

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 2264] NEW SERIES Vol. LVIII. No. 13. THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1936. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE	PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	97	100
King's as counsellors—coincidence between the late King's two illnesses and two acts of financial usurpation of his prerogatives—André Maurois on the causes of the increased stability of the British Monarchy—Social Credit and the king's prerogative of giving counsel—expediency or feasibility?—the Duke of Wellington and the Reform agitation—the King and "the peace of the realm"—the continuity of the king's attitude conserved in the overlapping of generations.		
THE FILMS. By David Ockham	99	
<i>I Give My Heart. The Thirty-Nine Steps.</i>		
THE TIMING OF LOANS		100
CHAOTIC CAT'S-CRADLE. By "Green Armlet"		101
Report and commentary on the proceedings at a recent meeting of the three Social Credit candidates.		
OBSERVATIONS OF AN ELECTION AGENT. By T. H. Nicholls		103
THE TOTEMISTIC MENACE. II. By "Presbyteros." Totem: <i>The Exploitation of Youth.</i> (Stovin.)		103
CORRESPONDENCE		104
Gladys F. Bing, William J. Robins, A. W. C., J. H., Anon., C.I.L.		

Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Kings As Counsellors.

When our late King fell ill a few years ago it was pointed out in this journal that the commencement of his illness synchronised almost to the day with the disappearance of his effigy from the currency note.

* * *

The commencement of his last, unhappily fatal, illness likewise synchronised with the announcement in Canada of the intention to institute a Loan Council whose powers will amount in effect to the right of veto on all policies, Dominion or Provincial, affecting the control and use of credit.

* * *

Whether these two events were causative factors in the breakdown of our late King's health, or whether the two synchronisations can be ascribed to a common causative factor—rationally or mystically—is a matter which those who have been investigating the doctrines, policies and manoeuvres of the Money Power may be left to ponder over for themselves. All we need say for our present purpose is that these phenomena may be regarded as manifestations of poetic coincidence. To a conscientious Constitutional Monarch any tampering with his prerogatives is a moral blow at his Person calculated to produce harmful physical consequences. Of course it is possible to reverse the sequence and reflect that the impairment of a monarch's health from natural causes can bring about the filching away of his prerogatives by providing the opportunity for thieves to make off with them. But whether the theft causes the illness or the illness the theft, the fact and the significance of their causal relationship remains the same.

* * *

To speculate in public about the feelings of our late

King on matters of policy would be an unprofitable act, and, at the present time, a breach of good taste. What he thought he thought, and what he counselled or warned his Ministerial advisers from time to time is their secret, which, if things proceed normally, will only be disclosed when all of us now alive shall have paid, like he, our debt to nature. Nevertheless we may indulge the hope that his influence in the counsels of the State on matters which we and our readers hold to be of supreme import to the liberties of the people has been wisely exerted, and that although it could not prevent the acts of veiled usurpation which we have exposed in many legislative measures of his reign, it may have slackened their progress, and, what is more important still, may have left his advisers with some feelings of trepidation lest events still to come may prove them to have been the fools who rush in where angels fear to tread. In the mood of such a reflection we can all say from the depths of our spirit: The King is dead: Long live the King.

* * *

Readers interested in the question of the King's functions in the Constitution will do well to get a copy of the *Evening Standard* of Thursday, January 23. The late editions (and probably the earlier ones as well) contain an article entitled "British Monarchy," contributed by André Maurois. This gifted French writer asks and answers the question why it is that in Great Britain the monarchy is "far more secure in 1936 than it was in 1836," while elsewhere, during that century, the tide of republicanism has submerged thrones. His article is a model of comprehensiveness, conciseness and compactness: no important point is omitted and no superfluous word is included. We would gladly reproduce it completely but for the copyright obstacle. For our present

purpose, however, it is sufficient for us to quote one short passage:

"Where, then, lies the Sovereign's sphere of action?

In Bagehot's view, he retains three rights—the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, the right to warn; and no wise King will ever desire more.

"Nothing must be done in the realm unbeknown to the King; and British monarchs are right in their insistence on this prerogative remaining inviolate."

Illustrating this he says that though the King cannot prevent a line of action, he can address his Prime Minister, saying: "Be careful, this is a dangerous path you are taking. I remember this or that unfortunate precedent. It is your responsibility of course, and if you insist I shall give my signature. But I warn you, you are making a mistake." The author remarks in this context that the King is enabled to give such counsels "thanks to the information provided by his Ministers."

The question which readers of THE NEW AGE will place uppermost is that of inquiring in what respects the prerogatives of the King can play a part in bringing about the liberation of his subjects from the tyranny of the Money Monopoly. To put the question into concrete terms of Social-Credit political action: Is there any impropriety in presenting a Petition to the King? This amounts to asking: Is it any use doing so?—for one must commence with the assumption that the King will not respond to any prompting which transgresses the proprieties. Logically the answer turns, or should do so, on the character of a given Petition, not on the fact of its presentation. The Royal prerogative of encouraging or warning Ministers would be reduced to nonsense if the King were cut off from all evidences of the trend of public opinion other than those communicated to him by those Ministers themselves. So would it even if he were fully informed of the evidences, but were prevented (or hampered) by any means from knowing how to interpret them. Once grant that the King has the right to encourage his Ministers to pursue a line of action, he cannot be denied the right to acquire from any source—official or otherwise—knowledge of the reasons why such a line of action is *desirable* and *feasible*. M. André Maurois makes mention of "precedents" as factors which have helped Kings to form judgments in the past. But the Social Credit objective raises issues for which no precedents exist to guide the King (or even his Ministers for that matter).

Broadly speaking, the crises of the past in which the Sovereign was constrained to exercise his prerogative of counsel as to what decision the Cabinet should make, involved considerations of desirability rather than of feasibility. The decision rendered necessary by the great crisis now unfolding itself here and elsewhere in the Empire involves considerations of feasibility rather than of desirability. For example, no complications about feasibility resided in the problem which the Sovereign had to solve when the Duke of Wellington was preparing to suppress the reformers and refuse them the vote. Unquestionably it was possible to give votes to the masses; and possible for votes to be cast and counted. The problem was entirely that of deciding whether it would be expedient to alter the balance of the power-to-choose Governments in favour of the propertyless classes. Opinions might differ, but at least the material on which they could be formed was familiar alike to the Sovereign and his advisers. Again, at a

much later date, the Sovereign required no new and specialised knowledge to form a judgment as to the wisdom or otherwise of creating Liberal Peers, or, if creating them, as to doing so at the first time of asking or after a period of delay. In both these examples the Sovereign and his advisers were able to foresee the results and to make up their minds whether they liked or disliked them. Further, however widely their several judgments diverged, each could be supported by appeals to commonly recognised facts and precedents. "You are unwise," M. Maurois makes his hypothetical Sovereign say to the Prime Minister: "I remember ——" But the imaginary conversation could be extended, the Prime Minister replying: "True, but does not Your Majesty also remember —?"

But when we now come to suppose the demand for the National Dividend to be the precipitant of a supreme political crisis, the question of expediency hardly arises in the broad statesmanlike sense in which it could be weighed in the past. True that certain interests may hold the policy to be inexpedient—but there may be considerable disinterested doubts: but practically no statesman to-day is prepared to take the responsibility of publicly avowing this issue to be one of expediency, much less the onus of persuading the public of the inexpediency. Lip-service to the principles of Democracy, and reassurances of the material benefits to accrue to all from their application, have gone too far for any statesmen to get up and say to the people: "We consider it inexpedient for you to enjoy these benefits." The utmost they could do in the way of dragging in the factor of expediency, and any say: "What you ask is not practical politics, and we attempt on our part to give it to you will fail and probably leave you in a worse condition than you are now." But to say that is to recognise the issue as turning on the factor of feasibility. And not merely political feasibility (for a collective public demand for benefits which are not to be extracted from any class thereof is essentially much more feasible in the political sense than were sectional demands in the past which have been actually conceded), but technical (financial) and natural (physical) feasibility.

Now this is the factor on which Ministers of the Crown are preparing to take their stand. They are going to say (when the time comes): "We are at one with you in regard to the desirability of the benefits you seek in your Consumers' Charter (or Petition) and if only a way of distributing them could be proved effective we should not wait to be asked. But alas——" Now, isn't that a pretty dish to set before a king? To be accurate one should call it a kettle of fish, for it logically involves one of two alternatives for M. Maurois's constitutional monarch: either to take independent steps for verifying or otherwise the theoretical soundness of the Social Credit Analysis and therefore the technical feasibility of the proposals—or to refrain from offering any counsel at all to his Prime Minister. It is obvious that in circumstances where the monarch derived his facts from the same source as did his Ministers, and likewise his method of reasoning from them, his counsels would be superfluous whether he tendered them or not. There must be some element of independence in outlook on his side to lend weight to his encouragements or warnings. So much for the logic of the exercise of the prerogative in normal circumstances.

But changes in circumstances alter logic, or shift its plane of application. A crisis may so develop as to threaten a grave disturbance of the Peace of the Realm. It is easily possible that King George IV. had shared the Duke of Wellington's attitude of mind as to the inexpediency of extending the franchise to the lower orders. But a juncture came when the King had to face three disturbing events—the intensification of street demonstrations on the part of the reformers; the military preparations to suppress them; and the sudden and swift withdrawals of gold from the Bank. As the King saw it, the safety of the realm was being threatened from two quarters—civil war and financial ruin. That being so it was comparatively easy for him to decide between two "inexpediencies"—whether to counsel the handing out of votes on the one hand or to counsel the shedding of blood and gold on the other. As is now history, he turned down the Duke. It is significant to note that the reformers got their votes because, not having votes, they had to express their will otherwise than by voting. They had tried petitioning; but this fizzled out. And it is certain that the Duke would have disregarded even the most imposing petition, while it is doubtful if the King would have troubled to argue the matter with him. The moral is that in real politics the expediency or otherwise of a debatable line of policy is held dependent on whether it will meet with physical resistance. After all, voting was invented as a convenient substitute for cutting throats; and the principle of "one man one vote" is derived from the calculation that on the whole every man is as good a throat-cutter as another. And broadly speaking, even to-day, the measure of benefit which any section of society can gain and hold by means of the vote is just that which it could help itself to in a rough house where votes didn't count. By "rough house" is not meant simply indiscriminate violence, but also strikes, lock-outs, and other non-centralised short cuts to the establishment of rights (legitimate or otherwise). The late Mr. Orage, when editing THE NEW AGE frequently reminded the then young and cocky Parliamentary Labour Party that all material victories won for "Labour" had been achieved, and would be, by the Trade Unions in the industrial battlefield.

Certain of our readers will probably be nudging us to remember that the reformers got Wellington down, not by their own force alone, but with the moral support of the bankers. The reformist posters: "To Stop the Duke Go For Gold" could not have been distributed, much less acted upon, if the bankers and other magnates of the City had been strongly averse to letting the gold go. They were not; they wanted it to go because it enabled them to frame up a scare for the King; for they themselves wanted to dilute the franchise because the dilution would facilitate the transference of real power from landlordism to banklordism. This needs stressing because it would be unwise for anyone to suppose that because certain forms of militancy were successful in wresting votes out of the Government a century ago the same forms would wrest dividends out of the Government to-day. For the first time in history the forces of finance are unanimously and implacably hostile on a major issue—which the demand for the Dividend raises. The granting of votes to moneyless people enabled the bankers to tell them how to vote to get money. But the granting of the money itself to moneyless people enables the people not only to choose loftier subjects to vote on but to make

their votes effective. The popular vote rivetted the armour of the Money Monopoly: the popular Dividend will pierce it.

The question has been asked in Social Credit circles how far the lamented end of our late King may affect the progress of our common campaign. Such a speculative question must perforce remain unanswered. Moreover, it cannot be discussed with propriety except by reference to the influences inherent in the fact of the overlapping of generations in human life generally and the special consequences (if any) of those influences in the case of ruling dynasties. For the first fifteen to eighteen years of a child's life he is constrained to adapt his impetuosity to counsels emergent from his parents' experiences. These counsels constitute a frame of reference in which he can later work out problems of life which his parents have not encountered. His impulses to try out what is new are clothed upon by imparted knowledge of what is old. And this will be particularly marked in cases where the son knows himself destined to encounter and deal with the same order of problems as has his father. In humble life the blacksmith's son may become a bus conductor; and in cases of this kind the lore and learning of the father is not so complete in its applicability nor so enduring in its influence as in cases where the son is born to fulfil a hereditary function. In the extreme case of kingship the heir to the throne may be said to go through an overlap of tutelage coextensive with the overlap of his father's life. The blacksmith's boy cuts loose as soon as he gets his job, and thenceforward probably begins to counsel his father! Not so with the eldest son of a king. So there is a specific functional meaning to the saying that a king lives again in his son. And the wisest conclusion to come to is that there will be a continuity of outlook threading successions to the throne, and that high policy is not perceptibly affected by the bequeathment of kingly prerogatives. At least, this is true in these latter days when the scope for the exercise of these prerogatives has become so narrow.

The Films.

"I Give My Heart." Directed by Marcel Varnel. Regal. Screen version of "The Dubarry" operetta. History made incredible and epileptic. Direction so jerky that it is difficult to follow the story without more knowledge of the period and its personalities than is possessed by the average filmgoer. The famous ascent of the Montgolfier balloon at Versailles in September, 1783, was, incidentally, not participated in by a dog, the "passengers" on this historic occasion being a sheep, a cock, and a duck. Has Elstree no research department? And why must all British historical films be so unhistorical?

"The Thirty-Nine Steps." Directed by Alfred Hitchcock. General Release. Although it owes practically nothing to John Buchan's admirable thriller except the title, and has a singularly unconvincing ending, this picture makes first-class entertainment. It is very fast-moving, is excellently directed and edited; the dialogue is unusually good, and the production in general represents the British cinema at its most technically efficient, which is to say that it is as good as anything of the kind that the American commercial screen has to offer. Special mention should be made of Peggy Ashcroft and John Laurie, who succeed in transforming small parts into rôles of real importance.

DAVID OCKHAM.

stood the position in Leeds—they "had to obey instructions" (presumably issued by Hargrave), but £300 a year was wrong. Douglas's figure was a guess. The figures for working out how much the National Dividend should be were not available (shades of Sir Josiah Stamp!). He thought a figure was necessary—the people wanted to know how much the Dividend would be—but £300 a year was wrong. "They" (presumably this speaker and some of his friends) were now busy "trying to work out the right figure" for the Dividend. This speaker seemed to show that he was rather a vague monetary reformer who did not accept the A + B Theorem nor the Price Calculus. He argued that if you could speed up production by a third, you could pay a Dividend of a third of the average income.

A speaker from Bradford pointed out that it was a mistake to suppose that a Dividend of a third could be paid in those conditions, as wages and other costs would have increased.

Mr. Townsend rose at this juncture on a point of order, and stated that he thought the business of the meeting was to discuss the Politics of Social Credit, not the Principles and their application.

Repeated reference was made throughout the meeting to "the autocratic rule" of the Secretariat, and "the would-be dictator," John Hargrave. The need for "a National Organisation" founded on "democratic principles" was stressed. A speaker from Leeds asked on two occasions in what way the needed "National Organisation" would differ from the Social Credit Party of Great Britain, but got no reply.

Apart from the Leeds men (perhaps they were "under instructions"?) there was hopeless chaos. The Bradford and Birmingham men appeared to want a leader who would not give orders of any sort. They showed no enthusiasm for the Electoral Campaign pledge-collecting, but felt it had better go on. They seemed to want five hundred candidates to be put up at the next General Election, and were "mysterious" about a scheme for financing them. This "mysteriousness" was likely to make the Leeds men suspicious. Where is the money to come from to finance the five hundred?—"Into the Valley of Debt rode the Five Hundred!"? (and the Norman-Stamp-Gregory smiled to Itself, and remembered how the Dogs barked, and how the Caravan passed on. . . .)

This meeting of the three candidates and some of their election helpers and organisers was a chaotic cat's-cradle—a tangled skein. It "did not wish to discuss" Hargrave's policy and organisation, yet nearly every speech referred to the Green Shirts. Several speakers, as reported above, wanted "a National Organisation" (run on "democratic lines") and each speaker obviously wanted to rule it.

The only point of agreement was in attacking Douglas's Secretariat, and "the would-be dictator," Hargrave.

The attack on Douglas and Hargrave took the same line, i.e., neither the Secretariat nor the Green Shirt Social Credit Party was "democratic": both were "autocratic," and both were out of favour on that account. The Engineer Autocrat and the Green-shirted Autocrat must be superseded. And so we must have "a National Organisation" of the Headless Horseman type, in which the Bankers, all unseen and unsuspected by ("the only"?) democrats, will be able to divide-and-rule by committee.

So let there be joy within the Social Credit movement (and also in Threadneedle Street). Look out for the Manifesto of The New National More-or-Less "Social Credit" Organisation, with its 500 Candidates standing for Some-Kind-of-a-Kind-of-a-Dividend (when "they" have been able to "work out" exactly what figure it ought to be—from "figures that are not available"!)—the Whole Boiling to be financed at the next General Election by . . . ? . . .

but at this point we are excluded from the mysteriously "secret" (but also "democratic"?) assembly. This conclave, however, will not be held at the Guildford Hotel, Leeds. Montagu's private office at the Bank of England will do very nicely. No doubt we ourselves, together with "our" 500 "Social Credit" (sez you!) candidates, all

honest democrats to a man (and not the "only" ones by any means), will be kept waiting. After all, the "experts" have to decide whether the National Dividend (wouldn't it be far better to call it a "Social Dividend"?—do let us call it a "Social Dividend"! is to be £2 5s. 2d. a year per family of six, or ten shillings a month for everyone over the age of 80 years. (And then, of course, there is the question of how to "get it back" by some sort of taxation scheme. . . . otherwise it will "pile up and up" and on and on. Moreover, are we quite certain that the "alleged plenty" does "actually exist"? . . .) All these matters have to be considered, and we must not complain if we have to wait while the Bankers conclude their "preliminary meeting." They also serve (the Bankers) who only stand and wait. We shall be "admitted," later on, to hear the Plan; and then, with our New National Bogus "Social Credit" Organisation, we shall be able to sweep away the nasty Secretariat, and the still more hateful Green Shirt Party. Hurray! Down with Douglas, and down with Hargrave! Long live Acephalous Democracy (in which honest and dishonest confusionists can leave out the fundamental principles of Social Credit, and befuddle the mass-mind with every kind of Monetary Reformism . . . After all, "something must be done about it," and as we cannot agree just exactly what, the best thing is to lump "everything" together (I mean, all the different Plans and Schemes) and . . . well . . . leave it to the 500 candidates to sort it all out . . . After all, "things can't go on as they are," and the great thing is to chuck all the bits-and-scrap into a pot, simmer the stew for 50 years (discussion), and then, perhaps, the problem will have solved itself . . . ?)

Anyhow, "£300 a year per family of four" is "wrong." Mr. So-and-So, of Birmingham, says so. And he knows. But if we all muck-in as "a National Organisation" run on REAL honest-to-goodness DEMOCRATIC lines—

It'll all come right in the end.

Thanks a million! (No, no, not £1,000,000!—why, even £300, or £75 per person, is "wrong").

What about a War? It would, at any rate, resolve all this "Social Credit" confusion. Here are a few extracts from the Army folder-card issued to the troops during the First World War:—

"[S.S. 535.] GAS DEFENCE. Remember that your Box Respirator and your P.H. Helmet are of importance second only to your weapons. Keep them in perfect condition. YOUR LIFE MAY DEPEND ON THEM.

KEEP THIS CARD IN YOUR PAY-BOOK. YOU HAVE NOTHING TO FEAR FROM GAS ATTACK, (a) if your Respirator or Helmet is in good order, (b) if you remain calm and carry out the measures in which you have been instructed."

Brenton is "wrong" (he once published an article I didn't like in "THE NEW AGE").

Douglas is "wrong" (I don't agree with the Electoral Campaign).

Hargrave is "wrong" (I don't like people dressed up in Green Shirts—and, besides, he wants to be a "dictator").

Everyone is "wrong" except ME! (and you, of course). Don't you agree? So let you and ME form "a National Organisation" run on "democratic principles"—and I'll get myself elected President or Chairman (that's easy enough to wangle—you'll vote for ME, won't you?).

Godstruth! Where's my Box Respirator and P.H. Helmet?

Oh my, I doe wanna die, I want to go home. . . . "GREEN ARMLET."

Social Credit Chart.

The demand for the new chart in colours referred to in THE NEW AGE of October 17 last has warranted the issue of a second edition, and enabled the price to be reduced. Single copies 7d., post free. Special terms for quantities to S.C. Groups. From the Designer and Publisher: Frank Griffiths, 49, Denman Drive North, London, N.W.11.

Observations of an Election Agent

By T. H. Nicholls,

III.

It is never possible to keep human frailties out of politics, and consequently an organiser must bear this factor vividly in mind.

He must remember that the local M.P. makes personal contact with all the substantial people in his constituency, both supporters and opponents, at some function or other, and that on such occasions the elector has an opportunity of mentioning anything he has to say.

But there are many electors, including some holding positions of considerable responsibility, who do not get this opportunity of personal approach, and in consequence there is always a tendency "to write to the Member about it." If it is some matter such as a delayed pension or a miscarriage of justice, this is probably the very best thing to do, always bearing in mind that the Member is a busy person. If he is worthy of his position, he has Parliamentary duties and social functions to attend, and in most cases ordinary business routine of some kind.

Consequently, the matter upon which the elector writes must never be of a frivolous character, for however conscientious the Member may be he cannot afford the time or postage to reply to hundreds of letters, more or less duplicates, sent to the order of some political organiser. His secretary costs him the whole of his Parliamentary salary, and is fully employed answering begging letters or requests for services.

Therefore, the organiser who aims to build his organisation does not tax the beast who has undertaken the heavy burden of Parliamentary representation.

Moreover, he knows that there is some risk to the writer of the trifling letter, for such people are seldom without obligations to some employer. That employer is, in all probability, a personal friend and supporter of the Member, and in a world of restricted employment it is unwise to cause unnecessary trouble which may have unpleasant indirect repercussions. By constitutional laws, ways and means have been provided for anyone to bring forward new political ideas, and people who refuse to use this door very rightly find the walls unscalable.

To argue that fifteen Members have been induced to sign a pledge by methods of personal approach does not indicate any advance for Social Credit. The pledge does not bind them to Social Credit: it simply binds them to conform to the wishes of a majority of their constituents expressed from time to time. By expression or implication every candidate accepts this pledge at his adoption meeting during an election. My last three candidates included it in their election addresses. No repetition is needed, and if it were not merely frivolous to do so there should be no difficulty in collecting six hundred Members' signatures by anyone foolish enough to attend the House for that purpose. If the same person cares to make this form of entertainment a hobby, he might extend it to the army, and get every soldier to pledge himself to perform the duties he is already sworn to fulfil. As an advance towards Social Credit this pledge of Members means nothing. As a measure of capability the method has a value, which, unfortunately, falls on the wrong side of the ledger.

Social Credit Party of Great Britain. Annual Dinner.

The next Annual Dinner will take place at Ye Olde Doctor Butler's Head, Mason's Avenue, Coleman Street, E.C.2, on Saturday, February 8, 1936. Time: 7 p.m. for 7.30. Tickets, 3s. 6d., obtainable from Headquarters, 44, Little Britain, E.C.1, or from the office of THE NEW AGE, 70, High Holborn, W.C.1. The promoters extend a hearty invitation to all members of the Social Credit Order irrespective of their views on Social Credit politics.

The Totemistic Menace.*

By "Presbyteros."

II.

NEW AGE readers will see how vital is Mr. Stovin's grasp of the situation from the following passage:

"In an S.C.M. pamphlet called *Digging with the Unemployed*, a number of ardent Christian intellectuals formed a 'gang' to work with some Welsh unemployed, 'in the endeavour to grope after the Christian solution of unemployment.' . . . The fact that unemployment might be a field of urgent national importance, demanding large co-ordinated enterprise with centralised finance was utterly obscured to them by their sedulous cult of a method which offers scope for Service and Sacrifice. The idea of Sacrifice and the masochistic pleasure of hardship in unfamiliar surroundings completely dulled their capacity for intellectual appreciation of the real economic problem."

The author penetratingly observes:

"This modern philanthropy is no more of the nature of real sacrifice or charity, than is the gallantry of a Scout who rescues for a Scout reward, or of a *Toc H* member who does a *Toc H* job, of the nature of real courage. Every member of a modern social service tribe is vociferously approved by the consensus of tribal opinion. Courage consists rather in taking a lonely decision after careful thinking, than in providing your quota of manpower without 'asking the real reason why.' . . . The cult of Fellowship is a neurotic manifestation of the modern fact of loneliness, poverty, marginality, intellectual futility and social disintegration." (p. 74.)

Mr. Stovin shows further how easily (citing the example of how *Toc H* placed itself behind the Housing Ramp) all this Totem-dragged mass may be worked up to march forth and make a Holy War of any purpose which the Bankers may wish to see accomplished.

Modern Youth is potential election-fodder and budget-fodder ready disciplined and doped, whilst it can be sufficiently herded in the manner of the Groups. The despairing prayer of a Buchmanite: "O God, manage me, for I cannot manage myself," must surely penetrate into the Holy of Holies at the Bank of England!

Here is an apposite story from an early *Toc H Journal*:

"A certain soldier wanted to know something about religion. His friend took him to see a *Toc H* Padre, and they all went into the *Toc H* Chapel.

"Somerville wants to know something about God, Padre."

"Rather a tall order, old chap; suppose you begin somewhere." Bill looked at the map. It was coming clearer now, that thing in the Cathedral.

"When the lights went out," he whispered, "and the Lamp was lit, it seemed to me that there was no need to do it—what I told the skipper. (Suicide?) There seemed to be Somebody there, talking to me. I don't know exactly. It seemed like an order to carry on."

"He looked beseechingly at the Padre, whose wise face was grave. The Padre nodded. 'I think I understand,' he said. 'It was our Elder Brother.'"

Jesus also, it seems, has become a Tribal Totem!

"Once religion becomes 'an order to carry on,' given by 'an Elder Brother,' it is obviously a safe toy for the man in the street, and a useful accessory to any group whose technique of suggestion is getting a little weak or worn. . . . Here are the serums, which Totemism is injecting into its followers to immunise them against the ravages of free acting and thinking."

Can Social Crediters develop a counter technique, an emetic or cathartic, that will eliminate these effects? Mr. Stovin suggests that possibly the unconscious, the instinctive resilience of the not entirely debauched human nature of modern youth may revolt against the Totem.

Meanwhile, is it any wonder that Sir Josiah Stamp looks upon Youth Movements with the wistful eye of a recruiting sergeant?

(Concluded.)

* Totem. The Exploitation of Youth. By Harold Stovin. (Methuen. 5s.)

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

SOCIALIST IDEOLOGY.

Sir,—Please permit me to answer Mrs. B. C. Best's question, printed in last week's "New Age." She asked: "If the ideology of the Socialist political parties enunciated the Social Credit proposals in 1897, why the Labour Party . . . turned down the Social Credit proposals in 1935."

In 1935 the British Labour Party turned down the Douglas Scheme; a different thing from rejecting a scheme of Socialised Credit. There are, indeed, many influential members of the Labour Party now advocating the complete Socialisation of Credit and the issue of a Social Dividend analogous to Bellamy's "citizen's dividend," first mentioned in 1897.

Mrs. Best is quite mistaken in her assertion that nothing I "can say will alter the fact that the Socialist party have the choice of a scheme that would abolish poverty . . . and will have none of it." I do alter the fact by saying that the Socialist party does not intend merely to abolish poverty, and, at the same stroke, stand a heavy chance of augmenting present money-power. The Socialist party has been obstructed in its continuous efforts to abolish poverty by the same powers as those now combating Douglasites; and their efforts are subject to the same legislative distortions. As the Labour leaders are practical politicians, they are more aware of such contingencies than most dreaming Douglasites appear to be.

It may be true that the Labour Party is only a little more informed on the subject of finance than the other political parties, but they are aware of the need to reform the banking and credit system. They may be slow in the uptake, but they spotted the flaw in the Douglas scheme which makes the phrase "Social Credit" a misnomer, and the distortion of the true and original meaning Bellamy gave the words when he first used them in "Looking Backward" and "Equality."

Further reasons for Labour's suspicion of Douglasism lie in the short-sighted attitude of Douglasites. Mrs. Best admits the influence of the Labour Party over "the masses," and proceeds at once to alienate that influence in the manner of a fool-salesman who swears at the customer his poor wits have failed to win.

While Douglasites follow Douglas in insulting the only political party which has deigned to consider his scheme, and which, in New Zealand, is attempting to inaugurate parts of it, both movements stultify each other.

There is no doubt that when Douglas Credit becomes SOCIAL Credit, Labour leaders will recognise it. Until then it will lack the power and incentive of mass-impulse which was the dynamic in Alberta and New Zealand.

Meanwhile, "the caravan moves on."

GLADYS F. BING.

"FOUND OUT."

Sir,—On several occasions during several years past I have been somewhat tantalised by the appearance (in "Notes of the Week") of the phrase: "To be intelligible is to be found out," attributed in each case to Lord Hewart. On each of these occasions I have been tempted to write about it, but have refrained, hoping that it would not be repeated; but it re-appeared again in "Movement Notes" (NEW AGE, Jan. 16, p. 85). Now the phrase in question occurs in Oscar Wilde's play, "Lady Windermere's Fan," Act I. So we may take it that Wilde was the originator and that Lord Hewart was merely speaking in inverted commas.

WILLIAM J. ROBINS.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A. W. C.—We thank you for calling attention to Horsfall Carter's article on "Irish Housekeeping" in the *New Statesman and Nation*, of January 18. We may deal with it later, but meanwhile, pass your information on. Physical self-sufficiency is the basis of financial sovereignty, and if the Free State is working towards the first objective it is working towards the second, whether consciously or not.

J. H.—Your joke about "Bisto" is worth trying out along the lines you indicate. So long as you avoid offence to the proprietors in your method of treatment there is a lot of punch in the famous picture advertisement showing the ragged little boy and girl rubbing their tummies and enjoying the aroma of this excellent flavouring material coming out of the open door which they are passing. It suggests the coining of the term "Bistocracy" as signifying a form of government above (and an outlook on prosperity below) under which the *scent* of good things is offered (and accepted) as the *substance*. Thus, our friend Snowden was a bistocrat par excellence—hence the ascent of Snowden. "He sneaked your bullseyes, sonny?—Well, be a little man, and stop crying, and then you will smell his breath!"

Anon.—Pages from *The Kerryman* (Tralee) November 23 last are welcome. The Social Credit analysis (in dialogue form) of the Loan Conversion operation is well done, especially where the holders of mortgaged bonds are invited to choose whether they will convert or sell out! We recommend it to speakers and writers. The price of the paper is twopence.

C. I. L.—Thanks for leaf from *The Aeroplane* of January 15. The articles are excellent in their realism. It is a pity that they are printed in such small type. The one entitled "Mystery Men" particularly should be in bold type, dealing as it does with the "hidden hand" obsession with its stupid ascription of superhuman wisdom and power to the political wirepullers of international politics.

Forthcoming Meetings.

The Social Credit Party of Great Britain.

National Headquarters: 44, Little Britain, E.C.1. 8 p.m. Wednesday, February 5.—Lecture: John Hargrave: "Social Credit in 1936; or, Time and Tide Wait for No Man."

Saturday, February 8, 7-45 p.m.—Annual Dinner. *Ye Old Butler's Head, E.C.*

Wednesday, February 12.—8 p.m. Speakers' Class. Subject for discussion: Draft Parliamentary Bill to Equate Consumption to Production in Great Britain.

London Social Credit Club.

Blewcoat Room, Caxton Street, S.W. Jan. 31, 7-45 p.m.—Question and Answer Night. Hon. Secretary: Dr. J. C. B. Mitchell, 2, Bromley Common, Kent

Manchester Social Credit Club.

Meetings on the first and third Tuesdays of each month at the Grosvenor Hotel, Deansgate, Manchester. 7 p.m. onwards. Visitors welcome.

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.]

"NETHERWOOD," The Ridge, Hastings
500 ft. up. 4 acres. Cent. H. & C. all bedrooms.
FRENCH WEEK - END FEBRUARY 1st.
SOCIAL CREDIT WEEK-END, FEB. 29th.
Lectures, Dancing and Song. From 7/6 a day inclusive.
Write for program.

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

ROBERT LYNEN, in a story of adventure,
"SANS FAMILLE" (U)

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