

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 1916] NEW SERIES Vol. XLV. No. 5. THURSDAY, MAY 30, 1929. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

| | PAGE | PAGE |
|--|------|------|
| NOTES OF THE WEEK | 49 | |
| <i>The Times</i> on the economics of railway building. General Electric Co. of America—ratio of wage-costs to prices. Pierpont Morgan looking after "European reparations." Lord Beaverbrook's railway-policy—are British railways pledged to America?—Bolivian precedent—J. H. Thomas the imperialist. Mr. Walton Newbold on the finance and financiers of the Underground Railways. The <i>Sunday Express</i> attacks Mr. Cramp—its statement that a locomotive can draw 1 ton 100 miles for 1d. | | |
| THE ELECTION. By C. H. Douglas | 54 | |
| CURRENT POLITICS. By W. T. Symons | 55 | |
| The Inversion of the Academic and the Vital. | | |
| DRAMA. By Paul Banks | 56 | |
| <i>Keepers of Youth.</i> | | |
| MUSIC. By Kaikhosru Sorabji | | 57 |
| <i>Das Rheingold. Die Walkure.</i> (Covent Garden.) | | |
| THE SCREEN PLAY. By David Ockham | 58 | |
| <i>Varsity.</i> | | |
| THE TURF EXCHANGE. By Hippophile | 58 | |
| THE "DON'T VOTE" CAMPAIGN | 58 | |
| The Economic Party's Posters. | | |
| RETROSPECT | 59 | |
| REVIEW | 59 | |
| The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism. | | |
| LETTERS TO THE EDITOR | 59 | |
| From Hilderic Cousens and W. T. Cranfield. | | |
| TWELVE O'CLOCK. By Sagittarius | 59 | |
| VERSE | 60 | |
| By Bayard Simmons. | | |

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The Times about a month ago had some things to say about railway development as the cause of the "serious financial crisis" in 1845. Now that the subject is being taken up by the Conservatives, let us listen.

"At that time some 2,000 miles of railways had been built, involving a capital of about £64,000,000, while about 3,500 miles were in process of construction, involving a correspondingly large amount of capital."

This is how *The Times* works it out. You put a lot of money down to build railways: to do so you have to divert it from other enterprises: the money goes for the most part in wages, and in materials representing wages "at a first or subsequent remove": the wages are spent on necessities—the greater part of which are imported: you have to pay extra money abroad without having any extra means of doing so: the exchange moves against you: money becomes dear and difficult for you to obtain. And there you are! It is a pity, but it is the will of God, or it is the way the law of the system works—representing the will of God at one or a subsequent remove. The conclusion drawn by *The Times* was that it is injurious to have "a disproportionate absorption of capital in internal investments." The immediate moral was: do not trust to Mr. Lloyd George's road scheme. Elaborating on this moral, *The Times* said that money put into road-improvement must be taken out of "ordinary business." By the context this means that you cannot make new capital equipment except by reducing expenditure elsewhere on current production; or, if you do not do this, you can only finance the new construction by inflation—which will mean higher prices and a depression of overseas trade. The general conclusion of *The Times* is that: "the smooth working of the economic machine depends on the symmetrical relation of all its component parts." Unemployment, *The Times* observes, is "often a sign of an unsymmetrical economic condition; and a universal road-making scheme would merely make it more unsymmetrical." The only safe cure for unemployment is to "make

more efficient" those industries which have in the past "contributed the major part of our export trade."

On this reasoning it will be seen that if, for instance, instead of laying £50 millions worth of railway equipment down in England you put it down in the Argentine, you are doing yourself more good financially. That is to say, the faster you get rid of tangible wealth, the faster you accumulate financial counters representing wealth. Or, to take another illustration: the faster you equip India and Japan with English cotton-spinning machines the more certainly you preserve the symmetry of the Lancashire cotton trade. To push the theory to its ultimate general conclusion, if England could export *all* her production, her people could accumulate an indefinite number of financial counters with which they could buy the nothing which remained.

Mr. Gerard Swope, president of the General Electric Company in America, has worked out comparative values of production and wages for that concern. Here they are:

| | Employees. | Wages. | Sales. |
|------|------------|-------------|------------|
| 1914 | 46,415 | \$37½ mill. | \$84 mill. |
| 1919 | 70,982 | \$91 " | \$238 " |
| 1921 | 70,570 | \$118 " | \$283 " |
| 1928 | 73,526 | \$134 " | \$348 " |

The ratios of production to pay for the four selected years were, in order, 2.23, 2.61, 2.40, and 2.61. In 1914 wages were about 45 per cent. of sales revenue, in 1919 and 1928 they were only about 38½ per cent.

In an American magazine called *Time* it is stated that of the "Triumvirate which now directs the destinies of the United States Steel Corporation," the board chairman, Mr. Pierpont Morgan is concerned with "European reparations" (sic): the president, James A. Farrell is "concerned with the making of steel," leaving the chairman of the finance

committee, Myron Charles Taylor, "the most active triumvir." Mr. Taylor has a pronounced "dislike for publicity," but

"Recent events, however, have made it difficult for Mr. Taylor to escape the public eye. When Guaranty Trust Co. and National Bank of Commerce were combined, Guaranty and Commerce Stockholder Taylor was chiefly credited with having brought the merger about. When the U.S. Steel bond redemption plan was first announced, to Myron C. Taylor went praise for having completed what the elder Morgan began, and for having made U.S. Steel completely Morgan, completely non-Carnegie."

Yes, and when the European-reparations redemption plan is announced, in all probability, praise will go to Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan for having made German steel completely American, completely non-European.

The Press is busy on national programmes. The *Observer* of May 19 recommends the development of railways, roads and canals. It does not show how the cost of the development is to be recovered. Presumably all three systems are expected to live by taking away each other's traffic. For new transport facilities do not create new traffic: they can only deal with the old traffic. An increase of traffic will probably accompany the process of development, but that traffic will consist of the materials needed for the development, and will cease directly the work is done.

The *Sunday Express* (May 19) concentrates on rail rationalisation. The *Sunday Referee* (May 19) laughs at such schemes, and publishes an article by Mr. Graham Hardy in which he points out that the *Daily Express*, five weeks previously, came out for (in its own words) "cheap money," and "expansion of credit," "in the interests of traders who make the wealth of the country and not of the banks and the money market who merely handle it." He says that four weeks ago he congratulated Lord Beaverbrook in an open letter in the *Sunday Referee* on having opened a credit-campaign, and that since then not a single article has appeared in the *Daily Express* on this subject. He asks: "What has happened to Lord Beaverbrook?"

Mr. Churchill has publicly thanked Lord Beaverbrook for his "valuable contribution to the discussion of this matter" (railways), paying tribute to his "able and ardent advocacy of this important step in modernisation."

In the *Sunday Express* of the same date as Mr. Graham's article, Mr. James Douglas writes under the title "The Issue That Has Transformed The Election." The issue is "Railways." He informs the public that—

"Early in March the *Express Newspapers*" [i.e., Lord Beaverbrook] "resolved to make the rationalisation of the railways the paramount issue of the general election." He adduces evidences that this objective has been reached. He shows that not only Mr. Churchill, but also Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. J. H. Thomas, Mr. Snowden, Sir William Joynson Hicks, and Sir Laming Worthington Evans have publicly endorsed the scheme. "The new Government is bound to carry it out, for all parties are committed to it."

This claim is conceded by the *Observer* of the same day:

"We are all railway reformers now. Mr. Churchill, Mr. Lloyd George, and Mr. J. H. Thomas compete in enthusiasm for that cause. . . ."

Lord Beaverbrook, who made this question move, is receiving bouquets from all sides—Mr. Churchill's being much larger than the Prime Minister's."

Mr. Graham Hardy, in his article already mentioned, declares that the idea is not Lord Beaverbrook's at

all: that as far back as 1916 the Fabian Society's Research Department "put forward a complete scheme"; that in the same year Lord Claud Hamilton advocated a pooling system for railway wagons which would save millions of pounds annually to the companies; and that ever since then the idea has been "a commonplace of Labour propaganda."

According to Mr. James Douglas in his article the Beaverbrook finance of the rationalisation scheme consists in raising a loan in the market in the usual way, and getting the State to guarantee it. The security for the loan is to be the new and larger railway-wagons which would be constructed under the scheme to replace the multitudinous wagons of smaller sizes and unstandardised types that are now in use.

"The new [20-ton and 40-ton] trucks would be the security for the loan and for the payment of interest on it, as well as for its redemption before the new trucks were worn out. The investors would be *Debenture holders* in a position superior to all the existing *Debenture holders*. For the railways could not be operated without the new trucks. If they defaulted the investors would be able to take possession of the trucks. Thus the taxpayer, as well as the investor, would be absolutely protected." (Our italics.)

By contrast with this kind of financing the *Sunday Referee's* credit-scheme is almost angelic. Its idea is roughly that the bankers, with the State as guarantor, should provide interest-free credit to all manufacturers and traders up to 50 per cent. of the value of their "fully developed productive mechanism" or fixed capital, charging them 1 per cent. for valuation and registration expenses during the first year, and one-half of 1 per cent. in subsequent years. Mr. Graham Hardy claims that if the scheme were put into operation this year there would be an immediate saving of interest to the railway companies of £5,000,000 per annum in *Debenture interest* alone. He also claims that if it had been put into operation thirty years ago these companies would by now have paid off all their loans, thus effecting a "saving of at least £12,000,000 per annum." We need not stay to test these claims now: it is the intention of the scheme that is here relevant, namely that of freeing industry from debt. As against the Beaverbrook plan of mortgaging the railways to a new class of super-debenture-holders, it is very nearly a good scheme. But, like every other producer-credit scheme, it lacks the one thing necessary to fulfil its beneficent intentions, namely, an accompanying national scheme of distributive pricing to prevent inflation. But all this is irrelevant to the present issue. Supposing the *Referee's* scheme to be inherently sound as a financial plan, the question would remain open whether it would be allowed to prove its soundness in action.

That question takes us into the realm of international finance, and therefore of international politics. The most dynamic of all international arrangements since the Armistice was the formal settlement of the Anglo-American debt. Readers will do well to refer to our issue of January 3 last when we dealt with the American loan to Bolivia in 1922. We quoted evidence from a book called *Bankers in Bolivia* * showing that the American banking group compelled Bolivia to assign to them a long list of national revenue-securities; and in addition (a) controlling share-ownership in the Bolivian National Bank and (b) prime mortgages or liens on Bolivian railways. At the end of our Notes we said that if all this was exacted by American finance to secure a loan of \$33 millions, what must have been its ex-

* I. L. P. Bookshop, 14, Great George Street, S.W.1. Published at \$1 by the Vanguard Press, New York.

actions from Britain to secure loans amounting to \$1,000 millions? We suggested an inquiry into this question by the present Government but said that we did not see signs of any such courage.

Let us adopt the hypothesis that the Bank of England and the British railway system became pledges to Wall Street; and see what direct or constructive pieces of evidence exist to confirm it. Before setting these out, let everyone remember that Britain's debt had been accumulating since 1914; it was not contracted at the date of the settlement-contract signed by Mr. Baldwin, as was the case with the Bolivian loan. This is important, because there must have been unwritten understandings between America and Britain about the question of security, beginning with the first instalment of the American loan; with the consequence that certain actions taken in Britain to conform to American loan-conditions could pre-date the official settlement. For instance, an Anglo-American understanding about British railways could obviously be reflected in British railway policy at any time after the first instalment of our borrowing, and quite easily some year or two before Mr. Baldwin signed the repayment-contract.

Hence, to begin with, the preoccupation of the Fabian Research Department and of Lord Claud Hamilton, both in 1916, with railway development, must be considered a relevant clue. Somebody, somewhere, must have inspired and given direction to this particular line of Fabian research. In that year we had a bloodless revolution which brought Mr. Lloyd George into power and threw Mr. Asquith out. We pointed this out in January and showed that the same sort of revolution took place in Bolivia and brought into power the Administration which contracted the loan-obligations exacted by the American bankers. In 1918 Mr. Lloyd George's Administration was talking railways, as is evidenced by a quotation from the *Daily Chronicle* of December 6 of that year, namely, a month after the Armistice.

"The news that the Government have decided to nationalise the railways is not a surprise. But it is very welcome and reassuring." Formal nationalisation during hostilities would have been easy to bring about, because in practice everything was more or less nationalised. But the proposal of nationalisation after the war-emergency was over suggests a closer connection with peace policy than with war policy—something having more to do with paying for the war than prosecuting the war.

Since that time we have seen nationalisation virtually established in the form of a railway merger under a public corporation—a body which we said last January was not unlike the "Fiscal Commission" which Bolivia had to appoint to protect the loan-security assigned to America. Next we must refer to Mr. J. H. Thomas's handsome contribution towards improving the security-value of British railways, namely, his handing them over a million or so which Mr. Churchill has presented to the railways under his de-rating scheme, and the raid which he carried out on the road-fund thereby taking control of money which had been earmarked for financing transport facilities which competed with the railways. Lastly, consider the increase in the price of petrol, and the regulations limiting the speed of motor vehicles which have been diverting traffic from the railways.

Taking all these facts together, it will be seen that their convergent effect is to pave the way for what we

may call Lord Beaverbrook's Bolivian debenture-scheme. Mr. James Douglas's reassurances to hypothetical investors, that they could foreclose on the British railways' wagons, and so paralyse the system, in case of default, bear a strong resemblance to some of the provisions of the loan-compact between America and Bolivia. Let us quote from our Notes of January 3:—

"Moreover, if any of this property [Bolivian railways] is not subject to mortgage under Bolivian law, the law is to be waived! Lastly, if by reason of default on the loan the bondholders foreclose on these railways and sell them up, the purchaser, his heirs, successors, assigns, etc., shall have 'the right to operate the said railroads for a period of ninety-nine years from the date of such purchase,' and the property shall be 'free from taxes and imposts of all kinds.'"

It is true enough that Mr. James Douglas's summary of the Beaverbrook debenture-rights is not so extensive as this, nor so frankly particularised; but what he does reveal implies something of the same sort; for if a group of Beaverbrook bond-holders foreclosed on the British wagons they could hardly take them home, or adapt them as homes: they would of course put the railway system under another control by a method equivalent to what is described in the above quotation.

It may here be asked why, if railways are to be nursed as security-value for State reasons, Mr. Lloyd George is going to the country on road-schemes, which must facilitate competitive motor-traffic. There are two or three answers. Firstly, Mr. Lloyd George's promises are conditional on his being "returned to power"—which phrase he can interpret as being given a clear majority over the other two parties. Does he expect that condition to be fulfilled? Next, granted he carries out the road scheme, there is no assurance that motor transport services will be allowed to benefit by the increased facilities free of charge. What they gained in profits could be taken from them in prices or taxes. Lastly, we notice that at Colne Mr. Ramsay MacDonald publicly challenged Lord Grey and Mr. Runciman as follows:—

"Do they really believe in the Liberal pledge which has been disappearing from the controversy in the last few days?"

"Is it the case, or is it not, that, as a matter of fact, a semblance of Liberal unity is being maintained on pledges and promises that the unemployment pledge will not be further used with any effect during the election?"

If this suggestion that influential Liberals have privately told Mr. Lloyd George to go slow on unemployment pledges it implies that he will go slow on the schemes designed to provide the employment. Again, it may not be Liberals who have put the brake on: it may easily be people above party politics altogether. With this consideration in mind, it is significant to note that the Government recently issued an official "White Paper" criticising Mr. Lloyd George's proposals—the propriety of its going so being the subject of bitter controversy even as we write. On the hypothesis that British railway policy is part of an international understanding it is easy to see why the Government has challenged precedents (as is alleged) by officially arguing against proposals likely to impede such policy.

It is again significant to notice Lord Beaverbrook's booming of Mr. J. H. Thomas by selecting him to appear opposite Sir William Joynson Hicks at the Great Debate at the Albert Hall. It would have been most appropriate if, when Mr. Thomas was ready to commence his walk through the hall up to the platform, a whistle had been blown, a signal dropped, and a green light shown. For Thomas is a railwayman. He has insisted on keeping his trade-union post all these years when neither his ambition

nor his pocket required him to retain it. It is pretty obvious that he remains in the high counsels of the N.U.R. for reasons of State. Again, not only is Mr. Thomas a big man in railway politics, but also a coming man in international politics. He has already been Colonial Secretary; and a paragraph in the newspapers the other day stated that if Labour comes to power he is designated as Sir Austen Chamberlain's successor at the Foreign Office. This seems to be confirmed by the fact, pointed out by P. B. last week in his account of the Beaverbrook Spectacle, that Mr. Thomas's chief objective during the debate was to show that he was a better imperialist than Sir William Joynson Hicks. Lastly, we have referred more than once to an old rumour that Mr. Thomas's ultimate ambition is to become the British Ambassador to the United States. If this is so our readers will agree that he is going the right way about it. He is also the right man for the honour in one respect, namely, that it will occasion him less difficulty to speak the American language than any other qualified aspirant that we know of.

A further railway item is a report in the newspapers last week that negotiations are proceeding for the amalgamation of three of the oldest wagon-building businesses in the country—the Gloucester Railway Carriage and Wagon Co., Ltd., of Gloucester; Hurst Nelson and Co., Ltd., of Motherwell; and Charles Robertson and Co., Ltd., of Horbury Junction, near Wakefield. The first two of these companies are associated with an important group of wagon-building companies through their arrangement transferring repairs to Wagon Repairs, Ltd. This news connects up with Mr. Baldwin's reference to the Duckham Committee* on mineral transport, which made the same recommendation as that which is the most prominent feature of the Beaverbrook programme, namely the elimination of small privately-owned wagons and the construction of larger railway-owned wagons to replace them. And we need hardly add that this recommendation connects up with everything we have been saying in the preceding paragraphs.

There is another aspect of the Beaverbrook plan to be commented upon. Even were its suggested American inspiration innocuous to British interests and his method of financing it unobjectionable, there are practical business reasons why his programme of wagon-substitution is unsound. Let us preface these with an excellent reflection which occurs in a report issued by *Coal Industry Publications* on May 18. It is as follows:

"It is too readily assumed that because a system has been developed over many years it must necessarily be antiquated and inefficient. The truth is that the existing system has arisen out of the necessities of the past and has been based upon practical advantage, as affecting the interest of railway companies, traders, and the community alike."

The facts on which this statement is founded are summarised from the Report in an article in the *Sunday Referee* of May 19. There are, it is admitted, over half a million wagons and trucks of all sorts and sizes on the railways, owned by colliery companies, coal-factors and merchants, and wagon-finance and wagon-hiring companies. But the reason is that these trucks are used for storage as well as for transport. One might express the position truly in the slogan: *Every wagon a warehouse*. Now these half a million warehouses-on-wheels are claimed to constitute a great economy in working. The Report claims that this is in the right line of development, because more than forty per cent. of these wagons are pooled in nine pools, and therefore the wagon-warehouse system combines the advantage of a common user with those of ownership by firms who use

the wagons, besides avoiding irregularity in working. Now—and here comes a crucial factor in the argument—the railways have declared, according to the Report, that the large "Beaverbrook wagons" to be placed under the ownership of the railway companies *would not be allowed to be used for storage*. The consequence is that not only would the colliery companies have to incur increased expenditure to facilitate the loading of the large railway-wagons at the pit-heads, but would incur heavy demurrage charges in addition for the time the coal was left in the wagons. To describe the ramp briefly, the coal industry would be squeezed for a rent-subsidy in aid of the railways, or else have to provide alternative storage accommodation at their own expense. One argument that had been urged in favour of the wagon scheme was that it would reduce the expenses of shunting. But the Report says that a railway representative told the Samuel Committee that any such saving would be more than wiped out by the disadvantage of not having wagons available for storage of coal by the owners, and that therefore no reduction in railway rates could be promised if the change were made.

It seems a curious fatality that the coal-industry (as also other enterprises raising minerals) should be called upon to subsidise the railways. It seems almost as if our exporting industries are being deliberately handicapped in favour of non-exporting industries. Such a policy would certainly favour America's game whether or not it were inspired by America.

After the facts we pointed out a week or so ago suggestive of an American copper-stranglehold on the General Electric Company, it would seem time for the public to be reassured as to whether the Canadian forests that provide the wood-pulp for Fleet-Street newsprint are under sterling-control or dollar-control. Nobody can deny the importance of eliciting the facts in face of Mr. James Douglas's boast that the *Express* Newspapers can choose whatever policy they like to make "the paramount issue of the general election." There is only one paramount issue—the control of credit-policy in this country, and its relation to international finance in general and New York in particular.

A suggestive sidelight on railway policy was afforded last January by Mr. J. T. Walton Newbold in *The Labour Magazine* for that month. He contributed an article called "The Bankers and the Underground." This was to supplement a previous article in which he had dealt with the interlocking of transport and electrical enterprises. He refers to a new incorporation on "an international, and indeed, inter-Continental scale" of the financial and transport and electrical interests in the Financial Transport and Enterprises, Ltd., whose headquarters are in Brussels. In his present article he considers the private Bills presented to Parliament to authorise the transfer of the L.C.C. tramway system to the Underground Group. One of the signatories to the Report recommending the transfer was Sir Oscar Emanuel Warburg,

"of whom we read in the 'Jewish Encyclopædia,' Vol. XII., p. 466, that 'as a director of the Electric Traction Company he was one of the founders of the Central London Electric Railway.'"

The Central London Railway has since been taken over, so far as management is concerned, by the Underground Group. Sir Oscar Warburg was director of the Electric Traction Co. from 1902 until 1907: Its first share list, filed in August, 1925, contained the names of the Banque de Paris et de Pays Bas, Lord Rothschild, Mr. Carl Meyer, Mr. H. L. Bischoffsheim—also the father-in-law of Colonel

* Mr. J. H. Thomas is a member.

Wilfred Ashley, viz., Sir Ernest Cassel, S. Bleichroder (representing the Berlin Rothschilds), Baron de Hirsch, Mr. Ogden Mills, of New York (later joined by Mr. J. P. Morgan, junr.), Mr. Jacob H. Schiff, of Kuhn Loeb and Co., of New York, and Mr. Arthur Wagg. The present board of directors of the Underground Electric Railways of London, Ltd., includes Sir Max J. Bonn, of Helbert Wagg and Co., Ltd.; and Gordon Leith, partners in Kuhn Loeb and Co. Mr. Newbold shows how these men and companies are further associated by the interlocking of directorships with Speyer and Co.—the original promoters in 1902 of the Underground—and the Barnartos and Joels, to whom they passed over their control during the war. The Schroeder and Helbert Wagg concerns are the London representatives of Speyer and Co. The Schroeder concern has been

"Very heavily financing coal and iron in the Ruhr," having acquired there, jointly with Dillon, Read and Co., of New York, some of the most profitable of the constituent parts of the Stinnes' Rhine-Elbe Union."

In this Company's latest return (November 20, 1928) appear the names of Lord Eustace Percy, Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland, M.P., A. L. Schlesinger of Kayser and Co., merchant bankers, and Sir Oscar Warburg, with more than 15,000 shares. Also Lord Hailsham—who, as Sir Douglas McGarel Hogg, pushed the Electricity Supply Bill through the House of Commons in 1926.

Helbert Wagg and Co. have extensive interests in Holland. They represent "some of the oldest interests in railway investments at home and in America." They draw upon the reserves of the Prudential Assurance Company. They promoted the British and German Trust, Ltd., over which Lord Ashfield presides, and on the board of which are the secretary of the Prudential, and directors of five Berlin banks, one of whom is Dr. Franz Schroeder of the Preussische Staatsbank. The London representative of his bank is J. H. Schroeder and Co. Lord Hailsham has another large holding in this Trust.

Mr. Newbold finishes by giving the names of the directors of the English and New York Trust Co., Ltd. Some of them are:

Benson, R. L., of Robert Benson and Co., Ltd., and Chairman of the London Electric Supply Corporation, Ltd. Fleming, Philip, of Robert Fleming and Co., Ltd. One of the partners in this company called Whigham was appointed a member of the Central Electrical Committee "set up under Lord Hailsham's fostering, the Electricity Supply Act of 1926.

Jones, I. E., of Helbert, Wagg and Co.
Smith, R. H. V., of Morgan, Grenfell and Co.—the London House of J. P. Morgan and Co., of New York.

The ramifications here described may seem confusing, but a general survey of them discloses a fairly well-defined principle. Rudyard Kipling described it in one of his stories by, we think, the phrase "Control of communications," which meant, in his context, that such control was the master-key to effective governing power. And here we get a glimpse of a dollar-pound-mark trustification, not only of railway property, but of electricity, and then of iron and coal, on which depend the construction of railway equipment and the movement of rolling stock. For instance, Mr. Newbold states that Schroeder and Co. have taken "enormous mortgages" on the Powell Duffryn Steam Coal Co., Ltd., in South Wales, and are "financing much of the rationalisation of the coal industry." If our Navy had been entirely dependent on coal-fuel the position would be critical; but it is bad enough as it is.

The *Sunday Express* of May 26 carries on its campaign for the Beaverbrook railway scheme. It has nothing to say in answer to the *Sunday Referee's* attack. It itself attacks Mr. Cramp, who has declared against the large-size wagons.

"The struggle for existence among nations is becoming more and more severe, and we cannot afford to have in our railways archaic methods, nor for that matter can we afford to employ in our Governmental system men of archaic ideas like Mr. Cramp."

What we really cannot afford is to have an archaic accountancy paralysing the "methods" of our railways and all other British enterprises. Nor can we afford Press Magnates who boast of their power to set Englishmen voting for the megalomaniac ends of cosmopolitan financiers.

The *Sunday Express* opens its very next leading article with this sentence:

"It has been stated in a well-written, well-documented and well-argued book that a locomotive is capable of drawing one ton of goods 100 miles for 1d. In fact this service is rendered to the public for 16s."

It is not made clear what expenses are represented by the penny, but that does not matter. The truth indicated is that which we have insisted on in these columns, that the cost of railway transportation in general is potentially negligible. It is the most efficient of all methods—smooth hard steel wheels running on smooth hard steel rails. The *Sunday Express* does not explain what the extra 15s. 11d. is for; all it does is to talk vaguely about the economy of the Beaverbrook trucks—and this against the fact that the highest estimate of a reduction in freightage to be made possible by the change of wagons was 5 per cent. guessed at by an official of the G.W.R. in Wales—"Less than 1d. per ton," as some coal-owner remarked. The bulk of that 15s. 11d. (or whatever the authentic figure may be) is, as our readers know, made up of unnecessary debt-charges which the New Accountancy of Social Credit finance would eliminate. It serves as a measure of the potential expansibility of the railway services which can become fact when the financial handicap of the present system is removed. Lastly, it serves as a measure of the rate at which the banks are withdrawing and cancelling unused purchasing power from consumption-markets to expand their secret reserves.

The M.M. Club will meet at the Kingsway Hall, Holborn Restaurant (Holborn and Kingsway), on Wednesday, June 5th, at 6 o'clock for 6.15. Major Douglas hopes to attend.

"The alleged cases of smallpox so regularly reported in the daily and weekly papers (which are evidently constantly supplied with the information they publish by the English Ministry of Health), as being treated in the Metropolitan Asylums Board Hospitals, are cases of a very mild, non-fatal disease, which many English doctors say is not small-pox at all. Some say it is alastrim, some say Brazilian pox, some pseudo-smallpox, some para-smallpox, and some even chicken-pox. Whatever the disease may be, it is milder than chicken-pox. It has been occurring in England for the last eight years, but there have been fewer cases during the last nine months than in corresponding earlier periods. This is the sort of 'smallpox' that is referred to in the Reports of the Health Organisation of the League of Nations, the information having been supplied by officials of the English Ministry of Health. The French officials who have tried to enforce a vaccination regulation against English travellers to France base their reasons on these alarming reports of smallpox in England. It is, therefore, clear that it is the officials of our own Ministry of Health who are to be blamed for the annoyance, loss, discomfort, and anxiety caused by the action of the French authorities."—National Anti-Vaccination League in pamphlet *Smallpox on the "Tuscania,"* April, 1929

The Election.

By C. H. Douglas.

I have been asked to elaborate slightly the reasons which govern my advice to anyone who asks for it, in regard to the present Parliamentary election. That advice is "Go to the polling booth, and spoil your voting paper by writing on it some such remark as 'A plague on all your houses.'"

The first, and most obvious reason for this advice, is, that the election is a cold and calculated fraud. It pretends to give the electorate an opportunity of deciding its policy. It is hardly necessary to point out to readers of this Review, that the utmost it can be said to do is to decide which group of persons, for the most part nominated by the Party "machines," will be allowed to translate the policy of international finance into its technical embodiment in English law.

It ought to be recognised, if it is not, by every intelligent citizen, that an attack upon the rights of tangible property, such as that staged, for instance, by the Labour Party, offers no anxieties to the financial Power. In fact, on the contrary. Such an attack always takes the form of taxation. Taxation is paid in money, which the financial interests control. In consequence the owner of property is obliged to exchange his property for money, which is then handed over to the Tax collector, and returns to the point from whence it came, that is to say, the bank. The State obtains nothing tangible by taxation. The only limit to this process, from the point of view of finance, is the point at which physical revolt takes place, and the financier is losing his fear of this. A few more years of skilful disarmament propaganda, and he will be safe. Not a word is said by the Labour Party about the ownership of credit and the power of creating money.

The Liberal Party is now openly the party of the banking and financial interests, as it always has been covertly, its policies representing the shortest cut to a complete financial dictatorship. If I could imagine that the world was obliged to continue under the existing financial system indefinitely, much as I dislike Whiggism, I should vote Liberal, on the principle that it is far better that the real Ruler and the ostensible ruler should be identified. No doubt that is why Mr. McKenna and Mr. Keynes are Liberals. I can't think of any other excuse.

The Conservative Party is, in fact, nothing but a moderate Whig Party, masquerading under a name associated in the minds of the country gentleman and the agriculturist with moderate Toryism, the Tory Party being inarticulate, and unrepresented. In spite of this, it is possible that the Conservative Party is the least popular of the three with the financial interests, as its subservience probably depends to an uncomfortable extent on the ability to keep it continuously misinformed as to the real issues involved in the financial question, and led by individuals either nominated or bribed to carry out banking policy.

But apart from the main, and sufficient general reason, it seems to me obvious that the rank and file of the British nation is greatly superior to its political leaders—a situation which one would expect under the circumstances, but which I think is not sufficiently emphasised. For example, Mr. Baldwin.

It has always been clear enough that there could only be two explanations for Mr. Baldwin, and, God wot, he needs explaining. The most charitable of these was that he was so inconceivably stupid that he might safely be trusted by the wire-pullers to be Prime Minister of Great Britain, on the same principle that Disraeli found no difficulty in appointing Chancellors of the Exchequer, since, as he observed, "No Englishman knows anything about finance." I regret that my belief in Mr. Baldwin's stupidity is

not unshaken. If he were as stupid as he appears to be, it would not be so necessary to advertise his honesty.

There can, I think, be no more amazing revelation of the depths to which politics have sunk in this country than the fact that it is regarded as a first class political asset to say that a Prime Minister of Great Britain is honest. A good many hard things are being said nowadays about the system represented by Harrow and Trinity, some of them true, and many of them not so true. It frankly amazes me, however, that a product of this system who is also Prime Minister and the first citizen of the British Empire will allow, for instance, Lord Melchett, to recommend him for the post, on the ground that he is honest, without taking the first public opportunity to spit in his eye.

Perhaps somebody will recommend Mr. Ramsay MacDonald for the same post on the ground that he has not yet been caught cheating at cards. There are not many points on which I could see eye to eye with Mr. MacDonald, but I do agree with him that what we need is a little courage.

In regard to this matter of the election, the British public is in the position of a man who goes into a restaurant and is offered the choice of soup, fish, or joint, the waiter remarking for his guidance that the soup is greasy, the fish is time expired, and the meat is tough. If, in spite of these slight drawbacks, he persists in dining, all I can say is that he deserves the ptomaine poisoning which I feel sure he will get.

"RETROSPECT."

Under this title we propose to republish, weekly, the subject-references to the "Notes" and articles on politics and economics in our "Contents" sections of, respectively, one, two, three, and four years ago, selecting the issues corresponding in date each year with that of the issue in which they will be reproduced. The first of the series appears elsewhere. Those of our readers who are systematically studying or disseminating Social Credit ideas will recognise, upon inspection, the advantages of this new feature. They will see that it constitutes a diary of events—not any event, but those particular events which we felt impelled at the time to select for comment. Additionally, the purport of our comments will often be indicated sufficiently clearly to enable our older readers to recall the details of our analyses. In any case, the dates of the references will enable them to consult the original articles if they wish to do so. Again, the juxtaposition of four sets of events or controversies, each exactly a year apart, will often be found, we think, to provide some interesting coincidences and syntheses to everyone who has grasped the fundamentals of the Social Credit theorem. They cannot help but refresh memories and stimulate thoughts. We are reminded of the saying: "The sum of all that is is the sum of all that has been." Certainly the sum of all that is happening to-day is the sum of all that we have said in the past; and we feel sure that there will be few weeks when the "Retrospect" will not have a manifest bearing on the events of that week, and will not virtually provide apposite footnotes to our current "Notes." We wish that it extended farther back, but as we did not commence to print a subject index until 1925, we must be content with the four one-year skips which cover this survey. Mr. Joseph Chamberlain declared on a celebrated occasion: "What I have said I have said." That is nothing. The retort to such a boast is: "Does what you then said now say itself?" That is the test by which we claim to abide.

"Politics is a field where action is one long second-best, and the choice lies constantly between two blunders."—Lord Morley. (And, now that there are three Parties—three blunders.)

"Mr. J. J. Mantell, formerly vice-president of the Erie Railway, has been appointed consulting manager of the Chinese Railways. He is to make a complete survey of the railway position in China and to report to the Chinese Government. It is stated that the Nationalist Government will apply to the American Market for a large loan for new locomotives, machinery, and equipment."—*Morning Post*, April 4, 1929.

Current Politics.

THE INVERSION OF THE ACADEMIC AND THE VITAL.

By W. T. SYMONS.

It is not to be wondered at that the saying "man is a political animal" is now honoured in the breach rather than the observance. The extension of the franchise has coincided with dilution of its influence upon Governments. The role of politician has steadily degenerated in public estimation. There was never a time since the parliamentary system was instituted and democracy attained nominal control of its destiny, when men felt less able by their votes to have any real effect upon the course of events in their own country, much less upon the relations between their own and other countries. The manifest subjection of civil liberty to ends of doubtful benefit, which characterised the conduct of Coalition Governments during the war, has been succeeded by the inability of any Party Government to cope with even the most pressing social evils, or to preserve Peace, except in very unstable equilibrium. A general feeling has resulted that nothing can be done; that certainly electoral promises can not be relied upon.

In brief, the General Election of 1929 in England is faced by a thoroughly discouraged electorate, and the future of representative Government is jeopardised. So far is the public intelligence from perceiving the real centres of power which have brought all national Governments into disrepute, that despairing hopes of the "strong man" are beginning to arise, and the manifest aggregate weakness provokes the fantasy of a hero who will make a magic conquest over all the forces of disintegration. In this dangerous situation the first need is to provoke discrimination between the real and the unreal political issues.

To this end, it is first necessary to enquire: what do we want of the political organisation? To that we answer: security in the pursuit of all personal objectives, within the limits of an agreed common law: prevention of any unit within the community from inhibiting, by monopoly or otherwise, the fullest well-being in every direction which the resources of the nation render possible; the positive encouragement of every advance in that standard; the active promotion of such international relations as will further these objectives by preservation of Peace, and by cultural and trading interchange.

It has to be recognised that modern governments appear to operate for quite different objectives to these. Scarcely is this less so in England under our elaborated form of parliamentary government, than in countries more openly subjected to control by a few or by one individual. The liberties of the English nation are so deeply undermined that even the Trade Union Act, an unthinkable infamy if its full provisions were ever called into operation, stands upon the Statute Book; and control of the country's most vital service, the financial system, is openly handed over to a private Company having heavy commitments in its policy outside the country, and objectives quite incompatible with the commercial and industrial prosperity of Britain.

These two great evils: the progressive loss of civil liberty and of control over financial policy, call for first attention. They issue in the gigantic development of financial policy, on principles so perverse that the mere token system, whose only appropriate place in human affairs is that of a flexible servant, dominates all political institutions, and supports, with every elaboration of the pretence that natural law dictates its self-imposed rules, the utmost extension of tyranny and servility. Unless this over-arching power is squarely recognised, and the limited range of political power seen in its true perspective, no new beginning can be made in creation of a true

democracy. It is especially desirable that the newly-enfranchised, who may be expected to look upon the nation's institutions with fresh eyes and fresh demands, should have well in mind that very little of vital importance for the country can be effected through the political machine until the problem of national well-being is released from monetary control. If but a few temper the party allegiances which their tastes and circumstances dictate, with a critical discrimination between those claims and promises which are possible of fulfilment, and those which are not, a new vitality will be imported into politics, and a rising tide of demand will be generated, of which neither Party will have a monopoly. Such a demand will work powerfully towards a common purpose; and from a common purpose can arise institutions expressive of the real constitution of men in association, wherein Government "of the people, by the people, for the people" will rest upon real principles instead of upon fantastic rules. We want Economic Democracy and will be content with nothing less.

A glance at the crucial troubles of the moment indicates the unreality of current political activity and shows how immediately every individual is involved. The vital matter, for example, of the proper spheres of central and local Government. It is impossible to solve this question, pressing as it is, within the ambit of the present credit control. Nevertheless, this matter has been forced upon the consideration of the citizen by the De-rating Bill, recently driven through a hostile House of Commons. No Parliament could deal faithfully with the overwhelming volume of business which has become concentrated in the central organisation. But at the same time the ever-encroaching financial veto of the Treasury upon County, Municipal, and Rural activities, renders it impossible for them to discharge the greater administrative responsibilities now being transferred to these bodies, and the irony of the situation is that they are compelled, by the impossibility of meeting their liabilities through local taxation, to seek the assistance which fetters them.

The faculty of administration is excellently developed in England, and the task of its allocation, from the Rural District Council to the Mother of Parliaments, is one natural to English genius. But such financial difficulty is imported into the operations of local government that threats of wholesale resignation are imminent in some districts, and the substitution of Treasury officials armed with plenary powers is the ignominious condition forced upon others.

Restraint is imposed upon the nation's life in every part of the political sphere. The citizen, awakened to a sense of the community, and wishing to contribute at least a good discrimination to the major questions of the day, is driven to the inverted feeling that vital matters are academic and academic matters vital. He knows that Education is vital; that Leisure is essential to any cultural advance. But these matters, which, he feels, should be the pre-occupation of any modern Government worth the name, are treated with scurvy disregard, or at the best with regretful neglect, for lack of money.

Similarly with the extreme poverty and mental distress involved in lack of employment, for those below a certain level of social security. The awakened citizen is given to understand that his question is quite academic when he asks: why should this suffering be imposed in an epoch of prodigal wealth, when the main difficulty of all traders is to dispose of their stocks?

Agriculture is starved in England—dismally, with profound injury to the whole stock of the English race; with steady narrowing of the margin of safety for mere necessities of food. Yet the conditions of its decline are accepted as inevitable, although from

the practical, the eugenic, and the technical aspect, no serious obstacle stands in the way of a thriving countryside.

It is thus with every large question which should be the subject of practical politics. These are left as academic; and the strength of the elected assembly of the country is expended, with infinite exasperation, in reaching compromises between the worst and the best that can be done for the people of England within the range of the accepted obstacles, which can be summarised in the statement that all the country's political life is conducted within the possibilities afforded by certain academic rules of finance which serve a perverse psychology and an inversion of real values.

Drama.

Keepers of Youth: Duke of York's.

Inside the play and outside the theatre Mr. Arnold Ridley asserts that private schoolmasters for the sons of gentlemen do not live up to their prospectuses. They are all men, he says, who have failed at something else. The very few who have brains have no morals. All this, far from arousing my moral indignation about the scandal of Brentley School, convinced me only that the inside of private schools is pretty much on a par with the world at large. The attitude of the public, so far, however, has been one of disbelief that private schools for the children of snobs can be so disreputable as Mr. Ridley alleges. There are, of course, excellent private schools. Nevertheless, there must also be others closely resembling Brentley. Mr. Paul Selver's novel, "Schooling," is by no means the only confirmation of Mr. Ridley's account apart from Mr. Hugh Walpole's. That education must certainly refine human nature is not a proposition inductively supportable by the observation of teachers in private schools.

The head of Brentley School talks prospectus by the hour to the parents of prospective pupils. He could have sold anything in America. While he is thus engaged his history master, Sullivan, walks in. This weary old man, who shirks all he can and knuckles under to everything because he knows he can never get another job, is described by the head in prospectus terms. The moment is bitterly and pathetically ironical, and Mr. Ridley achieves several such moments. The head's bootlicker, Mr. Slade, makes a speech to an imaginary assembly of boys every time he opens his mouth. He carries the school's sports records in his head, and talks prospectus even to his colleagues. "For the sake of the dear old school," he is not above spending his evenings patrolling the town to discover which boy takes the cobbler's assistant to the cinema. Jarvis, another teacher, passes every leisure minute cramming correspondence courses for the matric., for which he has sat six failures. The head himself is at Brentley because he had been sent down from . . . as we learned after he had expelled the truant-lover. Slade, Jarvis, and Sullivan had all failed to enter one or other of the professions. Knox, the games master, was in some respects of sterner stuff. He had no degrees, but he had one solid recommendation of playing for Kent at cricket during his holidays. He slept with the female servants, but he could not be sacked because, knowing the head's past, he had him on a salver. He spends his life venting a sadistic temper on all about him. In spite of everything he did, however, it is by no means obvious that the boys disliked him, or that he was a bad games master.

That Mr. Ridley's case for the public control of private schools is truthful there need be no doubt. But I could match every one of his teachers very

closely in schools publicly controlled. Whether the Slades moralised in the teacher's common room I know not; but they moralised in the class-rooms. A very small dose of naughtiness is enough to set any authority in the world from colonel to headmaster, glowering with the thunder of shocked Jehovah. Mr. Ridley's first weakness, therefore, is that he considers his menagerie peculiar to private schools. They are not even peculiar to schools. The second is that the private lives of teachers no more stamps the quality of their teaching than the private lives of kings and politicians brands the quality of their Government. How do men whose boyhood was passed at Brentley compare with those of controlled schools? At Brentley the teachers pretended to be morally perfect to the boys. So they do everywhere else. It is part of the authoritarian pose. Teachers and parsons are expected to be as saintly as normal parents pretend to be to their children. They can be grouped with the British constitution and Caesar's wife in perfection. Though, unlike these, they are not above suspicion. It is too much to ask, and no wonder parsons go secretly to Paris if they can afford, and teachers secretly to drink. Children prefer the doctor to the parson, tramps to teachers, and uncles to parents, because the former are what they say they are. They neither demand nor pretend to give moral perfection. Their taboos, if any, are human.

Mr. Ridley censures departure from perfection as much as he censures hypocrisy. This weakens his play as a play as well as prejudicing his case. He cannot be content to portray the school night and day. He introduces a romantic hero with the morals of Jesus Christ in practice and of an American uplift in precept. He pronounces voluble anathema on the sins of the others. Through him what might have been a work of rather grim and very interesting naturalism becomes a sentimental melodrama. Protecting the maid from the games master's invasion of her bedroom at midnight, he does not offer to fetch a dressing-gown for her; he puts his own coat round her. Only recollections of Victorian heroic melodrama and Tom Mix can be stimulated by such an act. As preparation for the unexpected arrival of the head, shirt-sleeves are no more compromising than coat-sleeves. Hour, night-dress, and bed were enough.

The play needs trimming; there is a fatal over-emphasis of points after they have been driven home. The head's introduction of the characters is too long; Slade's speeches continue to be made after the audience knows what he will say, by which time it would be enough to suggest them. The curtain where a row between Knox and Lake has to come to an end because of prayer-bell is perfect, but afterwards curtains drag. In spite of its faults, however, Mr. Ridley has made an interesting play, and may be congratulated on unearthing a subject on which the sanctimonious can still be shocked. Would that the romantic hero, however, had not come to defend sentimental orthodoxy.

Herbert Ross as the worn-out old history teacher gave a performance haunting long after the play is over. The weary face, the clothes old and crumpled, the quarter-inch of cigarette, the languid manner, and dull response combined to create perfectly a character intelligible and pitiable. Sullivan's self-rousing to urge a younger man out of the groove was worked into natural continuity. Knox, by D. A. Clarke-Smith, was over-acted. This stimulating actor might justify himself on the strength of Knox's lines, but such a manner would not have enabled him to play as an amateur cricketer for any club. Knox stuck too much out of the picture. The remainder of the parts were played competently and with humour.

PAUL BANKS.

Music.

Royal Opera, Covent Garden: Second Cycle—"Der Ring das Niebelungen."

The majestic work unfolds itself not too majestically, nor even nearly enough under Robert Heger, who with all his undoubted competence and skill in getting out of the hodge-podge of a London orchestra some semblance of clarity, and his consideration for the singers does not get down to the root of the Wagnerian phrase as does Walter, for instance. And why none of those brilliant German conductors such as Kraus, Knapperbutsch, Fried, or Klemperer? The seasons are becoming depressingly stereotyped of late years at Covent Garden. There are numbers of many fine, some brilliant, and a few supreme artists who are not on the list of singers, and others whose presence is amazing and inexplicable, so horribly bad are they. The suggestion at which I have been hammering for years, however, apropos the appearance of *Erda* from up behind a rock instead in that idiotic little dog-kennel concern, has at last been acted upon, and the lighting shows signs of intelligence, though it has still a long way to go before it becomes really good. That arrangement of floodlights from the back of the gallery is very bad, and must be most worrying and distracting to the people sitting up there, who are never really in darkness, but often in a sort of twilight, at times many degrees brighter than the light on the stage. The orchestra is distinctly poor this year—rough, crude brass, bad acid wood-wind, quite uncalled for by the exigencies of the score, general uncertainty of attack, and that dreadful woolly, fluffy string tone that passes for being rich and full with those listeners, and, of course, players, who know no better.

Das Rheingold. May 6.

The all-round standard of the singing was higher than any other performance I remember. Two minor parts, *Froh* (Henry Wendon) and *Freia* (Josephine Wray), were for the first time in my recollection sung by singers with good voices and satisfactory style. Josephine Wray was especially excellent. A new *Wotan* in Rudolf Bockelmann was a fine dignified and stately figure, with an admirable voice, well used, full, warm, and sonorous. Olczewska as *Fricka*, a superb figure, magnificent in gesture and bearing, but not quite up to her best form. *Alberich* and *Mime*, the inevitable and irreplaceable Eduard Hobich and Albert Reiss respectively. The more vocal of the two giants *Fafner* was a fine study by Alexander Kipnis, but for some reason his voice did not tell or carry at all well, which is singular, because he is one of the finest and most ringingly sonorous of the present-day Wagnerian basses. The voice sounded veiled and even a trifle muffled. I remember being equally surprised at the comparative ineffectiveness of this artist's singing in "Aida," a year or two ago. His *Gurnemann* in *Parsifal* invites one to expect equally great things of him in other rôles, which *prima facie* seem eminently suitable to him. Hans Clemens is noted for his *Loge*, which was very well sung, but struck me as not having a whole—sufficient of the "false fleeting" quality of the character. Those who know the remarkable study of this part by Walter Kirchoff or Karl Erb will perceive what is meant. Clemens was not Eldritch enough. Three very efficient and competent *Rheintöchter* were Odette de Foras, Betsy de la Porte, and Gladys Paturer, and they swam about to

admiration even if they did not always sing there-unto. The blot on the performance, apart from the bad orchestral playing—the abominable quality of the horns in the *Prelude* particularly, was the phenomenally bad singing of *Erda* (Anny Andrassy). It is not often that one hears worse sounds produced from a human throat in a great Opera House at any rate—add to that an out size in wobbles, and you have a combination that might issue from a cinema organ "vox humana" with the tremulant on, with the difference that the "vox humana" tremulant does not obscure pitch to the point of making it a hazardous guess to decide on which of three contiguous and adjacent semitones the sound is supposed to be pitched. Needless to say no trace of the portentous fate-laden expression of *Erda's* music could get through such a medium—*Erda*, for whom a Kirkby Lunn, no less, is adequate. Here, by the way, I should like to declare that there is no contralto or mezzo singing anywhere to-day who for marvellous beauty of voice and splendid artistry of singing, combined with magnificent interpretative abilities, can compare with what Kirkby Lunn was at the height of her power—a fact her own English compatriots, with their usual damnable purblindness and stupidity where their supremely gifted ones are concerned, completely failed, and fail to realise, with the exception of another great artist, Santley, who appraised Kirkby Lunn at her real worth. So much for *das Rheingold*. But surely it is not necessary to inform the house by the noise thereof that the *Rheingold* is being turned on and off with an electric light switch! Such careless barbarisms are a source of contempt and ridicule. They would not be tolerated in a provincial pantomime show.

Die Walküre. May 9.

This was a definitely uneven and ill-balanced performance. That Leider (*Brünnhilde*) and Olczewska (*Fricka*) could make the headway they did, more especially the latter, who was in great form, against such a *Wotan* as Wilhelm Fassbinder, was wonderful. He was a compendium of all the lacks and deficiencies that a *Wotan*, or for that matter any part, should not have. His inadequacies were often so grievous that one was more than once hard put to it to imagine how he could get through the work at all. *Wotan* is the central pillar of *Die Walküre*, and if he cannot properly fulfil his function the work falls to pieces. Leider did all she could against the dead weight, but she herself was not in her best voice, indeed, at the beginning one was not a little nervous for her, but she improved rapidly as she went on. The new *Sieglinde*, Meta Seinemeyer, is a distinct accession, she has a beautiful voice, on the whole well produced, but too covered towards the top register: it was a good study, but not startling as far as acting was concerned, which was trifle stilted and too deliberate. Olczewska as *Fricka* had quite recovered her rate. Olczewska as *Fricka* had quite recovered her rate, and was entirely magnificent. This is a rare performance of the outraged, angry goddess demanding punishment for the violation of her laws from the reluctant *Wotan* caught, as he says, in the net of his own weaving, between the guilt he incurs if *Fricka's* laws, which he himself established, are not enforced, and the treachery of withdrawing the protection of the sword which he had pledged to his son Siegmund. The latter very finely sung by Lauritz Melchior, who is one of the best Wagnerian Lauritz Melchior, and whose singing and interpretation of his parts visibly and audibly improve every year. The *Hunding* of Alexander Kipnis, very good, but not like Norman Allin's remarkable conception—one of the best I know, this last. The whole performance was rushed and hurried, the last act especially suffering from the conductor's rather indecent haste.

BALLADE OF PRINCELY VANITY.

Caesar was great, and Pompey, too, had power,
Both lived in ancient Rome in regal state;
Upon their stage they strutted for an hour;
The mob acclaimed; the world on them did wait:
But of their end let History relate;
Caesar, the mighty, in his hour of pride
Was visited by Pompey's tragic fate:
God ceased to think of him, and so he died.

Another to whom the world did cower
Was Alexander, by the Greeks called Great;
Courageous, young, and lovely as a flower,
Still of his martial skill professors prate:
With his sharp sword he built a super-state,
But when to make himself a god he tried,
And sought by force to invade Heaven's gate,
God ceased to think of him, and so he died.

Though Mussolini at the world may glower,
While Foreign Ministers expostulate,
The milk of human kindness will turn sour
If Blackshirts hit a Redshirt on the pate:
Who can prevent the answering Hymn of Hate?
Force leads to force; and power will be defied;
History will write, "At last he met checkmate;
"God ceased to think of him, and so he died."

ENVOI.

Prince, may you stand like a well-buttressed tower:
Believe me, Sire, though History oft has lied,
They withered like the gourd of Jonah's bower;
God ceased to think of them, and so they died.

BAYARD SIMMONS.

THE LATEST PAMPHLET.**An Outline of Social Credit**

By H. M. M.

With a Foreword by C. H. Douglas.

52 pp. Price 6d. Postage ½d.

Special terms for quantities quoted on application.

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 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.

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.
- COLBOURNE, M.
Unemployment or War. 12s. 6d. (Procured from New York to order.)
- 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.
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.
- DUNN, E. M.
The New Economics. 4d.
Social Credit Chart. 1d.
- GALLOWAY, C. F. J.
Poverty Amidst Plenty. 6d.
- H. M. M.
An Outline of Social Credit. 6d.
- HATTERSLEY, C. MARSHALL.
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.

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.
- 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.
- MCKENNA, RT. HON. REGINALD.
Post-War Banking Policy. 7s. 6d.
- SODDY, Professor F., M.A.
Cartesian Economics. 6d.
The Inversion of Science. 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. 3s.
- HILTON, J. P.
Britain's First Municipal Savings Bank. 1s. 6d.

Address: 70, High Holborn, London, 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.