

'Phone: F 1996.
**GOODWAY
 RETREADS**
 514b ELIZABETH ST.
 (Opp. Victoria Market).
GUARANTEED
 5 0 0 0 MILES.
 Quick Service.

THE NEW TIMES

GLACIARIUM
 ICE SKATING
 THE WORLD'S
 OLDEST
 PASTIME
 Two Sessions Daily,
 3 and 8 p.m. Admission 2/2
 Boots and Skates, 1/- pair

Vol. II. NO. 28.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JULY 10, 1936

Every Friday, 3d

Can You Soak The Rich? AND IS IT WORTH IT?

The "Catholic Worker" and "Tax To The Limit"

If you really want to bring about a reform, and not just to talk about it, there is very little use in urging or even in discussing ways and means which, whatever their other attractions, are most unlikely to be adopted. This is a truism—yet how many of our reformers bear it in mind?

Last week we drew attention to the expressed desires of Mr. Curtin, leader of the Federal Labor Party, that taxation should be heavily increased in order to extend social services. Now comes a further demand to the same effect in the columns of the *Catholic Worker* of July 4.

The *Catholic Worker* is a widely distributed paper, founded some months ago, we understand, by a volunteer band of enthusiastic young men who are eager to throw themselves into the fight for social justice, and incidentally to prove to those who say religion is the opium of the working classes that such is far from being the case. That such men exist, and that their numbers are rapidly increasing throughout all the Christian denominations in Australia, is one of the most hopeful signs of the times, so that if we presume to criticise their methods, we hope our motives will not be misunderstood. The *New Times* is an undenominational paper. It is not concerned, as such, with Catholics, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Calithumpians, or any others who have sincere beliefs. But it is concerned, and greatly concerned, to bring about a state of affairs wherein, amongst other things, all those who have sincere beliefs will be given a fair opportunity of living up to them. And where does this state exist today?

"TAX BIG INCOMES."

The article in the *Catholic Worker* bears the title, "Tax Big Incomes", and begins by reminding its readers that "there would yet appear no better way of emphasising one cardinal point of our policy than to reprint from our first 'leader' a sentence we must burn into the brain of every social student in Australia. That sentence reads: 'We must do everything to help forward all legitimate means of taxing to the limit those who have more than enough to make provision for those who have less than enough.' " And, further down, the article repeats: "If the poor are to receive the justice of Jesus Christ superfluous incomes must vanish. We must have heavier taxation on large incomes. The axe must fall."

The first remark we would make on this is that, however zealous they may be about God's justice, those who conduct the *Catholic Worker* do not appear to have an over-generous appreciation of His bounty. For it is actually a fact today, as has been borne out by all sorts of scientific investigations, that it would be practicable in such countries as ours, merely by using to the full our existing plant and labour, to give every family an income of something like a thousand a year. And our potential incomes, if industry were given its head, would be far greater. That is to say, instead of the axe falling everyone could have, if they so wished a "superfluous income."

Secondly, we think the "tax to the limit" suggestion, whatever its morality, is impracticable

and that it would not achieve its object of making provision for those whose plight is a cause of common distress to both the *Catholic Worker* and ourselves.

NO ROOM TO WIELD THE AXE.

To begin with, the rich, as objects of taxation, have entrenched themselves so cleverly that, short of outright confiscation, it is almost impossible to get at them by taxation—at least to the extent of more than pinpricks, and certainly not with an axe.

By way of demonstration it might be pointed out that taxation is higher today than ever before, that the poor are poorer, and that we still have the rich. We have been seeing the same phenomenon ever since the wartime profits tax was imposed.

Those of the rich who really matter, those who control the policy, which keeps so many of our people in destitution or next door to it, are well prepared for any constitutional onslaught. Rarely will you find them, as individuals, holding great properties or owning great enterprises. They appear as directors rather than as owners. This is the day of the limited liability company, of riches held in the form of shares. Comparatively few of these companies now pay very high dividends; mostly they have "watered" their capital over and over again. And in the process they have made sure that a considerable percentage has passed into the hands of the general public, into the possession of those favourites of our bankers, the "widows, orphans and retired clergymen." Even the banks have tens of thousands of small shareholders. Hence you will find that high company taxation can always be relied upon to bring wails of genuine distress from myriads of people, often people who paid per-

miams to buy into these "good things", and to whom even a nominally handsome return may mean a very low actual one. As an instance, the great Australian Glass monopoly, one of the few big dividend payers, has just declared a 15 per cent. distribution—but its shares are at such a price that re-

figure - - otherwise, as experience shows, nearly all taxes will be passed on.

MONEY SPENT ON LUXURIES.

The *Catholic Worker* seems to suggest that the State should adopt the second course, and limit earnings, and quotes some figures of Victorian incomes. Here is the first example it gives: "111 taxpayers, each with an income of £7,600 and over, share between them annually £1,438,054. If each of these taxpayers received only £2000 p.a., there would still be a balance of £1,200,000 for distribution to the needy, for slum reclamation schemes and for family endowment." We suggest that this is not quite correct. Thus the late Ben Nathan kept—and we understand his daughters still keep—a staff of something like 30 gardeners. So that when the *Catholic Worker* asks, "Is it not a fact that the appalling poverty of so many exploited workers demands that the money spent on luxuries by so many 'good' Catholics should be diverted to the families in our midst who are in dire need of daily necessities?" we should answer without hesitation, "Certainly not." Ben Nathan, we presume, was neither a "good" nor an indifferent Catholic, but the spending of money on his hobby of orchids (surely a luxury) gave an income to perhaps a hundred or more people who would otherwise, in all probability, have been destitute. From the point of view of wealth distribution it hardly matters two hoots what a man spends his money on. The purchase of a Rolls-Royce and a pram alike give incomes to those in the steel and rubber industry; beer and bread both mean incomes for farmers and for carters, and for all sorts of other people. In fact, unless you diversify your spending, unless you embrace

"MUST HAVE OUR WOOL"—MUST THEY?

In 1934 the world production of staple fibre, the new substitute for wool, was 54 million lbs. In 1935 it was 161 million lbs. (nearly a fifth of our total wool exports). Within one year Italy's production rose from 22 to 11 million lbs., Germany's from 20 to 53 million lbs., and Japan's from two to 12 million lbs.

It is expected, says the Victorian president of the Italian Chamber of Commerce in Australia, that Italy will shortly be producing 150 million lbs. per annum, which is more than the total quantity of wool she formerly used, and most of which came from Australia.

What of the clever Japanese? Hitherto they have used our wool almost entirely for their own use. Will they now, like Italy, be compelled, by our economic madness, to satisfy the needs of their home market with the substitute? And will they then visit us with just retribution by FLOODING THE WORLD with it at a cut price, depriving our wool growers of 90 per cent. of their market, and completing the process which Lyons, the bankers' Yes-man, has begun?

It depends upon whether the people of Australia permit Parliament to act as agent for the overseas bankers' combine, or whether they insist that

Parliament is THEIR servant.

cent buyers are shown a net return of only a little over 3 per cent.

The only effective way, through taxation, of dealing with the inordinately rich is either to confiscate their capital outright (which means Communism) or to deal similarly with all income above a certain

return for nothing, and that this consideration discloses the fundamental absurdity of a financial system which so distorts physical facts?

Why is it that you went on to add, "An economic settlement is hardly to be hoped for"? The principles of such a settlement have been before you since 1919, and could be applied by your Government within a few days. These principles provide in essence that sufficient money shall be distributed to the "surplus millions" to enable them to have financial access to the "surplus production."

The matter requiring the attention of yourself, and of the Government of which you are a member, is the domestic problem of equating income with prices in this country.

This end cannot be achieved by the continued prostitution of your Government to the tenets of "sound finance," and it is to your eternal shame that, having analysed the situation so accurately, you yet balk at supporting the true solution, merely because it involves throwing the glove in the face of your banker masters.

Or is it that you are hopeful once again of holding the position of Australia's wartime Prime Minister, and of allowing Australia to go tenfold further into pawn to the private monopoly of finance?

THE NEW TIMES

W. M. Hughes, Esq., M.H.R.,
 Parliament House,
 Canberra.

Dear Sir,

From your public utterances it is increasingly plain that you know the particular log, which conceals the nigger in the present economic woodpile. You have sniffed around the woodpile for years, but have not yet plucked up sufficient courage to dive in and unearth the quarry. Any possible doubt on this point is set at rest by the following words reported in the Melbourne "Sun" as having been used by you at Brisbane on July 26:

"The increasing intensity of competition for markets must lead to armed conflict UNLESS ECONOMIC SETTLEMENT IS FOUND. Nations are compelled to engage in a struggle for existence in its most intense form, and that struggle is now being displayed in the fight for markets. Talk of peace is utterly futile in a world armed to the teeth, AND IN WHICH NATIONS ARE ENGAGED IN A DESPERATE STRUGGLE TO SELL THEIR GOODS IN FOREIGN MARKETS TO FEED THEIR SURPLUS MILLIONS.

Do you suggest that a nation can really deed its "surplus Millions" by sending a preponderance of its real wealth out of its borders? Have you never reflected that a country would achieve the pinnacle of financial prosperity if it exported the whole of its production in

luxuries in particular, we must all go back to handicrafts, single fur-row ploughs, and the dirty finger nail stage of existence.

What is more, if all big incomes were confiscated by the State the result would be negligible. The *Catholic Worker's* figures of Victoria's taxable incomes in excess of £1000 a year amount to a grand total of £10,047,342, shared between 6120 persons. If you left each of these £1000 (thereby dismissing the Nathan gardeners, etc.) you would have only £4 millions—less what is now already paid in income tax—to distribute among a very high percentage of the 1,800,000 persons in Victoria who at present have shockingly insufficient incomes. How much better off should we all be?

The position is seen still more clearly when we look at it from a national viewpoint. Australia, with a population of about 6½ millions, is estimated to have a total income of somewhere around £500 millions. This figure contains many duplications—for instance, in so calculating it, the Nathans' income, that of their gardeners, and that of the doctors to whom the gardeners paid fees, etc., etc., would all be added together. So to assess today's average income of all Australians at 30/- per week each, or, say, £6 to £7 per family, would probably be a very generous estimate. Just compare this with the scientists' and engineers' estimate of £20 a week—and you get the direction in which the *"Catholic Worker"* ought to be thinking. That direction is not one of subtraction from the rich, but of addition to the poor. We are well aware that there are numbers of rich who have become so by quite unconscionable means. The *Catholic Worker*, in the issue we are quoting, strongly attacks the Colonial Sugar Refining Co.'s directorate. We are quite in agreement; we have given these gentlemen mention ourselves very recently, but we were more concerned to point out that this industrial monopoly and most others which are exploiting the public in general—and sometimes, though not always, their own employees in particular, derive their main power to do so from their very close affiliation with banks, which in the case in point have a direct majority representation on the board.

The present money incomes of a comparatively few very rich epepee may be ill gotten; some of them doubtless are. Nevertheless, in these days of rapid communication, of worldwide selling, and of extra-ordinary advancement in scientific progress it is quite feasible for a person to amass great wealth without any injustice. Henry Ford, one of the richest men in history, is constantly held up as a shining example of the employer who pays the highest wages for the shortest hours. Ford makes only a trifling profit on every car he turns out, but he turns them out by the million. Would the *Catholic Worker* limit him to £1000 a year? And would this incentive have been sufficient to spur Henry on to become one of the greatest benefactors of our time?

WEALTH AND INCOME

Like the Labor party, the Communists and the Single Taxers the *Catholic Worker* appears unable to distinguish between real wealth



THE NEW TIMES

Published every Friday by New Times Pty. Ltd., Elizabeth House, Elizabeth and Little Collins Sts., Melbourne, C.I. Postal Address: Box 1226, G.P.O. Melbourne.

Telephone: M 5384.

Vol. 2. No. 28.
FRIDAY, JULY 10, 1936.

The "British Capital" Racket Again

The daily press is agog with news of fresh development for Australia. Mr. Latham Withall, special commissioner in London for the Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia, tells us through the cables that a great deal of new English capital is to be invested here—at least £500,000 on cotton alone. Mr. B. S. B. Stevens, Premier of New South Wales, was reported on Monday to have had "many conferences with important financial interests regarding the investment of British capital in certain public utilities and in private enterprise." On the same day it was announced from South Australia "under a plan to provide Adelaide with cheap power electricity, brown coal deposits at Moorlands, eighty miles from Adelaide, will be examined by Commonwealth geophysicists. Should the report be favourable, British interests, it is understood, will undertake the development of the project. The coal is believed to have a higher calorific value than that at Yallourn (Vic.)."

This South Australian project is typical. First, the investigations will be made "in Australia by Australian citizens (whether born here or not does not matter), who will examine fully all the physical aspects. Should they decide that the project is both desirable and feasible, we shall in due course expect to see armies of Australian workmen on the construction job. As at Yallourn, probably, railway and road links will have to be established, a power house with its machinery and transmission lines will be erected; dwelling houses, shops, municipal buildings, hospitals, school and churches will be built. All these things will be done in

THE PRINTED WORD
in
Pamphlets, Booklets, Leaflets, Weeklies, Monthlies, Annuals, Newspapers, Magazines, or Books
EXCELLENTLY AND ECONOMICALLY PRODUCED
By
THE ADVOCATE PRESS
309-319 LONSDALE
PLACE MELBOURNE
Phone 6831 (3 lines)

Australia by Australian workmen with Australian materials—possibly a small part of the machinery may be imported in exchange for Australian wool or some other locally produced commodity. Therefore the job will in every sense be an Australian job. When the powerhouse is operating, it will still be an all-Australian affair, both in the production and in the consumption end.

There is one exception. Turning back to the newspaper report we find: "Should the report be favourable, *British* interests, it is understood, will undertake the development of the project." Does this give the lie to anything we have just said? It does not. Everything that is visible will be Australian, as at Yallourn. The *British* part will be the provision of the "capital." Does this mean that the workmen will be paid with British money, for whatever it is worth? Again, it does not. They will all draw their pay in Commonwealth notes or Commonwealth coins or by means of cheques drawn upon banks within the Commonwealth, and available for spending only within the Commonwealth.

Then where does the *British* capital come in? That is one of the mysteries of finance, which you must not dare to question, much less to understand. The Prime Minister of New Zealand showed an inquiring turn of mind in this direction a week ago, and British capital was horrified. The *Financial Times* said that his notions "spring from well-intentioned but dangerous ignorance, advanced without due appreciation of the fact that credit goes hand in hand with a strict regard to fulfilment of obligations. Challenge this, and credit immediately wobbles. When Mr. Savage appreciates this point the pother he has aroused will lie down." And the *Financial News* said: "Mr. Savage apparently means business, but we are confident it is he, and not the bondholders, who will 'think again'. No New Zealand politician, least of all a Labor politician intent on launching ambitious costly social schemes, dare face a complete closure of the London capital market. Naturally, Mr. Savage is asking for relief, and naturally, too, the bondholders will refuse, and there we may hope the matter will end."

That is pretty plain speaking, is it not? But supposing Mr. Savage, or we ourselves, decide to go ahead with "costly social schemes" in spite of "a complete closure of the London capital market." Shall we not still have the men, and the materials, and the capacity to produce Australian money as required to pay for work done in Australia? And if the London capital market—that is, the London domiciled bankers—instructed the British Parliament (it *does* instruct the British Parliament) to put an embargo on our goods

just to get even with us, who would suffer first and most? The first to suffer would be the same London capital market, which collects its perpetual toll from us only through our being able to sell our goods in Britain and thus acquire sterling. And where the peoples, as apart from the "capital markets," are concerned, who would live longest before starving if the rest of the world were submerged—those who people Britain or those who people Australia? Who, apart from this mysterious invisible "capital," have the greatest physical resources available to supply their urgent needs?

These matters are only the rudiments of common sense, and anyone but a people bamboozled with the mumbo jumbo of bankers' finance would have realised long since what a swindle is being put over them by all this talk of importing "capital."

If genuine British industries wish to establish themselves here, and if they will add to our real wealth, by all means let us extend them a hearty welcome (though we hear the Australian drug combine is not falling over itself to welcome the projected Boots enterprise from Britain). But if we are to have such industries, the cardinal essential is that *the whole* enterprise, including the proprietary interest, must be established here. Otherwise we merely intensify our present deplorable position. Constitutionally we are a sovereign country; industrially we are little better than a colony of the London "capital market," rack-rented in the interest of absentee landlords.

And our position will never be retrieved until we realise that all those things, which are physically possible to us, are likewise financially possible, whatever the London capital market may say.

Even the Worm—

Strange movements and stirrings begin to be discernible even amongst the domestic pets of high finance. In our issue of April 24 we reported the open revolt of Mr. J. L. K. Gifford, lecturer on Economics in the University of Queensland, against the hopeless doctrines of the Premiers' Plan, and his still more open derision of his brother economists for subscribing to it. A few weeks ago we had the highly diverting spectacle of Professor Giblin publicly at variance with Sir Henry Gullett. And during the past week still more University economists have begun to find their souls.

In Sydney, Mr. H. Black, lecturer in Economics in Sydney University, delivered an address before the Constitutional Association, which was so sensible that it might have been delivered by an ordinary layman. Drawing attention to the Ministry's flouting of democracy in its method of imposing by regulation the new duties to wreck our trade with Japan, Mr. Black described Cabinet's refusal to submit the matter to Parliament now as "mulish obstinacy." Mr. Lyons, he proceeded, in his nationwide broadcast had said that the entire responsibility lay with Japan, whereas the Ministry seemed to have overlooked that Australia first disturbed the status quo, and invited Japanese retaliation. A day or two earlier Professor

Copland sent a long letter to his semi-official organ, the Melbourne *Herald*, which was notable for his open challenge to the Government's spokesmen, Mr. Lyons and Sir Henry Gullett. This was the most courageous utterance we have ever seen from Professor Copland. Where the Prime Minister asked that everyone should "keep out of the ring," the Professor put on his boxing gloves, asked for the publication of all documents concerning the Australian-Japanese discussions, and actually finished by making a gesture to the Prime Minister that was on a par with the Danzig gentleman's parting salute to the League. "I hope," he said, "the pastoralists and other exporting industries . . . will not think they are under any obligation to remain inarticulate on this question. The more it is discussed the better for the country in the long run."

But the most surprising contribution of all has come from Professor Wood, Dean of the Faculty of Commerce at Melbourne University. Here are two extracts from the daily press reports of his inaugural address (on July 1) when opening a series of lectures on financial control in business: "Banks would not make sufficient credit available to enable the people to purchase the goods produced" (*Herald*, July 2). "It was clear, he argued, that in the national interests the regulation and the control of the value of money should return to the point where in fact it resided, to the Federal Government. Professor Wood held that the regulation and control of the value of currency necessarily implied the regulation and control of credit as well. That reform was so inevitable that to predict it was no longer to be regarded as a feat of prophecy. The installation of a modern and more efficient steering device would infuriate some ancient mariners, but would not be indefinitely postponed."

Coming from sources that have for so long been either silent or assenting towards economic and financial practices which are as unjust as they are unnecessary, these most recent utterances of our professional economists are

a matter for congratulation and for hope. In the past we have often criticised these men for their attitude, principally because we felt that they were insincere, and that, instead of throwing their undoubted influence into the movement for social justice, they were, through fear of their own jobs, hindering it. It is more pleasure to us to congratulate them now than it has ever been to attack them. And we sincerely trust that they will give us further cause for congratulations in the future. Even economists should remember that if they presented a united front to the common enemy—the people's enemy as well as theirs—they can't all be sacked.

THOSE HUMOROUS FRENCH!
A daily press cable from Paris on June 30: "The Government intends to make an intensive study of the means by which Australia recovered from the depression. A statement to this effect was made today after the Premier of New South Wales (Mr. Stevens) had interviewed the Minister for Finance (M. Auriol)." That reminds one of the Pope's request to J. A. Lyons to write him a memorandum on how to deal with unemployment.

SPREADING THE LIGHT

To hear Mussolini talk, one would think he was the first ever to bring light into dark places.

In the interests of national prestige, I am prompted to remind him that we have been doing it for years.

In a recent issue of the *Aeroplane*, the editor relates, with obvious pride, how the R.A.F. deals with troublesome tribes on the Indian frontier. Raise your hats and listen:—

"Each little village has a dammed reservoir, which supplies water in the dry weather and irrigates the crops. Instead of bombing the village, the R.A.F. goes for the reservoir. Ultimately, by the law of averages, one or two bombs break the dam, and away goes all the water down the valley. It removes the tribe's water supply completely, and the crops die from lack of water."

If any foreign potentate has got anything new to brag about, let him speak. Till then, lie down, little novices, lie down.

—Yaffle, in *Reynolds News*.

LIFE AMONG THE HOPELESS

VI.

By E. C. B.

[This is not a story. It happened in Melbourne this week, and is the sequel to what was related by this contributor in our issue of June 26. —Ed. N.T.]

"Bury them in batches of three!"

Jean fretted over her dead child, and worried over the little one that had been spared to her. In spite of the pleadings of Bill, she would not eat any of their scanty store of food. For five nights she sat up—silent, awake, and brooding. Bill sat up with her—loyal, tender Bill; hoping and praying that his wife would sleep—or cry!

As the nights dragged by, Jean became harder to console, and antagonistic to her mate.

Then, suddenly, one night she became talkative—venomously, virulently, bitterly raving. Hour after hour, incessantly, Bill heard all that he held fine in life degenerate into obscenity.

Slowly it dawned on him—HIS MATE WAS INSANE! He fought against the horror of it; tried to care for his little son and his demented wife.

Despair, little by little, began to corrode Bill's mind, too! Perhaps it would be better if they were all dead! He looked around the room. His hand closed on a pair of shears, Jean screamed! We went in, and Bill was soon under control, and sobbing his big heart out.

The baby has been placed under the care of the Neglected Children's Department. They took Jean away to a receiving home on Monday. She is quite mad!

Bill is a broken man.

Just one more family smashed!

How many more before you learn?

THIS HAPPENED IN MELBOURNE THIS WEEK!

WOMEN AND CHARITY

By LEONORA POLKINHORNE.

In a recent series dealing with women and their relation to various aspects of our civilisation (one is constrained to use the word civilisation for want of a better), an endeavour has been made to point out the necessity of a complete co-operation between men and women for the re-making of a better world; a world, in short, to which one could apply the word civilised without ironic intent. Such co-operation lies at the very root of life itself, and should never have been discontinued. It is a union of two tremendous forces, the dynamic and the conservative; one blazing new trails, the other conserving, building, and generally tidying up the mess. There is no question of who is the superior, for it does not matter in the least, seeing that they are not rivals, but partners. What one lacks, the other supplies. The whole root of the present world's sickness lies in the failure to realise this. It has been pointed out previously that man has achieved an astonishing material success in an exclusively male fashion; but lacking the whole human force (since he tried to plan the world all alone), he succeeded only in creating a Frankenstein monster, which threatens to destroy him. Now it becomes necessary to point out the failure of the female owing to this bad arrangement.

One of the most vicious habits into which we have fallen in these days is the habit of charity. It is not noble, nor beautiful, nor great. It is merely a slovenly, indolent and cowardly method of salving our consciences for the appalling conditions we see around us. Mostly we don't see them, and take care not to. To say that one half of the world does not know how the other half lives is understating it. In a small town like Adelaide, for instance, one suburb has scarcely any notion of the conditions of life in another. Thus, the dwellers in favoured "residential" suburbs may go through a lifetime without one glimpse of an "industrial" suburb, and consequently have only the vaguest idea of how such people live. The only contact dwellers in "residential" suburbs have with the submerged is on Fridays, when they are implored by shabby, down-at-heel men and women to "buy a button, please." Or they may occasionally toss a parcel of unwanted clothes in the Lord Mayor's basket at the Town Hall. Otherwise there is an incredible division between the two kinds of suburb, as "slumming" is not at all a fashionable pastime in Adelaide, and, anyway, there is no time for it. There are one's "social duties" (whoever was the first person to call a round of pleasures "duties", I wonder?), the annual holiday in summer, and one's duty as a citizen in attending political meetings. These political meetings are of course, conservative gatherings, where a completely receptive audience hears once more what it already knows (and that is the aloha and omega of Conservative politics in Australia)—the unceasing necessity of "keeping those dreadful Labor people down." No need for the actual personal contact with misery. Are there not organisations that deal with these things? There one has an excellent chance of getting rid of those shabby or out-of-date garments which are merely littering up the house; and then one has that splendid feeling of having "done good" thrown in, so to speak with a minimum of trouble. The clergy and others who take charge of these "gifts" increase the feeling of self-satisfaction by their gratitude and the assurance. "You don't know what good this will do." If, instead, they would gently insist on these generous donors going with them on a personally conducted tour of the slums, it is possible that some faint idea might be born in their minds that there was something not quite right in the social structure.

THE COLLECTORS.

Then there are, of course, those good ladies who go collecting for various charitable causes, such as the Children's Hospital, the Protestant Children's Home, the Boys' Orphanage, the Mothers and Babies, etc. The indictment I make against all such is their refusal to think, to ask themselves what is at the root of all this business. I indict them not only for not using their brains, but for the assistance they give, not to the poor (for they are in reality helping to injure them), but to the inhuman system that has brought about such conditions. I do not admire them. I do not applaud their unselfish services. I look on them as the tame tools who, in their feeble way, are doing their utmost to prop up the crazy economic structure and putting off its inevitable collapse.

We should not blame them, I suppose, for not using their brains, for it is only recently that women have been allowed, and seldom encouraged, to do that. They have been assured in song and story, in sermon and lecture, that the world of emotion and sentiment was theirs, and not the world of thought. We have progressed perhaps, from the days when a gallant was heard to say, "Curse me if I can endure the pretty dears to have an atom of sense," but still too much is forgiven to the mentally lazy woman. She should be made to feel that she is a menace to society. One would like to round up all these "charitable" women who firmly believe that they are doing a Christian duty with their collecting boxes, and deliver some blasts of truth to them. "Come, sit you down", one would say to them, "you shall not budge."

"You go not till I set you up a glass,
Where you may see the inmost part of you."

WHAT SHOULD BE SAID

Then one would proceed to say: "You think you are being good and doing good, but in reality you are simply being intellectually indolent, and falling back on your emotions and impulses, because it is easier to do that than to think. You have lost the habit of thinking, if you ever had it, and you are not making the least effort to regain it. Have you ever given five minutes' thought to the causes of the wretched poverty you see around you? Have you ever considered the absurdity of this house-to-house collection for social services? Did you ever ask yourselves what sort of a system we are living under, when such things are considered necessary? Have you ever asked yourselves why there is such a tragic and conspicuous lack of money everywhere while there is abundant evidence that there is no lack of anything else? Have you ever considered challenging a system that makes so wretched a provision for its hospitals, its orphans, its mothers and babies? Are you satisfied that nothing better can be done for the sick, the poor, the orphaned, the life-givers than this begging from door to door? Do you consider that we should, be proud of our 2000 years of alleged progress, alleged Christianity, when such objects as you take under your wing are left to the chance of private donation? Do you not consider that it is your duty as a citizen to make a study of these things, to challenge your clergyman, your district member about it, to make it a subject of conversation on your social visits? Do you not know (you must have heard it often enough) that we are living in a world of material prosperity, and that we are not allowed to have it; that the world's living is made but we are reduced to a wretched and degrading want? Have you heard of the 20,000,000 undernourished people of Great Britain—our Great Britain, you know, the land of hope and glory? Have you never studied the terrific figures of unemployment

throughout the world, an unemployment that should be paid leisure, but is, instead, semi-starvation and bitter humiliation? Do you think it is quite right that machinery, which was designed for man's greater happiness is causing him to be thrown on the scrap heap as a superfluous thing?

"Has it never dawned on you that as long as we acquiesce in this monstrous state of things they will go one indefinitely? Have you never considered that it is the duty of every citizen, whether man or woman—but mostly woman, because of her mother-care—to give all the thought and time possible to this most vital of all questions, and to know no rest or peace till the answer is found? If you have not done all this, your "charity" is merely a sounding brass and tinkling cymbal, and the sooner you drop it the better. Go to those who thus employ you and say you will have no more of this tinkering with effects, but that you have resolved to dig down to the causes. That will cause them, also, to do a spot of thinking, and you will already have begun to do some real good."

Yes, that is what one should say to them; but, instead, one looks angrily at them and says, "No, I have nothing for you", and they go away thinking, "What a mean, hard-hearted woman! Thank goodness they are not all like her!"

BUTTON DAYS.

Button days too, find plenty of women at street corners with boxes and badges. Here in Adelaide it is a weekly affair, and many "good" citizens express their hearty approval of it in the public press. Some rude things have been said to these women by irritated citizens, and, of course, that does no good. One might call a meeting of all charity workers and tell them the truth about the whole matter. Or women's organisations might make a special study of the thing. So far, all that they have done in this direction is to ask the Lord Mayor not to grant button-days to any society that has not an audited balance sheet! Their request was refused. So it goes on.

Imagine a button-day for cancer research! Public charity drives for an important national problem like cancer, when every woman in five and every man in seven is doomed to die of that fell disease! Surely that alone should arouse the unthinking to some sort of mental effort!

It has been truly said that the best thing we can do for our country is to think for it. Unfortunately, that is the one thing the average citizen refuses to do. Both sexes come under this condemnation; both are ruled by their emotions and prejudices rather than by their reason. Men have no excuse, because they have had the best chance through the ages to develop their mental faculties, but women face the greater responsibility because their maternal instincts should arouse their mother-wit, and it is their job, anyway, to see that the people of the world, who are their children, do not languish in poverty and misery when a little rational thinking might get them out of it.

It has already been pointed out that Florence Nightingale, when she knew that soldier comforts were in harbour, did not allow herself to be impeded by red tape in her access to them. She defied every precedent and all authority, and swiftly went after them. That was woman at her highest, proudly and resolutely asserting her determination to put humanity first. There we see a combination of brain and heart, with the heart speaking that excellent wisdom of common sense with which woman confutes and derides man's worship of symbols. Cannot the women of this day follow that example, by demanding in no uncertain voice that the wealth produced by the machine shall be given to their children by the socialisation of credit, the National Dividend and the Just Price Factor? Surely this would be a far finer and more lasting contribution than the feeble, brainless itinerary with a begging-box!

MY VIEWS ON COMMUNISM

By JOHN HOGAN

If I had my collar on backwards, I could say, "I am a Communist," without running the risk of being regarded as an associate of those political extremists who, justifiably fed up with the results of "Sound Finance," and not granted in time the opportunity of understanding the great, constructive policy of Social Credit, now find it difficult to relinquish their determined opposition to all existing forms of control and ownership.

I want boots. The responsibility of running a boot factory has not the slightest appeal to me. There seems to me no reason to believe that industry under its present ownership and control would be unwilling or unable to supply me with whatever footwear I might require if I could pay the price. That is, if I had the money. The profit incentive may have defects, but it gets results. All sections of industry are today restricting output for one reason alone—the community has not the buying power to pay profitable prices. Which, taking profit as the wages of administration, simply means that sufficient cash credits are not in circulation to cancel the costs of production. Give me the buying power, and then, after making the maximum demand on the capacity of privately-owned industry, I'll tell you whether it is inefficient or not. It is not industry's job to provide me with either work or money, but with goods. Its efficiency is judged from its production. My money must come from elsewhere.

When I, as a consumer, control the source of my purchasing power, then, it seems, I shall automatically have most effective control over industry.

In Democracy, a Government with no authority from the people to control its own credit is beholden to the banks from whom it borrows, and is directed by them. In Industry, when the people cannot finance production freely through purchasing, the nominal owners are controlled by those who supply the overdrafts on which they then become dependent, and are at the mercy of those who, by selecting not only the conditions of lending but the personnel of their borrowers, can tie up and combine industries until trusts and monopolies are the order of the day. The fact that bank directors and industrial directors are often identical arises out of the monopoly of credit. Abolish the monopoly of credit, equate the purchasing power of consumers with the producing power of industry, and you have all the control of industry and its operations that you want. What is

more, individual freedom is preserved and freedom of choice exercised.

The orthodox political Communist, so called, is also very determined that physical force is necessary to bring about any effective change. Why? The suggestion is Fascistic. If you have a majority of determined public opinion, and you have never yet had that for such an objective in our essentially revolutionary Democracy (allowing of a complete change every three years), then that majority is all-powerful, and automatically controls the much-abused "forces of the State." The power of public opinion, once it exists, is all power. To suggest that physical force will be needed is to suggest that a majority endorsement of your views is unobtainable, and that you will try by any means to impose the will of a minority on the majority. That is wrong, however right the minority may be—however slight the majority may be. The majority must exist before a constructive and democratic change is possible, and it is absurd to suggest that in the very nature of things the majority cannot be persuaded to follow the right in time.

Of course, if the majority were thwarted, every reformer would agree to any steps required to ensure its supremacy and the maintenance of democracy. Our present job is to awaken the majority. When we've got them, then let us talk about making them effective. We'll find it unnecessary—Parliament will long since have acted. But if that view is wrong, of course, well . . . Anyway, Communist or not, surely you'll join in awakening the majority to demand results, and not antagonise them by suggesting destruction.

Finally, the question of ideals. We're all Communists in our ideals. We all visualise wistfully a state of economic Christianity—not regimented State Capitalism, with the freedom of the individual crushed, but well, the perfect State. All we do is really directed to that glorious goal. How far ahead, we do not know. Economic Christianity. Embodying the grand statement of America's Declaration of Independence: "The Inalienable Right of Man to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." We all join now in breaking down the obstacle of the private Money Power that stands between us and the continuance of progress towards that goal today. And afterwards we'll no doubt instinctively do what is necessary to keep going. Humanity seems to have muddled along.

VICTORIA'S EXPANSION CAMPAIGN APPEAL To Raise £500 Fighting Funds Immediately

DID YOU READ THIS VITAL ANNOUNCEMENT
LAST WEEK?

IF SO, WHAT HAVE YOU DONE?
IF NOT, READ IT NOW, THOROUGHLY,
AND THEN ACT!

"If you can't join us in the front line, don't stand and admire—come on with the ammunition when it's needed for a smashing offensive."

Loyalty Certificates Now Ready
1/-, 2/-, 5/-, 10/-, £1

(£1 Certificates convey Life Membership of Movement if desired.)

BUY THEM YOURSELF. SELL THEM YOURSELF.
WE ARE RELYING ON YOU TO STAND BEHIND US AND SEE US THROUGH THE NEXT FEW VITAL WEEKS AND MONTHS TO A SOLID, WELL-ESTABLISHED FOOTING.

Write in immediately to G.R. Trenoweth, State Organising Secretary, with your contributions and requests for books of certificates.

VICTORIA IS GETTING UNDER WAY.
DOUGLAS CREDIT MOVEMENT OF VICTORIA ROOM 8,
BLOCK ARCADE MELBOURNE

SLUMS

By BRUCE H BROWN

(iii.)

(Continued from our last issue.)

Empty stomachs, like unemployment, must be a secondary consideration. Our slum abolitionists talk only of better houses within the rent-paying capacity of the slum victims. That was the professed intention of the slum reformers in England, but their efforts have resulted in an increase of debt and death. Our own philanthropists and charity-dispensers are heading in the same direction, for, so far as I have been able to find out, their plans make no provision at all for putting the all-important question of *incomes* on a more satisfactory basis. On the contrary, they are standing behind the interests responsible for the financial manipulation, which has caused the debasement of our standards and the increasing poverty round about us.

Names prominently associated with the local slum abolition activi-

MR. ABBOTT AGAIN

A heavy fall in wool and wheat prices would imperil Australia's recovery and cause anguish in the homes of many who remembered too well the unemployment of the last few years . . . Perhaps the most charitable thing to say about the Ministry's action was, "Lord, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

—Mr. J. P. Abbott, president of the Graziers' Association of N.S.W., and member of the Monetary Commission, July 1.

ties have also been prominently associated with the Premiers' Plan and the policy of low wages; and although they admit that finance is their only difficulty, they say never a word about the nature and origin of it, or of the small anti-social clique who control it to the detriment of the rest of the community. Indeed some of them have actually subscribed to the callous attitude of the banking system as expressed in a circular issued by the National Bank in May, 1932, in which it said that no proposal for financial assistance to the Government would be approved—"Unless it is accompanied by definite indications that the Governments are doing all things necessary to reduce their expenditure in keeping with the conditions of the times. This would involve . . . additions to unemployment, but the problem of resultant unemployment is secondary." That, mark you, was issued at a time when more of the things we need in everyday living were being produced than ever, but a plenitude of goods could not be allowed to interfere with the bankers' dictum that there was to be a shortage of money. This shows how important it is that men with the idea that money is paramount should be shown unmistakably that we want nothing to do with their ideas, and how necessary it is that they be relentlessly swept out of all positions of public influence.

BOOKS ON MONETARY REFORM

Why Poverty In the Midst of Plenty? By the Dean of Canterbury . . . 8d.
ABC of Social Credit. By C. Barclay Smith . . . 7d.
Dividends for All By C. Barclay Smith . . . 7d.
Tell Me the Story Simply. By W. H. T. Duggan . . . 7d.
Modern Problems and Mental Attitudes. By Rev. J. T. Lawton . . . 1/1
Economic Democracy. By C. H. Douglas . . . 5/10
Credit Power and Democracy. By C. H. Douglas . . . 6/10
Social Credit. By C. H. Douglas . . . 8/4
The Breakdown of the Employment System. By C. H. Douglas . . . 4d.
Monopoly of Credit. By C. H. Douglas . . . 6/3
AN OUTLINE of Social Credit. By H.M.M.
The Douglas Manual

ALL POST FREE
Obtainable from The Douglas Social Credit Movement, Room 8, The Block Melbourne

They must be replaced by men determined to see that money is managed so as to completely fulfill the needs of the community, instead of being used to thwart, limit, and even prevent their fulfillment. If unemployment, which means loss of wages, is secondary, then empty stomachs, which result from loss of wages, must also be secondary.

A LESSON FROM JAPAN

In this respect it would seem that we could learn a useful lesson from the Japanese War Chief, Sadao Araki. He dreams of the time when the Japanese people will no longer talk in terms of money, whether in regard to external debt or internal bonds. "The illness of the world", he said, "is not yet diagnosed. We don't know where to put the plaster. To paste a plaster on the head is no use when one has a stomachache. When the right place is found the plaster must be applied immediately. I can't understand why people fiddle round so much. Now take all this talk of surplus rice causing trouble. People complain about that in one breath and then in the next wonder what to do about undernourished school children. With surplus rice there should be no undernourished children. Yet what are the officials doing about it? Such matters should not be left to charity. If it is money that is wanted, I will find it somehow." In other words, money will not be allowed to interfere with the happiness of the people. Has any Australian military general given expression to common sense like that? Not one. They are all money-mesmerised.

Since then, and this only a couple of weeks ago, the Japanese Minister of Finance told Sir F. Leith Ross, economic adviser to the British Government and representative of Montagu Norman, that Japan would not attempt to assist China while she remained tied to the Western ideas of finance. And later still we have had the public admission of our own Prime Minister that all the present trouble regarding our trade relations is due to Japan's greater knowledge and more sensible use of finance. He did not put it that way, of course, but his admission that Australia's action has been taken because Britain can't compete with Japan's prices means the same thing, for it is merely evidence that in Japan money is brought into existence to meet all national requirements.

We also have the word of an American journalist who lived many years in Japan, Manchuria and China that "in Japan, militarism does not mean an army acting as policeman for the wealthy manufacturers and financiers as has usually been the case in the West." In addition to this, the Japanese historian, Fukuchi, says, "A person living from another's labour is a criminal according to fundamental national ideas." It is also known that no new invention is held in cold storage in Japan to protect vested interests. The discovery of such a situation would be followed immediately by drastic action on the part of the Japanese Patriotic Society of the Black Dragons, action of the kind we recently saw when members of the leading financial houses were assassinated. From this it is clear that the military leaders of Japan are aware of the Western money swindle, which keeps the people of all such countries in absolute subjection to the few who operate the swindle. In the true sense, the Japanese Army and Navy are the radical element of the country, and they know exactly how the people are robbed and who do the robbing. If our military leaders were similarly intelligent and were imbued with similar ideals for the good of the people at large we would feel inspired to support them.

No one can truthfully deny that Money alone stands in the way of the abolition of poverty and all the objectionable things which

emanate from it. No one can truthfully deny that *Money* is merely a system of tickets and figures, practically all of which has its origin in an inkpot. No one can truthfully deny that all we need to remove the difficulties of undernourishment, slums, hospital accommodation, decent wages for nurses, government and municipal finance, and so on are more figures in the finance accounting books and more money symbols available to the people in the form of money tickets. No one can truthfully deny that the only reason we are short of these figures and tickets is because of the surrender to a private monopoly by the Commonwealth Government of its sovereign power to create the people's money and to control the financial policy of the country. No one can truthfully deny that the Commonwealth's trading difficulties are due to the shortage of money tickets in the hands of the Australian people. And no one can truthfully deny that so long as we permit the existing financial arrangements to continue, all efforts to rectify our national ills must fail.

WORK FOR A LIVING.

All this being so, is it not obvious that instead of talking of *work* and *unemployment* we should be demanding the monetisation and distribution of our increasingly abundant production? Anyone who says we must *work* "to earn our living" should be required to explain what he means. In the present stage of mechanisation and use of solar power it is as though we had a great and increasing heap of food in front of us, but must not touch it until we have "done something" to earn it. This philosophy applies, of course, only to the "working class"—the other

If Great Britain went to war with a European Power, the British people would never consent to the British Fleet being sent from European waters to defend Australia, because the heart of the Empire would be left undefended. This would mean that for probably a long time Australia would have to rely on its own resources.
—Lt.-Gen. Sir Talbot Hobbs, July 1.

Australia is generally admitted in Government circles to have only one potential enemy—Japan. In view of the above, what of the Government's present attitude towards this nation, which desires, rather, to be our friendly customer?

class, being of different clay, is not included in this work complex, and may not only hoe into the heap of food, but actually select the best of it without any conditions at all!

This "work to earn a living" idea is advanced by those who benefit from the private manufacture of money and regard all others as "the working class." Sir Robert Knox, representing Australian employers, told the International Labour Conference at Geneva, on June 19, that "it was conceivable that the workers' lot was pleasanter and better in every way by working the present 44 hours a week than it would be if they worked only 40 hours. Forty-four hours' work would obtain for them more of the good things of life than 40 hours' work." Is it true that if we work longer, we will obtain more, and if we work less we must obtain less? Are machines, solar energy, science, and the like not to enter into the question at all? Did farmers obtain more of "the good things of life" when they slaved from before daylight till after dark in recent years? They did not, and no one knows better than the primary producer that his access to the good things of life is governed by the *price* he can get, and *not* by the hours he works. If it were governed by hours the men on the land would all be millionaires. Unfortunately, their returns are controlled by the swindling fellows who determine financial "vales" through control of our money supplies.

ONLY TWO CLASSES

There are only two "classes" in the community—the workers

and the value manipulators—and up to now the benefits and "the good things of life" have gone to the latter. This is why Sir Robert Knox, who does not include himself in the "working class", would be able to get the good things without working for them, and without any conditions as to the "hours" he should observe. Increased "work" on his part has not been the explanation of the very considerable increases in his own income, the fact being that he is continually receiving "something for nothing", regardless of its effects on the community at large. He is typical of the select few whose financial position grows stronger and stronger at the expense of slums, malnutrition, human scrap, sweating, poverty, misery, bankruptcies, suicides, and the rest of the products of the money swindle.

Lack of work is no reason whatever for deprivation of income. The only purpose of work is to produce or convert the gifts of the earth into articles for use or enjoyment. If machines are doing this "work", and actually making the things available in increasing quantities, what sort of work shall we ask our citizens to undertake in order that they may "earn their living"? By the very act of bearing us, our mothers "earned" our living for us, and God in His wisdom has fully provided the materials, which are necessary to give us that living. God will not be outdone in generosity, either, and, as John Hogan reminds us, He never sends an invoice with His gifts. If we took a census of all the people outside what is called the "working class" to find out what work they, do "to earn their living", the invariable reply would be, "I don't work. I live on the dividends I receive." Those people are able to live comfortably because they receive sufficient money tickets to give them claim to the things made available by machines and the "work" of a decreasing number of other people. If they did not receive the tickets they could not get the goods, and without the nourishment of good food and the protective warmth of good clothes their bodies would display the same reactions as we see in the slum areas. Nothing but the lack of these money claims causes the pressing problem of the slums as we have it today.

WORKING FOR TICKETS.

We therefore suggest that we *do not* work to "earn" our living. We work today that we may get hold of some bankers' tickets as a licence to get some goods on which to exist, so that we may be ready for work again tomorrow, and that we work in this sense only because we are the serfs of the controllers of the banking system. The power rests absolutely in the hands of the ticket manufacturers, and it is because the ticket manufacture is in the hands of an unscrupulous monopoly that so many of our people are suffering the privations of want

AUTOMATIC TELEPHONES —
AUTOMATIC ACCOUNTS—WHAT
OF THE SAVED LABOUR?

The preparation of telephone accounts will be greatly facilitated by an addressograph machine, which has just been installed at the General Post Office, Spencer-street. The machine, which is the first of its type in Australia, cuts a roll of paper into account sheets, prints on both sides of the sheet, and also perforates and punches the sheets ready for mailing.

—"Argus," July 4.

The machine is stated elsewhere in the press to prepare 45 accounts a minute, and to have cost only £2000.

in the midst of great abundance. So long as this monster can perpetuate the lie that we must "work to earn our living", hopelessness must continue to be the only outlook of the poor devils whose "work" is not wanted. We do not want the work of the mansion-dwellers of Toorak or Darling Point, but they suffer no disability because of that, and this is the principle that must be extended to the rest of the community in relation to the wages of the machine—the new "worker." The earth and its fullness are yours and mine by inheritance, and the only "work" necessary is the amount required to convert this fullness into serviceable goods. When that has been done, whether manually or by machinery, the fullness must be distributed equitably to all of us. Then, *and only then*, will it be possible to abolish poverty and the slums it breeds, and the first necessity towards the consummation of this is for the community to regain control of its own credit.

(To be concluded.)

DO NOT ARGUE ABOUT
SOCIAL CREDIT

WITH—
THE POLITICIAN
THE BANKER
THE ACCOUNTANT
THE BUSINESS MAN
GIVE HIM A COPY OF

"CAPITAL AND INCOME"
AND TEST HIS INTELLIGENCE.

"CAPITAL and INCOME"

By Joseph T. Hollow, M.B., Ch.B.
Price, 6d.; posted, 7d.

Order your copy from
NEW TIMES PTY. LTD., Box 1226, G.P.O.,
Melbourne,
or through your newsagent.

WRONG AGAIN—THE SANCTIONS ISSUE

By "AQUARIUS."

It is fair to say that at the close of the First World War in 1918, and for several years afterwards, there was a general belief, fostered by the pronouncements of men in positions of influence...

In the sphere of finance no less a personage than the Warburg who had founded the Federal Reserve Board of America gave out an assurance that the bankers had the situation well in hand.

In the industrial sphere it was plain to everyone that the war had

power, an appalling and ever-increasing growth of debt to the international banking system, and a generally accepted idea that the true end of an economic system was to provide work. It disclosed a system, which distributed goods and services through the same agency...

This explained (and still explains) the increasing necessity for economic sabotage and the colossal waste of effort which goes on in every walk of life.

In 1923 we find Douglas addressing a committee of the Canadian House of Commons and voicing the following ominous warning: "I am convinced that if you continue along the lines that you are following at present...

To this committee he explained that "under the present system wages, salaries and dividends distributed over, say, a period of one year are not available in the hands of the buying public to buy the production of that year; they have in a considerable measure returned to the credit system from which they emerged during that year."

"You have under the present system really no alternative between an almost unmanageable unemployment problem and a policy of modified inflation which results quite inevitably in a fairly rapid rise in prices. If you follow the first line and restrict your credits and so forth you are absolutely bound to have a most formidable political problem resulting out of unemployment."

"The result is a fiercer and fiercer external competition to export, and a more strenuous competition for external markets to dispose of the stuff which you cannot sell in your own country, and to dispose of it externally with a view to getting export credits into the country to keep your machine going."

Since 1919 a small but ever-increasing body of men—plain, ordinary men in every walk of life—have grasped the significance of Douglas's diagnosis and proposals. Armed with this understanding

they, too, have been able correctly to foretell the fate of the various palliative measures from time to time adopted by the monopoly of finance and its political satellites.

The orthodox prophets have continued to prophesy falsely, as indeed they have been paid to do by their masters, and they are apparently completely unabashed by the failures of their fancies to run anywhere but a consistently bad last.

THE SANCTIONS FARCE

Social Credit journals throughout the world, on the other hand, so far back as October and November of last year, correctly foretold the failure of sanctions and so-called collective security. They were able to point out immediately that Mussolini was merely carrying orthodox tenets to their logical conclusion in attacking Abyssinia.

He is, however, not the only mad dog of Europe. This same necessity to find work and markets afflicted all his neighbours, and rendered abortive any attempt to enforce economic sanctions, which by their very nature entail the loss of markets with consequent unemployment at home.

To quote a Social Credit publication of November 1935, "sanctions had to fail because there is not a government in the world which is not publicly committed to finding employment for its subjects, and markets for its produce."

In the case of oil sanctions there was the additional fact that the oil companies are huge international monopolies, which can snap their fingers at governments. The British Government plumped heavily for sanctions. This Government is a majority shareholder in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. (local branch, C.O.R.), but has not a majority on the directorate.

WHAT ORTHODOXY FORETOLD.

And now let us turn to the pitiable forecasts of orthodoxy with respect to sanctions.

Mr. Eden, in Britain, backed the sanctions horse to win hands down, and so did his colleagues.

In Australia the Government rushed a Bill through the House, and went so far as to compel the resignation of a Cabinet Minister who voiced his humble opinion that sanctions would prove (a) futile, or (b) effective, in which latter case they would lead to war.

Mr. Menzies stated that the Government's "adherence to a policy of sanctions is based upon its profound belief that collective action will be productive, not of war, but of the prevention or limitation of war."

The Economist (orthodox City of London publication), so late as

February 8, 1936, went on record as follows:—

(1) "The scales of destiny are now perceptibly inclining against the aggressor."

(2) "Mr. Eden, General Hertzog, and M. Titulescu, and their colleagues in fifty countries, are determined to make sure that a flagrant and certified act of aggression shall not be rewarded with success."

(3) "Signor Mussolini's prospects of success are receding all along the line. In the first place his army is in difficulties on the Northern front, where his main force is concentrated and where his prestige is at stake. In the second place the existing sanctions are proving effective as far as they go. In the third place the dreaded oil sanction is looming up again, and, finally, the League of Nations' united front is not only holding fast, but is visibly consolidating."

THE SEQUEL.

And now what? Just seven months later—

Mr. Menzies: "It seems to me that the recent decision to end sanctions was inevitable."

Mr. Eden: "There is no longer any utility in continuing these measures as a means of exerting pressure on Italy. Sanctions have failed."

The word-swallowing convulsions of the Economist are not yet to hand, or perhaps such are City of London standards of intellectual honesty that none are expected.

Mr. Menzies went on to suggest the rebuilding of the League on the lowest common denominator—with each nation to decide how far it would act against an aggressor like Italy. In effect this would result in each nation saying to an aggressor nation: "Tut-tut! You naughty aggressor," and proceeding to sell to it (probably on credit) all the materials necessary to blow the victim nation apart (as America did in the last war).

Sanctions have failed because they cut across the grain of the holiest of holies of the financial system, the achievement of an export surplus. The bankers are ready to supply credits against wealth sent out of a country, but not against that same wealth remaining in a country. Sanctions have failed also because international finance did not care to risk forcing Mussolini to take charge of Italy's monetary system.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The position now is that the fiction of collective security has been exploded, and there are already signs of an armament race and the old system of secret alliances. The world is marching steadily to that tragedy which Major Douglas foretold—simply, because no nation will put its own monetary system in order so that its own production is fully represented by purchasing power in the pockets of its own subjects.

The question before you, Citizens of Australia, is whether you will demand that this reform be instituted here, or whether you will follow to hell on this earth the Warburgs who "have the situation in hand," the Coplands who said in 1929 that the depression would be mild and short of duration, the Menzies and the Edens who pinned their pathetic trust in sanctions and collective security, the thousand and one who have talked of turning the corner and have hoped to deal with a problem of glut by "means involving a common sacrifice." Are you never going to listen to the message of salvation, which has been hammering at your skulls since 1919? The cure for the economic mess is simple. Open the national credit account! Issue the National Dividend, and institute the scientific price discount.

Down with the bankster combine and the economics of death!

Queensland Douglas Credit Party Notes

The State Art Union, with its attractive first prize of one thousand 1/- shares in the Golden Casket, is showing itself a "winner" from the jump. As the tickets cost only 3d each, the acute shortage of purchasing power makes it all the more attractive to those who have no scruples about a "little flutter."

The "Tin Lizzie" Fund is crawling along on two cylinders only; but Mr. J. Apps and the Ascot Branch have each sent in £1 Mr. Ford is becoming anxious lest he should not have to donate the £10; do hurry and make him look anxious that he will have to "part up." Fifteen more subscriptions of £1 are needed. Who will be the next?

The first Queensland Social Credit paper has just been born. It is called the Queensland Social Credit News. It is a hefty lad, with a

"EXCEEDINGLY SENSITIVE."

"London is exceedingly sensitive to any suggestions of variation of contractual obligations. This was well demonstrated last week by the criticism that followed an intimation that New Zealand might seek a reduction of interest on external loans."—"Argus," July 5.

We remember this same sensitiveness on the part of London, otherwise the City, otherwise the bankers, when Mr. Lang made a similar intimation in regard to N.S.W. But we fail to recollect that any great sensitiveness was displayed in the same quarter when Britain, with nearly £200 millions of gold in the Bank of England, varied her contractual obligations to the U.S.A. to the extent of outright default.

lusty cry, though at present he will only cry once a month. Even thus, his "howls" will cause considerable disturbance to the money-mongers, whose underground exercises have undermined their nerves. The activities of the Party will now be even more fully broadcast than heretofore. The first issue of the paper is a very creditable one indeed, and reflects great credit on the editor and the International Publishing Company of Brisbane.

The State Secretary, Mr. G. H. Gray, and the Wide Bay organiser, Mr. G. H. Nichols, will undertake a combined tour of portion of the Wide Bay Division. The meetings will begin on the North Coast on Monday, July 20, and the following itinerary will be arranged:—Monday, 20: Palmwoods (Mr. Gray), Buderim (Mr. Nichols); Tuesday, 21: Maroochy River (Mr. Gray), Mapleton (Mr. Nichols); Wednesday, 22: Cooran (Mr. Gray), Sky-rings Creek (Mr. Nichols); Thursday, 23: Cotharaba (Mr. Gray), Kin Kin (Mr. Nichols); Friday, 24, Cooroy (Mr. Gray), Eumundi (Mr. Nichols); Saturday, 25: Tandur (Mr. Gray), Cedar Pocket (Mr. Nichols); Monday, 27: Goombourian (Mr. Gray), Canina (Mr. Nichols); Tuesday, 28, Veteran (Mr. Gray), Long Flat (Mr. Nichols); Wednesday, 29: Maryborough, meeting to be arranged. The 30th and 31st and August 1 will be spent in the area of the Burrum District Council. Members and supporters in these districts may secure further particulars from the local branches or direct from State headquarters. It is intended to do the balance of the Wide Bay Division later in the year, about September or October.

A remarkable coin detector, installed by the Bank of New South Wales, is shown in the current issue of the Herald-Cinesound News Review. This amazing machine infallibly detects spurious coins, and is seen at work separating the bad coins from the good. "Herald," July 4. Wanted: A machine that will infallibly detect the spurious use of our national financial credit by the private bankers.

not lessened the world's productive capacity in spite of several years devoted to large scale destruction. On the contrary, productive capacity, both in plant and knowledge how, had increased at least threefold.

The cry went up for ever more and more production as the road to paradise.

With one accord these prophets of the millennium had failed to understand the fundamentals of the economic system under which they were living. The war was attributed by them to moral causes, to unholy aims of military aggrandisement, to anything in short but the true cause. They failed to appreciate that the factors which had caused the war were still operating unchecked, and indeed more viciously.

THE REAL CAUSE OF WAR

It was at this stage that the voice of C. H. Douglas was raised in protest, and in "Economic Democracy," published in 1919, we find a complete analysis of the ills of the economic system, coupled with a thorough specification for their cure. The analysis disclosed a system built upon regimentation and Sisyphism, a chronic insufficiency of distributed purchasing

THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY Proposed Visit to Australia. The State executives of the Douglas Credit Movement in Australia propose to invite the Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Hewlett Johnson) to visit Australia in September next to conduct a nationwide lecturing tour. To cover any possible unliquidated expenses, a guarantee of £500 will be required. Victoria's share will be £120. Interested persons willing to guarantee a portion of this amount, should it be required, are asked to fill in the form below and to forward it to the State Secretary, Douglas Credit Movement of Victoria. Room 8, Block Arcade, Elizabeth-street, Melbourne. No money should be sent with the form. GUARANTEE FORM. The Dean of Canterbury's Nation-Wide Lecturing Tour Guarantee Fund. I, the undersigned, will if called upon subscribe £... .. to the above fund. Signed... .. Address... ..

