

# THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER"

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, AND ART

No. 1869] NEW SERIES Vol. XLIII. No. 10. THURSDAY, JULY 5, 1928. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	109	TWELVE O'CLOCK. By Sagittarius	114
The delay in the Savidge case report—the split between Scotland Yard and the Home Office—no Hyde Park prosecutions during May. The <i>Referee</i> on the revalorisation of the French franc. Mr. Graham Hardy on company reconstructions. Mr. Penty on machino-facture. Steel politics and Protection. Oil politics—Mr. Churchill on the Government's obligation not to interfere with the Anglo-Persian Company's price policy. Mr. Maxton and the I.L.P.		LENIN AND THE SOCIAL CREDIT OBJECTIVE. By Gordon Jacks	115
LEFT-WING TAXATION. By C. H. Douglas	112	<i>Lenin</i> (V. Marcu).	116
VIEWS AND REVIEWS. The Fascist and Bolshevik Dictatorships in Antithesis. II. By W. T. Symons	114	DRAMA. By Paul Banks	
<i>The Fascist Dictatorship of Italy.</i>		<i>Tell Me the Truth.</i> Nju.	117
		A DIALOGUE IN HELL. By Axieros. (Translation.)	119
		A REVIVAL OF HANDICRAFT. By A. J. Penty	119
		<i>The Idea Behind Craftsmanship.</i> Economics of Khaddar.	
		VERSE	
		By William Repton (118). L. S. M., and N. B. (119).	

## NOTES OF THE WEEK.

In a murder trial, when all the evidence has been tendered, examined, and reviewed, the jury are shut up in a room until they have arrived at a verdict. They are not permitted to consult with anybody but themselves; they are completely isolated from society until their job has been accomplished. The reason is that they are expected to make up their minds exclusively on the legal evidence, and to say on which side the balance of probability lies. Moreover, they must say "Guilty" or "Not Guilty" without reference to what the effect of their verdict may be on the prisoner or on society in general.

Contrast this procedure with that which has followed the Savidge Inquiry. The three Commissioners, who were the jury in this case, went home at the end of the proceedings. For weeks since they have been free to discuss the case with any and every person or organisation which can conceivably have an interest in its final outcome. In other words, the public inquiry was merely a short prelude to an extended private inquiry which is not yet finished. At the trial of Brown and Kennedy it took a couple of hours to send them to the scaffold. It has taken several weeks for the Commissioners to decide whether the police exceeded their duty, notwithstanding that in this latter case the victim of the alleged crime was alive and able to describe her experiences. If it is really so difficult to arrive at the truth in such favourable circumstances, we are not surprised that people are uneasy about verdicts and sentences in trials involving capital charges.

While the Commissioners are coughing the police are taking a holiday. During the month of May not a single charge of indecent conduct in Hyde Park was brought by them, whereas the average number of such charges was forty per month. Presumably this period of inactivity has continued through June. It is said, also, that there has been a similar decline in

charges against street bookmakers, and in other charges which have hitherto been held to be sufficiently supported by a police officer's uncorroborated testimony. Whether, as a result of police inertia in regard to Hyde Park, the result would be "a disgrace to civilisation in a fortnight," as Sir William Joynson Hicks remarked last week, is a matter for people who use the Park at night to consider.

Sir William added that the situation was causing him the "gravest anxiety." We do not wonder. He is jointly responsible with other politicians for administering a system of repression in the interests of a Financial Government, and for exacting a reluctant obedience from practically the whole population to a body of laws imposing unnecessary sacrifices on them. The political Government dare not fall out with the agencies they employ to compel obedience. A few years ago, when the police began to form trade unions there was a tremendous scare. Some hundreds of them were dismissed from the force, and in a week or two the remainder received substantial increases in pay, and other concessions. To-day the situation is worse, because the rank and file of the police force are obviously either carrying out orders from their own chiefs, or are at any rate not being punished for their present passivity. The disaffection reaches higher up. The Government's task is to devise means of composing the difference without cheating the democrats of the verdict of censure which they were so hastily and unthinkingly stirred up to demand by the Press. Sir William Joynson Hicks, fresh from his triumphant victory over the Trades Union Congress on the issue of "dictatorship" over the Government, looks like having to accept defeat on the same issue to-day. Scotland Yard is in effect telling the Government that the police are not going to risk being accepted to-day as truth-tellers, and rejected to-morrow as liars on undisclosed grounds of political expediency. There must be rules laid down so that a police officer may do his duty impartially whether he has to arrest the lowest or the highest in the land. This is going to be a difficult matter. But there is no

assailing the moral justice of this demand, and something of that sort will have to be done. It will be interesting to see what the Government will do about it. Scotland Yard could, merely by opening its mouth, put an end to the popular belief in constitutional government. We should guess that against every instance where the police have acted too rigorously on their own account in establishing charges against delinquents, there must be dozens where they have acted too leniently under pressure from the Home Office—where they have refrained from bringing any charge at all.

There has been a discussion in a number of newspapers during the last week on the question whether politicians are underpaid. The consensus of their conclusions is that they are. The common line of reasoning is that there are so many agencies competing with politics now that "the country" will have to bid up if it hopes to secure the services of the "best brains" in politics. Our answer to this is that unless the overriding financial principles under which politics is practised are radically altered, the country's need is not for intellectuals but for magicians. The bankers set the community the task of disgorging at least twice as much money in prices and taxes as they receive. The politicians, who without exception regard this as an inevitable requirement, have clearly no function for which they can reasonably demand remuneration unless they can invent a new system of arithmetic. Up to the present they have not done so. Instead, they have contented themselves with exhorting the people to practise the magic themselves, or passing laws to compel this or that section of them to shoulder the task for the sake of the rest. In short, politics is dope. This is so for much the same reason that the Bolsheviks applied that epithet to religion. They rightly regarded religion in its institutional aspect as an agency of exploitation. It worked by teaching people to neglect their duty to this world in order to fulfil better their duty to the world to come. It worked out by causing people to regard sacrifice—abstinence—as a virtue in every plane of life. Politics works out in exactly the same way. It is, in fact, only because the priest plays the game of the politician, who plays the game of the banker, that the remuneration of the priest is tolerated at all as a proper object of State expenditure. As soon as the State Church fails to earn a dividend of hypnosis out of its capital expenditure of religio-political dope, it will be definitely disestablished and disendowed.

The question under discussion amounts to this: "Is the doper worthy of his hire?" Naturally the answer of the Press, which is rapidly superseding all other agencies of deception, is a vociferous "Yes." Hence there is a general feeling, engendered in Fleet Street and impudently imputed to the public, that Prime Ministers, Judges, the higher Civil Servants, and other hired illicit drugsters ought to get more needle-money. The newspapers have had their little bit already: they are all selling at double the pre-war price, and nobody objects; and this in spite of the fact that if there is anything in the statement that mergers and trusts ensure economies, the standard price of a newspaper to-day ought to be nearer a farthing than a penny.

A writer in the *Referee*, who signs himself "Arthurian," in describing the effects of the re-valorising of the French franc, makes the following remark:—

"As the newspapers say: 'It means heavy loss to the pre-war rentier'; and people who have paid premiums to the insurance companies in good gold-standard money for years now see their policies reduced to one-fifth of their rightful value."

If this is true, the moral to be drawn is that the

spendthrift cannot be robbed. If you use your money to buy goods, nothing can exhaust their utility value to you except fair wear and tear. If you do not buy to sell again you can keep clear of the backwash of financial juggling. In some instances the spendthrift does even better financially than the saver. There is the case of the two sons of a gentleman in Austria who died and left them equal legacies. One invested his legacy and the other drank his in wine. Yet when the inflation-ramp had run its course, the first discovered his legacy was worth nothing, while the second sold his empty wine bottles for more than the amount of his original legacy. The present financial system penalises thrift right and left in the long run, but nobody sees it. Yet it is as clear as day that when bankers call in their loans the "broadest backs" have to stand the heaviest burdens—i.e., the thrifty have to bear all the sacrifices.

Mr. Graham Hardy makes reference in last Sunday's *Referee* to the capital lost in various recent company reconstructions. Here is his table:—

Dunlop Rubber .....	£10,500,000
British Dyestuffs .....	2,750,000
Vickers .....	12,000,000
Crosse and Blackwell .....	4,500,000
Sheffield Steel .....	2,000,000
Armstrongs .....	11,000,000
Baldwins .....	4,250,000

Thus, seven concerns alone have lost £47,000,000. He adds that coal, cotton, and railways would make a startling addition to this total if statistics were available. He rightly repudiates on behalf of manufacturers the thoughtless charge that losses of capital are due to their inefficiency, but he wrongly attributes them to the operation of interest. Interest is not a general burden on the community; it is a particular exaction from some sections of the community, but is offset by an equivalent benefit to other sections which receive it. When interest after collection is not used as personal income, and spent on consumable production, it is a contributing factor to the economic deadlock; but not more so than profits generally. Interest and profits together do not account in quantity for the gap between ultimate prices and personal incomes. The proof that this gap must occur under the present unregulated price-system can be given without taking interest into the question at all. If all bank money were loaned free of interest the major defect in the economic system would not be made good.

Let us sketch out the Social Credit analysis. We say that when the general price-level rises consequently on the construction of, say, a new factory "Z," the consumers begin at once to pay in to the existing factories "A" to "Y" an aggregate extra sum of money equal to the sum being disbursed on "Z." Call the cost of "Z" £1,000. We say that at the time when "Z" is completed, and before "Z" begins to function (and physically depreciate) the consumers have parted with the £1,000 paid out by "Z," which "Z" will later require to recover as depreciation or replacement charges. In that case the only way in which "Z" could recover them would be if firms "A" to "Y" were to hand back their extra revenue of £1,000 as a free gift to consumers. (New bank loans are excluded, because these would create new costs equal to their amount, and would leave the £1,000 gap unclosed). But "A" to "Y" cannot do this even if they would, because these firms in their turn have got themselves into "Z's" difficulty with regard to their own depreciation charges; and they need "Z's" £1,000 to help them out with meeting their own depreciation costs.

This may be confusing to trace back in detail in single cases, but it ought to be clear that as a general

proposition consumers are always *pre-paying* the depreciation charges of capital construction *during the progress of the construction itself*. Industry as a whole recovers all its money disbursements (both for current output and new factories, etc.) in or through current retail prices charged, and savings collected as investments. That means that Industry ought to be able to renew its factories out of its own accumulated resources, and should not need to make any charge for their "depreciation." But Industry is not able to do this, and the reason is that the banks, who create the loan-credit for Industry's disbursements, get it all back again from Industry and destroy it. This process is not evident to casual observers because it is hidden in the multitudinous over-lapping of bank-loans and repayments, and the extreme range of amounts and time-lengths involved. But it is going on. The result is that Industry has to pilfer the depreciation charge from its own investors. That is the teaching of Mr. Graham Hardy's table.

In a scientific system of finance the effects of the above indiscriminate destruction of credit by the banks would be offset by new credit. Take the case where "Z" factory was built. At the moment of its completion the consumers had paid its cost into Industry elsewhere. It is now a new asset worth £1,000. Its owner is entitled to recover this £1,000 in his future prices to the community. But the banks have destroyed this £1,000. Let them. That is their routine job. A repaid loan cancels a deposit automatically in their books and they can't help it. But there is a higher credit authority than the bank, and that is the Government. There should be a national credit account, and into it should be entered the cost value of "Z's" new factory considered as a new national asset. Against this asset the Government should create and give money to the community at the same rate as "Z's" factory physically depreciates. That is the principle—and it means that the public as consumers would at all times have a call on free Government credit equal to the cost value of all the existing capital equipment in the country. This call, however, would only be effective at the same rate as the equipment was wearing out.

We may appropriately make reference here to Mr. Penty's short article elsewhere in this issue. We have discussed his views on machine production as against human craftsmanship more than once. He refuses to see any good in mass production by mechanical means. We affirm, on the other hand, that the only thing wrong about the machine is it is not allowed to do its work when it has been made. Far from having enslaved mankind, machine-fac-ture considered as a thing in itself is mankind's emancipation. What stands in the way is, to speak courteously, the "human" craftsmanship of the banker. The machine can be dismissed from the case. The real issue is whether a whole population shall be forced to do distasteful work simply to make it easier for the banker to enjoy doing his.

With this reservation we have much sympathy with Mr. Penty's outlook. He refers hopefully to the striking revival of hand-spinning and hand-weaving in India since 1920, when Gandhi first advocated it. It has increased its strength twenty times and now gives employment to 50,000 spinners and weavers. He attributes this to the increasing "overhead" and "selling" costs which hand-production escapes, and also to the improvements in the hand-spinning wheel and loom; and expects that in the near future textile handicrafts will be able to compete on equal terms with machine production. All this amounts to the contention that the little machine can be made as efficient as the big machine—a very different proposition from his indiscriminate damming of machinery

as such. We believe this to be true in regard to a great deal of production, and have seen it urged against the present policy of trustifying and centralising electric power and suppressing small local power installations.

The danger to this Indian experiment is the same as has prevented mass machinery from functioning, namely that the high financiers will "regulate" it as soon as it seems likely to upset their policy. To be completely immune from financial attack, an industry would need to be in a position to make its final articles without buying anything. It is possible to do it, too, as the following facts will show.

In a public house exactly opposite King's Theatre, Hammersmith, there hangs an old engraving bearing this subscription:—

"To Robert Throckmorton, Esq., Buckland House, Farringdon.

"This Print, representing the beginning, progress and completion of an extraordinary undertaking to prove the possibility of Wool being manufactured into Cloth and made into a Coat between sunrise and sunset, which was successfully accomplished on Tuesday, 13th of June, 1811 is respectfully dedicated by his most obliged and humble Servant John Williams, Land Steward to the late Sir John Throckmorton.

"On the day above stated, at 5 o'Clock in the morning, Sir John Throckmorton presented 2 South down Sheep to Mr. Coxeter of Greenham Mills near Newbury, Berkshire. The Sheep were immediately shorn, the Wool-sorted and spun, the Yarn spool'd, loom'd and wove, the Cloth burr'd, the mill'd, row'd, dy'd, dry'd, shear'd and press'd. The Cloth having been thus made in 11 Hours was put into the Hands of the Taylors at 4 o'Clock in the afternoon, who completed the Coat at 20 minutes past 6. Mr. Coxeter then presented the Coat to Sir James Throckmorton, who appear'd with it the same Evening at the Pelican Inn, Speenhamland. The Cloth was a hunting Kersey of the admired dark Wellington Colour. The Sheep were roasted whole and distributed to the Public with 120 gallons of Strong Beer. It was supposed that upwards of 5,000 People were assembled to witness this Singular and unprecedented performance which was completed in the space of 13 hours and 20 minutes.

"Sir John and about 40 Gentlemen sat down to a Dinner provided by Mr. Coxeter, and spent the Evening with the utmost satisfaction at the success of their undertaking." ["London: Published by John Mitchell, 33, Old Bond Street."]

It is not stated whether the Indian weavers are working under the same conditions as regards their material as are set forth in the above narrative. If they grow their supplies of cotton, and do not "improve" their wheels beyond the possibility of making them themselves, they can do some good. But even so, from all accounts a good deal of money-lending goes on in India; and in the last resort the people are liable at any time to tax impositions which could destroy the fruits of their hand-craft policy. At the same time a development like this is a logical reaction against financial repression, and is to be welcomed and fostered wherever found, because it is one of many similar reactions in other quarters of economic life, all of them converging towards the final revolution in financial policy.

America's growing economic difficulties are reflected in the action taken by the U.S. Steel Trust and the Bethlehem Steel Company. They have applied to the Federal Trade Commission for sanction to set up an export association. Five years ago, when certain independent American steel firms tried to establish such an association, these two great corporations held aloof and the project came to an end. The reason suspected for this change of attitude is contained in some gossip in New York that the European steel cartel is cutting into the export business of these firms. Another possible reason is that they have been tempted by the success of the Copper Export Association, which not only appears to have

maintained its copper markets but has been able to raise prices. A representative of the *Financial Times* has been interviewing British steel manufacturers, who say that they do not anticipate their markets being affected.

It is to be hoped that this is true, because a deputation of steelmakers waited upon Mr. Baldwin last week, saying that they could not compete in price with low-wage countries. They said that the industry was now working only at 60 to 70 per cent. capacity. The difference in cost of production on that output as compared with working at 90 per cent. capacity was at least 10s. to 15s. more per ton, dependent on the product. The deputation urged the Prime Minister to apply a "safeguarding" duty to the heavy steel industry.

This pressure on the Government to resort to Protection is growing steadily stronger in spite of the tirades in the Bankers' Manifesto against international trade barriers. But the chances of the present Government surviving the next election on such a programme appear to be remote. Now that half the electorate is composed of women, it seems as though the Free Traders' catchwords and phrases will gain vastly in effect. Women, though now so widely engaged in industry, still retain their consumer complex, and to them Free Trade scares about "higher prices" will outweigh Protectionist reassurances about "higher earnings." But we are not concerned about the political outcome of the struggle. The stark fact is that there is no money about and there is only one source whence money can be provided. Whatever party succeeds Mr. Baldwin will have to face this fact or incur the penalty of ignoring it.

In 1913 the British Government secured control of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company so as to ensure supplies for naval and other vital purposes. Subsequently this company began to undersell the great American and Dutch combines in the markets of the world, and this competition became intensified later on by the entrance of the Russian oilfields into the fight. The Anglo-Persian competition was dealt with by the formation of a merger, in which it became allied with the Standard Oil and Royal Dutch Shell concerns. This left the Russian interests still independent, and as the enlarged Combine could not counterbalance the Russian price advantage, it has endeavoured since to protect itself by promoting anti-Bolshevik propaganda. During that period there occurred the Home Office's "third-degree" raid on Arcos, followed immediately by the *Daily Mail's* attack on all petrol dealers who would not give to that journal an undertaking that they would not sell Russian petrol. In a leading article on the subject the *Referee* states that "it is believed that the Combine is striving to purchase the entire output" of Russian petrol. Whether it succeeds or not, there is an uneasy feeling that a rise in the price of petrol to British users is likely to take place. This was shown in questions directed at Mr. Churchill last week inquiring what was the position of the Government as principal shareholder in the Anglo-Persian company. Mr. Churchill replied that the Government were "under an obligation not to interfere with the commercial management" of that company. The only reassurance he could proffer was that if this country were "held up to ransom" by foreign combines it would be the duty of Parliament to consider the new situation. Leaving the Navy out of the question, the motorists of Britain seem to be in for a rough time. The cheap "tainted oil" which they obediently boycotted at the *Daily Mail's* direction looks like being bought over their heads and sold to them at a profit. In the meantime

Mr. Churchill has expropriated them from the ownership of their road fund and imposed on them a petrol tax in addition to the tax on vehicles. This whole story affords a graphic picture of the impotence of political Governments in respect of the two fundamental implements of economic policy—credit-issue and price-regulation. They have been effectually scared off from interfering with the creation or the destruction of deposits. While this state of affairs continues every potential Administration of whatever Party colour may be considered to have abdicated before it takes office.

Mr. Maxton appears to have satisfied a majority of the National Administrative Council of the Independent Labour Party that the publication of his joint manifesto with Mr. Cook does not threaten the disruption of the Labour Party. If the report is correct, it means that the Minority Movement is going to rely on political methods to achieve its object of lifting the worker above the poverty line. If Mr. Maxton has a scheme for bringing effective pressure on the Labour Party to that end without prejudicing that Party's chances at the polls, we should like to have it explained to us. In the meantime we notice that Mr. Ramsay MacDonald professes himself quite unconcerned about the effects of the Manifesto.

Arising out of our Notes of last week a correspondent wants to know where he can get an equilateral tetrahedron. He has failed to get one from an educational supplies establishment. We suggest that he make the thing himself out of cardboard, or set some children on the job. They have only to cut out four equilateral triangles of the same size, fix them in position, and hold them so by pasting paper round. That is another significant property of the object; once you have assembled its four parts you cannot help making it right.

## Left-Wing Taxation.

By C. H. Douglas.

Under whatever name the parties to political controversies may pass locally, whether that of Conservative, Tory, Liberal, Radical, Socialist, Communist, Republican, or Democrat, it does not require very much acquaintance with the subject to recognise that they represent, wherever found, certain broad attitudes of mind which are conveniently described by the Continental terms "Right Wing," "Centre," and "Left Wing."

This is generally recognised. To a lesser degree, it is also recognised that extremes meet, that the extreme Right Wing reactionary, and the extreme Left Wing revolutionary are fundamentally similar. There is little but a difference in form and mechanism between the ideas of a Mussolini, and a Lenin or Trotsky, and they are identical in their contempt for liberty and passion for the rule of centralised force.

It is elementary to observe that in such cases as the political systems of Russia and Italy, we are spectators of the ultimate incarnation of a system of thought. Since the distribution of this system of thought is not confined to the countries in question, we should expect to find evidences of it elsewhere. I think we do find such evidences, and as they are specially plentiful in the field of taxation, that field will fully repay a little attention.

To observe that the extreme revolutionary has a passion for the imposition of taxes is to state the obvious, and it would be true enough to say that this passion might be explained, firstly as an exhibition of the revenge complex, and so far as intellectual processes enter into it, as being based on the idea that the poverty of the poor is due to the

richness of the rich. Similarly, the acquiescence of the Right Wing reactionary in taxation, so long as it penalises the less fortunately situated, might be put down to a more or less conscious recognition of the fact that as taxes have to be paid in money, the mass of the population can, by taxation, be kept in a position of subservience to those from whom alone money can be obtained.

It can be found by anyone who will take the trouble to investigate the matter, that these mental attitudes have certain characteristics in regard to taxation, which are more subtle, and one of these is the marked preference of the extremist mind for direct taxation, in the form of income tax, inheritance duties, the capital levy, and so forth, as opposed to indirect taxation of the nature of duties on articles of a consumable nature.

An examination of the fundamental nature of direct and indirect taxation, however, is sufficient to explain this phenomenon. Direct taxation is involuntary, and it is deflationary. Income tax and other taxes of a similar kind must, if we disregard more or less irrational modifications such as exist in our own taxation system, be paid by everyone. The taxpayer has no power of discrimination, and he falls into a rigid classification of which the determinant is the state of his bank book. The fact that one spend a major percentage of it in fostering, let us say the betting industry, while a second with a similar income, may devote the same proportion to an investigation of the cause and cure of cancer, is a distinction without a difference to the collector of taxes. On the other hand, a tax upon tobacco gives to the individual power of decision as to whether he will pay it. If he feels strongly on the matter, he need not buy tobacco.

It is well understood by most of the readers of this review that taxation in its present form is an unnecessary, inefficient, and vexatious method of attaining the ends for which it is ostensibly designed. But while this is so, there is, of course, a sense in which, by side, taxation is inevitable. Public services require a provision both of goods and human service, and the mechanism by which these are transferred from private enterprise to the public service must in its essence be by a form of taxation.

Now just as there are two methods in theory by which the unearned increment of association, which we call public credit, can be distributed, these two methods being either a grant of "money" or a general reduction of prices, and the choice between these two methods is one of practicability and not of principle, so there are two methods by which this transfer of goods and services from private to public use can be obtained, the direct and the indirect method, and it is curious that we have such a tendency to insist on the direct method, with its crudities, complications, and inequities. It would be both simple and practical to abolish every tax in Great Britain, substituting therefor a simple sales tax on every description of article, and, apart from other considerations, such a policy would result in an economy of administration far in excess of anything conceivable within the limits of the existing financial system. Why do we not do it? I think that in essence the answer is simple.

What we may call, for the purposes of this present article, "the taxing mind," is obsessed with the idea that it has a divine mission to reform the minds, morals, and manners of humanity by the aid of its favourite instrument. It advocates taxes on tobacco and whisky, primarily possibly because it thinks the country must have the money, but antecedently because a number of quite possibly foolish people enjoy smoking tobacco and drinking whisky. In some cases, notably in the case of entertainment

taxes, it is quite openly postulated that pleasure and, in particular, luxury of any kind is in its very essence suspect, and ought to be satisfied to be specially heavily taxed. This idea has such a general and unthinking acceptance that it is almost axiomatic to assume that anything connected with industry must take precedence in importance to anything connected with leisure or enjoyment. The culmination of this idea is the tax on income. Now, most people know quite well that popular "sentiment" of this or any other character is of the nature of steam in a boiler—its results depend not so much on the steam as the use which is made of it. The manipulators of the steam are deflationists (bankers, generically speaking), and the passion for direct taxation is exactly the steam necessary to work the deflation machine to the end that money may be scarce and that the banker may control both industry and population.

The practical importance of the foregoing considerations lies in the fact that the admixture of "moral" considerations into the question of finance and taxation is probably the most potent factor in the prevention of rational modification such as that embodied in the Social Credit idea. It is increasingly clear to me, at any rate, that the majority of those who, while eager to assist, are not suited, either by temperament or inclination, to become experts on the technical aspects of these matters, could do no greater service to the cause which they have at heart than by concentrating on this aspect of the question. It has many times been my own experience in dealing with individuals who might have been of signal assistance to an effective check on the financial monopoly, that in the last resort their true objective was not the solution of industrial or political difficulties, but the imposition of their own particular form of morals upon the community by the agency of economic Government. Until the validity or otherwise of this attitude has been definitely settled, there can be no advance. Government by economic restriction is fundamentally incompatible with either maximum output or maximum efficiency.

Nothing has done more to destroy that real, if somewhat misunderstood "brotherhood of the trenches" than this question of taxation, with which, in Great Britain, is closely associated the wicked misuse of the word "dole" in connection with unemployment insurance, a device which was diabolically calculated to produce the impression that the tragic results of banking policy were due to the incubus of a shiftless proletariat.

Within the last few days Mr. Justice Rowlatt, to his great credit, has denounced the calculated obscurity in which the statutes governing taxation are involved. That is a most hopeful symptom of the growing revolt. I do not think that any manipulation or even reduction of finance will effectively deal with the problems of finance. But we shall be progressing when taxation is recognised for what it is—a Machiavellian device for the further enslavement of both those who clamour for it and those on whom it is imposed.

Guildhall Police Court: John Lipson, a man of diminutive size, was brought in by a constable standing over 6 feet in height. The Alderman, on seeing them, said: "I think I have now before me the largest constable and the smallest prisoner in London to-day." Lipson was charged with offering to fight the constable while he was intoxicated. "What is he charged with?" asked the Alderman. "Getting drunk and causing a disturbance," was the reply.

"But, Lipson, you should not be drunk." Gentlemen get Lipson: "It's all very fine talking. I've no bed to go to." (Loud laughter, as the reporters say at St. Stephens.) Lipson was discharged with a caution.

—*Evening Standard*, 100 years ago.

## Views and Reviews.

### THE FASCIST AND BOLSHEVIST DICTATORSHIPS IN ANTITHESIS.

By W. T. Symons.

#### II.

Every transfer of political power by Revolution has been accompanied by such horrors that it is unprofitable to dwell upon its incidents except to discover, if possible, the points of difference from other revolutions. The world's interest in the upheavals of Russia and of Italy lies in the ideal discernible beneath the orgy of blood; in the one a World Order, in the other a Great Nation. It is possible that the violence in these cases is incidental to the establishment of the proclaimed ideal, instead of the ideal being invented to obscure, even from the perpetrators, a totally unmoral basis of action.

We may perhaps detect in the latest Fascist enactments—the Law of the Corporations and the Labour Charter—a parallel to the conception of an economically equal society which has been brought about in Russia. Is it possible that the Italian nation may begin the development, in a new mode, through Fascism, of a Christian order of society, by imposing a relatively equal pressure upon employer and employed? The question cannot be answered without reference to the power behind the Dictatorship, and the purpose served by Fascism in the general policy of that power. Why is Fascism approved, and why does even the brutal assault upon an official of the British Embassy pass without mention in the daily Press?

The Class War is "real" in the sense that men are in fact at one another's throats along the alignment of possessor and dispossessed, but it is in truth only the hubbub by which men's attention is diverted from their common subjection to the power of world-financial policy. The artificial distress created by the money power compels them to fight one another instead of the common enemy who throws them into conflict. The struggle is cleverly staged as the Class War, and the combatants do not understand the game in which their enthusiasms and passions are exploited. But Fascism is in essence a new phenomenon. It is the first militant revolt of the upper and middle classes against that "equality of opportunity"—to starve, which Finance now feels strong enough to mete out impartially to all classes of society. It is not gentlemanly of Finance to overlook the divine arrangement by which the threat of starvation has been limited to those who, like eels, are used to skinning—at those times when it does not suit their masters to employ them, and it would therefore be quixotic to feed them.

Had Fascism shown vision and attacked the real enemy instead of expending its venom upon its fellow victims on a class differentiation, a new political order would indeed have been inaugurated. But fear and greed and insensate ambition evoke no vision.

The future of Fascism is therefore bound up with the existing world financial domination. If the principles of financial policy are maintained, Fascism will in all probability carry on a violent and tyrannous existence until its masters' purpose is fulfilled in the complete destruction of personal initiative in Italy, a consummation unlikely to be achieved without precipitating further war upon a gigantic scale—a risk to which financial policy exposes all nations, since the power breaks down just there, in its psychological blindness. The dangerous tension between Italy and Yugo-Slavia is the gunpowder barrel most likely to fire the train. But if a rational money system can by any conceivable revolution be instituted in the world, the Fascist Dictatorship will

come to an end, and what is useful of Fascism will be incorporated in a new Italy.

The older Governments of the world, for all their impressive appearance, and assumption of a position "above the battle," stand between the opposing dictatorships of Italy and Russia as fat profiteers with terror in their souls, pretending that the politics, the economics, and the psychology which served them in the pre-war period can be re-established in the world of to-day. They naturally hold the ring unfairly, favouring the combatant who denies the real nature of the uncomfortable class-conflict, and injuring the one who proclaims that very war to be his mission, and proletarian victory his purpose.

By so doing the Powers still repudiate their democracies, and serve those who during a century of Industrialism have made the world safe for finance-capitalism. They wish to believe that the same methods can be re-established and crowned with success. It is the illusion of those who have learnt nothing from the War, and have only faintly smelled the fire in which their world must be consumed. They are deceived by their own ability, under the guidance of Finance, to drown the voice of misery and frustration which is the real aftermath of the war. They regard as their charge that small number who, smiled upon by the makers and destroyers of money, hold the world in thrall, and produce anonymously in all countries by "sound finance" and the application of "economic law," the same murderous effects which Mussolini exhibits dramatically and in miniature in his climb to political ascendancy. The Dictatorship in Italy suits the policy of the money lords, and Fascism "crooks the knee" quite submissively to them, unlike the Dictatorship in Russia, which defies them. Who will ever know the exact price in human misery at which the Italian war debts were reduced to a fraction by the British and American Governments? But Finance is here controlling the passions of men, and of the bursting point of that gun no measure can be taken. At some degree of pressure the most astute calculation will be disproved, for neither the soul nor the beast in man will accept the domination of gold for ever.

## Twelve O'Clock.

"Shakespeare strikes twelve every time."—Emerson.  
EXTRACTS FROM "THE NEW AGE."

Edited by Sagittarius.

"Poetry—written words—cannot be more thrilling than life itself, except to those whose blood is dish-water."—Charles Baudelaire.

"As long as society goes on tying men and women together in pairs for life because God told it to, or because no man can be trusted of his own free will to keep any but a young woman, or because human offspring takes an unconscionable time to grow its own wings, 'The Taming of the Shrew' can be performed in dress ancient or modern, and nobody need seriously mind the anachronisms of custom."—Drama.

"Either the bankers must serve the industrialists or the industrialists will absorb the function of banking. This would happen even were there no precedents; but since there are precedents it will happen more quickly."—Notes of the Week.

"The 'debate' in the Daily News on the question 'Where are the Dead?' is proceeding right merrily. There is plenty of room for every argument because the question is not susceptible of argument."—Notes of the Week.

"There is one man in England above all others who is qualified to define and argue the materialist position on equal terms with the divines, and that is Mr. Chapman Cohen, the editor of the Freethinker. He has not been asked to contribute to the symposium."—Notes of the Week.

## Lenin and the Social Credit Objective.

No group of people having a social-economic objective can afford to ignore the study of that specialised technique exhibited by individuals who have been able to "move the masses." Lenin was just such an individual. He was a politico-psychological technician. He was not an economist.

One hears a great deal about the economic technician in the Social Credit movement, but the one thing lacking is a clear politico-psychological technique which will carry the Social Credit theory from theory into operation.

That is why there is always a sad little sag at the back of the minds of Social Credit enthusiasts. They talk together, and hope, but a tiny voice is always saying: *We know by logical reasoning that the Social Credit analysis and proposals represent the solution to the economic problems of our civilisation, but—what can be done?—What can we do to bring it about?*

And there is never any satisfactory answer to that question. The economic technician cannot answer that question. It is one which should not be put to him; it is enough that he has made a correct analysis and logical proposals.

The economic technician, having given an honest answer—"I do not know"—is sometimes astonished to see his erstwhile eager students and disciples turning away from his logical teaching towards metaphysics, mysticism, and speculative subtleties.

The need for a politico-psychological technique is already pressing hard upon the Social Credit movement. There are three main phases through which the Social Credit movement will pass:—

1. Economic analysis and programme: the work of the economic technician.
2. Politico-psychological analysis and plan of action carried out: the work of the politico-psychological technician.
3. Economic programme put into operation: once more the work of the economic technician (while the politico-psychological technician "holds the fort" and enforces the new regime).

The first phase is already accomplished, but many do not realise it. The second phase must set in, and many are afraid of it. Nevertheless, there is no stopping the existing economic system, the Douglas Proposals released something fundamental which will sweep us into the second phase, or sweep us aside as material through which the Economic Rummymede cannot take shape.

It is necessary for everyone to begin to prepare his mind for the second phase. In doing this there can be no better study than that of outstanding politico-psychological technicians who have proved themselves able to operate in this post-war world.

Whether we agree with bloody revolution or not, Lenin, as a technician, cannot be ignored by the Social Credit Movement. His methods must be studied closely, however strongly we may dislike the immediate results of Bolshevism.

Book after book is now coming from the press on the work and methods of Lenin, Gandhi, and Mussolini.

"Lenin," by V. Marcu,\* is the most detailed and consecutive account of Lenin's life and work so far published in English. It is particularly instructive because it contains a great number of passages from the enormous output of articles, pamphlets and letters from Lenin's own pen.

These passages reveal Lenin in the midst of Party bickerings, and the bitter opposition within his own ranks, building up that underworld of highly in-

\* "Lenin," by V. Marcu, translated by E. W. Dickes (Gollancz. 21s. net.)

dividualised, centralised, and disciplined organisation which was to undermine the Tsarist regime and replace it.

The following quotations from Lenin's words can be aptly applied to certain circumstances, states of mind, and intellectual groupings within the Social Credit movement at this moment:—

"The Militant Union for the Liberation of the Working Classes (Lenin's first organised threat in 1896) . . . issues leaflets. It is not the leaflets that threaten the gentlemen, but the possibility of our man action."

"No class has attained dominance in history without first singling out its chosen leaders, its representatives, men capable of organising and leading the movement."

Of his association with the Socialist and revolutionary elements before he formed his own organisation, the Bolsheviks, Lenin writes:

"I was at work in a group who set before themselves very far-reaching and comprehensive tasks—and all of us, all the members of this group, had to suffer from the painful, torturing consciousness that we were dilettanti."

"One must have something to dream of." (From Lenin's book, *Where to Begin?*)

"Men must be trained up who will devote to the Revolution not only their free evenings, but their whole lives; an organisation must be developed of such dimensions that within it there can be carried out a precise division of labour for the various kinds of work that we want." (From Lenin's first article in *Iskra*.)

"I must tell you that it is much more difficult to catch ten able men than a hundred idiots. I shall uphold this principle, however much you may rouse the masses against my 'anti-democratic' attitude."

"Discipline and organisation which are such a stumbling-block for the bourgeois intellectuals, are particularly easy for the proletariat to accept, thanks to its factory schooling. . . ."

"Revolt must . . . associate itself with an elemental mass movement."

"We are for Democracy in so far as it serves our purpose; when it becomes possible we shall be the first to introduce it."

"Either struggle until the final victory, which means a rising; or give up the struggle altogether."

Writing of the paper, *The Proletarian*, Lenin says: "A periodical without a policy is a preposterous, senseless, scandalous and noxious thing."

"Man's intelligence may be only a feeble rushlight in the darkness of night, but I am not going to let that flickering little flame be blown out by mystics and metaphysicians."

Lenin broke off all the threads that still linked his group with other Socialist schools of thought, saying that it was "necessary not to amalgamate, but to secede."

During the Great War he attacked the Socialist Pacifist attitude, saying:—

"No, the capitalists have . . . every reason to wage war; they must, in fact, wage war if they want to keep capitalism going."

"The Government (Kerensky) must be turned out. . . . It cannot be turned out at once; it cannot be turned out by the ordinary methods."

"The word must be: *Power to the Soviets, land to the peasants, peace to the peoples, bread to the hungry.*"

Finally, to show that Lenin was a first-class politico-psychological technician but completely lacking in economic technique:—

"It will be necessary to proceed with the utmost energy . . . against the highest officials, as against the capitalists. . . . These methods of control and of compulsion to work are more effective than the legislating and the guillotine of the Convention. . . . We must compel the officials to continue at work within the framework of the reorganised State. . . . If any would not work, neither should he eat! That is the fundamental principle, the first and the most important of all. . . . The Soviets will introduce the work-card for the rich and then for the rest of the population. . . ." (From Lenin's pamphlet, *Can the Bolsheviks Maintain Themselves in Power?*)

Ilyich St. Paul Lenin, in those words reveals himself as the creator of the Socialist Work-Card State. But the "compulsion to work" first applied to the rich

and then extended to the rest of the population has not, and cannot, solve Russia's economic problem. In spite of the Soviets, the U.S.S.R. is still suffering from financial poverty in the midst of real wealth—like the rest of the world. With Lenin we say, "One must have something to dream of," but it is a wretched dream that ends in a work-card.

GORDON JACKS.

## Drama.

### Tell Me the Truth: Ambassadors.

There are two antithetical theories of how to make theatre-managing worth while in summer. One is that the public can be enticed inside only by the dramatic equivalent of strawberries and cream; the other is that the harassed city men who demand relaxation, with none of this damned thinking stuff, all go off in their cars to play golf or tennis on these drawn out days, so that the theatre must provide for the handful of blasphemers who are ready to judge the work of God Almighty. Critics belong by profession, and affect to do so by inclination, to the latter group. Yet scarcely anyone had a friendly word for Madame Bramsen's "The Man they Buried," which Mr. Lion withdrew in discouragement after a few performances. Nearly everybody, if the Press can make or break a play, must have hoorayed for "Tell Me the Truth." This does not necessarily mean that the summer policy of light farce as against highbrow drama is vindicated. It may mean that its value cannot be tested until critics are compelled to take their holidays before the experiment is begun.

The fun of "Tell Me the Truth" is drawn from two springs. One of these is a refreshing maiden aunt who blows the gaff on the virtuous poses of spinsterdom. In this part Iris Hoye gives a richly comic performance. The other source is the original treatment of an exchange of identity. Wrigley, one of the parties, is already travelling incognito when he first appears on the stage, and gives the impression that it does not matter whose name he takes so long as he gets the girl—a reversal of the order of the sexes according to repute in such a situation. He arrives at what Americans, with their aristocratic respect for names, call a mortician. After he has made Amelia love him for himself, however, he lets out the secret that he is really a millionaire, whose father, just to make the whole world kin, was a plate-layer before he bought the line. The other party to the exchange is a young man whose parents made doubly sure of his going to the devil. They left him an orphan in Chicago, and before that they baptised him with the intoxicating Christian name of Worthington. Alcohol is a consoling thing anywhere, but it is the one thing that makes a prohibitionist country bearable. Once Worthington Smythe was assured that the case of whisky which formed his luggage was intact, Wrigley was welcome to the girl. Women do right to take a firm stand against alcohol. It breaks their monopoly.

As the drunken Smythe, Rupert Lucas was so good-humouredly funny that nobody bothered whether he got the money that the play was about or not. Apart from the three characters mentioned, however, together with that of the girl, Amelia, Mr. Leslie Howard's play is parsimonious with its acting material. Morton Selten extracted a certain amount of comic business out of the solicitor, but the rest were only sketches. As Amelia, Edna Davies lacked ease and flexibility. She recited too much. Amelia, brought up among maiden aunts who kept up the parlour-convention, ought to have made every modern young emancipated thing in the auditorium sigh for the thrill of original sin which a girl could

get by looking at a man in the modest old days. Perhaps she did not succeed in doing so because she does not believe in them.

### Nju: Gate.

With unflinching adventurousness of spirit the Gate Theatre Salon, in Villiers Street, continues to introduce its members to the growing world. Any chronicle of theatrical events of the present day which omitted an account of the Gate would resemble a church with a cemetery but no baptismal font. After "Nju," this theatre will present "Six Stokers Who Own the Bloomin' Earth," a dramatic satire of politics by an American, Elmer L. Greensfelder, with a film commentary made at the theatre by the producer, Mr. Godfrey. This will finish a season with whose record of live experiment in drama no theatre licensed for public performance could possibly compete.

"Nju" has been adapted from the Russian of Ossip Dymov by George Merritt, and it is a paradoxical sort of thing to have to admit, after praising the ultra modernity of the Gate Theatre, that its interest, although it was written so recently as 1907, is largely historical. The play is a shadow before the event of the method of the expressionists. Indeed, it is at the forking of the ways leading to the psychological suggestiveness of Jean-Jacques Bernard, and to the sign language of Kaiser and the producer-theatre moderns. What have become specialised forms in the present generation are in "Nju," as it were, still mixed in the dough. Its best scenes—the first, second, and ninth—are technically prophetic. Things just occur, and the audience is left to speculate as to motives and causes, hints of these being divulged in the dialogue. Characters are largely inarticulate; their conduct and relations come into the light in patches, from which glimpses the audience can deduce their lives and natures. The workings behind the foreheads of stage-figures are treated as no less inscrutable than those behind the foreheads of real people, whose accidental admissions, as all the world assumed before psycho-analysis, are more illuminating than their deliberate explanations. "Nju," in short, marks the revolt against those thousands of plays in which the characters were inhabited by the spirits of literary journalists who made sure of the audience knowing the characters' minds by writing up the unknowable. In "Nju" the characters speak as self-centred human beings do speak, which is with little concern for their intelligibility. To wish to be understood in everyday life is almost a symptom of disease.

The play is, then, nakedly simple. Nju is the wife of a man who allows others to flirt with her because they thus lend him fire to keep both her and himself warm. Naturally she longs for real fire, and leaves him for a poet. Recognising the good qualities of her husband as well as those of her poet, she dies, no doubt, though it is not expressly stated in this particular production, by suicide. In spite of Mr. Godfrey's magnificent film-like silhouette production, with its cunning manipulation of light, the play, apart from the aspects of it dealt with above, is deficient in solidity. Probably the cause of this is that the method is in advance of the theme, an evolutionary problem for metaphysicians! Domestic tragedy is neither big nor novel enough for the expressionist technique. In M. Bernard's case, the enchantment of his psychological suggestion notwithstanding, the plays in which the domestic theme has a monopoly have not the firm strength of the plays of the expressionists. The domestic tragedy, except as a fraction of the tragedy of social environment, belongs to the older method of explicit psychological analysis such as Strindberg's, or even the older method still of poetry and rhetoric.

Beatrix Lehmann, Peter Godfrey, and Raymond Huntley, as wife, husband, and lover respectively,

all gave very sincere interpretations of the suggested characters. In Beatrix Lehmann Mr. Godfrey has found an actress with something more than a natural talent for tragedy, and her development should be well worth following.

PAUL BANKS.

## A Dialogue in Hell.

[Reprinted from "L'En Dehors," 22 Cité St. Joseph, Orleans. Translation by J. Haining.]

**Aristippos**—Why fliest thou my sight, Lucretia? Thinkest thou thy virtue in danger? Thou seemest to forget that shades are protected from what thou namest "dishonour." The shadow of a body could only know the shadow of dishonour.

**Lucretia**—Learn, O Greek, with thy persuasive and faithless tongue, if so be thou canst comprehend that the very shadow of a dishonour is still too much for a virtuous soul.

**Aristippos**—Yet, in this region, thou needst not care what the other shades think of thee. We are not here, as when on earth, ceaselessly at the mercy of that stupid "public opinion" which gives sometimes the colour of Good and sometimes the colour of Evil to the same actions, much as the dyer dips his raw material into purple or saffron.

**Lucretia**—Thy discourse is dangerous, Aristippos, for thou knowest how to make palatable the poisonous draught: it is none the less poison, and I am not astonished that the Sons of the Wolf became impotent libertines after contamination with such enervating doctrines. Know then, once for all, that a virtuous woman has no concern with the opinion of others in distinguishing what is shameful from what is not.

**Aristippos**—By what canst thou recognise when an act is shameful, I am curious to enquire?

**Lucretia**—The impertinence of thy question deserves no reply. I pity thee if thou dost not know that our natural virtue is flattered or wounded according to our actions.

**Aristippos**—"Our natural virtue," sayest thou? **Lucretia**—Certainly, I repeat it. The light which every man carries within him illumines those acts he may accomplish and those he should reject.

**Aristippos**—Thou wouldst think it shameful, for example, that a brother should espouse his sister? **Lucretia**—Absolutely, and I approve our laws which punish such abominations.

**Aristippos**—I had foreseen thy reponse. **Lucretia**—Then why question me?

**Aristippos**—Thou shalt soon see. Besides, we have eternity before us and we need not fear the regular drip of the clepsydra bringing conclusion to our conversation. Listen. Although thou dwelt in a remote little town and idly occupied thy time directing thy servants and supporting the altar of the domestic Gods thou must have heard of a very ancient, powerful and wise people who inhabited the valley of the Nile.

**Lucretia**—The Egyptians, thou meanest? But what have they to do with our theme? **Aristippos**—Haste not. Thou knowest they were the first to have any ideas of the Gods and excelled in all the arts and sciences in such measure that the Lydians and the Achæans joined their school.

**Lucretia**—I know not whither thou leadest me on this tortuous path. **Aristippos**—Sufficient that thou follow me. What wouldst thou say on learning that amidst this industrious, just, and wise people the union of brother and sister was very widespread?

**Lucretia**—I should say that what was good for Egypt was not good for Rome.

**Aristippos**—Let me tell thee that that reply signifies nothing except that every country possesses different customs. Yet it might have made its way on

earth, for "popular phrases" are often empty vessels which each can fill as he wishes; even quite often are they without bottom like the cask of the Danaids, incapable of containing anything. But in this region our convictions are not affected by words, and all those grand sentiments of virtue, dignity, and honour reduce themselves to words only.

**Lucretia**—How could a word exist having no correspondence to a reality?

**Aristippos**—I perceive, without displeasure, O daughter of a rustic and austere people, that thou hast profited by the company of those keen minds who peopled the banks of the Cocytus. But let me tell thee in my turn that thou hast never seen, except in effigy, a siren or a centaur, hast thou?

**Lucretia**—Never.

**Aristippos**—That is the reply of every honest and sensible person. Hence thou agreeest that a thing which does not exist may have a vocable designing it. Similarly with virtue.

**Lucretia**—Thou darest compare virtue with the products of mythology?

**Aristippos**—I dare.

**Lucretia**—But thou forgettest that creatures have sacrificed their lives for virtue!

**Aristippos**—Men have indeed sacrificed their own lives—more frequently the lives of their fellows—to imaginary beliefs. If Alcestis had not been so credulous she would not have paid heed to an oracle forged in all its parts by priests, and Agamemnon must have had his mind deranged to believe that by murdering his daughter at the base of a formless idol he would acquire the power to stir the torpid winds and waves. Far from me to pretend that these monstrous deeds were useless, since Euripides has transfigured them into fiction which moves me as much as reality, but without terrifying me. I wish thee to remark, in offering these illustrious examples, how it is possible to make sacrifices to a vain fancy. The truth is that men believe in virtue as they believe in the Gods—although the former exists no more than do the latter.

**Lucretia**—So now thou deniest the Gods? **Aristippos**—That indignant pose ill suits a shade. It is our privilege, we, the dead, to say quite frankly what the living dare not confess except with much hesitancy and reserve.

**Lucretia**—Well, thou mayest doubt the Gods! After all they are perhaps not indispensable in explaining the world. But virtue, how canst thou doubt that?

**Aristippos**—I do not doubt it. I deny it. There is no more merit in chastity than in the possession of golden tresses. Nature has not, in fact, given to every mortal an equal propensity to love; she has totally refused it sometimes, though rarely; certain women she has endowed with the insatiable desire of the Bacchantes and to others the calm chastity of the muses. Like my friend Laïs thou dost only obey thy body as he obeys his.

**Lucretia**—Dost thou compare me to such a venal wretch? Thou must be as immodest as a cur!

**Aristippos**—Insult me if so be thy mood; insults cannot reach a shade. Even blows are powerless to harm my imponderable body.

**Lucretia**—Scurriously clown, thou laughest at everything, even the most sacred of things!

**Aristippos**—What wilt thou? There is nothing sacred for a cur. But instead of noisily disputing like living folks, tell me rather what impelled thee to suicide: if thou wert then moved by an obscure cause, thou hast had time during thy wanderings in Taenarus to meditate upon the famous Delphic device: know thyself.

**Lucretia**—Thou knowest nevertheless that I could not survive the dishonour inflicted upon me by the cowardly Sextus Tarquinius.

**Aristippos**—I know the facts composing thy story, but the secret motives determining thy conduct

escape me. Since the act thou namest as "dishonour" took place without witnesses, could'st thou not have buried it in a tomb of silence more impenetrable than the pyramids?

*Lucretia*—Could I? Did not the wretch himself go about everywhere boasting that he had possessed me with my own full consent? And had I been able my dignity would have refused such a baseness.

*Aristippos*—Thou lovedst thy husband, did'st thou not?

*Lucretia*—My duty commanded me to love him.

*Aristippos*—Leave aside thy duty, thou didst love him?

*Lucretia*—Yes.

*Aristippos*—And thou wert capable of sacrificing his happiness to a superior reason which appears to me very problematical?

*Lucretia*—That reason was for me a certitude. Being dishonoured in my own eyes was enough to make life intolerable to me: whoever believes in his own virtue is sufficient unto himself.

*Aristippos*—Thou declaimest as a heroine of Tragedy. Where is the public thou countest upon to applaud thee? Is it these bloodless forms that pass hither and thither under those black and barren poplars? Would'st thou not be better to reply to this dilemma: either thy dishonour (since thou retainest the word) was involuntary and there can be no fault where the intention is lacking; or thou gavest thy secret adhesion to it and, in that case, thy death could change nothing in an accomplished fact. But, indeed, thou seemest to cogitate thy answers as though thou wert before the Three Judges.

*Lucretia*—I fear thy captious spirit may drag me to pronounce words I might afterwards regret.

*Aristippos*—Speak fearlessly. No Clerk of the Court is here to record thy words.

*Lucretia*—Ah, well, here thou art. Doubt not I was victim of odious violence. Thou knowest by what means Sextus Tarquinius obtained my consent to yield myself to him; not only did he threaten to kill me—a threat insufficient to bend my will, for we Romans . . .

*Aristippos* (interrupting her)—Yes, yes, I know; thou wast already thinking of furnishing matter for the painters and poets of ages to come.

*Lucretia*—Let not thy sarcasm interrupt my speech. Not only, I say, he threatened to kill me, but designed to fell one of my slaves and stretch him out near me on the couch consecrated to Hymen. I preferred to yield to his violence, rather than, by not forbidding it, have my memory covered with opprobrium. Thou knowest what happened and . . .

*Aristippos*—But why this hesitation?

*Lucretia*—Only in the kingdom of Orcus could I dare tell thee what remains to be told.

*Aristippos*—Bah! Cast off thy mask of affectation.

*Lucretia*—Ah, well! As Sextus Tarquinius outraged my virtue he cajoled my flesh with a pleasure that, although considering it guilty, I was not sufficiently mistress of myself not to experience. This pleasure, which charmed my senses, and which my reason forbade me to take any part in soon became a devouring remorse, to deliver myself from which I took my life.

*Aristippos*—So at last thou admittest—implicitly—that thy senses were conquerors over thy reason since the latter was impotent to efface the impression of pleasure in which thou participated in spite of thyself. Thy death, of which thou makest so much noise, was neither more nor less than a defeat of thy will. How much wiser to let thy reason give place to thy senses?

*Lucretia*—If I understand thy words aright I ought not to have experienced the slightest anxiety?

*Aristippos*—Quite right. It was easy to reassure thy exacting conscience by reflecting that thou hadst no course open but to obey violence, and thou couldst not in strict justice assume the responsibility for an enjoyment that was forced upon thee. We are no more the masters of our sensibility or insensibility to pleasure than we are to heat or cold. We cannot consider love with lucid wisdom; some endow it with all sorts of sublime attributes whilst others see in it naught but shame and baseness. What indescribable folly for man to have attached notions of "good" and "evil" to a bodily function! Dost thou not find it quite natural that each of us may satisfy his hunger or thirst as the need arises?

*Lucretia*—Certainly.

*Aristippos*—Thou dost not declare the acts of eating and drinking "shameful"?

*Lucretia*—No; I reprove their excess, which is harmful to our health.

*Aristippos*—Ah! That is another story; but the actions themselves?

*Lucretia*—I do not dream for a moment of attaching a moral judgment to them.

*Aristippos*—Why then reserve such judgment for the satisfaction of the sex appetite? We must not censure acts which in no way whatever attack our liberty. Notions of Good and Evil were no doubt useful at the formation and development of human society; to-day they still serve in maintaining necessary limits upon the ignorant and stupid masses. But they are only beliefs without foundation like the chimera of mythology. There is only one reality; pleasure that all men seek, or pain that with one accord they avoid. Now by what right shall we blame an act which is agreeable to us and causes suffering to none?

*Lucretia*—Very good. But what would become of a State wherein the relations of men and women were not subject to rules?

*Aristippos*—By so saying thou acknowledgest that mortals erect the pretended interest of the Commonwealth into imprescriptible laws of conscience.

*Lucretia*—Yes, perhaps it is indispensable to veil the truth so that men should respect it.

*Aristippos*—Thou art not quite wrong; but the wise may raise the veil without risk. The Goddess takes no offence. Though her eyebrows frown, in her heart she smiles. Like thee, Lucretia, she likes to be ravished.

AXIEROS.

#### MOTHS.

TO E. P.

So Summer brought you to the dance again—  
O'er meadow, lawn and swaying poplar trees  
When stirring leaves in twilight make refrain  
To those rare thoughts that come in hours of ease!

You, pretty moth, with eyes of gleaming fire,  
Dance in the air, and waver to and fro—  
You took no wisdom from your unknown sire,  
Who perished in a light so long ago.

"Fly from the glare!" in terror hear my cry,  
"Rest for a while on starry flowers that shed  
Their blissful perfume in the garden nigh,  
And forswear all that all your kind misled."

You took no wisdom from your unknown sire,  
But leap and die, burnt in a cruel blaze.  
I hear above an aeroplane retire—  
My brother man, I ponder on thy ways.

WILLIAM REPTON.

## The Revival of Handicraft.

Many pamphlets have been written to familiarise the public with the aims of craftsmen, but I do not know one that puts the case more concisely than "The Idea Behind Craftsmanship,"\* in which Mr. Mairet presents his case. Mr. Mairet sees clearly that the revival of craftsmanship is an indispensable part of any effort to grapple with the evils of industrialism whilst he also realises how inadequate it all appears to be to the average man to whom all efforts to revive craftsmanship appear as a fad. It is difficult to review a pamphlet which is so succinct, for it is like distilling an essence of an essence, but I may call attention to the many excellent phrases which the book contains. Thus, "they (the craftsmen) take up their tools with as much gusto as industrial workers 'down' tools." . . . "Everything in nature is both a means and an end at the same time." . . . "It is often said the mechanical age has plunged us into materialism, but it would be truer to say it has misled us into an inhuman idealism." That is just what has happened. It expresses exactly what is wrong with reformers generally to-day. They are almost a contempt for truth. They have moved so far away from reality that they are entirely incredulous when by chance they hear of it. Their appeal is to silence. Yet they persistently refuse to test the validity of their activities by reference to results. When unpleasant facts are forced upon their attention in such a way that they can no longer ignore them, they do not recant but change their ground and invent new theories to justify what has happened. Years ago I used to think that when the deadly results of industrialism became acknowledged reformers would abandon their position. But I was mistaken, and the reason I was mistaken was that I took them at their face value. I supposed that people whose faith was in science would be prepared to examine facts in a scientific spirit. But of late I have come to the conclusion that all such people are romantics who like to see the wheels go round, and that it is why they are ready to believe anything that appears to justify their activities.

The "Economics of Khaddar," † is a scientific treatise, but as it does not flatter the prejudices of our pseudo-scientists it is safe to say it will not be read by them. Nevertheless it should be, for Mr. Gregg sets out to test the Gandhi movement by strictly scientific standards and comes to very different conclusions from those of most Western cities. Mr. Gregg shows that Gandhi has great economic insight, and that his policy is the one to effect the economic redemption of India. What is more, experience has already proved that the Gandhi policy is successful. Since 1920, when Gandhi first advocated the revival of hand-spinning, and hand-weaving, the movement has increased its strength twenty times, and it gives employment to-day to 50,000 spinners and weavers. It continues to grow in spite of the fact that it has been deserted by the politicians. Mr. Gregg analyses very carefully all the economic factors in the machine industry on the one hand and improvements in the hand-spinning wheel and loom on the other (experiments for which purpose are being made by inventors all over India) will in the near future put textile handicrafts in a position to compete with machine production without artificial aid. Already the efficiency of hand production has been more than

\* "The Idea Behind Craftsmanship." By Philippe Mairet. (New Handworkers' Gallery, 14, Percy Street, W.1.)  
† "Economics of Khaddar." By Richard B. Gregg. (S. Ganesan, Triplicane, Madras, S.E.)

doubled since 1920, and if the efficiency of the spinning wheel could be increased only two and a half times it would to-day stand even with the mill spindle considering all the overhead charges and selling costs which hand production escapes. The "Economics of Khaddar" is a book that should be studied by all interested in the revival of handicraft, for it indicates the lines on which a revival can be made to succeed. A. J. PENTY.

"The avidity with which our international bankers seize upon the profits involved in floating foreign issues is arousing serious concern and grave doubts as to the advisability of further unlimited placements. The private banker who pockets his profits and unloads the bond issues upon our great middle class, cares little for ultimate consequences." . . . "Governor Young of the Federal Reserve Board, in response to my question propounded at a recent hearing in the Banking and Currency Committee room in the House, said that I, as a member of Congress, could not look at the records of the Board or at any of the memoranda or correspondence which they had involving any of the transactions growing out of the meeting in Washington between the Federal Reserve Board and the representatives of the central banks of Europe in the summer of 1927."—Representative Carroll L. Beedy of Maine reported in the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, June 9, 1928.

"According to reliable information M. Poincaré has decided against early stabilisation. It is no secret that plans have been under detailed study by the experts of the Finance Ministry and the Bank of France for a return to the gold standard within a month or two, and that the Bank of France has been pressing for early action. But there is very definite indication now that he has made up his mind against it, pleading that he must have time to feel the pulse of the new Chamber, to watch the development of prices, and to make sure of the equilibrium of his 1929 Budget, before he can undertake once for all the fate of the currency. . . . From representatives both of the Right and Left parties in his Cabinet opposition has arisen to stabilisation. There is also opposition from a still higher source. All which was enough to kill a plan which M. Poincaré was extending to accept only grudgingly. . . . From the external point of view the prospect is equally perplexing, if not serious. The issuing institutions in America and England must be content to face an indefinite prolongation, and even accentuation, of a situation in which the Bank of France has them at its mercy in regard to credit conditions, while at the same time being utterly unable to control credit conditions at home. The outlook is not one that promises stability."—Paris Correspondent, *Manchester Guardian*, May 26.

#### SUBSIDIES.

In horror from all subsidies we turn  
Except, for these two purposes we give  
To export Coal which we should like to burn:  
To export Men who'd like at home to live.  
L. S. M.

#### MIRACLE OF THE FIFTY THOUSAND.

"Herring fishing off the Manx coast is phenomenal. . . . some boats, unable to find a market, had to dump 50,000 herrings into the sea."—*Evening Standard*, June 19.]

Who says the Age of Miracles is past?  
God made us feast—but Mammon makes us fast.

When God made miracle, the crowd was fed  
With two small fishes and five loaves of bread.  
With fifty-thousand fish—miraculous skill  
Of Mammon!—now the crowd goes hungry still.

Who says the Age of Miracles is past?  
Strangely they feasted, we as strangely fast.  
Say, would you be (though Science call this treason)  
Fed by your Faith, or starved for other's Reason?  
N. B.

#### NOTICE.

The M.M. Club will open at 5.30 on Wednesday  
July 4th. Meeting for discussion at 6.15.

Anthroposophical Society in Great Britain.

## A PUBLIC LECTURE

By GEORGE KAUFMANN, M.A. Cantab., at the  
**RUDOLF STEINER HALL, 33 Park Road, N.W.1**  
 Sunday at 8.15 p.m.

"SPIRITUAL SCIENCE, CHRISTIANITY AND  
 SOCIAL HEALING."

8th July: Future of the machine age. The true and false  
 initiation of the Will.

Full syllabus on application.

Admission free. Collection for expenses

### THE LATEST PAMPHLET.

## Social Credit in Summary

4 pp. Price 1d. (Postage ½d.)

A broad survey of the principles and technique of the  
 Social Credit Theorem and Proposals in a series of thirty-  
 nine short paragraphs, numbered and cross-indexed.

Quantity Rates: 25 copies for 1s. 3d., 50 for 2s. 6d.,  
 100 for 4s. 6d., 1000 for 42s. All prices include postage.

**THE CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY,**  
 70, HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON, W.C.1.

Readers in Australasia can get supplies from Mr. C. A.  
 Haythorpe, Elmore, Victoria, Australia.

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

#### SET A.

Comprising:—

Social Credit in Summary (1d.).  
 The Key to World Politics (1d.).  
 Through Consumption to Prosperity (2d.).

Post free 6d. the set.

#### SET B.

Comprising:—

Set "A" above.  
 The Veil of Finance (6d.).

Post free 1s. the set.

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

## 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 unem-  
 ployment of men and machines, as at present, or of inter-  
 national 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 pro-  
 vide effective demand for the whole product of industry.

## CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY

### Books and Pamphlets on Social Credit.

- ADAMS, W.  
 Real Wealth and Financial Poverty. 7s. 6d.
- BRENTON, ARTHUR.  
 Social Credit in Summary. 1d.  
 The Key to World Politics. 1d.  
 Through Consumption to Prosperity. 2d.  
 The Veil of Finance. 6d.
- DOUGLAS, C. H.  
 Economic Democracy. 6s.  
 Credit Power and Democracy. 7s. 6d.  
 The Control and Distribution of Production. 7s. 6d.  
 Social Credit. 7s. 6d.  
 These Present Discontents: The Labour Party and  
 Social Credit. 1s.  
 The Engineering of Distribution. 6d.  
 Unemployment and Waste. 1d.  
 Canada's Bankers and Canada's Credit (Reprint of  
 Major Douglas's Evidence at the Government  
 Enquiry in Ottawa). 2s. 6d.  
 The World After Washington. 6d.  
 Great Britain's Debt to America: Method for Repay-  
 ment. (A reprint of Major Douglas's suggestions  
 to the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, in  
 1922.) ½d.
- DUNN, Mrs. E. M.  
 The New Economics. 4d.
- GALLOWAY, C. F. J.  
 Poverty Amidst Plenty. 6d.
- HATTERSLEY, C. MARSHALL.  
 The Community's Credit. 5s.  
 Men, Money and Machines. 6d.
- POWELL, A. E.  
 The Deadlock in Finance. 5s.
- SHORT, N. DUDLEY.  
 It's Like This. 6d.
- SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT (Symposium by  
 members).  
 Social Credit and Economic Democracy. 6d.
- TUKE, J. E.  
 Outside Eldorado. 3d.
- YOUNG, W. ALLEN  
 Dividends for All. 6d.

### Critical and Constructive Works on Finance and Economics.

- CHASTENET, J. L.  
 The Bankers' Republic. 6s. [Translated by C.H.  
 Douglas.]
- DARLING, J. F.  
 Economic Unity of the Empire: Gold and Credit. 1s.
- FOSTER, W. T., and CATCHINGS, W.  
 Profits. 17s.  
 Business Without a Buyer. (In preparation.) 10s.
- HORRABIN, J. F.  
 The Plebs Atlas. 1s.  
 An Outline of Economic Geography. 2s. 6d.
- MARTIN, P. W.  
 The Flaw in the Price System. 4s. 6d.  
 The Limited Market. 4s. 6d.
- SODDY, Professor F., M.A.  
 Cartesian Economics. 6d.  
 The Inversion of Science. 6d.
- WAKINSHAW, W. H., and THOMPSON, H. J. D.  
 The Golden Crucifixion of John Bull. 6d.

### Instructional Works on Finance and Economics.

- BARKER, D. A.  
 Cash and Credit. 3s.
- COUSENS, HILDERIC (Editor).  
 Pros and Cons. A Guide to the Controversies of  
 the Day. 2s. 6d.
- HILTON, J.P.  
 Britain's First Municipal Savings Bank. 1s. 6d.

Address: 70, High Holborn, London, W.C.1.