

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER"

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND ART

No. 1710] NEW SERIES Vol. XXXVII. No. 7. THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1925. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SIXPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE	PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	73	
Mr. Frank Hodges and low-temperature carbonisation: saving the mining industry by subsidising other industries: effect on foreign mining interests. Mr. Snowden repudiates the Communists; the terrors of Snodgrazing. Mrs. Wootton on Douglas: has consumer-credit nine lives? the supposed surplus of money a fallacy: the method of "retiring" money: the supposed impracticability of price-control: the bogey of profit-making: is a partial application of Social Credit possible? the "rationing" argument. The F.B.I.'s national advertising scheme to promote the habit of buying British goods. The Chinese turmoil and its inner meaning: America and the European Powers' loan policy: Moscow and Wall Street.		
WOMEN'S MOVEMENTS IN ANCIENT GREECE.		78
By C. C. Polhill		79
"THE LITTLE REVIEW." By C. M. Grieve		80
VERSE. Plans. By A. Newberry Choyce		80
THE DIVERSITY OF DEANS. By "Old and Crusted"		81
MUSIC. By Kaikhosru Sorabji		81
REVIEWS		
Outlines of a Philosophy of Art. The Economic Laws of Art Production. A Discourse upon Usury. The Way Out. Streamers Waving.		83
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR		
Social Credit and the Simple Life. By M. Talbot		
Grace. What Can We Do? By "Simple Simon" and Q. P. Savings. By H. B. S. L.		
The Wife and the Dividend. By Roger Anderton and R.		

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Mr. Frank Hodges' speech at Bedworth, in which he emphasised that the conversion of coal into power alone promised the restoration of the country's industries, has naturally received the endorsement of the Liberal Press, which claims that the scheme is a will not lay claim to it as well, for the sooner the public is diverted from the question of *whose* scheme it is to that of *what* scheme it is, the better for the restoration of the country's industries. To say merely that it consists in the erection of low-temperature carbonisation plants all over the country at a cost of £10 millions is not the sort of answer wanted. Nor is the assurance that as a consequence industry will be able to produce a larger number of products per unit of labour employed. The kind of assurance required is one which tells us that the community will be able to consume a larger number of products per unit of labour employed. To the orthodox this distinction will look like hair-splitting, for one of their axioms is that more production means more consumption. This is only true in the sense that production must precede consumption. "Who will not work, neither shall he eat" is correct as a generalisation if it means that unless mankind exerts, or employs, energy there will be no energy-products to be eaten. But this option of employing as an alternative to exerting energy is the fundamental issue between the Old and the New Economists. The former would limit mankind's consumption by the measure of mankind's personal exertion. The latter would expand consumption to the measure of all exertion—mechanical as well as human. The difference is vital, because it is so enormous in its practical consequences. For if total consumption may expand only as the total quantity of human effort ("work by hand or by brain," as the Labour Party puts it) the maximum rate of increase in consumption cannot exceed the actual rate of increase in population—while, of course, it may be anything less down to the point of starvation and social collapse. In this connection the following figures are illuminating. During the last century the population of this country has risen from about

18½ million to 46 million—it has multiplied 2½ times. In the same period the total energy put into the productive system is estimated by Major Douglas to have increased by at least 3,000 to 4,000 per cent., i.e., to have multiplied 30 or 40 times. Taking the lower of the last-named figures and dividing it by the population index, you arrive at the conclusion that the average rate of consumption per head of our present population ought to be 12 times that of one hundred years ago, assuming the same time is being spent in production. Contrast this theoretical result with the situation to-day. Far from being in a position, if necessary, to knock off eleven-twelfths of our present consumption and still live as we did a century ago, it is a question whether the reduction of a mere one-tenth or even less would not finish us. Obviously, then, there is no relation between the increase of productive power and the ability to absorb more products. There is no prospect that, for instance, low-temperature carbonisation will raise the standard of life of the community. It may "restore" our industries, but it will not restore the human beings who serve them. There will be more congestion of debt-charge in factory ledgers and less digestion of product in human stomachs.

Mr. Cook and Mr. Hodges are both right and both wrong. Mr. Cook says, and rightly, "I am not going to tolerate any restriction of my clients' the miners' standard of life; in fact I am going for a better standard." But he assumes, and wrongly, that funds exist within, or can somehow be created by, the industrial system, which will make his programme practical. Mr. Hodges says, and rightly, that this assumption is fallacious. The money is not there. But he in turn assumes, and wrongly, that the mere raising of fresh finance and the use of it in increasing the efficiency of the mining industry will benefit the miners. Has not this been the very method of the last century? We have multiplied power thirty times, and are as we were. What is his reasoning? "The thirty-first time will be lucky"—is that it? If Mr. Hodges would only analyse the existing Price System he would see that the very last thing that

would benefit the miners would be to finance the mining industry, which he proposes to do. What would happen? The mining industry would borrow £10 millions. It would then spend them. The recipients of the £10 millions would be the Capital and Labour *outside* the mining industry, not inside. Inflation would now set in, prices would rise, and the miners would have to pay the increase, although their wages would not have risen, and by the time the whole £10 millions' worth of low-temperature-carbonisation plant had been delivered and installed the money would have become the property of extra-mining interests who would have used it to pay off bank-loans, over-due taxes, and a host of other arrears. Extending our vision somewhat beyond that point, we can hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the following Budget Day announcing that owing to the improved trade of the manufacturers of coal-carbonisation plant his expected revenue from income-tax had been exceeded, and that, "according to the rule governing such situations," the surplus had gone automatically to the reduction of debt. To put the matter in a few words, the £10 millions would have gone back to the credit-system and have been cancelled out of existence before the "improved" mining industry was ready to tout for its first order. The miners would have a new overhead burden of £10 millions to recover in prices, but nobody in the country would have any money to set against that sum. Now, if we were Mr. Cook, we would implore Mr. Hodges to set to work in the opposite direction. If it is the mining industry that he proposes to help, let him get *any other interest than* the mining industry to borrow and spend money on "development." In that event the colliery proprietors would benefit by receiving some of the resulting orders, and this would give Mr. Cook a chance to cut in and secure some of the new revenue for his clients. Mr. Hodges' scheme, under the existing price-system, simply means that the mining industry would "restore" the other industries by giving them £10 millions' worth of orders. It would owe £10 millions, and have no prospect of recovering it so far as the home market was concerned. And if Mr. Hodges hopes anything from foreign markets, we shall be interested to know how he, as secretary to the International Miners' Federation, is going to square matters with his non-British clients, the foreign miners. Are they going to sit down quietly while an improved British mining industry fishes for money in the territorial waters of their own markets? Or is Mr. Hodges going to advise them also to go in for low-temperature carbonisation developments as well? If so, we shall see the world's miners dancing on frozen feet.

Mr. Philip Snowden has been warning the country through the *Daily News* (not the *Daily Herald*) that the Communists "are out to 'smash' everything—the capitalist machine, Parliament, the Labour Party, the British Empire," and so on. He quotes such passages as these from their literature: "The Hendersons, Clynes, MacDonalds, and Snowdens are hopelessly reactionary, but in the interests of the revolution, the revolutionaries of the working classes must give these gentlemen certain Parliamentary support," and after a short time "the workers will be disappointed with such leaders, and will come over to Communism." Mr. Snowden assures the *Daily News* readers that the Labour Party as a whole has no sympathy with Communism, and declares that "the future of the Labour Party in this country depends upon dissociating itself completely from all sympathy with Communism." That value of a sort attaches to these opinions of Mr. Snowden's is apparent by the fact that a note at the end of his article says: "Copyright by the Universal Press Bureau, 366, Strand, W.C.2." Mr. Snowden's concern for the future of the Labour Party is evidently a revenue-producing concern for somebody

or other, but we look in vain for evidence that it is an idea-producing concern. One would have thought that, since the Communists are staking the success of their programme on their expectation that the workers will be disappointed with Labour leaders, he would have offered evidence that the expectation was ill-founded. But not a bit of it. On the contrary, he seems to admit that it is true. On this assumption his attitude is quite natural. If the Labour Party is going to fail to deliver the goods it will require a reasonable excuse. Such an excuse would be ready to hand if only the Communists would cut themselves off from the Labour Party, and formally oppose and obstruct it in the sight of the timid non-revolutionary electorate. But the Communists are too astute to play that game. "No," say they. "we are not going to stop the beggars mounting horses, in fact we'll help them into the stirrup: and then, if they ride to Hell—as they will—you workers will know whose fault it is." The proper answer to this mischievous policy is for the Labour Party to take riding lessons. But the trouble is with the horses. Mr. Snowden would manage to keep his seat very well on a nice, quiet Liberal horse (possibly that is why he is loafing round the *Daily News*' stables); but those unbroken proletarian beasts!—no; that's a stiff proposition. The situation reminds us of the episode in *Pickwick Papers* where Mr. Winkle, having got unwillingly involved in an affair of honour with Doctor Slammer, arranged with Mr. Snodgrass to act as his second—

"If I fall," said Mr. Winkle, "or if the Doctor falls, you, my dear friend, will be tried as an accessory before the fact. Shall I involve my friend in transportation—possibly for life!"

Mr. Snodgrass winced a little at this, but his heroicism was invincible. "In the cause of friendship," he fervently exclaimed, "I would brave all dangers."

How Mr. Winkle cursed his companion's devoted friendship internally . . .

"Snodgrass," he said, stopping suddenly, "do not let me be balked in this matter—do not give information to the local authorities—do not . . ."

Mr. Snodgrass seized his friend's hand warmly, as he enthusiastically replied, "Not for worlds!"

Snodgrass is poisonous feeding for humbugs. Imagine a photographer who announced that he had taken some exquisite pictures, but when asked to exhibit them said that he was sorry but he had not developed the plates yet because he could not gain access to a dark room and the necessary chemicals and equipment. Then imagine some critics of this photographer coming along and saying to the photographer's friends: "This man is a rotten photographer; you'll scream when you see his pictures; we'll back our opinion by helping him to get his dark room, and so on—and the sooner the better." What would these friends think if the photographer's reply was: "No, I don't want these critics to help me: they are only pretending to assist me: they are really trying to destroy my reputation, and their honest course would be to stop me getting into the dark room"? Would they not nudge each other, with the single thought in their minds—"After all, is not the proof of the plate in the development of it"? . . . The French word for a photographic developer is precision itself: it is *Revelateur*. . . .
* * *

Mrs. Barbara Wootton replies to her critics in the current issue of *The New Leader* (June 12). As the Editor has closed the correspondence we will make a comment or two on her reply. She says:—

I would point out that it is the root of Major Douglas's theory that "wages, salaries and dividends will not purchase total production." ("Control and Distribution of Production," p. 23.) This is because, in his view, part only of the price paid for any article goes into the hands of individuals by whom it is forthwith spent, the rest going to banks in repayment of advances and disappearing there.

("Economic Democracy," pp. 71, 72.) But this overlooks the fact that, since banks make their profits out of advancing purchasing power, they are constantly making new advances as old ones are repaid; though they do not necessarily do this, as things are, at the best possible rate.

Far from overlooking this point Major Douglas makes it part of his case. For instance, he says of the shortage in question ". . . the remainder of the Home effective demand is loan-credit" ("Economic Democracy," 2nd edition, 1921, p. 72), and the same assertion is made by him frequently enough in his later writings. But even supposing that he had overlooked this fact, how would its present announcement affect the position? If the whole community produces goods which must be priced at £100 to cover costs, and has only, say, £50 available when these goods are ready for sale, is it a satisfactory solution of the problem for the banks to lend (not give, observe) the community the £50 they are short of? Of course not. What is required is not only that the total possible output shall be purchasable by total individual incomes, but that no part of those incomes should represent new debt.

To meet this supposed perpetual shortage of purchasing power, Major Douglas would fix prices in accordance with a formula which, so long as we are adding to our capital equipment, would mean selling everything below its cost of production. Manufacturers are to be recouped for the difference between prices and costs by a special issue of Treasury Notes. ("Social Credit," p. 211.)

This means a steady increase in the issue of money. Nor can I find that any provision is made for retiring any of these notes, the volume of which would soon become portentous.

If Mrs. Wootton denies the fact that there is a shortage of purchasing power, it is, of course, easy to show that an issue of money to make it up (!) would cause a surplus. But if there be a shortage, it is difficult to show how by making it up to the required quantity you make more than the required quantity! This kind of argument is like warning us against letting air into a vacuum chamber for fear of an explosion. She cannot find that any provision is made for "retiring" (i.e., cancelling) any of this money. We presume she means that Major Douglas has not set up an *ad hoc* technique for cancelling consumer-credit as such; for she must be aware that a general provision for the cancellation of credit already exists. "Every repayment of a bank-loan destroys a deposit" says Mr. McKenna. Now in dealing with this point it is necessary to pay proper regard to what is implied by a shortage of purchasing power. (We are assuming that the fact of the shortage is granted.) The main implication is this: that taking the community as a whole it has, for instance, £50 in its own right as a body of private individuals; it has produced a quantity of goods for which it has incurred costs amounting to, say, £100 as an organised body of industrialists. Since all industrial costs have their origin in bank-advances, industry's unrecovered expenditure on production represents a debt due to the banks. Therefore this £100 is a debt due to the banks. Now in regard to the £50 which the community holds, nobody dreams of calling for a special provision for "retiring" this money when it shall have been spent on the purchase of goods. Everyone knows that it will then go back through Industry to the banks and be cancelled. Let us suppose that to happen in this case. The position would have received half the goods, as *individuals*, would have received the remaining £50 worth of unsaleable goods and would still owe £50 to the banking system. Now Major Douglas's proposal amounts in principle to creating and issuing to the community as *individuals* this further £50, not as a loan, but as a gift. Further, he makes it a condition of the gift that it shall be spent on acquiring the remaining goods. If this course is taken what is the conse-

quence? That Industry will supply the goods and collect the £50, which it will apply to the repayment of its outstanding debt to the banks, who would then cancel it just as they did the first £50. Thus Industry would now be out of debt, and the community would have had all the goods. It will, we hope, be clear that no special new technique for cancelling credit is required for the ultimate cancellation of free, as distinct from loan, credit. The free credit is ultimately applied to the cancellation of bank-debts—but with this vital physical difference, that it empties congested markets into bare homes during its journey. Now look at the matter another way. Mrs. Wootton is very anxious that there should not be a "portentous volume" of surplus money about, and appears to be satisfied that this "evil" is avoided by the present procedure of the banks, which she says is that of creating and lending new credits as fast as the old ones are cancelled. That is to say that in the case we have been considering, she would have lent £50 to the community as an industry instead of giving it to the community as individuals. That this would give her her prompt "retirement" all right we readily grant, for the bulk of the new advance would short-circuit (through inflation) back to the banks in repayment of the old debt without having caused a transfer of goods to the individuals of the community at all. Something of the process by which this would happen we have shown in our earlier Notes in connection with Mr. Hodges' mining development scheme. From the bank accountancy side the matter can be seen very clearly. Imagine that the community owes the banker £100, and that it has only £50. It makes not the slightest difference to the question of "excess of money" in circulation whether the difference of £50 is now issued as a gift or as a loan. If the gift leads to an excess in the market, so must the loan. That is to say that the effect outside the bank in either case is the same; the community will now have £100 instead of £50. The difference is in the entries in the bank's ledger. In the case of a loan, the community would now be shown as owing £150, and would possess £100. But in the case of a gift the community would be shown as still owing £100, and would possess £100. In the first case there would have been entered a new deposit reflecting a new debt; in the second, there would have been entered a new deposit without any new debt. Let it further be noted that the effect of a gift of credit could be produced in the bank's ledger without the issue of any credit at all—i.e., merely by writing off £50 from the community's original debt of £100. Remark, we are not putting any of these alternatives forward as suggestions; our purpose is to prove that it is possible to apply the principle of giving credit away without necessarily increasing the amount of credit circulating in the market. And this truth is supported by the fact that what would be given is ultimately not credit but goods. The credit, as such, would be "retired" after it had distributed the goods. This is what differentiates the scheme from that of Mrs. Wootton, which would not only "retire" the credit, but "retire" the goods as well.

In the face of this vast and growing money demand, I find it impossible to believe that universal price control could be enforced—least of all in a community organised, as the Douglas community still would be, on a profit-making basis. During the war, with a relatively insignificant increase of money, it was found possible to control the prices of certain essentials so long as their distribution was also rationed; but the new money found its outlet in a correspondingly greater inflation of the prices of other articles. Under the Douglas scheme it would be necessary to control ALL prices.

The money demand would not be vast and growing unless the goods supply were vast and growing. Besides which, if this language suggests an accumulation of surplus money, we have shown that the idea is mistaken. Major Douglas has laid down the prin-

ciple that credit shall be cancelled as and when consumption takes place. Where he differs from orthodoxy is that he takes precautions that it is not cancelled faster or sooner. Universal price control is not so difficult as partial price control. The banks now exercise the power of universal price control. Mrs. Wootton herself recognises this so fully that she has a credit-scheme of her own for stabilizing the price-level. She speaks of "enforcing" control, implying that industrialists will be unwilling to come under it. That, in its turn, implies that they will not be so prosperous within it as outside it. Again, this implies that they would necessarily be richer or poorer according as their prices were higher or lower. This is wrong. Any Government which announced and explained the Douglas policy to Industry would secure its willing co-operation, for it could offer an indefinitely expansible market in return for an agreement over conditions of price. There would be no more an enforcement of policy than is involved in the negotiation of any ordinary business contract. Is Mrs. Wootton not aware that at the present time firms are quoting for contracts at an actual loss in order to keep afloat? Does she suppose that such firms would refuse to do business offered to them because part of the bargain involved an understanding as to the basis of charging a *clear profit*—and a generous profit? Would any firm refuse? She seems to impute to men of business the psychology of the politicians with their eternal "principles." A business man is in business to make money—on certain orthodox "principles" if they pay, or on some other "principles" if they pay better without imposing risks. Tell him that he is to limit his rate of profit for the "good of the community," and he will invoke all the "principles" he can lay tongue to against you. But offer him a guarantee that if he limits his rate of profit he shall make a *larger aggregate profit* as a result, and you'll hear precious little about principles, and quite a lot about "when will you be ready to fix this little matter up so that we can make a start?" Mrs. Wootton thinks that profit-making is an obstacle to the sort of price-regulation agreement that Douglas envisages. On the contrary, it is the lever of his scheme. Profits are only an obstacle to those who wish to suppress them. Douglas wants to universalise them in the form of the super-dividend. With regard to Mrs. Wootton's point relative to the case of a partial application of the Douglas Scheme, it is true that the immediate consequence might be an inflation of prices outside the regulated industries. But the evil attributed to inflation varies with the character of the article concerned. If it is a loaf of bread, that would be bad; but if it is a wireless set—well, not so bad. We should be content to see food, clothes and houses brought into the scheme for a start. Then let the luxury trades inflate if they like; we would prophesy that as soon as the public saw what was the result of the trial in essential commodities there would be a strong political urge to get the power to compete with the outsiders. Just give Douglas a start, and just let the Co-operative Wholesale Society get a taste of what trading under Social Credit conditions means, and that society alone would put the fear of God into the luxury profiteers. It would be in their business in a month or two.

But suppose this difficulty could be overcome and the fixed prices maintained. Since the volume of money would always be in excess of the total prices of goods, what would happen to the machinery of distribution? Either the first-comers would day by day buy up all the goods immediately available for sale, leaving the rest of us to go without until production should catch up (which by hypothesis it never could), or there must be universal rationing of everything. It seems misdirected energy deliberately to create conditions which must then be counteracted by universal price control and universal rationing, and yet leave our major problems of employment and wages and industrial relations untouched.

Most of this reasoning is now ruled out. The very conditions attaching to the issue of consumer-credit ensure that the quantity of money will not exceed the price values. How can a specific issue of money to the buyer, just sufficient to enable him to meet a given price, produce an excess of money over price? As to the first-comers clearing the market, that would be an excellent argument against a change from a Douglas régime of unimpeded production back to the present system of restricted production. Seeing that there is no scramble now, with half our productive power out of use, and ten per cent. of our adult men out of work, we need not pursue the subject. As to rationing, the scientific limitation of consumption is inherent in the price-regulation factor, and that is all the rationing required.

* * *

The Federation of British Industries has sent a memorandum to the President of the Broad of Trade suggesting that a fund be allocated by the Government to run an extensive advertising campaign on a national scale for at least two years. The advertising would be mainly newspaper display, but would be supported by posters, public meetings, broadcasting, films, local shopping weeks, and even social activities, all directed to promote the use of British rather than foreign goods. Says the memorandum:—

"A public habit of this nature cannot be created by small sectional efforts, or be firmly established in a short time, and the Federation are convinced that a national campaign lasting over two or even three years is required."

The cost of the scheme is not estimated. But as the value of foreign manufactured goods imported by this country last year totalled £300 millions, the Federation think that "if only a small percentage of this amount were diverted to British producers, the relief in unemployment and the gain in revenue would far more than compensate the Government for any expenditure involved." No doubt, if it were possible to restrict imports without any adverse effect on the volume of exports. Then again, we do not like the implication that it is the Government which is to invest money in this enterprise. The Government means the taxpayer. If the Government shows a loss it can compel the community to bear it. If on the other hand there is a gain, there will be a surplus on the Budget, and it will go to the reduction of debt and not be applied to the relief of taxation. But in the nature of the case, there can be no gain to speak of. Taking into consideration the fact that in principle imports are paid for by exports, the Federation can hope nothing from its campaign for the diversion of demand from foreign to British products; it could only gain if the British consumer were hoarding instead of spending his money, that is, if he were voluntarily saving up money under conditions which allowed him to apply it to consumption when he liked. (This rules out "savings" in the form of insurance, instalments of house-purchase, and so on, which are clearly not available.) In short, the problem is how to attract more money out into the home market. Since you cannot attract money that is not there, advertising is useless. If one thing is certain, it is that consumers in general are already spending all the income they dare. Then again, at what sacrifice is the desired change of habit to be indulged in? We suppose that at equal prices it would not take much exhortation to get the man-in-the-street to prefer British-made goods. But if he is asked to pay more, he must do with less of them, and he is short enough as it is. However, we agree so far with the Federation that it is to the home market that it must look for a revival of trade, but we think it will agree with us that a revival measured by only a small percentage of £300 millions (even if there were nothing to offset it) would be a meagre contribution to the problem before it. Now what a good thing it

could make of this advertising scheme if in each newspaper announcement there were to be printed a coupon entitling the holder to a 20 per cent. discount from the prices of goods bearing a mark denoting that they were British. Think of what a jump of 25 per cent. in the present demand on British goods would mean—let alone any new demand diverted from the foreigner—if the sellers got the discount made up to them by periodic issues of free credit by the Treasury. This suggestion is probably a little premature, and we really only hazard it, but all the same we do seriously say that the Federation ought to take an early opportunity of "putting a case" of this sort to the financial authorities. That is to say, to ask them to submit a closely-reasoned opinion on what would be the effect of a free grant of credit in this way, basing their view on the supposition that the Federation were agreeable to advise all its members to co-operate in any pricing scheme which would ensure an equitable division of the benefit as between themselves and the consumer.

* * *

Students of foreign affairs would do well to refer to our two articles of a year ago (THE NEW AGE, of May 29 and June 5, 1924), entitled "Loans and War Risks." These articles were a review of Dr. Feng-Hua Huang's "Public Debts in China," in which he indicted the foreign Powers in respect of their financial intrigues in, and impositions on, China. In view of recent events in Shanghai and Canton, the facts quoted in our articles take on a vivid significance. Not the least interesting circumstance about Dr. Huang's book is the fact that it was edited by the Faculty of Political Science of the Columbia University, and forms one of a series of "Studies" issued under the auspices of that University. The propriety of this American University's sponsorship of his thesis is apparent, for although the American Government took its share of the plunder in the earlier stages of the negotiations under the Six-Power Pact which he describes, his account of America's dramatic renunciation of participation in the Loan that was eventually forced on China in April, 1913, goes to create the conviction that the American Codlin is the friend of the Chinese, not the European Shorts. "The United States Government have no intention of preventing the free development of the great Chinese nation," declared President Wilson at the time, and among his reasons he referred to some of the proposed conditions of the Loan then being contemplated, particularly that which requested China to submit to supervision of her international finances by foreign supervisors, on which he stated:—

"The present Administration regards this as touching the independence of China . . . Moreover, the responsibility attaching to such a request, in case of eventualities, might lead to the necessity for forcible interference, not only in the financial, but also in the political affairs of China. Such is contrary to American national principles . . . In short, our interests in China lie in the open door, with the object of cultivating friendship and mutual benefit."

Commenting on the effect of this declaration, Dr. Huang wrote: "Whatever advantage the United States might have lost for the time being through her voluntary withdrawal from the consortium was more than compensated by China's growing confidence in this country (America)." This and other items in Dr. Huang's book are sufficient of themselves to explain the present phenomenon of the Chinese rioters' marked discrimination against Britain and Japan, interests; and we can be quite sure that this propaganda has been sown judiciously in the Far East. How far the Bolsheviks are responsible, as alleged by the Press, for promoting the disturbances we cannot know, but to the extent to which they are responsible they must also be responsible for this anti-British, anti-Japanese, and (shall we say?) pro-

American policy of the revolutionary movement. And, in connection with this implied hint of a Washington-Moscow exchange of nods (to put it no higher) one recalls the incident of the shipment of leaders from the New York ghettos to Russia just in time to take charge of the final revolutionary coup which raised Lenin to power. Since all the things recounted by Dr. Huang, we have had the Great War, and we have seen those European nations (chiefly Britain, France, and Germany) whose financial impositions on China he indicted so strongly, fall themselves under the financial domination of Wall Street. In fact, as China was to Europe, so Europe is now to the United States. Not only do we see local obstacles being put in the way of our (European) enforcement of old loan-contracts with China, but we see an external limitation put upon our freedom to indulge in new loan-contracts anywhere. Even as we write we have in front of us an issue of the *Daily Mail*, in which on one page we are told "Chinese Attack British Police"—"Japanese Sailors to the Rescue"—"Legations Ablaze" (a British Legation is the only one mentioned), and on another we see an article by Mr. J. M. Kenworthy, M.P., headed "Our Foreign Loans Embargo"—"To Oblige Wall Street," in the course of which he says:—

"Any bank, financial house, insurance company, or big investor wishing to grant finance or financial facilities or credits or loans abroad gets an intimation that really amounts to a warning from the Bank of England. And so great is the power of the Bank of England that these warnings are usually heeded. Apparently the reason why this embargo is still in operation is that there is a fear that we will be drained of the gold accumulated in London."

Wall Street—Moscow—anti-British and anti-Japanese risings in China. Wall Street—Gold Standard—Bank of England—prohibition of foreign British loans. Wall Street—California—Exclusion of Japanese Immigrants. Wall Street—Hawaii—American Naval Demonstration against Japan. Wall Street—Washington—the enforced cancellation of the old Anglo-Japanese alliance (at least in its formal aspect; in all essentials the alliance persists). Meanwhile, if we are to believe Sir Joynson Hicks, Moscow is financing Communist plots against the integrity of our industrial system. Again, Moscow has renewed for another twenty years the concession granted to the American Harriman Combine for the exploitation of the manganese mines at Chatura in Georgia. Lastly, "The Rubber Association of America has declared war against the British Rubber 'Monopoly,'" is the opening sentence of a report from New York. This is enough for a single morning's news. These things, are they not, are they not, ginnings of a catastrophe? These, are they not, are the *propaganda* that will force the Social Credit issue as no amount of reasoned argument will? Who is the British statesman from whom we shall suddenly hear the announcement that this country has renounced participation in the international scramble for external markets? When is the British Government going to dazzle, appease, and deliver the world from the body of this death by discovering and annexing the population of Great Britain? The time is short, but no doubt God will hold His hand if there is but one intelligent ruler alive in the land.

"THE CREDIT SYSTEM."

The whole world is carried on on the Credit System; if everyone were to demand payment in hard cash, there would be universal bankruptcy. We think as we do mainly because other people think so. But if everyone stands on everyone else, what does the bottom man stand on? Faith is no foundation, for it rests in the end on reason. Reason is no foundation, for it rests upon faith. [Samuel Butler's Note-Books, p. 328.]

Women's Movements in Ancient Greece.

By C. C. Polhill.

In no point is the contrast more marked between modern life and that of the great ancient civilisations than in their respective attitude to women. In this contrast between modern Anglo-Saxon feminism and ancient Greek masculinity, the advantage is far and away with the latter. It is saner, juster, and truer to nature. Feminism is the logical outcome of men's attitude to women during the last century, and in the present day. If the bulk of writers for fifty or a hundred years past are right, in their idealisation of the sex, then all that the men can do is to leave Parliament, the Law Courts, and all the administration of the country in feminine hands and retire as graciously as possible. Before such perfection this is the only course. But if these gentlemen are not right, and reverence for woman, as reflected in popular novels, is merely the result of morbid sentimentality, which in its turn is dependent on certain physical tendencies, then it is high time to consign it to the limbo of false ideals.

We wonder how many are aware that the Feminist position has been admirably anticipated and portrayed in at least three Greek plays, the "Lysistrata," the "Thesmophoriazusa," and the "Ecclesiazusa" of Aristophanes. They are burlesques it is true, but the difference between Greek sentiment and our own is seen to advantage when we realise that a situation which in our days seems ready to take place as sober fact, was treated in Athens as so wild, so fantastic, so ludicrous a situation that it only figured on the stage, and in a comedy at that.

Yet on the other hand the very existence of these plays is a sufficient indication that ideas of women's "emancipation" were abroad. Aristophanes could not have ridiculed ideas which had no existence in fact. And we can gather from other and more sober sources that such movements actually were on foot. But the comic poet in these pieces gives life and colour to what would otherwise be but faint hints to us. They are an exaggeration, but an exaggeration truer than a dry disquisition would be. In the light of the present they appear to be also prophetic. Woman as the saviour, as the only one who can possibly put things right after men have bungled them so badly, that is the notion "Lysistrata" stands for so uncompromisingly in the mocking farce of Aristophanes. Yet that very notion is supposed to be so distinctively modern.

Furthermore, regard should be had to the time when this play was produced. It was at the beginning of 411 B.C., shortly after the Athenian fleet had been destroyed off Syracuse. It was the very moment of the decline of Athenian power, when her empire was crumbling away from her. Such a period is always signalled by an advance of the women. The same phenomenon might be observed in the decay of the Roman Empire, and of the Byzantine Empire, and the British Empire at the present time—but the less said about that the better. Still, things did not come to such a point then as they have now come to with us. Women have at last entered Parliament and the Ministry. Feminism never developed as far as this in ancient Athens—except on the stage.

It is our purpose in the present article to give some extracts from the "Lysistrata." These extracts may be more easily intelligible to the reader if we first give a brief summary of the plot.

The women have decided to take matters into their own hands and put an end to the senseless wars that are rending Greece in twain. To attain this object they all vow to abstain from intercourse with their

husbands till the men agree to make peace. Lysistrata, the originator of the scheme, initiates this plan at Athens, while Lampito, a Lacedaemonian woman, undertakes to carry through the same methods with the help of the women of Sparta. Meanwhile, at Athens, in accordance with Lysistrata's plans, a party of women has seized the Acropolis (the impregnable citadel which commanded the city, and which, besides being the religious centre of Athens, contained the treasury). The great doors of the propylaea are bolted, and the men are excluded. The women are thus in control of the public funds and can prevent the men from using them for war purposes. In the end the men, tired of being debarred from all access to their wives, agree to make peace, and all ends in the utmost friendliness and goodwill.

Now for the play itself.

Lysistrata has summoned the women to meet her. After she has waited impatiently for some time, her friend Calonice puts in a tardy appearance. To her first she proceeds to explain her scheme.

Lys.: If the women come together here, those from Boeotia and from the Peloponnese and ourselves, together we will save Greece.

Cal.: What could the women do that is wise or glorious, we who sit all painted, clothed in saffron frocks, with powdered faces, wearing Cimbric robes and dainty slippers?

Lys.: It is these very things that I look to, to save Greece, the saffron frocks and the perfumes and the shoes, and the rouge, and the transparent robes.

Cal.: In what way, pray?

Lys.: So that none of the men of our day shall lift up spear against the other.

Cal.: Then by the two gods I will dye my robe saffron.

Lys.: Nor take up shield—

Cal.: I will put on a Cimbric garment.

Lys.: Nor dagger—

Cal.: I will buy some dainty slippers.

Lys.: Then ought not the women to have been here?

Cal.: No, by Heaven, they ought to have flown here long ago.

At length a few women appear in the distance. On their arrival, one of them named Myrrhine, addresses Lysistrata.

Myr.: Are we late, Lysistrata? What do you say? Why are you silent?

Lys.: I do not praise you, Myrrhine, coming late for such an important matter.

Myr.: I could hardly find my girdle in the dark. But if there is something so pressing, tell it to us now we are here.

Lysistrata however thinks it is better to wait. She is expecting women from the other States of Greece. At length Lampito, a Lacedaemonian woman arrives on the scene.

Lys.: O dearest Spartan, hail, Lampito. How brightly shows your beauty, sweetest! What a complexion you have, and how robust your figure!

Lam.: I think so, by the two gods. I do gymnastics and kick my heels up to my thighs.

This is an allusion to the Spartan custom whereby the women took part in gymnastic exercises like the men. . . . Meanwhile other women arrive from Boeotia and Corinth and other States of Greece. Finally Lampito, unable to restrain her curiosity any longer, breaks out with the question—

Lam.: Who, then, has assembled this army of women?

Lys.: I myself.

Lam.: Say what you will to us.

Cal.: Ah, do, dear lady.

Myr.: Tell us this weighty matter that is on your mind.

Lys.: I would do so at once, but before I speak, I will ask you this one little question.

Myr.: Whatever you wish.

Lys.: Do you not long for your children's fathers, away on military service? For I know that every one of you has a man absent. My husband, at all events, has been away, ing Eurates.

Cal.: And mine seven whole months in Pylos.

Lam.: And mine, if he comes from the ranks, has only time to seize his shield and is flown away and gone.

Lys.: Are you willing, if I find a means, to join with me in ending the war?

Myr.: By the two gods, I, if it were necessary, would take off this frock and sell it this very day.

Cal.: And I would slit myself in two like a turbot, and give away the half.

Lys.: I will tell you, then, for the matter must not be

hidden. We, O women, if we are to force the men to make peace, must abstain—

Cal.: From what? Say.

Lys.: Will you do it, then

Cal.: We will do it, even if we must die for it.

Lysistrata then declares her daring plan. It is that all the women must abstain from their husbands' beds until such time as they are prepared to make peace. The effect of this communication on the women is ludicrous. Without a word they all turn round and proceed to walk away.

Lys.: Why do you turn away? Where are you going? You here. Why do you purse your lips and nod your heads? Will you do it or will you not? What is your intention?

Myr.: I would not do it; let the war drag on.

Cal.: Nor I, by Heaven; let the war drag on.

Lys.: You say this, you turbot? And yet but a moment ago you said you would slit yourself in half.

Cal.: Well, well, what you wish. If I must, I am willing to go through fire. That is better than what you ask. It is not possible, O dear Lysistrata.

Lys.: And what about you?

Myr.: And I am willing to go through fire.

Lys.: Oh how dastardly is all our race.

In a last effort of despair Lysistrata appeals to Lampito.

Lys.: But, dear Spartan friend, if you alone go with me, we will still put the matter right. Vote with me.

Lam.: It is a difficult thing, by the two gods, that you ask. But yet—for we badly need peace.

Lys.: O dearest, the only woman among all these.

The other women, after hesitating a little, finally follow Lampito's example. They then proceed to take an oath. Instead of the blood of a sacrificial animal, they swear fidelity over a bowl of wine, and finish with the words, "If I prove untrue, may the bowl be filled with water." After this, Lysistrata and her comrades withdraw to the Acropolis, which has already been seized by a party of women. The authorities become alarmed, and a magistrate, with police, arrives on the scene. He orders Lysistrata under arrest, and he has to abandon the attempt. Finally he tries reason. There follows an amusing duel between the magistrate and Lysistrata. The magistrate asks what the women's object is in seizing the acropolis.

Lys.: To keep the money safe, so that you may not use it for fighting.

Mag.: Why? Do we fight with money?

Lys.: Yes, and everything else is in confusion.

Mag.: But what will you do with it?

Lys.: Do you ask me this? We will manage it for you.

Mag.: You will manage the money?

Lys.: Why do you think this strange? Do we not manage the money at home for you altogether?

Mag.: But it is not the same thing.

Lys.: Why not the same thing?

Mag.: We need this for fighting.

Lys.: But, in the first place, there must be no fighting.

Mag.: But how shall we be saved without it?

Lys.: We will save you.

Mag.: You?

Lys.: Yes, we.

Mag.: A shameful thing indeed.

Lys.: So that you shall be saved, even if you do not wish it.

Mag.: It is a nice thing you are saying.

Lys.: You do not like it, but it must be done none the less.

Mag.: By Demeter, it is a crime.

Lys.: You must be saved, my good man.

Mag.: And if I do not want it?

Lys.: For that reason all the more so.

What we have given will serve as a fair sample of the play. In the end the men starved of conjugal affection are ready to come to terms. Envoys come from Sparta in hot haste. The desperation of all the men to arrive at an agreement is ridiculous. Aristophanes is here making fun of one of the most fundamental instincts of human nature, yet he cleverly works into the play all the lessons he intends to convey. While ridiculing the women, he puts into the mouth of Lysistrata sage words about the folly of fratricidal wars that were devastating Greece, and that, in spite of the common kinship of the Greeks and their past services to one another in time of need, finally peace is proclaimed. The Athenians entertain their Spartan guests to a banquet, and find that they are not such bad fellows after all. The men and women are reconciled, and the whole piece ends with songs and dances by the Athenian and Spartan choruses.

"The Little Review."

By C. M. Grieve.

The spring issue of *The Little Review* is a tonic to a Britisher not consoled by the existence of *The Criterion*, and still less by the launching of *The Calendar of Modern Letters* (despite Mr. Muir's excellent series of articles therein) in the present plight of British literary and artistic journalism, and, indeed, driven to such a pass that he must needs hope that even *The Adelphi* will yet surmount the difficulties by which it is beset, and *Apollo* not get any worse. That is the state of affairs. Fortunately America comes to the rescue. I always look forward to *The Dial*; it is infinitely better than anything we have to offer in return; but it is unfortunately curate's eggish. *The Little Review*, however, is engrossing from cover to cover; sans longueurs.

The current number contains a short story by Jean Toomer, whose work I have previously referred to in these columns, and another by W. C. G. Jitro, in which the spirit and experiences of a family on holiday are realised with extraordinary economy and restraint of statement. Mr. Jitro has the art of saying at least ten times as much as he puts into words. By this I do not mean that he leaves things to the imagination of his readers. He doesn't. "Holiday" is certainly one of the finest prose studies that have yet come out of America. It is interesting to compare it with a passage from Sinclair Lewis. The difference is the difference between Wellsian reporting with American localisation, and that stylistic *je ne sais quoi* that lifts a bit of writing sheerly out of the ruck of journalism even at its best.

The acrid wit of Maxwell Bodenheim's verse has already penetrated across the Atlantic without any loss of pungency. He is represented here by two typical poems. Carl Rakosi, a Hungarian, living in New York, has three pieces, of which "Sittingroom by Patinka," is by far the best, with its ending:—

"Their white feet were an exhalation of the lovely sin of Death, for they were bawds."

Louis Grudin's work will be remembered by readers of "Broom." He has gained power greatly in the interval, and has here three excellent poems, the second of which "Since He Must Burn" should certainly find a place in any anthology of the best fifty poems America has produced during the past year— or two years.

The number is strong on the art side with reproduction of the sculpture of O. Zadkine, the young Russian sculptor whose wood carvings "The Accordion Player" and "The Prophet" are certainly sarcasm raised to the Nth; paintings by Eugene MacGown, to whose work as a "peintre ingenu" Rene Crevel devotes an interesting note, Cedric Morris, Lett Haines, Man Ray, and Louis Lazovick, who also contributes a Memorial Exhibition article on the art of Dorothea Dreier who, he says, "has written one of the first chapters in the new and original book on modern art, in which the younger American artists will register what in the terminology of Spengler might be called *Die Raum-symbolik der amerikanischen Kulturseele*."

Readers of my recent articles on "The Third Factor" may be interested in the editorial article on the Machine-Age Exposition organised by *The Little Review* for this autumn. "Utility" it is claimed,

"does not exclude the presence of beauty. On the contrary, a machine is not entirely efficient without the element of beauty. Utility and efficiency must take into account the whole man. Let us take one of the simplest and most obvious examples, the Ford car. It is a byword for utility and efficiency, to the unthinking. Yet the thousands of jokes at its expense, the endless jeering about the part of the millions of owners, who also brag about its efficiency, is the evidence against it. The lack of rhythmic balance in its organisation, its stupid, sterile, vertical lines, frustrate all consciousness of horizontal motion and velocity. It is justly considered a freak."

* See Rogers' translation. Bell and Sons, 1911.

Again:—

"Those who see in the machine nothing but a menace or a utility are simply those people who never see anything at any time."

N. Granovsky, the Russian constructivist living in Paris, who made the decor for Tzara's "Cœur a Gaz" deals with the same issue in a note on "Æsthetics and Utility," where he remarks:—

"The automobile 'Bugatic,' with the proportion of its parts and the combination of its materials, may serve also as a fine example of plastic art. The rhythmic balance in the co-ordination of its parts induces a keener consciousness of velocity and motion than its actual speed of 125 kilometres per hour. Our sight, gradually accustomed to environmental factors, is sensitive not only to the practical side of things, but to the æsthetic play of their component elements as well. To satisfy these normal needs, to develop them, is the aim of the artist-creator. To enrich the æsthetic experience, to make it more varied, to bring it into close contact with life—that is his problem."

Of outstanding interest is Theo Van Doesburg's account of the literature of the advance guard in Holland. It is time something was beginning to be heard in Britain of Doesburg himself, and of Piet Mondriaan, Anthony Kok, A. H. Feis, I. K. Bouset, and others of the "De Stijl" group. So far as the British reading public is concerned few who know anything about modern Dutch literature have heard of anything more recent than the sonnets of Jacques Perk, or the work of Adema van Scheltema, Henrietta Roland Holst, or, at best, Albert Verwey, though readers of THE NEW AGE are, of course, au fait with Multatuli and, most of them probably, Lodewyk van Deysse. These last two were the chief figures in the movement of the "80," as it is called. "But remember," says Doesburg, "that this movement which created an organ, *De Nieuwe Gids* in 1885, defended a tendency which had already lapsed in France: naturalism in prose; lyric sentimentalism in poetry—*De Nieuwe Gids* is now the most conservative organ in the literary world." The contemporary movement did not find a real rallying-point until the establishment of "De Stijl" in 1917, and since then the forward movement in Holland has rapidly gained strength, and has certainly now reached a point at which it deserves the attention of British readers—and the support of those elements in this country who recognise the terrific deadweight of pretentious and rigorous conservatism against which it is struggling in so lively a fashion.

The same writer also deals at length with the evolution of modern architecture in Holland, particularly with the work of Van t'Hoff, J. J. Poud, Jan Wils, Rietveld, Van Eesteren and others, which certainly justifies all that Doesburg claims for the "De Stijl" movement on this side of its work. The article is one of the most lucid and detailed statements of new architectural methods and ideals I have yet come across, and I cordially commend it to every reader interested in the subject. Young Holland has in certain directions unquestionably a great deal to teach Young Britain.

PLANS.

Since I can build my Love no tower
To be her beauty's fitting house,
Shall I not weave a roof of thatch
In Spring beneath the shining boughs,
And lead her sweetly to that place
Some unimaginable eve,
Some night when all the million stars
Burn over-brightly to believe,
And say: "O Sweet! O dearest Sweet!
This little dwelling I have made
Where one who cared might enter in
And stay secure and unafraid!"
Shall I not tell her this, and then
Go in and close our eager door,
And hold the Loveliest of all
In happy thrall for evermore!

A. NEWBERRY CROYCE.

A Diversity of Deans.

By "Old and Crusted."

... the most particular thing in the company was a large, round-faced man, with a wig, that was a dignitary in some great Episcopalian church in London, who was extraordinary condescending towards me, drinking wine with me at the table, and saying weighty sentences in a fine style of language, about the becoming grace of simplicity and innocence of heart, in the clergy of all denominations of Christians, which I was pleased to hear; for really he had a proud red countenance, and I could not have thought he was so mortified to humility within, had I not heard with what sincerity he delivered himself. . . . One day soon after, as I was sitting in my closet conning a sermon for the next Sunday, I was surprised by a visit from the dean, as the dignitary was called.

("Annals of The Parish." John Galt.)

"I du believe in prayer an' praise
To him that hez the grantin'
O' jobs,—in every thin' that pays,
But most of all in cantin':
This doth my cup with marcies fill,
This lays all thought o' sin to rest,—
I don't believe in princerples,
But oh, I du in interest."

("The Biglow Papers.")

The external aspect of Deans has changed somewhat since Ann. Dom. 1773, when the Rev. Mr. Balwhidder entertained the Episcopalian dignitary in his manse at Dalmailing; where they dined off a goose, "a boss bird," and a roasted pig with an apple in its mouth, washed down with "London wine," supplied from Lord Eglesham's cellar. Good, sturdy, Tory fare that! The description certainly does not apply to "our Dean," although he has one thing in common with the "large round-faced" one, and that is a faculty for "saying weighty sentences in a fine style of language," a gift no doubt highly appreciated by the citizens of the Great Republic, where the Very Rev. W. R. Inge has been enjoying for three weeks that American hospitality which he describes as "a thing apart—more lavish, generous, and delicate than can be found in any other country in the world." Evidently Deans are evocative of good entertainment whether it be proffered in an Ayrshire village or New York. In fact, I would be delighted to have his gaiters under my mahogany, and could promise him more euppeptic fare than a conjuncture of roast goose and pork—and perhaps a glass of something

"that has been

Cool'd a long age in the deep-delved earth,"

more to his taste and better for his digestion than the iced water of "Prohibitia."

Now that the Very Rev. wanderer is home again, there will be considerable curiosity to learn whether he has any novel criticisms to offer on men and manners in America. Well, we have them, and very promptly, too. Three articles in the *Morning Post* that will be read with deep interest on both sides of the Atlantic, but—as far as I am concerned—they leave me with the impression that on more than one important point this very acute observer has kept his thoughts to himself. Of course, there is the usual reference to "unexampled prosperity," supported, as it happens, in the *Spectator* for May 23, by Mr. Arthur W. Page, editor of the *American World's Work*, who, quoting Professor Carver, of Harvard, says:—

"The general economic policies of this country come more nearly to conforming to a sound economic program than do those of any other government on the face of the earth. That is why we are achieving so much more in the way of prosperity for all classes than any other country is achieving."

Quite so; but there are others, and no mean judges either, who are not so convinced of the soundness of that "economic program," and who would also join issue with the Dean on his assertion:—

"My confidence in the stability of Western Civilisation was greatly increased by what I saw and heard in America. The social structure in that country seems to be impregnable."

Is America's "economic program" so very different from that of Germany in 1914? and is her policy less fraught with danger to the liberty of Europe, or less likely to jeopardise the stability of Western Civilisation? The attempt to secure the hegemony of Europe by military power very nearly succeeded, but met with disaster in the

end; so may the more subtle scheme, of attaining a similar supremacy by financial means, meet with a similar fate. Now the Dean is far too keen a student of social phenomena, far too experienced in the things of this world, not to appreciate the prominent part played by finance in the vaunted "prosperity" of America. I am sure he knows a German-Jew banker when he sees him—be he never so cleverly disguised in horn-spectacles and a nasal drawl—and has about as much use for this pestilent hybrid as any other sound Tory. Then why this reticence? I give it up.

No, this much-flaunted prosperity cannot be taken at its face value. There is a discount to come off. This puritan-profitteer paradise, with its Teuto-Hebraic guardian angels, its Ku Klux Klan on the one side and its Hibernian Catholicism on the other, is just as likely to go up in smoke and flame as go on prospering. Here is a sample, quoted from one of the Dean's articles, as evidence that such a calamity is possible:—

"Protestantism—we would draw and quarter it—we would impale it and hang it up for crows to eat; we would tear it with pincers and fire it with hot irons; we would fill it with molten lead and sink it in a hundred fathoms of hellfire."

Not much "grace of simplicity" or "innocence of heart" about that!

The "sound economic program" may end in a pogrom of financiers if Europe revolts—or files her petition—and Warburg and Co. are faced with the unpleasant duty of lecturing a disillusioned people that they are unable to collect the tribute which is the basis of their chimerical prosperity because their late allies refuse to pay in interest already signs of unrest. Sir Esmé Howard, speaking at the banquet of the American Iron and Steel Institute, gave the prosperous gentlemen there assembled to understand that unless they offered better facilities for doing business with them, neither we nor the rest of Europe would be able to pay our debts. And if in response to such an appeal the tariff-wall were lowered—which is very unlikely—would it mean increased competition in world-markets, and more wars, or only an unemployment question in America, and a slump in automobiles?

The root of the matter is simply this. America had her chance, but could not rise to the occasion. In 1918 there was given to her such an opportunity of service in the common cause as has never been offered to any other people at any time in the world's history; but the lust of gain was too strong, the financial "pull" too great, so, in her own picturesque slang, she "quitted"—and chose "prosperity." Well, she has it, but it may turn out to be but a spurious article—and a bad investment in the long run. It pays "to play the game" sometimes.

Music.

An individual who signs himself Coe, in "La Revue Musicale" for the current month—a typical specimen of the tribe whose imbecilities were inflicted on us to vomiting point during the war, and afterwards—endeavours to conceal his fury and rage over Mr. Cecil Gray's admirable "Survey of Contemporary Music," which I received at length here some time ago, under a display of mockery and irony. All the "lieux communs du petit bourgeois musicien" we are told are to be found in the work, the author of which, we are further informed, "se croit Ravachol et n'est que Homais." The obvious retort is that in the remarks of Monsieur Coe—are to be found all the "lieux communs" of those who think themselves the beau monde and bon-ton of music, and who are actually only the sense of proportion (we will say nothing of his critical sense) is to be found in his expression of astonishment that the name of Gabriel Fauré is not mentioned in a book devoted to such as Strauss, Delius, Elgar, Schönberg, Bartok, Busoni, and van Dieren, which is analogous to expressing surprise that in a book devoted, let us say, to such as d'Annunzio, Mallarmé, and Huysmans, no mention were made of Rupert Brooke or Mr. Compton Mackenzie.

The people who know nothing whatever about music have been singularly busy lately giving their opinions about it. Thus Lord Birkenhead has been making some remarks that can almost take their place beside that marvellous utterance of a judge in one of the Beecham bankruptcy hearings, who when Sir Thomas's solicitor remarked on the enormous fortune this superb musician and fine artist had lavished upon the furtherance of music in this country, remarked, "What is the good of that?" The latest of the egregious

tribe to disport themselves, but by no means the least egregious, is Margot, Countess of Oxford and Asquith, who emerges with the jewel of an observation that "Italian music is insultingly obvious and has no argument whatever." At least let us be thankful that the music of the land that has produced Gesualdo, Palestrina, Frescobaldi, the two Scarlattis, Porpora, Donizetti, Bellini, and Verdi is not so bad as to have incurred Margot Countess of Oxford and Asquith's approval.

With the exception of Arthur Schuab's two recitals, at which I was most unfortunately prevented from being present, little of any importance has been going on. Of the minor pianists, Ivan Phillipowsky has easily been the best—there is personal force, vitality, and intelligence behind his playing. There have been the usual swarm of colourless, insignificant nonentities, some of whom are quite clever in a glib, slick sort of way at playing the notes of the music in their programmes, and, of course, none who were or ever will be able to play the music itself.

The Don Cossack Choir have given some curious and entertaining exhibitions of trick singing, reproduction of bassoon arpeggi, pedal points, frizzicati, and so on. Of their powers as singers of genuine choral music one had no opportunity of judging, for the works they sing are evidently chosen just as a vehicle for exhibiting their stock effects, which are amusing for five minutes, boring for ten, and after that just maddeningly irritating. With music it all had no connection whatever. One cannot withhold from them a tribute to their precision, their unanimity, and their mastery of their particular method of vocal jugglery, but choral singing it is not. The tenors are at times agonising to listen to, and the basses only average, except for one or two very fine voices, who are occasionally allowed solos. A little of their vitality and fire would be welcome to liven up the dull, dreary stodge that is the usual English choir, as well as their precision and discipline—things at which the English shy in music, preferring a well-meaning muddle, as in other departments of their activities.

KAIKHOSRU SORABJI.

Reviews.

Outlines of a Philosophy of Art. R. G. Collingwood. (Oxford University Press: Humphrey Milford. 2s. 6d. net.)

The Economic Laws of Art Production. Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith, G.C.B. (Chairman of the British Institute of Industrial Art). (Oxford University Press: Humphrey Milford. 6s. net.)

Writings on "æsthetics" or "economics" of art are attempts to catch in a verbal net the uncatchable; to recover the drowned moon from the well with a pitchfork!—for art, "useful" or "fine," cannot be adequately defined, cannot, without grave error, be isolated in an "economic" or "philosophic" framework of words, because the scientific method will no more fit it than it will religion. Art in its nature is illogical; above or below reason (the domain of the scientific method); and in creation, above or below consciousness (the intellectual concept). Probably below, for art appears to be the foundation and primary of all other activities; so that the evolving of a "philosophy" or "economic laws of art" should be appraised according to their own canon. But we live in a complex world of realities in which philosophies and systems of economy must answer to other tests to be serviceable. "Outlines of a Philosophy of Art" aims at stating a general conception of art and the developing of its consequences. "It is the view that art is at bottom neither more nor less than imagination" and an attempt "to develop the conception itself in such a way as to lay bare the implications contained in it." No claim to novelty in the general conception stated is made, but the book seems to fulfil its purpose and title. For novelty, however, let us turn to the second book on our list. In the preface to "The Economic Laws of Art Production," the author tells us that this book came to be written because it was discovered that there was no existing text-book which covered, even approximately, the subject-matter of the syllabus entitled *Art in Relation to Commerce*, included by the University of London in their scheme of studies for the Bachelor of Commerce degree. Well!—here is a good beginning in the output of such text-books—a meritorious effort covering much ground and suggestive of many direc-

tions for study, at least for its avowed purpose as aid to embryo Bachelors of Commerce! But really—after allowing for the meritorious achievement of the work—will such studies produce much else than sterile bachelors?—And art is creation! Are old maids the most useful students of maternity? The object of this book is "to apply the methods of economic science to the discovery and exploration of the special laws and tendencies which affect the production and distribution of material objects, in so far as they fall within the category of works of art." But these orthodox methods of scientific inquiry are apt to prove a "jigsaw" puzzle, without some of the necessary pieces of it to fit together every logical limitation making great gaps in the design. The author confesses that the very term "economic" is used in the widest sense, to cover many phenomena which are perhaps more usually called "sociological," which is all to the good; but a still wider treatment must be found if inquiry is to be "fruitful" in "positive results," i.e., a treatment which takes cognisance of "Utopian" solutions of "economic" error, for example. The laws and tendencies which affect favourably the production and distribution of works of useful art are such as ensure a condition of adequate leisure for the artists; conditions of life such as allow them access to at least the necessary minimum of food, shelter, raiment, and the materials of their crafts; the means of calling their fellows' attention to their products (which produce the public culture in art), and the distribution of their products depends upon the effective powers for their acquisition in the control of their public. Granted these conditions in even moderate degree, a high level of art culture is inevitable, for it cannot seriously be maintained that our people are lacking in ability or the appreciation of ability—as the promise to be found amongst our contemporary students or the history of our past proves. But neither "economic" enquiry nor "education," as understood in our Universities—as gathered from books—can have much effect in fostering or spreading ability in the useful arts. A working definition of the economic characteristics of a work of art is attempted under five headings. Let us glance at the first three. (The fourth, "Unity," and the fifth, "Beauty," would carry us further than our space will allow at present.) Here is the substance of the first three: Of a work of art, I. It must be a work of human labour. II. It must have utility, and a utility involving "two important differences from the pure Jevonian doctrine applicable to commodities in general; (a) emphasising the element of quality of fulfilment of function, and (b) implying a doctrine of "ends" as well as "means." That is, "utility as an element in a work of art is a function of two variables; (a) the degree of perfection of the adaptation of 'means' to 'ends,' and (b) the degree of nobility of ends sought." III. It must have "congruity"—that is to say, it must loyally conform to the limiting conditions imposed by the materials and other technical conditions of its production. Now this law of "congruity" in works of art must cover also the limiting conditions of the choice of materials and technical means suitable to the production of the work of art in conformity with the "element of quality of fulfilment of function" irrespective of economic cost—a condition of technical fitness which is anti-pathetic to economic fitness, for in balancing technical utility with social utility, economic fitness does not enhance the art-content, but only enhances utility in a Jevonian sense. It is a technical application of the law of "congruity" which precludes the mass production of many types of useful art works by the machine, because they (some) must be works of human labour; and is in conflict with any real law of minimum economic cost, for "the prime condition, 'other things being equal' . . . so easy to stipulate," is impossible in practice to ensure. The question of economic cost in the useful arts is bound up with the modern question of machine mass production, and the answer to that question is simply this: That when the measurements of economic cost are effected by a ratio, based on potential achievement in production, the machine must be used when it is the best possible tool for the craftsman in his purpose of producing a product which shall have the best possible

"quality of fulfilment of function"—as, for example, in some products of the instrument and engineering trades, when mathematical accuracy is an important factor, or for the lightening of toil in necessary bulk production of the necessities to the mass of life, but for no such purpose as controls production to-day, i.e., the mere saving of cost at the expense of quality for purposes of private profit at the expense of the community. When such realistic questions come to be considered as the "central difficulty of the problem, the weakening of the links between the source of artistic inspiration and the actual work of production, and the consequent decay of their power of mutual reaction," it is disappointing to read that "a synthesis between design and industry which presupposes similar (to the middleman's) financial strength on the part of the design-organisation is so far beyond the range of practical politics that a solution of the problem on this basis does not require serious consideration." It is disappointing because the author, "putting aside Utopian solutions, which imply a reversion to handicraft industry or the control of manufacture by Guilds of Design" also puts aside by omission another solution, doubtless "Utopian," but one which is demanding increasing attention—the solution offered by an adequate purchasing power spread amongst all classes, giving effective demand for all possible production and eliminating private usury as a controlling factor. "What we require is a scheme of national economy which shall be ideal or serviceable to us," says Professor Lethaby, and the "art" impulse of middlemen concerned in "profits" in competition with other "profiteers" in an artificially restricted market is not likely to be serviceable. For in the production of the useful arts, there are really only two legitimate voices which should be heard—the designer-producer's and the consumer's. In such a "Utopian" society as readers of THE NEW AGE must be able to conceive, a society with a sane financial system; with purchasing power freely circulated amongst all classes up to the actual total of productive output demanded, the consumer will inevitably have a larger share in deciding the quality or art-content necessary to his demands. A keener competition in quality will be abroad when the sabotage of art work, by financial restriction; by the refusal of life, as craftsmen, to most of our fine craftsmen; by the denial of a stall in the great market for the exposing of art wares is no longer possible amongst a free people any more than it was possible when the people were free, and, being free, a "living national art culture" blossomed in our cathedrals, our homes, our utensils, furnishings, arms, and the very tools of our humblest crafts, that beauty might be produced by beauty!

A Discourse upon Usury, by Way of Dialogue and Orations, for the better Variety and more Delight of all those that shall read this Treatise. By Thomas Wilson (1572), with an Historical Introduction by R. H. Tawney. 392 pp. (G. Bell and Sons, Ltd. 15s. net.)

"Men may live on overdrafts, but few men love their bankers," remarks Mr. Tawney in his 172 page introduction. Whatever may be the truth of this judgment as a generalisation for all time, it is certainly not wide of the mark when applied to the state of feeling in the latter half of the sixteenth century when Dr. Wilson was writing his thesis. Never were scorn and hatred more piously committed to publication than at this time. Yet seldom has the need for recourse to credit transactions been more insistent. Economically speaking, England was still in a European backwater. Apart from the wool and cloth trades, which were controlled by the Antwerp agents of the London cloth monopolists (they were politely called Merchant Adventurers), this country had not yet established any financial or industrial predominance in Europe. While the Fuggers of Augsburg were to a large extent controlling the destinies of the world, crowning Holy Roman Emperors and buttressing the power of the Spanish Hapsburgs with princely overdrafts, England was painfully struggling to avert the ruin and disintegration which almost followed the internal financial crisis consequent on the opening of the Potosi silver mines and the all too generous use of base metal in Henry Tudor's mint. Every department of social life was darkened by the shadow of the moneylender; and the bounces and curving swoops of the pound sterling were the biggest joke on the Antwerp bourse. The government was already subject to revolutions and counter-revolutions of a

politico-religious character, and this business of the coinage and the exchange, which nobody really understood, was the last straw. Statesmen held tight (to nothing in particular) in breathless dismay, at one moment sanctioning loans at a maximum limit of 10 per cent. and at another forbidding the charging of interest at all in a desperate endeavour to put back the clock to the Middle Ages. Meanwhile the government itself borrowed money feverishly on the best terms it could get, and the evolution of the credit business went on unhurried and unshamed, scarcely troubling to assume the specious disguises which were readily forthcoming in answer to sentence of banishment. In the "Discourse upon Usury" Dr. Wilson utters a deep-throated protest against the tendencies of the age, sufficiently eloquent indeed to convert to canonical piety the single merchant-banker who walks within these pages (what lone soul could resist the charm of Dr. Wilson's charming sixteenth-century English?), but hardly loud enough to be heard above the clinking of silver and rustling of parchment in Lombard Street and the chattering cry of that rascally grasshopper, Gresham, as he sprang lightly back and forth on his own and the Queen's business between "the City" and the Antwerp exchange. Gresham indeed was playing M. de Morny to Elizabeth's Napoleon III., but with greater success. He knew that the banker, local and international, had come to stay, and he was up to all, or nearly all, of the tricks of the later financial hero. We can still derive great pleasure from Dr. Wilson's exquisite prose, and Mr. Tawney's long introductory contribution is of considerable value to the student of Tudor history. It is paying him a high compliment and one which few economic historians deserve, to say that as a literary stylist and as a writer of clear, nervous English he is in his own province on a level with Dr. Thomas Wilson.

The Way Out. By Edward A. Filene. (Routledge. 7s. 6d. net.)

"This book," so its wrapper tells us, "should bring hope to many who view with despair the class struggle and the poverty of the masses." It may—to the unsophisticated, but without a technique for their realisation. If we can have mass production and mass distribution and high wages and low costs—well . . . er—er—there you are! To which America—with reservations, one of which is that he would not tinker with the currency or have anything to do with "flat money." To him the banker is an omnipotent but from the arts, the impresario of the productive abilities of society." Again: "In a very real sense he controls the team work of mankind." This is already pretty well realised over here, whatever may be the case in America. "The banker may furnish the credit for creative effort, but he rarely gets the credit for creative results: the business of rightly administering our applause is a thing we Americans should have thought out." This is a new idea to us. We banker to the "teams" who did the work. However, if the *nouveau jeu* of votes-of-thanks from the communal staff to the financial directors of the industrial system will create a better feeling and a more powerful inducement to economic co-operation, by all means let us have them. The banker only feels the "creative thrill at second hand," says Mr. Filene, and it is "harder for him to maintain a sound social sense" than it is for the trader and engineer. All quite true. What next? "If I have done nothing more than to call attention to it, I am satisfied." This should bring hope to many who view with despair, etc., etc. (vide wrapper). . . . Oh, dear! oh, dear! (Now we are engaged, Edward, you will really tell me all my faults, dear, won't you?!!)

Streamers Waving. By C. H. B. Kitchin. (Hogarth Press. 6s.)

This is a parody of the dissective female studies of modern lady novelists written with Mr. Huxley's cleverness, and with even less revelation of the author's own attitude beyond a cynical toleration. Lydia Clame lives with two other arty females in Beam-square, W.C.1. She is in love with Geoffrey Rimington, who is interested in cricket. The false report of his death in Switzerland (this is rather unconvincing), following a description for spinsters of Dorlip of the "fuller life" dwelling house for spinsters of slender incomes, causes Lydia to take a frenzied swim in the Thames, and she dies of pneumonia in a Bayswater nursing home while Geoffrey and her other friends are turned away by the callous attendants. Lydia's desire for Geoffrey is her only genuine emotion, and this met with merely a polite response.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE SIMPLE LIFE.

Sir,—I read with much pleasure your appreciation of "Agriculture and the Unemployed," by William Wright, M.P., and Arthur J. Penty. It certainly seems fitting that the journal carrying on Major Douglas's attack on the faults of our present financial system should also give publicity to such an indictment of our present barbarism—largely the outcome of the very system so ably criticised by Major Douglas.

It has been suggested to me that the very principles involved in the advocacy of a simpler life are in direct contradiction to the Science of Plenty upheld by Major Douglas. But surely this is not so.

To begin with, the New Economics would most probably be applied first of all to agriculture, and this being so, the advantages to the agricultural worker, together with the increased vitality of the worker himself, would inevitably tend to attract and absorb the unemployed exactly on the lines Mr. Penty suggests.

Further, while it is probably true that a sudden accession of riches is frequently followed by a display of luxury and extravagance, it is an accepted fact that the possession of wealth results in a higher culture and simpler life. It is obvious, therefore, that the New Economics would be the first step towards the realisation of Mr. Penty's ideal state.

M. TALBOT GRACE.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

Sir,—I do not think it is a very encouraging prospect that you hold out to us. If we are to wait till the "beginnings of the catastrophe emerge," so that the "people in control," of whom the "decision lies," may be stirred by a sense with whom the "decision lies," may be stirred by a sense of their own danger, we may wait a little too long. These self-confident controllers like "bossing the ship" until the last minute, and they have a way, too, of getting clear themselves at the last minute and drawing the insurance afterwards.

And, after all, who are they that we should wait for their decision? If the Social Credit theory is true, or even only approximately true, the sooner it is put to the test of experiment in a small way the better, so that all may see its results.

I revert to the idea of the Post Office Savings Bank or other State Bank inaugurating the system. If the present controllers of our destinies will not allow such experiment we must get rid of them. And the quickest way—probably the only way—to do this is to stir the indignation of the multitude against them.

SIMPLE SIMON.

Sir,—P. Q. says that he will not presume to determine who is a sciolist and who is not. For my part I think that the mark of a sciolist is a disposition to teach coupled with an indisposition to submit to questions and criticism. He is what in familiar slang we call a "knowall." He thinks that he knows all that it is necessary to know, and resents any suggestion that there may be facts having an important bearing on the subject in hand which lie outside his present field of vision.

The rule then for discovering the sciolist is to question the propagandist, and if he refuses to answer, or answers arrogantly, evasively, sarcastically, or petulantly, you may be fairly sure that you have spotted him.

Q. P.

SAVINGS.

Sir,—The article in the *Baltic-Scandinavian Trade Review*, "Is the United States Saving Too Much?" is like an echo of Professor Hobson's "Economics of Unemployment." The argument against saving is, of course, sound as far as it goes, though the writer does not seem to realise, as far as it goes, that all saving clogs the economic machine, and that therefore the need and pressure to save must be abolished. But to say that sales resistance is "not the fault of distribution in the economic sense" is going farther than Hobson, and is a mis-statement which can be corrected by (1) the figures given by Major Douglas in the Canadian enquiry, gathered from various high authorities and showing that between 1900 and 1920 "actual physical production" per head of population in the United States increased "at least 30 per cent.," whereas the real wage fell slightly; (2) by the Labour Research Department's Circular of last October, wherein Mrs. Margaret Cole showed that the real wage in Britain had dropped pretty

steadily since 1900; (3) by Professor Bowley's calculation of the total of British incomes just before the war—an average of £184 per family.

It is to be noted that the Hobson view has from the first been set against the Douglas Theorem.

H. B. S. L.

THE WIFE AND THE DIVIDEND.

Sir,—Referring to Mrs. Chambers' speech at Swanwick, and your comments thereon in last week's NEW AGE, I would like to register my complete agreement with the point of view of Mrs. Chambers.

Surely Social Credit envisages an ever increasing proportion of the population being set free from the necessity of working as a condition of obtaining a livelihood: we want to substitute the dividend for the wage. To my mind it is fundamentally wrong to make the family the receiving unit of this dividend, and not the individual. It may, as you say, be the only practicable way to start with, but let us never lose sight of the fact that the individual is entitled to his or her share of the national inheritance as a human being, and a woman should not be dependent on the whim of a man for the receipt of her share.

Where the dividend is distributed to the individual, what harm can a husband do to his wife by stopping her house-keeping money? When they are both living off dividends the housekeeping money would probably be jointly contributed, and if the husband tried that game, his wife would not be compelled by economic circumstances to go on living with him.

ROGER ANDERTON.

Sir,—The paper by Mrs. Chambers, printed in the current issue of THE NEW AGE, which was one of the bright stars in the Swanwick firmament, refers to a correspondent who expects the adoption of Social Credit "to endow and glorify the Home." As the individual who is responsible for this phrase, I should like to add that I gladly accept Mrs. Chambers' criticism, for she expresses me more clearly than I could express myself. There can exist no real Community (such as the Home) except it be based on the deepest respect for the Individual; and conversely, no true Individuality can be realised except through interpenetration in the Community. Since free association between man and wife implies economic independence or the power to refuse such association, the distribution of social dividend must necessarily be individual, so that all association may be truly voluntary.

But I shall still expect the Home to be glorified through the individual endowment.

R.

CENTRAL LONDON GROUP

Meeting at 70 High Holborn, W.C.1, on Thursday, June 25th, at 7 p.m.

An Address: "How to Read a Balance Sheet," by Mr. A. Brenton.
Discussion: All Readers invited.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH COUNCIL MONTHLY BROADSHEET

Contains

a survey in the briefest form, and without comment, of the most important current financial facts and opinions, culled from a wide variety of sources and arranged to exhibit the reactions of Finance on Politics, Commerce and social life.

No propagandist can afford to be without it. Handy size. Price 2½d. monthly, including postage. Annual subscription: 2/6 post free. Quantities: 2/6 per dozen, post free.

Apply, The Secretary, ECONOMIC RESEARCH COUNCIL,
33 ELM TREE ROAD, LONDON, N.W.8.

SPECIMEN COPY SENT ON RECEIPT OF POST-CARD.

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY

REPORT OF THE CUNLIFFE COMMITTEE.

This Report should be in the hands of every speaker and writer on the New Economics. It describes the working of the Gold Standard before the war. Every paragraph contains information of the highest propaganda value.

POST FREE, 6½d.

Through Consumption to Prosperity. An Outline of Major Douglas's Credit Proposals. Reprinted, with additions, from the "New Age" of October 16th, 1924. Written specially to serve as an introduction to the study of the New Economic Theory. Gives a clear account of its distinguishing features, with just sufficient argument to establish a *prima facie* case for further investigation. 16 pp. Price 2d. (postage ½d.). Prices for quantities, including carriage, 6—1/-; 10—1/6; 50—6/9; 100—11/3; 500—50/-.

Socialist "First-Aid" for Private Enterprise! A reprint of the "Notes" in the "New Age" of April 17th. A critical examination of the I.L.P.'s "Nationalisation" policy from the "Social Credit" point of view. A useful pamphlet to distribute in Labour and other reformist circles.

The Monetary Catalyst—Need Scientific Discovery Entail Poverty? A reprint of the "Notes" in the "New Age" of June 5th. Written with the special object of attracting the attention of business, technical and scientific men.

Both pamphlets are the same dimensions as the "New Age" pages, and will fold conveniently and neatly for posting in an ordinary foolscap envelope. Single copies will go for ½d. postage, as "printed matter," if the envelope is unsealed. The price of each is 1d. (postage ½d.). Larger quantities: 10—10d.; 25—2s.; 50—3s. 9d.; 100—7s.—all inclusive of postage.

"The Community's Credit."

A reasoned consideration of the theoretical content and practical implications of the DOUGLAS CREDIT PROPOSALS.

By C. MARSHALL HATTERSLEY, M.A., LL.B.

Crown 8vo, 165 pp. Price 5/- Nett (Postage 2d.)

Catalogue of other books and pamphlets free on application

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

Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to "THE NEW AGE PRESS."

All communications should be addressed, Manager, THE NEW AGE, 70, High Holborn, W.C.1.

"Letters to the Editor" should arrive not later than the first post on Saturday morning if intended for publication in the following week's issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

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

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