



THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."
A WEEKLY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND ART
No. 2310] NEW SERIES Vol. LX. No. 7. THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1936. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.] SEVENPENCE

THE MESSAGE OF EMMAUS.

Abide with me

But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel.

Fast falls the eventide

Then he said unto them: O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken.

The darkness deepens

And they drew nigh unto the village whither they went: and he made as though he would have gone further.

Lord with me abide

But they constrained him, saying: Abide with us, for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent.

When other helpers

As he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them.

Fail, and comforts flee

And their eyes were opened, and they knew him: and he vanished out of their sight.

Help of the helpless

And they said to one another: Did not our heart burn within us while he talked with us by the way?

Abide with me

And they rose up at the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

A figure has gone from our midst who had become a symbol of hope to the distressed people of this country and their kin beyond the seas. With the disappearance of that symbol has vanished their hope. They are setting out on the same sad journey as did the two travellers to the village of Emmaus. They had trusted that this figure had been he which should have redeemed them from their poverty and misery. But they are left to recount in sorrow "how the chief priests and the scribes delivered him to be condemned to death and have crucified him." For to them the tragedy of the Abdication is a re-enactment of the tragedy of the Crucifixion.

Howsoever, they forget that the Crucifixion was the necessary prelude to the Resurrection. They forget that the initial triumph of the scribes and pharisees made certain their ultimate defeat. It may well have been in those far-off days that there were those in whom sudden disillusionment created resentment—those who had conjured up the picture of redemption through the setting up of an earthly kingdom patterned on the traditional model. Naturally, to these, who in their minds had endowed their Master with the power to do this thing, it would seem that his failure to do it made him deserving of reproach. They might feel that the tragedy could have been avoided, and that their Master had "let them down" by not avoiding it.

However that may be, the feeling of having been "let down" has been the predominant feature of the people's reaction to the event of last week. Exactly how they have been let down they cannot say. They have not been allowed time to think. The betrayal, condemnation and banishment of King Edward took place in the compass of exactly seven days. "What thou dost do quickly" spoke Christ to Judas; and the injunction has seemed wise to his spiritual descendants in high places round the Throne to-day.

It is difficult to write these words, because, as the conspirators against a renescent Monarchy foresaw, any adverse judgment of their act can be construed as a disparagement of the new King who has succeeded to his brother's place. That this is not intended should become clear from what is to follow, but all the same, let it be made clear at once that it is not intended.

For one thing, the prerogatives and functions which the new King inherits are not the same prerogatives and functions that the late King relinquished—or, rather, was forced to relinquish. The Money Power, like the fraudulent executor, has misappropriated a part of the inheritance. So any attempted estimate of the comparative competence of our new King to exercise his new prerogatives and to fulfil his new functions would be hopelessly irrelevant to the new situation. Competence, in the absence of opportunity to exercise it, is nothing. And, since the event of last week it can truly be said that every opportunity for the reigning Monarch to exercise influence contrary to the policy of the Money Power has been eliminated from what is called the British Constitution. The Monarchy is now the tomb of the Monarch, and the tomb sealed by the stone of Financial Autocracy.

It should be noted that if this were not so, if King

George were inheriting the same opportunities as seemed open to his brother, then those persons who are complaining that the late King's abdication has "let us down" are saying that the new King's accession has "let us down," and are therefore committing themselves to the proposition that the new King is inferior to his brother. Such a comparison, though only implied, might prove to be dangerous to those who make it, as well as odious to others. No; what has "let us down" has not been the abdication, but the pre-existing potential restrictions on the initiative of the Monarch which King Edward discovered through the experiment of testing them. Let no-one be side-tracked by the visible occasion of the test: it was his act of testing the restrictions that is the vital thing. By resisting them he disclosed them. More than that; by resisting and disclosing them he forced the Money Power behind his Ministers to use in the open the instruments of reprisal which in normal circumstances it uses in secret, if there be any occasion to use them at all. By this act he has bequeathed to his successors on the Throne clear evidence of their impotence to relieve their subjects from oppression. He has further bequeathed to the public clear evidence of the fact that the authors of the oppression are the freeholders of the Throne. The nature of this evidence is indicated by the following facts.

On September 12, 1935, THE NEW AGE printed a letter from Mr. James Golder taking exception to the serial publication in *The News Chronicle* of humorous pictures which, he pointed out, had the effect of holding up the institution of the Monarchy to ridicule. In those pictures the central figure was designated by the artist: "The Little King," and was presented in the same sort of character and situations as are the figures familiar to the public as "Dot," "Carrie," "Mr. Spilliken," Strube's "Little Man," etc., etc. Kings were the object of the same kindly but derisory treatment as Walt Disney bestows on Mickey Mouse. In short, Monarchy was Mickey Monarchy. Mr. Golder uttered the warning that if the Monarchy were made to look ridiculous it would soon be made to look superfluous. He invited *The News Chronicle* to put an end to the series.*

[Four months afterwards King George V. is borne through the streets to his last rest. On the way, the Cross becomes detached from the Crown, and falls to the ground: "An omen?" watchers ask.]

On October 14, 1936, a certain intelligence agency alluded to a scheme which was afoot "for a social plant to be exploded under the King." The method of planting it was for reference to be made "from the pulpit" to

* A passage in Mr. Golder's original letter was not printed at that time. It ran as follows:—
"For instance, if the heir apparent has tasted some thing of life and genuine liberty, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that a public opinion might be built up capable of forgiving him, if, when his turn comes, he abdicated in favour of, say, a President or a Dictator. Such men he could argue to-day wield the power of Kings. And get all the thrills, while the real Kings wield the form of power and get the pageantry only. If it be answered that Presidents and Dictators can always be had, like footballers, or prize fighters, for money, but that Royalty holds Sovereign rights and prerogatives not exchangeable for money, it is possible to reply that abdications have been well advertised in recent years as very good paying propositions. So that, if a prince should want a man's life of thrill and adventure without the boring formalities of an automatic Kingship, well, there's a way, if there's a will supported by the people."
In the light of last week's events the prophetic nature of this analysis needs no emphasis. It was written some months before the death of King George V.—Ed.]

"the very different standards of conduct set to his subjects by the late King."

On October 21, the same agency mentioned the pending Simpson divorce action, and predicted that it would have political repercussions which the London Press were already in a position to discuss, but were held back by considerations of prudence. [At this date the whole American Press was freely reporting and discussing the facts which the British public did not become aware of until December 3.]

On December 1 Dr. Blunt, the Bishop of Bradford, made the reference above predicted. *The Yorkshire Post* (which belongs to the Becketts—Mrs. Anthony Eden's family) prepared a leading article, copies of which were sent to the London Press, which that paper published on December 2. In this article a construction was placed on the Bishop's remarks which he subsequently denied was in his mind when he made them. On December 3 the London Press came out with leading articles based on this construction, that is to say, articles discussing the matrimonial intentions of the then King of England.

On December 9 (the day before the Abdication) the aforesaid agency stated that the differences between the (then) King and the Cabinet go "far deeper than the Simpson affair." It repeated a report that it had previously made that Mrs. Simpson had lunched with the Queen who said she found no fault in her. It also stated that Mrs. Simpson had, over a month ago, made a declaration through intermediaries to the Archbishop of Canterbury exactly on the lines of that which she recently issued from Cannes. [I.e., her wish not to stand in the way.]

The agency in question has no connection with any party or movement—its news service is in general of equal value to every kind of newspaper which cares to use it. Hence, where its information coincides with any theory about the causes of events it may be regarded as impartial confirmation and not calculated collusion. Its main statement about deeper issues is borne out by the selected extracts from the Press published in *Social Credit*, December 11.

The most sensational event in the Press last week was the issue of *The Catholic Times* of December 11. This paper came out with a headline right across the front page: "Money's Ramp Against King," followed by another: "Financiers Use the Moral Issue To Force An Artificial Crisis." Following that was the following declaration printed in heavy capitals.

We are for the King. We are against the financial and political powers who are forcing King Edward from the Throne. What we want is the re-establishment of the Monarchy as a power in Government, a power which must increase.

Let us not be misunderstood. We are not condoning—no Catholic can condone—the re-marriage of any person who has been divorced after a valid marriage.

But the King's proposed union was not the cause of the crisis, but a weapon in the hands of those who made the crisis, a cudgel with which to smash the Crown.

An effort is being made to crush the King in order to weaken the nation, frighten money to New York, wreck the stabilisation pact and so give international finance once more the control of the people's destiny. It is the

last desperate plunge to force the King to serve money and not the people.

The King's marriage to a married person whose husband is still living would be a great scandal, but it would not absolve us from our allegiance to our King.

* * *
Readers of THE NEW AGE who reflect on all these matters in the light of what they know about the policy and practices of the Money Monopoly will realise that if abdication had been deferred for even only a week or two it would not have happened, or if so, would have opened up issues involving the illicit prerogatives and powers of High Finance. Matters would have leaked out which would have enabled the public to understand and prompted them to sympathise with a declaration on behalf of the King to the effect that he required guarantees that, as King, he would be permitted to discharge those responsibilities implied by the reassurances that he had given to the dwellers in the distressed areas. When he spoke the words "Something must be done—Something will be done," they accepted them as meaning that he expected to do something about it. The obvious strategy for the Money Monopoly was to get rid of him on an irrelevant issue so as to forestall the otherwise inevitable disclosure that the King was up against powerful financial interests who had decided that nothing need be done or would be done. They could not let the King withdraw his promise in public, for that would have aroused intense curiosity about the reason. They would have liked the King to forget his promise, remaining on the Throne as a symbol of hope while abandoning all attempts to fulfil that hope. But, to his honour, he did not stoop to this evasion. He thought and acted as any honest and bold man would do, and decided: **Since I cannot act as a King I will not be a King.** His act of abdication insofar as the voluntary element in it was concerned, was equivalent to that familiar to trade-unionists as *going on strike*. And insofar as it was involuntary it was equivalent to *being locked out*.

Here is a report of a tap-room altercation last Saturday evening.

- A.—I'll never forgive him for letting us down.
B.—Who's "us" ?
A.—Why, us—the people.
B.—Never mind the people: speak for yourself; how have you been let down?
A.—Me? No, I am thinking of the distressed—
B.—Come off it. You thinking of the distressed! Why, you rotten b—, you've never said a good word about 'em and never done a thing to help 'em. Those blokes singing outside last week; what did you call 'em—"lazy lurchers."
A.—So they are, a lot of 'em.
B.—Yes; I know your sort: you always sympathise with them as are out of reach and can't ask you for anything.
A.—Never mind that. A man shouldn't run away from his duty.
B.—Yes, but it depends on who says anything's a duty.
A.—Well, his duty was to do what he promised.
B.—That's all right if he could do what he promised.
A.—Well, if he couldn't he shouldn't have promised.
B.—All right again if he knew he couldn't.
A.—He should have made sure before he promised.
B.—What do you mean? Asked Mr. Baldwin—?
A.—Yes, I suppose so—
B.—Or Mr. Neville Chamberlain?
A.—Whichever you like—anybody.
B.—All right. Now you better sort out your grouches and make up your mind what's biting you. Was it a

apparent motive. There is no explanation but that some Unknown Evil has possessed these people, is using them as instruments of its maleficent purpose.

Good. And now for clues. No. 1 is this: That this marsh land marks the site of buried prehistoric remains. Some of them have been dug up and preserved. Among them is a skull. This is what the doctor finds out from a friend. The friend exhibits the skull. It is an evil skull. It snarls at you. It epitomises all the bestiality of the long ago. Having looked at it you can't get it out of your thoughts. You feel as if its owner was yet alive and intent on working evil on you. At any rate, that is how it affected the doctor.

But what next? What is to be done about it? And just here Mr. Wells stops producing thrills and begins on a pseudo-psycho-analytical thesis on the failure of modern civilisation. He hangs it on an aphorism which he places in the mouth of a character: "We have broken the frame of the present." Yes, that's wot's torn it, as one might say in civilised vernacular.

The breakage of "the present" is defined and expounded by a psycho-analytical practitioner who constitutes himself a prophet of disaster. He harangues the inquiring doctor at inordinate length in the jargon of modern psychology. The meaning of what he says, reduced to plain English, is that whereas, once upon a time, man lived in the present, and for the present, today man lives in contemplation of the past and speculation about the future. Man has broken the bounds of his one-time ignorance. He knows what he was in the beginnings of time, and can project pictures of what he will be or may be at the end of time. Man has discovered that he is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever. He is the eternal beast—selfish, cruel and greedy. Civilisation has not altered him inwardly: it has served him merely as make-up. Man's uplift has been lipstick. Chaos and destruction are in front of him. And so on.

Thus the prophet of disaster. The snarling skull recovered from the marshes is truly typical of man as he is now. And just as the inspection of that skull created in the doctor feelings of repulsion and fear, the knowledge that the same skull is inside man now has the same effect, though the truth is more vaguely apprehended. Man's bestiality persists, but in the disguise of sublimation. He has not civilised himself; he has civilised the means of satisfying his bestial passions. Whereas he once committed murder with his own hands he now commits it through mechanised extensions of his hands.

By now the reader will see that Mr. Wells's promised story peters out in a diatribe against war, and a warning that the cause thereof is rooted in the hearts of mankind. Yes; and what are we to do about it? The answer lurks in the rhetorical formula that we must take a grip of ourselves and face facts. It seems to mean that we must follow the psycho-analytic method of breaking free of our Fear by isolating the cause of it and staring at it objectively—bringing it up out of our sub-conscious. We must, as it were, take our bestial skulls in our hands and recite, each of us: "Ah me! That's Me!"

Mr. Wells lacks the courage to reveal at the end of the story whether the diagnosis and prescription are his own. He is content to leave the responsibility to his hypothetical professor. Nevertheless the reader is bound to assume that Mr. Wells thinks them a subject for serious study. And, adopting that assumption, the logical trend of it is towards establishing a doctrine highly favoured by the Money Monopoly, namely that the social

and economic deadlock of to-day, and its attendant suspicions, fears, animosities and cruelties, are the resultant of mankind's psychological disorders. The deadlock is only to be unfastened through a change of heart. Students of the credit question will recognise that this way out is equivalent to telling us to lift ourselves off the ground by tugging at the tags of our boots.

Insofar as Mr. Wells's story is to be taken seriously it suggests that he, not his readers (meaning men generally) most needs his medicine. If he had only produced a blue print of his snarling skull there are plenty of doctors who could tear away the pseudo-scientific phantasy that he has woven round it. Come on?—what were its craniological measurements? With these known, the general character of the ancient wearer of this headpiece could be established. Whether the skull snarled or not is neither here nor there. All skulls snarl if it comes to that. The only evidence is the shape of the skull. The shape is the index of character. Name a period in the remote past when men lived in the present, and for the present—that is, when men lived as animals live (according to the doctrine: Sufficient unto the day are the problems thereof) then at that period men's skulls approximated in shape to animals' skulls. But to-day they do not. There has been a divergence. And the divergence attended the development in man of the reflective capacities in the brain. The backward-sloping forehead slowly tilted forward, betokening the development of intellectual faculties which functioned as controllers of bestial propensities. When Mr. Wells's hypothetical doctor exclaims, as he is made to do, about the skull in question: "What! That in my blood," he is talking nonsense.

"Social Credit in Alberta."

This is the title of a booklet just published by the Rev. J. H. Stark. It describes what has been happening in Alberta since the Social Credit Government took office. Mr. Aberhart contributes the Foreword, in which he recommends the booklet as "a contribution to the understanding of the movement in which we in Alberta have assumed a position of leadership." The Premier formulates the objective of this leadership in these words:—"We must solve the problem of want in a land of potential abundance—we must learn to use our own credit as the means of increasing purchasing power and effecting the distribution of goods and services which we are capable of producing."

Mr. Stark's narrative covers all phases of the Government's efforts, including the recent preparatory steps towards issuing the Dividend. In a preface he disclaims the intention to appeal to the technician, citing *The New Age* and *The New English Weekly* as typical sources of technical enlightenment for those who want it. His intention is to arouse the interest and win the sympathy of ordinary citizens both inside and outside the Province. His booklet will be invaluable to students of politics who want to see the problems facing the Alberta Government assembled and described in a brief compass. It contains 16 pages and costs 1s. post free. It is to be obtained from the author, the Rev. J. H. Stark, Box 184, Veteran, Alberta, Canada.

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.

Green Shirts and Canada.

Halliday Thompson and Alberta.

The Winnipeg Free Press of November 24 publishes a leading article on the visit by Mr. Halliday Thompson to Edmonton, Alberta. The writer makes fun of the visit, saying (1) that apparently the Green Shirts want to rescue Alberta from Mr. Aberhart, (2) suggesting that Douglas has repudiated the Green Shirts and (3) pointing out that if the Green Shirts rescued Alberta from Aberhart's economics in the name of Social Credit someone would have to rescue Alberta from the Green Shirts' politics. Would it be Douglas? If so, who would save Alberta from Douglas?

A recent issue of *The Albertan* reported that Mr. Halliday Thompson had offered himself to the Alberta Government as an adviser, but that the offer had been declined.

Hargrave in Ottawa.

The Ottawa Citizen of November 25 has a leading article discussing the arrival of Mr. John Hargrave, "the Green Shirt leader of the Social Credit Party of Great Britain," in that city. The article is sympathetic in tone. It reports Hargrave as being non-committal in regard to the question whether he would go to Edmonton to study the position, and as stating that much would depend upon a possible visit he might make to the United States. The rest of the article is a summary of Hargrave's comments on the prohibition of uniforms by the British Government. It mentions, in conclusion, Hargrave's book, *Summer Time Ends*, which "created a critical stir" when published simultaneously in Britain and America a year ago.

The King.

[This report should have appeared last week, but was crowded out.—ED.]

At a crowded meeting of the London Social Credit Club, held at the Blewcoat Room, Caxton-street, Westminster, S.W., on Friday night, December 4, Mr. Saxon, the speaker of the evening, introduced the subject of the present crisis and the attack on the personal liberty of the King by the Money Power. The chairman (Dr. Purves) pointed out that if the King be bound, who can be free?

Mr. Kearney showed from documents in his possession that the real issue was the King's refusal to be put off by the restrictions of the bankers in regard to the salvaging of the distressed areas.

The discussion which ensued raised the feeling of the meeting, and a resolution was passed to send a telegram to His Majesty, with copies to the Prime Minister and the Lord Chancellor. The resolution read as follows:—

At a meeting of over 100 members of the London Social Credit Club it was unanimously resolved, with loyal acclamation, to send Your Majesty the following message: We, the members of the London Social Credit Club, view with abhorrence the vile attack made on the personal freedom of Your Majesty.

We hereby declare that in the fight into which Your Majesty has been drawn against the hierarchy of the Money Power by Your Majesty's interest in the distressed areas, we are heart and soul loyal to your Majesty.

The chairman then invited Major Thomson, of the Social Credit Secretariat, to announce that organisation's proposed activities. The members present agreed to sell a special issue of *Social Credit* in the streets next day, and to distribute handbills for a loyalty rally at Denison House, Vauxhall Bridge-road, S.W., on Saturday, December 5, at 7:30 p.m., jointly organised.

Major Thomson also conveyed to the meeting the opinion of Major Douglas that, if the King stood firm, it would break the Government, and mark the beginning of the end of the Money Power.

The meeting also resolved that every individual present should send a personal telegram of loyalty to His Majesty.

Reviews.

Nature Hits Back. By Macpherson Lawrie, M.B. (Methuen. 5s. net.)

As Major Douglas exposed the fallacies of the present economic system, showing that it was based on an untrue philosophy, so the author of this outspoken book exposes the same philosophy from a medical point of view. Work-that-you-may-live has produced troubles galore in the economic sphere, and has resulted in a C3 population, with jaded nerves, despondent outlook, and dreadful lassitude of mind and body. Dr. Lawrie pillories his own profession for their cart-before-the-horse attitude in being "pre-eminently concerned with established disease," which fills our hospitals, while paying no attention to the "minor mental symptoms" which are the heralds of most terminal diseases. He postulates three symptoms which, he says, "are the essential tragedy of modern life." They are nervousness, despondency, and lassitude. While agreeing that they rise from within, Social Creditors will maintain that exterior conditions are responsible for the genesis of the fear conditions in the mind. No work, no life, is enough to drive the strongest mind to despair. Our great hospital system, too, provides lots of work, and as such receives the ardent support of our financial rulers. Healthy individuals mean fewer hospitals and less opportunities for "made" work. A healthy community would have far too much time to investigate the systematic robbery of its freedom, and would undoubtedly take steps to remove the robbers. There is method in the madness which Dr. Lawrie so rightly deplures.

The three symptoms are clearly outlined by the author in the first section—The Hospital and the Street—and exhaustively dealt with in the following parts. Quite definitely, he says, nervousness and lack of enthusiasm "are two diseases which not only wreck individual peace and enterprise, but which, if neglected, spread and destroy a nation as inevitably as a cancer, disregarded, destroys the life of man."

This solemn statement, from a man who knows from experience, cannot be lightly set aside. The untrue always works destructively in thought, word, and deed, both in the human body and in the body politic. The true working of the human machine and its controlling mechanism, which lives to work, is ably shown by Dr. Lawrie, and will be dealt with in succeeding issues.

Social Credit advocates have a heavy task in hand, trying to teach a fear-ridden people the truth, and Dr. Lawrie deserves our best thanks for having so fearlessly aided us in destroying a lying philosophy which has so fiendishly rotted the minds and bodies of our people.

H. E. B.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

SIGNS AND PORTENTS.

Sir,—Your analysis of the factors in the King's Problem in *THE NEW AGE* for December 10 deserves every commendation from those who are anxious for a right understanding of the present crisis. Others may "dramatise," and hence confuse; but those who are aware of the ultimate issues involved, and know to what point in the body political all vital initiative is gravitating, must be content to analyse as keenly and truly as possible. There is plenty for the dramatist, but precious little of verifiable data for the analyst to work upon. Necessarily so, because it is of the very nature of a hidden Government to camouflage its activities. "Now they are hid from thine eyes!" There is no need to stress the possibility of collusion between the two Front Benches; it is nowadays a familiar convention of Parliamentary life. No explicit denial of any sort of undertaking between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition can impress those who understand the basic identity of both Government and Opposition Policy. To deny the existence of such undertakings, whilst working by implicit collusion is the barest kind of *ignoratio elenchi*. Where are the "Rebels" of yesteryear? How is it that

"Patriotism" and "Unanimity" amongst the Labourites themselves manage always to be so disgusting? Data—scientifically satisfactory data, that is—is indeed scarce. But already it can be garnered, scarce as it is, by the discerning. The following appears in the City columns of *The Times* (the commentator is discussing Coronation Postponement insurances):

"... the liability, if any, will naturally depend upon the circumstances as they eventually appear. The rates paid for these Coronation insurances, which were first placed last August, have varied from 8 to 20 guineas per cent., according to the risk covered and the state of the market; higher rates being charged by underwriters as their books became 'full' with business. An interesting insurance effected by a number of firms is one under which a loss is payable in the event of the cancellation or postponement of the Coronation from any cause excluding the illness of the King, the death of any member of the Royal Family, or war. It was common knowledge when these insurances were effected that they were prompted by the reports which were then being given publicly in American newspapers."

There is no doubt as to where the vital and determinative reactions begin!

That remarkable astrologer, Mr. R. H. Naylor, in his *What the Stars Foretell for 1936*, makes these significant predictions: "There is little doubt, therefore, that we shall lose more than one central figure in the British Empire during 1936" (p. 187.)

After referring to the fact that Saturn and Neptune are in opposition near either the Meridians or the Horizons at nine out of the twelve Lunations in the year, he ventures thus: "The indications as for December are of a curious and baffling nature. The year seems to end on a false note. It is as though the world was waiting and uncertain" (p. 230.)

The symbolism is tragically apposite. Neptune is the planet of mob inversion, of left-handedness. Saturn, under such an opposition, is the squalid reaper and destroyer.

One is reminded of your oft-repeated counsel of prudence to those who would challenge in any way the usurpation of the National will by the Money Monopoly. Although the Money Power itself dwells in a moral region "beyond good and evil," it will always resort to the moralistic weapon against its challengers. Isn't it really a curious inversion, not to say perversion, of values, when an Archbishop is able to garnish his adherence to the Apostles Creed with the fantastic superstition that "The greatness of England rests upon the integrity of the City"? This alliance of high finance and Archiepiscopacy, fantastic though it is, has proved potent against a King who chanced to offer a vulnerable point in his conduct and character. It is not a high incentive to moral rectitude, but it is tactically prudent and necessary to remain as far as one can, morally invulnerable.

Naylor did not go so far as to define the status and function of the "Central figure." We shall look for portents concerning the Central figure-manipulator, the Central Banker!

"PRESBYTEROS."

Reflections on Responsibility and Control.

[Extract from leading article in the *Social Credit Review of East Africa*, October 23, 1936.]

The Convention of Associations debated the question of a larger measure of responsibility in the government of the country. The word "control" was frequently used. It seems that there was a great deal of confusion in the minds of the delegates, for some, obviously, understood the word "control" to mean a "check" or restraint not only on the Government's administration but also on its policy; and some, like Captain Cotter, obviously took "control" rightly to mean the exercise of power.

Responsibility does not go without power, although, thanks to the hidden and supreme influence of money, the reverse

principle is notoriously established. The Convention asks for a larger responsibility, hoping thereby to receive a larger power. But just as power to-day goes without true and effective responsibility, things can be so arranged as to grant responsibility without power; so that some people may exercise full power, and some others bear full responsibility, the latter being the scape-goats of the former. That is the kind of situation which would undoubtedly arise if Kenya people received the larger measure of responsibility they ask for. It must also be remembered that the local so-called Government has no power at all in the true sense, and therefore bears no responsibility, except for the administration of the policies which are dictated by the real power, the Colonial Office. And the responsibility of the latter is not towards Kenya communities, but towards the Home Money Power which directs the policy of the British Empire; so that the Convention wants some Kenya people to shoulder alone the responsibility for the failure of the policies over which these people have no control, having no power. Therefore to ask for a larger measure of responsibility whilst enjoying not the full exercise of power is nothing short of a ridiculous demand.

There are two kinds of responsibility: responsibility for what is done wrongly and responsibility for that which is not done. There is no responsibility, in the same sense, for what is done rightly since the grant of the exercise of power is conditional upon doing what is supposed to be the right thing for the good of the community.

Notice.

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

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

PEACE BEGINS AT HOME

SOCIAL CREDIT

AS A

CONSTITUTIONAL
ISSUE

BRITONS UNITE FOR NATIONAL
DEFENCE

RESIST INVERSION BEFORE
INVASION

SEE CREDIT POWER
A JOURNAL OF SOCIAL DYNAMICS

Edited by J. GOLDER, M.I.Mech.E.

No. 32. November Issue. TWOPENCE

Post Free in Britain only THREEPENCE
Distributing Office: 70, High Holborn, London, W.C.1.

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 70, High Holborn, London, W.C.1, England (Telephone: Chancery 8470), and printed for him by THE ARMY PRESS, LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London, E.C.4, England (Telephone: Central 3701).