

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 2251] NEW SERIES Vol. LVII. No. 27. THURSDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1935 [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
THE SECRETARIAT. Editorial	213	REVIEW. By EZRA POUND	218
MOVEMENT NOTES	214	THE SECRETARIAT AND "THE NEW AGE." Statement by Arthur Brenton, editor	219
The election—the Secretariat's candidates—boycott of Townend.		Running away from the Committee of Privileges.	
ALBERTA NOTES	215	DOUGLAS DICTA ON ACTION	219
Aberhart's bid for control of Calgary municipality—bankster threats of direct action. The Secretariat and Aberhart's Alberta campaign—the Douglas-Bardsley yes-no attitude—resulting suspicions and antagonisms.		DOUGLAS ON SOCIAL CREDIT ACCOUNTING	219
TRANSLATION AND ADAPTATION. By R. Laugier	217	"A FAITH MONEY MAHOMET." Reprinted from <i>The Sunday Sun and Guardian</i> (Australia)	220
ON FIRST LOOKING INTO JOYCE'S SYMPOSIUM OF PLATO. By John Shand	218	Exhibit of bankster propaganda against Social Credit.	
Plato's <i>Symposium</i> (Joyce).		CORRESPONDENCE	220
		R. H. Rosetti (National Secular Society).	

THE SECRETARIAT.

Report and Accounts Four Months Overdue.

Moral Claim of Social Credit Journals to Unconditional Subventions out of Douglas's Royalties.

The *Ottawa Citizen*, of October 18, reproduces with acknowledgments, the article entitled "The Nature of Credit," which appeared in THE NEW AGE of October 10 under the signature of Arthur Brenton. In a covering letter to him accompanying the cutting, the editor of the *Citizen* makes allusion to "the splendid work you are doing in support of Douglas's revelation."

We welcome this tribute not only because of its spirit, but particularly because in its phrasing it correctly epitomises the unique function of THE NEW AGE under its successive editorships since the "revelation" was made in this journal.

This is a reminder that before the next issue of THE NEW AGE appears the first anniversary of the late A. R. Orage's death will have occurred. It will be remembered that he passed out on the night of November 5-6 within an hour or two of his having spoken by wireless on the Douglas revelation.

Developments in the Social Credit Movement since the small band of his admirers watched him being laid to rest have deepened the sense of loss among the veterans who stood by him in the old days. No man has greater love of truth than he who publicly abandons a theory of his own for that of another, particularly when by doing so he deliberately abandons an established title to intellectual leadership and at the same time risks his economic security.

If Orage had been animated by the commercial spirit he could have said to himself: "I am enjoying fame, and maintaining my journal in a flourishing condition; I am surrounded by congenial spirits who co-operate with

me in advocating and expounding the National Guilds idea. Why should I put forward Social Credit and alienate my supporters?" Alternatively he could have said: "If this new idea, or discovery, is going to be commercially profitable, and I apply my talents and resources to its furtherance, why should I not exact a legal agreement establishing my right to a share of the profits? Further, knowing as he did that the discovery had been drawn up in the form of a specification with the idea of patenting it (an idea that was found to be illusory) he could have put it forward under his own name.

It will be remembered that when the Labour Party examined the idea, their report described it as the "Douglas New-Age" scheme, which suggests that it was recognised on both sides as partly accredited by Orage. Since then, in a strictly commercial frame of reference, THE NEW AGE has given free advertising space to the Social Credit idea of a value of several thousands of pounds. The final result is now manifest to all. Douglas's name has become a household word and is exclusively and indissolubly united with the term "Social Credit." His writings can now be published on a profitable commercial basis. And from now until there is a happy end to the necessity for advocating Social Credit the profits will continuously expand.

The Social Credit Secretariat has been incorporated as a company with powers, among others, to appropriate the royalties payable out of these profits. That is the legal situation. But, morally, the Social Credit journals which made, and are making, these royalties possible (let alone other revenues and emoluments to the Company or its officials) have a right to a substantial proportion of their amount.

Movement Notes.

A paragraph in *The New English Weekly* of October 24 states that Mr. Reginald Kenney is to stand as the "National Dividend" candidate for North Bradford at the forthcoming election. No notice of this candidature was sent to THE NEW AGE, or it would have been published in last week's issue.

Commenting on Mr. Kenney's candidature that journal says: "He has the support of the Bradford Social Credit Group and the West Riding Association of S.C. Groups; and since districts under this Association have reported 70 per cent. to 80 per cent. successes in the Electoral Campaign, Mr. Kenney's prospects are of the brightest." Readers will recall the notice in these columns a few weeks ago of the debate between Mr. Kenney and Mr. Durbin on Social Credit at the Kensington Town Hall. The debate resulted in a two-thirds majority vote for the Social Credit case.

The Bradford Group have issued circular letters to other Groups in the West Riding area appealing for funds and service on behalf of Mr. Kenney. They state that his candidature will have the full support and co-operation of the Social Credit Secretariat. The Social Credit Secretariat have officially advised Mr. Townend that they are unable to publish, whether paid for or not, the announcement of his candidature for South Leeds in their weekly journal, on the grounds that they have no "official knowledge" of it, were "not consulted" about it or about the formation of the "so-called Social Credit Party of Great Britain under whose auspices" Mr. Townend is "apparently standing."

Leeds and Bradford are so near each other that the standing of candidates in both constituencies will divide the support which could have been concentrated on either. From one point of view this is regrettable, but from another, not. So far as it is regrettable Mr. Townend and the Social Credit Party have nothing to reproach themselves about, because their decision to contest South Leeds was taken before anything was known of a contemplated contest in Bradford. Moreover, it was a matter of common belief in the Movement that the Secretariat were opposed in principle to running candidates against those representing established Parties. It is something gained to have this misunderstanding cleared up.

It stands to reason that neither candidate can hope to make such a good show as if he had a clear field in the area; but that can't be helped now, and it is the duty of members of the Movement there to secure for each the best result possible in their respective constituencies. Happily the two candidates are not standing for the same constituency; so supporters of either can work in a spirit of friendly emulation. Can Bradford show the way to Leeds or Leeds to Bradford?

Since the foregoing was written news arrives by wire from Birmingham of a third candidature. It is in the following terms:

"Mr. H. C. Bell is standing as the National Dividend candidate for the Erdington Division of Birmingham. He will be nominated on Monday, October 28, by the Erdington Douglas Social Credit Group, and has the backing of all Birmingham Groups. Mr. Bell is well known in the business life of the city, and is a member of the executive of Birmingham D.S.C. Group. His candidature has the

full support of Major Douglas, and S.C. Secretariat. Financial and other assistance is required, and should be sent to Mr. S. P. Abrams, 133, Rotton Park Road, Edgbaston, or to National Dividend Committee Rooms, 2, Edward Road, Erdington, Birmingham.—Abrams.

This makes a total of three constituencies to be contested. At the General Election in 1931 the returns for them were as follows:

Birmingham, Erdington.	
Eales, J. F. (U.)	35,672
Simmons, C. J. (Lab.)	16,676
Unionist majority	18,996
Total electorate	67,448
Total poll	52,348
Absentees	15,100
Bradford, North.	
Ramsden, E. (U.)	31,537
Butler, P. (Lab.)	12,401
Unionist majority	19,136
Total electorate	52,864
Total poll	43,938
Absentees	8,926
Leeds, South.	
Whiteside, B. N. H. (U.)	14,881
Charleston, H. C. (Lab.)	14,156
Boult, F. (Lib.)	6,291
Unionist majority	725
Total electorate	45,548
Total poll	35,328
Absentees	10,220

As to the prospects of the candidates it would have been useful to know precisely what total number of signed electoral pledges had been secured in each of the three constituencies at the time of the opening of Bradford do campaign. The percentages quoted for Bradford do not convey anything. The information needed is this: How many electors in the North Bradford division have signed the form? There are nearly 53,000 of them. What percentage of that number have signed? And so with the other constituencies. However, each candidate will presumably be provided with this information privately, and certainly ought to be, because it is with these signatories that he would need first to get into contact with the object of enrolling workers in the campaign or collecting funds.

The discrimination of the Secretariat against Mr. Townend may handicap him in the presentation of his case, but insofar as he is able to bring it to the attention of the electorate the question of his relationship with any organisation, whether it calls itself a "Party," or a "Secretariat," will be of no importance. Everything will depend on the form of his appeal and the competence of his advocacy. In theory a "National Dividend" candidate may appear to stand a better chance of success by dissociating himself from "Social Credit" or any "plan" or "method," and a "Social Credit" candidate a worse

chance through association with it. But in practice such dissociation is not possible. Firstly, it is accepted all over the world that "National Dividends," "Social Credit," and the "Douglas Analysis" are all one and the same thing. Secondly, their identity is expressly corroborated by the fact that the two "National Dividend" candidates are being backed by avowed *Douglas Social Credit* groups, and supported by "Major Douglas and the Social Credit Secretariat." So, to the electorate, a candidate standing for the Dividend will be regarded as a Social Credit candidate, and anything he says to explain away the association is likely to be used against him as evidence of crooked dealing.

It is no doubt a pleasant intellectual exercise to decide what every elector ought to know about "Dividends," and not to know about "Social Credit," but in an election campaign the opponents of either or both will naturally join in and take a hand in teaching the electorate about the same subject. Obviously whatever tactics are the best for furthering the influence of the Movement are precisely those which the bankers will concentrate on spoiling. They are able, if they wish, to fill the air with arguments against the Social Credit technique, with the result that if a "National Dividend" candidate shows any apparent disposition to dissociate his programme from that technique they will prompt the electorate to interpret this as proof that he has no answer to the criticisms, and therefore has no right to inspire hopes for results.

To sum up: if the bankers wish, they can force a "National Dividend" candidate to disclose his belief in Social Credit. Of course they may not so wish: they may play up to the candidate's dissociation of the two things. And there is a reason why they should, for although it is true that electors are not competent to prescribe methods, it happens also to be true that an electoral mandate for "results" without reference to methods would suit the bankers' books.

As a matter of fact, it is impossible for any Social Credit candidate (and hereinafter the term Social Credit will be used to refer to National Dividend advocacy as well) to appeal for a mandate without discussing methods, let alone getting a mandate. By "methods" is not meant detailed administrative proposals (such as appear in the Scheme for Scotland) nor attempts to resolve mathematical problems like the A + B Theorem. "Methods" is a wrong word, and its use in connection with political action has introduced misunderstanding. The right word is "principles," connoting technical financial principles. No candidate can make an intelligible speech in advocacy of Social Credit without attacking the principles now in operation and upholding those which ought to be in operation. For example, the mere recital of the phrase "Dividends Without Taxation," or "Dividends Without Debt," is a virtual invitation to any audience to inquire how it can be done. Even though the speaker cannot hope to demonstrate the "how," he can, and will be obliged to, establish a strong antecedent presumption that the "how" is feasible. He cannot do that without expounding Social Credit in its essential technical sense.

The proof of this will be afforded during the next fortnight. The "Address" and speeches of all three candidates will be found to be mutually indistinguishable in scope of content. There will be differences of style, and of emphasis in non-essentials, but the circumstances of the campaign will force them to put their cases according to how the electors wish to hear them.

The "Douglas" ostrich can't hide his rump by showing his head under the sand and squawking "Dividends."

Alberta Notes.

The Calgary Correspondent of the *Financial Times* reports (October 21) that the Social Credit Party of Alberta propose to contest every municipal office vacancy on November 20 in Calgary. The Party's candidates will seek election as mayors, school trustees, and so on. This is the "first drive" in a campaign to capture the municipalities of Alberta.

He comments that this new move has "alarmed taxpayers and big property owners," particularly as "party politics have not hitherto entered Canadian civic affairs." He says that if Social Credit wins control in Calgary it is expected that the "banks will withdraw the usual loan facilities required by the City," and that "there might be bankruptcy proceedings against the new municipal authority, and possibly a ratepayers' strike." He concludes with the statement that the Civic Government Association, which won the Calgary municipal elections a year ago, "favours giving Social Credit candidates the seats to bring matters to a head." (Our italics.)

There is one disadvantage in using the term "Party" in association with Social Credit, because this term connotes the old system of sectional rivalries for limited, and predatory, objectives. "Party politics" in the accepted sense means politics based on the principle that the nearest to the ideal Government is that which dispenses the *Greatest Good to the Greatest Number*. Until the discovery of Social Credit this was the best practical canon of sound Government that could be formulated. But it suffered, both morally and practically, from the defect that it rested on the antecedent assumption that harm was an inevitable by-product of the process of doing good. The principle: "the greatest good to the greatest number" was an admission of the principle: "the least harm to the least number." It was taken for granted that some had to suffer that others should benefit. So the utmost that any party thought of claim-benefit. There was something like this: "If you will vote for us, and the interests which we represent, we will give you the maximum balance of rewards over sacrifices." To this there was attached the unspoken proviso:—"in the long run," meaning "if you give us enough time and don't obstruct us"—a proviso which of course would not be fulfilled. To put this into other terms, the offer or promise of each of the established parties amounted to saying: "We can produce the best results possible under the iron laws of sound finance." That, of course, meant that the legislation foreshadowed, however well-intentioned, was to be a variant of the old put-and-take game. This brings us to the core of the ambiguity in the term "party." "Party politics," as conventionally interpreted, is put-and-take politics. The politics of a Social Credit "Party" expressly contemplates legislation under which there will be no Putters, but all are Takers. It does not stand by the vague test: "Is the community better off on balance, or as a whole?" but by the precise and critical test: "Is every individual in the community better off?"

So, whatever may be the strength of the case against the introduction of "party politics" into municipal affairs, it has no validity against Social Credit politics. Moreover, there is no person or interest in any municipal area who has ground for objecting to the consequences of Social Credit advocacy and implementation (insofar as this is possible in municipal work). This is of course on the understanding that behind the Social Credit politics stand the authentic Social Credit technical principles, and not colourable imitations of them.

But the distinction between a Social Credit Party and other parties goes deeper than this. The Conservative, Liberal and Socialist parties have been, and still are, alternating visible instruments of an abiding invisible party which we designate the Bankers' Party. Each in turn has taken service, and all of them will shortly be competing to take service, under the direction and supervision of the Treasury and the City. The Social Credit Party disdains entering into such competition.

The mandate that it seeks is fundamentally one for abolishing this servile rivalry, and for taking control of the powers by which the other parties are content to be controlled. The Social Credit Party thinks, educates, and agitates on an entirely different plane of politics from the others. Far from contesting with them for the futile "powers" hitherto "rewarding" the victors at the polls, it seeks to enlarge their vision and ambition, because by doing so it will bring about a combination of all three which will then be the party of the People, arrayed against the party of the Bankers. The Social Credit Party, as such, is an *ad hoc* pioneering organisation whose conscious aim is to create the conditions of its own dissolution. It exists to abolish the need for its existence. It thus inverts the principle of self-perpetuation which animates all other political institutions. It will remain in existence under its distinctive appellation and form as long as, but only so long as, it is compelled to do so by the obtuseness or obstinacy of the orthodox party caucuses. It would win over these caucuses if possible; but failing that, it must seek to win rank-and-file followers away from them. And it must do this, and will do it, by showing leaders and led alike that what they are now fighting each other for is not worth having.

With this as a background the reference of the *Financial Times's* Correspondent to the introduction of "party politics" into municipal affairs reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the situation. Social Credit does not introduce such politics; on the contrary it eliminates them. If, however, we go below superficialities and define "party politics" in the realistic sense of the politics of the Bankers' Party, then the answer to the people who have been complaining about the interference of the Social Credit Party is that municipal affairs have never been free from "party politics." What may be said with truth is that the Social Credit Party is delivering a visible challenge to the invisible financial policy to which all municipalities are subjected without knowing it. You do not "introduce" a thing by disclosing its existence, much less if the object of your disclosure is to get rid of it. And that is the purpose of the Social Credit Party. To be exact, it does not seek to abolish politics from municipal affairs (that is impossible, for municipal affairs are politics), but it seeks to eliminate the "party" element from politics. Get rid of the bankers and parties will get rid of themselves.

The following leading article from the *Ottawa Citizen* is worthy of attention for two reasons. One is that it usefully recalls the bankers' ramp in Newfoundland, and the other is that the writer pays a high tribute to Mr. Aberhart's integrity and firmness. We may add that another tribute to him is paid in the latest *New Era* (Australia) that has come to hand.

ALBERTA IS DIFFERENT.

[From *The Citizen*, Ottawa, October 18.]

Premier Aberhart's decision to invite a Montreal financial adviser named Robert J. Magor to meet the provincial Government at Edmonton caused more surprise than it need have done among observers of Alberta's effort to escape from needless poverty in an age of plenty. The Prime Minister said at Edmonton a week ago:

Mr. Magor has not been engaged by the government. He is coming here to confer with us in order to clear up the financial situation left by the old government.

Mr. Magor's preliminary part in advising the government of Newfoundland, before the parliament of the island colony abdicated under pressure from international money power, would perhaps be disturbing. It is well to remember, however, that Alberta is different from Newfoundland. The western province is under profoundly different leadership.

Alberta is badly in debt like Newfoundland, but the legislature of the province is made up of members who owe nothing to the dealers in usury. Premier Aberhart is in office with a clean slate, without financial assistance from Toronto, Montreal, New York or London.

The legislature in Newfoundland had been honycombed

with graft. Some of the transactions connected with the arranging of loans included corrupt politics involving responsible Ministers. They were unable to offer any stout resistance when financial interests outside made it clear that Newfoundland's right of self-government must be given up. They who paid the piper called the tune.

* * *

When Mr. Magor went to Newfoundland in 1931, he found the government in desperate financial straits, largely due to difficulties arising from the dubious politics of former legislatures. "Who's Who in Canada" has the following to say of the part played by Mr. Magor in helping to bring about the transition of Newfoundland back to the status of a crown colony, under commission rule, from having been the first British colony to attain self-government:

[Robert James Magor, of St. James Street West, Montreal] was later requested to assist in the securing of funds for the meeting of the interest on the National Debt of Newfoundland, December, 1931, and June, 1932. The latter date he secured by disposing of the petroleum monopoly for the Island to the Imperial Oil Co. The essence of the deal was that they should subscribe to the extent of One Million Seven Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars in issue of Two and a Half Million, which was necessary to meet interest on National Debt. This procedure was necessary in order to carry on finances of the country until the form of future government was determined, which has since resulted in the appointment of Commission Government under the control of the British Government.

No longer a nation, deprived of the privilege of adding any more to the "national debt" by pawning the natural resources, the islanders are being put through the process of belt-tightening to meet interest on foreign loans. It will probably take more than one lifetime before Newfoundland has redeemed itself from this state of bondage.

* * *

It is quite probable that some interests abroad, perhaps the "foreign power" of finance spoken of by Mr. Bennett at Sherbrooke a year ago, would like to see Alberta brought similarly under outside control. High financial authorities wanted the whole of Canada to be so controlled by "national government"—which Mr. Mackenzie King exposed on the public platform as nothing but a scheme of government by imperialist money power.

Alberta cannot be so regimented. The overwhelming vote of the province last August for Social Credit has been followed by a similarly decisive vote to elect Social Credit members to the federal House. Any scheme to entangle the western people in a new web of debt is foredoomed to failure. Even though this provincial administration were thwarted, the result would only be destructive. There would be civil war before Alberta would submit to the subservience imposed on Newfoundland.

Premier Aberhart is a stronger character, however, than any of the unhappy political figures in Newfoundland. He may be found stronger than any of the schemers in the citadels of foreign money power. He will need advice from financial experts on technical details, but he can take expert advice without being deflected from Social Credit policy.

Alberta's guidance is from a more fundamental source than the influence of corrupt politics as it operated in Newfoundland. Alberta is different, as Premier Aberhart must surely demonstrate.

Contrast this with the estimate of Mr. Aberhart written by Mr. Bardsley, as Secretary of the Social Credit Secretariat, to a Canadian correspondent when Mr. Aberhart was organising the League which won the election of last August.

"I agree with the suggestion that the pamphlet [Aberhart's] be disowned and discredited in every way possible. The multiplicity of useless effusions and associations for the development of some person's ego, who has been inspired by Social Credit, is to me a deplorable thing, and this pamphlet is the worst yet."

The receipt of this letter had the effect of stiffening the

Translation and Adaptation.

By R. Langier.

There are two reasons why the vast majority of translations are bad: firstly, the work is despised and poorly paid; secondly, the wrong kind of people do the job. Some of the translations of great authors, put out by reputable publishers, are shamefully and inexcusably bad. Either the people performing the task of adaptation would appear to be half-witted, or else they are ignorant of the language into which they are translating. Thus, in an imposing volume of translated European classics, issued by an American publisher, I recently came across an "English" version of Arthur Snitzler's "Lieblei." It was called "Light o' Love," which is good enough—but it read like a translation from a foreign language, which is not so good. In the scene where the husband comes to the young student, who is the wife's lover, the husband is made to say, "I wish those (letters) which you have received." The italics are mine; and the verb should be *want*: better still, a peremptory demand for the letters, expressed in good English, should have been substituted for the German line.

There is no reason why a translation should read like a translation, if the right man does the job. Gerhart Hauptman's "The Beaver Coat," in the translation by Ludwig Lewisohn, is excellent. René Fauchois' "Prenez Garde à la Peinture" was adapted by Sidney Howard in a manner to rival the original, and the triumphant success of "The Late Christopher Bean" indicates the results to be expected when the task is properly achieved.

Publishers make a mistake to despise translation, and to hire poor, hard-driven hacks to do such work. Every good translation is a miracle; and the miracle is only performed when by some happy circumstance, rather akin to the meeting of "affinities" and love at first sight, a Fitzgerald happens upon a great Persian poet; a Baudelaire is attracted by a Poe; or an Edwin Muir adapts from the German.

For years—let us say from sixteen to twenty—I imagined that Guy de Maupassant was a fifth-rate writer of mildly suggestive stories. This was partly due to the fact that I saw the master of the *conte* exposed in dubious "rubber-good" shops, described inimitably by Conrad in *The Secret Agent*. But Puritan idiocy and prurience were only partly responsible for this early impression of mine: bad translations confirmed the notion, and were in fact worthy of their surroundings. Then I discovered Lafcadio Hearn's most excellent adaptations of de Maupassant, and so gained one of the greatest pleasures of my life. I would just as soon read the American translator as the original French.

The common practice of publishers is to hire hacks of the pedagogic class to do translations. These poor devils are incredibly badly paid. In three cases where books of mine have been translated I have discovered the adapters prepared to translate a sixty- or eighty-thousand word novel for a sum equivalent to £10. To this kind of translator it is usually "spare-time work," and he or she teaches languages. It is plain that work "paid" at such a rate is likely to be bad; but it need not be, in this age of half-starved talent. The real reason why most translations are mediocre lies in the fact that the adapter is chosen because of his knowledge of the language that that has to be translated. This is not at all necessary.

critical attitude adopted by the correspondent and others who had done all the pioneer work of educating the United Farmers of Alberta in Social Credit towards Mr. Aberhart's policy and proposals. (Some of the latter were admittedly unsound technically.) This brought them into antagonism with Mr. Aberhart's supporters, the bitterness of which was later made manifest in the running of Aberhart's candidates against U.F.A. members, whether Social Credit supporters or not, and, since then, in the same contest for seats in the Dominion Legislature. The result is now history—a complete elimination of the U.F.A. from both legislatures. All this time Major Douglas, who, one supposes, was party to the writing of the letter, or at any rate was made acquainted with its contents, refrained from publicly endorsing it, and left open to Mr. Aberhart the opportunity of interpreting his silence as evidence of benevolent neutrality, an interpretation which gathered weight from the fact that he, Major Douglas, had previously autographed Mr. Aberhart's pamphlet. The state of the atmosphere at that time can be gauged from the following remarks made by Mrs. Frank Gostick, one of Mr. Aberhart's leading speakers who subsequently won a seat in Calgary. They were made in a speech at a Social Credit Convention:—

"Mrs. Frank Gostick . . . urged that ranks of the Party be not split, and said she believed Major C. H. Douglas could not split the Alberta movement. She claimed that some said Major Douglas was coming to draft a plan for Alberta, she did not see the need of paying him 9,000 or 13,000 dollars, for the British economist had said others could draft a plan. If there was any suggestion he had been 'bought,' Alberta would not be safe for Major Douglas, she declared."—Report of Social Credit Convention at Calgary.

Mr. Aberhart did not repudiate her sentiments then or afterwards.

When the news of Mr. Aberhart's smashing victory reached London, it is not surprising that newspaper interviewers were unable to get an opinion from any Director of the Secretariat on it. It was on a Saturday, it is true, and only Mr. Bardsley was accessible. Major Douglas was yachting somewhere and wouldn't be in Town until the Monday. Mr. Bardsley naturally excused himself from saying anything. Well, interviewers are persistent people. One of them, in default of anything better, routed out the editor of *THE NEW AGE* on the Saturday, and the interview was published in the *Manchester Guardian* on the Monday. He said all that could be said so soon after the event, and the pessimistic tenour of his comments will be seen to have been justified by the facts narrated above, and by the further fact that he was aware of the technical defects in some of Mr. Aberhart's proposals. On the Monday the *News Chronicle* interviewer saw Major Douglas, and elicited from him the information that the Aberhart triumph suited his book. This greatly relieved the other Directors. One of them said: "Oh, this has taken such a load off my mind." And in their exuberance they opened a "Victory Fund" in their paper, *Social Credit*.

Across the Atlantic there were mixed feelings about this. Mr. Aberhart could afford to grin about it, but without any feeling of obligation to the Secretariat, whether the Douglas soft-splitter or the Bardsley loud-splitter. The U.F.A. people had to grin and bear it. Why, they asked themselves, were we not told beforehand that Aberhart's success would suit the Secretariat's alterations with Mr. Aberhart's admirers. Or were there two sets of books?

Notice.

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

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

As Lafcadio Hearn knew, and himself insisted, what is required of a translator is a great knowledge of the language *into* which he will translate. Going further, the translator not only needs great dexterity in use of the language his work will appear in, but, more important still, he should have an artist's perception of the artistic effects aimed at by the original author.

This is where the small, schoolmaster type of translator falls down; and this is the reason why most translations are poor, if not positively infuriating. It takes an artist to translate an artist. The artist making the adaptation should be—at least at the moment of working—somewhere on the same level as the creator of the work. A Baudelaire can see precisely the effects Poe aimed at; and Baudelaire can produce, upon the mind of a French reader, precisely the effects that Poe produces upon the minds of sensitive American and English readers. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, in his preface to *The Early Italian Poets* wrote:—"The life-blood of rhythmical translation is this commandment—that a good poem shall not be turned into a bad one. The only true motive for putting poetry into a fresh language must be to endow a fresh nation, as far as possible, with one more possession of beauty."

Rossetti looked upon literalness as a secondary thing in translation, but with his fine perceptions he never confused literalness and fidelity. M. L. Mègroz says of Rossetti, "He is supreme as a translator of Villon. Even Swinburne would not attempt a version of *The Ballad of Dead Ladies* after Rossetti had done his miraculous version."

And Rossetti was able to translate the early Italian poets because he himself was, to a remarkable degree, capable of *feeling* those emotions, perceptions, intuitions and dreams experienced by his primitive countrymen.

Our greatest poets have been attracted towards translation, because it is work for poets: it is not work for hacks.

On First Looking into Joyce's Symposium of Plato.

By John Shand.

The reader must excuse me from attempting a formal review of Michael Joyce's translation of Plato's Symposium, which has been most elegantly printed and bound by Dent's and published at only six shillings. First, I am no scholar, and so I cannot tell whether Mr. Joyce is a good or a bad one. Second, the translator is an old friend. I have seen what pains he has taken to render this Greek masterpiece into an English one, and know how anxiously he has tried to give us the spirit as well as the letter of the original. The only other version of the Symposium I can compare it with is Shelley's, which, I am told, is inaccurate, and know to be much too heavily written to give any adequate notion of the precise, yet informal, grace of Greek conversation. But I am entitled to air my observations on this book, and on the art of translating, just because, as Joyce quotes from Dr. Johnson, "translations are, in general, for people who cannot read the original." The learned may be allowed to comment on its accuracy. It is for the unlearned to say whether it makes pleasant reading.

And the unlearned are in a vast majority these days, as they were in the heyday of English translation, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The decline in the quality of translations during the eighteenth and particularly the nineteenth centuries was due to the decline in the quality of English prose, and also, probably, to the fact that the freedom of Greek and Latin expression was contrary to the sentimental and hypocritical public morality which grew in those centuries almost to a disease. The decline in the

number of translations in proportion to the enormous increase of readers, however, was due, I suggest, to the fact that every gentleman was supposed to be able to read the classics. To-day, this is once again so little the case that perhaps we may hope for a renaissance of the art of translation, especially as we are again beginning to speak our minds in print and to talk as freely as the Elizabethans.

Yes. For those of us in my fix who have "little Latin and less Greek," but who are curious to read the many classics to which we have lost, or never have been handed, the key, there are always those fine fellows the translators. Fine fellows they are, every one, as are all those who try to act as interpreters and to lessen the curse laid upon man at the Tower of Babel. We cannot love them all, to be sure, since fine fellows may be great dolts; and there are scores of translators whose mastery of dead languages or living is equalled only by their clumsiness in writing their native tongue. Many are called but few are chosen translators. Whoever loves our language at its best must often turn in despair from the dull efforts of well-meaning pedants into an abhorrent specimen of Brummagem English. For translation, if it is to be anything better than mere cypher-reading, is an art; an art that calls for much more than a walking Latin-English or Greek-English dictionary. We must have exactness, scholarship, of course. But the greatest erudition, the most profound scholarship will hardly give us a readable version of Herodotus, Livy, or Suetonius, and can never hope to create such delightful additions to our own masterpieces as North's Plutarch or Chapman's Homer, or Thornley's "Daphnis and Chloe," of Longus, or the "Golden Ass" of Apuleius, which Adlington gave us in 1566. For, as I say, at the risk of repetition, the ideal translator must convey to those able to appreciate the best of English authors all the pleasure and delicate light given to those who can savour in the original the best of the ancients.

With these things in mind, I unhesitatingly place this translation of the Symposium as amongst the best things of the kind I have read. It is in very choice English, I do assure you. Well digested in the scenes, and set down with as much modesty as cunning. This is not the time for me to rise and explain what an enthralling conversation Plato here recorded, or with what wit and pleasantness and wisdom Socrates' speech caps all the others. Read it, and learn for yourselves. It might have been written yesterday, if we had a Plato and a Socrates.

Reviews.

"VU," No. 380, and subsequent issues.

France and as many foreigners as have got hold of No. 380 of the French publication "Vu" are indebted to Francis Delaisi for the first clear exposition of the *de facto* government of France, which is viler than any *de facto* government save possibly the English.

The universal conviction that French politics are too completely rotten to arouse even interest is confirmed, but the analysis is so clear that one gets down to pragmatic basis. The five gangs of Swiss Usurers came in with Necker. The great banking romance occurred when the Rothschilds did in Napoleon and forced the calvinists to admit them into the holy circle of infamy. These six banking families still direct the Banque de France, along with six industrialists, De Wendel, metallurgy or war material, Vogüé, chemicals, Dûchemin, chemicals, Poulenc, chemicals, Tinardon, chemicals, Darblay, paper products.

Along with these, three straw men, government officials who are lent enough money to obtain enough shares in the Banque to qualify for office, but whose loans can be called if they don't crawl on the dotted line.

That is the history of France for the last Hundred and thirty-five years. The rest is cinema shadow.

The five holy calvinist tribes are Hottinguer, Mallet, Vernes, Mirabaud, and De Neufize.

This is the great worm that gnaws at French vitals, and

this explains why they get three "governments" in a week. It also explains why London can bully M. Laval.

La Tour du Pin said justly that the XIX century would be known as "la siècle de l' usure" but he didn't get down to personalities. Naturally the "République" is a farce, and until Daladier enlightens a few of his boneheaded reds; or someone trepan Léon Bloom and puts a mind in place of the soft porridge implanted by malevolent nature in his cerebral chasm, there is no likelihood of the french working man dodging TAXES. There is no danger of the peasant getting better pay, or of any frenchman being able to respect his own nation.

Against which slough of infamy, no Englishman can cast the first stone. By curious coincidence the next page of "Vu" carries the congress of semitic writers (plus the epigons of the Tolstois and Huxleys).

We note the convenience of having a subsidised left committed to absolute intolerance and absolutely closed to monetary ideas. If this 7% paying "communist" compendium be kept prevailingly hebrew, such purity has an advantage to bankers. It is always easy, and alas too easy, to start pogroms and excite the utterly irrelevant issue of "race."

One usurer is as another. Hell makes no distinction. It gives no preference to one bloodsucker over another. Usury is *not* shaving. Usury is the root of all wars. Nothing but wars makes debts fast enough to suit "great" financiers. Crops grow too slowly. Machinery makes farm tractors too slowly. Till you reform the banks of France and of England you will have wars.

15 years peace, and interest rates have gone down. No Czechoslovakia 8%, no Italian 7%. Only 7%, to Russia. Sixes scarce, fives harder to find. Naturally Eden is sent to Geneva. If the public gets into a temper the gun firms "can take it." The Banks are not brought to light. The international chamber of commerce has the "same aim as the Carnegie Foundation" (refer to their joint Press "Release No. I.")

For fuller details see Delaisi's articles in issues following Vu, No. 380. Abyssinia is England's enemy in as far as the Genevan horseplay takes Englishmen's minds off distressed areas, and the relations of finance (as is) to the population of England.

EZRA POUND.

The Secretariat and "The New Age."

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES.

(Statement by Arthur Brenton, editor.)

Last year the Executive of the Cardiff Social Credit Group appointed a committee of three persons, of whom the Dean of Canterbury consented to be chairman, with the object of holding a judicial investigation into certain issues raised by me arising out of my relations with the Secretariat. One of these issues concerned the disposal of funds contributed to THE NEW AGE.

The appointment of the committee was accepted in principle by the Secretariat, and a preparatory correspondence took place between the Executive and the Secretariat on the one hand and myself on the other, lasting about two months. When the time came for the fixing of a date and a meeting place Major Douglas sent Mr. Bardsley to Cardiff where the latter met the Executive and advised them that Major Douglas "viewed with suspicion" their action in promoting the inquiry as possibly having been inspired by "agents provocateurs."

Upon this the Executive decided to abandon the idea, and wrote me expressing the hope that in the interests of the unity of the Movement I would concur in their decision. I did.

Since that time ex parte statements have been privately made by members and officials of the Secretariat on the particular issue mentioned above.

Comment is unnecessary.

Douglas Dicta On Action.

There is no need for a Movement. (1925.)

There is really no need for a journal. (1931.)

I didn't ask for a Movement to be formed. (1925.)

If they like to ask for my advice I will give it, but to ask me to lead the Movement is another matter. (1925.)

Whatever you like doing best for Social Credit is the thing you will do best, and is the thing you should do.

Before you start to bring in the new system make sure of your economic security in this one.

Before I put pen to paper on Social Credit I took steps to make myself safe against direct attacks on my economic security. (1921.)

If you [i.e., hecklers at a meeting] prefer the existing system to the one which I am advocating, I can get along under it as well as you can. You are not obliging me by accepting my views.

If you [members of the Movement at a conference in 1921] think you must take some concerted action, as distinct from educative propaganda, the only thing I can suggest to you is that you try to get hold of the "price"-end of the credit system by mobilising consumers' demand in various localities, and directing it towards selected shops under agreements whereby the customers will receive a price-discount made possible by the savings in overhead charges.

The function of THE NEW AGE, and of other educative agencies, is that of a sign-post: it points the way in which the traveller should go if he wants to reach a given destination. It can't take him there or make him want to go there.

"When you have ten million people voting you can be perfectly sure that nine million people are twenty-five years behind the times, and therefore common agreement is impossible. . . . The public will never do anything; you, individually have got to do it." (Public speech at Aberdeen, April 28, 1932, published in THE NEW AGE of October 11, 1934.)

Douglas on Social Credit Accounting.

Letter to THE NEW AGE, March 9, 1933.

Sir,—No doubt numbers of your readers will have noticed the attempt made to discredit a pioneer in monetary reform, by in a recent law case having nothing to do with finance, by suggesting the misappropriation of funds subscribed by the public. For this and other reasons I should suggest that the following principles be adhered to in any application for financial support which it may be necessary to make for Social Credit:

- (1) The appeal should be made for an *ad hoc* purpose (not, e.g., "Social Credit").
- (2) It should be signed by an individual, who will be responsible for the disbursement of all sums subscribed.
- (3) If any portion of the funds so collected is to be used to pay wages or salaries as distinct from trade bills, the amount and destination of such sums should be clearly stated in the appeal.
- (4) A formal account should be at the disposal of any inquirer.
- (5) The principle of personal responsibility should be rigidly observed in all financial transactions.—I am, etc.,
C. H. Douglas.

"Faith-Money Mahomet."

ANOTHER AUSTRALIAN PRESS EXHIBIT.

By J. T. F.

[This is an exhibit of the kind of dope which can be put out against Social Credit. It appeared in the "Sunday Sun and Guardian" (Australia), on January 21, 1934, a few days before Douglas was due in Sydney. Notice that it forces the question of "methods" into the foreground, and "results" into the background.—Ed.]

Due in Sydney by the Maloja on Thursday is the new Mahomet of money, Major Clifford Hugh Douglas, aged fifty-five. He is the English engineer who has refashioned economics on his anvil, and refined all the gold out of money.

For, although they made him an engineer, his heart has always been in the printing trade. He has shown to his own satisfaction that a currency with gold backing is just plain unnecessary.

Because (he will tell you) if you look at money from a certain angle on a moonlit night you will find that it is all just pure psychology, a matter of thought waves.

Strange that an engineer who regards machines and factories as real should consider money as merely a frame of mind.

No doubt he objects strongly to receiving material non-psyche pounds sterling (each worth 12s. 6d. in gold), and pays them away gladly.

A SORT OF RECEIPT.

Douglas says, in short, that while wheat is really valuable, the money we get for it is not. It is only a "ticket"—a sort of receipt. It is not an equivalent.

Common experience, on the other hand, shows that the money (fundamentally gold) is just as real and valuable a commodity as the wheat, because we can either hoard it or get potatoes, furniture, or anything else we want for it.

If money has no equivalent value to the wheat, the seller obviously has given his wheat away for nothing.

Not so many years ago people carried real money (golden sovereigns) in their pockets.

Then they thought it handier to have very carefully water-marked paper notes to represent the heavy sovereigns—£40,000,000 in notes to replace 40,000,000 sovereigns. Any more notes would have constituted inflation.

Some liberties have been taken with notes since then, but they still definitely represent those sovereigns now so carefully locked away in Federal vaults.

Australian notes at present are backed by gold and sterling. Sterling in turn is backed by gold, securities, and foreign currencies.

Douglas has forgotten all about the days of sovereigns, and how paper money arose.

Even the Soviet sticks to orthodox finance—its currency being backed by gold, platinum, jewels, and foreign currencies.

Human experience tells us again and again that you cannot use for money something which in itself represents no value.

Yet, if it is true that money in itself has value, the whole Douglas structure falls to the ground.

You cannot "create money" out of nothing, as Douglas proposes, if the money is to have any real value.

"CASH" BY THE YARD.

Once Douglas can get you to admit that money is not a commodity, once he can get money cut off from the realities of every-day business, he can, of course, prove anything.

He can then turn round with all the authority of an engineer and order you to manufacture 500,000 square yards of "money," and you daren't refuse without contradicting yourself.

Douglas sees pound notes and cheques floating around and exclaims: "Presto! There is your money! How simple!"

He ignores the gold behind the notes, and the deposits behind the cheques, just as he ignores the security behind bank loans.

He says, in effect: Why have gold backing if we can have notes? Why worry about deposits if we can have cheques? Why have security if we can have credit?

Instead of all these things, let us have Faith! He has adapted faith healing to finance. He frowns on material cash, and turns to the coin of the mind.

That money must be definitely related to its gold backing, and also to the amount of business doing, he fails to see.

The German inflation which broke these rules taught him nothing.

If Germany's real currency could so soon become worthless, through breaking simple currency laws, what is to

become of Douglas's Faith Money, when it breaks the same Laws?

He would have solved the American crisis by taking all the Yankee gold out to sea and dumping it. By dumping gold, the Major could have depreciated the dollar much more rapidly. He could have nose-dived it down to nothing in a day.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

THE NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY.

Sir,—Permit me to correct an error in the article on "Private Limited Companies" in your issue of October 10.

The National Secular Society is not incorporated, as stated in the article referred to. The writer no doubt had the *Secular Society Limited* in mind, which was formed in 1898, and is incorporated. By the famous Bowman Case judgment given in the House of Lords, bequests to the Society were declared to be legally sound, but the more important point was that it consolidated and confirmed the change in the interpretation of the law regarding blasphemy by laying it down that even the fundamentals of religion may be attacked providing the decencies of controversy are observed. R. H. ROSETTI, General Secretary.

National Secular Society,
68, Farringdon-street, London, E.C.4.

Election Appeal.

Mr. H. Norman Smith, who is contesting Faversham in the Labour interest, is an active Social Credit exponent. He has a fine chance of victory, and readers willing to help with cars on or before polling day should notify Mr. P. L. Wells, Labour Agent, Central Committee Rooms, 96, High-street, Sittingbourne, Kent, as soon as they can.

NOTICE.

Social Credit at the Albert Hall.

The London Social Credit Club is organising a Douglas Social Credit meeting at the Albert Hall on Friday, November 29, 1935. The Marquis of Tavistock and Mr. Norman Smith will be the principal speakers. Officers of assistance will be gratefully received and should be sent to Dr. Joyce Mitchell, 2, Bromley Common, Kent, Hon. Sec., London Social Credit Club.

Forthcoming Meetings.

The Social Credit Party of Great Britain
(The Green Shirts).

Wednesday, November 6. 8 p.m. Lecture: John Hargrave: "Why we must win South Leeds for Social Credit at the next Election." National Headquarters: 44, Little Britain, E.C.1. W. Townend, B.A., candidate for South Leeds will also speak.

Manchester Douglas S.C. Association.

On Friday, November 8, at the Milton Hall, Deansgate, Manchester, at 7.30 p.m., Rev. Father G. J. Seaton on "Social Credit and Christian Morals."

Public Meetings.

These meetings are organised by the London Social Credit Club.
At the Blewcoat Room, Caxton-street, Westminster.
Friday, November 1, at 7.45 p.m.—Speaker, Mr. Best. Subject, "The Flaw in the Price System."

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.]

ACADEMY CINEMA, 165, Oxford St.
GER. 2981.

Awarded the Volpi Cup at Venice, 1935, for the World's Best Screen Performance
PAULA WESSELY (of "Maskerade" fame) in
"EPISODE" (A)

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70, High Holborn, London, W.C., England (Telephone: Chancery 2470), and printed for him by THE ADDRESS PRESS, LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London, E.C.4, England (Telephone: Central 3701).