality. How long will it take Hollywood to learn that it has given us so much that is outstanding in this direction, and only the best is to-day good enough? Good items are humorous dialogue, an amusing burlesque of a wireless attempt to be amusing, and an admirable imitation of George Arliss by Mitzi Green, now a grown-up young lady.

"Son of a Soldier." Directed by Lebediev.

It was not until last month that this Russian picture, which was made some years ago, was publicly shown in England, and it would be unfair to judge it by present-day technical standards. Excellent features are the acting of the boy players—who are admirably type-cast—and the economical of speech, while the English version is also too stagey—a rare fault in Russian films—and this combination of the real and the unreal characterises the whole production. The propaganda—dealing with the evils of juvenile labour under the pre-war Czarist régime—is clear enough, but the theme is dealt with in too superficial a manner, and Lebediev consequently fails to produce the effect that he obviously set out to achieve. The picture is being handled in this country by the Kino organisation, 33, Ormond Yard, W.C.1, and readers who are interested will be able to ascertain the time and place of future showings on application at that address.

DAVID OCKHAM.

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.

"Money Power."

His Grace Dr. Mannix, in the address quoted in our columns this week from the Melbourne *Tribune*, pointed to the fact that in a world of plenty a large section of humanity is in absolute want. He associated that with the concentration of the "money power" in the hands of a comparatively "small number of people." There, in our view, Dr. Mannix touches the chief cause of to-day's universal depression.

It is not that those who control international finance are necessarily an evil or sinister group. They are rather the product of opportunity. The system they manipulate is the growth of generations, and, though it is undoubtedly used to the enrichment of those who control it, its chief fault lies in the fact that money has secured an absolutely predominant place in modern economy.

Its original purpose was as a means by which to bring the man who wanted something into effective touch with the man who could make it. The substitution of metal for cattle as money was an improvement not for any intrinsic value in the metal, but because it was easier to carry around and divide into suitable sizes. The invention of coins simplified this system and the development of paper money, of cheques, notes, bills of exchange, and, in fact, of the whole modern scheme of credit brought its usefulness to perfection. It made possible the highly-organised system of production and distribution, which would be quite impossible to carry on if every transaction had to be paid for with coins.

But this complicated modern financial system, with its credits and currencies, its inflation, deflation and reflation, its central banks and commercial banks, its going on to its gold standards and coming off gold standards has, by the passing of time, been turned entirely from its original purpose and has become not the servant of man but his master. Through its manipulation it was found that vast wealth could be made and still vaster power over men's lives and fortunes be wielded. Its control became the goal of ambitious men and to-day international finance has become more powerful than governments. The misuse of this power for private profit has produced the paradox on which Dr. Mannix commented—that in a world of plenty there is indescribable want, in a hundred nations enormously rich in goods there is indescribable poverty. Whatever the way out of this morass is—and it is a certainty that there will be no escape until the money interests are dethroned from their present absolute dominion over the lives of people and nations—the man or men who solve this most fundamental of all economic problems will have earned the benediction of the 30,000,000 victims of world unemployment and their 60,000,000 dependents.

—The Irish Press, December 1.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES.

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO BANKING, CURRENCY AND CREDIT. NOTICE.

Notice is hereby given that the Commission of Inquiry into Banking, Currency and Credit is prepared to receive representations on matters covered by its Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference are as follows:—

"To examine and report on the system in Saorstát Eireann of currency, banking, credit, public borrowing and lending, and the pledging of State credit on behalf of agriculture, industry and the social services, and to consider and report what changes, if any, are necessary or desirable to promote the social and economic welfare of the community and the interests of agriculture and industry."

Persons or bodies wishing to submit representations should communicate in writing with the Secretary of the Commission at 1, College-street, Dublin, with a view to the submission of a memorandum of such representations. They should indicate whether or not they are prepared to supplement their memorandum by oral evidence, should the Commission so request.

Unless it is otherwise arranged, the memorandum furnished to the Commission will not be regarded as confidential, but as available for publication. Meetings to hear oral evidence will be held in private, but it is intended that (in the absence of an express arrangement to the contrary with the witness) the evidence will be published in course in conjunction with the report.

The Irish Press, December 1.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

ENGINEERS AND ECONOMICS.

Sir,—On October 18th you devoted considerable space in your Editorial Notes to comments on a table of preliminary analyses of various Economic Systems which are now seeking public support with a view to replacing the existing one. This set of analyses merely exhibits the *general aspects* of certain systems, but in no sense is it a precise economic Report. It was drawn up, as a guide, by the Committee of the Engineers' and Scientists' Economic Study Group, as you state correctly.

To their astonishment, the Committee find that you have placed before your readers a completely misleading picture, not only of the set of analyses just referred to, but of the character and standing of the Group. While it is evident that your comments have been made in good faith, your assumptions are so groundless, and your diatribes upon our Group are at once so unwarranted (and so damaging to its prestige) that the Committee confidently request that you will publish this letter of refutation and protest.

Most serious is your statement that this Group is:—"inspired and set in motion under the patronage of International Finance" and that its labours will inevitably "end up at the Bank for International Settlements."

In view of the nature of this statement, and of its far-reaching implications, the Group can only reply by giving it a flat and unequivocal denial.

The names of two other bodies occur in the course of your comments on this Group, viz. the Association of Scientific Workers, and the International Faculty of Sciences. Kindly make it known that neither of these has even a slight working or other agreement with this Group. That each of those two bodies, in turn, has afforded the Group facilities, in the way of a habitat for Committee Meetings and journal space for matter, is merely a tribute to their courtesy and generosity. Our Group owes no kind of allegiance to any other body or interest, or to any individual. Its members are technical and professional men who are freely giving their services, all animated by the single thought that they can and ought to serve the community at this time of need. Furthermore, their work is being conducted on a basis which is primarily National.

Our Group is about to publish an Interim Report. This will clearly set forth the aims of the Group, and outline the progress of its work. A copy shall be forwarded to you on publication. Meanwhile, it will be of interest to record that the Engineers' and Scientists' Economic Study Group came into existence in 1933, as an entirely non-party, independent group of professional men, its first members being associated with the institution of Mechanical Engineers. Feeling strongly that orthodox economists and statesmen are merely floundering in the dark, and noting the early collapse of the World Economic Conference, they determined to initiate and carry through an entirely independent research into fundamentals.

At an early meeting of the Group the following resolution was adopted, and it forms the basis of the Group's activities:—

"We, as a representative group of engineers and scientific workers, are dissatisfied with the fact that the community is not enjoying a standard of living and endowed leisure commensurate with the potential advance for which science and engineering are responsible, and we are meeting to discuss why the paradox arises and how it can be resolved."

As yet, the Group has not decided "how the paradox can be resolved," but its technical committee is busily at work with that objective in view. It is quite obvious that, without a sanely workable foundation, the life of the individual is jeopardised, as well as that of the community. The monetary and accountancy system is, therefore, receiving the close attention of the Group. Yet, however sound a scheme may be in itself, there will be little likelihood of being put into practice unless a considerable body of opinion is marshalled behind it. For this and

other reasons the Group is giving due weight to cultural and psychological considerations, as well as to those which are purely economic. Its investigations, therefore, are truly sociological, as you remark; although perhaps you will forgive our dissenting from your suggestion that they constitute "a cross-word puzzle."

To revert to the particular table of analyses to which you have referred, it should be explained that these only profess to exhibit certain general aspects of various schemes. Detailed examination of these and several other schemes is now being carried out, but the Group properly defers its comments until the work is further advanced.

For political and other reasons it is deemed necessary for the Group to arm itself with replies to a large number of questions. Work carried out with this degree of thoroughness clearly cannot be "rushed," but your readers may be assured that the Group is not wasting time. Finally, we may add, in view of your own devotion to the "Social Credit" proposals of Major Douglas, that these will receive the same disinterested attention as is devoted by the Group to proposals from any other source.

As, sir, we have established the erroneous character of your comments on this Group, our Committee is persuaded that you will be more than ready to make every correction that lies within your power.—Yours faithfully,

ALEXANDER H. HAYES.

Hon. Secretary.

[We are only too pleased to publish Mr. Hayes' friendly reproach and disclaimer.

We would assure him that the readers of THE NEW AGE are most unlikely to have placed such a sinister construction on our comments as he imagines. As he was, we think, informed at the time, we wrote without knowledge of certain particulars afterwards supplied to us.

But if we had been in possession of it our remarks would not have been different in their essential tenour. We wished, and still wish, to warn all groups who start to investigate the economic problem to remember that there are astute and powerful interests working to sterilise or side-track those investigators who push their inquiries in the true direction. One way in which they can succeed is in encouraging such groups to bite off more than they are competent to chew. Problems, for example, of a psychological or moral order do not come within the purview of engineers, whose special experience lies in the realm of physics. Moreover such problems, according to Social-Credit theory, are derivatives of one single major problem, the solution of which will therefore cover them all. That problem is purely technical—i.e., one expressly suitable for engineers to tackle—and it consists in examining the existing principle on which the ostensible object of production is to distribute the products in toto, as they can be completed, among the general body of consumers. Does the application of that principle achieve that purpose or defeat it? That is the fundamental issue.

We will leave the matter here, as there will be further opportunities for comment later on.—Ed.]

FASCISM AND SOCIAL CREDIT.

Sir,—Mr. Frank Griffiths takes up a good deal of space, but contrives to say surprisingly little, and brings forward not one scrap of evidence to justify the description of Fascist economic policy as "Planned Poverty." In what way does he imagine that he has exposed as a fallacy the Fascist contention "that the State is more important than the individual"? Since the interest of the State is the interest of its totality of its individuals, surely it should be rescued from its present subservience to anti-social factional interests. To argue the reverse is to argue in terms of Economic Liberalism, now utterly discredited.

Similarly, in what way does Mr. Griffiths think he has overthrown our argument that to accept from the community it is necessary to give to the community? What other title is there to a share in the common wealth except work? Though science to an ever-increasing extent helps us with the problems of production, it will always remain true that man's labour in some degree will always be required. The

burden of work must patiently be borne by the entire able-bodied adult inhabitants, no matter how short the working day.

Such a state of affairs belongs to the future rather than to the present. Thus, if to-day the potential demand of the people for goods were to be turned into effective demand, there would be a need, not for less work, but for more work, in order to meet that demand, and surely it should be our main concern to absorb the unemployed into productive industry by fostering the process.

The position of Italy and Germany at the moment bears no ultimate relation to Fascist economics, since the urgent problem in those countries is to keep high the morale of the people until such time as the structure is sufficiently advanced to permit of the scientific planning of production and distribution. Every nerve is being strained in both countries to secure a larger measure of economic self-sufficiency, and until this has gone a little further it is patent that both Hitler and Mussolini must be dependent upon conditions of world trade and, therefore, to some extent, on international finance. Even so, the progress made by these great men surely must win from us our unbounded admiration.

Surprising as it may seem to Mr. Griffiths, work is the best restorative of morale, especially when that work forms part of a great constructive national effort. It is, however, no part of Fascist principle to advocate a return to "hand labour." Instead, we seek to make the maximum use of machinery, the full benefits of which will only be realised in a State planned according to the Fascist totalitarian principle.

A. K. CHESTERTON.

(For the British Union of Fascists.)

COMMUNISM OR FASCISM.

Sir,—In stating that "Communism or Fascism, it is all Planned Poverty," the General Secretary of the Green Shirt Movement merely resurrects an exploded belief of ten years ago. Then, many people believed that the Italian and Russian régimes represented different sides of the same medal, but the fallacy of any apparent similarity has long ago been shown to be not even superficial.

Fascism, whether in Italy or in Germany, or of our own hooligan variety, has one feature in common: it postulates the continuance of the production and distribution of the necessities of life for private profit. It is true that the so-called "Corporate State"—an illiterate phrase—ostensibly aims at the limitation of profits, but such a policy is about as likely to produce any practical results as a declaration by the Great Powers that, while they will not disarm, they intend to limit the number of deaths and injuries in the next war. And Fascism in practice, so far from solving the problem of starvation in the Age of Plenty, has merely accentuated the insane process of production for destruction.

Communism, on the other hand, aims at production and distribution for the service of the community; it places the interests of the majority before those of a minority. To assert a likeness between the two systems is akin to saying that there is no fundamental difference between disease and health, or between poverty and riches. DAVID OCKHAM.

[Mr. Ockham misses the point. It is not that Fascists or Communists consciously aim at Poverty, but that their respective methods of planning Plenty must result in necessarily lead to Heaven. Mr. Ockham sees the distinction in the case of Italian Fascism, but overlooks its existence in that of Russian Communism. In Russia, the Government is busy building up the mechanism of the Capitalist system as we know it here—mass-production under centralised direction. If it proposed to distribute this production by some other method than *via* the money-part, there would be room for optimistic prophecy on the part of its upholders. But there is no indication that Moscow, any more than Rome, intends to do this, or to run the money-system on Social Credit principles. We have pointed out more than once that the prerogative of private profit-making is accompanied by the responsibility of private production out of profits. Transfer profits to the proletariat, and the responsibility will be transferred also; and

its fulfilment will be enforced by taxation or by deductions from wages "at the source."—Ed.]

Sir,—The General Secretary of the Green Shirts allows himself to be misled by the popular belief that there is an analogy between the methods of the Fascist States and those of the Soviet Union. That Planned Poverty describes the situation in Italy and Germany at the present moment nobody who knows anything about the efforts being made to "spread out" employment (and wages) in those countries will deny. But the essential difference lies in the fact that at the beginning of the Five Year Plan (1928) the Soviet Union was only at the stage of industrial development that Great Britain had reached about a hundred years ago. Poverty in the U.S.S.R. was a real, not an artificially maintained condition. Their planning has been and is primarily for the purpose of creating new possibilities of wealth, and secondarily for getting it across to the consumers. You will not see any Communist "noticing with approval the lack of modern machinery," but instead, a (to us) almost fanatical worship of every new machine, because increased product means higher wages and shorter hours.

Their financial theory may not be fully approved by the Green Shirts, but the point to be digested is that all financial credit in the U.S.S.R. is based strictly on real credit, and this is recognised as a social possession. When their real credit equals the accumulations of Western Europe, it will be time enough for them to consider such possibilities as the National Dividend. Till then, it may surely be conceded that their glorification of "labour" is, in the terms of human happiness, a better stimulus to wealth-creation than the threat of unemployment and dispossession, which has driven our workers to pile up potential plenty in which they are forbidden to share. V. A. HEYTT.

[The real test of Soviet policy will not arise until it has more or less caught up with other nations in the accumulation of modern productive machinery.—Ed.]

THIS FREEDOM!

Sir,—It was under D.O.R.A. that an Act of Parliament was made law whereby a tax was imposed upon entertainments. At the time, I believe, certain safeguards were incorporated into the Act, but since then the Act has gradually been amended in such a way that it has now become a travesty.

I recently arranged to give a lecture entitled "Colds, Catarrh, and Constipation," and now, to my surprise, I am informed that such a meeting is taxable under the Entertainments Act!

It would appear that by such anomalies as this our permanent officials are gradually filching away from us all the elementary rights which surely should be the birthright of citizens of this country, which we boast as being "the birthplace of the free."

ERNEST E. WAY.

3, Woodlands Terrace, Charing Cross, Glasgow, C.3.

WOMEN AND SOCIAL CREDIT.

Sir,—May I suggest that S. M. W.'s description of the condition of Danish women a thousand years ago is hardly useful to Social Credit policy now? The picture resembles remarkably the state of women in most other countries before the industrial era, namely, helping men to scratch a living from the earth and bearing, and caring for, the race at the same time, and having the same commodity-value as now.

The phrase, "equal pay for equal work" is red-herring without nourishment or meaning. There is no gauge which can measure the relative values of the results of men's or women's efforts. In a Social Credit State when we all work—if we wish—at what we like, whether we are paid or not, the value of our labours will be made manifest and we shall see where each sex excels above the other. Until then, we do not know, we cannot tell; speculation is futile and reserve the better part of discretion.

As for Nature having a plan and Major Douglas being part of it—without being so far in Nature's confidence as S. M. W., I do ask whose plan it is which bestows upon us Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini? Because, unless some outsiders step up and lend a hand to Major Douglas I have a feeling that "Nature" is going to make a mess of that "plan" for women. The draughtsmen differ so drastically that the blue-print will be unreadable!

GLADYS F. BING.

Answers to Correspondents.

E. L. R.—"Psychology and Action." Your letter is off the track. You stress the idealism of Social Credit, arraign the "profit-motive" of Capitalism, the issue being debated involves the question of the methods to objectives. Give yourself a little more get the hang of it.

THE NEW AGE

1907—1922

We are preparing a series of volumes of the writings of the late A. R. ORAGE. For this a complete file of *The New Age* under his editorship is urgently needed.

If readers of *The New Age* have sets for sale (preferably unbound) covering the whole or part of the above period, will they kindly write to

STANLEY NOTT,
69, GRAFTON ST., FITZROY SQ.,
W.1.

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.

Brilliant French Version of VICTOR HUGO'S great Classic
"LES MISERABLES" (A)
with Harry Baur and "EVERGREEN" (A)
Special Children's Programmes every Saturday, 11 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

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

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY

Books and Pamphlets on Social Credit.

- BRENTON, ARTHUR.
Social Credit in Summary. 1d.
The Key to World Politics. 1d.
The Veil of Finance. 6d.
Through Consumption to Prosperity. 2d.
- C. G. M.
The Nation's Credit. 4d.
- DEMANT, V. A.
This Unemployment. 2s. 6d.
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 ARCADE
PRESS, LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London, E.C.4, England
(Telephone: Central 3701).