

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER"

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 1794] NEW SERIES Vol. XL. No. 13. THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1927. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	145	CONGRESS AND THE STRIKE (Editorial)	151
The <i>Wheatsheaf</i> on Dr. Leaf. Ministry of Labour's new departure in statistics—basing sales on consumer incomes. The <i>Europa Year-Book</i> . Mr. Wilson Harris on America's dealings with Colombia and Nicaragua. The <i>Evening Standard</i> on the United States' penetration of Latin America.		VIEWS AND REVIEWS. Men and Labour. By R. M.	152
LORD WEIR AND LEADERSHIP. By C. H. Douglas	147	<i>A Short History of the British Working-Class Movement</i> (Cole).	
DRAMA. By Paul Banks	149	THE QUEST OF VALUES.—II. By Janko Lavrin	153
<i>Pygmalion. The Beaux' Stratagem.</i>		ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY (Review)	154
A PRIEST'S VIEW OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS. By Philippe Mairet	150	<i>The Plebs' Atlas.</i>	
		REVIEWS	155
		<i>The Press. Whence, Whither, and Why? African Clearings and A Lucky Lad.</i>	
		LETTER TO THE EDITOR	155
		From A. W. L.	

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

We notice a review of Dr. Leaf's book, *Banking*, in the January number of the *Wheatsheaf*—the organ of the Co-operative Movement. The reviewer, in passing without challenge Dr. Leaf's assertion that banks do not create credit, and in giving this view currency by referring to him as "an authority," without mentioning that there are equal authorities who contradict him, is unwittingly sponsoring ideas inimical to the Co-operative principle of the Consumer's Dividend. The average member of the Movement would look very sick if, one fine morning when he stood behind his front-door waiting for the postman to bring him his dividend, he received instead a notice saying that the money had been retained by the Society for the purpose of financing its business. It would be small comfort to him, relying (as he often would be) on the money to pay his rent with, to be told he would be paid, say, five per cent. per annum on it. He could not pass that kind of baby on for his landlord to hold. But that is the logical end of the theories and objectives of the "Leaf" school of finance. If banks cannot, or will not, create credit, any growing industry (which must of necessity get extra credit from somewhere) will have to get its additional supplies out of the already existing pool. That pool comprises wages and dividends. In the instance under discussion it comprises primarily the cash resources of Co-operative employees and members. Therefore if Dr. Leaf is right—or if the banks arbitrarily persist in restricting the issue of new credit—there will have to be raids on the money of Co-operators to make up the deficiency. If the directors of the Society will look round, they will see evidences in some of the largest capitalistic enterprises of the dispossession and impoverishment of the profit-taking classes by the writing down of capital in all sorts of ways. This is a result of credit restriction; and it is not going to stop at Capitalism; it must inevitably spread over to Co-operation unless the policy of credit

restriction is abandoned. It is strange to see the *Wheatsheaf* accepting what is virtually die-hard financial propaganda as scientific knowledge, especially at a time when the "Capitalist" Press is beginning to ask inconvenient questions about it. The editor must in future give out books on finance to competent reviewers. We do not suggest that he must choose financial experts, but at least his reviewers should be aware of the current value of this or that financial pronouncement in the polemical market. They could learn something even in the correspondence columns of *The Times* if they wanted to play for safety.

A circular letter dated January 17 has been sent to business houses by the Ministry of Labour announcing "a new departure in the use and issue of unemployment statistics." It proceeds to explain that—

"In recent months a number of manufacturers and distributors have applied to the Ministry of Labour to enquire whether they could be regularly supplied with tables showing the course of unemployment from month to month in each town or area served by an Employment Exchange. The information in each case was required to enable the firm to adjust its sales activities to the changing prosperity of the various local areas, or to make due allowance for such changes in judging the effectiveness of its advertising or salesmanship." (Our italics.)

Six or seven years is a long time for the business man to take in realising that all his efforts to make customers shoe-conscious, razor-conscious, car-conscious, and what-not are so much wasted effort unless they have first been made cash-conscious. One cannot blame him, surrounded and deafened as he has been by raucous publicity-men boosting Advertising as though it were the Kingdom of God—telling him that if he would seek that first of all other things would be added unto him. They would create demand, they boasted. They never could. They could only mobilise demand which had already been created—created by employment, or rather by the

emoluments of employment. The truth has now been given practical recognition in this "new departure," which we are entitled to accept as the most flattering tribute to the New Economic policy that has yet been yielded to it by the world of industry. (Ah; so something at least of what those high-brow economists have been gabbling about cuts ice after all, does it?) Notice, by the way, that the impetus comes from Industry, not the Government, whose duty it is to think out and initiate these things. It does not, of course, take us very far; but it affords a firm emplacement to which we can move forward our heavy guns.

The "Local Unemployment Index" (the title of the new publication announced by the Labour Ministry) will give, for 637 towns, as well as for county areas, the numbers of insured persons in each area, together with the respective percentage rates of unemployment for men, for women, and for juveniles. It will be issued monthly to subscribers only. The initial yearly subscription will be £5. (There is no mention of a royalty for THE NEW AGE.) The principle involved in the decision to prepare these statistics is certain to create an appetite for more sooner or later. For instance, fluctuations in the wages of people in employment are just as relevant to the sales-objective of manufacturers and traders as are fluctuations due to changes in employment. It would be useful if the branch banks in all these separate areas could be prevailed on to supply statistics of their weekly turn-over of legal tender; for these figures would afford an approximate comparative record of changes in the total volume of local consumer income, whether arising from employment or from the "Dole." The Federation of British Industries might well consider this further "departurè." But even then, industry wants to plan ahead, and not wait for indices of current incomes. It requires forecasts of what consumers' incomes are likely to be, one, two, and, if possible, several months ahead. This is much more difficult, but some help could be given by tabulating the places where capital development schemes were projected, together with their expected duration and cost. But out of this would eventually evolve a demand among industrialists for records of the volume of bank loans, actual and projected, in every town and county area—which, we are afraid, is not practical politics. It is the old story once more; the most vital factors required in the preparation of statistical guidance are bank secrets.

The second edition of "The Europa Year-Book,"* is announced. It surveys Europe from an international standpoint, and its scope and outlook will be fairly indicated if we call it the "League of Nations Almanack." Among other items mentioned in the prospectus are: "Survey of Economic and Social Conditions"; a Who's Who, giving 15,000 names of leading personalities in all the European countries; a description of the five major, and thirty-four minor, international authorities and societies; accounts of the four Peace Treaty Commissions; a whole section devoted to The Holy See; the British, French, Italian, and Dutch possessions outside Europe; a whole section on "Americans in Europe"; another on "Latin-Americans in Europe"; and a "list of the books of the year dealing with outstanding European problems." As a side-line the publishers offer two handbooks, one entitled "International Cartels," and the other "American Investments in Europe." (Price 2s. 6d. each; postage 4d., or 6d. on the two copies.) It is not surprising to find among the "Readers' and Press Opinions" quoted in respect of last year's edition, Colonel

* "The Europa Year-Book," 1927. (Europa Publishing Co., Ltd., 6, Duke Street, Adelphi, W.C.2. Price 15s. Postage 9d.)

House's tribute: "One of the most interesting and valuable reference books that I have seen;" and one from Walter Lippman, *The World*, New York; "... contains just the sort of thing that a man on my job is looking for." An inventory of the property on which Uncle Sam's loans and investments rest, and a directory of Wall Street's prospectors and exploiters at work on it are certainly both "interesting and valuable," and, in Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's tea-meeting terminology (presumably because there's a melon to be cut up) "worthy of a hearty welcome."

Mr. Wilson Harris in the *Daily News* of January 17, contributes an interesting article on America's dealings with the six little republics which join the North and South continents. The six were five not so long ago. The extra republic is Panama. How it appeared he explains. America wanted to cut the Panama Canal. The Isthmus of Panama belonged to Colombia, who was offered ten million dollars for the rights. Colombia thought the figure too low, and stood out for a better offer. Whereupon—

"After various not very secret comings and goings between Washington and the Panama zone, the Province of Panama revolted overnight from Colombia, declared itself free and independent and sovereign and all the rest, rushed through an agreement with the United States, pocketed the 10,000,000 dollars instead of Colombia, and settled down to a period of relative prosperity under the benevolent patronage of President Roosevelt."

This illustrates the reverse process to that described in respect to Santo Domingo last week. In that case America stepped in to suppress a revolution; but here she provoked one. Mr. Harris goes on to point out a difficulty that has arisen. The United States is concerned for the defence of the Panama Canal in time of war. The insignificant little republic of Panama cannot defend it; so the United States has just negotiated a treaty whereby, in the event of any threat to the Canal, Panama becomes for military purposes a piece of American territory. So far so simple. But Panama, as a free, independent, and sovereign State, happens to have signed the Covenant of the League of Nations. Her signature, given in 1919, committed her to abstain from war without first resorting to arbitration or inquiry by the League Council. As Mr. Harris comments, she will need a "pretty dexterous spokesman at Geneva" to demonstrate how those two obligations can be reconciled. But there is more to come. A little further north there is another section of the Isthmus, Nicaragua. In 1916, America agreed with Nicaragua to buy for 3,000,000 dollars a naval base, and the right to build a canal across the country. To-day there is an attempted revolution there. A General Diaz is in power, and is approved by the United States. He is being attacked by a Dr. Sacasa, of whom the United States disapproves. So marines have been landed declaring a neutral zone between Dr. Sacasa and his objectives, and in effect interposing a blockade between him and all sources of munition supply. The result of Washington's policy is, in Mr. Harris's words, to "produce a strain such as has not existed for many years past between the United States and Latin America." This is the usual result of the Old Economic régime. Investments; ships to protect them; bases to shelter the ships; marines to protect the bases; and political freedom deferred till the final war is over.

The writer of "A Londoner's Diary" in the *Evening Standard* of January 21 has a paragraph on the same subject. He remarks:—

"To some extent European traders and investors here gained by America taking on the role of a policeman with a big club. But ultimately they stand to lose because there is not the least doubt that Washington has used its powers mainly in the interests of its own citizens—to arrange loans, to get concessions, to forward American

penetration, to supervise and hamper the commercial and financial dealings of these Republics with the nationals of other Powers. Moreover, this policy has embittered all the Central and South American States, who see in it not only present complications, but the threat of future domination."

In the long run a nation, however superior in economic equipment, cannot successfully compete against others unless she can defend her right to compete by force of arms. There will be no end to the risks of war, no disarmament, until the supposed necessity for this competition is seen to be a financial myth. Happily there are signs here and there that belief in the omniscience of the financiers is wavering.

In previous years the Press has waited for the bank chairman to "tell them all about it"—and then swallowed it whole. In more recent years the newspapers have tried chewing the meal. This year the *Daily News*, in the person of its City Editor, goes a bit further and gives these chairmen a hint as to what the menu ought to be. He writes on January 18—two days before the first of the series of annual meetings:—

"Banking chairmen could do no greater service to the country than frank discussion, for or against, the Bank of England's policy, of which criticism fills the air in private talk in the City."

He speaks of great industries, through loss of trade occasioned by the dear money policy, having had to "pawn their assets for the loan of bank money"; and demands a lower Bank Rate. He quotes from the letter of a correspondent that—

"Owing to the failure of dividends from companies whose shares have been looked upon as almost gilt-edged many middle-class families are faced with the prospect of no income or of a diminished income."

Continuing, he says that employment cannot be increased until the question of financing new trade has been arranged. And even when employment is increased "the proceeds of trade will be pledged to lenders of money in greater volume than ever before." Industry has had to pawn capital built up in previous years, and "has had to spend the proceeds on maintaining its very existence." "Here, then, he declares, is a situation for the bankers to meet." It is: and we are gratified to see this evidence of understanding as to where the responsibility lies.

The "New Age" Dinner.

There are indications that the forthcoming Dinner will be the most successful that has been held. It is certainly taking place at a most opportune moment. On the one hand there is a marked tendency on the part of masters and men to kick against the effects of financial policy, and on the other unmistakable signs of divided counsels on the part of the credit monopolists. Every reader of this journal who supports its economic policy should make a point of attending. We address those who have not yet done so. Although the price may be a real handicap in some cases, our experience is that diffidence has been the most frequent cause of abstention. So let us say this: that in no instance where newcomers have broken through their nervousness have they failed to volunteer expressions of their pleasure afterwards. "I did not think it would be like that," is the typical formula. Let no one be put off by that bugbear—clothes. Evening dress is optional. That option is not a mere concession. It is symbolic of the outlook of the Social Credit movement. It is expected of guests that they shall come in the dress that they want to wear, not what they think they ought to wear. We need not elaborate this, because, after all, unlike other functions of the kind, the proceedings at New Age Dinners are on a plane where everyone of dress cannot intrude. We, therefore, urge questions of dress special effort to be present on this occasion. Tickets are now available; and we shall also be pleased to consider, and remove if possible, any other difficulties that may be brought to our notice. No contributions to funds of any kind are asked of individuals at these functions.

Lord Weir and Leadership.

By C. H. Douglas.

The post-war period has been marked, among other phenomena, by the emergence into very considerable prominence of a group of Clyde industrialists and bankers, who, together with certain newspaper Peers, are sometimes referred to as the New Aristocracy. All of them did very well out of the war.

The representative industrialist is probably Lord Weir, and, as such, he has recently been expressing himself, evidently under the stress of some irritation, in regard to "false prophets" who, while "having no experience of leading anyone, fertile in fault-finding, and with an affectation of knowledge they do not possess, set themselves in books and papers and lecture halls to disseminate their crudities of thought and partisan sophistries."

I may hasten to disclaim any idea that criticisms I have myself made would be likely to penetrate to Lord Weir, or if they did, would provoke this rather rhetorical outburst. But there is an idea behind it which is worth examination. I suffer from certain disabilities in undertaking the task, firstly, because I have met Lord Weir, which inevitably cramps one's swing, and, further, that I do not move in "Reformist" circles to any noticeable extent, and in consequence my observations may not be those which would be made by others who "set themselves in books, etc." I am, therefore, restricted for material to matter which is already at the disposal of anyone interested.

In the first place, it has to be admitted that, in the sense that he himself means it, Lord Weir is a leader. Absolutely anyone who can take up, say, a million pounds worth of stock in a business concern can be a leader; in fact, can only with difficulty avoid being a leader. I do not suggest that that is the only qualification possessed by Lord Weir, for I know it is not. But I do say it is the essential qualification. I do not suppose that he would himself suggest that the position in which he finds himself is solely, or even principally, due to his unaided efforts. As the inheritor of a very wealthy private company, immune from any serious competition for the headship of it, he is about as useful an argument for promotion by merit as, say, Mr. Edsel Ford. They may both have merit, but their position does not prove it, although promotion (and remuneration) by "merit" are strong points in the policy of both of them.

Having said that, however, it might surprise Lord Weir to hear that I think there is a great deal to be said in favour of the system to which he owes his position—a great deal that has not been said half as effectively as it ought to be. But what can not be said about it is that the fact that, under present conditions, a man is an industrial leader, is any proof at all that he ought to be a leader. Or, perhaps I might say that it provides quite a good mechanism for training a leader, but no evidence that he knows where to lead to. I hope to deal with this latter aspect a little further on. First, I should like to devote a little attention to Lord Weir's rather sweeping assertion (in which he compares unfavourably with the critics he rebukes) that the critics of industrial leadership, without exception, are without relevant experience, and do not know what they are talking about.

Every form of activity has its irresponsible critics. Lord Inchcape, another of the Clyde Group, for instance, has recently been making a number of arbitrary statements on the subject of Christianity and Foreign Missions, both subjects a long distance from banking. Even uninformed criticism, like the cackling of the Capitolean geese, may give a warning. But I think that what Lord Weir really con-

tends is that no experience which is not just like his own can be admitted in support of criticism.

To see to what extent this is justifiable, I must drag in myself, because, as suggested above, I cannot answer for anyone else. As a member of a profession to which Lord Weir belongs, I have spent about fifteen years as an official of engineering undertakings, all rather larger than Lord Weir's own firm, and dealing with a wider range of production. During a considerable period of that time (which was a time when the pound was a pound and not 6s. 8d.) I was remunerated by annual sums running comfortably into four figures. I mention this merely as presumptive evidence that I knew something about my job; and I think that Lord Weir will agree that a good deal of experience, not merely technical but administrative, inevitably goes with the circumstances I have indicated. In addition, however, it happened that my work brought me into close contact with permanent officials in India and elsewhere, American industrial organisers, and other persons whose point of view on industrial questions, while again differing both from that of Lord Weir (who, I think, has not resided much out of Great Britain) and of myself, is quite worth consideration. I might perhaps say, incidentally and somewhat irrelevantly, that such success as I did achieve during these times, which I confess was a source of some satisfaction to me, was achieved without the exercise of a grain of family influence of any kind whatever; that it has never been suggested to me that I was overpaid, and that the friendliest relations still exist between myself and the concerns to which I am referring.

Now, it would not occur to me to argue with Lord Weir on the details of pumps and feed-water heaters, which, I think, were his original speciality. But if he were to contend, which I do not say that he does, that I, for instance, am not entitled to be heard, at any rate, on a matter which is fundamentally allied to general engineering problems, and in regard to which what is called "a knowledge of the world" is very useful, I should be sorry, but his opinion would not seriously affect mine; and I think quite a number of people would agree with me. It would merely suggest to me that he did not understand what I was talking about.

I have tried to establish, first, that the position in which Lord Weir finds himself does not properly absolve him from the duty of replying to criticism, directed, of course, not against himself personally, but, as one might say, as an official of the industrial order; and, secondly, that there is room for some latitude in the qualifications of the critics. Perhaps that may justify proceeding to the examination of the legitimate grounds for criticism.

For my own part, I think that these are three in number at least, and I am inclined to think Lord Weir recognises one of them. During the past 20 years, what one may call the industrial administrative system has become far less fluid. Initiative has been suppressed. It has become far less easy for an individual with special aptitudes to get into a position in which these aptitudes can have free play. "Promotion by merit," like the measurement of credit by gold, establishes no recognisable relation between merit and the places available for merit to fill. This is the more important in that it oppresses chiefly the more active-minded individuals in the community; and, probably as a consequence of this, it is more obviously connected with industrial unrest than the other two more important causes of complaint which, so far as I can see, Lord Weir does not appreciate at all. I refer to the interlocking of industry with a defective financial system, and the misdirection of large numbers of wage-earners. In order to support this statement, it is helpful to examine his own activities (so far as they are public property) since the war.

So far as I am aware, and excluding his connection with the Power Supply problem, which is not amenable to his initiative, he has been identified with two major projects: the provision of what is known as the "Weir" house and the Anglo-Scottish Beet Corporation. Both of these undertakings are, to my mind, clear evidence of where, being a leader, he would lead us: both of them are a sacrifice of intrinsic or physical characteristics to the objective of financial success via cheapness, irrespective of quality. I think it is sufficient in regard to the Weir house to suggest a comparison between it and a Cotswold cottage of the sixteenth century to realise that the enormous progress in applied science in the past two or three hundred years is negated at the point where it is actually supplied to the individual for his use. Exactly the same criticism may be levelled at beet sugar: it is never even suggested that it is as good as cane sugar. So far as I am aware, all that is claimed for it is that it is cheaper than cane sugar. Incidentally, its manufacture raises up a formidable water pollution problem which is at present engaging the attention of the Ministry of Fisheries.

But a short and more general criticism which can be levelled at existing industrial leadership, and to which, I think, the public is entitled to demand an answer, is that since the function of a leader is to lead (and this country and the world in general is in a bad mess) the primary if not the final responsibility for explaining the mess rests upon those in positions of leadership; and some indication is necessary that a change of direction is contemplated. There is a strong and growing feeling that a mere composition between leading industrialists and the titular Labour Leaders with whom they have become so friendly, is in the nature of a conspiracy against the public, and that efforts to that end are not free from a desire to burke investigation of the true causes of unrest.

It is my own opinion that if, instead of maintaining a position of intolerance of criticism, these questions were squarely faced by industrial leaders, not with a view to finding the line of least resistance, but with a determined effort to rectify the situation, there would be an immediate subsidence of the growing challenge which Lord Weir appears to resent.

Most people in this country will let anyone lead them in the direction in which they want to be headed. But a persistence in leadership in a direction which becomes less and less attractive as its results in fiercer competition, decreasing economic security, and threat of inter-continental war become clearer, will, unless every sign of the times is mis-leading, result in depriving Lord Weir and those who seem to be associated with him, of a very great opportunity.

PRESS EXTRACTS.

"The fact that Governor Miriam A. Ferguson had declined to issue an appeal to cotton growers to reduce their 1927 acreage 27 per cent. was noted in a despatch of October 26. The Governor stated:—

"I shall not issue any proclamation of this kind at this time. As a cotton farmer as well as an official, I do not think I am justified, as conditions may so change the situation as to make such advice improper. . . . We hear a great deal about the willingness of the Federal Reserve Bank and the big bankers to help the poor farmers, but the people had just as well know the facts now, and that is that the Federal Reserve Bank will not loan a dollar on cotton unless it is in a bonded warehouse and with the endorsement of the banks, and the banks already have sold a dollar on cotton unless the farmer already has sold it to a cotton buyer, and whatever aid the banks are extending or are willing to extend is only helping the price of cotton. If any farmer doubts these facts, just let him go to the banks and try to get any money on his cotton on his farm or try to get any money from the Federal Reserve Bank."

The Commercial and Financial Chronicle, Nov. 20, 1926.

Drama.

Pygmalion: Kingsway.

Whether Shaw's plays are adapted to the medium of the stage refuses to be asked. He has bent the stage to accommodate them. Of "Pygmalion" he said that the universal success of this most didactic of plays proved his contention that plays should always be didactic. If Shaw's plays were denied a home in the palace of Drama—on propagandist, sermonising, or other grounds—it would be necessary to pander to his self-importance the more by giving him credit for inventing a new sort of art.

Here is a drama of ideas that maintains earnest laughter for a whole evening, and sends the audience home, in defiance of all philosophy, wiser and merrier. Shaw himself certainly regarded the play as propaganda. "If it only makes the public aware that the most important people in England are phoneticians, it will serve its turn." If "Pygmalion" was propaganda for simplified spelling it has been an enormous failure. A more subtle inference, granting that Shaw knew what he was doing, would be that he was trying to show advertisers the unexploited artistic possibilities of advertising, in which case it was equally a failure in effect, though in means a fine gesture.

The fact, of course, is that Shaw never knows what he is doing. "Pygmalion" combines a comedy, of manners, a comedy of morals—every bit as legitimate comic material—and a comedy of social conflicts, which the late nineteenth century shoved into comedy by betraying that democracy had imperfections. Shaw's boast that he made this jolly comedy out of the dry faculty of phonetics is bunkum. He made it out of the multiple personalities in himself, moving among the pretensions of the middle-classes, the antagonism between man and woman, and between the man-maker and the happiness of society. In plays like Shaw's, as in poems like Milton's—Professor Higgins has "a Miltonic gesture"—where the author personifies and dramatises his own conflicts, psychological criticism is to-day unavoidable. Such work does not exemplify the author's possible health, it reflects his present ills, together with those of his epoch; and less the ills that the author deliberately reveals than the more dangerous ills he is not aware of.

Professor Higgins, played on this occasion with Esmé Percy's versatile Shavian understanding, incarnates the nineteenth-century lust for dominion. He is the god in the play, the Shavian omnipotent efficiency living under the cold light of the sun, able to mould a flower-girl into a duchess. He can be roused to passion only by stimulating his professional jealousy of all the inefficient rivals for god-head. Yet his likeness to Alfred Doolittle—"except on certain points"—had to be admitted by himself. Alfred Doolittle, the performance of the evening given by George Merritt, is not merely the ambassador of the "undeserving poor" insisting on being heard instead of damned. He is not a type, whatever critics may say. He is like nobody in his class. What he is is another of Shaw's multiples, fighting with Higgins across the chasm of broken personality.

Alfred Doolittle prefers to be given five pounds rather than ten, lest his heart be invaded by that destroyer of happiness, ambition. Bliss contrasts with ambition throughout, and bliss is betrayed. It is Higgins who inadvertently betrays Doolittle to the thrall of middle-class morality. Doolittle's argument for the necessity of accepting his legacy and losing his status as undeserving poor is the most illogical in all Shaw, and it brings Doolittle down on the side of the main chance.

This pursuit of the characters is curious. Shaw's multiple personalities refuse to be dissolved. They keep the actual plays dragging on after they ought to end, even by getting, as in St. Joan, ticket-of-

leave from Hell. The reason for following "Pygmalion" into the future is to prevent his marrying Eliza Doolittle under pressure of public opinion. The terror of a happy ending is a greater tyrant than the craving for it.

Between the claims of making the best of things as they are and being driven by the life-force to a cold country, Eliza Doolittle herself never knows where she is. The play is half a vindication of the prayer about blessing the squire and keeping us in our proper stations, and half Cinderella without the fairy prince; which helps us to understand why Mr. Shaw's final acts present his characters at ceaseless cross-purposes, helplessly going on torturing and frustrating themselves for no human reason.

Shaw's own reason for forbidding the marriage between Pygmalion and Galatea was that Pygmalion had a good job and a good mother. When a man is so anxious to explain himself it is fit that we learn as much as possible from his explanations. Enough, however; beyond praise for Bessie Rignold as Mrs. Higgins, who was a good mother, and for Grace Edwin as Mrs. Pearce, the maid. Gwen Ffrangcon-Davies as Eliza gradually improved—or I gradually grew absorbed by the comedy, to the neglect of the players—throughout.

The Braux' Stratagem: Lyric, Hammersmith.

Among the jolliest nonsense in the English theatre William Farquhar's "The Braux' Stratagem" competes for first place. Its magnificent make-believe rolls out in fine frenzy that makes the actors really seem like children of the gods on a half holiday. These husbands, mistresses, wives, and lovers, good-humoured highwaymen, and rollicking innkeepers are creatures of Paradise, with the merriest contempt for all the righteous folk who count on getting there. With a twinkling humour, and a wit that tastes like old wine, this play is in one respect only centuries old; it is not neurotic. Its characters, creatures of fantasy, are single-minded in their love-making, their drinking, or their robbery. They know what they want. Yet at the end of a refreshing display of easy divorce, in a ceremony more picturesque than the one in which the marriage was contracted, four true lovers are eugenically paired to live happily ever after; and the robbers gaily dragged off to prison to share the freedom and forgetting of all creatures of fantasy once the dream is finished.

James Whale, as the drunken Squire Sullen, the fellow who, on its being assumed that he would not lie with his wife in his soaked condition, horrifiedly asks if he is taken for an atheist, had not full scope for his talent. James Whale can give an idea of sullenness, but nobody should require him to be taciturn. Nigel Playfair's highwayman, Gibbet, was also unnecessarily restrained; he ought to have been much nearer a monstrous clever fellow. Most of the other players, however, took advantage of the spaciousness of the piece to give a bouncing display. Scott Russell's Boniface, the jolly landlord of the inn, and Miles Malleon's Scrub were magnificent in mood and temper. The latter looked and lived the part of handyman butler who knew more about the inside of the family cupboard than he would tell, no matter how many fathoms deep the ocean of beer inside him.

Edith Evans triumphed; the play moves round her. Her Mrs. Sullen would justify the Restoration to the most sincere republican. Every nuance of her part was rendered clear through her range of tone and gesture. She was an aristocrat with complete self-knowledge, a romantic after disillusionment. The delicacy with which she suggested the impropriety of her thoughts must have won approval for them from a Puritan. It is no use quoting her lines, there is nothing to be done but to go and hear her speak them. It was for this that she was born.

PAUL BANKS.

A Priest's View of Psycho-Analysis.

By Philippe Mairet.

It is sometimes said that the science of psychology, in its latest developments, is likely to supersede religion as the means of human guidance and the criterion of conduct. It is a plausible idea. In its conceptions of "complexes" and the unconscious mind, science has come to consider consciousnesses as beings which, while they are not man himself, act in and through man. As a science of the emotions, which undoubtedly it is, psycho-analysis is invading a sphere we have always considered spiritual. When we compare the procedure of analysis with the religious practice of confession and absolution, it certainly looks as if the doctor is now aspiring to take over the function of the priest.

The best discussion of these relations between the Christian religion and these developments of psycho-therapeutic science is still to be found in Mr. Cyril Hudson's short treatise published five years ago. Whilst the majority of the clergy is undoubtedly hostile, suspicious, and ill-informed with regard to the whole subject, there are, according to Mr. Hudson, a few priests who are inclined to learn and practise the new psychology in their cure of souls. Mr. Hudson himself is well-informed, cautious, and perspicacious; and he carefully damps the enthusiasm of these more daring clerical colleagues by enumerating the divergencies between the technique of psycho-analysis and confession. Psycho-analysis deals with things repressed into the unconscious mind of the patient; things he does not consciously know at all, and which it would therefore be impossible for him to confess as a penitent. No doubt the practice of confession may prevent the formation of such psychic tangles, but it cannot directly cure them.

Moreover, psycho-analysis aims at one single and complete moral catharsis of confession, in order to set the individual thenceforth free to live entirely in his own way. Confession is, on the other hand, a methodical habit of reconciling the soul with a spiritual ideal of Man, with definite norms of action and reason; a right confession confers upon the penitent the power of unity with that supernatural Being. Unity with one's own unconscious and unity with another Being—the Oversoul of Humanity—are two different conceptions giving very different results. For these reasons, among others, Mr. Hudson is opposed to the idea of priests being influenced by psycho-analytical methods. He thinks they should study psychology in order "to be able to read the surface indications of a repressed complex when they see them": but they should hand over the treatment of such cases to a qualified expert. In this common-sense conclusion there is a useful possibility of co-operation between religion and science. It is reached, too, by a Christian thinker who is well aware of the fact that many—probably most—psycho-analysts are opposed to conventional sexuality. But Mr. Hudson is well aware that no analyst worth his salt ever attempts to drive a patient into a path to which the better part of his nature is opposed: for to do so would almost certainly make the cure of the patient impossible. There are dangers in this direction, as in every other, but they are not so great as the danger of leaving repressions untouched by dismissing analysis altogether.

Besides psycho-analysis, there is another production of modern psychology which has certain affinities with religion; that is, Suggestion, which, as practised by the followers of M. Coué, has been said to be a rational version of prayer. This is an exaggeration, for auto-suggestion, as it is taught and understood, remains a psycho-therapeutic method, without any norm of will or action in it. But Mr. Hudson seems to have a grudge against it: he treats it with

much less sympathy than psycho-analysis, because it is more crudely concerned with the questions of physical health. For prayer to be occupied with such questions, he affirms, would be to take the "essentially pagan view" that prayer can bend or alter the will of God. Flying to the opposite extreme, therefore, he says that every truly Christian prayer is an expansion of the one clause, "Thy Will be done." But to cut the perceptive element out of prayer altogether is to abolish it: so far as the worshipper really wills the Will of God, has he not a true perception of certain needs as they arise? Mr. Hudson cannot believe in cosmic fatalism to quarrel so with the "psychological determinism" of Freud. He argues, with reason, that this doctrine of Freud, together with his avowed hostility to religion, show that the great psychologist has himself a "determinism-complex." Whether this is so or not, Freud could hardly have given scientific form to his study of the human mind without assuming that every psychic state has an assignable cause. That, however, does not prove the case for psychic determination. There may also be spontaneous and "underived" contributions to the stream of psychic events.

This possibility has been envisaged by Dr. Schiller in his defence of general indeterminism: which is worth recalling for the sake of those who may not know it. This is the view that conjunctions may arise in the physical world, and still more perhaps in the psychic, when opposing forces are exactly balanced in unstable equilibrium, like a billiard ball upon a knife-edge. The conjunction would then be under the control of a "strictly minimal" force, which might have very great and important consequences. This conception would allow us to believe in "a power not ourselves" which makes for righteousness, and it is a power which is also omnipotent in the ultimate working-out of things. Mr. Hudson makes use of it as a defence against pure psychic determinism.

The consideration of the psycho-analytic attack upon Christian theology and dogma closes this excellent study. That attack has developed and extended since the book was written, and there is now much more for the author to do. In the main, he bases his vindication of Christianity upon the grounds of realism and historicity, but since psycho-analysts have pretended to explain the whole drama it is now necessary to explain their explanations. Unfortunately, it would be hard to find a psychologist as humbly respectful to religion as Mr. Hudson is to the science of psychology. If he could be found, however, much of this controversy might be skipped, and more good work might be done in the manner that Mr. Hudson foresees.

SEA NOCTURNE.

Lights on the sea-line go,
Vibrating to and fro,
Errant, mysterious, low,
Seen bright, seen dwindled;
But that one steadfast spark
That cleaves the drooping dark,
For what all fortunate bark
Is it enkindled?

II.

With far-flung beam it stands,
On rough and perilous lands,
Warning with upraised hands
The grey shipmasters;
Why did no beacon free
Flare out on Life's broad sea,
To warn and presage me
Of Love's disasters?

LIONEL GRANT

Congress and the Strike.

(Editorial).

Last Friday the Conference of Trade Union Executives at the Central Hall, Westminster, endorsed by 2,840,000 votes to 1,745,000, the action of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress in calling off the General Strike. For once in a way the Press has been bare of comment on the "scandal" of the block vote. Elsewhere on the same day Mr. Justice Eve endorsed the action of the Shop Assistants' Union in paying contributions to the Trades Union Congress in furtherance of political objects. This decision was enthusiastically cheered when announced to the assembled Trade Union Executives at Westminster. Glorious! Two victories over the extremists—one over the lefts, the other over the rights—all on the same day. Hurrah for the Middle Course—hurrah for Mediocrity—down with Responsibility—up with the Parliamentary Labour Party.

The *Daily Herald* as the house-organ of Parliamentary Labour urges the Trade Union Movement to cease hunting for scapegoats, to let bygones be bygones, to remember that although leaders "who were at the centre during the Nine Days may have made mistakes" yet they "strove honestly to do what seemed to them right." (Our italics.) It finishes with the following peroration:—

"It is of the future that the movement should think. The Spirit of the National Strike still lives, and though it may be called upon in different ways, it is the persistence of that spirit, overcoming all differences, which makes the onward march of Labour certain."

It puzzles us to understand how tolerance of inefficient leadership on the ground that it "meant well," is going to contribute to the onward march of Labour. The *Daily Herald* boasts that the Spirit of the National Strike still lives, but it spends one section of its article to raise, without answering, the question "What was the purpose of the Strike?" The only feasible definition of that Spirit, having regard to this uncertainty, is the Down-Tools Spirit. But if there is one thing certain about the spirit of the T.U.C. leaders who have now been whitewashed and repudiated a strike policy absolutely. So we have presented to us a picture of an army, disarmed by its own generals, being promised it shall march onwards. Onwards, yes—but into the prisoners' camp.

There is a close analogy between the two "victories" to which we have referred. In the case of the Strike fiasco, the *Daily Herald* points out that there was a complete misunderstanding between the General Council of the T.U.C. and the miners on the question of policy. It says that the General Council's objective was to use the strike to compel the mine-owners and miners to "re-open free negotiations for a settlement on the lines of the Samuel Report"; while that of the miners was "to prevent any reduction in wages, any increase in hours, or any departure from the principle of National Agreements." The misunderstanding, it declares, was due to the vagueness of the Council's resolutions, which gave rise to differences in interpretation. This sort of thing, it continues, cannot be helped,

"To assume that a resolution, in phrases that at the best are often loose, means the same thing to everybody who votes for it is a cardinal weakness in all democratic movements—and not least among Trade Unionists."

Now we turn to the Shop Assistants' Union. Here again we have divided interpretations, this time of resolutions passed by Parliament instead of T.U.C.

Council. Mr. Justice Eve based his decision not on the terms of any statute, but by reference to the intentions of the Legislature; and further, not by reference simply to its intentions in respect of the particular statute appealed to, but to its general attitude on cognate issues. For instance, while agreeing that the Legislature intended specifically that a Trade Union should not spend money on politics out of its general funds without the authority of its members; yet, he pointed out, the Legislature "discourages the interference of the courts in the domestic administration of all corporations and similar bodies." From this it appears that a Trade Union can transgress specific Legislative enactments so long as it acts in consonance with the general Legislative outlook. Now the general outlook of the Legislature is necessarily a capitalist outlook. Hence the encircling network of statute law is large-meshed on the Right and small-meshed on the Left. This is what is meant by the loose phrase: "One law for the rich and another for the poor." If the case against the Shop Assistants' Union had been, not that it had used general funds for political objects, but the reverse (imagine, for instance, that it had been proceeded against for using some of its political funds for remunerating pickets during the General Strike), it would probably have lost the day, because the attitude of the Legislature, being political, is generally and naturally favourable to the unauthorised diversion of funds to politics, and is certainly hostile to their diversion to direct-action.

These twin incidents show that the T.U.C. and the Courts are automatically gathering Labour's thoughts and Labour's money out of the economic field, where they might become dynamic, and into the political field, where they must remain static. Then again, centralised organisation, whether of Labour voters in a Party, or of Trade Unionists in a congress is Capitalism. To speak of Anti-Capitalist institutions is a contradiction in terms. The only freedom left to those leaders is to try to engineer a merger between the Trade Union Movement and Capitalism. "Peace in Industry," "Workman Directorships," "Co-Partnership," "Profit-Sharing," and so on; what else do these mean? Trade Union investments, too—to come down to brass tacks—are munitions for Finance-Capital. If Dr. Leaf himself ran the Trade Union Movement he could not do more to implement the policy of the banks and trusts than are the Executives of the great Trade Unions already doing in this respect.

The more of Demos that goes to make up an organisation the more undemocratic is the result. If there has been one issue upon which the opinion of the rank and file of Trade Unionism should be consulted, it is the decision of the T.U.C. to call off the Strike. How did it occur that leaders who had accepted the Samuel Report conducted a strike ostensibly in support of a body of men who had not accepted it? Who was to blame for the misunderstanding? If, as the *Daily Herald* says, the fault lay in the General Council's inefficient resolutions, who drafted them, and in consultation with whom? The rank and file of Labour may get some information on this subject, but Mr. Cook's proposition to refer all the circumstances to them for their vote was ruled out of order at the Conference. It would be interesting to know where the individual workers come in. They are often reminded that it is wrong in principle as well as cumbersome in practice for them to endeavour to tie their representatives down beforehand to a given course of action. Delegation is wrong; Representation is the thing. That is to say, you trust your representative's judgment, and have the right to sack him afterwards if he makes a

mistake. But what becomes of this right if, directly a case of alleged wrong judgment is brought, you are told to let bygones be bygones, that "the man meant well"? It is no use the *Daily Herald's* trying to be uncertain about the objective of the men who bore the brunt of the strike. They had it so fully in their minds, that it spilt out of their lips everywhere—"If the miners go down we all go down." They fought for the preservation of the miners' wages and hours. That is to say, the strikers rejected the Samuel Report. But their leaders, they now learn, had accepted it. Here is a conflict of policy, a fundamental issue; and if the rank and file are not permitted to inquire into and pronounce judgment on it they may as well never again attend a lodge meeting. They pay in their shillings; then their Unions hand the money over to the capitalists to mind; then in a crisis their leaders find out to their great surprise that capitalism is too rich to be affected by direct action. It is true that the Trade Unions are also rich. They can show scrip valued at millions of pounds, all safely invested in the enemy's heavy artillery.

The General Council has a good defence for its action. But it will not make it, for if it did it would open the eyes of the workers to some inconvenient facts—as, for instance, that Labour, under the existing financial system, cannot force anything tangible out of Capital. The Council's real and frank defence would be that it could not help letting the workers down; but in explaining why, it would be obliged to admit that it will not be able to help doing so in any future crisis of a similar kind. It would indeed require heroism for leaders thus to say in effect to their constituents: "Look here, you have put us in positions of prestige and emolument, but the job you expect us to do is impossible." So nothing will happen—until one of the unions awakens to the facts and applies the policy of self-determination to its affairs. In this connection one thinks of the Miners' Federation, but the present attitude of Mr. Cook holds out no prospect of such independent action. In spite of his disappointment at the vote of the Congress he is reported to have said:—

"To those who desire that we [the Federation] should disaffiliate from Congress I want to declare that any such attempts will have my fiercest opposition."

The reason given is that a "division in the ranks" of Trade Unionism would be playing into the hands of the employers, whereas the "greatest task of all" is to "reorganise our unions and to strengthen the General Council for the conflicts that are to come." To which we reply that disaffiliation from Congress cannot divide ranks which Congress has already turned into a rabble; that continued affiliation to Congress in the hope of changing the personnel of its General Council will ensure perpetual war in the movement; that if, alternatively, Mr. Cook's idea is to convert the existing Council to stronger action, his Federation would best do that by withdrawing its contributions and then advising Congress that it was open to a business proposition as to the terms on which it would re-affiliate. The unplaned fact is that the Miners have been subsidising a body to protect their members' wages, and this body has not delivered the goods. Not only so, but it has not delivered goods to any other workers—an alternative which might possibly have consoled a class-conscious enthusiast like Mr. Cook. In his own words, Congress has "provided the employers with support of their campaign to reduce the wages of other workers, as they are already attempting to do with the postal workers, farm workers, municipal employees, and others." The chief characteristic of a successful business man is his instinct for knowing when it is time to cut his losses and clear out. We commend that fact to the notice of the Miners' Federation.

Views and Reviews.

MEN AND LABOUR.

I.
The acknowledgment in Mr. Cole's* preface of indebtedness to the collection of books and papers made by George Howell, and now in the Bishops-gate Institute, almost moved me to write of Howell's instead of Mr. Cole's history. Howell's "History of Trade Unionism" was a cry from the heart on behalf of the working-classes; accepting the existing structure of society, Howell joined with everybody who would work under those conditions for the amelioration of the lives of the working-classes. His history manifested passion. After experiencing Howell's chapter on the Tolpuddle labourers, or on the fanatical courage of Samuel Plimsoll on behalf of the seamen, one can hold one's self back neither from shedding tears, nor from vowing never to rest short of Utopia.

Mr. Cole has been described as the Sidney Webb of the Guild Socialist Movement. It is not his métier to stir men's blood; he only speaks right on, recording, with occasional ironical epigram, the development of the institutions created by the working-classes in their endeavour to establish a distinction between themselves and the other materials of machine industry, and to seal their status as human beings. The pathos—and working-class history is a tragic epic—of Mr. Cole's narrative is between, or even behind, the lines. We read again and again that the miners, the builders, or textile workers, after a long struggle, were beaten owing to the exhaustion of their funds; that in 1866 a Yorkshire miner said that he had been locked out for two years out of the last six; that from the passing into law of the Master and Servant Act of 1867 cases of leaving without notice were dealt with by summons, heard in open court by more than one Justice instead of in the Justice's private house, and that fines were inflicted instead of imprisonment. Only imagination can bring home the implications of this tale, for Mr. Cole is watching the organisations grow, which, after trial and error, it is to be hoped will secure the working-class charter of manhood.

By 1848, when the Continent was swept by anti-capitalist revolt, the revolutionary movement in England had failed. The repeal of the Corn Laws was a master stroke of capitalist genius. Through that measure the new class of employers not only gained the confidence of a great section of the working class by the prospect of cheaper food; it ensured, as Bronterre O'Brien said it designed, to ensure, cheap subsistence for labour and, therefore, low wages; and at the same time by killing the English grain cultivation it increased the pool of unskilled town labour that competed at subsistence level. After the consequent breakdown of Chartism and the whole Utopist movement the working-classes tacitly accepted the conditions of wage economy.

The working-classes from 1850 practically yielded to their fate that, if England were to retain her occupation of the world's factory, the poor must be always with us; and they set out to alleviate as best they could, without challenging capitalism, their own poverty. In place of the generation that had left the fields with its fathers, and yearned to go back with Cobbett, a generation had arrived that had known nothing but the machine-shops of the towns, and it

* "A Short History of the British Working-Class Movement." By G. D. H. Cole. Vol. II., 1848-1900. (Labour Publishing Co. 6s.)

patiently tried to make its hatches rustle with as much straw as it could get. Forgetting its fathers' dreams and their longing to emulate the French revolutionaries, the working-class turned to such adaptable ideas as the Utopians had bequeathed, gradually realising those of permanent value in established and recognised institutions. Trade Unions undertook more and more the employment risks attendant on having a proletarian for a father. Friendly societies encouraged provision for sickness, age, and burial.

Strongly bound together, as well as to the new arbiters of national policy, if not by religion, at least by dissent, working people adopted the values of the new economy; abstinence, thrift, self-help, those divine slogans of early capitalism, won spontaneous working-class allegiance without any necessity for justification by the prophets of the age. Co-operative societies, springing from trading experiments of toy-town magnitude, began to organise the expenditure, and to utilise the accumulated tiny savings, of industrial workers. From successful trading to successful production: the Co-operative Wholesale Society, with its present-day capital and productive factories, especially in the Nonconformist north-country, arose from the association of trading-societies. Gradually great numbers of working-people found themselves shareholders in immense joint-stock companies, replicas of those on which capitalism was based. The system of trial and error had eliminated ideas not capitalist in tendency. In the process of establishing the Co-operative societies, for instance, experiments in production for purely local needs, or for the purpose of finding work for unemployed members, like the attempts at forming labour colonies, were sooner or later abandoned. The very air was capitalist.

Thus the working-class, although it had to fight unremittingly for the meanest human recognition, accepted its filial kinship with the new rulers, striving after stability and respectability; becoming, as Mr. Cole phrases it, in every way thoroughly Victorian; facilitating—and to some extent causing—that mighty economic prosperity which led to the supersession of the gospel of eternal love by the gospel of eternal progress. For a quarter of a century the workers really appeared to be sharing, in a modest way, the benefits of capitalist expansion. During this period of free trade, when Britain dominated unquestionably the market of the world for manufactured goods, suffering only under the occasional natural famine that nobody could help, or under the occasional financial crisis that nobody understood, the skilled workers in appreciable degree, and the unskilled workers in some degree, did partake, incidentally or directly, in the results of economic dominion. Agriculture was the exception, for agriculture was a doomed, and, apparently, so far as England was concerned, an unnecessary industry.

Hours of labour had been reduced, if not with final justice. Economic offences against the race typified by the employment of women and children for shamefully long periods or in mines had been either stopped or diminished in severity. Improvements in sanitation conferred benefits incidentally upon the workers, although they were brought into being through the fear of the rich lest they be infected by the diseases of the poor. The indispensability to modern industry of workers who could read and write opened the possibility of new experience for the workers. Many social amenities, such as the supply of gas and water, came within the reach of the artisan. Unspeakable capitalism had passed. England, in faith and pride of achievement, was a sort of minor anticipation of present-day America.

In this quarter-century from 1850 to 1875, the responsible classes had a great opportunity of utilising community of values for the unification of the whole people. Perhaps in view of the meanness of those values it is as well they missed it. Yet their history is a sorry one. Not until 1875 did the relations between employers and workmen finally become a simple civil contract, the breaking of which could not entail for the worker penalties particular to itself. Of the members of the Royal Commission of 1867 only Frederick Harrison, Thomas Hughes, and the Earl of Lichfield had human conscience enough to sign the minority report recommending that no act committed by a workman should be unlawful unless it were unlawful if committed by anybody else.

Yet on the strength of national prosperity and the steady growth of trade union organisation; and in face of stupid antagonism towards all claims for consideration of the workers by the employers; human recognition, and some status as citizens, were attained. The early eighteen-seventies witnessed the enactment of more social legislation than any other period in English history. Public Health, Housing, Factories and Mines, not to mention the Education Acts, decreed that henceforth capitalism, notwithstanding the power and obstinacy of its *entrepreneurs*, should be to some extent regulated. Let capitalism kill its own geese, it had to be held in check.

R. M.

The Quest of Values.

By Janko Lavrin.

II.—CONSCIOUSNESS AND EVOLUTION.

I.
Humanity as an organic whole is an abstraction, and in the present dispensation it is bound to remain an abstraction. We may indulge in sentimental theories about universal unity, yet a hundred theories cannot alter the concrete fact that mankind is composed of numerous races, nations, classes, and individuals, whose main object seems to be eternal strife and struggle with one another. The forms of this struggle vary, but its essence remains the same; it is a fight for supremacy—individual, national, and racial.

We talk of the equality of races only from a kind of humanitarian convention. We may be craving for it, yet in our hearts we do not believe in its possibility. If such an equality suddenly became a compulsory duty of our epoch and in our conditions, our very sense of justice might protest against it. To claim that the "pre-historic" negroes are entitled to the same rights as those nations which until now have carried the burden of history (and paid for it!) would be as absurd as unjust. To be brief, those only are equals whose historical functions and responsibilities with regard to our planetary evolution are equivalent. Nations, like individuals, occupy on the whole the place they deserve, that is, which they have conquered through their will and effort. A race which has stopped in its development and does not contribute anything to the growth of life on our planet, relegates itself thereby to an inferior role. As long as it remains in that role it will be looked upon as underdeveloped, lazy, and parasitic individuals by their active fellow-beings.

Justice has nothing to do with "equality." It demands, of course, that backward individuals and races should be given freely every opportunity for expressing themselves—every chance of *making* themselves equal to the best. If they fail in this,

they themselves must be held responsible, in spite of all sentimental theories about humanity.

II.

As soon as we try to consider mankind *sub specie aeterni* we notice that the whole process of history is a continuous duel between matter and various stages of human consciousness. The growth of life is in essence the growth of human consciousness, searching for new means of self-expression. In this tendency it has to fight for its liberation from "matter," "nature," "external conditions." It has to fight, in fact, against necessity, against the bondage of Fate—in the name of Destiny. To give up this fight would mean a capitulation before Fate. To stop at a certain stage, sticking to an obsolete "truth"—however great and useful the latter may have been in its time—would also mean decay and death; the greatest truth of to-day may become the greatest lie to-morrow, and therefore an obstacle to further growth.

This is incidentally the tragedy of our established religions. Once they were real creative forces. But instead of moving on, they stopped, and all their life-giving water was thus converted into a stagnant marsh. The same could be said of many ideas and impulses which once were great and inspiring, but now are mummies in the museum of history.

If the fight between Fate and Destiny is one of the chief conditions of human growth—both individual and collective—the tendency to move on is all the time counteracted by the law of inertia. There is always a Syren in us which not only bids us to stop at a certain achievement without undertaking the pains of further evolution, but also drags us back to the past: back to the idyllic primordium of humanity, or, which is equally bad, to a primitive *unindividual* "union" with nature (à la Rousseau). Individuals and nations decay when they no longer find within themselves sufficient power to resist the law of inertia.

This law is the trump-card that Fate throws out in her gamble with humanity. And she usually wins. Most individuals and nations cease their inner development sooner or later: some of them even in the phase of childhood, quite oblivious of the fact that all that ceases, and is incapable of renewing itself continuously, is doomed to perish. The absence of ascent is in itself downfall. And the most critical periods in this respect are those of transition, those which have exhausted one plane of human consciousness and are helplessly groping for the next. It is here that so many succumb to the "law of inertia" and to regression.

III.

The growth of human consciousness as a whole has three distinct planes: the pre-individual, the individual, and the over-individual. The pre-individual plane is that of the undifferentiated group-soul in which every individual ego is dissolved in the same way as single drops of water are dissolved in a sea. This type of consciousness is more or less expressed in primitive and patriarchal communities. In an ideal community of this kind individual selves do not exist, and have no right to exist: every individual self-assertion would be a danger to the compactness of the whole, and to its natural unity, its collective instincts and traditions. Nature herself seems to be working through such communities as she is working through an ant-hill, or a bee-hive. Internal as well as external harmony is one of their chief marks, and the idyllic happiness of this stage has been recorded by our myths and legends of the Paradise or the "golden-age."

Yet this state of vegetative happiness would in the long run utterly enslave man to Nature. He would be absorbed and swallowed up by her, gradually drifting back into the state and status of "happy" animals. Hence a reaction becomes imperative.

Adam had to be expelled from his vegetative Paradise in order to take the burden of growth upon his shoulders. The moment of expulsion, of the great "original" sin, to adopt the orthodox phrase, was the awakening of individual consciousness! Man fell from the harmonious whole to work out his own salvation at the cost of unheard-of toil and suffering. For the first time life became an individual problem, and man's mind was overwhelmed by ever-increasing quests and questions which had to be solved.

The beginning of individualisation, that is, the breaking-up of the "conservative" group-soul, is the beginning of growth and also of history proper. Yet since this process involves a complete sacrifice of the "golden age," the compact patriarchal organisms are disrupted, and gradually replaced, by external organisations, such as the State, in which codified law is substituted for custom and tradition. In the course of this disruption the released individual asserts his own self against everything—against society, against tradition, against his fellow-beings, even against the entire world-order. His endless capacities—good and bad—awaken, become stimulated by the struggle, and all that we call progress or civilisation is the result of this struggle. The centrifugal forces, however, soon threaten to take the upper hand until they degenerate into a destructive war of all against all.

Having once arrived at this point, humanity has only one choice left; either to find a new unifying focus, or to perish through its own "atomisation." An instinctive search for such a focus is rather typical of the present age. All our interest in religion, in mystical doctrines, in intuitivism, etc., may seem dilettantist and superficial; yet the impulse which is at work behind these is infinitely deeper than are intellectual fads and fashions. If the beginning of growth was the fall of the self from the whole, the reverse movement—that from the individual self to the whole—seems to be now the only salvation. But as this movement takes place either in the wrong direction, or on the planes which have already been surpassed, our quest gives us nothing but increased disappointment and despair—provided we are honest with ourselves.

It is our final despair which makes us realise that on the present plane of consciousness no solution can be found; nor can it be found on the planes already left behind; man can no longer return to the whole at the price of giving up his individual self, that is, in order to *dissolve* in "nature," or in the compact primitive masses (as Tolstoy would have it). This would be "salvation" along the line of least resistance, and consequently an act of cowardice. He must either perish or rise to a new plane—leaving the Old Adam behind as a snake leaves behind its worn-out skin.

But on a new plane all ultimate problems, including the problem of humanity, would necessarily assume a new and a more vital aspect.

Economic Geography.

The present troubles in China, Mexico, and Nicaragua—do not mention future outbreaks no one knows where—make it almost a necessity for the student of affairs to live with maps. It was a happy idea of Mr. Horrabin's to assemble in one volume a series of maps which he had drawn from time to time for *Lansbury's Labour Weekly* and *The Plebs* to illustrate articles on economic geography. The result is "The Plebs' Atlas."* In a Foreword he truly says that maps of the ordinary sort befog students by presenting a wealth of unessential detail, all of it emphasised equally. What is wanted is a series of diagrammatic maps in which only the most important place-names and economic facts are shown. Mr. Horrabin supplies this want; and by using

* "The Plebs' Atlas." Containing 58 maps with Notes and Index. By J. F. Horrabin. (The Plebs League, 162, Buckingham Palace Road, S.W.1. Price 1s., post free.) Obtainable also from the Credit Research Library, 70 High Holborn, W.C.1)

different sorts of shading, and arrows (as well as letter-press) he has given a local habitation to that old advertising slogan—"Every picture tells a story." We strongly endorse his expressed hope that students will use this atlas when reading foreign news from day to day. On every page there is an ample margin of white space on which they can write their own supplementary notes, and so keep the maps up to date. Since the printing is all in black and white, there is scope for the use of red and blue pencil by those who care thus to make the pictures even more graphic than they are; and we are glad to notice that a good stout rough-surfaced paper has been chosen, presumably with this idea in mind. The survey is thorough. To mention only one or two of the items in the "List of Maps"—there are "The Five Great World Groups—American, British, Russian, the Far East, and the French"; "The New Map of Europe"; "America and the Caribbean Area"; and, most important of all at this moment, several maps dealing exclusively with phases of the Chinese struggle. As regards the technical efficiency of the drawings and the lucidity of their lessons the work of Mr. Horrabin is admirable. We should have considered the volume cheap at half-a-crown. There is one suggestion we would make. An edition bound in stiff boards ought to be issued. The present paper covers are an inadequate protection for a work of daily reference such as this is likely to be.

Reviews.

The Press. Labour Research Department Studies in Capital and Labour. Vol. II. (Labour Publishing Co., Ltd., 38 Great Ormond-street, W.C.1. Price 1s.)

This book surveys "Types of Newspapers," "Newspaper Ownership," the "Organisation of Newspaper Companies," "The Harmsworth Interests," "The Berry Group," "Newspaper Workers," and "The Influence of the Press," among other items. The volume under review is the second edition, dated, January, 1923. There may be a later edition. If we hear that this is so we will give a further notice to it. We print this reference for the information of several readers who have inquired for a book on the above subject.

Whence, Whither, and Why? By Robert Arch. (Watts and Co. 3s. 6d.)

Mr. Arch's book has a title suggesting that he intends an answer to the riddle of the Universe; but after reading the quotation from Omar on the title-page one sees that the questions which head his treatise only signify his agnostic state of mind. The first chapters are occupied with logic, and are business-like, if not very original or interesting. He even aspires to try his teeth upon the paradox of Zeno, and breaks them in the attempt. "Size," he says, "is at bottom *number*." That disposes beautifully of Zeno, of course, if Mr. Arch can prove it. He has only to square the circle, or to give the arithmetical relation between the side of a square and its diagonal—details he has omitted from this book—and Bergson and Einstein who will personally review his work! But this will not do, except in a Pythagorean sense, which is far from Mr. Arch's mind. Size is *not* num-ber. Size belongs to space. Space is essentially simultaneous and the number of the simultaneous is One. Space and One are indefinitely or infinitely *divisible*, the instants of Time are indivisible but infinitely *multipliable*. The living reality in which they are united in our actual experience is neither divisible nor multipliable, but perfectly continuous; but as soon as we *think* about that continuous reality, space and time are separated by thought and we live in paradox. The paradoxes of Zeno are not meant to be explained away, they are meant to be understood. They are the simplest proof of our intellectual limitation. However, apart from his desperate assault on Zeno, there is little enough fight in Mr. Arch. In his last pages, upon the meaning of morality, he proclaims "psychological Hedonism," a doctrine that satisfies him most—or perhaps we should say dissatisfies him least." This "truth," he says, is not affected by the subjective feeling of "ought." That is a good example of the partial paralysis of the intellect called Sorites; one of its commonest symptoms is this shirking of the mind's true generalisation. Its cause is the will to evade the necessity for any fixed belief or defined assumption. From this Mr. Arch declines easily to the idea that there is such a thing as an immoral "ought," and concludes that the less ethical theory is built upon the subjective feeling of "ought," the better. Yes, but what about action, Mr. Arch? Is that, also, the better the less it is based upon a sense of duty?—and, if not,

is ethical theory best which ignores the fact? Mr. Arch does not mean to be immoral, but he does seem to be very anxious not to mean anything at all. After these dark sayings, there is an ending exactly like that of one of Mr. Bertrand Russell's books, an exhortation to finish our miserable little lives with the least possible deflection by any kind of faith or ethical principles: after the delivery of which he very properly retires from the business. There is room for men of faith and for whole-souled sceptics, but for fugitives who only take pot-shots at everything from the ambush of Agnosticism there is neither room nor time.

African Clearings and A Lucky Lad. By Jean Kenyon Mackenzie. (Hopkinson. 5s. and 3s. 6d.)

The rewards of the reviewer are few, compared with the annoyances which leap round and claw at him, like dirty children in the back streets of literary adventure. And when there are no books for him to take home save a couple of tracty-looking odd volumes painfully scribbled by some woman missionary out of her loneliness, why should he not curse loud and long? For it is not true that the reviewer dislikes hard work; he dislikes wasted work. So he takes up the missionary books with a heavy heart, and an evil intent—and finds himself in the presence of genius, that quality of mastery so modest and yet so confident, so hard to define yet so unmistakable. These books are different in subject, and therefore different in treatment. The first is a series of things remembered in a civilised armchair from the green and darkling depths of a jungle in the Cameroons. The second is a few vignettes from the early days of the writer's father, when he was a shepherd lad in the Highlands, and had not yet come to the United States to enchant Presbyterian congregations. It might be thought that we should here have a mannered, affected, kail-yardified business before us, but praise the pigs, it is not so. We see the boy, the youth, the young man through adoring, filial eyes, it is true, but none the less clearly and simply and charmingly for that; and the pages of this little book are fragrant with a clean breath from the past. As for the African sketches, they are magnificent. Would that all authors, missionaries included, might set themselves the same standard of craftsmanship, might think out as earnestly what they want to say and take the same care and pride in the saying of it. From other authors, Miss Mackenzie borrows nothing but the plain lessons of their experience. Yet she takes pains worthy of Kipling himself to know her people and the scenes in which they live, and when she comes to the putting of pen to paper, nothing will serve her but the best. An almost Chinese reverence for the responsibility of the written word controls her hand:—

"I am visiting Sorrow of Evening. The walls of her little bark hut are hung with a gray film of nets; for she lives by the sea, and her husband is a fisherman. With a seine of checkered cloth she has been fishing in a back-water, and now she heaps her catch upon a mat of green water, and now she heaps her catch upon a mat of green leaf that she has spread on the clay of her floor. All her fish are little, very little; all are bright. None is longer than an almond. Some are like moonstones and some like opals; some are freckled with gilt and some with vermilion. Some little bold ones are striped like tigers, and burn there on the green of the banana leaf—there they all burn and glimmer and glitter for a moment, and I remember them for ever."

Or she walks alone by the sea-shore:—
"I walk out, and the night beats upon me in a light fall of starlight, and the damp of the dew and the soft insistence of the waves and the sharp insistence of the thousand thousands in the grass and the sudden sweetness of the bugle melt my heart that is hard with the monotony of the day's work—and set their record for ever in the wax of it."

A metaphor from a gramophone, made poetry. Could any but an artist do the trick? But it isn't a trick, of course. It may be conscious art, but the feeling is there. And what else matters but feeling and the hand that never falters, the chisel that never slips?

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

LOAN RATIONING.

Sir,—I am glad to learn from your correspondent, Hilderic Cousens, that "there are plenty of people who believe that the existence of a factory or a farm or someone unemployed constitutes a valid right to an issue of financial credit to enable them to produce," and I would suggest that if credit loans were rationed in proportion to turnover that the objections raised would not apply.

A. W. L.

The Social Credit Movement.

Supporters of the Social Credit Movement contend that under present conditions the purchasing power in the hands of the community is chronically insufficient to buy the whole product of industry. This is because the money required to finance capital production, and created by the banks for that purpose, is regarded as borrowed from them, and, therefore, in order that it may be repaid, is charged into the price of consumers' goods. It is a vital fallacy to treat new money thus created by the banks as a repayable loan, without crediting the community, on the strength of whose resources the money was created, with the value of the resulting new capital resources. This has given rise to a defective system of national loan accountancy, resulting in the reduction of the community to a condition of perpetual scarcity, and bringing them face to face with the alternatives of widespread unemployment of men and machines, as at present, or of international complications arising from the struggle for foreign markets.

The Douglas Social Credit Proposals would remedy this defect by increasing the purchasing power in the hands of the community to an amount sufficient to provide effective demand for the whole product of industry. This, of course, cannot be done by the orthodox method of creating new money, prevalent during the war, which necessarily gives rise to the "vicious spiral" of increased currency, higher prices, higher wages, higher costs, still higher prices, and so on. The essentials of the scheme are the simultaneous creation of new money and the regulation of the price of consumers' goods at their real cost of production (as distinct from their apparent financial cost under the present system). The technique for effecting this is fully described in Major Douglas's books.

The adoption of this scheme would result in an unprecedented improvement in the standard of living of the population by the absorption at home of the present un-saleable output, and would, therefore, eliminate the dangerous struggle for foreign markets. Unlike other suggested remedies, these proposals do not call for financial sacrifice on the part of any section of the community, while, on the other hand, they widen the scope for individual enterprise.

THE NEW AGE is on sale at Henderson's, 66, Charing Cross Road (close to Leicester Square Tube Station) and at the news stand on the corner of Holborn and Chancery Lane (opposite Chancery Lane Tube Station).

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS.

Contributors are asked to take note that a column of large type in THE NEW AGE contains about 700 words, and a column of small type 975 words. Their contributions should therefore be of 700 or 1,400 words in the first case, or 975 or 1,950 words in the second.

Except in special circumstances articles should not run on to three columns. Normally a writer should be able to explain his thesis adequately in one or in two columns. If not he should divide it with the above measurements in view.

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.

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

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

"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.

The "NEW AGE" ANNUAL DINNER

will take place on

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12th, 1927,

at the

FLORENCE RESTAURANT,
Rupert Street, Piccadilly, W.

Tickets 7s. 6d.

Applications to the Manager, the "NEW AGE," 70 High Holborn, W.C.1 (Telephone: Chancery 8470).

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY

The Key to World Politics. Chart showing plan of world government now being attempted by the international financiers. Price 1d. (postage ½d.).

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/-.

The Veil of Finance. Reprint in book form of a series of articles from "The New Age" by Arthur Brenton. If a banker appeared on an island under primitive conditions, and applied to its activities the present laws of "sound finance"; what would happen? This is the main basis of the author's analysis and its application to the costing and pricing laws of modern industry. 64pp. Price (paper covers) 6d.; (boards) 1s. (postage 1d.).

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.

A consecutive introductory reading course in Social Credit is provided by the following sets of pamphlets:—

SET A.

Comprising:—
Unemployment and Waste (1d.).
The Key to World Politics (1d.).
Through Consumption to Prosperity (2d.).
Socialist First Aid (1d.).
Catalogue (gratis).

Post free 6d. the set.

SET B.

Comprising:—
Set "A" above.
The Veil of Finance (6d.).
Post free 1s. the set.

Catalogue of other books and pamphlets free on application

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

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.