



sane, well-considered, thoroughly well-examined Socialism felt to be probably its biggest enemy."

"This extraordinary manifestation of the unity of industrial will was a thing drawn forth by the circumstances of the case, and was justified amply, and should be welcomed unstintedly, because it was a first line, a magnificent, solid, first line of defence that the miners and trade unionists put up."

Which is the real Mr. MacDonald the leaflet does not suggest.

The general tenor of these leaflets is that the workers are coming to ignore Parliament and to rely on the direct exercise of their power in the industrial field to bring satisfaction of their demands. Yes, but what evidence has Parliament shown that it has any plan, and any courage to carry it out? One would think that the institution of the franchise was only thought of last night, and that the wicked "Reds" were up at five this morning trying to stampe the population into violent action before the papers came out with the news that the ballot-box had been discovered. Good gracious!—as if people had not been voting and suffering for generations—as if they had not been multiplying and multiplying the means of feeding themselves during the last century, and waiving all the time for a dividend in terms of breakfast. What has Parliament been doing all that time? What has been its attitude—without distinction of Party—to the food-seekers, but this—"A little more patience, please"!—"It is always darkest just before dawn"!!?

And that inverted Bowl we call the Sky,  
Whereunder crawling coop'd we live and die  
Lift not your hands to It for help—for It  
As impotently rolls as you or I.

Let any student of affairs review the main questions of policy on which this country has taken action since the war, and ask himself how many of them have been even debated in the House. The Anglo-American debt-funding compact, the "Restoration" of Austria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, the Dawes Plan, our own Deflation measures, the embargo on our foreign loans, the resumption of the Gold Standard; all these things, which affected immediately the fundamental conditions of our economic existence, took place without Parliament's once having claimed its right to hear and to pronounce upon the reasons for them. And what has been the outcome of this impotence and cowardice? That this country as a whole has been committed to engagements of all sorts which, whatever they may be, are promises made that the British people will henceforth live at a Poor Law scale of comfort. It would appear that Parliament only exercises its right of debate when everything worth debating is already settled. It is as though there were, for instance, a question whether £45 million should be given away to the community, or £1 million, and Parliament went to sleep while some external person or body decreed that the sum should be £1 million, afterwards waking up to decide how to apportion the money. Proportions of well-being and security as between one section of the people and another—ah, yes, the Chamber will become an ocean of oratorical chests heaving under hurricanes of eloquence. But quantity of well-being and security for the community as a whole—hush! they're settling that in Threadneedle Street! We call upon Mr. J. M. Keynes to tell the coal owners who are so solicitous for the prestige of Parliament that this is true.

In his pamphlet *The Economic Consequences of Mr. Churchill* (which ought to have been entitled *The Economic Consequences of the Treasury Committee on the Currency who Instructed Mr. Churchill*) he has successfully argued that the depression of wages is being brought about by credit restriction.

Now, since Parliament has no power to control the flow of credit, it should be clear that the present wage disputes have arisen independently of Parliament, and, more important still, must be solved independently of Parliament—*unless Parliament shall claim and secure new powers over financial policy*. This brings us to Mr. Cook and other "direct-action" leaders. He and they are quite right to ignore Parliament while Parliament ignores its prime responsibilities in the above direction. But, on the same reasoning, they are quite wrong to expect to get forward by "smashing the capitalist." For look again—the depression of wages by credit restriction; what does this mean? Credit always flows out from the banking system *via the Capitalist*. The Capitalist, as an employer and wage-payer, is in practice no more than an agent of the banks. To talk of smashing the Capitalist because he is trying to cut wages all round is to talk too late; the financiers have already smashed him by restricting his credit, or at least smashed him in prospect if he cannot reduce his wage-bill. Happily aggressive terms like this are not met with so frequently in Labour circles to-day as they were in the period from which the compilers of the above leaflets have chosen their extracts. The policy behind Councils of Action is little more than one of defence against aggression from above. That is a right policy. Whether the Trade Union movement knows it or not, it is a Consumers' policy as well as a Wage-earners' policy. It says that there is a point below which the *shopping-power* of the majority of British citizens shall not be pressed. And when looked at from this point of view, is there any manufacturer who sells in the home market, or any retailer at all, to whose interests such a policy can be said to be a danger? And if no danger, then why give way to perturbation because organised Labour may be taking measures to stand by it when it is challenged? Before Douglas first published his analysis of the credit system it could have been reasonably objected that this attitude on the part of Labour, when one could prove by reference to revenue and profits that its minimum claim could not possibly be afforded by industry, amounted to no less than a deliberate destruction of productive activity and enterprise. But that test will not suffice now. No man who has given any study to the credit question is going to be cozened into counting up what money happens to be available within the industrial system; all his calculations have to do with what amount of fresh money can be created and brought into the industrial system. And so our advice to the leaders of the industrial labour movement is to speak to the capitalists in something like the following terms:—

"We are sorry to be involved in a conflict with you, but it is your fault that this is the case, and not ours. We have decided that wages have gone down quite enough. We are not going to suffer any further reductions until after we have been beaten in a general strike. You reply that in that case you will be between the Devil and the deep sea. On the one hand, you cannot get credits unless you reduce our wages, and so lower your costs sufficiently to get orders. On the other, if you attempt to bring costs down in that way, we shall stop working. As we see the situation, you are suffering from a succession of financial shocks. You sustain these without a protest in the hope that you will be able to transmit them to us. You must abandon that hope for the future. We are not going to be the final shock-absorbers of the industrial system any longer. If we were convinced that the shocks were necessary or inevitable we might meet you in a discussion how most equitably to distribute them. But we are not convinced. We, with our fewer facilities for learning the secrets of finance, have discovered a *prima facie* case for suspecting that the shocks could have been avoided. Have you made the same discovery? Or are you acquainted with the case and the answer to it if any? Or have you not yet thought of investigating the source and origin of the shocks? In the last case had you better not set about such an investigation? You do not like our Councils of Action. How if you should discover that the reason

why they have come into existence is because you have not formed Councils of Action of your own—not to facilitate the transmission of the shocks, but to reverse their direction? Look at it this way. You are humane men. You know that the downward progress of a financial burden means an actual shortage of necessary things in a man's home. You would not willingly allow this if you knew how to stop it. Well, you can stop it. Instead of accepting the burden you can take the same sort of action as we are taking, and hand it back to those who seek to saddle you with it. Our Councils of Action are not directed against you, but against those who have made you their agent. It is true that up till very recently we have called you tyrants, but we did not then recognise that you were visiting on us impositions which you had yourselves inherited. What we now ask you to do is to repudiate the inheritance in the names of both of us—master and man. If you refuse, then we must continue to repudiate it at the point where we first feel it—which means war between us natural allies, provoked and maintained by our common enemy. And while we fight, this enemy will be financing foreign enterprises and helping them to supplant us in our old markets. Luckily the coal subsidy gives you time for reflection. It is for you to decide what you will do when the time comes for its withdrawal. There are only two courses open to you; to acquiesce in the withdrawal, which means that you will have to be catspaws once more and fish the money out of the glowing depths of our resistance; or to challenge the alleged necessity for the withdrawal, which means that the preparations we are making to resist you will be so much additional bargaining power for both of us. And when we speak of "bargaining" we use too strong a word. If the thing which we conjointly aim at is demonstrably possible, it is ours without any argument—for what persons, and what forces can be brought against the whole community? It is for you now to examine this thing; for you to study for yourselves the proposition which has been before us, that there can be generous profits for you, high wages for us, and low prices for us all, at one and the same time—and that the scheme can be set going immediately. You risk nothing by looking into it, while you are faced with a violent upheaval if you do not. And if, having, *according to your own independent judgment*, arrived at the opinion that the proposition is sound, you hesitate to trust to your judgment alone, by all means consult the experts of the financial system—but let us first appoint each our own representatives to meet together and frame a questionnaire to be addressed to the financiers, and take steps to have both the questions and the answers printed and circulated for the information of everyone who is interested to have them."

The first essential feature about such an approach as this should be to emphasise that industrial Labour, while arming for its own protection, is ready to ally itself with Capital. The second should be that the condition of such an alliance is entirely disconnected from any political aim. It should not suggest (much less intend) a State Bank, or imply that a "Socialist Government" should be the "supreme authority over finance"—matters which were quite legitimately discussed by Mr. Mosley on the occasion of his lecture before the I.L.P., but which would be out of place as terms for an industrial settlement in the present circumstances. On the contrary, so far as the labour leaders referred to politics at all, it should be to assert that the scheme hinted at could be consistently launched by any Government. The value of such an announcement of terms would lie in the fact that they did not demand any specific action, but simply gave a *specific direction* to further the document could state quite clearly that what the labour leaders were interested to know, and what they desired the Capitalists to help them to elicit, was in the main simply the answer to this question: *Is there any means whereby new credits can be issued without raising the price-level of retail commodities?* There are derivative questions of course, but the whole industrial and social problem depends for its final solution upon what is the true answer to that question. Our readers know that the answer is a tremendous "Yes"; but the task is to get the truth home to those who flounder about under the impression that it is "No." Until that happens, it is

useless for the public to hear arguments as to the implications of the "Yes." But once the "Yes" is forced from the sealed lips of the "financial advisers to Mr. Churchill" by an insistent Capital-Labour demand for "Yes—or No—and a reasoned proof if No," it will need very little else than Mr. McKenna's testimony as to the nature and origin of credit to reveal the hitherto unsuspected path to industrial and social restoration. In the ordinary way we should feel our time wasted in passing advice of any sort, but now that everyone is at his wit's end—which means that everyone is tottering on the brink of his intuitions—the truth of Social Credit may the sooner break into his consciousness. "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief" prayed the gaoler in the old story. So with economic salvation. "Too good to be true," speaks the "wit"; but what of the spirit—sharpened by physical repressions from generation to generation—does it not comprehend that a persistence of the present system is too bad to be true, and is it not urging men everywhere to cry out "*Who will make me believe this new truth?*"!

Mr. Garvin's article in this week's *Observer* is chiefly devoted to the international debt question. He points out that America is committed to a policy under which she will receive repayments from Europe which will rise to the prodigious total of £90 millions per annum, and that this process is planned to go on for the next sixty years. He is not cheerful about the immediate consequences, and the only consolation he offers is that our great-grandchildren will probably not put up with this legacy we are leaving them. He can keep it to himself. Always this "Posterity." Have we sinned, or our parents, that we should be plagued with such an affliction? In the name of Posterity we have eaten grubs on our bellies. For the sake of Posterity we have turned loaves into millstones. A hundred years ago other lunatics did the same things for us who are their Posterity. Thank them for nothing. If they had eaten as they produced they would not have bequeathed us a debt. Posterity—the financiers' Mrs. Harris; it is the best for everybody if we act on the assumption that there "ain't no sich person." The American debt, proceeds Mr. Garvin, can only be met by corresponding taxation in Europe. There will be less profits, less wages, less money for social reform as well as for private enterprise. These things "cannot be prevented." At the same time "the millions of democracy do not understand." Hence "industrial unrest is kept alive." Not only that, but "friction is set up among the Allies," while "Asia, excusably misreading the case, is led towards chaos by the spectacle of white disintegration." In another passage he hints that the feeling in Europe for America will be "permanently at zero" in consequence of the debt problem. Looking back, he says that the British Government was profoundly right when it suggested an all-round cancellation of debt. But America would not. He suggests that future British statesmen will have to strive to create between this country, France, Germany, Belgium and Italy "a system of economic co-operation bound to extend to the colonial sphere in tropical Africa at least." Mr. Garvin appears to believe that not only shall we all be able to go on living somehow under the compulsion of the American debt repayments, but that these will in the long run "do more than the League of Nations to promote the unity, the power and the wealth of Europe." His article could have been written in a short sentence:—"Everything seems to show that we shall all be pushed over the precipice, but somehow or other we shall not go have faith, just as it is something for THE NEW AGE to be occupied with the task which is going to justify the *Observer's* faith. In the meantime we should

remark that Europe will not suffer at all from the effects of paying her debts. In so far as she actually will succeed in paying she will have antecededly earned the necessary dollars or dollar securities by selling goods to America or to other countries in payment of goods which they have sent to America. In that way, American manufacturers will do the suffering. The danger does not lie there; it lies in the action which will be taken by American industrialists to prevent the repayment of the debt, and in the counter-action taken by European industrialists to repay it. It is in this light that the Prince of Wales's visit to the Argentine must be viewed. We dealt with the strategical aspects of his tour at the time he began it; and all our comments have their economic parallels. It is almost as though the Prince of Wales had heard the American bankers tell their clients not to fear Europe's payments, as they did recently, because the goods representing those payments would go to "neutral countries." For behold he is busy making friends with the big-wigs of one of the most important "neutrals" with the object—almost explicitly described in the London Press—of developing the trade between them and ourselves at America's expense. There is no doubt that his visit will have some pretty tangible results; so much so that we should not wonder if somebody in New York did not agitate for a new reading of the Monroe Doctrine apropos of his activities.

Following the breaking off of the negotiations of the British and French financial experts, M. Caillaux published in the *Ere Nouvelle* an attack on Sir Otto Niemeyer, the principal British expert in the debt negotiations, who accompanied Mr. Churchill to Paris a few months ago. It suggested that in making excessive demands upon the French people Sir Otto is thinking more of the interests of the financiers than of the British people. This week M. Caillaux comes to London to discuss the question with Mr. Churchill. The difference between Mr. Niemeyer's demand of £20,000,000 a year and France's offer of £9,000,000 a year is sufficiently large to occasion some disquiet as to the outcome of the renewed negotiations. The *Matin* declares that if M. Caillaux offers more than the £9,000,000, he "will be stoned in France," while the *Figaro* asserts that a payment of £10,000,000 a year would "ruin French agriculture," and accuses the British nation of trying "to set the whole of Europe to a term of hard labour." Of course, our independent settlement of our own debt question with America is once more brought into the indictment, and we are told that we must not plead our commitments in that direction as a justification of our call on France—for we did not consult her when we undertook them. This is an unassailable argument, and we do not remember seeing any honest attempt to answer it, the "replies" put forward mostly taking the irrelevant form of calculations of "how much France can pay." The *Daily News* quotes it, but lets it alone, merely stating that if M. Caillaux dare not offer more than £9,000,000, "it is equally true that Mr. Churchill would not dare to face a British Parliament with the acceptance of a derisory offer." This is entirely wrong. If Mr. Churchill's financial advisers chose to assent to the "derisory offer," he would not have to "face" Parliament at all—there would be no opposition worth the name. What, for instance, did Parliament do when the British nation was pledged by these same advisers to pay America at such a ruinous rate? Nothing. It has grumbled since, but we do not require Members of Parliament at £600 a year to curse in an empty stable; we elect them to look after the horse. The *Daily News* continues: "Public opinion in this country has definitely crystallized on this question—there has been no such unanimity of conviction on any issue since the war."

Passing over the precise definition of what constitutes "public opinion" (about 45,000,000 citizens are taking no notice of the question at all) we should say that this very unanimity was *prima facie* evidence that the conviction was wrong. Our readers will remark the close correspondence between the industrial problem at home and this international problem, and will see that the same advice that we have offered the trade unions applies to France. France in this case is to be the shock-absorber—if she allows it. But she is resorting to "Councils of Action" and "Defence Corps" in the shape of submarines and aeroplanes. She has already told us that we are the catspaws of America. She has, further, hinted that we should be allied with her and other European countries in resistance to America, and not be content to act as a shock-transmitter—a Wall Street baillif. So the problem for Britain is exactly the same as the problem for her industrialists. And the solution of both problems is one solution—the adoption of Social Credit finance. And the obstacle—what does it amount to when the nature of the whole problem is properly analysed?—it is nothing but an obstacle of our own imagination. Whence comes the power by which a Samuel may "mercilessly explore" the affairs of our coal industry and risk a civil war, or a Niemeyer the affairs of friendly nations and risk a European war, but the power we impute to them through ignorance. Directly we distrust their purpose we have destroyed their power.

## The Veil of Finance.

### VI.

It will be useful to notice a very natural question which will occur to anyone who has not given much attention to the fundamentals of economics. The question will be this: "How is it that international trade has continued so long without breaking down?" The answer is that the break-down has been delayed by the process of *lending* the surplus—i.e., by *overseas investments*. To go back to the last phase of our illustration—the divided island. The two groups on separate islands were there presented as being at the *same stage of civilisation*—both producing unsellable surpluses by similar methods. But what if one of the islands happened to be what we shall call a backward island—an island on which there had been no industrial development? To consider this, we will re-unite our divided island, and suppose that the original islanders happen to discover a second island of the sort described, the inhabitants of which grow corn by primitive means, and live very frugally. We will call their island New Island, and the original island Old Island. Now, the banker on Old Island gets to hear that the soil on New Island is much more fertile than that at home. So he calls together the ploughmakers and addresses them in this fashion:—

"Gentlemen: You are at present in this position. You possess £1,500 of value in a factory and ploughs, but there is no demand for them on this island in any way approaching that figure. But I have a scheme to put forward. It has to do with New Island. I am informed that the soil there is so rich that corn could be grown with only a half the labour and ploughs than we have to use here. I propose to enable you to supply the New Islanders with ploughs. They have no money to pay for them; but that is a small matter. I shall go over there and fix up a foreign loan of £1,500. I shall have some share forms printed—300 of them of £5 each. These will be called New Island Government Bonds. They will pledge the New Islanders to pay back the principal with interest just as in the case of the Debenture shares I have told you about. As soon as they agree to borrow the money I shall create a credit for £1,500 and issue it—not to them, mark you; but to you as and when you export ploughs up to that value to them. Thus you will recover by your overseas trading the £1,500 costs you owe me and which you cannot recover by sales at home."

This is agreed to. Let us now stop to review the finances of Old Island immediately before the issue

of this export credit. At that moment the corn-growers have their £1,500 clear profit. It will be remembered that they borrowed £500 originally, sold their corn for £2,000, and repaid their loan, thus having £1,500 left. Seeing that the plough-makers are now going to be financed again by the banker, there is no need for the corn-growers to invest their profit with them. We will suppose they are going to use £500 of it to prepare the next harvest (as we assumed before), but are keeping the other £1,000 on deposit with the banker. As to the plough-makers, they owe the banker £1,500, they have no money, nor is there any on the island but the corn-growers' £1,500. At this juncture the new credit of £1,500 is issued. It is paid by the banker to the plough-makers, and they, in their turn, send ploughs to New Island to that cost. (We are ignoring the question of profit.) If we now suppose the plough-makers to devote this £1,500 to repaying their first loan, they are now seen to be free of debt. (They do not have to pay any of it out in current wages because, by assumption, the ploughs are the old surplus and not current production.) So much as concerns them. The New Islanders have got the ploughs and formally owe £1,500 to the Old Islanders, although for the moment they really owe it to the banker, who holds the New Island Government Bonds to that amount. Next we come to the banker. Assuming him to follow modern banking procedure he will not be content to tie his money up largely in bonds; it is his policy to keep money as "fluid" as possible, "in case it is wanted by his clients"! (Readers must here pretend not to know that banks can create money at will.\*) So he takes steps to float the New Island Bonds—to get the investment market to absorb them—that is, he wants to get the Old Islanders to pay him back his money and take the Bonds in exchange. Now the only possible investors are the corn-growers, who have £1,000 free to spend outside their business. To them the banker goes, and he unloads Bonds on them to that value. The other £500 worth he has to keep, and they figure in his books as a *bank investment*. Next he applies the £1,000 to cancelling part of his export loan, and that money is cancelled like the other, and goes out of existence.

So now we can tabulate the position:—  
The banker holds £500 value of Bonds.  
The corn-growers hold £1,000 value of Bonds.  
The ploughmakers hold nothing, but owe nothing.  
The corn-growers have £500 in hand for their business.  
The New Islanders owe £1,500 to the Old Islanders.

So far, not so bad. And if the exportation of another lot of ploughs were to be financed in the same way the Old Islanders could keep going.

But now we have to consider the question of the New Islanders' repayment. We will suppose that they use their ploughs on their rich soil to such good effect that they get harvests of twice the quantity of corn *per plough used* (which is a convenient way of measuring their success) than it is possible to raise on Old Island. What will this mean? That it will be *cheaper* to import corn from New Island than to grow it on Old Island.

Let us consider the meaning of "cheaper" in this sense. Leaving the question of money alone, it here means that more corn can be imported from

\* We are not ignoring the objection that the banks' freedom to create credit is limited by the amount of legal tender banks by the Government. The distinction between the Government and the Government is false in the sense that the reverse; the banks are the Government, and whatever amount of legal tender the political Government issues it is under the advice or the decrees of the real, the financial Government.

New Island per plough exported than could be grown in Old Island per plough used; that for, say, 20 ploughs sent abroad the Old Islanders could get more corn than if they used the 20 ploughs at home. That is a healthy position, or might be so but for one fact, and that is (as was pointed out in our first chapter) that the Old Islanders' economic policy is to consume as little corn as possible. But on the other hand their banker's financial policy is to see that the New Islanders repay their loan (with interest); and this repayment must be received as corn from New Island—for the simple reason that that is all the New Islanders are producing. So a problem arises: if corn is to come into Old Island, and the islanders are to eat no more than before, less of it must be grown at home. But if that happens fewer islanders will be wanted in the home corn-growing industry—let us now call it by its name—Agriculture. This, in itself, need not necessarily be a bad thing, but again it must be remembered that the Old Islanders had agreed with their banker that nobody should draw a money income unless he *did some work*. So, unless they alter this rule, the importation is going to be a bad thing—it is going to deprive either all the farmers and farm labourers of a part of their income or some of them of all their income—probably the latter. Thus the social evils of poverty and destitution will raise their heads there. This is familiar ground to everybody, and we need not elaborate the argument. But what is not so familiar is the reactions of this situation in the purely financial region of stock and share values. Let us use a few simple figures. The corn-growers on Old Island used £500 for their production. Let us assume that the quantity of corn being produced and consumed is normally 200 quarters at 50s. a quarter. Now let us assume that the New Islanders are in a position to send 200 quarters across to Old Island. (This is a very large quantity proportionate to the New Island debt, but the principle is not affected by our taking it as our figure.) Suddenly there would appear on Old Island a corn importer, and he would be financed by the banker. The lowest price of corn at home being 50s. a quarter, he could import the New Islanders' corn at anything less—but let us say 40s. a quarter. We'll imagine him to offer them that price. He signs a contract, and the banker creates a credit for £400 and puts it at the disposal of the importer. The corn comes in, and the importer offers it to the Old Islanders at just a little margin below 50s.—say, 49s. He disposes of the whole quantity, gets £490, repays the bank, and has a surplus of £90. But where has the £490 come from? It comes out of the £500 which the home corn-growers have been paying out for services in preparing their own harvest. So, by the time they reap their corn—which has cost them £500—the islanders have only £10 wherewith to buy home-grown corn. That marks the end of home corn-growing. Land will go out of cultivation and work will stop. And with work, income. But what about the corn-growers' £1,000 of New Island Bonds?—their "savings"! Cannot they live on these while they are turning round to find some new job to work at? But to be "lived on," savings must be in the form of money. These savings are in Bonds. So the Bonds must be turned into money. But where are the buyers? The only money on the island is £10 in the hands of the islanders generally, and £90 which the importer has got. Therefore, the maximum *market price* of the Bonds is £100. (It may be less, if the people who have the money are not keen on buying the Bonds.) "But surely the banker will create and issue £1,000 of money and give it to the corn-growers in exchange for the Bonds—that is only fair, seeing that he took away and destroyed money to that amount when he 'floated' them?" That is a



sorry to say that it is only an evidence of the prevailing inability to think upon these subjects in accordance with reality.

The difference between labour, performed as a social function duly recognised and recompensed, and selling one's labour in the open market at its market price, is a vitally important difference in Human Right; hardly short of the difference between honourable service and slavery. In any State where equality found its due expression in a Parliament of Rights, this truth would inevitably become a truism.

Steiner makes some carefully guarded suggestions as to the form which this renewed economic life must take. He is not advocating a Utopian scheme, but knowledge of vital principles gives him a degree of prophetic ability to foresee some things which are necessary and possible; and they are of considerable interest to students of THE NEW AGE economics. He does not advocate the total abolition of Capitalism. He is well aware that, without some form of private capitalism, there can be no free enterprising activity in a State. But all the workers in an enterprise should have a living relation to its success or failure. Steiner also suggests associations of both producers and consumers, to define the common needs and to fix prices. These are things which must arise out of the self-organisation of a sound productive system. To prevent the tyranny of capital, Steiner requires some arrangement by which money values should "wear out" at a certain speed, representative of the speed at which capital commodities themselves become outworn. He tentatively proposes that all money might be called in, and reissued at a lower rate from time to time, in order to effect this. Not being familiar with THE NEW AGE economics, he was unaware that this necessary objective can only be scientifically brought about by subsidising the consumption of needed production, at the expense of the communal Credit. I believe he would have been more than interested to know that it is now quite easily possible so to "water" the capital without "watering" the currency. Slight, and merely suggestive, as are Steiner's remarks upon finance, he understood that the financial organisation is the arterial system of the economic life; and that, as the political life must produce a Parliament, regulating the common life of right, so the economic life must produce, through the higher associations of its producers and consumers, a credit system, with Banks, to regulate the economic life in its own economic way.

While modern thought is dominated by the conception of the Unity-State, it is impossible for the life of economics to be organised upon its own true principles, in its own way. For if the economic forces capture and dominate the State, they prepare revolution. If the State dominates economics, as the Socialists will have it, poverty is the result. Without the collateral liberation of the spiritual and political lives, the life of economics cannot be saved from disintegration.

The idea of the Unity-State, and the endeavour to force all three departments of life into one central administration, does not tend towards social unity. By being obliged to co-habit, the three lives only become more divorced in spirit, and lose touch with reality. Paradoxical as it seems, to minds nurtured in the dogmas of the Unity-State, the Threefold organisation, far from disintegrating the social life, is the only means by which it could find its true unity. For every individual, through the activities of life itself, plays a part in each of the three divisions of the Commonwealth. In each of these he should experience an activity which is independent and real. Then the unity of the Commonwealth would be in himself, in every individual. Here only is the true Centre and Unity of human association, and not in the State. The State is an intellectual abstraction.

## From Dostoevsky's "Notebooks."

Translated by S. S. Kotliansky.

I.

### A VARIANT OF A PASSAGE IN "THE DEVILS."\*

"Will no one in the whole planet, having done with God and believing in self-will, dare to assert the whole of his self-will in its most complete manifestation? It is like this, as though a poor man on suddenly receiving an inheritance should get frightened and not dare approach his millions, considering himself unworthy of it. I want to assert, even if I am the only one who dares, yet I will assert."

"Assert then!"

"I have done with God, and therefore I myself am obliged to become God. I must shoot myself."

"Can that indeed be the reason? You see, you are saying that I always agree with you. I can't refrain from saying that these problems are unprofitable to me. Why must you shoot yourself?"

"Because the most complete manifestation of my self-will is the taking of my own life. I will enact the most complete manifestation."

"You had better kill some one else."

"That would mean the lowest manifestation of my self-will,—and that is like you. But I want the highest,—and that is like me. I am bound to do it."

"You are bound? You did not make it clear, did you?"

"In order to assert myself completely. There is no higher idea to me than the idea that there is no God. If there is none, I do not see how mankind will go on living, if it is not reborn in a different form and body. History is on my side. Man has always invented God in order to make it possible for him not to kill himself. But I do not want to invent God, I know that He does not exist, and I do not want to lie in my turn. I alone on earth and in the history of the universe do not want to invent God, I will not submit. If He is not, then I certainly am God, for then there is none higher than myself on the planet. There cannot be. Science is on my side. I occupy and succeed to the former place of God, and therefore I must kill myself; for I cannot be without God, nor can I be God myself. As I am not going to manifest my fullest self-will. As to the former God of complete unbelief . . . I will kill myself. Let them learn."

"Who is to learn?"

"All, all shall learn. There is nothing hidden which shall not be revealed; it is He who said so."

And he pointed to the image of the Saviour, before which a lamp was burning.

"In Him then you believe? You have even a lamp burning?"

"In Him? Listen, exactly in the same degree do I not believe in the former God, as He did believe. There was a day on earth and in the middle of the earth stood three crosses. One on the cross believed so much that he said to the other for his belief: 'to-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise.' The day passed, both died—and found neither paradise, nor resurrection. What was said on the cross turned out a lie. That man was the highest product of the earth. The whole planet with all that there is in it, with all that has been and will be, is not worth a single word of that man! Never before nor after, never will there be anything like him, this miracle. The miracle being that there never was nor will there be anything like him. And now, if with him a lie happened, if the laws of nature did not spare even him, and caused even him to tell a lie, to believe in a lie and to die for a lie,—then the whole planet rests

\* From the Manuscript of "The Devils," Part III.

on a lie and on mockery. Therefore the very law of the planet is a lie, and the whole of life is the Devil's farce, if there were a Devil. And if so, wherefore live? Answer if you are a man, if you are an honest man, if you are serious and great. Suppose I alone say that I am God; but if I am God, I wish to be like the former God, I wish to judge the planet, to alter the revolting lie of its law, and if that is impossible, then to destroy it! But since I do not know how to alter it, and cannot destroy it, then I, God, wish to destroy myself. Enough, it is time!"

[Let me be the one who does not lie against all! To invent a God for the fools and to deceive them all their lives long in order to ride on their backs and in order that my seat may be soft to sit on,—I do not want that.]

"But are you alone an atheist? Are you the only one who has realised that there is no God? Are you alone a suicide?"

"I alone. I alone have realised it, only myself. I do not understand how one can realise that there is no God and not kill himself instantly. Only a wretch who is not worthy of being a man could realise that there is no God, and not kill himself. One can't consent to ten or fifteen years of life in order to be annihilated afterwards. And, besides, all those fifteen years to be aware that there is no God, and to go on inventing Him for fools! To realise that there is no God, and not to realise that oneself

God, is impossible. And once having realised, manifest the attribute! My attribute is self-will—I shall shoot myself in order to manifest my self-will. That is the only way in which I can assert my protest and my unsubmitiveness. My attribute is self-will."

## Readers and Writers.

### THE MAKING OF A POET.

Talking with a noble old scholar the other night, I remarked that the day was coming for Tennyson to return to favour, and to be enjoyed without prejudicial either for or against him. The face of the Victorian lighted up with joy and surprise at this statement by a contemporary of the Sitwells and other post-Dada sentimentalists. Imagine my surprise, therefore, when he replied: "Yes; your children will be well brought up if you can bring Tennyson and Browning into favour again. But I feel that the trouble with Tennyson was that he knew too much about the brain."

Now I think that the tribute to Tennyson's mental equipment was necessary, for underneath the Laureate's sombrero of vanity was a brain that perhaps had more unhelped vitality than the much adulterated mind of Browning. It is quite probable that Browning's greater achievement was due not to his being more alert or more penetrative than Tennyson, but merely to his whole organism—the entire man—being more completely integrated. He had a powerful animal force, and this was always the chief motor of his activity. Hence we should call him a poet of feeling, of sense, rather than of intellectual insight. He is thus more the conventional poet than was Tennyson—an artist who re-creates his world by sympathy rather than by detached compassion (this in spite of the Pope's soliloquy in the "Ring and the Book").

Tennyson, however, was more variously moved, divided between unreconciled impulses, and so doomed never to attain that larger coherence which alone is capable of perfect epic expression. But with all this failure, we must recognise that he was an epic poet, impelled at his finest moments by a dry, intellectual passion as clear as the Mediterranean sun—or as Homer. Browning was not like that. Browning was foggy, Gothic, warm; and his emotional nature caught the light of truth and broke it up into the vivid hues of human sentiment.

He was the poet of gesture and accident; always, in short, the dramatist.

This difference between the two men may perhaps best be seen by an examination of their craftsmanship. Here is a typical piece of Tennyson's best fabric; and one feels that it definitely places him in the Homer, Dante group. Had he been able to keep that power always burning—had it been an atmosphere, rather than an effort—he would have been all that his contemporary idolaters claimed him to be. This passage is quoted merely to show his method—the unconscious man—at its best.

He spoke, and one among his gentlewomen  
Display'd a splendid silk of foreign loom,  
Where like a shoaling sea the lovely blue  
Play'd into green, and thicker down the front  
With jewels than the sward with drops of dew,  
When all night long a cloud clings to the hill,  
And with the dawn ascending lets the day  
Strike where it clung: so thickly shone the gems.

But that fine quality could not be sustained. Again and again a languor creeps into his work, and on analysis it is found to be indicative of some central tiredness of soul that prohibits the final precision which carries from unity of detail to unity of construction. Tennyson really is a poet of superb fragments. Those fragments have a chastity, a rigour of style to be compared with the Iliad. But we get the lapses of nervous vitality that destroyed him, or rather left him, thus debilitated, a prey to vanity, pessimism, and rhetoric. So the "Idylls of the King," which might have been a great poem, are Athenian fragments—placed in Hyde Park. There is a line in his "Vision of Sin" which might well be used as a prayer on his behalf—"Give him new nerves with old experience."

What struck me with surprise at the remark of the old scholar was the fact that here was a wise man perpetuating the fallacy that the poet is a sort of inspired dullard. Was he right in maintaining that too much knowledge is a dangerous thing for the poet? The answer depends upon our conception of the nature of revelation. It must be agreed that true poetry is the result of revelation; but revelation is the result of what? It is the result of an apprenticeship to the craft of thought which begins at the birth of self-consciousness, and which ends only at death. The poet has to learn—a well-nigh impossible task—to develop certain powers within himself, which Wordsworth categories as six: "first those of Observation and Description,—i.e., the ability to observe with accuracy things as they are in themselves, and with fidelity to describe them, unmodified by any passion or feeling existing in the mind of the describer; whether the things depicted be actually present to the senses or have a place only in the memory. This power, though indispensable to a Poet, is one which he employs only in submission to necessity, and never for a continuance of time; as its exercise supposes all the higher qualities of the mind to be passive, and in a state of subjection to external objects, much in the same way as a translator or engraver ought to be to his original. Secondly, Sensibility—which, the more exquisite it is, the wider will be the range of the Poet's perceptions; and the more will he be incited to observe objects, both as they exist in themselves and as re-acted upon by his own mind. Thirdly, Reflection—which makes the poet acquainted with the value of actions, images, thoughts, and feelings; and assists the sensibility in receiving their connection with each other. Fourthly, Imagination and Fancy—to modify, to create, and to associate. Fifthly, Invention—by which characters are composed out of materials supplied by observation; whether of the Poet's own heart and mind, or of external life and nature; and such incidents and situations produced as are most impressive to the imagination, and most fitted to do justice to the

characters, sentiments, and passions, which the Poet undertakes to illustrate. And lastly, Judgment—to decide how and where, and in what degree, each of these faculties ought to be exerted; so that the less shall not be sacrificed to the greater; nor the greater, slighting the less, arrogate, to its own injury, more than its due. By judgment, also, is determined what are the laws and appropriate graces of every species of composition."

That reads somewhat strange and formal to our generation, for whom the arts of poetry and novel-writing are means of amateur self-expression, to be taken up, or dropped, as the casualty of mood and moment suggests. If we re-animate by sedulous thought each of the terminologies employed by Wordsworth, we can remind ourselves of the unflagging discipline to which the poet must submit himself before he can attain the quiet intensity which is the only human condition that can be pregnant with revelation.

RICHARD CHURCH.

### Reviews.

**Schooling.** By Paul Selver. (Jarrols. 7s. 6d.)

Mr. Selver chronicles a new master's first term at a low grade "Grammar School" in Kent. The vulgar and ignorant staff form a depressing picture, only relieved by the amused detachment of Mr. Osten and the author's humorous observation. Food, however, appears to occupy too much of his attention. Leonard is an uninteresting cypher, and merely bears the weight of the narrative in which the intriguing personality of Vic Osten makes occasional appearances. An idealised Selver, he is so superior to the other members of the staff that his presence at such an establishment is unconvincing. He contributes to the *Mistral*, the editor of which, Mr. Tillyard, is "the greatest of all journalists." Leonard is introduced to "James Anthony Cross, or, rather, H. E. Bassett—HEB," Eli Peck, and Sid Hope, the cartoonist, but their remarks are disappointing. Except for the art criticism, the sample contents of the *Mistral* are likewise flat, and lack the authentic touch of Cursitor Street. Messrs. Jarrols are to be congratulated on the appearance of this 7s. 6d. series, the best at present produced.

**The Last Years of Rodin.** By Marcelle Tirel. (A. M. Philpot. 7s. 6d.)

Mme. Tirel became secretary to Rodin in 1906. She has the mind of a dressmaker, and reveals more of herself than of her master in a preface. Mlle. Judith Cladel describes her lecturing of Rodin as the yapping of a pug dog after a lion, but she was faithful and disinterested, and hated the greedy relatives and pushing officials who beset the sculptor in his declining years. Unfortunately, it is impossible from her disconnected account to understand the intrigues over Rodin's works; only fragments emerge between the enormous gaps in what she knows or thinks essential. There are three interesting photographs of the great man, and the book is much better produced than is usual with this kind of stuff.

**Proteus, or the Future of Intelligence.** By Vernon Lee, Litt.D. (Kegan Paul. 2s. 6d.)

What is Intelligence? Knowledge is acquired by experience, wisdom consists in applying it, and intelligence is the application of experience and intuition to common affairs, as distinct from intellect, which is reasoning power applied to special subjects. Intelligence is sense, more, however, than the so-called common sense, which is so often non-motive, a sense of humour and of proportion. It follows therefore that while knowledge, wisdom, and intellect are all measurable, intelligence is protean, not so much in time, as Vernon Lee thinks, as individually, and its constitution varies according to taste, for our estimates of qualities are dissimilar, and intelligence in particular is a quality on which those least qualified to judge presume to air opinion. Vernon Lee forgets Tolstoy when declaring that none of the prophets of disaster, except Mr. Wells, foretold the war. If Wells, why not Morel—or Fisher? On the cover is printed the *Saturday Review* comment: "A concise, suggestive piece of work"; but it appears to be diffuse and tedious. Methinks and Nay are no longer considered humorous.

### LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

#### THE WEIGHING OF THE SERAPHIM.

Sir,—The answer to Mr. Philip T. Kenway's question appearing in your issue of August 13 is obvious: Mr. Mitrinovic's dicta appeared in THE NEW AGE because it is THE NEW AGE. Like Mr. Montgomery, I seemed to detect a hand of "M. M. Cosmoi" in the writing in question, and uttered instant welcome to the return of such a feature. Its publication indicated to me that a very important person connected with THE NEW AGE, viz., the Editor, lives in the spirit of "the spacious days of Mr. Orage and A. E. R.," and is concerned to secure its expression at the cost of experiment.

Mr. Sonovabic, in a very clever and entertaining manner, has matched intellect (in the form of wit) against intellect. But there is a quality in the mind of Mr. Mitrinovic which he has thought to brush aside, viz., the sublimation of intellect and the plane of enhanced vision consequent upon this. In the middle stream of mysticism—that in which the enlightened and daring intellect endeavours to interpret the noumena of life to the general intellect—the difficulties of expression are enormous; hence the apparent obscurantism of the dicta in question. There is, however, another aspect of the matter, which is that a mind moving in an extra-normal (in this instance, supernormal) dimension will express life in a correspondingly different language, the symbols of such language being by no means forced (one might almost say "forged"), but purely natural to the things expressed. In such a dimension Mr. Mitrinovic doubtless moves and knows all he says.

One further suggestion: a new language (the equivalent here of a new plane of perception) is not understood by being torn at, as it were, with tooth and claw. No symbolologist would proceed in this way. Instead, if the intellectual statement of a thing be in glyphs—as that of the most spiritual metaphysic is bound to be—the attitude most likely to produce beneficial results would be that of alternate meditation and research; with, one might add, more meditation than research. In other words, there may be a revealed science as distinct from natural science, requiring as a first condition of its understanding a mind much more passive than active.

In fine, while I do not profess yet to have understood "The Weighing of the Seraphim in Men," I plead for a recognition of the fact that its author has something to tell us, and in that particular way, and need anything more be said to those who affirm the right of the individual to create vision?

W. E. WALKER.

Sir,—I am obliged to confess the same difficulty as Mr. Anderton in regard to the writings of Mr. Ewing and Mr. Mitrinovic. After all if ideas are to be conveyed by language, then the reader must be "en rapport" with the writer in reference to the use of words; and I submit that neither of the gentlemen referred to is using language justly. There is no doubt that Mr. Ewing means something which I am persuaded it is worth our while to convey. But is there no more familiar phraseology which will convey his significance of such terms as Absolute, Truth, Good, Beauty, Divine Being, and God? Do these concepts require of us a new perspective, or are they no more than evidences of Mr. Ewing's immersion in metaphysics? Most of us will have had such a disillusioning after footing with the "Absolutes" that unless Mr. Ewing can bring his thesis within the compass of practical intelligence we shall very soon be bored stiff. What are these absolutes, anyhow, but negative finites of no meaning. We know the truth of a fact, and we know a thing to be good, just as we know smoothness and length in reference to things. But Truth and Good, etc., without terms of reference are products of over-reasoning and no less empty than Smoothness and Length. All of which is commonplace.

Mr. Mitrinovic's article suggests a possibility that the writer is using our phonetic system of writing as a pictorial system. Conceding that the ubiquitous capital letters are intended, and not merely defective orthography, what, for instance, is the special distinction of "Oneness" as against "oneness," or better still, "singularity." Are we required to be susceptible to visual impressions as well as (or instead of) the ideas expressed by the words; so with the mind's eye and think with the eye's mind? If we can be helped thus far then we will put our best efforts forward, and as there is a good deal of this mystery writing about we may be able to pick up a few threads as to the intention of it.

FRED H. AUGER.

Sir,—Perhaps the origin of the "fog" which envelops THE NEW AGE lies in conflicting assumptions. The existence of an objective world is an assumption which stands empirical tests so well that it has become axiomatic in the West. We are apt to forget that it is not a self-evident proposition, but one which requires, either instinctively or consciously, a most adventurous act of faith. There is overwhelming subjective evidence for subjectivity. It is not hypothesised, but is the stuff of hypotheses. An entirely objective world and entirely subjective reality are two equally valid and mutually destructive assumptions, but the implications of both can apparently be held by the same individual by popping from one to the other in a fog. Subjective reality which denies the existence of an objective world is usually qualified by the admission that objectivity exists but ought not to exist. Hence the desired "end of the world"—a view which corresponds to an apocalyptic version of the doctrine of Jesus of Nazareth, but contradicts another view. Lord Shaftesbury and Dr. Barnes are arguing about this. It is impossible to present or comment on conflicting assumptions without bias. Mr. Montgomery suggests, in the form of a question, that the agnostic is an ignoramus. Yes; if he is not on the Gnostic's list as a thing that "is" he is ignored, so he is "ignoramus"—that is to say rejected as "non-existent." Fortunately, the magic does not work, it leaks out that something or other (in this case "the" ignoramus) does exist but ought not to exist.

What assumption or combination of assumptions does THE NEW AGE advocate? S. F. MEADE.

[None. In these regions we are "anxious agnostics" holding the ring, and on the watch in case any of the gladiators drops something valuable during the struggle—in which event we shall appropriate it to our own purposes.—Ed.]

Sir,—It is to be gathered from recent correspondence that a certain person, D. Mitrinovic, has heaved a brick through the opaque minds of some of your readers, and this is only fitting and proper in a paper bearing its particular title. Your contributor has in a measure thrown the architect's outfit at those who cannot even use a set-square; hence all this trouble. In the noise made, his critics have overlooked the fact that he answers a question that was put forward by Pilate—this is not the least of his contributions to the sphere of intellect. It is uncomfortable to be rudely awakened, and I confess that it has given me considerable enjoyment to find that as a counterpoise to your gritty but realistic economics there is still room for other matters of thought. Mr. D. Mitrinovic, in his attempt to weigh the seraphim in man, has at least given us something to think about; he is some thousands of years ahead of his time, in the same way that the teachers of exoteric religions are some thousands of years behind the present day. Some years ago I should have been proud to have written the parody contributed by a correspondent, but as my philosophy is only very elementary, in which I understand that water wets and fire burns, and that the world is a little house in which there is room for all mankind to dwell in unity, I stand back and smile. Wireless telegraphy and easy communication between nations are bringing us to realise this as a fact, and in "World Affairs" M. M. Cosmoi at least gave me the A B C of cosmogony.

CHRISTOPHER GAY.

Sir,—Stand by Mitrinovic, and never mind if he does whiles flee awa' to heaven and leave us all sitting. The once soaring Pegasus of THE NEW AGE has too often, of late years, seemed to have something the matter with its wings. It is a pity anyhow to criticise any contributor too severely unless the critic can find a better man to put in his place; but there have been others far more in need of this indulgence than Mitrinovic.

H. B. S. L.

#### "THOSE CARTOONS."

Dear Sir,—Those cartoons! How dramatic they are! How intelligible! How full of thought and poignant feeling! They are the reaction and comment of a sincere artist and thinker living in the bitter conditions of our chaotic times: they do not portray Utopia, nor originate in it, nor are they "a sample of 'the Arts in Utopia'" which the same mind can visualise.

They proclaim the urgency of our cause, convey paragraphs at a glance, and if it is at any time desirable that popular support be obtained for a movement to acquire the power of Social Credit for democratic use, then as posters they would be arresting and valuable. If to feel intensely and express one's feelings is "common" and "vulgar" possibly the common and vulgar (the mass of humanity)

will understand a hand that is cunning on their behalf, that paints the stupidity and injustice of a system that oppresses them as the terrible grotesque thing it is.

They are shocking, sir! Shocking! and that is their virtue. In them is the ache of the hopeless and harassed poor, who live in the squalor that the present financial system has produced; in them is the agony of the mutilated who groan on the battlefields to which that system ruthlessly and inevitably brings nations; in them the perverted and painful things it has produced by its usury move, sinister and threatening to all that civilisation has achieved through labour and goodwill; and in them is symbolised the spirit of greed that underlies the system.

They are no light mockery, elegant and fastidious, graceful and entertaining, to charm the "intellectuals" with a sense of their own exquisite perception—Mr. Eiloart would prefer such no doubt—but the spirit that animates them is critical and humane for all their gruesomeness, and they evince great power of draughtsmanship adapted to and conditioned by the nature of the subject matter and the medium. Those designs from blocks cut by Mr. Mackey in particular are fine.

May we who do appreciate his disinterested service to the cause thank him for them. WALTER E. SPRADBERRY.

Sir,—I should have thought it unnecessary to have to point out that I have attempted no "sample" of the arts of Utopia. Quite the reverse. I am not living in Utopia, alas! My apology for such cartoons of mine as you have thought fit to publish, appeared in a letter in your issue of December 4, 1924.

"N. F. Eiloart" is now given space in your columns to merely shout, without any argument or stated reason. Thus, hear him: "And those cartoons, sir! How common they are! How vulgar! How badly drawn! And how little they represent the real spirit animating either side portrayed."

Well: "How," "how," "how"? (Belonging to all, Should cartoons be "common"? (Pertaining to the ready to be of service.) "Vulgar"? (Pertaining to the multitude, vernacular.) On what knowledge, principle, or critical ability is the drawing adjudged as bad? (Is it still true that "a man must serve his time to every trade save censure; critics all are ready-made?")

Perhaps an explanation will be forthcoming. At least, of his last "how." It should be interesting. Is "N. F. Eiloart" quite sure he has gathered what the cartoons represent?

Any urchin can throw a stone and run away. Perhaps I should have merely replied in the intelligent manner your correspondent employs, thus: Yah! Boo!! Rotten!!! HAYDN MACKAY.

#### SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY.

Sir,—In reply to Mr. Neil Montgomery, I only received my copy of THE NEW AGE containing Mr. Mitrinovic's article after my letter had been written and posted. Hence my silence. As others have taken the matter up, I am content to leave it in their hands. If Mr. Montgomery will look again, he will find I made no suggestion of an "Index Expurgatorius"—I value absolute freedom of expression too much for that.

The superiority of Mr. Montgomery's attitude is rather amusing, and will remind readers of THE NEW AGE of the attitude of the High Priests of Finance when one dares to criticise their dogmas. He is, I think, unfortunate in coupling "agnosticism" with adolescence. Adolescence is the period when human beings are most prone to mysticism and to the acceptance of religious ideas. Mr. Stanley Hall analyses the matter thoroughly in his book "Adolescence," and Professor Starbuck in a smaller volume, "The Psychology of Religion." Indeed, Mr. Chapman Cohen, who has made a life-long study of these questions, states in his book, "Religion and Sex," "One outstanding feature of this more scientific enquiry into the nature of the conversion has been to demonstrate that it is almost exclusively a phenomenon of puberty and adolescence." The statistics of religious revivals show this plainly, and the Church has always made special efforts to imbue people's minds with religious ideas during adolescence, when they are most likely to accept them. May I remind Mr. Montgomery that "Adolescent Insanity" very frequently takes the form of Religious Mania?

In reply to Mr. Ewing, I would point out that my protest was against using words which have a generally-accepted

meaning, giving them a different one, and then arguing from that basis. I am quite ready to accept the definition of God as "The Supreme Being: The Creator and Preserver of the World," but not as Truth, Love, or Wisdom, which have entirely different meanings. Nor can I see how such a God displays these qualities. Where does the Love come in when He "creates" one form of life to prey upon another: when humans cannot live without destroying other forms of life, etc., etc.

"The tiger through the jungle stalks his prey:  
Hawk swoops on robin: robin worm doth slay,  
Plant, insect, beast, all is one whirl of fray:  
From dawn of sentient life, no shelter  
In the universal welter."\*

As against Dickens' view I would submit that it is to those who have studied facts that we owe any growth in our knowledge of life and the universe. Galileo and Newton, Hutton and Lyell, Lamarck and Darwin advanced human knowledge more than any theologian, and in the teeth of the strongest opposition from religionists.

ROGER ANDERTON.

\* "The Song of Life." H. Ormond Anderton.

### SOUNDLESS MUSIC.

Sir,—Mr Mackey's interest in my "moonshine" would be more convincingly shown if he came to see it, but as he prefers to ask me questions at a distance, I hope you will allow me to reply.

I note that the passage I supposed corrupt was after all intended to convey the obvious truth that Michael Angelo was unable to express his concept of God except by imitating a man.

(i.) I had been to the cinema and seen stunts, but I don't think the method suitable, as colour at the cinema is altogether unsatisfactory and the method by which the "stunts" are prepared is exceedingly laborious.

(ii.) The name "synchrony" I'm quite willing to accept.

(iii.) My scale system is simply this: On the analogy of European sound-music, I divide the semi-circle into twelve semi-tones of 15 degrees each, and for colour I divide the spectrum similarly into twelve. There are no primaries. I set no limits to the art, though no doubt they exist. Nor do I bother about numerical vibrations. My scales allow me to compose. Some other composer may find scales that enable him to compose better. I hope so. Still, here is at least a beginning.

Now, as to time. I claim that extension in time is just as essential to painting and sculpture as to sound music and to literature. A painting or sculpture is built up from the first touch to the last, as a sonata or an essay. The difference is that at present the painter presents to the public the finale only, or if he presents every touch he puts on the canvas he is compelled to show them, not in orderly sequence, but together, as appear the notes of a musician's score.

As to the last question, Why don't I stick to sound? I don't stick to sound simply because I'm a painter. I prefer to appeal to the mind through the eye. The reason seems enough for me, whether Mr. Mackey sees it or no.

W. N. HILLS.

10 Essex-road, Leyton, E.10.

### DEBTS AND SERVICES.

Sir,—The phrase, "Debts must be paid in goods or not at all," occurs in your leading article, but are not debts sometimes paid in services? Is it not usually the object and intention of those who are already well off in goods to annex the services of as many of their fellow creatures as possible? This, it seems to me, is what the American financiers want of England. They have nothing for her to do just now, but Japan is just over the way, and how convenient for Wall Street to have England like a dog on a leash ready for eventualities. Therefore England must not be allowed to pay off her debts just yet, but must await a suitable opportunity for working them off. She is in danger of becoming what Lord Grey called "the conscript appendage of a foreign power."

SAYONARA.

["Goods" obviously included services in the context of our article. As far as we understand Sayonara's reference to "services" in the latter part of his letter, they would not work off any debt, because they would not be ordered and paid for.—ED.]

## 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, 6<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>d.

**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 1d.). 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 1d. postage, as "printed matter," if the envelope is unsealed. The price of each is 1d. (postage 1d.). 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

"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.

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.

### 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.