

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART

No. 2053] NEW SERIES Vol. L. No. 11. THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1932. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK	121	CURRENT SOCIOLOGY. By Paul Banks	128
Professor Gregory to address the Industrial Christian Fellowship—the technique of confusion discussed in relation to the behaviour of the "Oozlem Bird."		Mr. Arthur Henderson and the Peace Conference. Labour's intellectual advisers—Mr. Greenwood, Lord Passfield, and Mr. Cole.	
THE INTERNATIONAL IDEA. By C. H. Douglas	124	MUSIC. By Kaikhosru Sorabji	130
NEWS NOTES. (Editorial)	126	The Musical Times on the B.B.C.	
		THE FILMS. By David Ockham	130
		Street Scene. Out of the Blue.	
		CORRESPONDENCE	131
		Neil Montgomery and Raymond Harrison.	

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The Industrial Christian Fellowship have "decided to consider 'The Monetary Crisis: Its Causes and Remedies.'" One of the three presidents of this institution is the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop's trip to Jerusalem as the guest of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan will be fresh in our readers' memories, Mr. Morgan's intimate relations with Mr. Montagu Norman, Sir Otto Niemeyer and other international bankers can be taken for granted. Events in Australia last year give point to the saying: "If Niemeyer comes, is Gregory far behind?" And it is Professor Gregory who has "kindly promised to give the opening address" at the Council Meeting, which is called for Wednesday, January 13, at 8 p.m., at the Upper House of Convocation, Church House, Great Smith Street, Westminster. Guests are invited (and among those who have received and accepted invitations are several advocates of Social Credit). There is to be opportunity for discussion (both on that evening and on the following morning), and guests are invited to contribute to it because of the "supreme importance" of the subject, and because of its "technical nature"—invitations having been extended only to those who have "shown special interest" in these matters. The Lord Bishop of Lichfield, Vice-President of the Fellowship, will be chairman. We see that the motto of the Fellowship is: "We stand for Christ and His principles, independent of party."

It is clear that Professor Gregory will set sail with both wind and tide behind him. Not only does the title of his address postulate a multiplicity of "causes and remedies," but the standing orders of the discussion, as deducible from the motto just quoted, will exclude remedies directed to an economic purpose while admitting those directed to a moral purpose. The only chance for common-sense to get a look-in lies in the possibility that the Chairman may wink at breaches of the standing

orders. A lot of happy little accidents will aid the Professor. Probably the guests, between them, will bring forward a dozen or so remedies to be debated alongside the dozen or so that the speaker is sure to review in his opening speech. Then, time is the essence of the ramp. Allowing six hours altogether for the proceedings, we can safely calculate that, in all, the Professor will be on his feet for two hours (indefinitely expandable unless the Chairman rations him as he must the guests) leaving four hours to be shared by, say, fifty guests—which is less than five minutes each if they all speak. And assuming that the guests' suggested "causes" or "remedies" number twelve, that allows an average of twenty minutes for each. It is therefore easy to foresee that by the time when the Council proceeds to draw up its "Summary" (of what?—whether conclusions, confusions, or impressions—is not stated) on the morning of January 14 the assemblage of guests who have stuck it to the end will languidly acquiesce in the adoption of "any old thing" in the way of a general pronouncement—and we would not mind betting that Professor Gregory has even now got one drafted in outline, ready to be submitted to the yawning guests at the propitious moment.

This will be all the easier to do because, since the subject is of a technical nature, and the nominal chairman, the Bishop of Lichfield, is not a technician, Professor Gregory will be the effective chairman. And since, again, whatever views he may hold on the administrative technique of banking (a harmless field of controversy like the Irishman's "public row," in which anybody is permitted to join in) he is an implacable upholder of the axioms on which banking policy is founded. It is a comparatively simple matter to insinuate into the mind of a Bishop the conviction that any challenge offered to those axioms impugns the "principles of Christ," and that however scientific the evidence supporting the challenge, the inspiration must be derived from "party" considerations. The Archbishop of Melbourne provided the classic example of this confusion—and the Archbishop of Canterbury runs him pretty close. In the Melbourne version of the Lord's Prayer, the

Christian is now enjoined to pray: "Lead us not into inflation"—while the Lambeth Slogan is: "For God and Credit!"

Referring to the conclusions at which the Council may be expected to arrive, we think we can make a close guess at the general nature of the "Gregory Summary"—or, shall we say, the music of the "Gregorian Ramp"? We are helped in the attempt by the fact that a parallel investigation into a parallel subject by a parallel institution was undertaken not long ago and has just been reported on. We refer to that moralo-political educative corporation called The General Federation of Trade Unions, run by Mr. W. A. Appleton. Last year it set up a Committee to "institute an inquiry" into the "effect of gold and credit upon price, trade, and employment." Its reason for doing so was "because of the vital importance of the subject to all the employable population" (Our italics.) The Report was issued on December 9. Listen to the "Appleton Summary":—

"We are convinced that monetary standards, currencies, and credits do affect trade and employment:

"We are also convinced that they form part of a subject too profound and too complex for hasty generalisation.

"The study of this subject may be attempted by all,

"But conclusions concerning it can only safely be reached by those who, in addition to expert knowledge, and wide experience, are actuated by the highest conceptions of morality and public service.

"Indeed, we cannot escape the impression that the success of any national or international monetary policy will be materially influenced by the moral standards of those who promulgate and operate it."

"We will now call upon Brother Appleton to pronounce the Benediction. Will the congregation please rise?" This passage is apocryphal, but seems to have almost the authority of the canonical citations which precede it.—E.D.]

The learned investigators (C. Kean, F. W. Birchough, A. Naesmith, and W. A. Appleton) say, in the Introduction to the Report, that

"From the beginning of the inquiry, it was necessary to realise that all standards, mediums, and currency had international bases and ramifications, and that any attempt to vary these must, to be successful, have international sanctions." (Our italics.)

Evidently, like the famous Labour Party Committee, they had the assistance of an expert banking official. Here is their description of the "Basis of Credit":—

"The essence of credit is the voluntary action of the contracting parties, the lender and the borrower. It may be restricted by folly, or expanded by deception, but attempts to force it would destroy its foundations and dry up its sources. It rests upon both a material and a moral basis; upon commodities and character; upon goods and reputations."

The following piece of information is helpful!

"Credits are not necessarily from bankers because bankers advance them. These latter, as custodians of other people's capital, are not, apart from the limited capital derived from the profits of their trading, able to create; they only extend credit; the creation is the work of those who save."

Towards the end of the Report are the following observations:—

"During our examination of facts and records we have marvelled at the credulity of mankind; at its gambling proclivities, and at the willingness of governments to condone financial manipulation provided they were allowed to share in the spoils. . . .

"Examination and comparison emphasise the fact that the law of diminishing returns applies as surely to inflations of credit as it does to inflations of currency. . . .

"We may, however, be permitted to say that we have been favourably impressed by Professor Alfred Marshall's elaboration of the Ricardian theory of a monetary system based upon an internationally agreed ratio between gold and silver bullion values."

This Report (16 pp.) is published as at the Federation's headquarters, Central House, Upper Woburn Place, W.C.1, and is worth getting (if it can be got hold of—for it is not priced, and is presumably intended for internal circulation) as an exhibit. We confess ourselves at a complete loss to know for what reason any Trade Unions affiliate themselves to this evangelistic concern. The money might just as well be paid to the Salvation Army, and better, for the Salvation Army does perform some service to British Trade Unionism, if only through its activities in promoting emigration, to that extent relieving congestion in the labour market. We suggest to readers who belong to affiliated Trade Unions—What do their leaders think they're buying for the fees paid to the Federation? Is it "wise spending"?—is it "Buying British"?

It is hardly to be supposed that the inquiry inaugurated by the Industrial Christian Fellowship will result in anything so manifestly inept as the Report just considered. The occasion will be semi-public, and the guests will at least know better than to swallow quite such crude dope as we have seen to be put over upon, and through, Mr. Appleton's committee. Nevertheless, the conditions of the inquiry are such that, unless challenged, the same character of conclusions will be arrived at, though in a better diplomatic form. Professor Gregory, says the circular, has "kindly promised" to give the opening address. Goodness gracious, we should think he would! And we should like to know who inspired the invitation to him. A glance at the list of banking heavy-weights who are going to deliver free lectures on the "Crisis" (see "News Notes" elsewhere) is one among several signs that the credit-monopolists are moving heaven and earth to secure platforms where they may put their case under conditions of immunity from effective cross-examination. The only possible conditions under which any real enlightenment could be gained from the attendance of Professor Gregory would be those under which he appeared before the guests of the I.C.F. in just the same capacity as did Major Douglas before the Macmillan Committee. A suggestion like that would instantly fill the promising Professor's diary with prior engagements. He is not out to formulate a coherent statement of evidence and have his arguments subjected to sustained judicial probing. He is out to display a necklace of variegated *obiter dicta* threaded on some such theme as "the complexity of the subject as a whole," and leading to the conclusion that "after all, only the experts are able to see it whole" and that therefore they be authorised to wear the necklace as a chain of office, and get on with the job without interference. The performance will be much the same as if someone proposed to explain the Divine Plan of the universe by telling his beads. At least, that seems to be the prospect, and if it is not to be the fact, the guests who advocate Social Credit will have to exercise some ingenuity, and enjoy some luck in addition, if they are to catch the Oozlem Bird. The name of the bird is supposed to be a contraction of Jerusalem; but that is by the way. They show it in America (or that is the story—which need not be believed) and the guide usually describes its habits as follows:—

Ladies and gentlemen,—This is the re-markable Oozlem Bird. This bird, when he is attacked by his feathered enemies, ascends in the skies, flying in ever decreasing circles, until at last he disappears into his inside—from which point of vantage, ladies and gentlemen, he exclaims of *dee-rision* at his baffled pursuers!

Here is an illustration of oozlem strategy.

I'm broke.
Ah, but think of industry.
But industry's broke.
Ah, but think of the nation.
But the nation's broke.
Ah, but think of the world.
But the world's broke.
Ah, then think of God.

The spiral of logic always disappears into the region of the indeterminate, the imponderable, and the immeasurable, where the faculty of reasoning is paralysed, or, if not, is insulated from relationship with concrete problems. Sir George Paish, for instance, is always talking about the "psychological" impediment, and saying that the "human element" would obstruct the operation of even a perfect credit-technique if one could be discovered! The truth is that insofar as the running of the economic system in the right way is concerned psychological energy, so to call it, is not a whit less tractable than electrical energy. Even to-day the direction of mass psychology is carried out by advertising experts who, within limits, are able to pre-determine not only the qualitative, but also, in many cases, the quantitative results of their publicity-schemes. It is true that there are incalculable elements in the psychology of every single individual, but it so happens that these freaks of character, so to call them, which differentiate individualities, are, at the worst, simply neutral to the essential requirements of a sound system of economic co-operation, and, at the best, conducive to the objective of the system. So far as the measure and nature of the response of the masses to direction from above still remain incalculable, the reason is not that anything is inherently wrong with their psychology, but exactly the contrary; it is because the attempted direction involves a conflict with the law of survival which rules throughout the animate kingdom. This, of course, sets up a long range of resistances throughout society, the most intense of which manifest themselves in active disobedience, and so on down the scale through sullen acquiescence to the bottom end where are the types who are ready to deny their natural instincts in the name of "culture," "duty," "goodness," and what not. Thus it is that we read how Somerset House was "taken by surprise" by the flocking of dutiful taxpayers to pay up before the day; or, previously to that, how the Admiralty got an equal surprise of another nature from Invergordon.

There is another reason why the responsiveness of mass-psychology is unpredictable, and that is because the direction, besides being anti-natural in its consequences, is equivocal in its character. It is bad enough to tell impoverished people plainly that abstinence is necessary, but it is ten times worse to ring the changes on "strict economy" and "wise spending" without notice and without reason. All the "human obstructions" to the present financial system from which people like Sir George Paish infer that they will not let any system work, are so many proofs that society is psychologically healthy, and that the health will manifest itself directly the bankers are replaced by a Social Credit Authority which tells the people what it wants to do, how it proposes to do it, and how it wants them to help. Obstruction! The directive administration will float on the "human element" like the needle of a marine-compass floats upon mercury. The experience of the last election has established, once and for all, that the people of this country are prepared to try any experiment authoritatively and clearly recommended to them, however unpleasant. The snag is not in their spirit but in their flesh, namely: Is it humanly possible for them to survive the experiment? It is not their psychology, but that of the bankers, which is now on trial.

The only way in which to deal with oozlemism is to pluck the bird before it can rise. This reflection bears upon the problem of devising suitable tactics at meetings such as the I.C.F. proposes to hold, in order to overcome the handicap which official procedure automatically imposes on informed critics. Taking the case of any meeting of this sort it is incomparably more helpful from the bankers' point of view to expose a single apologist for their policy to examination by twenty critics than twenty apologists to examination by a single critic. In the latter case the potential critics could afford to concede nine-tenths of the total time to the apologists, on condition that they were allowed to dispose of the remaining time as they thought best. For, granted that condition, they could get together beforehand and arrange (even by ballot supposing disagreement) for one of their number to cross-examine the speakers. They would, as it were, elect a barrister, and although they might suggest the general direction in which he should push his investigations, they should otherwise give him a free hand. And he would use his free hand to pluck feathers out of the bird—not any feathers, but *wing-feathers*. As a rough illustration, let us quote from the Macmillan Committee's Minutes of Evidence (the italics are ours):—

4404. Professor Gregory: "It has made £10,000 profit?"—Major Douglas: "Of course it has made £10,000 assets. This is jumping from the money to the goods all the time. . . ."

Or, in the language of the showman, it was flying up on the oozlem spiral. Major Douglas wasn't having any fundamentalist disappearances that morning! If any baffling of pursuers was to be done it had to be done on the ground. Thus Gregory lost one feather.

What made this possible was the Committee's procedure, which allowed a series of questions and answers between two people to be pursued along a coherent line of elucidation. Contrast this with what always happens during the "discussion" time so generously afforded by the astute promoters of bankster conferences. Rarely does any independent participant in the discussion get the chance to put a supplementary question, let alone a string of them. The Chairman blandly reminds him that "others" have views to express. Yes, those "others"! And of course the meeting finishes up in the highest altitude, where it returns a vote of thanks to the invisible bird and gravely receives his derisive acknowledgments. As we have remarked, it will require much ingenuity to counter this technique; but that should be a stimulus rather than a discouragement to every critic who gives his time to attending gatherings of this sort. If heckling is not concerted in some way the hecklers are bound to be disconcerted every way.

A TALL ORDER.

The New Europe Group, International House, 55, Gower-street, W.C.1, announces a series of lectures at this address on the present situation in Europe. They are to be given on January 14, 18, 21, 25, and 28 by Mr. Albert Newsome (2), Mr. O. Köllerstrom, Mr. D. Mitrovic, and Mr. John Gould Fletcher. The subjects, in order, are "Labour and the Culture in Europe," "The European Fourth Estate," "The Parallels of Social and Individual Psychology," "Psychological Analysis of Racial Conflicts in Europe," and "The Outlook of Modern Youth." Prospectuses can be obtained from the address given. The Group, whose President is Professor Patrick Geddes, is in existence because the "present situation" is "becoming disastrous," and can only be saved by people who will "survey the situation as a whole," and pro-claim that all man's activities are "inter-related," since the "forces which produce" them are "all connected at their source, which is the human organism." . . . "There is no school of thought which has surveyed the situation as a whole." What is required is "the creation of a public which wishes to make a synthesis of present-day knowledge." They'll have to hustle some—if it is the next Crisis they're thinking about.

"The International Idea."

By C. H. Douglas.

[Notes of an Address delivered in London.]

I should like to impress upon you that in bringing forward the subject which is covered by the title for discussion, I have no intention of merely initiating an interesting discussion upon a philosophical abstraction. As you are aware, I regard society at the present time as being the battle ground of two fundamentally opposed ideas, at any rate as they are put forward, and the future of society as likely to be determined by which of those ideas shall prevail. So far as I can see, those of us who are here in this room constitute the general staff of one of the armies. We are the general staff, not perhaps because of any outstanding qualifications for the task, but because there does not seem to be any other on our side with a clear conception of what it is trying to do. Now one of these ideas, the one which we oppose and which has many forms, has one of its embodiments in the idea that the logical and almost inevitable form that social progress must take is the breaking down of all differences, social and national, and the setting up of a world state.

But the first doubt which I should like to assist you in casting upon this superficially attractive idea is to direct your attention to the fact that, like all the other analogous ideas of which it forms one exhibit, it is impervious to the assault of fact. The fact that the Irish Free State has split itself off from Great Britain, and that India and Egypt seem likely to go the same way, that there is a strong and growing Home Rule movement in Scotland, and that certain States of Australia are contemplating secession from the Australian Commonwealth, that there is quite a strong, if not articulate, division growing up between the Eastern and Western States of the American Union, and between the Eastern and Western Provinces of the Dominion of Canada, that Spain seems likely to split into two separate republics, that of Catalonia and that of Northern Spain, and many other instances of the same type, offers no evidence or argument to the Internationalist.

Now, of course, there is a perfectly straightforward and practical explanation of this propaganda for internationalism, and for practical purposes one does not really need to look further. Hardly a day passes without a leading article in *The Times*, or other papers of the same type of interest, remarking, as though it were axiomatic, that the world is one economic unit and that no adjustment of the present discontents can be expected which does not proceed from international agreement. These journals are ably seconded by High Clerics. This opinion, you will notice, is never argued; it is always stated as though it were obvious to the meanest intellect, which is, in fact, just about what it is. Now, as I have just said, the simplest explanation of this is that if you only make a subject large enough and involve a sufficiently large number of people in the solution of it, you can rest assured that you will never get a solution. A democracy of a thousand voters can be personally approached and convinced on any subject within a reasonable period of time, but if you enlarge the franchise to include everyone over twenty-one in a population of 45,000,000, you can be reasonably sure that any general conclusion at which it will arrive, it will arrive at twenty-five years after that conclusion ceases to be true. If you can super-impose upon that by means of a controlled Press, Broadcasting, and other devices of a similar nature, something that you call "public opinion" (because it is the only opinion which is articulate) you have a perfect mechanism for a continuous dictatorship, and moreover it is the form of dictatorship which is

fundamentally desired by the collectivist mentality—a dictatorship which has power without responsibility.

There is, however, another explanation almost equally obvious and probably equally true, and that is that local sovereignty, particularly as it extends to finance, is a barrier to the supremacy of international finance.

A Jewish financier, expressing his contempt for Gentile mentality, once remarked that the secret of the inability of the Gentile to shake himself free from the dominance of finance resided in the fact that the Gentile was incapable of distinguishing between numbers and things. I should be inclined to go further than that, and say that the mentality which is attracted by the Internationalist idea is incapable of distinguishing between numbers, things, and individuals. It is a type of mentality which is fostered and ultimately becomes inseparable from people who deal with nothing but figures, and is, in my opinion, the reason why the banker in particular is fundamentally unsuited for the position of reorganiser of the world. No banker, as such, has any knowledge of large undertakings. He thinks he has, because he deals with large figures, and he mistakes the dealing with large figures as being equivalent to dealing with large numbers of things and people. Mr. Brenton has dropped upon a letter from a correspondent to *The Times* of December 8, and referred to it in *The New Age* of December 17. It calls attention to a hesitating way to one of the most important ideas I have ever seen in that newspaper, which idea I feel sure must have crept in by mistake. It is contained in the enquiry: "Can like be equated to unlike, by any necromancy of gold?" You might put the matter another way by enquiring whether there was any similarity between a Beethoven Sonata and a bottle of wood alcohol in New York, because you can buy either of them for 5s.

Now this is the idea which is at the root of the Internationalist idea where it is held sincerely. It is that you can obtain an elaborate series of statistics regarding the populations of the world and put a committee down at Geneva, or elsewhere, to legislate for them on the basis of statistics. It is an idea which would never be accepted by anyone who had ever run or organised a small business, and its most vocal exponents, such as, for instance, Mr. H. G. Wells, or Sir Norman Angell, have never, I think, been responsible for the organising of a business of any kind. Their qualifications for organising the whole world have never, as one might say, been checked by any kind of laboratory experiment. They are, in fact, in exactly the position of a would-be bridge builder who is ignorant both of the Theory of Structures and the Strength of Materials.

The danger to the world of this idea is instant and practical. There is a world movement definitely conscious of its aims, counting amongst its adherents many persons placed by social position, prestige, and other conditions, in what would seem to be a most impressive relation to politics and organisation, which is consciously working for just exactly this purpose. With it, or behind it, however you like to regard the matter, are all those forces whose ends are best served by the subjection of the individual to the group. While it will certainly fail, its backing makes a conflict certain.

I should like to direct your attention, as a more than usually illuminating instance of what I mean, to an article which appears in the November issue of *The International Affairs*, which is the journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, commonly known as Chatham House, an organisation which possesses a Royal Charter, and which (as viewed from

Chatham House) brings together the best brains on all subjects connected with high politics. The article is entitled "The Trend of International Affairs Since the War," and the following extracts are indicative of its nature:—

"Either our modern economic internationalism has to be sacrificed, or else we must learn to live our political and our cultural life on the modern world-wide scale, which we have achieved in our economic life already."

"The other alternative, of course, is that we should bring our political and our cultural life into harmony with our economic life; that we should preserve our economic internationalism by internationalising our social life through and through, in all its layers."

"You remember, perhaps, that one of the most famous generals in history once remarked that his opponents were invincible because they never knew when they were beaten. It is my hope that this same kind of invincible ignorance—a really heroic form of ignorance, may carry our generation to victory in our spiritual war for the establishment of universal and enduring peace." (! ! !)

"If we are frank with ourselves we shall admit that we are engaged on a deliberate and sustained and concentrated effort to impose limitations upon the sovereignty and the independence of the fifty or sixty local sovereign independent States."

"The surest sign, to my mind, that this fetish of local national sovereignty is our intended victim is the emphasis with which all our statesmen and our publicists protest with one accord, and over and over again, at every step forward which we take, that, whatever changes we may make in the international situation, the sacred principle of local sovereignty will be maintained inviolable. This, I repeat, is a sure sign that, at each of those steps forward, the principle of local sovereignty is really being encroached upon and its sphere of action reduced and its power for evil restricted. It is just because we are really attacking the principle of local sovereignty that we keep on protesting our loyalty to it so loudly. The harder we press our attack upon the idol, the more pains we take to keep its priests and devotees in a fool's paradise, lapped in a false sense of security which will inhibit them from taking up arms in their idol's defence."

"In plain terms, we have to re-transfer the prestige and the prerogatives of sovereignty from the fifty or sixty fragments of contemporary society to the whole of contemporary society."

"In the world as it is to-day, this institution can hardly be a universal Church. It is more likely to be something like a League of Nations. I will not prophesy. I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly, but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands."

"But supposing this does not happen? Supposing that the present generation of mankind is defeated in the end, after all, in the strenuous effort which we are making to centralise the force of sovereignty?"

"But Prussia has not ceased to be one of the great States of the modern world. She is still great because her public organisation . . . is still second to none. I suggest to you that history is likely to repeat itself here, and that, once again, what Prussia is to-day, France and Great Britain and Italy, yes, and even the United States, are likely to become to-morrow. For the sake of the peace and prosperity of the world, I devoutly hope that my prophecy will prove correct."

Now if the address from which these extracts are taken had been given at some local Socialist or Communist Forum, and had appeared in, let us say, *The Worker*, or some other organ of those sections of society which are more obviously suffering from the present state of affairs, one would, if one had felt obliged to notice it at all, have remarked that it was rather poisonous nonsense, and left it at that. Communists, in their periodical appearances in the police-court, might well refer to it. But the speaker was Professor Arnold Toynbee, who was one of the British representatives at the Peace Conference, and I believe, amongst other things, is, or has been, the occupant of the Chair of Greek at London University, and the occasion was the Conference of Institutions for the Scientific Study of International Rela-

tions held at Copenhagen on June 8, 1931, at which twelve countries were represented, and, in addition, delegates attended from four international organisations, the nature of which was not stated. These Conferences were initiated by the League of Nations Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. The address, therefore, from the auspices under which it was given, is a matter for serious attention. The first point in it to which I should like to draw your attention, is the emphasis that it places on the fact that the work of which the speaker is so proud has been persistently pursued for the last twelve years with all possible energy and in every country, and yet it does not appear to occur to the speaker to question whether there is anything in the state of the world at the present time which would suggest that the results could be regarded as a subject for congratulation to anyone outside the confines of a criminal lunatic asylum. In Europe, the national sovereignty which has, perhaps, been most wholly delivered over to the tender mercies of the League of Nations in the period under review is Austria, and if the state of Austria at the present time is an exhibit as to the state that the whole world will be in when it, too, has been brought under the League of Nations, then I think we can say in all seriousness, "God help the world." You will notice that this peculiar blindness to facts which seems to be characteristic of all persons afflicted with the collectivist mentality is strongly in evidence, together with the peculiar determination to regard the populations of the world as only salvable through a continuous course of deception, by being made to vote, and to think, and to call for things of which they do not know the meaning or the result.

You will also note that there is not a single reference in this article, and in general there rarely is in proposals of this nature, any reference to the remote possibility that so far from nationality being the cause of the world-wide unrest, it is sovereignty, whether national or international, which is resented, and that to replace national sovereignty by international sovereignty is to still further complicate and exaggerate the evil against which the whole world is rebelling. Or to put the matter another way, Professor Toynbee, and others who think like him, are not really interested in removing the cause of complaint at all, they are merely interested in making it impossible for complaints to become effective.

I think it is significant that what one might call "good-class" propaganda for internationalism has for many years been a passport to political success, particularly in Great Britain. It has been clearly allied with political Liberalism, and the support which political Liberalism has always received from International finance is well known. Strictly speaking, the orthodox tenets of British Trades Unionism are strongly national and anti-international, a fact which anyone can prove for themselves by talking to the average working Trades Unionist on the subject of Protection. Yet the British Labour movement, which has also received considerable covert support from international finance, has officially presented a policy of internationalism as a part of its platform, and those Labour and Trades Union officials and politicians who have in the past been most conspicuously successful have taken care to render, at any rate, lip service to the international idea.

It is perhaps hardly necessary to point out to an instructed audience that the conflicts between nations, at any rate in modern times, are not due to the existence of nations so much as to the existence of conditions which cause friction between nations. To argue that the best way to stop war is to abolish nationality is exactly the same thing as to say that the best way to stop fighting between individuals is to abolish individuals.

News Notes.

INSURANCE LEVY ON THE MIDDLE CLASSES.—In the *Sunday Express* of January 3 it is stated that a recommendation is to be made to the Government to rope everybody into the Unemployment Insurance Fund up to the income limit of £500 a year. The reason is frankly stated; namely that there is comparatively little unemployment in the classes now proposed to be included. In other words, the lower-middle classes are to have a new tax imposed upon them. The report features "bank clerks" as the stars in this piece of victimisation. Presumably the object is to produce the impression that "it can't be a bankers' ramp when bank officers are among the victims."

"MONEY" AND "THE WEEK-END REVIEW."—In the issue of this review for December 12 Edwin Shanks writes the following in the course of an article on Capitalism:—

"Money is, however, something which humanity invented for its own convenience—just as it invented bustickets. The economists, the authorities on currency, banking, and exchanges, are as men who should say 'There is to-day a lamentable shortage of tickets on the route between Aldgate and Victoria. This means that many will have to walk who want to ride, that the company will run the service at a loss, and that drivers and conductors will be thrown out of employment. Nevertheless, do not let us despair. Sooner or later the mysterious ways of Providence will again supply an ample flow of tickets and all will be well.'"

"The banker, dealing in a secondary product, the means of exchanging things, has acquired a wholly unnatural supremacy. To-day the industrialist thinks of himself as a representative of capitalism *vis-à-vis* his proletarian employees largely because of the persistence of an old habit of mind. That habit is being worn away by the pressure of realities, and when it is worn away far enough the last stage in the transformation of the world as we know it will set in."

SOCIAL CREDIT IN THE PRESS.—The following is extracted from the editorial notes in the issue of *South African Golf* of December 15:—

"Everyone is interested these times in economic problems, though it is very certain from what is being said and written that very few understand the problem thoroughly. By way of acknowledging the receipt of a pamphlet (Credit Research Library, 70, High Holborn, London, W.C.1) on Major Douglas's Social Credit Proposals, we can only say that it makes most interesting reading, and that, having read it, we cannot possibly do less than say that any citizen of South Africa could do a great many things worse than write to the address given, enclosing one shilling for a set of introductory pamphlets. One economist to whom we addressed ourselves on the subject said that the scheme was certainly superficially attractive to anyone who was not a trained economist, but when one came to analyse it one found that its ultimate effect was inflation. As a matter of fact there is no disguise about it: the very essence of the scheme is scientifically controlled inflation. It would, nevertheless, be a downright pleasure in these times of puzzling conditions to listen to a full-dress debate, or a series of debates, by acknowledged experts, with the Douglas scheme as the main theme. We make no excuse for referring to this subject, excepting that golfers form a most important section of society, and that anything which offers a solution to a world problem—we shall call it a world crisis—is one that ought to be passed along."

This journal is wholly devoted to golf, and is the official organ of the South African Golf Union. It is published at the address: Athlone, Cape Flats, Cape Town. (About 40 pp., monthly, price 1s.) We can see the appositeness of a pat on the back from this unexpected quarter; for on the economic golf course nobody seems to know where the next green lies, or whether there's a hole in it. It's a case of "All together, boys!—one big drive!—anywhere, so as you smack it good and hard!"

MARKING DOWN NORMAN'S STOCK.—In the January number of the *National Review* Mr. Leo Maxse says some trenchant things about the Treasury

("stuffed with Free Traders and Deflationists") and about Mr. Montagu Norman, who, "outside his Bank and the Treasury, is regarded as one of the most wrong-headed men in the City of London."

"He is far more interested in the condition of Central Europe than in the state of England, and his contribution towards the elucidation of our industrial problem before the Macmillan Committee can only be described as childish."—(*Daily Mail*, January 2.)

This is a pretty clear indication that the divergence in the inner counsels of the Bank of England is widening. It is true that Mr. Norman still retains his post, but it is not improbable that he has been taken off the salary list and put on a commission basis—a change which is all too frequently the prelude to the sack. With regard to the growing irreverence of the Press generally, it would have been useful if it had not come ten years late. The time to question Mr. Norman's policy was when he began to carry it out. We hope that the lesson will be taken to heart, and that the modified policy which is now contemplated will not be left for THE NEW AGE to attack alone. When thieves fall out honest men do not come by their own by taking sides with one of the gangs; and the duty of the Press, which stands for public rights, is to use bankers' dissensions as an occasion for pushing an authentic public policy.

POST OFFICE REFORM.—A memorial signed by 320 members of the House of Commons asking for a Committee of Enquiry to overhaul the affairs of the Post Office was recently presented to the Government. *The Times* of January 4 emphasises the significance of the action, but adduces no reason for this sudden manifestation of ostensible spontaneity on a subject which, to say the most of it, does not come into the first dozen items preoccupying public attention in order of importance or urgency. The leader-writer, however, lets drop one remark which indicates the source of the ramp. He refers to the £140,000,000 of capital investment, and the staff of 230,000, now under the control of the Post Office. Clearly a concern of these dimensions is one that should be run on "business" lines—that is, independently of political interference! Two hundred and thirty thousand wage-drawers: think of it. The bankers must be feeling something like Napoleon (wasn't it?) did about London, and saying to themselves: "What a Service to sack!"

JUDGES' SALARIES.—*The Times* of January 7 offers a closely reasoned argument for the exemption of Judges from the cuts imposed by the Order in Council under the Economy Act, 1931, affecting servants of the Crown. The first part is an analysis of the legal implication of the Order, and is based on an article by Sir William Holdsworth on the subject in the current issue of the *Law Quarterly*. Exactly who are "servants of the Crown?" The conclusion of *The Times*, as also of Sir William, is that Judges are not "servants" within the meaning of the Order. Service implies a master—the Stuarts tried to make judges their servants but failed—the Constitution upholds the independence of judges—and so on. The second part of the article is on practical lines. The total possible saving on the contemplated cuts is £40,000. This, the writer urges, is as "dust in the balance" against the risk of an "appreciable decline in the quality of justice dispensed by the Supreme Court." We hasten to warn a "with-drawal of good-will" on the part of Judges, but rather a "lack of enthusiasm"—as Mr. W. J. Brown would call it—on the part of barristers in offering to fill vacancies on the Bench. You see, the salary of a Judge is not more than half, and in many cases not more than a tenth, of the sum earned annually by successful barristers; and if a heavy cut is imposed, naturally the barristers who will be willing to fill

vacancies in future will be men of second-rate qualifications—hence the "decline in the quality of justice." Such is the writer's contention. Well, if a barrister's money-earning power is to be the measure of his capacity for administering justice of the first quality, we think we would take the risk of the second quality. In law as in commerce, City interests are arbiters of money-earning power, and if *The Times's* doctrine is to prevail, the eventual consequence will be the "Bankster Bench."

THE ELECTION AND THE "MORNING AFTER."—*The Times* has been showing increasing signs of nervousness about the election ever since it told the National Government, on the declaration of the polls, not to be frightened at its huge majority! In its leading article of January 6 there are signs of incipient panic. The writer endorses a letter in the same issue from Miss Violet Markham in which she suggests that the Government should facilitate the regular holding of monthly meetings of constituents addressed by the respective members with the object of explaining the national policy. He shows that he is aware of the snag in this suggestion—namely, that these gentlemen lack the capacity to explain anything at all—by saying that they must "take the troublesome course of understanding and explaining the policy." (Our italics.) Our readers will recall that if a lump of clay had stood as a National candidate it would have got in. And this was sufficiently near the truth to justify the prophecy that if these members come out on the mission so thoughtfully designed for them by Miss Markham, there is hardly a single one of them who is not certain, wherever he goes, to come up against individual electors technically competent to make nonsense of anything he dares to say in extenuation of the deeds done under the Economy Act. We should estimate that, for every Ministerialist missionary, there are at least three advocates of Social Credit competent to discredit his gospel on at least level terms—not to speak of perhaps ten times that number of credit-students good enough to shake public confidence in his authority. More important still, the technical competencies in debate or discussion which the missionaries will have to meet will derive a multiple effectiveness from the circumstance that audiences will be emotionally on the side of the critics. *The Times* realises this, and in fact obligingly enumerates the immediate occasions of popular hostility as follows (our paraphrasing):—

- Delay in setting up a general tariff.
- The means test for "transitional" payments to the unemployed.
- The beer duty (consumers' hostility).
- The beer duty (trade hostility).
- The beer duty (loss of revenue to the Exchequer).
- Income tax.
- Pay-reductions (public servants).
- Losses to British importing undertakings.

The Times, reflecting that there are 250 Members of Parliament who have got in for the first time, is apprehensive lest, in the face of these "grumbles," as it calls them, they should turn round and criticise their own leaders.

"Nothing is easier than for the member himself to become the arch-grumbler and to deceive himself into thinking that participation in criticism of his own leaders is a manifestation of a manly and independent spirit."

Whether anything is "easier" or not, nothing is more certain than that if these gentry are set to fight their electoral battles over again once every month face to face with their own constituents they will have to choose between loyalty to their leaders and loyalty to their own sanity. It's the nursing home for them—if they dodge the casualty-ward. *The Times* offers them no help in the way of prescribing how they shall meet the "grumbles" except the general suggestion of a policy of the "Let's-talk-

about-the-weather" type. Thus: The National Government has "set a good example." The proof of the goodness is that the example has been followed by two Dominions! Then follows an enumeration of international problems—debts, reparations, trade, conferences and what not on which the poor hunted member may ring the changes until his pursuers lose the scent and give up the chase.

MORE LIGHT ON THE CRISIS AND THE WAY OUT.—There are to be six free lectures on "The World's Economic Crisis and the Way of Escape" at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, E.C. (Ludgate Circus), on the following Thursdays at 6 p.m.:—January 21, 28; February 4, 11, 18, 25. The speakers in order of date, are Salter, Stamp, Keynes, Blackett, Clay, and Beveridge. Admission free. Tickets for reserved seats obtainable from the Secretary, Halley Stewart Trust, 32, Gordon Square, W.C.1. Telephone, Museum 2271.

"DIVVERS."—We can now authenticate our recent allusion to the tendency towards boycotting the Scriptures at the Universities. In *The Times* of November 25, p. 14, col. 2, under the headline "University News," the chief item is titled "Abolition of 'Divvers' at Oxford." "In Convocation" (on November 23) it is announced that: "The main business of the House was the consideration of the Preamble of a Statute enacting that Holy Scripture should no longer be part of the First Public Examination." The Preamble was approved by 140 to 99.

"With the growth of the Honours Schools the examination was felt more and more to be an interruption of the main studies of the undergraduates." (Mr. H. M. D. Parker: mover.)

"BANKSTER."—Readers will be amused to hear that some American paper mentions the word "bankster" as having been (a) coined in France, and (b) applied with a political connotation to American bankers. They will recall that the first shot attributed the origin to *The Freethinker*. Let us hope for as many more misfires as possible, for then it may be worth the while of some enterprising newspaper to offer a prize for the right answer.

"THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT."—A correspondent suggests that, although late, we might record the fact that in *Action* of December 3 a gentleman, signing himself Christopher Hobhouse, delivers an attack on Major Douglas's book extending to more than a column.

"This new book relates the critical basis of the 'Social Credit' scheme, and omits the constructive superstructure. The latter, any schoolboy could demolish." (Our italics.)

It is rather a pity that there wasn't a schoolboy on the Macmillan Committee.

THE REMEDY.—M. Flandin, French Minister of Finance, says:—

"Put the Balkan peasant in the position to buy a new pair of boots, a manufactured shirt, and a pair of trousers, and you have the key to the whole economic situation of Europe." (*Western Mail and South Wales News*, December 12.)

We have heard of people "living by taking in each other's washing"; but there should be an up-to-date version, e.g.: "We all live by sending our washing out." Seeing that the situation is universal we presume the key lies in the world's becoming outfitters to the man in the moon.

HUMAN PERVERSITY.—A man admitted into the Sunderland Hospital is said to be suffering from starvation. He collapsed in Ryhope Road, and said he had been tramping about in search of work, and had not eaten for three days. He is Walter Brunton (38), a carter, of Borrow Street, Stockport." (*Newcastle Evening Chronicle*, November 23, 1931.) This "collapsing" business ought to be stopped. It is really a "withdrawal of good-will," and impedes the efficient administration of the Economy Act.

Current Sociology.

Whenever a job is to be done which has nothing to do with realities, it becomes the *forte* of the avuncular Mr. Arthur Henderson. In a foreword to the "Peace Year Book, 1932," Mr. Henderson rehearses the wise saws and modern instances with which he will no doubt win loud applause at the Conference from both the people's gallery and the bankers' stalls. If nations were not wasting vast national wealth on armaments, he says in effect, their Budgets could be easily balanced and bankruptcy would no longer hang over them. "Surely," he pleads, "the lesson is plain," disarm and establish peace, and "go far to recreate confidence." Oh, Mr. Henderson, such neglect of actualities comes not to bring peace but a sword; it delivers the world over to policies which must inevitably drift it into war, no matter how peaceful the intentions of its mismanagers may be. Firstly, armaments are only in the most superficial sense a reason why nations have difficulty in balancing their Budgets; and at present disarmament would probably cause those Budgets to be still more difficult to balance, and would certainly multiply the bankruptcies of the persons who in community are the foundation of States and nations. By depriving vast numbers of soldiers and sailors, dockyard and arsenal operatives, and munition-factory owners and their staffs of their present excuse for both existence and the receipt of financial credit, disarmament would constitute a measure of deflation; it would reduce the demand for final products of every kind, depress prices, and further congest the labour market. It would, in short, intensify maladjustment and dislocation. It would, moreover, compel Governments, in the existing condition of the world, to be increasingly secretive as regards potential armaments. Civilian airplanes, as in the case of disarmed Germany, would be built for rapid transformation. Invisible weapons of a more deadly order would come into potential service without peoples even knowing of their discovery.

But it is futile to advocate disarmament the world-situation being what it is. Politically, a glance at the Japanese-Manchurian or the Anglo-Indian situation settles the question. But war-making is not a primary human activity. It is necessarily derivative from its objective, which, whether schoolboys are taught that it is for dominion's sake or not, is fundamentally economic security and prosperity. Wars are undertaken for land, treasure, or tribute; for raw materials or customers. All other kinds of alleged objectives are either secondary or even the romantic shop-window dressing with which a creature tortured by conscience has mentally transformed its motive of necessity or cupidity into the passion of a holy mission. If the objectives of war, economic security and prosperity, are legitimate human aims, war cannot cease until they are attained, and disarmament cannot come about until war has ceased. If the objectives of war are attainable by any means other than war, if there is any possible technique for realising economic security and prosperity other than destroying competitors, war can, of course, be rendered out of date by the application of that technique. It has been completely established that the present method of distributing financial credit to consumers, because it piles up unemployable capital, and necessitates exporting more from each credit area than can be accepted by that credit area from outside, renders war necessary. It has also been completely established that the same financial system inevitably drags all but a few nations deeply into the debt of the credit institutions of the favoured few. Any nation's determination not to be a *debtor* necessitates war, for the simple reason that such a nation must be pre-

pared either to defend its markets, or to attack any nation which secures its potential markets. Accordingly, any person who accepts the existing financial system, who does not want to bring it into line with the wealth-producing system, accepts the necessity of war, whether he is aware of the fact or not; and any advocacy of disarmament or of world-peace he may indulge in can be only one of things, sentimental or personally profitable. The reform of the financial system required to realise for mankind the legitimate objectives of security and prosperity has been formulated. It is not too late for Mr. Henderson to make history with a realistic Chairman's Address at the Disarmament Conference which would spare it of cant and possibly bring the alleged objective of the Conference appreciably nearer. The odds are heavily against his doing so.

Mr. Henderson is not the only Labour Leader whose exile from office gives him time for meditation. "For twenty years," Mr. Arthur Greenwood has told the Cambridge University Labour Federation, "there has been no constructive thought in Socialism, as the mind of the movement has been occupied in practical effort in Parliament and local government." At last there is a reason why the Labour Party's report on the credit analysis of Major Douglas was as it was; why it showed no understanding of credit, and denied facts which have since passed into common knowledge. It is surely a boon and a blessing to men that the signatories to that report, the self-elected mind of the Labour Party, "now has breathing space and time to look round." Labour is one of the repositories of real credit; it is one of the trinity of labour, capital, and the inherited resources of the community, whose co-operation with consumers is indispensable for the communal enjoyment of the potentialities of real credit, its leaders have a solemn trust. They are under a human, mental, and spiritual obligation to their followers, to bring about, if possible, a system of distributing so called "over production" which will ensure the satisfaction of all human desires not prohibited by law. Mr. Greenwood has done his thinking. He is ready to teach the University of Cambridge what is "our task" now. It is to preach the gospel of Blatchford and Wells!

Mr. Greenwood is passionate about this task, while retaining self-possession enough not to over-look technique. He will preach the gospel of Blatchford and Wells in terms which will embody the agonies and experiences of the last ten years, and in language the new generation can understand. Were the young men of Cambridge flattered by the suggestion that Robert Blatchford, and creator and syllabic companion of working-folk, and teacher of Henry Dubb, needs an interpreter for the new generation? As for the gospel of Wells, what has that democratic pursuer and purveyor of individual omniscience to do with the new generation? Wells has dug himself in as one of the institutions of the new generation has to supersede. "Kipps" and "Mr. Polly" and all Wells's work which springs from his fear of being confused with them, but has been a follower of every other camp, from the created no disturbance in any of them, from the scientific entrepreneurs' to the financiers. Wells certainly awoke the lower middle-classes to consciousness of their moral state, and gave them an acutely painful awareness of their social inferiorities. But he has no creative idea to give either class or community. The conceptions of Wells are divine potency. Wells's challenge to God has been far more important for Wells than the release of mankind, who are in his view such miserable sinners that he can see no hope for them except in benevolent

slavery under financiers and financiers' scientific advisers. But the undergraduates of Cambridge may have bottomed Wells before Mr. Greenwood found a new mission in preaching Wells's gospel in language which the new generation can understand.

According to Mr. Hamilton Fyfe, the Labour Party is to avoid the financial and banking issues in the formulation of its policy for the immediate future. On the advice of their intellectual leaders, including Lord Passfield, the leaders of the seven million voters who could not be stampeded are "to stick to general principles" and carry out a great "educational drive." Such leaders are as feeble in opposition as they were in office. What the community, including the capitalists, suffers from at the present time, and has suffered from for nearly ten years, is not lack of education in general principles. It is not incapacity to understand Blatchford, Wells, and Sidney Webb. It is that the industrial giant has to wear Hop-o'-my-thumb's shoes, while the bankers monopolise the seven-league boots. It is the community's failure to rationalise the financial credit system in accordance with modern discoveries and industrial capacity which has caused the set-back of Labour's political aspirations, which matter little, as well as of the folk's legitimate aspirations for prosperity and security, which matter absolutely. A twentieth-century campaign cannot be conducted with nineteenth-century ideas; and the attempt of the Labour Leaders to do so will lead to the total loss of their party, beginning with the Co-operative Party ally. The Co-operative Party cannot run itself on general principles. It consists of a host of small capitalists with a consumer-consciousness, and its direct experience of the gulf between productive power and demand must lead it to insistence on a practical and detailed policy for setting free the resources of the co-operative community. Without an understanding of credit, and without a policy for the reform of the credit-system, there is no future for any party.

The first of a series of articles, entitled "War Debts, Reparations, and Gold," by Mr. G. D. H. Cole, announces Mr. Cole as "the noted economist," and various publicity paragraphs draw attention to his many activities and achievements. It looks as if he is about to be elevated to the post of expert adviser on Labour's future policy. His activity and encyclopaedic knowledge, however, have as yet only fitted him to be the godson of Mr. Sidney Webb, and to carry on the worship of encyclopaedism. It is useless to consult encyclopaedias for advice in an unprecedented situation. For example, in Mr. Cole's view, the only way to straighten out the tangle is "by real and close international co-operation—by writing off debts and reparations, and letting prices rise through a more liberal credit policy." Possibly Mr. Cole realises that war-debts are not merely "external," and that the writing off of "external" debts implies the writing off of "internal" debts, which is impracticable in a credit system dependent on collateral security for the creation of credit, at any rate until after the system has collapsed. As long as the issue of credit is limited to production, tariff walls for the protection, as far as possible, of the home market will be necessary in many countries. Further, "a more liberal credit policy bringing about a rise of prices" is simple, uncorrected, inflation, which would revive the vicious circle of wages and prices, and force on Mr. Cole's followers a repetition of the old battles. Finally, it does not matter how liberal the credit-policy, it must, if it succeed in reviving consumer-demand, because it has to flow through the productive channels, accumulate new costs more rapidly than it delivers goods; that is to say, the consumer's purchasing-power would be extracted from his pockets as fast

as he received it, while the amount due to be collected from him in the future would increase. Since perpetual acceleration is no more attainable than perpetual motion, a new deflation policy would inevitably repeat the present depression. The only alternative to correcting the credit-system is, of course, endlessly to correct its cumulative mistakes, in the certainty that they will continue to be made. The correction of those mistakes being necessarily at somebody's expense, dispute as to who should suffer the loss is unavoidable; hence class war and international war remain necessary means of resistance. Such are the implications of Mr. Cole's policy, of the Labour Party's policy, and of the policy of every person who does not recognise and act upon the obvious truth that the fundamental flaw in the economic system is in its failure to provide for consumption by the issue of credit direct to consumers.

PAUL BANKS.

Co-operators and Crises.

A correspondent sends us two most significant letters which he has received in answer to his enquiries. The first is from the Co-operative Wholesale Society Bank, from which the following passage is quoted:—

"With reference to your enquiry, we have to state that we as bankers can only deal with business on banking lines, and we should not be concerned with any question of the supply of commodities in lieu of cash."

The second is from the Financial Secretary of the London Co-operative Society, Ltd., and is as follows:—

"Replying to your letter of . . . addressed to our . . . Branch, you can, of course, in normal times always draw goods from the Society against the amount of your Share Capital, but if a financial crisis arose I should think possibly that legislation would be introduced that would make inoperative any guarantees such as you suggest."

Well, at least one can say that here are two straight tips, and from that point of view our readers can congratulate the Society, our correspondent, and themselves on this frank disclosure of the situation.

Notice.

All communications requiring the Editor's attention should be addressed directly to him as follows:

**Mr. Arthur Brenton,
20, Rectory Road,
Barnes, S.W.13.**

Renewals of subscriptions and orders for literature should be sent, as usual, to 70, High Holborn.

NOTICE OF MEETING.

A public meeting will be held at the National Trade Union Club, New Oxford Street, on Friday, January 29, 1932, at 7.30 p.m., at which A. R. Orage, Esq., will speak.

NOTICE OF DANCE.

The Leisure Society.—A dance will be held on Saturday, January 23, 1932, at St. Andrew's Hall, Vereker Road, West Kensington, W.14. Commence 7.30 p.m. Tickets 2s. 6d., refreshments included. Dress optional. Tickets can be obtained from A. C. Garrad, Flat Eleven, 5, Powis Square, W.11.

S. LONDON DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT ASSOCIATION.

Social Credit propagandist in S.E. London requires unpaid secretarial assistance in order to further the objects of the Social Credit Movement. Duties will include fortnightly attendances on Saturday or Sunday afternoon or evening for about one hour. Refreshments will be provided. Those interested, who should be qualified Social Credit technicians, and who should preferably have access to typewriter, are asked to communicate with P. Alexander, 43, Bradgate-road, S.E.6.

Music.

A clever article in *Musical Times* for January contains the amusing suggestion, supported by ingenious arguments and analogies, that a properly run B.B.C. ought to have nothing to do with the broadcasting of the floods of rubbish under the guise of dance music *et hoc genus omne*, which under present conditions, has a large place in the daily programmes. The author says, and possibly quite rightly, that the B.B.C. does not, in any other department of its activities, literature, drama and so on, descend to the abject depths of banality tastelessness and vulgarity that it allows to be plumed in this particular branch, and that as a big public Corporation, it has the right and the duty to decline to pander to the lowest taste of the lowest intelligence. The writer contends that people have no more right to expect the B.B.C. to purvey, nor the B.B.C. no more obligation to purvey this trash, than say a Savile Row tailor has to supply a thirty shilling suit of reach me downs, or I would like to add, Chanel or Lanvin has to provide models for the taste of Brixton and Streatham, and that the people who want this sort of thing should be plainly given to understand that they must get it elsewhere—not from a great and important public body. The writer says he does not believe the B.B.C. if it modified its policy along these admittedly exemplary and ideal lines, would lose more than an infinitesimal number of its subscribers. If I personally felt that to be the case, I should certainly agree with *Feste* (the writer of the article in question) wholeheartedly, and theoretically I do, but I most emphatically do not believe that such a change of policy would affect the subscription list of the B.B.C. as little as he thinks it would. I am conducting a few private enquiries to ascertain what proportion of listeners listen to the music and the intelligent part of the programmes, and what to the trash. All the evidence so far from a number of people with unique opportunities for ascertaining the listening habits of a wide and typical group of people, points to one and one conclusion only—an immense and overwhelming majority listens to nothing but the rubbish. Now for some evidence in support of this terrible assertion.

(i.) I myself live in a huge block of London flats—200 to be precise—over and over again in fine weather I have taken special note of the programmes being listened to, and in the vast majority of cases, when an interesting or intelligent programme and trash have been provided—it is the trash that my neighbours have been listening to.

(ii.) A friend in a great Government office with hundreds of employees, tells me that *not one* of his colleagues ever listens to anything remotely resembling good music, and his experience is that the only thing most listeners ever listen to at all are the dance bands and such trash-mongers, and as he moves about a lot over the country, he is in a peculiarly favourable position to discover what people do listen to.

(iii.) Another friend, confined for many weeks in a very big hospital through which hundreds of inmates passed during his sojourn there, and which was provided with a wireless installation to every bed, declares that he too was the only one who ever listened to the programmes of good music or intelligent stuff, and that these aroused the fury of the inmates who could never get enough of the rubbish and railed loudly whenever their supply of trash was interrupted for something better.

So far that is the result of my little enquiry, and further evidence I shall publish as it arrives. I myself cherish no sentimental illusions as to the nature of that evidence, nor do I believe that it will do anything else but confirm what I have discovered up to now.

I do believe however that there is a large audience potentially, for the good stuff, but that in comparison with the audience for the muck it is, and will remain, minute. I believe that small audience

should be fostered and encouraged as much as possible, and the audience for the muck is doing so, indirectly and involuntarily no doubt. We have had too too ample evidence of how exiguous and precarious is the support that the real music lover can give to music, how indifferent, for instance, the standard of orchestral performance that has to rely on his patronage alone for its support. The B.B.C. with its enormous income derived from, I am convinced, in the stupendous majority of cases the muck-lovers, is enabled to give music lovers orchestral performances of a high and increasingly high order such as they have hitherto never had from a national organisation. The B.B.C. also by reason of its enormous income and the immense scope of its activities consequent thereon, gives employment to musicians on a scale of unprecedented size. These are it seems to me two such wholly admirable consummations, that the provenance of the money that keeps them going seems to me of singularly little importance by comparison.

Again, the opportunities for hearing good music must not be increased to such a point that they will cease to be valued, even by those who appreciate good music. The quantity of good music broadcast by the B.B.C. is quite as great as the average music lover can assimilate with safety—and occasionally more. Saint Cecilia, no more than anyone else, can afford to make herself cheap even to her votaries, without danger to herself as well as them, and a Saint has so much further to fall to degradation than common or garden folk!

KAIKHOSRU SORABJI.

The Films.

Street Scene: Regal.

The film version of Elmer Rice's play, adapted by the author, is an unparalleled example of the cinema's misuse of its potentialities. As given on the stage, the play was done without a change of scene or a curtain, and since the setting embraced an apartment house together with the side-walk and roadway in front of it, this could not have been adhered to throughout for film purposes without the use of a screen of abnormal size. But use should have been made of the most elementary possibilities of the cinema; the director should have made use of flashbacks and cut-ins. Instead, the whole of the action takes place outside the house, and we are given a series of close-ups illustrating small sections of the street scene. This method not only interferes with the continuity and interest, but succeeds in eliminating much of the atmosphere of the stage version. A few sequences, such as the opening sunrise over New York, the scene in which Rose Maurant sees from the elevated railway the crowd in front of the house just after her mother has been shot, and some camera angles, indicate how much more effectively King Vidor, the director, might have done his job if he had worked on more orthodox cinematic lines. Not, I think, that it is fair to blame Mr. Vidor; I believe the treatment is on the lines laid down by Sam Goldwyn, whose satisfaction with his own productions is remarkable even in a Hollywood magnate.

The film has, however, another defect, for which it seems fair to throw the responsibility jointly on the director and Mr. Rice. In order to bring it within the customary time limits, compression has been necessary, and the adaptation has not been too well done. In the play, every role is given its due importance and its proper relationship to all the other characters; this balance has not been preserved in the film, especially in the case of the shrew-gossip (among the multiplicity of players I cannot recall her name) whose part is given disproportionate importance, with the incidental result

that the atmosphere of impending tragedy is blurred, and that excessive use is made of comic relief that is in the end not too comic.

"Street Scene" is, however, worth seeing for the sake of the acting. As Rose Maurant, Sylvia Sidney gives one of the most charming, intelligent, and sympathetic impersonations I have had the pleasure of seeing for a long time; this young actress deserves promotion to stardom. Estelle Taylor, a screen veteran, is admirable as Mrs. Maurant; I preferred both her and Miss Sidney to the players in the Globe production of 1930. David Landau, who was also the Mr. Maurant at the stage; he is one of those highly finished actors who are equally excellent in both media. William Collier, junr., is good as Sam Kaplan, although not so good as Leonard Sachs in the London production, and Anna Kostant, as Shirley Kaplan, contributes an exquisite little character study, in which every vocal inflection, gesture, and facial play are just right.

Just as one goes to see the stage or screen adaptation of a novel with which one is familiar with a whole series of preconceived ideas in one's mind and of an already seen play. Possibly, I should have been inclined to praise this film more if I had not seen the play; filmgoers who have not may rate it more highly.

Out of the Blue: Pavilion.

When will Elstree come to grips with reality? Or, if the presentation of real people and real situations is beyond its capacity and intention, and it must continue to give us farce and upper middle-class drawing-room comedy, why not give us something good of its kind? "Out of the Blue," an adaptation of the musical play "Little Tommy Tucker," is not good of its kind, and is another example of the extent to which British films have progressively deteriorated as they have developed into greater successes at the box office. It should be played much faster, is based on situations that have been done to death, and most of its alleged humour is of the type that passed as funny in the provincial music halls of the eighteen-eighties. Jessie Matthews makes her screen debut in this film, in which I found her more tolerable than I ever have on the stage, although she again gives her characteristic impersonation of the vicar's daughter, and should not have been allowed to sing. Incidentally, "Out of the Blue" should either have had no music or more and better music.

This Week's Films.

Academy—"Martin Luther" and "Cinderella." Two German pictures; both silent.
Empire—"The Cuban Love Song." Talkie with music. Directed by William Van Dyke. Cast includes Ernest Torrence, Lupe Velez, Jimmy Durante, and Lawrence Tibbett.
Stoll—"Tarnished Lady," Tallulah Bankhead's first talkie, and "77, Park Lane."
Tussaud's—"The Flying Fool," with Benita Hume, and "The Unholy Garden," with Ronald Colman.

DAVID OCKHAM.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

"ON STANDING ON ONE'S HEAD."
Sir—I should like to thank Miss Short for her letter. It seems to me that in some ways she has put my argument more clearly and concisely than I did. All the same, I still feel that my quarrel is rather with Esotericism as an attitude than with M. Ouspensky as an individual. While agreeing with her that there is an aristocracy of technique in such things as she cites, I think that explorers in the realm of spiritual values are in a somewhat different category. There we can only look to genius for guidance, which depends in turn, upon direct inspiration. And there seems to be no technique at all for capturing inspiration. All the evidence we possess, from those who have experienced it,

points in the opposite direction. "The Spirit bloweth where it listeth," and it frequently seems to choose those who, from our point of view, and to judge from their mental or moral attainments, are totally unfitted for it. The lowly, the stupid, the ignorant, or even the vicious, seem often to be preferred by this frolicsome hurricane, while the wise and the prudent rarely seem to attract it.

If this be so, the startling conclusion emerges that "initiates" armed with infallible, or even likely recipes, do not and cannot exist, and those who claim to be such are, to put it quite brutally, charlatans. Worse than that, they are likely to be the most formidable enemies of the genius, who is the only real initiate, though he may have but the haziest notion how he became so.

No one knew this better than Blake. Hence his fulminations against the "initiate" angels "whose pride springs from systematic reasoning," and against the "horses of instruction," and "the straight roads made by Improvement." Hence also my quotation from him.

NEIL MONTGOMERY.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF LIGHT.

Sir,—In a recent issue of THE NEW AGE appears an effusion entitled "Standing on One's Head," which has evoked a protest from one of your readers. As a supplement to her remarks, it may be useful to draw the attention of your readers to the work being done by the Brotherhood of Light in Los Angeles: the modern representatives of a body which has, by its secrecy, preserved the ancient mystery teachings through two thousand years of Christian persecution and Church omnipotence to this democratic age when they may be studied without further obstacle than a moderate expenditure. As they have been striving for the last ten years to distribute their literature to all interested, they can hardly be said to hide their light under a bushel—while their methods and views are certainly democratic enough to suit anybody. Unlike Mr. Montgomery, the extremely able author of the B. of L. manuscripts (and he has now a formidable number to his credit) would appear to have taken all knowledge for his province, and in his latest publications is endeavouring not only to create a public sentiment against war, but actually to prepare the way for the Dougias proposals. If readers doubt me, let them obtain Lesson Serial No. 165, The Abolition of Poverty, and they will find THE NEW AGE analysis of over-production and under-consumption cogently and clearly expressed. I do not know the identity of this writer, but there is no excuse for ignorance of the work he is doing. The "lesson" mentioned can be obtained for the modest sum of 1s. 1½d. from Mr. A. E. Charles, "Hillsboro," 107, Tottenham Lane, Crouch End, N.S. The B. of L. address is Box 1525, Los Angeles, but Mr. Charles would send particulars to those interested, if postage is enclosed for reply.

RAYMOND HARRISON.

20, Colville Terrace, W.11.

SIR JOSIAH STAMP ON MONEY.

A DUAL CURRENCY.

We referred recently to Sir Josiah Stamp's Ludwig Mond Lecture on "The Present Position of Monetary Science." The lecture is now available as a 30 pp. booklet at the price of 1s. It is published by the Manchester University Press, 23, Lime Grove, Oxford-road, Manchester. The only point of interest we need record is Sir Josiah's reference (p. 25) to a "very ingenious theory" that has been shown to him. "It provides for the separation of the currency into two categories with different bases . . . for transactions in capital goods and transactions in consumption goods respectively." These he terms "capital currency" and "income currency" respectively. The name of the author of the scheme is not mentioned—a curious exception to the lecturer's rule of authenticating the ideas reviewed in this book.

NOTICE OF MEETING.

Belfast Social Credit Group. Captain W. Adams, B.Sc. (Econ.) B.Com., F.L.A.A., will give a public address entitled "Credit Reform and a National Government" in the Y.M.C.A. Minor Hall, Belfast, on Monday, January 18, at 8 p.m. Discussion and questions.

FOR NEW SOCIAL CREDIT GROUPS.

Incomplete series, possibly 200, of THE NEW AGE from 1921 available free and post free in return for highest subscription offered to THE NEW AGE Guarantee Fund within ten days' date of this issue. Write Box 6, New AGE, 70, High Holborn, London, W.C.1.

ACADEMY CINEMA, OXFORD STREET

(Opposite Waring & Gillow). Phone: Ger. 2981.

SUNDAY, JANUARY 17th.

Premier Pabst's Great German Sound Film

"WEST FRONT 1918."

Also Reiniger Silhouette "The Flying Coffin" & "Hungarian Dances."

Last days "MARTIN LUTHER," and Berger's "Cinderella."

TUBERCULOSISITS TREATMENT AND CURE
by Dr. ADRIEN SECHEHAYE.

(Translated from the French.)

No one interested in T.B. can afford to miss reading this book.

Price, 5/- from Booksellers or Post Free from the Publishers,
B. FRASER & Co., 62, Pepys Road, S.W.20.**THE "NEW AGE" CIGARETTE**Premier grade Virginian tobacco filled by
hand in cases made of the thinnest and purest
paper, according to the specification described
in this journal on January 23, 1930.

Large size (18 to the ounce). Non-smouldering.

Prices: 100's 7/6 (postage 3d.); 20's 1/6 (postage 2d.)

Price for Export ex English duty quoted
on minimum quantity of 1,000.FIELDCOVITCH & Co., 72, Chancery Lane, W.C.2
(Almost on the corner of Holborn and Chancery Lane).**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.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

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

CREDIT RESEARCH LIBRARY.**Books and Pamphlets on Social Credit.**

- 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 Breakdown of the Employment System. 1d.
The Control and Distribution of Production. 7s. 6d.
Social Credit. 7s. 6d.
The Monopoly of Credit. 3s. 6d.
These Present Discontents: The Labour Party and
Social Credit. 1s.
The World After Washington. 6d.
A + B. 1d.
Social Credit Principles. 1d.
Warning Democracy. 7s. 6d.
- DUNN, E. M.
The New Economics. 4d.
Social Credit Chart. 1d.
- H. M. M.
An Outline of Social Credit. 6d.
- HATTERSLEY, C. MARSHALL.
This Age of Plenty. 3s. 6d. and 6s.
Men, Machines and Money. 4d.
- HICKLING, GEORGE. (Legion of Unemployed.)
The Coming Crisis, 2d.
- POWELL, A. E.
The Deadlock in Finance. 3s. 6d.
The Flow Theory of Economics. 5s
- TUKE, J. E.
Outside Eldorado. 3d.
- YOUNG, W. ALLEN.
Ordeal By Banking. 2s.
- W. W.
More Purchasing Power. 2s for 6d.

**Critical and Constructive Works on
Finance, Economics, and Politics.**

- DARLING, J. F.
Economic Unity of the Empire: Gold and Credit. 1s.
The "Rex"—A New Money to Unify the Empire.
2s.
- HARGRAVE, JOHN.
The Great Pyramid—An Analysis of the Political-
Economic Structure of Society. (With diagrams.)
1d.
- HEWART (LORD).
The New Despotism. 21s.
- 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.
- SYMONS, W. T., and TAIT, F.
The Just Price. 2d.

**Instructional Works on Finance and
Economics.**

- BARKER, D. A.
Cash and Credit. 3s.
- CLARKE, J. J.
Outline of Central Government. 5s.

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

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70, High Holborn, London, W.C.1 (Telephone: Chancery 3470), and printed for him by THE ARGUS PRESS LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London, E.C.4.