

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."
A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART
No. 2213] NEW SERIES Vol. LVI. No. 15. THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1935. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE	PAGE
NOTES OF THE WEEK The laws of Libel, Blasphemy and Seditious bearing on Social-Credit political policy.	165	THE FILMS. By David Ockham . <i>The Lives of a Bengal Lancer. Girls Will Be Boys. Farewell.</i> 173
ELEMENTAL ECONOMICS. By John Grimm . A working model of the modern production-system.	167	MUSIC. By Clinton Gray-Fisk 173 Cyril Smith.
WHAT WILL REMAIN? XII. By R. Laugier .	169	CORRESPONDENCE 174 T. H. Story, F. L. Hammersley, R. L., T. C. W.
MONEY. By "Unemployed" 170 An exercise in simple propaganda.	170	NEWS NOTES (Editorial) 174
INCOMES AND PURCHASING POWER. By A. B. .	171	THE THEATRE. By Andrew Bonella 175 <i>Between Us Two.</i>
DUTCH FINANCE 172 Jonathan Swift and Benjamin Disraeli on Dutch methods of finance in England.	172	

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

Libel and Social Credit Action.

Recent events involving the law of libel tend to create uncertainty as to the principles of procedure in the courts when social, political and financial notabilities are the aggrieved parties to actions. When such uncertainty arises it serves to aggravate the antecedent and long-standing uncertainty about what constitutes libel itself. On the latter point it is sufficient to say that there is no solicitor who has not been obliged on some occasions to tell clients: "You have good grounds for what you have written about Lord X, but, you see, he (and his friends) have a lot of influence (or money) and—well, you never know what line juries will take under the spell of expert (highly-paid) advocacy: so I recommend you not to fight the case." And the same prudential considerations would weigh in cases where it was Lord X who was the author of a defamatory statement or innuendo. The solicitor would have to advise his aggrieved client not to enter an action.

While it is true that the law is equal as between rich and poor, it is also true that the rich enjoy an overwhelmingly larger margin of impunity in the matter of invoking the law than do the poor. To the ordinary jury there is a strong antecedent presumption that when the rich party defames the poor one he is not actuated by malicious motives, that what he says is therefore in the public interest, and that the allegations he brings are therefore more likely to be true than not. In the converse case the jury would entertain the presumption of malice, private interest or inaccuracy in regard to the matter at issue before even beginning to listen to evidence.

These things cannot be helped so long as the structure of society continues to conform, as it does, to the design of the financial hegemony under which we all live; so it is futile to launch a direct protest against the situation on that narrow front. Nevertheless, for the very

reason that these things operate, it is the duty of judges to refrain from overloading the already loaded dice with which the gaming has to take place. Yet they sometimes give rulings which, at any rate in our opinion, amount to advocacy.

Judges rightly resent the intrusion of bureaucrats on to the bench, and have pointed out the viciousness of a procedure in which one party to a suit sits in judgment on the case of the other party (e.g., the Minister of Health in cases of "excessive prescription" or the Postmaster-General in cases of contested telephone charges, etc., etc.). But precisely the same violence is done to justice if an authority appointed to try an action on the precise ground that he is not a party to it vacates the chair and takes the well of the court on either side.

It is taught in text books that the function of a judge is to decide on the *relevancy* of evidence, and the function of the jury to decide on the *cogency* of evidence. That principle doubtless works satisfactorily in cases where the consequences of a judgment affect only the interests of the parties. But as soon as such things as "the public interest" are explicitly or impliedly involved the criterion of relevancy ceases to be wholly technical—wholly the concern of the trained expert, and becomes partly political—partly the concern of the common citizen who is called to serve on the jury.

It is permissible for anybody to contend that the "public interest" itself is often more a matter for the expert than for the citizen, but that is only a way of saying that the manner in which a given judgment will affect the public interest is beyond the comprehension of members of the public, or that even if within their comprehension, dangerous to explain. In other words, it is not in the interest of the public to understand why something is not in their interest!

Thus in the action, Leon Franklin and the Westminster Bank (THE NEW AGE, June 4, 1931), counsel for

the Bank submitted that it was not in the public interest for the impression to go round that any bank could render itself contingently liable to pay out such a sum of money as £450 millions—this being Mr. Franklin's claim on which he sought judgment. Amusingly enough Mr. Franklin himself based his claim on the public interest—he did not seek to recover this sum but, he said, to establish the principle of the "sanctity of contract." As will be remembered, the case came into court amidst virtual giggling and went out amidst virtual loud laughter.

Exactly three weeks after this (THE NEW AGE, June 25, 1931) came another episode of profoundly greater moment. This was the action brought by Mr. F. H. Hamilton to test his rights as a taxpayer on a particular issue to which the Inland Revenue were the respondents. Apparently the law which the judge would have to apply to the case was susceptible of interpretation in Mr. Hamilton's favour; at any rate, when the action had opened and was part heard, Snowden suddenly popped up in the House of Commons and hustled through a measure designed to clarify the meaning of the law then being invoked by Mr. Hamilton. Thus in a few minutes the Lower Court, the Court of Appeal and the House of Lords were simultaneously debarred in retrospect and prospect from investigating the merits of Mr. Hamilton's case. And why? The same old reason, the "public interest." The calculation was that if he had succeeded the case-law thereby established would have decided a sufficiently large number of other similar issues between citizens and the Inland Revenue to affect the estimates on which the Budget was nominally balanced. As students will see, this amounted to identifying the "public interest" with the bankers' policy of deflation, and the lessening of the rate of deflation with danger to the stability of the State.

We have often pointed out in these pages that the validity of the technical axioms underlying the bankers' policy—which the Social Credit Movement exists to challenge—is a question which the authorities reserve from investigation by investigators who are competent to tackle it, or, when this cannot be prevented, allow to be investigated only in circumstances or under conditions which exclude material evidence from the investigation. The Official Secrets Acts are the lock on the bankers' private ledger, and the Master Secret guarded by these Acts, is the automatic confiscation of the public's purchasing-power through the prices of commodities and securities.

Now, whereas it is thus against the "public interest" to bring into question the technical infallibility of the super-banking hierarchy, so there seems to be a tendency in the Courts to apply the principle in cases where the moral integrity of the super-social hierarchy is called into question. Nobody in his judicial moments would say that a person's goodness proved his cleverness, much less that his cleverness proved his goodness. Yet the public generally are constantly imputing both attributes indiscriminately to the "stars" of finance, politics and society. This confusion is such an asset to the Money Power that no one familiar with the subtle ways in which it guards its monopoly can doubt that every Big Name in society, as well as in commerce and politics, is protected as to its reputation by the influence of High Finance. Thus an act of speech or writing which defames, or even ridicules, a Big Name of any sort and

in respect of any matter may touch a nerve at the high-financial centre, whether the shock is communicated directly or through one or more "stations." Nobody can tell in a particular instance, but in general this statement has at least the force of strong presumption.

How else is one to explain such an episode as this. A Big Name comes into court complaining that Mr. X has made defamatory insinuations against him in association with a Mr. Y. Counsel for the Big Name, in examining his client, asks him: "Do you know a Mr. Y?" Presumably the Big Name is able to say that he does not—else why should his own counsel ask him the question? But before he can answer the judge intervenes with the reprobatory remark to counsel: "Is that question necessary?" Counsel thereupon deferentially withdraws the question. Evidently he had thought it a necessary question, or at least a helpful one in establishing the truth: and certainly the ordinary onlooker would think the same. The answer: "I do not know Mr. Y, and have never heard of him" would probably have settled the case. It might have been a different matter if the question had been put in cross-examination by counsel for the defence, because the author of a defamatory statement must not be encouraged to issue it entirely in anticipation of securing evidence lending colour to it from the other party. But here it was the aggrieved party who was prevented from volunteering a statement in support of his action. We do not reflect for a moment on the motives behind the handling of the case, but we are bound to question its effect. It leaves room for the deduction that there may be coming into operation an undeclared but over-ruling doctrine that it is against the "public interest" for people to get the impression that it is possible for representative men and women to lay themselves open to attacks on their reputations. Such a doctrine may be harmless enough up to a certain point, and we should approve it insofar as it stopped wanton gossip about the personal conduct of anybody. But there is real danger that the doctrine might be extended to cover cases which turned entirely on the interpretation of the very term the "public interest." And it would be only too easy for this to happen, for unfortunately most of the public are ignorant of the factors most vitally touching their real interest, and, more unfortunately still, the majority of jurists misapprehend their significance.

It is closely relevant here to refer to the laws against blasphemy. It was authoritatively laid down many years ago (by Coleridge, we think) that there was nothing actionable in publishing arguments for atheism, provided that they were expressed in decorous terms, and did not cast ridicule or odium on theistic beliefs, thus wounding the feelings of believers. This dictum has been consistently derided by the successive editors of *The Freethinker* (Foote and Cohen) as meaning that the methods of Freethought propagandists were to be decided by their opponents, who would seek to deprive them of the weapons of satire, irony, sarcasm, ridicule, and invective. The Blasphemy Laws, while not disarming the Freethought Movement, placed upon them by least, that was the construction placed upon them by the Lord Chief Justice at the time we speak of. Ponderous writings in archaic language which only congenial philosophers would trouble to read were permitted, but such were hopeless in a campaign to enlist

sympathy or support from the general public in the midst of other causes (not to say entertainments) competing for their attention.

Now, the laws of sedition and libel are capable of being made agencies of disarmament in the secular sphere of controversy just as were the laws of blasphemy in the religious sphere. Some years ago a banker permitted himself to hint that certain credit-reform criticisms of the financial system partook of the nature of sedition. Well, he's out of date to-day. The dissemination of credit-theories, including Social Credit, is not only legally permissible but socially respectable. The advocacy of any of them is not incongruous with the top-hat and old school tie. Social Credit is no longer socially discreditable. *But*—and it is a big "but"—a good example must be set in the courtesies of debate and the conventions of action. "Talk about it, but don't do anything," said Mr. John Hilton on the wireless to the schoolchildren, a somewhat cryptic piece of advice which can, however, be construed to reflect an official hint that the subject must take its proper place in the queue of plans and schemes awaiting the attention of the Government. Assuming that to be so—and we have grounds for saying that it is not unlikely—we hope that nobody is preparing to accept advice over-hastily from the enemy as to the way in which the Social Credit campaign is to be fought, much less to give hostages for the "correct behaviour" of the Movement.

To begin with, Social Credit is not one among several ingredients of economic reconstruction: it is the essential and fundamental pre-requisite to any conceivable planning that will bear fruit. If any bankster diplomat is making approaches and saying: "Let this proposal take its turn," he either does not understand what it is or he does not mean it to have its turn. Again, assuming the technical soundness of the Social Credit Analysis, what is the vital recommendation of the proposals in the deepest political sense? It is that they make feasible the transition of economic activities from the era of fruitlessness to that of fruitfulness with the least disturbance (at best with none at all) of the existing order of society. Next, what are the circumstances in which this contention is presented? They are that forces outside the control of the Social Credit Movement are threatening the present order of society, and that their effect will become more and more perceptible the longer the adoption of Social Credit is delayed. Notice the difference between Social Credit and Communism on the one hand and Fascism on the other. Communism's object is attained through the disturbance of the existing social order, while Fascism's objective requires a post-facto disturbance of it. Let us assume that the country, and even the Government, are as averse from both these alternatives as are members of the Social Credit Movement. If the Government want to escape them the way of escape is provided by the adoption of Social Credit. But if the Government have decided to reject Social Credit, and are hoping in some way to prevent the electorate from being stampeded into the Black or Red armies, it would be a colossal piece of impudence for them to come to the Movement and say: "Please spend your money, time and effort in promoting the observance of democratic forms as a bulwark against the attacks of would-be despots." It would be tantamount to asking the Movement to help them dodge the precise object for which

the Movement exists. Apart from that, if the Press, Wireless and Party Platforms, which can be enlisted to defend democracy, are not powerful enough to do so, what hopes are there that the Movement could make good the lack with their own small resources in members and money, especially in view of the margin of time available for the job?

The proper defence of democratic forms consists in showing that the machinery of representative government has been captured by Finance; and the only way in which this can be shown is by continuing to explain the ideal technical use and the actual political abuse of the credit system. By this method it can be shown that any substituted despotic mechanism of government in this country can be captured and used by Finance much more easily than has been the democratic.

Elemental Economics.

By John Grimm.

Perhaps the clearest bird's-eye view of the modern economic system can be shown in the following diagrammatic form.

Take a pair of compasses and, from a given centre, inscribe five circles, of a radius, respectively, of 1 in., 2 in., 3 in., 4 in., and 5 in.

Let the largest—outermost—circle represent a complete production area (if you like, an island) containing natural resources sufficient in variety and quantity to maintain the life of the inhabitants. Think of the circle as representing the coast-line of the economic system.

Next draw, say, two wavy lines (like you see in maps) from the common centre of the five circles out to the coast-line, meeting it at any three points you like. Let these lines represent rivers, and imagine that their common source at the centre consists of a sort of "gusher" (like an oil-well). Imagine that at the same place are situated all the natural resources of the island. Imagine that the people at the same place collect some of these resources and load them into barges, with the intention of transporting them out to the coast. And, at the coast, as it were at the estuary of each river, let there be a warehouse to receive the cargoes at the end of their journeys. Let these warehouses represent repositories for distributing the cargoes, some part of which are consumable by the people. Now, of course, natural resources are not consumable, so that they must be made so during the journey. Imagine, then, that the people at the centre, when they have loaded their barges, get on board and carry on the work of conversion as they float down the rivers.

So far this picture embraces the fundamental facts of what we call "production"—namely that men do not make the materials in any consumable product, but that their "producing" of them consists simply in changing their form and moving them to where they are accessible by the consumers who want them. Thus *conversion* and *transportation* are the essential links between natural resources and the means of life—between a store of what is useless and a store of what is useful to the consumer.

Now in watching, in imagination, the barges floating down the rivers, it will be seen that they will pass through the circumferences of the inner circles. In the diagram these are one inch apart, and there will be four points of intersection on the way to the coast. These intervals represent distance travelled, and time occupied; they can also be assumed to measure off five stages

in the conversion-processes taking place on the barges through the whole journey. For convenience let it be assumed that each barge starts with 100 tons of natural resources and that one-fifth, or twenty tons, are converted during each interval.

At each point of intersection imagine a lock and a wharf. These will mark the places where the cargoes pass out of one zone into another. Assume that at these places the cargoes are transhipped or landed in the manner to be described.

Remember, there are two rivers and two barges. Let these be designated A and B. Assume that on barge A the crew are making consumable goods, and are able to land twenty tons at each wharf, landing the last twenty tons at the coast. Assume that on barge B the crew are making machines and so on, which will not be finished until they reach the coast. Barge B does not land anything at the intermediate wharves.

Both barges are imagined to start from the centre and travel at the same rate, reaching each lock and wharf at the same time. The transshipments and landings are simultaneous at each wharf. Thus barge A will drop twenty tons of consumables at the first wharf and transship eighty tons. Barge B will transship all its cargo. Both crews will disembark, remaining inside the first zone. The crew of barge B can now be imagined to come along overland to the wharf where the twenty tons of consumables are, and share these up with the crew of barge A. Assume that these crews represent all the inhabitants of zone No. 1.

The same procedure follows in zones 2, 3, 4, and finally on the coast, where the last twenty tons will be shared up, and the machine landed.

In the meantime the barges of the series A and B will be plying forwards and backwards within their respective zones, repeating the processes described. The inhabitants (crews) of the island will be consuming at the rate of 100 tons per period (lock to lock) and adding to their store one new machine in the same time.

Each machine obviously becomes the property of the inhabitants taken together—nothing appears to stand in the way of their making whatever use they like of it; and certainly they would not use it in such a way as to obstruct the regular landings of goods by the "A" barges along the river, but rather to increase the cargoes and landings.

Notice how this happens. Every time two barges, A and B, arrive at any zonal lock and wharf, the 20 tons of consumables landed from barge A, and made entirely by crew A, are shared up between both crews A and B, notwithstanding that nothing has been landed from barge B, the whole cargo of which passes out of the zone. Temporarily crew B share in the product of crew A's services; but ultimately, when the machinery is completed and landed at the coast, crew A will share in the product of crew B's services—that is to say, they, with crew B, will receive property-rights in the machinery. These are the second and final instalment of their common reward for services jointly rendered. This outcome is sensible, equitable and feasible.

So much for the physical side of the operations. Now we come to the financial side. There would be no difficulty in these people's working a sort of share-out ticket system in conjunction with their activities provided that they thoroughly understood the physical facts above outlined. They might agree, for instance, to appoint captains of barges who would write out service-

tickets each of which would represent a proportional title to what was made. They would have to settle two things. One, and the most important, would be to see that all the tickets when added together constituted a claim to, or property right in, all the products added together, i.e., both the consumables and the machines. The other—by far the less important, *provided the first was assured*, would be to decide whether one man should get more tickets than another or all share alike.

As regards the first thing, the captain of barge A might issue a series of tickets called an A series, and the captain of barge B a B series. If so, when two barges arrived each at the first lock and wharf, captain A could pay off the crew (including himself) with 20 A tickets representing 20 tons landed. Captain B could pay off his crew with 20 B tickets representing the partial conversion of the machinery *not* landed. And so on, zone by zone, until the end of the journey.

Now at each wharf in turn along the distance there would be 40 tickets and 20 tons of consumables, and the questions would arise: Should the two crews give up all these tickets in return for the consumables?—and, if so: How are they to acquire the machinery later on? Suppose that the two captains asked the lock-keeper to settle this, and to superintend the share-out on the wharf. He would probably decide to price the consumables at 2 tickets per ton. And when he had got the tickets he would retire or destroy the 20 of the A series, but retain and save the 20 of the B series on behalf of the crews of his zone, which he could hand out again later on when the machinery to which they belonged was landed on the coast ready for sale. He would see no object in making the price of 1 ticket per ton, for the crews would have no use for 20 tickets extra at the time when there was nothing to buy. Nevertheless, the *true* price of the consumables would be 1 ticket per ton, and the 2 tickets per ton a false, or inflated, price, which, however, would be corrected by the subsequent re-issue of the B series of tickets. On this principle of *complete temporary withdrawal* of tickets and *partial compensatory ultimate re-issue*, the machinery as well as the consumables would pass into the unfettered ownership of the inhabitants of the island.

But now suppose that there was such a thing as a Lock-Keepers' Combine, and that their object was different from that of the people. Being in command of the rights of way and of the wharves along the rivers, they might proceed as follows. They could arrange that some members of the crews should be paid more of the tickets than were the rest. Let us call these favoured ones the officers. Suppose, then, that of the 40 tickets taken ashore 25 were held by the officers and 15 by the men. The lock-keeper could then fix the price of the consumables at 1 ticket per ton. The officers would now hold 25 tickets. Suppose, next, that the lock-keeper said: As a condition of my letting barge B through the lock I shall require you officers to invest your 20 tickets in the machinery—I will give you other tickets called shares, and these will entitle you to the benefit of that machinery when completed, and the benefit of that ownership will be that you can sell it, or rather, hire it out to the islanders for so many service-tickets a week, month or year.

Substitute for the term "lock-keepers" the term "book-keepers," meaning the bankers, and you will have a fairly clear picture of how the present economic system is worked to-day.

What Will Remain?

By R. Laugier.

XII.

"Art should employ the manifold richness of its subject matter to supply on the one hand the deficiencies of our actual experience of external life, and on the other hand to excite in us those passions which shall cause the actual events of life to move us more deeply, and awaken our susceptibility for receiving impressions of all kinds."—Hegel.

"The domain of art is not the intellect but the emotions—not thought but feeling; it occupies itself with thoughts only as they are associated with feelings. Bettine says, 'Art is the intuition of spirit into the senses. What you feel becomes thought, and what you strive to invent becomes sensual feeling.'"—George Henry Lewes.

"Folly is as often owing to a want of proper sentiments as to a want of understanding."—Hazlitt.

It is time, and more than time, to conclude a scrappy article, which has been written with the hope that it might be suggestive, rather than with any confidence that it could possibly be "accurate" in any "scientific" sense. Indeed, one of my beliefs is that so-called "scientific" exposition has brought us to such a pass that a little healthily irresponsible "guessing" can make things no worse, and might even make them better.

A glance has been cast over some of the principal cultural themes that run through our belles lettres. I have suggested that intellectual arrogance, in saint and Puritan, has led to the subjection of the masses, and to the existence, in very many minds, of contempt for the masses. It would seem that the early saints meant well, but their withdrawal from life rendered them badly equipped to serve common man. Whether these messiahs "come with a sword," or not, their teachings are translated chiefly with the sword. Their parables may be explained how you will, and they are ignobly interpreted by baser natures. In a happy society—one not burdened with desperate fear—the saint might be allowed to live—as it is, he kills or is killed. The saint and the Puritan would produce God's kingdom on earth, but through misunderstandings and ignorance the actual results are not happy. Man's kingdom on earth might be preferable.

The reaction that follows upon disappointed hopes, produces the stern teachers of duty and obedience, and this results in the strong serving their "duty" for their own ends, and the weak being sadly dutiful to any kind of authority. All this pain and ugliness produces a "pessimistic" philosophy which may appear to have a certain rugged vigour and frankness; but, unfortunately, the "pessimism" is based upon false assumptions, due to simple ignorance of financial matters. (What an anti-climax!)

An offshoot of pessimism is the cynical "man of the world," the "tough" nature, the worshipper of "strength" in action. Again, what might be desirable in such doctrines is misinterpreted by the weak, who form the majority. Finally, the pessimist frequently acts as though he thought: "The nest is so foul, it does not matter if we foul it a little more." It seems to me that cynicism is certainly behind the Frenchman's failure to get his monetary system reformed. For four centuries the ablest French dramatists have steadily exposed the tricks of Finance—and the exposure has been extremely well done—and yet the average French-

man, knowing as much as he does, appears not to believe in amelioration.

But the failure of the Theatre is, fundamentally, due to the rise of Puritanism and the conception of life as Business, and the neglect, or banishing, of cultural and artistic values. What is "wrong with the Theatre," is, quite simply, absence of joy. When language, the instrument of culture, is debased, the artist, and especially the dramatist, is helpless. Said Xenophon: "The beginning of a right education is the examination of words." All culture is revealed in the manner of interpreting and emotionally apprehending certain "key" words, every epoch having its characteristic words.

The modern man of the metropolis (the provincials have no theatre), says: "I find life so dreary, already, that I don't want to see a tragedy. I want to see something bright and snappy." What this really means is, that the modern dramatist has no emotional, lyrical language (and poetic rhythm) with which he can produce a tragic drama that will sublimate the sorrow and render heroic the sufferings of modern man. The dramatist cannot get away from the accepted language of his age. Whether the poet is permitted by contemporary speech to write:—

And all our yesterdays have lighted fools

The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!

or whether the unfortunate author must present the drama of the "inarticulate"; or write: "Aw Hell! Say, what's the use . . . ! Aw, hell . . . ! Say, what's the use . . . ?"

Well, this makes all the difference as to whether you have a theatre which can deal with the realities of modern life, in their most profoundly tragic and moving aspects, or whether your play-wright must stick to "drawing-room comedy." The dramatists are not to blame, and are certainly not indifferent to the sufferings of the people (except the older Socialists); but the younger dramatists cannot get a public into the theatre for plays that argue about "problems," or that deal with tragic themes in the language of truck-driver or shop assistant.

To overcome this difficulty Synge went to the language of the Irish peasants, but this narrows his appeal. He wrote:—

On the stage one must have reality, and one must have joy; and that is why the intellectual modern drama has failed, and people have grown sick of the false joy of the musical comedy, that has been given them in place of the rich joy found only in what is superb and wild in reality. In a good play every speech should be as fully flavoured as a nut or apple, and such speeches cannot be written by anyone who works among people who have shut their lips on poetry.

The moral exhortation of Puritans, and the problem dramas (as seen at their worst in Brioux), have nothing to do with *emotion*, as artists apprehend the word. Moral preaching, of static ethical values, is a mere spouting of platitudes, expressed in *clichés*: that is, the language is dead; it has only emotional significance for its author, and his dreary like; in fact, it has not always significance even for its author. (Hence the failure of preachers. God knows we have had enough of them!) The great prophet, like the artist, uses his *wit*, not his sentimental rhetoric, to put over his truths. Job was witty; Jesus was witty; Swift, Voltaire, Sydney Smith—

these are witty. They present new truths, and reveal them with such brilliant art, that such truths are implanted in the minds of listeners and readers for ever. The "word" comes as a shock, quickening the most apathetic. Wit depends upon poetic insight and imagery, and the language of wit and poetry is, of course, the exact antithesis to the stale, dead, rigid "morality" which has been pumped into us, in an awful never-slacking stream for at least four centuries.

The modern mind has become blunted to poetic language and to genuine wit: in place of wits our cities are filled with the "sophisticated" clerk and typist; the Smart Alec and the "wise-cracker." Social Credit is a living culture; in essence poetic, witty, and above all human. How is it to be put over? How are the apathetic to be quickened to intense passion? How is victorious mediocrity to be forced to accept, for the first time in human history—the doctrine of equal chances, of *la carrière ouverte aux talents*? How is the ascetic, the Puritan, the iconoclast, the cynic-sentimentalist, the duty-exploiter, the duty-slave, the business-man, soldier, clerk, office-girl—how are these to be persuaded to accept life?

(To be concluded.)

Money.

AN EXERCISE IN SIMPLE PROPAGANDA.

How we love it. What? Money. Why? If you've got money you're all right, you can have pretty well anything you want. Without it, misery. Freedom; yes, we don't want to be dictated to; freedom with money, not without; the freedom of a stray dog isn't very inviting.

"Higher wages for all," yes, indeed. But what it means is really higher INCOMES, not particularly wages; it doesn't matter whether the income is wages, salaries, or dividends. The Co-operative dividend is very welcome. A national dividend would be very welcome. A dividend of, say, a pound a week, to every man and woman in the country. What a god-send to millions it would be. And why not? Is there any reason why we can't have a national dividend of a pound a week for everyone? No.

Unearned income; dividends are called unearned income. Well, why not? Earn or die; is this the idea? Get a job or starve. Get a job; always look for a job; never think of going into business. To go into business and employ those who want jobs means capital.

We do not need money to live on; we need bread and butter to live on, and there is plenty and to spare for every man, woman, and child. Food, clothing, furniture, houses, books, toys, pianos, motor cars, ships, trains, aeroplanes, picture palaces, all these are produced by man, man-made; nature's raw material converted. Nature's raw material is not man-made. It exists by nature, every child born inherits nature's raw material. Raw material is the "capital" out of which what we need and live on is made. Nowadays this "capital" is claimable by means of money. Money gives title to nature's raw material; and therefore to its money equivalent. Nature's raw material is free to everyone. If he wants to go into business instead of living on an unearned income, let him have free credit, money's equivalent; credit and money are virtually identical; with credit to your current account in the bank you can

draw cheques, buy wholesale, sell retail, make a profit and live.

So much for capital, so much for going into business for the purpose of earning a living. Now about a dividend, unearned, a national dividend.

Every child born inherits nature's free raw material; also the knowledge left us by inventors long since dead by which this raw material is converted into the things we use.

Industry, the productive system and business of the nation, Great Britain, Limited, if you like, as one gigantic producer, uses our nature-given raw material; our capital is thus invested, invested in business; investors are entitled to dividends. Shareholders in Great Britain, Limited, and shareholders in a company are usually not workers in that company, they receive dividends without working. Therefore, every man and woman should receive a dividend as a shareholder in Great Britain, Limited. Let our members of Parliament see that we get it.

It is for the experts and not the layman to find out how to do it without inflation. Money, like chairs and tables, is man-made; it does not fall from the skies like rain. Some manufacture furniture, others manufacture money. Money nowadays is made of paper; silver coins are legal tender only up to forty shillings, and copper coins up to one shilling. All the rest is paper money, some of an expensive kind, banknotes, most of a cheap kind, cheques; all big business is settled by cheque; according to the Encyclopædia Britannica, page 415, 90 per cent. So there is no necessary difficulty about the manufacture of money, as much as is needed can easily be produced, manufactured out of paper, tickets to buy. Let us therefore have some, a National Dividend, payable weekly at the Post Office or anywhere else. "UNEMPLOYED." Battersea.

GREEN SHIRT ACTIVITIES.

From June, 1932, to October, 1934, the Green Shirts have: Held 3,426 outdoor meetings, which at least 187,000 people have attended.

Held ninety-seven indoor meetings, attended by at least 4,900 people.

Attended thirty-two demonstrations.
Sold 58,066 copies of the Green Shirt paper, *Attack*.
Distributed 223,000 propaganda leaflets.
Established Green Shirt Sections covering London (N., S.W., S.E., E., and Central) and in Berks, Bucks, Essex, Hants, Herts, Lancs, Oxon, Sussex, Yorks, Warwickshire, Worcs, and Scotland (Glasgow); as well as Sections in Australian.

The movement looks upon itself as the Social Credit Agitational Instrument, and has brought all its energies to one focus-point, expressed in one simple four-word slogan: "DEMAND THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND!"

By doing so it has drawn all other Social Credit groupings towards that same focus-point and that one slogan.
[The above appears in a leaflet entitled *From Kinsman to Green Shirt—A Record of Events*, by John Hargrave, being the re-print of an article contributed to *Health and Life*, January, 1935. The price is 1d. Published at 44 Little Britain, London, E.C.1.]

A full report of Green Shirt activities at Birmingham, on the occasion of Mr. Lloyd George's visit to that city to expound further his "New Deal" proposals, will appear next week.

Incomes and Purchasing Power.

A correspondent puts forward the proposition that at certain stages in the production-process consumers are placed in possession of a surplus of money which, if not withdrawn by inflated prices, will serve to compensate them for a deficiency of money later. The general answer is that such a withdrawal does take place because of the short time elapsing between the issue and recall of bank loans compared with the time elapsing between the commencement and end of any series of production-processes.

If a bank lends £100 to industry for a month, and having got it back, lends it again for another month, and so on for ten months, the cumulative record of loans will now be £1,000. Supposing that over the 10-month period 1,000 units of product have been made. Private individuals will, of course, have had the handling of the £1,000, but, unless every month the whole production of 100 units has been made in consumable form and sold to them, a part of the production must remain unsold every month and be carried forward to the next. But unfortunately the bank does not allow an equivalent portion of the £100 loan to remain unpaid. The consequence is that industry either charges the £100 a month for the part of the product sold for consumption, or charges some less amount, collecting the balance in the form of investments in the unsold part of the product. Taking arbitrary figures, and dealing with only three stages (to save space) the position can be tabled thus:

Month.	Units of Production		Value of Investment.	
	Sold.	Unsold.	Invested in	ment.
First	80	20	20	£20
Second	80	20	20	£20
Third	80	20	20	£20

At the end of the tenth month the issued capital of industry is £200. Now, at no time has there been more than £100 in money in the hands of private individuals; nor is there at the end of the tenth month when industry is in debt to some of them to the amount of £200, or to put it another way, all of them owe some of them the £200. There must now be an extra price-levy on the means that the production sold will fall below 80 units and the production unsold will rise above 20 units (assuming another loan of £100 for the same total volume of production).

In practice of course the bank would insist, as a condition of lending, that the programme of production was altered so that fewer consumable products were made, and more "capital" products. At a later stage the bank would stop the continued production of the "capital" products as well, and even order the destruction of some of them with the consequential reduction of the investors' "capital."

Notice particularly that this difficulty has nothing to do with such questions as whether banks create money or not, or what kind or quantity of money should be in use; it has to do with the way in which any quantity or any kind of money is manipulated and accounted under the existing laws of finance and commerce. In this illustration the banker could start with 100 golden sovereigns—and that is why we used the expression above about his getting the money back and lending it again. We emphasise this because it shows up the hollowness of the arguments about the gold-standard as the fundamental factor, whether for good (as some urge) or for evil (as do others). Fundamentally anything will serve as money that can be counted—and any kind of

money will serve us well or ill according to whether we count it rightly or wrongly. The Social Credit Theorem is not a monetary theorem but an accounting theorem.

Now anyone can see in broad principle what ought to be done with the counting of the £100 in the illustration. To work up to it suppose (a) that it were possible for the individuals concerned to invest all their incomes during the ten months; and suppose the opposite, namely (b), that it were possible for them to buy for consumption the whole of the product month by month. In the case "b" everyone will see the sense of the banker's getting back his 100 sovereigns month by month. The figure 100 would measure the loan, the units of production, the cost of production, the units sold to consumers, and the price recovered from them.

But in the case "a" everyone ought to see the nonsense of the banker's pursuing exactly the same course in these exactly opposite circumstances. Yet that is what he would do under the existing rules of his order. And the result at the end of the ten months would be 1,000 units of unsold products "costing" £1,000 in the investment-ownership of certain individuals (it might be of all of them—it would make no difference), while the amount of money available to buy them would be nil.

In such a case, what could the banker do to bridge the gap? The people would require £1,000 to be issued to them gratuitously. But we have chosen to allow the banker only his 100 sovereigns. Well, if the money won't come up to the price the price must come down to the money. And the only way to effect this in the circumstances would be as follows: that towards the end of the tenth month, before the 100 sovereigns were called in to the bank for the tenth time, prices should be marked down to one-tenth of their cost, so that the £100 would clear the unsold products out of industry on its way back to the bank.

The justification of this should be easily seen. For the nominal cost of £1,000 represents the lending and recalling of the same 100 sovereigns ten times. Since no products were delivered to consumers, each retirement of the 100 sovereigns was the retirement of totally unexercised purchasing-power. Contrast this with case "b" where, since all the product was delivered every month, each retirement of 100 sovereigns was the retirement of fully exercised purchasing-power.

Now in actual experience the situation lies somewhere between these two extremes. The banks' retirements of loans represent retirements of partially-exercised purchasing power. The cumulative margin of unexercised purchasing power is roughly represented to-day by the difference between the immense valuation of the nation's permanent assets of all kinds (answering to the £1,000) and the comparatively small amount of money in the hands of the community (answering to the £100).

A. B.

Notice.

All communications concerning THE NEW AGE should be addressed directly to the Editor:

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.

Dutch Finance.

I.

SWIFT'S VERSION.

[Quoted from Swift's "History of the Four Last Years of Queen Anne," written about 1713.]

By all I have yet read of the history of our own country, it appears to me that the national debts, secured upon Parliamentary funds of interest, were things unknown in England before the last revolution under the Prince of Orange. It is true that in the grand rebellion the King's enemies borrowed money of particular persons, upon what they called the public faith; but this was only for short periods, and the sums no more than what they could pay at once, as they constantly did. Some of our kings have been very profuse in peace and war, and are blamed in history for their oppressions of the people by severe taxes, and for borrowing money which they never paid; but national debts was a style, which, I doubt, would hardly then be understood.

When the Prince of Orange was raised to the throne and a general war began in these parts of Europe, the king and his counsellors thought it would be ill policy to commence his reign with heavy taxes upon the people, who had lived long in ease and plenty, and might be apt to think their deliverance too dearly bought; wherefore, one of the first actions of the new Government was to take off the tax upon chimneys, as a burden very ungrateful to the commonalty. But the money being wanted to support the war (which even the Convention Parliament, that put the crown on his head, were very unwilling he should engage in), the present Bishop of Salisbury [Burnet] is said to have found out that expedient (which he had learnt in Holland) of raising money upon the security of taxes that were only sufficient to pay a large interest. The motives which prevailed on people to fall in with this project were many and plausible; for supposing, as the Ministers industriously gave out, that the war could not last above one or two campaigns at most, it might be carried on with very moderate taxes; and the debts accruing would in process of time be easily cleared after a peace. Then the bait of large interest would draw in a great number of those whose money, by the dangers and difficulties of trade, lay dead on their hands; and whoever were lenders to the Government would, by surest principle, be obliged to support it.

Besides, the men of estates could not be persuaded without time and difficulty to have those taxes laid on their hands which custom has since made so familiar; and it was the business of such as were then in power to cultivate a moneyed interest; because the gentry of the kingdom did not very much relish those new notions on government, to which the king, who had imbibed his politics in his own country, was thought to give too much way. Neither, perhaps, did that Prince think national incumbrances to be any evil at all; since the flourishing republic where he was born is thought to owe more than it will ever be able or willing to pay. And I remember, when I mentioned to Mons. Buys the many millions we owed, he would advance it as a maxim, "That it was for the interest of the public to be in debt"; which, perhaps, may be true in a commonwealth so crazily instituted, where the governors cannot have too many pledges of their subjects' fidelity, and where a great majority must inevitably be undone by any revolution, however brought about. But to prescribe the same rules to a monarch whose wealth arises from the rents and improvements of lands, as well as trade and manufactures, is the mark of a confined and cramped understanding.

I was moved to speak thus, because I am very well satisfied that the pernicious counsels of borrowing money upon public funds of interest, as well as some other State lessons, were taken indigest from the like practices among the Dutch, without allowing in the least for any difference in government, religion, law, custom, extent of country, or manners and dispositions of the people.

But when this expedient of anticipations and mortgages was first put in practice, artful men in office and credit began to consider what uses it might be applied to; and soon found it was likely to prove the most fruitful seminary, not only to establish a faction they intended to set up for their own support, but likewise to raise vast wealth for themselves in particular, who were to be the managers and directors in it. It was manifest that nothing could promote these two designs so much as burdening the nation with debts and giving encouragement to lenders; for as to the first, it was not to be doubted that moneyed men would be always firm to the party of those who advised the borrowing upon such good security and with such exorbitant premiums and interest; and every new sum that was lent took away as much power from the landed men as it added to theirs; so that the deeper the kingdom was engaged, it was still the better for them.

Thus a new estate and property sprung up in the hands of the mortgagors, to whom every house and foot of land in England paid a rent charge, free of all taxes and deductions, and purchased at less than half value. So that the gentlemen of estates were, in effect, but tenants to these new landlords; many of whom were in time to force the elections of boroughs out of the hands of those who had been the old proprietors and inhabitants. This was arrived at such a height that a very few years more of the war and funds would have clearly cast the balance on the moneyed side.

As to the second, this project of borrowing upon funds was of mighty advantage to those who were in the management of it, as well as to their friends and dependants; for, funds proving often deficient, the Government was obliged to strike tallies for making up the rest; which tallies were sometimes (to speak in the merchant's phrase) at above forty per cent. discount. At this price, those who were in the secret bought them up, and then took care to have that deficiency supplied in the next session of Parliament; by which they doubled their principal in a few months; and, for the encouragement of lenders, every new project of lotteries or annuities proposed some further advantage either as to interest or premium.

II.

DISRAELI'S VERSION.

[Quoted from Disraeli's "Sybil: Or the Two Nations," 1845.]

If it be a salutary principle in the investigation of historical transactions to be careful in discriminating the cause from the pretext, there is scarcely any instance in which the application of this principle is more fertile in results than in that of the Dutch invasion of 1688. The real cause of this invasion was financial. The Prince of Orange had found that the resources of Holland, however considerable, were inadequate to sustain him in his interest; and he had found that the resources of France, held in necine rivalry with the great sovereign descended to us, held authentic conversation which has descended to us, held by William at The Hague with one of the prime abettors of the invasion, the Prince did not disguise his motives; he said, "Nothing but such a Constitution as you have in England can have the credit that is necessary to raise such sums as a great war requires." The Prince came, and used our Constitution for his purpose: he introduced into Holland the system of Dutch finance. The principle of that system was to mortgage industry in order to protect property: abstractedly, nothing can be conceived more unjust; its practice in England has been equally injurious.

In Holland, with a small population engaged in the same pursuits, in fact, a nation of bankers, the system was adapted to the circumstances which created it. All shared in the present spoil, and therefore could endure the future burden. And so to this day Holland is sustained, almost solely sustained, by the vast capital thus created, which still lingers among its dykes. But applied to a country in which the circumstances were almost entirely different, to a considerable and rapidly-increasing population, where there was a numerous peasantry, a trading middle-class

struggling into existence, the system of Dutch finance, pursued more or less for nearly a century and a half, has ended in the degradation of a fettered and burthened multitude.

Nor have the demoralising consequences of the funding system on the more favoured classes been less decided. It has made debt a national habit; it has made credit the ruling power, not the exceptional auxiliary, of all transactions; it has introduced a loose, inexact, haphazard, and dishonest spirit in the conduct of both public and private life; a spirit dazzling and yet dastardly; reckless of consequences and yet shrinking from responsibility. And in the end it has so over-stimulated the energies of the population to maintain the material engagements of the State, and of society at large, that the moral condition of the people has been entirely lost sight of.

The Films.

"The Lives of a Bengal Lancer." Paramount production. Directed by Henry Hathaway. Carlton. Here is yet another English film that has been left to Hollywood to make. It is described on the programme as "suggested by the novel by Major F. Yeats-Brown"—which was not a novel—but beyond the second half of the title and two minor incidents it owes nothing to "Y.-B." As a matter of fact, "Bengal Lancer" is not a book that lends itself to any save the freest screen adaptation, although its autobiographical theme—the conflict between the man of action and the mystic—has dramatic possibilities enough.

What the Paramount studios have actually made is a picture of the North-West Frontier (pronounced "fronteer" by all concerned) full of fighting and pig-sticking and tent-pegging, exciting in parts, and, in general, good melodrama. Setting and action alike are pleasingly out of the ordinary, and the result is quite first-class entertainment, that promises to be a considerable success, even if a characteristic American sentimentality conflicts with the English atmosphere that the producers have obviously been at great pains to achieve. In this connection, it was also a mistake to select a partly English and partly American cast, although the Transatlantic accent is partly explained by making one of the characters a Scottish-Canadian and giving the Colonel's son an American mother and upbringing as a prelude to Sandhurst.

Direction, editing, acting, and photography, are alike excellent; Guy Standing, Gary Cooper, and C. Aubrey Smith call for special mention. There is a solitary female member of the cast—Kathleen Burke—and while the presence of a white woman is necessary to the plot, her inclusion in the entourage of the Afghan chieftain seems to require some explanation.

By the way, the Paramount Company may be interested to learn that the English for "getting a citation" is "mentioned in despatches."

"Girls Will Be Boys." British International Production. Directed by Marcel Varnel. Plaza. This agreeable trifle stars that finished veteran, Cyril Maude, and the delightful Dolly Haas, who played in "Lieses Kommando," and was described by me in these columns as the screen discovery of last year. The film is amusing, has fast action and good dialogue, and is far more to my liking than some of the recent more pretentious productions of the same studios.

"Farewell." Directed by Geza de Bolvary. Curzon. It is interesting to contrast this French film with the much costlier "Blossom Time." The latter had neither a single outstanding player (save for Athene Seyler in a secondary part) nor a line of dialogue that stuck in one's memory; was unimaginatively directed; and relied mainly on the box-office popularity of Richard Tauber and of Schubert's more sugary and hackneyed melodies. "Farewell," which deals with an episode in the early life of Chopin, is admirably acted, directed, and edited; perfectly cast; holds the interest from beginning to end; and is, in short, an almost perfect example

of a film with music and about a musician. The music is entirely Chopin's; it has been so tactfully selected and welded with the action, that for the first time within my recollection I can say of a picture of this type that it contains neither a note too much nor too little.

Chopin is sympathetically played by Jean Servais, but the outstanding performance of a cast that deserves mention in its entirety is that of Luciene le Marchand as George Sand. It is dangerous to praise a film player too highly on the score of a single impersonation—as witness Lya de Putti and Marlene Dietrich—but this talented Frenchwoman plays the role so convincingly and in such accordance with one's conception of what the novelist must have been like (save that the actress has the advantage of looks), that one must definitely regard her as an artist from whom much is to be expected. She has personality, charm, and intelligence.

Not the smallest merit of this admirable picture is that it never for a moment suggests costume drama. The players wear the clothes of the early eighteen-thirties, not as though they were at a fancy dress ball, but rather as if it were their everyday attire, and this period piece has atmosphere as well as fragrance.

DAVID OCKHAM.

Music.

Cyril Smith, Wigmore, January 11.

Perhaps Mr. Smith is the best of the younger English pianists. This, however, is not particularly high praise in itself, for if we exclude the Anglo-Semitic there are hardly any worth mentioning. As a technician Mr. Smith is not by any means a Horowitz, but his equipment is very considerable, enabling him to throw off the Paganini-Brahms Variations, the Liszt Sonata and Dohnanyi's Capriccio with comparative ease.

Mr. Smith is indubitably musical, but his ability is, as yet, to some extent outdistanced by his agility, as is so often the case. His playing of the Brahms was agreeably clean and clear, though some of it was conceived on rather too small a scale, and it was a pity to have omitted some of the best variations.

The Liszt Sonata, in my opinion, decidedly gained by Mr. Smith's process of desentimentalisation in the slower sections, for in this vein Liszt is more often a good deal nearer bathos than pathos, but the more dramatic sections of the Sonata lacked the necessary dynamic force and character—notably in the opening—the approach, in fact, was too English.

I have not yet seen it, but I understand that an abridged version of the Sonata has been made by Siloti, in which the work is reduced by about a fifth.

This is advantageous, inasmuch as the composition in its present form lasts the better part of half an hour, and much of it is mere repetitive rhapsodic rhodomontade.

This Sonata, like the Schumann G minor, the Chopin B minor and B flat minor, the Brahms F minor, and others of that ilk, surely has earned a minimum rest of ten years.

Albeniz's "Triana" was not very successful, being lacking in sufficient variety of tone colour and rhythmic subtlety, but it must be admitted that this is a piece presenting peculiar pianistic problems, that the writing is ungrateful and quite unnecessarily difficult, and that very few artists give it really satisfactorily. It is indeed a great pity that Godowsky's admirable arrangement, which is far more pianistic as well as musically more effective, is denied publication owing to the refusal of Albeniz's widow to countenance any further "tampering" with her husband's music. This point of view is common but ill-informed, and those who object to such "sacrilege" on a priori grounds would do well to read Godowsky's vindication of transcriptions, paraphrases, etc., in his preface to his free arrangements of Schubert's songs. Mr. Smith was more at home in Dohnanyi's exciting Rhapsody in C, which he played with full appreciation of its somewhat commonplace but cheerful character.

CLINTON GRAY-FISK.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

FASCISM AND SOCIAL CREDIT.

Dear Sir,—Apparently Mr. Chesterton does not like my questions, but does not say so, and does not like the application of the *reductio ad absurdum* to his theories, but does say so! Perhaps he will tell us where he draws the line between his "work in some degree always being required," with scientific progress continually making for a shorter working week, and my Two Minute Week? Also it would seem that so long as only a portion of the whole population are not required as producers their "unemployment" is a curse, but as soon as the whole population become unemployed as producers it will be "that happy state."

I would point out to Mr. Chesterton that the "power of science" does not "stimulate" human needs, neither is the purpose of applied science to create fresh labour, as he appears to believe. He is like all orthodox theorists in his belief that Work is Wealth. In order that Wealth may be produced Work must be done, but it does not mean that human beings must necessarily do the Work. It is the purpose of Industry to produce the maximum of Wealth with the minimum of Work. Applied science enables us to produce so much with so little effort, but it does not enable us to produce more Work! We would use a machine to do ten men's work with one man to operate it, but we would not use a machine which required ten men to do the work of one man. Our friend's mind works in the opposite direction to that of Social Creditors, but his eyes work with ours. He can see how silly it would be if we used Workmaking machines, but he argues in the opposite direction. Human needs require no stimulation, in spite of "Eat More Bread" and "Wear More Boots" campaigns as evidence to the contrary. Industry is quite capable of satisfying all reasonable human needs to-day, and once it is pressed to satisfy them to the full it will work better with increasing efficiency. We have plenty of needs requiring satisfaction to-day, but since they are not backed up with money it is not possible for Industry to satisfy them, and so the produce of Industry clogs the machinery.

"Plenty-for-All" exists to-day with only a portion of our available manpower engaged in production. The only way the orthodox can suggest for giving people a title to what is already produced is to increase the gluts! I suggest the only sane way is to give everyone Old Age Pensions at birth, and talk about More Paid Playtime instead of More Paid Worktime.

T. H. STORY.

TO READERS IN HULL.

Sir,—I have been approached by one or two friends regarding the possibility of forming a local Social Credit Group.

Will all persons in Hull and district who are interested kindly get into touch with me at 15, Malm-street, Boulevard, Hull, as soon as possible.

F. L. HAMMERSLEY.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

BALANCING INCOME WITH PRICE.

R. L.—According to your quotation from Mr. Gaitskell's thesis, it seems that what he is trying to establish is this: that if new money for new capital production is issued to an amount equal to the sum of the following items, which are concurrently swelling costs,

1. Depreciation charges,
2. Re-investment of income,

there is "no reason to expect a deficiency." But this is simply affirming the self-evident truth that a compensated deficiency is not a deficiency. Nevertheless, if the two items tabled above are to be charged in the consumption market, and sufficient new money is to arrive there at the same time, the new money issued ought to be *more than* equal to those costs, because not more than a fraction of it comes into people's hands as spendable income.

SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE PRESS.

T. C. W.—Thanks for copy of document. Perhaps we had better delay comments until a reply is received. Apart from the question of a boycott, newspapers have their business side, and will give preference to subjects whose sponsors are ready to give them a *quid pro quo* in the shape of advertisements, or, on the other hand, are in a position to draw support away from the refractory management.

News Notes.

(Editorial.)

INCOME TAX.

Committee on Income Tax. Been sitting since 1927, when appointed by Mr. Winston Churchill. (Loud laughter.) Keeps co-opting fresh experts. (*Daily Express*.)

THE BIG FIVE.

Bank-Chairmen's speeches. Only slight divergence of emphasis on methods. Unanimity on fundamental policy. (Summing-up in *The Times*, February 2.)

HOW MACHINES MAKE EMPLOYMENT.

New defence of accounting machines. In commerce—the economy helps exporters to secure new markets abroad and to provide more employment. In banking and insurance—the economy in number of clerks employed obviates the necessity of enlarging premises to cope with new business: the resultant saving in overheads "must result" in "higher wages all round." (*The People*, February 3.)

UNDERWRITERS MUST LIVE!

Television boom. A ramp to encourage shy investors. Sets at £50 to £80. Radio King, J. P. Morgan (U.S.A.).

MY CONSTITUENTS!

Means-Test hardships. Row in the House on January 30. "The public have been misled" (members of all three parties). Questions: By whom? What are M.P.s for?

BOOSTING SELF-DENIAL.

Salvation Army. Rothermere gives luncheon at Savoy Hotel to General Eva Booth, January 11. (*Daily Mail*, January 12.) Tribute to work of Army. Among those present, Sir George Sutton.*

* A figure in Miss Louise Owen's action *re Daily-Mail* shares.]

THE GREAT UNPAID.

Problem of the lay magistracy—article and letters in *The Times* of January 1 and 19, and February 2. Howard League for Penal Reform calling meeting, at which Sir William Jowett* is to preside.

* Miss Louise Owen's counsel in action *re Daily-Mail* shares.]

WHOSE CODE?—AND FOR WHOM?

"If a universal moral code be not recognised, it becomes positively dangerous to engage in scientific inquiry in restricted spheres." (Father Canahan, lecture on "Ethics and Economics" in Dublin. Reported in the *Irish Free Press*, January 31, under captions "Object of State Policy"—Mr. de Valera on Catholic Principles—Jesuit's Lecture.")

ARMS AND THE BANK.

In 1929 the Governments of Britain and India agreed to sell arms and ammunition to the King of the Hedjaz to enable him to suppress a rebellion in part of his dominions.

The Theatre.

"Between Us Two." By Dudley Leslie. Criterion.

Loretta was an airwoman who specialised in record-breaking-cum-sex-appeal. Ronnie was a rising journalist who wanted both Loretta and a little son whom he could teach to keep a straight bat and a stiff upper lip, to use his fists and to be gentle to all weaker creatures. Loretta was disinclined to "dwindle into a wife," but was so fond of Ronnie that she was prepared to bear him a son or two, so long as her career didn't suffer. The possibility of her bearing daughters, who would have to be instructed in netball and hockey, was not discussed. Grant Hartley was an Oil King who financed Loretta's flights in a rather tactless way, which put Ronnie's back up; while Anne, Loretta's widowed cousin, did her best to widen the breach and capture Ronnie. So much for the theme; Mr. Leslie offers no solution of the basic problem, but brings down the final curtain with a neat bit of stage-craft instead. This is a middling little comedy, with some appalling streaks of sahibry and pucklandom. Miss Leonora Corbett wears all kinds of charming clothes, but even that seductive flying suit in the last act leaves us unconvinced of her powers as a pilot; she has neither the presence nor the poise to sustain a long leading part. Mr. Jack Melford works away manfully as Ronnie, and does his best with the stuff about the little son. Mr. D. A. Clarke-Smith, as Grant Hartley, pulls the show together whenever he comes on the stage, which is not so often as we should like, and Miss Eva Hudson is delightful as a coloured maid. I could not believe in either Miss Mabel Terry-Lewis as a meddling mother-in-law or Miss Oriel Ross as the dangerous widow, but I fancy the author was at fault.

ANDREW BONELLA.

Forthcoming Meetings.

Green Shirt Movement For Social Credit.

National Headquarters: 44, Little Britain, London, E.C.1. Wednesday, January 30, 8 p.m.—Lecture by Edgar J. Saxon, Editor of *Health and Life*, "Why I Stand for Social Credit."

Wednesday, February 13, 8 p.m.—Lecture by John Hargrave, the Green Shirt Leader, entitled: "Ride the Whirlwind and Direct the Storm!"—dealing with the Psychodynamics of Political Action for Social Credit.

London Social Credit Club.

Blewcoat Room, Caxton Street, S.W.1.

February 8, 7.45 p.m.—"Poverty and Over-taxation:—The Obvious Remedy," by Marquis of Tavistock.

February 15, 7.45 p.m.—Address (title to be advertised later), by Mr. R. J. Scrutton, editor of "Prosperity."

February 22, 7.45 p.m.—"The Historic Background of Social Credit," by Dr. J. C. B. Mitchell.

Birmingham Douglas Social Credit Group.

Friday, February 8. Lecture by John Hargrave, Founder and Leader of the Green Shirts. "The National Demand for Social Credit." Wesley Hall, Church-road, Erdington.

February 13.—Resistances to Social Credit Propaganda.—P. R. Mason, Esq.

February 27.—Life or Money?—A. L. Gibson, Esq.

March 13.—World Affairs from the Social Credit standpoint.—E. H. Bill, Esq.

March 27.—The Emergent Order.—Dr. Tudor Jones.

April 10.—The Advance of Social Credit.—J. R. Morton, Esq.

Cardiff Social Credit Association.

Until further notice, discussions and debates will be held every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m., at the Angel Hotel, Cardiff. All are invited. Collection.

Erdington (B'ham.) D.S.C. Group.

February 8th, 8.0 p.m., at the Wesley Hall, Station-road. Lecture by John Hargrave, entitled "The National Demand for Social Credit." The meeting to be arranged in collaboration with the Birmingham Green Shirt section.

The New Age Club.

[Open to visitors on Wednesdays from 6 to 9 p.m. at the Lincoln's Inn Restaurant (downstairs), 305, High Holborn, W.C. (south side), opposite the First Avenue Hotel and near to Chancery-lane and Holborn tube stations.]

The value was £31,437. The King never paid. The transaction, which came to light in the report of the Auditor-General, was entered into without the knowledge of the Treasury—owing to the arms having been supplied from existing stores. The Treasury express regret that "adequate safeguards were not taken." (*Star*, January 31.) The only "safeguard" possible would have been to accept goods in exchange. Then there would have been a squeal from some part of the Empire or other over the loss of a market. So the King's default has saved some economic disturbance, and all is well. As for the money, the amount can be added to the Floating Debt without anybody suffering.

UNDER-SUBSCRIBED LOANS.

The Press recently gave publicity to a syndicated report showing that several recent loan-issues including the L.C.C. and the Australian issues) were badly supported by the public; and figures were quoted showing what large proportions of them were "left on the hands of the underwriters." These gentlemen, in the last resort, are the banks, and the real significance of the information is that (taking the two cases enumerated) the ratepayers in London and the taxpayers in Australia are more in debt to the Money Monopoly than they are to private investors. Emerging from this is the further fact that the future values of the securities depend so much the more upon the attitude of the professional holders of them towards the policies of the governing bodies in question.

DOWN WITH REASON!

"Speaking of the new Finance Minister, Dr. Schacht said, 'We do not want a clever man—we want a strong and determined man. He must reduce expenditure, whether he understands the reason for it or not. I would much sooner see resolution than intellect.'" (Conversation between Dr. Schacht and Lord D'Abernon at the Reichsbank, January 23, 1926.—Lord D'Abernon's Diary, Vol. 3, p. 220.)

"THE NEW AGE" DINNER

Preliminary Notice.

The ANNUAL DINNERS of The New Age will be resumed this year. Arrangements are in progress for holding the next one at Frascati's Restaurant towards the end of March.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT PRESS ASSOCIATION

Notices respecting the structure and objects of this Association, now in process of formation, will shortly be sent to editors of journals advocating Social Credit.

ACADEMY CINEMA, Oxford Street.
GER. 2981.

Willy Forst's Viennese Sensation of Europe
"MASKERADE" (A)
with Paula Wessely.

Social Credit Reading Course

SET A.

Comprising:—

Social Credit in Summary (1d.).
The Key to World Politics (1d.).
Through Consumption to Prosperity (2d.).
Social Credit Principles (1d.).
Post free 6d. the set.

SET B.

Comprising:—

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

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

The Social Credit Movement.

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

In Course of Preparation.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT WHO'S WHO, DIRECTORY AND YEAR BOOK.

Editor pro tem, **ARTHUR BRENTON.**

Editorial Committee in process of formation.
Collaboration invited.

Readers are invited to submit:

1. Biographical items concerning leading figures (whether themselves or others) which ought to be recorded.
2. Names and addresses for the Directory section.
3. Suggestions as to what material (speeches, statistics, historical data, etc.) is best worth placing on permanent record in the Year Book section.
4. Information as to societies and organisations advocating Social Credit or other principles of financial reform. Date of formation: objects: officers: structure: fees, etc., etc.

Communications to Arthur Brenton, 20, Rectory Road,
Barnes, S.W.13.

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.
The Veil of Finance. 6d.
Through Consumption to Prosperity. 2d.
- C. G. M.**
The Nation's Credit. 4d.
- DEMANT, V. A.**
This Unemployment. 2s. 6d.
God, Man and Society. 6s.
- DOUGLAS, C. H.**
Social Credit. 3s. 6d.
The Douglas Manual. 5s.
The Breakdown of the Employment System. 1d.
Canada's Bankers. (Evidence at Ottawa.) 2s. 6d.
The Nature of Democracy. 6d.
The Monopoly of Credit. 3s. 6d.
These Present Discontents: The Labour Party and Social Credit. 1s.
The Use of Money. 6d.
The World After Washington. 6d.
Social Credit Principles. 1d.
- DUNN, E. M.**
The New Economics. 4d.
Social Credit Chart. 1d.
- GALLOWAY, C. F. J.**
Poverty Amidst Plenty. 6d.
- GORDON CUMMING, M.**
Introduction to Social Credit. 6d.
- H. M. M.**
An Outline of Social Credit. 6d.
- HATTERSLEY, C. MARSHALL.**
The Community's Credit. 1s.
This Age of Plenty. 3s. 6d. and 6s.
Men, Machines and Money. 3d.
- RANDS, R. S. J., B.A.**
The Abolition of Poverty. A Brief Explanation of the Proposals of Major C. H. Douglas. 4d.
- POWELL, A. E.**
The Deadlock in Finance. 3s. 6d.
The Flow Theory of Economics. 5s.
- TANKERVILLE, EARL OF.**
Poverty Amidst Plenty. 6d.
- TAVISTOCK, MARQUIS OF.**
Short Papers on Money. 6d.
- YOUNG, W. ALLEN.**
Ordeal by Banking. 2s.

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

- HORRABIN, J. F.**
An Outline of Economic Geography. 2s. 6d.
- LUDOVICI, A. M.**
A Defence of Aristocracy. 7s. 6d.

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, England (Telephone: Chancery 6470), and printed for him by THE NEW AGE PRESS, LIMITED, Temple Avenue and Tudor Street, London, E.C.4, England (Telephone: Central 3701).