

ON OTHER PAGES:

THE BIG IDEA (Page 2.)

MACHIAVELLI
OUTDONE. (Page 3.)

A BAITED TRAP.
(Page 4.)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 8. No. 34. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, AUGUST 28, 1942.

Now, when our
land to ruin's
brink is verging.

In God's name,
let us speak while
there is time!

Now, when the
padlocks for our
lips are forging,
Silence is crime.

Whittier (1807-1892).

You Were Not Taught This History At School!

William Cobbett And The Financial System

A most enlightening lecture to the Association to Defend British Culture was given in Melbourne last Saturday evening. The lecturer was Mr. Eric D. Butler.

We have pleasure in publishing the following notes of his address:

"The blame is not the landowner's . . . it is due to the infernal funding and taxing system, which, of necessity, drives property into large masses in order to save itself; which crushes little proprietors down into labourers; and which presses them down in that state, there takes their wages from them and makes them paupers, their share of food and raiment being taken away to support debt and dead-weight, and army, and all the rest of the enormous expenses, which are required to sustain this intolerable system. Those, therefore, are fools or hypocrites who affect to wish to better the lot of the poor labourers and manufacturers, while they, at the same time, either actively or passively, uphold the system, which is the manifest cause of it. Here is a system which, clearly as the nose upon your face, you see taking away the little gentleman's estate, the little farmer's farm, the poor labourers meat dinner and Sunday coat; and while you see this so plainly, you, fool or hypocrite, as you are, cry out for supporting the system that causes it all! Go on, base wretch; but remember, that of such progress dreadful must be the end."

No, the above extract is not from the writings of a contemporary writer on economic democracy. It is from a book written approximately 120 years ago. The name of that book is "Rural Rides," and the author William Cobbett.

Cobbett was a remarkable man, a man who saw clearly, even in his time, what was wrecking England.

His work has been deliberately neglected, although I hear that he is to be studied as a part of the Leaving English course at the Melbourne University next year. But, I venture to say, that he will only be studied from a literary viewpoint, and that the material studied will not contain any reference to banking or the Jews.

A Product of Rustic England

Let us examine a few facts about the life of this man. He was born in 1762, a typical product of rustic England. It has been written that ". . . through him speak a thousand Cobbetts, too horny-handed to hold a pen, hairy, weather-stained, deep-chested yeomen and peasants; yet not one of them, I dare say, a better man than this Farnham farmer's boy, whose weapons included the sword, the spade, the voice, and the pen."

"His father was a farmer. His mother could not even write. But this was no disgrace in the eyes of her third son, William, who, in latter years, showed that he appreciated real values in life. He wrote of a certain woman, in his book, 'Cottage Economy': She had brought up forty children and grandchildren, and had it said of her that she had done more work than any other woman in Sussex; and that there was not a working man or woman who had not, first or last, either resided or been fed under her roof; and though she could neither read nor write, understood well the making of bread, the

brewing of beer, the keeping of cows, the raising of pigs, the salting of meat, the rearing of poultry, the obtaining of money, the making of rushes to serve instead of candles . . ."

I wonder how many "progressive" bureaucrats could do those real things

Cobbett grew up as a farmer's boy. He came under the influence of Swift at the age of 11. (I wonder if he ever read Swift's little-known book, "The Expulsion of the Jews from England," now unprocurable anywhere.) He joined the British Army and taught himself to write English while a private on sixpence a day. He subsequently wrote a splendid English Grammar, far better than I have yet seen produced by the "great" educationalists. He mastered French, and also wrote a French Grammar. He then wrote a simple book on mathematics. What do the planners say to this? He developed a remarkable literary style. "What descriptions, what opinions, what campaigns of words! It is like watching a man, a confident, free-speaking man, with a fine head, a thick neck, and a voice and gestures peculiarly his own, standing up in a crowd, a head taller than the rest, talking democracy despotically." His literary output over nearly 50 years of writing was prolific. Farming, history, economics, and other subjects were dealt with soundly. In my pamphlet, "The War Behind The War," I have quoted from his scholarly book, "The Jews in England." That book is never mentioned in any list of Cobbett's

works. It is one of my treasured possessions, because there are very few copies in existence now.

He was exiled to America in 1817 because of his attacks on the Jews and the bankers. He sat in the British Parliament of 1832.

All my extracts in these notes are from "Rural Rides," written by Cobbett as he moved about England on horseback. He was then over 50. What a remarkable and detailed report! I consider it a magnificent piece of history, entirely different from the reporting we get today by our "modern" writers. All emphasis is Cobbett's.

The Jews

A great deal of opposition to Cobbett was created by his work on the growth of Jewish control of the English landowners as a result of the financial system. Here is a typical extract:—

"It is, upon the whole, a most magnificent seat, and the Jews will not be able to get it from the present owner; though, if he live many years, they will give even him a twist. If I had time, I would make out an actual survey of one whole county, and find out how many of the old gentry have lost their estates, and have been supplanted by the Jews, since Pitt began his reign. I am sure I should prove that, in number, they are one-half extinguished. But it is now that they go. The little ones (Continued on page 7.)

DIETITIANS WIN FIRST ROUND IN FIGHT FOR THEIR RIGHTS

Those dietitians who attended the session of the Victorian Legislative Assembly on Wednesday, August 19, to hear the debate on the Dietitians' Registration Bill, must have been considerably heartened and delighted by the addresses delivered by the members for Collingwood and Brighton respectively.

Skill in debate and swiftness in thrust and parry were surely never displayed to better advantage by Mr. Tunnecliffe than in his opening speech, which dealt exhaustively with all the serious implications contained in this apparently innocuous piece of legislation. Any lingering doubts as to the real purpose behind the Bill must have been dispersed in the cold light of reason turned upon it by Mr. Macfarlan, who brought to the subject an analytical quality of mind developed through long experience in the legal profession. His address, listened to by members and public alike in intent silence, made patent the fact that consulting dietitians had been justified in feeling the same misgivings which the member for Brighton so forcibly and convincingly expressed.

Amongst the most interesting points brought out in the course of the debate was the adverse effect of the Bill upon various individuals, institutions, and colleges of physical culture, which did not appear, at first sight, to come within the scope of its provisions. These included chiropractors, osteopaths, nurses from training hospitals, baby health centres, the Warburton Sanitarium, and the physical culture organisation founded by the late Mr. Clarence Weber. It was further established that neither the general public nor those persons vitally affected, as mentioned above, had asked for the Bill, but that it was inspired by a select coterie at the University of Melbourne, who had not yet reached the

stage of issuing Diplomas in Dietetics. As Mr. Macfarlan so aptly expressed it; "maybe this little coterie is desirous of placing a close fence round its interests . . . and of preventing competition by persons who have had many years' practical experience and study."

A certain amount of hostility towards any attempt to "corner healing" was also refreshingly evident, and the opinions of leading doctors in Great Britain upon this aspect of the question were quoted with good effect by Mr. Tunnecliffe. Several members, including Mr. Everard, Deputy Leader of the U.A.P., spoke very feelingly of the injustice done by a Board set up under a previous Bill, to Mr. Saunders, the well-known masseur; an injustice which it required a special Act of Parliament to remedy. It was apparent from the trend of the debate that many members feared lest similar discrimination might be shown against so-called "lay dietitians" by the proposed Dietitians' Board, composed of medical men or hostile University nominees. The general feeling of the House seemed to be that such a Board should be elected by the dietitians themselves, and that a Select Committee should be appointed to remove glaring anomalies in the Bill and to reconcile all the various points at issue.

When, during the course of a long address, Mr. Holland stressed the point that Sister Kenny, unappreciated in her own country, but ac-

(Continued on page 8.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

According to the Melbourne "Sun" of August 14, implementing conscription in Quebec led to shooting affrays when the police endeavoured to serve the notices. The loyalty of Canadians, and their desire to assist the war effort is not disputed; but, seemingly, they resent being conscripted, and regard it as an insult to their British traditions of freedom. They are apparently of the opinion that if they are to fight against totalitarianism abroad, they are not going to have it imposed on them by dictators within their own country.

SECOND FRONT: Mrs. Roosevelt (who often appears to be more realistic than her husband), in reply to questions and enquiries for a "second front" at a public gathering, asked those clamouring for this move "if they could supply her with details about the number of ships and supplies available and required." What a nasty blow for these self-styled war experts, who, incidentally, are not likely to take an active part in the suggested action. It is to be hoped that such a forthright statement does not cause trouble in the Roosevelt domestic sphere.

NEW ORDERS: Much ink is being spilt in praising the "New Order" ut-

terances of Mr. Anthony Eden and Mr. Cordell Hull, of Britain and U.S., which appeared (as if by accident) simultaneously—and the daily press duly did the rest; two facts, which suggest that careful consideration tempered with suspicion, is required. Like most statements on this matter, they are identical in so far as they lack any reference to the individual's freedom to manage his own affairs, and it should be remembered that the views featured by the daily press are those of men who led the people into the present mess, and who therefore are quite unlikely to be capable of pointing the way out. Moral: Beware of press boost, and those they boost.

(Continued on page 6.)

ASSIGNMENT IN UTOPIA

Reprinted from the book of that name, by Eugene Lyons, formerly the United Press correspondent in Moscow, etc.

(Continued from last issue.)

BOOK I. PRELUDE TO MOSCOW. III. On the Eve of Fascism.

In the autumn of 1920, Italian workers seized the metal plants in Milan and ran up the red flag. Hope of world revolution, dimmed by reverses elsewhere, flared up once more. And since I thought the impending Italian revolution needed its John Reed out of America no less than its Russian precursor, I was soon in the steerage of an Italian liner bound for Naples. I was equipped with credentials from the Federated Press, a struggling labour news agency, and the "Liberator"; one cardboard suitcase half-stuffed with paper to keep my worldly belongings from rattling; and that weeks' salary from "Financial America" by way of sinews of war.

The long hand of Italian anarcho-syndicalism (via a well-placed word from Carlo Tresca) reached down into the bowels of the ship and yanked me up into the comforts of officers' quarters. On deck I struck up an acquaintance with a slim, shy fellow a few years my senior, Norman Matsen by name. He, too, was inclined to push the ship along for fear of missing the revolution. For a day or two, we pretended to be the plenipotentiaries of respectable capitalist journals. Then we looked one another straight in the eyes, laughed, and laid our cards—that is to say, our press credentials—on the table. He, too, was exclusive and authenticated correspondent for the Federated Press and the "Liberator," and a candidate for the role of Italy's John Reed. Norman and I shared a room, our deficits, and our soaring thoughts in the next six months, and discovered that Italy was brimming over with potential John Reeds, all representing the Federated Press and the "Liberator." If the Italian proletariat failed to live up to our expectations, at least Italy did not. Naples was an extravagant dream come true. We explored its narrow streets and smelling cafes and stuffy music halls. We hunted up comrades at Socialist Party headquarters and wrote reams of "first impressions" which, alas! never got printed. We helped a scared and bungling secret service man, assigned to shadow us, to make out his report and treated him to black coffees. We mixed with Neapolitans in a daze of intoxication that blended the Bay of Naples and "Viva Lenin e Trotsky!" Pompei and socialist mass meetings, everything exotically old and desperate, with the Soviets around the corner.

Then came Rome and the Pension Dinesen and socialist Deputies and Roman girls who exchanged Italian and kisses for English and kisses. We went into homes in crowded side streets, where grimy children answered to the name of Lenin and Trotsky and Karl Leibknecht and Rosa Luxembourg — thousands of these little Lenins and Liebknechts were destined to be hurriedly rechristened after the fascist March on Rome. We watched fist fights on the floor of Parliament and saw the earlier castor-oil episodes in the rebirth of the glory that was Rome. How I managed to pay the rent and board at the "pension" is a miracle somewhat blurred in memory. A few articles in the "Nation" helped; a dollar went a long way when turned into inflated lire.

Fred Moore, by the time I left for Italy, was in full command of an obscure case in Boston involving a fishmonger named Bartolomeo Vanzetti and a shoemaker named Nicola Sacco. He had given me explicit instructions to arouse all of Italy to the significance of the Massachusetts murder case, and to hunt up certain witnesses and evidence. The Italian Labour movement, however, had other things to worry about. An ex-socialist named Benito Mussolini, and a locust plague of blackshirts, for instance. Somehow I did get pieces about Sacco and Vanzetti into "Avanti!" which Mussolini had once edited, and into one or two other papers. I even managed to stir up few socialist

"onorevoles," like Deputy Mucci from Sacco's native village in Puglia, and Deputy Misiano, a Sicilian firebrand at the extreme Left. Mucci brought the Sacco-Vanzetti affair to the floor of the Chamber of Deputies, the first jet of foreign protest in what was eventually to become a pounding international flood.

Norman and I went to Livorno to witness the epochal congress of the Socialist Party, which saw the birth of a Communist Party and the tragic splintering of the Left forces that opened the road to Mussolini's legions. We consorted only with the Communist wing, of course, and sang paeans of praise for Terracini and Bombacci and the other leaders. Nothing less than immediate revolution suited our fervour and theirs. The excessive caution of the Parliamentarians and timid evolutionists, we were convinced, had nipped a Soviet revolution in the bud when the metal workers took over the factories. Resentment against the lost opportunity smouldered in our hearts and flamed into oratory from the Left. We had on our side, moreover, the weight of the triumphant Russian proletariat whose agents were in Livorno to guide and inspire. What matter if the Bolshevik faction

was a minority in this conference, since it spoke with the voice of the Third International, not to mention history and humanity?

Only one argument directed against the Left baffled its orators. It was hurled at them by Serrati from the Centre and Modigliani from the Right. In the light of subsequent Italian history that argument seems irony at its most tragic.

"A dictatorship may be possible in Russia," the Left was repeatedly admonished, "But surely, comrades, it is unthinkable in our country. We Italians are individualists, anarchists, by nature. Discipline, blind obedience? Ma che! When an Italian sees a "No Smoking" sign in a tramcar or theatre, it reminds him to light up. To talk of organised restraint and dictatorship in our land is foolishness!"

Even the Communists could not deny anything so axiomatic. They said that in Italy, maybe, the new social order would be established without the need for dictatorial methods. A little more than a year later the fascist dictatorship was in force . . .

Though we posed as correspondents, the Livorno congress was no mere "story" for Norman and me. We felt it to be an extension of the civil warfare over in Soviet Russia, a local sector on the widening front of an international class struggle. We cheered and booed at the proper points along with Communist sympathisers in the six steep galleries of the Teatro Goldoni.

But the Associated Press correspondent came from Fiume for the occasion, took the proceedings less seriously. He was never quite sure who was Left or Right or why. No-

thing in his training as a Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, police reporter had prepared him to record an epoch-making split in the Italian socialist ranks. Indeed, his private summary of the talkfest was remarkable both for its simplicity and comprehensiveness. Strolling between Norman and myself after a stormy session, he confided it to us: "Just look at 'em! Karl Marx and the other guy with the alfalfa on his chin whose pictures are on the wall, and Bombacci, Serrati, Modigliani!"—he called off the leaders of all the factions who happened to wear beards—"just, a lot of Jews!"

The other guy with the alfalfa, of course, was Friedrich Engels, as Germanic as Bismarck. Bombacci, the eccentric Communist leader, was an expert. Only one or two of the other leaders in the limelight were Jews, and in Italy the anti-Semitic issue was never a serious factor. But for a Pittsburgher whiskers are whiskers.

The exigencies of the Sacco-Vanzetti defence took me to the southern olive and grape provinces into Sacco's native village of Torremaggiore. I found that his elder brother, Sabino Sacco, was the socialist "sindaco" (mayor) of Torremaggiore. Red flags were flying over the municipal building and the cooperative store, and nearly every infant born since November 1917, was named for some Bolshevik deity. I even saw a baby "Soviet" peacefully sucking her mother's breast. Rumours of the blackshirt "camions" rumbled even through Puglia, and occasionally violent incidents were reported from larger towns. But the suggestion that a fascist regime was in the offing would have sounded like gibberish to Torremaggiore and a thousand other villages gesturing with red flags and Russian catch-phrases.

Sacco-Vanzetti matters also sent me into the Marchesan hills, beyond Jesi, to a sleepy, mud-coloured village called Santa Maria Nove. I tracked down an anarchist deportee from Massachusetts, whose yellow-haired wife wept for the vanished glories of life in a New England shoe town, snatched from her by the ardour of Mitchell Palmer's agents. The man's shelves were lined with brochures on the home manufacture of bombs, and he professed himself a terrorist of the Galleani School. So deep, however, had the fear of American law and police entered his heart that it needed a week of pleading and threatening and pressure by Merlino, the grand old man of the anarcho-syndicalist movement, to bring this terrorist to the point of signing an innocuous affidavit in support of Sacco's alibi.

No sooner had I descended from the Marchesan heights, though, than he recovered his magnificent courage. It expressed itself in a coloured picture post-card addressed to me at my prim Danish "pension," and showed an anarchist iconoclast hurling a smoking bomb at a row of gods. My standing with the Roman police must have been greatly improved by this belated boldness at my expense. It was not the only time I was to meet bomb-throwing bravada masking abject cowardice.

Already, in the civil strife between blackshirts and Communists or socialists, the casualties were too numerous for the newspapers to report in full. Daily tallies of the number of Reds and Blacks killed all over the country had to suffice, and the preponderance of Communist over Fascist deaths increased rapidly. The legend, which pictures the March on Rome as a bloodless seizure of power, ignores the ferocious bloodletting, which preceded it.

Panic spread in the Italian labour ranks. Almost overnight it seemed, after the Livorno split, the sense of confidence and faith in their own strength departed from the revolutionary elements. An influx of Communist refugees from Hungary, after the collapse of Bela Kun's Government, deepened the gloom in the Italian circles with which I was in contact. Norman and I smuggled a few of these homeless, penniless refugees into our hotel room for a period, and heard hair-raising tales of torture in Horthy's prisons. One boy bared his back and chest by way of illustration. They were thickly sown with tiny raw wounds. "Cigarette bums," he explained, "a favourite Hungarian amusement."

THE BIG IDEA

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Creditor" (Eng.).

(Continued from August 14 Issue.)

While, unquestionably, control of Financial Credit is, or was, the most powerful weapon in the armoury of the Enemy, the attack upon integrity—that is to say, the steady policy of corruption and perversion—is made by many other mechanisms—patronage to High Office, or any office, bits of ribbon, titles, mere advertisement. They are all variants on the Credit theme, and to imagine that money alone (although undoubtedly first in priority) requires decentralisation is to court failure.

I do not think that, at any rate in the first place, "morality of objective" has much to do with integrity—I should not deny a much higher degree of integrity to a New York gangster than to quite a large number of highly esteemed ecclesiastics. It consists in a certain simplicity and directness—a clear view of what you want to do, and an indifference to by-products. To achieve anything, you must have it, and without it, you will achieve just what your effort is worth. So far as I can judge, little or no integrity has been applied to political affairs in this country for some years, but a great deal to the advancement of politicians and functionaries. For instance, I should regard Mr. Winston Churchill as a man of high integrity—I should judge that he regards every situation from the single-minded point of view of its effect on the fortunes of Mr. Winston Churchill. What is wrong is that far too many other fortunes are affected at the same time. That is to say, a centralised system of totalitarianism requires, even if it could be made to work, a completely selfless integrity which is not only unknown, but is not Christian. "—thy neighbour as thyself," presumably means what it says. So far as I understand Christianity it is the easy (not necessarily the immediately easy) way—e.g., the proper way—to do things—"my yoke is easy, my burden, light." It is not a pathetic and everlasting effort to do the undoable. The Satanic ideology of work, employment, austerity, sacrifice, is not an ideology of achievement. Surely anyone can see that. It is an ideology of sabotage, destruction, corruption and decay.

Superficially, it would appear possible to make a success of centralisation of Power. The situation is not unlike that involved in the "conveyor-belt" production publicised, but not invented, by Mr. Henry Ford. Until it was copied by his competitors, it gave him command of the market. Nowadays, he is

obliged to obtain business by much the same methods as other manufacturers.

As we can see by observation, the only result of building up a "strong" State is to force the building of one still stronger. The British traditional policy of the balance of power was the only practical way of dealing with this outcome of the State system, and had the British Government retained that integrity (in the sense that I have defined the word) which it began to lose with the rise of the Whigs and their backers, there would have been no world war. But the oblique vision which was the inevitable result of the conflict between a national policy and a policy warped to advantage the international interests of Rothschilds, Sassoons, Schusters, Schiffs, Stems, Schroeders, and other sibilants has been fatal to that single-mindedness which was essential. If anyone supposes that a mass grouping of Power will do anything to hasten the coming of a still more appalling war, if we survive this one, then I can only ask him to consider the rapidity with which this one has come upon us, when, twenty-two years ago, we appeared to have reached a period of impregnability.

On the other hand, provided that absolute integrity of purpose, combined with freedom to contract out can be maintained, progressive decentralisation must succeed. The integrity of purpose required is not in opposition to human nature, as in the case of progressive centralisation, but in its best interests. It is in fact essential to the further progress of humanity, just as exercise is essential to the growth of a child. Nothing is so destructive as continual frustration (that is one of the worst features of Government departments) and nothing develops a man like achievement. Such virtues as are peculiar to the newer countries derive directly from the absence of unnecessary hindrances. The British are being stifled with them.

(To be continued.)

MACHIAVELLI OUTDONE

The Destruction of European Culture and the Production of Chaos

A Talk Broadcast from 7HO Hobart, at 6.30 p.m. on Sunday August 16, by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

Out of this war at least one great idea of importance has emerged. Even those who are usually politically passive have got hold of it. The idea is: "If we, as a nation, can find £500 million a year for purposes of destruction, then we are going to find similar sums for purposes of peace."

That idea, if it is to produce useful action, requires to be expressed in more precise terms. I would state it this way: "If this country, with most of its eligible men engaged in war work of some kind, can be fed, clothed and supplied with munitions of war by the rest of the population, then when those men return to occupations of peace, and when the machinery of war is turned to peaceful work, then we can look forward to a period of great prosperity—especially when we consider the vast strides made in the use of new machinery, new inventions and new technique."

When my generation returned from the last war and saw the huge new munition factories, with rows and rows of the latest automatic machines manned by girls and old men, we thought then that when we young men got back to work we would make the mighty productive effort of the war look small. That was what we thought—but other people thought differently.

At that time we knew little about how a country was run. Mr. Montagu Norman was practically unknown; our dear friends, the Rothschilds, did not come into our history books and the gigantic combine of Kuhn, Loeb and Co. was never discussed in newspapers or in any of the popular books on political subjects. We were as politically ignorant as babes, and we were treated as babes—somebody else's babes.

By the end of 1920 some of us began to realise that the problem of producing wealth, producing food and clothes and houses and motorcars, was no real problem after all. If any job wanted doing, all that was necessary was to supply the incentive, and men produced what was wanted as they always had done—and as they are doing now.

In wartime, if a job was required to be done, the money was made available, and the job was done; but after the war, although thousands of jobs were waiting to be done, the money was not available. The supply was turned off at its source. The incentive was removed, and jobs were not done.

In England, France and Germany, the wheels of industry began to slow down, unemployed began to hang round the street corners; the spirit of enterprise was being gradually killed by fear and uncertainty of a future which nobody appeared to be able to predict with even a gambler's chance. The vexatious frustrations and paralysing hindrances, which beset the paths of all enterprise, affected the foundations of all society!

Out of this post-war confusion much discussion arose among all classes of society; we were deluged with a flood of pamphlets and literature, most of it without much real value. We were told by some people that the trouble with the world was that we did not work hard enough, and therefore we were poor and discontented.

As this did not explain why we had such a large surplus of goods of all kinds, this argument failed to convince the more intelligent investigators. The Socialists said that our trouble was due to the greedy capitalists; but as the greedy capitalists could not eat all the bread available or use all the commodities available or use all the labour available, that argument failed to carry conviction with men like myself.

Others said that we were up against the financial system, but as a financial system does not operate automatically, and is controlled from day to day by men, it is obvious that this line of attack must misfire unless we pinned the blame on to the real culprits—those who control the financial system. You don't blame a

motorcar for knocking you down you blame the man behind the wheel.

The more we examined the situation the more we realised the importance of three facts: The first was that there were a few men in this world who had tremendous and ridiculous powers over whole States and nations and parliaments. The second was that there was a deliberate attempt to destroy and limit any type of production, which was destined to be of any benefit to you and me. And thirdly, that no man was permitted to reach high office unless he subscribed to this policy of destruction and frustration.

The immediate result of this policy of frustration was a tremendous amount of friction and discontent and contempt for authority. In fact there was little authority left except that of compulsion, of force thinly veiled under the guise of Law.

ODD ITEMS

(From the "Social Creditor.")

"Thanks to their prominent position in the OGPU, they hope to set up a military dictatorship in place of Stalin, and then suddenly substitute the name of Fascism for Bolshevism, with which, except for the Black Shirts, it is absolutely identical." . . . "The impending world war, accordingly, will therefore very likely bring about a very serious state of affairs in the interior of Russia, owing to the unpopularity with the masses of the Soviet system of government, although they are not strong enough to abolish it. They would hail a revolution with joy. . . ."

—Ludendorff: "The Coming War."

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which was quite probably founded with the best of motives, is, with its close associate, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, a whole-time agency for Jewish world intrigue. Its Annual Report for 1941 is a good instance of that curious inability to refrain from "spilling the beans" on which many writers have remarked in connection with God's Odd Choice. After quoting a resolution passed by the U.S. Congress in 1910 in favour of "constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace"—i.e., to make revolt impossible, it made public a conference held at Chatham House attended by "sixty-two persons all of great influence and importance, coming from ten countries, including Germany and Italy." The resolution passed is so illuminating that we propose to publish it in full at a convenient time. The last paragraph of Section II reads, "We recommend that the leading Governments, especially in the first instance those of France, Great Britain, and the United States, should consult one another without delay for the purpose of coming to a provisional stabilisation of exchange on the basis of gold—allowing for the possibility of readjustment in case of need—with a view to the establishment of a stable WORLD GOLD STANDARD." (Our caps.—Ed.)

It then goes on to say "The Atlantic Charter . . . may be regarded as an endorsement of, and a supplement to, the principles proposed by the conference held at Chatham House." So now you know.

* * *

American army engineers recently passed through Edmonton on their way north to start construction of the highway to Alaska. The high-

There were concentrated attacks made on the character of the British people, designed to destroy their prestige and therefore their credit and their way of life. The individuals and the democratic way of life was quietly and surreptitiously held up to ridicule by organs of publicity run by the same men who were deliberately making the democratic way of life impossible. At the same time we were being taught to admire the collective life of society—the society of the ant-heap, of the bureaucrat run by a suitable superman or dictator.

No people on this earth wants to be messed about by hordes of officials, to have countless laws and regulations imposed upon them with their attendant penalties. People will only submit to such conditions during a crisis or when they are reduced to a state of chaos.

I affirm that that state of chaos was deliberately produced; I affirm that on dozens of historical occasions the chaos that spread over Europe could have been stopped and the difficulties of the people of England, France and Germany easily overcome by those who had the power to do so. They did not do it, and they knew what would happen if they did not do it, and what had happened was designed by them to happen.

Time after time France could have been saved from chaos; time after time Germany could have been saved from Hitler; time after time everything that could be done to destroy England was done. The stage was

way will go through Edmonton, in spite of political opposition in Ottawa which has blocked the start of this project for the years since it was first proposed.

* * *

"Most men in public life who are fortunate enough to secure the services of an efficient private secretary like to retain him as long as they can. That, however, was not the practice of the late Judge Brandeis. He made it a rule to engage every year a new secretary, recommended to him by his friend, Professor Felix Frankfurter, from among the students who had just graduated at the Harvard Law School. By the end of his year in Washington each of these young men had gained not only first-hand knowledge of Supreme Court procedure, but valuable insight into the workings of the mind of America's most eminent liberal jurist. The advantage of this method to Judge Brandeis himself was that it kept him in constant touch with the younger generation in his own profession. Moreover, in the course of years these ex-secretaries came to form a considerable group of disciples whose attitude towards public affairs bore the impress of their former employer's personality."

—The "Otago Daily Times," December 31, 1941.

WISE WORDS

"The great inlet by which a colour for oppression has entered into the world is by one man's pretending to determine concerning the happiness of another."—Burke.

"Power obeys reality, and not appearances; power is according to quality, and not quantity."—Emerson.

"I will never shut the doors of my senses. The delights of sight and hearing and touch will bear thy delight. Deliverance is not for me in renunciation. I feel the embrace in a thousand bonds of delight."—Tagore.

"Politicians are great corrupters of words. Dealing habitually with evasions, and forced to conceal their meaning, or lack of meaning, they retire behind a cloud of vaguely-used polysyllables, and their words, broadcast by the newspapers, infect the domestic breakfast-table, and the club luncheon-table, and the evening gatherings of village Hampdens; and out of this muddle of words there comes a muddle of ideas. The sloven in words is a sloven in thought. . . . Words are mystical things . . . the most marvellous of man's inventions. They are the embodiment of the invisible. To use them rightly is an obligation, and should be a delight."—George Sampson

being set for the destruction of the world's greatest nations.

Perhaps at no time in the world's history was the task of presenting the truth to the people so difficult as it has been during the last twenty-five years. We were swamped with such a flood of propaganda from all sources; such a flood of lies, mis-statements and half-truths that the mental energy required to break through to the truth was beyond the powers of the great majority.

For every man who stood up to speak the truth there were dozens of professional speakers ready to pour ridicule and contempt upon him. These hired speakers were able to overawe the ignorant by sheltering under the name and the prestige of the great national institutions.

There was no institution that was not used to hide the motives of the men who attacked those of use who challenged the accuracy of the official propaganda. Europe was swarming with cheats, knaves and liars; with big, fat cheque-books in their pockets; there was a continuous and violent battle going on between the prestige of character of individual man, and the prestige of money; and the prestige of money was winning all along the line, especially among the extremists of the Left and Right. Esteemed and respected directors of successful British undertakings were pushed out of their jobs, and their place taken by yes-men of the International Banking group. Any man, no matter how exalted his position might have been, rapidly disappeared from the public ken if he dared to expose what was going on. Gradually our collective experience brought us face to face with the fact that not only were we witnessing the deliberate destruction of the social and economic foundations of Europe, but also the deliberate destruction of its moral standards. The whole of Europe was being uprooted and destroyed, and its place was being taken up by an ant-heap civilisation imposed on mankind by gangs of intellectual and moral larrikins.

The complete inability of people to protect themselves from their own Governments has been the tragedy of this century.

The Art of Government has been known for centuries, but not to the people. Certain select families probably had the secrets of Government handed down to them; many of these families were probably conveniently killed off.

The appalling ignorance of the so-called educated people as to how a country is governed is only matched by the barefaced exploitation of this ignorance by those in power. Hitler, in his book called "Mein Kampf," spills some of the beans on the gentle art of Government, or how to deceive most of the people all the time. The best tricks in Hitler's "Mein Kampf" were probably taken from Machiavelli's "Prince" and from the "Protocols of Zion," which Hitler admits having read.

There is no doubt in my mind that whereas the people of Europe have been brought up on what we called "Puritanism"—that is, a religion of humble submission, self-sacrifice with the promise of a pie in the sky when they die—the ruling gangs of Europe have been brought up on Machiavelli's "Prince" and on the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion."

Machiavelli was a Florentine statesman of the sixteenth century, who wrote several books, especially one called the "Prince", which was written to a prince explaining how to impose his will on a rebellious people and to retain his power over the people.

One of Machiavelli's favourite tricks was to "Divide and Rule"; that is, playing the two extremes against the middle: using the nobles to keep the people in order and using the people to keep the nobles from becoming too ambitious.

Another piece of advice given by Machiavelli was that when a prince had a particularly foul piece of work to inflict on the people he advised him to use a parliament to do it; by this means he would escape the blame and maintain his good reputation.

But the choicest piece of Machiavelli's creed is best given in a translation of Machiavelli's own words. Here it is:

" . . . And he who has known best how to employ the fox has succeeded best. But it is necessary to know

(Continued on page 8.)

The New Times

A non-party, non-sectarian, non-sectional weekly newspaper, advocating political and economic democracy, and exposing the causes, the institutions and the individuals that keep us poor in the midst of plenty.

Published every Friday by New Times Ltd., McEwan House, Elizabeth and Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I. Postal Address: Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne. Telephone: MU 2834.

Vol. 8

FRIDAY, AUGUST 28, 1942.

No. 34.

A Baited Trap

The above heading is substituted for that of an article by J. M. Keynes, entitled "How Much Does Finance Matter," which appeared in the B.B.C. "Listener" of April 2, 1942, and receives our attention hereunder. The reason for the amended title is that it is more descriptive of the purpose of the article

Observant readers of such propaganda articles on economic or post-war matters will have noticed a curious mixture of realism and orthodox fiction, which is obviously designed to deceive, and is the more dangerous on that account. The aforesaid article by J. M. Keynes fits this category nicely. He commences by placing himself in the position of explaining "Where's the money to come from" for post-war reconstruction, and answers this "one-time poser" by truthfully pointing out that you don't build houses with money; you use bricks and mortar, steel, concrete, labour and architects—which, of course, conveys the idea that he has, at last, some elementary knowledge. Then he deals lightly with the technical problems, and admits that we (presumably meaning economists and bankers) have sometimes bungled in the past. So far, so good, and note how disarming his presentation is.

But from this point the big idea slowly emerges. He says "If we keep good employment when peace comes, which we can and mean to do, even the post-war budget problem will not be too difficult." Keynes, it should be remembered, is an economist and a director of the privately-owned Bank of England, so, when he says "We" he means the Bankers and Economists, and if the last statement is analysed, it will be obvious that another financial depression is not necessarily in the scheme of things to come. Neither is leisure, but the "Work" State and the "Planning" State definitely are. Machinery for controlling and regimenting labour is already in existence; the Allied Works Council and the Manpower Regulations are but two Australian examples.

At this point the plot thickens, and the task of preparing the people for the Bankers' "New Order" of discipline and control becomes rather obvious when the following extract is studied:

"In 1919 public opinion and political opinions were determined to scrap at the first possible moment many of the controls which were making the technical task easier, and I hope and believe that this time public opinion will give the technicians a fair chance by letting them retain, as long as they think necessary, many of the controls over the financial machinery which we are finding useful, and, indeed, essential, today." The technicians referred to are, of course, the Bankers and Economists whose actions and advice are responsible for the world chaos, and who simply used the Governments of the day to institute the regulations and "controls" for the safety of the "technicians" and their unworkable financial system. Now, these blunders have the effrontery to urge the retention of the "controls" as long as they see fit.

Again, Keynes' propaganda touches on the question of employment. In this approach the earlier realism is replaced with economists' jargon, thus: "The first task is to make sure there is enough demand to provide employment for everyone, the second task is to prevent a demand in excess of the physical possibilities of supply." Of course, these factors could not be left to the people; oh, dear no, they must be planned in order to make work for economists; supply and demand factors cannot be left to adjust themselves; no, both factors must be interfered with by planners. And, of course, he does not distinguish between "demand" and "effective demand" (demand backed by the necessary funds).

Then the orthodox presentation of the so-called export problem receives consideration thus: "Immediately after the war the export industries must have the first claim on our attention, and I cannot emphasise that too much. Until we have rebuilt our export trade to its former dimensions we must be prepared for any reasonable sacrifice in the interest of exports." Presumably, similar jargon is being publicised in every country, and, as before, all will seek to export more than they import to obtain a "favourable" trade-balance, resulting in the continuation of the primary cause of war—the fight for markets. By this stage of his article Keynes has departed entirely from his original theme of "How much does finance matter," and has entangled himself with the white elephants of unemployment and exports. Then he deals with management, and here we find the core of the Bankers' New Order when he says: "Those in charge must concentrate on the vital task of central management." Here he seems to have a lot in common with the bureaucratic socialistic central planning. But he does at least make it clear that the same old gang will be in control and that more centralised control through Government regulations is the major idea. Enforced employment is clearly part of the plan, with the money mechanism a secondary consideration as a means of control.

The latter part of the article again takes up the early theme, that money does not matter, when he says anything we can actually do we can afford, and again he disarmingly admits their (the bankers) former folly of keeping labour unused and unhappy in unpaid idleness. Just by way of giving good measure,

FRAUDULENT DEPRESSIONS

Will We Take Another?

(A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown.)

(Continued from last issue.)

Sir, —We have seen from the evidence of the late Sir Robert Gibson that the Commonwealth Bank followed the "advice" of the Bank of England. This Bank of "England" had deliberately caused the markets for our exports to slump in 1929 to such an extent that "by February, 1930, the difficulties of finding overseas money to cover Australia's payments abroad had become so acute that the Commonwealth Government appealed to the British Treasury for assistance in finding credit to meet a small loan falling due.

"The Chancellor of the Exchequer referred them to the Bank of "England," which apparently found the necessary credit, but suggested sending Sir Otto Niemeyer for a report on the financial position of Australia." (Quoted from "The Story of the Commonwealth Bank," by D. J. Amos.)

This meant that the very institution, which had brought the Commonwealth Government to such a sorry pass was the selfsame institution to which they were referred for "assistance." The British Treasury also is entirely subservient to the same institution, and the great democratic government of democratic England does only what the Bank of "England" permits. Truly, Montagu Norman spoke the truth when he said, "The difference between the Bank of England and the British Treasury is the same as the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee."

Sir Otto Niemeyer did come to Australia. He also went to several other countries, and—believe it or not—a serious contraction in the quantity of money occurred in each country immediately after he got there. In August 1930, he attended a meeting of our Loan Council, and laid his demands before a conference of Premiers. The demands were accepted, and the Governments of Australia agreed that budgets would be balanced regardless of any cost in human suffering. Note particularly that the PEOPLE had not asked for the balancing of budgets. That was a demand from the Bank of England, and a demand from that institution was, and still is paramount, even in a democracy! Mr. H. N. Brailsford wrote of the humiliating situation as follows:

"Today you may behold a continent on its knees. It has bowed to Niemeyer's dictation. It will cut down its imports. It will lay the axe to all its expenditure on social services, including education. It will reduce salaries of its civil servants. It will cut wages all round. It is prepared for an increase in unemployment from the present 18% to a possible 30%. It is kissing the rod that chastened it. 'On all hands,' we read, 'the help of Sir Otto Niemeyer is warmly appreciated.'"

And that, Mr. Editor, was the literal truth. The parsons, priests, politicians, and press tried to outdo each other in fawning upon this tyrannical representative of the Bank of "England." I have been informed that Mr. Theodore stood out against him, even to the extent of forbidding entrance to his office, but cannot vouch for the truth of it. If it were so, I raise my hat to Mr. Theodore, and regret there were not a lot more responsible Australians to do the same.

A little later, when the position had rapidly deteriorated, the Scullin Government appealed to the then chairman of the Commonwealth Bank Board to increase the supply of Australian money so that Australian goods in Australia could be sold to the Australian people. The Government asked him to increase the note issue by £20 million. According to "Smith's Weekly" of 4/10/30, Sir Robert Gibson, who had only recently been reappointed as chairman of the Board for a further period of seven years, replied as follows:

"Mr. Prime Minister and Members of the Cabinet, you ask me to inflate

the currency by issuing another £20 million in notes. My answer is that I bloody well won't."

And he didn't. On the "advice" of the Bank of "England" he was insisting upon reductions in wages, salaries, allowances, pensions, and social benefits of all kinds, and so far as he was concerned, it was the National Government's place to TAKE orders, not to give them. Clearly it was a financial dictatorship posing as democracy, and, as already indicated, even the pulpit was used in all churches to impose the fraud on a poorly informed community.

In those days I went from church to church to hear for myself what the preachers were saying. It was pathetic, and when I had the audacity to ask questions my sanity was challenged. The general idea was that the Bank of "England" was everything that was virtuous, that the men imposing the hardships were church supporters, and that we should bear our burdens without complaint. The suggestion that the great men who had been "honoured" by the King, and who were such experts in the practice of the most mysterious of all sciences, could be acting contrary to the best interests of the people at large, was simply too preposterous. It is a strange fact, however, that in a great number of cases the very men whose names have appeared on the "Honours" List are the very men responsible for our community disabilities. In this respect, I have already said sufficient about "Sir" Robert Gibson. What about "Sir" Otto Niemeyer?

Before the outbreak of the present war I had ascertained that Sir Otto was apparently a warmonger and a peacemaker at one and the same time, for in addition to association directly with Montagu Norman at the Bank of "England," he was a director of the National Bank of Egypt, a director of the Vickers Armstrong armament works, a director of the Bank of Europe in Paris, a director of the Anglo-Continental Bank, a director of the Bank for International Settlements at Basle, and a member of the Financial Committee of the League of Nations, having been succeeded as chairman of that Committee by Dr. Melchior—a partner in Warburg's Bank of Hamburg. (You will recall that it was Paul Warburg who started the system of "Central" Banks!) It would be reasonable, I think, to say that Sir Otto's interests were somewhat "international," although I offer no comment as to his nationality. But his chief activities are as a high official of the Bank of "England."

The Bank of "England" itself is a private business, and is not a Government institution, as so many have erroneously believed. It has 25 directors, and many of these either have or represent foreign interests. A list of shareholders is never published, and we know neither its profits nor the amount it distributes to shareholders. Its governor, who was a member of an American banking house, has, since his appointment in

(Continued on page 5.)

he paints a glowing account of cultural and industrial development which will ensue, if we, the people, leave it to them, the bankers. The whole presentation can only be described as clever but dangerous inspired propaganda to fool the people into imposing trust once more in bankers and their henchmen, the economists. It is significant that the "B.B.C. and the press of the world is open to them to assist in the work of fooling the people through such plausible publications.

"THE NEW WORLD CHARTER"

N.W.R.M. REPLIES TO MR. BUTLER

Mr. Eric Butler.

Dear Sir, —The executive committee of the N.W.R.M. wishes to thank you for your constructive criticism of the New World Charter. They feel that it is only by such criticisms that progress can be made. It is therefore hoped that the following observations will be accepted by yourself and all other staunch reformers as a cordial attempt to clarify certain points for future discussion.

POINT 1. —The executive of the N.W.R.M. defined social credit as follows: "National or social credit shall be understood to mean credit made available by and in proportion to the nation's real wealth, supplied interest free and debt free through the people's or Commonwealth Bank, directed and controlled by a National Credit Board composed of representatives of the State, the consumers and the producers."

The foregoing definition was given for the purpose of defining Social Credit, as presented in the New World Charter, and not particularly as a specific definition of Social Credit as a philosophy or for general use. However, we acknowledge your definition and will incorporate it in the revised edition of the Charter. Your definition reads: "Social Credit can be defined as the belief inherent in society that individuals in association can get what they want, providing it is physically possible."

POINT 2. —You state: "Even with a debt and interest free money system, we could have greater tyranny than we have today. It is a question of control. Our fundamental task is to show people how they can control their institutions. We cannot reform these institutions until we obtain control of them."

With this the executive agrees in full, and, has taken great care in the Charter to make this point clear. In general the whole framework of the plan is designed to give the people control of their elected representatives, for it has been clearly seen that unless we, the people, have political control, there is little chance of gaining financial and economic reform. In detail, it can be seen in Stage 1 of the financial and economic reconstruction, page 39 of the New World Charter, and particularly in the second pillar, political reconstruction, page 46, Stage 2; both sections of which are quoted hereunder:

STAGE I. Financial and Economical Reconstruction: Immediate Principles of Action.

- (a) To reinstate the Commonwealth Bank as a National or People's Bank.
- (b) To nationalise Credit and Cur-

rency with control vested in the people.

(c) To see that Creation, Control, Issue, and Cancellation of Credit and Currency shall be vested in the People by means of a National Credit and Currency Board, comprising representatives of—

1. The Commonwealth (the Treasurer).
2. The People's Bank (the Governor).
3. The People (representatives of the staff, producers and consumers).—directing the Commonwealth or People's Bank to issue National Credit for the nation's use (scientifically controlled by the National Credit and Currency Board), debt and interest free, backed by the actual wealth of the Commonwealth.

Note: Private advances, if necessary, would be interest free, but not debt free. The principal would have to be repaid.

Method by which these would be brought about:

- (a) The power of organised public opinion.
- (b) A public inquiry, with exhaustive examination and report, followed by recommendations to be approved by the people.
- (c) A petition to the Governor-General and his Prime Minister.
- (d) The writing of a personal letter to Parliamentary representatives.
- (e) A referendum to amend the Constitution.
- (f) A people's referendum to implement the finally desired proposals.

STAGE 1: PROPOSALS IN WORKING FORM:

(a) Financial and economic security shall be the inalienable right of every man, woman and child, and shall be guaranteed by the Commonwealth Constitution. Without financial and economic security, political democracy is abortive.

(b) The creation, control, issue and cancellation of credit and currency shall be vested in the people by means of a National Credit and Currency Board, comprising representatives of consumers and producers, the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank, and the Commonwealth Treasurer, who shall, by virtue of his office, be the Chairman of the Board.

(c) The National Credit and Currency Board shall, subject to the Commonwealth Parliament, determine

the volume of credit and currency which shall be issued from time to time, and direct monetary policy.

(d) The Commonwealth Bank, which shall be controlled by a competent Governor, shall be the instrument by means of which the National Credit and Currency Board's policy shall be implemented.

(e) When credit is required for any public purpose whatsoever, such as for financing the war, or for financing post-war reconstruction, it shall be made available through the Commonwealth Bank, interest and debt free, in accordance with Section 504 of the Commonwealth Royal Commission's Report on Banking.

(f) In all that is done, finance, credit and currency shall be made to serve the people and money shall be our servant, not our master. The power shall be removed from money—it shall become a medium of exchange and not a commodity to be bought and sold. Production shall fit consumption, and there shall be no poverty amidst plenty.

STAGE 2 To Elect Municipal Councils, Provincial Councils and Federal Legislature.

How Appointed: Municipal Councils—By universal adult franchise, elected on merit and ability. Provincial Councils—By universal adult franchise, elected on merit and ability. Federal Legislature—By universal adult franchise, elected on merit and ability.

The Control: The control to be vested in the people through the initiative, referendum and recall, and to apply to all three bodies. All councils shall operate on the committee system. Councillors to retire every five years.

POINT 3. You say: "The London Times" and other mouthpieces of financial orthodoxy are quoted as suggesting a 'new order.' Beware! This advocacy of 'new orders' and 'monetary reform' is, I believe, part of the plan of confusion."

The executive is fully aware of the red herrings that are constantly dragged across the trail to confuse the people, and it feels, therefore, that it has the measure of the enemy's tactics. It is aware of the bankers' swindle in presenting the Federal Reserve Bank to the people of U.S.A. when they clamoured for monetary reform. This was only possible because the people were uninformed on the real issues at stake, and were not aware of the power and objectives of the international financiers. The plans, methods and objectives of these notorious gentlemen have been amply exposed in the New World Charter,

and as the Movement believes in the democratic action of the power of numbers informed on the real and vital issues, it will certainly not be sidetracked by cat cries of New Orders, money reforms, etc., no matter from where they come.

POINT 4. You state: "I think that the idea of Educational Reconstruction: 'To train all citizens in the New World concept of citizenship' (page 7), will meet with strong disapproval in many quarters. It savours too much of planning other people's lives. Who is to do the training? Once the people obtain economic security and personal liberty they will be in the position to adjust their ideas on education. They would listen to those who believe that they have worthy suggestions to make. But the individual must be free to decide for himself. The suggestion of planning other people's lives is further emphasised on page 8: . . . the child and adolescent shall be moulded to serve. . . . Personally, I am strongly opposed to moulding of any kind."

As an observation on this point, we would suggest a more careful reading of the section of the Charter dealing with Educational Reconstruction. In the first place, the whole concept is based upon the fullest development of the human personality, with training in how to think, so that the individual will be free to decide the great issues of life for himself. The New World Reconstruction Movement's executive is violently opposed to the regimentation—planning and telling people that they must think and believe—as evidenced by dictatorship, Fascists, high finance and vested interests, etc.; but this does not mean that certain basic principles and training in tune with the principles of (1) The Golden Rule; (2) The Brotherhood of Man; (3) The principle of service and a new citizenship in keeping with the political, financial and economic changes suggested in the Charter, should not be instituted. The following two paragraphs from pages 48 and 49 of the Charter demonstrate this principle:

"(1) The emphasis, then, of our education—our method—will be personality, citizenship, wisdom, the ability to think and reason, to play the game of life, to know how to live and what to live for. To understand and live up to the New World Concept of Citizenship through service and a true brotherhood of man, thus the new education shall be the development of the person, the bearer of values.

"(2) The essence of school education would not be the preparation for a livelihood, but rather the development of interests that would make a living fact of the leisure life of the child in adult years. To aid children to be happy and healthy with a trained mind and initiative in the art of living, and later specialising in their life's chosen work in advanced and, if necessary, adult education. But they must learn to be a citizen first and learn the New Standard of Service, and then later see that they are a round peg in a round hole, and not a misfit in life. Under New World Reconstruction there would be no need to first earn a living at the expense of one's talents and abilities. There would be a place for all to serve in their highest capacity, in confidence that when the time comes they will know how to make the best possible world. This is the secret of great teaching."

We feel, Mr. Butler that you must agree that the best violinist, singer, painter, architect, artisan, or citizen must frame a basis or foundation upon which to grow. We believe in individual development and personality, but we feel that humanity could not be left to run wild even if it had economic security, and we hope you are not just shying at words without going into the full concept presented, which we claim allows for more freedom, individual action and growth than any such concept yet presented on education. We dislike bureaucratic planning as much as you, but there is no point in going to the other extreme and opposing all planning—provided that planning is for individual freedom, happiness and security. The Sydney Bridge, the great cathedrals, the beautiful cities, and the great inventions were largely the result of forethought and planning. If no thought or planning had been done by our forebears in the City of Mel-

(Continued on page 8.)

U.E.A. ACTION

HOME MEETINGS

At a home meeting held in Malvern last Thursday, a Local Group of the U.E.A. was formed by a band of enthusiastic actionists. A very interesting discussion was held on various subjects and phases of U.E.A. philosophy and many very good suggestions were put forward. The value and need for such groups and meetings was expressed by all, as also was the need for ACTION. All present showed in a practical manner their willingness to assist by contributions and offering the use of their homes. With the passing of a resolution to hold the next meeting in approximately three weeks, a very interesting and constructive meeting closed. It is intended to include a special feature in the next meeting, so watch the U.E.A. Action notes for further information.

To all supporters and actionists of the U.E.A. who realise the value of decentralisation and personal contacts, we make a SPECIAL APPEAL. Assist us in the formation of local electoral groups by offering the use of your home one evening for a meeting. The value and importance of these groups cannot be too strongly stressed. Remember, such groups play a big part in making democracy function. Use your home, and also attend the meetings in your locality. Write to me NOW—at headquarters, or No. 1 Arthur street

Malvern, S.E.4. WILL YOU PLAY YOUR PART?

—Fred. W. Elliott, Jr., Metropolitan Organiser.

"Public Apathy and Politicians"

"Further condemnation of liquor abuses was made by Mr. Hollins, M.L.A., in an address at St. Kilda Presbyterian church yesterday. He alleged that corruption was rampant, particularly in Parliament, and blamed public apathy for allowing such things to continue.

"If there was corruption the people were party to it. It was said we had the best politicians that money could buy. (Laughter.) But the people got the politicians they deserved. Democracy was dependent on spiritual values. The people should organise to bring about reform. There should be collective action for a wide-scale frontal attack on corporate evils. People should choose politicians for their worth. The party spirit, in both Church and State, was destroying democracy. The community had lost faith in party politics, but still tolerated it. They did not subscribe to party funds as in the past, but the liquor interests were prepared to give money lavishly left and right. Any party, which accepted it, was immediately compromised. The people must bring pressure to bear on their political representatives to end social evils, but public apathy was such that today a fine of £2 was necessary to compel them to vote."

—Melbourne "Age," August 24.

Fraudulent Depressions

(Continued from page 4.)

1920, spent a great deal of his time in New York, "consulting" the Federal Reserve Board, of which Paul Warburg, the originator of the Central Bank System, was until recently the dominating force. The Governor of the Bank of "England" has been described as "Wall Street's deflation agent to bring Britain into line." What line and whose line? How well he has served his principals is shown by the trend of events since he started. He keeps his name out of the press as much as possible, rarely appears in public, goes to extraordinary lengths to hide his movements, and never explains anything. He was a close collaborator with Dr. Schacht, of the German Reichsbank, and was present behind the scenes when President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill formulated the Atlantic Charter, which promises "freedom from fear and want," but carefully avoids any reference to liberation from financial servitude, or freedom from the mental anxiety of trying to make ends meet on insufficient income.

Yours faithfully,
BRUCE H. BROWN

189 Hotham Street, East
Melbourne, C.2. 23rd
August, 1942.

(To be continued.)

(Reprinted from the "Social Crediter," England.)

Less than six months ago, it was reported that Douglas had said that before long we should all be Social Crediters, and it would then be more important than ever to know what was a Social Crediter. Major Douglas had gone on to say that our formula (i.e., the formula for a Social Crediter) was an absolute, like the formula for sulphuric acid.

(There is a formula for sulphuric acid—whatever it is. If it is H₂SO₄, that's it. If H₂SO₃ is not the formula, then some other arrangement of symbols is the formula. Sulphuric acid has a formula. HCN is not the formula for sulphuric acid. It is said to be the formula for prussic acid. Prussia acid is not sulphuric acid. The difference between the two acids is an absolute difference. It is a difference, which never ceases to be the same difference.)

If we are not yet all Social Crediters, the prophecy has been already fulfilled at least to the extent that it is beginning to be difficult for some Social Crediters to distinguish between themselves and persons variously occupied in the community, who, without in the least claiming to be Social Crediters, seem, to those whose eye they catch, to be acting (but more often talking) rather like Social Crediters. The problem thus set would be purely academic if it were not that our difficulties in face of our present discontents (the world's) are not intellectual. They are "military." To see a soldier running is no proof that "the enemy is on the run." To see a lot of soldiers running is no proof that they are running away. Nor is it a proof that they are running to your assistance. To see a lot of soldiers running and to know that they are running away is no proof that you are overtaking them. Up to the present, the retreat of the opponents of decentralisation of policy in society has been a perpetual retreat. A perpetual retreat is really a kind of victory, and to ensure it all that is necessary is superiority of transport facilities.

The metaphor does not hold completely, because the terrain to be traversed, politically, changes, and the perpetual retreat assumes that it remains, at least, relatively, the same for pursuer and pursued. There is an absolute difference between trying to do the inherently impossible and trying to do the possible. Social Crediters believe that the Grand Judaeo-Masonic plan for "total" centralisation of policy (Totalitarianism, whether National-socialist totalitarianism or International-socialist totalitarianism) is inherently unworkable—ultimately. But ultimately is at the end, and most men and women want a chance before the end comes. If, however, the end is very near, they may have a better chance than if it is very far away. Many of them have arrived quite near to "the end," with fairly clear heads and healthy wills. There is thus reason to believe that what we are trying to do is the possible. Is it necessary to know pursuer from pursued in the Great Retreat to which we are trying to set a limit? Do we need to know a Social Crediter: to know whether the "absolute formula" is represented? Douglas says "yes."

Very well: let us take Lord Elton. Lord Elton has written a book, prominently displayed for sale in these times of paper shortage, in which there are some "promising pages."* The book is being widely read by the kind of person who, with much less inducement from shop-window displays, might be reading "The Big Idea" or "His Service Is Perfect Freedom," if not

*"Saint George or the Dragon," London: Collins,

"The Monopoly of Credit"—and acting on it in many cases.

In a brief foreword, Lord Elton tells us a little, but not much about himself. He says that some readers of his second chapter will at once write him down "an inveterate opponent of progress; while others, if they reach the sixth, may choose to class him as a Socialist." He pleads guilty to only two "prejudices." He believes that change, however sweeping, should have its roots in the past; and he is a Christian. The first of these "prejudices" Lord Elton shares with all of us who do not entertain wholly unconventional notions concerning the nature of Time. Change consists in "passing from one state to another," the time of the initial state being past relatively to the time of the final state. But doubtless Lord Elton means to imply that, in regard to social change, he would "conserve" more things (unspecified) than certain other people, of whom he is thinking, would "conserve." Concerning his second "prejudice," it is well known that people holding quite different philosophies claim to be Christians, a contingency foreseen in the New Testament, which consequently recommends an "acid" test by which individuals may be known: "by their fruits."

On beginning to read Lord Elton's book itself, it is immediately apparent that he is addressing himself to readers who are assumed to be sympathetic towards, or likely to be persuaded easily into sympathy with, ideas not supposed to be widely current outside of the relatively small circle of people who read the "Social Crediter." They are current, and it is we who have made them so. He says that few statesmen would be willing to prophesy how their own countries, or the world itself, will be governed in five years' time, save those who do so for the sake of propaganda. "Our civilisation is in dissolution." He says it is doubtful whether Hitler (or Hitler's "era") can hold down the reluctant nations by force forever. Without using Douglas's words, he seems to see the truth of the statement that "Probably the future of humanity turns on the answer to a single question: 'Does Social Power proceed from within, or does it reside in guns, tanks and aeroplanes?'" He says there will never be a perpetual peace unless we organise perpetual change. We should not have said, "organise" here. We might more gracefully have said "respect," or (with reservations) "permit," and, in that case, we might have said, not the same thing as Lord Elton, but the opposite. Obeying God is the opposite of trying to "run" God for a vested interest, even if the interest is vested in a private view of goodness. Although subtly attached to what we would consider a wrong idea, the idea of the necessity of "international" control, Lord Elton says that a "power" in possession of overwhelming strength, "whether it is paramount German Her-

renvolk or an International Police Force which exercises it," will be "seeking to stifle the most powerful force in nature." He recognises that this force is Life. In a contest between nations, there is "no speck of rottenness" which may not have its influence upon the outcome. The "invisible forces of righteousness" will not do the fighting for us. "I believe that it is true that all evil is ultimately self-destructive But it may be a very long run indeed." "Progress is neither inevitable nor continuous." "Nothing in history or theology suggests that, because Nazi rule is evil, it is impossible that the world should now be plunged into a thousand years of slavery." The meaning of every crisis in history is that it is a choice. "The fortieth century will be as free as the twentieth to revert to the law of the jungle, or the morals of the farmyard, and call it Progress." "Crisis is a Greek word, signifying judgment, or decision." "Our war aim cannot now be this reform or that, not 'social justice' or the restoration of Czechoslovakia or a new paper League of Nations, but rather to prove that it is tyranny which is obsolete, and not the British Commonwealth."

There is a tilt at "the culture of paper constitutions," whose "planners counted on solving all the problems of the new world by the speedy enforcement of systems which they, and others, have been persistently advocating, and the electorate as persistently rejecting [omnipotent and responsible electorate!], for the last fifty years,"—a "peculiar form of war profiteering." The new age will be a new age, and the isms will be outmoded and "date" irremediably. This country never has cared for the "a priori" plans of experts and cranks, but "has preferred to proceed empirically from problem to problem, tackling them successively by the compass-bearing, so to speak, of a long-descended instinct for self-government." But this only means that the planner "has to go to work within that framework with which empiricism and instinct will have already presented him"! Empiricism and instinct have, of course, received no assistance from planners. They are alone responsible for the "set."

Lord Elton proceeds to an attack upon the attack upon morale. Having fought unsuccessfully the Thornbury Division of Gloucestershire twice (1924, 1929), and having been expelled from the Labour Party in 1931 as a supporter of Ramsay MacDonald, a pacifist, the peer created in 1934 castigates the pacifists. Those who survived the last war were the physically or morally less well qualified, "who, for one reason or another, preferred to control margarine, or to drive ambulances behind the lines, or . . . were too conscientious to fight at all." Now, however, Lord Elton can see something curious in the fact that "ostensibly" Conserv-

(Continued on page 7.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

FINDING WORK: It has been truly said, "What has not been lost, cannot be found," which is especially true of "Work." Nevertheless, the daily press informs us that Mr. Frost, of the Repatriation Department, has found work, for himself, in finding work for returned soldiers, but that he has not been successful in the latter quest, because he has 148 returned men whom he cannot place. The report states "returned soldiers are eligible to receive sustenance for three months while waiting for jobs." Presumably, after that period, they, like the heroes of other wars, will have to peddle bootlaces, matches, or other less useful articles.

TRAGIC ERRORS: The Adelaide "Advertiser" of July 24, under the headings, "No Return To Gold Standard" and "Tragic Errors Will Not Be Repeated," reports Lord Simon (Lord Chancellor) in the House of Lords as follows: "After the war, Britain's immense wealth in the form of coal must be used to restore her international economic position. It is now recognised that attempting to transfer vast sums of money from one country to another as a network of money debts was twice cursed. He had heard no whisper of any intention of repeating the former experience of returning to the gold standard. I say with the Government's authority," added Lord Simon, "that these tragic errors will not be repeated." It is pleasing to have such an assurance, but if Lord Simon hasn't heard the whispers—nay, the loud shouts—about returning to the gold standard—well, his hearing is not the best.

UNION GANGSTERISM: An example of the gangster methods of union officials is to be found in an article published in the Melbourne "Herald" of August 15, wherein Mr. R. T. Sanderson, chairman of the clothing trades council, says that, "Members of his council signed the compulsory unionism agreements because the big stick of Government action was used against them. He said: 'It had been reported to me that

upon signing the agreement, the firm concerned received a contract within a day, that they knew they never would have received otherwise." From this it is apparent that some Government official is handing out contracts under the direction of trades union Capones. Suitable words to describe this state of affairs could not be published; but action, not words, is required to prevent this vicious racket from being legalised.

MEDICINE RACKET: Another form of compulsory unionism is reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of August 15, wherein allied members of the chemical groups are seeking legislation to compel manufacturers of proprietary medicines to employ a chemist. This move, as intended, would drive hundreds of small manufacturers out of business—because they could not afford to pay a chemist. Big monopolies, of course, would not be so affected, because chemists are already on their pay rolls. It would be reasonable to say that 99% of our legislation represents minority interests, and it seems that the only safeguard against such undemocratic legislation would be that evidence that a majority of electors require the specific legislation must be produced before a Bill is even discussed by Parliament.

UNWANTED IDEAS: Mr. E. W. Miller, a practical scientist and a local British subject whose name did not appear on the "Honours List," claims to have produced a substitute for petrol, consisting entirely of Australian-made ingredients, at a cost of 2/6 per gallon. As it constitutes a threat to the big oil monopolies, it has not been well received; the Supply and Development (should be called the "defy and prevent") Department being especially unhelpful. In 1936 Mr. Miller invented an electrical faultfinder which was also rejected by the authorities; but later it was found that the German Messerschmitt plane exhibited in Melbourne was fitted with a similar device. Evidently these Departments need watching very closely.

RATION MYSTERY: As yet only Mr. Dedman accepts the necessity for clothes rationing—especially of woollen goods. But, assuming that he is the only infallible person, why is the Donegal Tweed—which, according to a practical tailor (Mr. G. S. Moore, reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of August 1), wears well and is much quicker to produce—not produced? It seems that, as the same "Herald" said in one of its off-guard moments, "There is no reason for rationing other than the discipline it imposes."

BUREAUCRACY: As an indication of the utter inefficiency of our socialistic planners, and the difference between the honeyed promises to encourage enlistment and the actual resulting raw deal handed out to some, the following soldier's comment, published in the Melbourne "Sun" of August 20, is illuminating: "On my discharge, I was entitled to a civilian suit, but none was available, I had no civilian attire, and had to wait weeks for an identity card—then a further period for a ration book. I am 50, and after all this I was ordered to report for registration for universal training." This letter was referred to an army official, who pointed out that the disgusted digger was just one of hundreds of other returned soldiers, similarly afflicted. Now, some individuals are responsible for this result, and whoever they are, they should be dismissed immediately.

COMMUNISM: The Canadian Minister for Justice, speaking on the question of legalising Communism, is reported as saying that "he would be reluctant to recommend anything, which could be interpreted as legalising real communism in Canada." It is not stated what he meant by the abstraction, "Communism," which, as such, can have no connection with the gallantry of Russian soldiers; but if the actions of most of those professing that creed are any guide, it means anything which tends to further the idea of removing the power from the people and placing it in the hands of a centralised bureaucracy, like that of Hitler's dictatorship—which they profess to oppose.

WARRING ISMS: Arising from Mr. Fadden's statement that the Opposition desired to combat "Wardism" and "Dedmanism," and general attempts to introduce socialism without a mandate, Mr. Curtin has developed heat under the collar and threatens political fireworks. Here we see the rival power-lusters at each other's throats; but the truth of the matter is that John Citizen doesn't want any of these isms, which are foisted on him by the Party gangsters, and the sooner all of them are eliminated in favour of independent representatives who will simply ascertain what their electors require and give effect to such wishes, the sooner this disgraceful brawling will disappear, and democratic representation become a reality.

YOU WERE NOT TAUGHT THIS HISTORY AT SCHOOL!

(Continued from page 1.)

are, indeed, gone; and the rest will follow in proportion as the present farmers are exhausted. These will keep on giving rents as long as they can beg or borrow the money to pay rents with. But a little more time will so completely exhaust them, that they will be unable to pay; and as that takes place, the landlords will lose their estates. Indeed, many of them, and even a large portion of them, have, in fact, no estates now. They are called theirs, but the mortgagees and annuitants receive the rents. As the rents fall off, sales must take place . . . in order that the Jews may be put in full possession."

"Progression"

Cobbett did an amazing amount of historical research, and was always at variance with the "accepted" historians, who have maintained "progressive theory" of history. Let Cobbett speak:—

" . . . I suppose that every inch of land that I came through this morning belongs either to the Duke of Richmond or to Lord Egremont. No harm in that, mind, if those who till the land have fair play; and I should act unjustly towards the noblemen if I insinuated that the husbandmen have not fair play, as far as the landlords are concerned; for everybody speaks well of them. There is, besides, no misery to be

seen here. . . . Hume and other historians rail against the feudal-system; and we 'enlightened' and 'free' creatures as we are, look back with scorn, or, at least, with surprise and pity, to the 'Vassalage' of our forefathers. But if the matter were well inquired into not slurred over, but well and truly examined, we should find, that the people of these villages were as free in the days of William Rufus as are the people of the present day; and that vassalage, only under other names, exists now as completely as it existed then. Well; but out of this, if true, arises another question, namely: Whether the millions would derive any benefit from being transferred from these great lords who possess them by hundreds, to Jews and jobbers, who would possess them by half-dozens, or by couples?" We now know the answer!

Destroying the Aristocracy

Those of us who have applied our studies to real history, have, we believe, helped to make more generally known the fact that those individuals who seek to reduce the whole of mankind to a uniform serfdom have first created a dispossessed class; they have next directed the feelings of this class against the "upper classes," thus making the "upper classes" believe that they can only keep their economic security by keeping the

Lord Elton's Altar—Continued

ative newspapers with large circulations "unostentatiously surrendered" their literary columns to those who subscribed to the prevalent conventions, "and nobody thought it odd that for years the chief fiction reviewer on the Conservative 'Observer' should have been a lifelong socialist." He attributes this to "timidity"! Lord Elton has discovered that "anyone who will take the trouble to look back over the opinions invented for the egregious Blimp by his distinguished creator, will discover how often . . . it is not Low but Blimp who was right." He quotes Mr. G. D. H. Cole: "Punctuality, regularity, discipline, industry are a set of slave virtues."

Lord Elton claims to have argued for "an hour on end with intellectuals about intellectuals, and at the end of it all" he has found them "not, I think entirely owing to my fault, still apparently under the impression that I was attacking intellect."

The more intellect the better, says Lord Elton. "No community can prosper if it lacks powerful intelligences. Only, if the community is indeed to prosper, they must be wedded to character and experience." The character and experience of the Readings? Strakosches? Normans? Sieffs? Macdonalds? "Who has not encountered by now the zealous ideologue who cannot keep his own shoelaces tied up or find his razor in the morning; who can neither live happily with his wife nor pay his tailor; whose private life, in fact, has been laid waste by timidity, selfishness or incompetence, but who is confidently prepared to organise British industry or plan world federation?" Most seemingly courageous of all, Lord Elton goes for the most absurdly flattered of all the present symptoms of social disease, the secluded young, whose "education" may be "to wear blinkers for too long." He cites Aristotle for the opinion: "The young are not fit to be students of politics, for they have no experience of life and conduct, and it is these that supply the premises and subject matter of this branch of thought."

"We have created," says Lord Elton, "a civilisation rich in means, but almost destitute of Ends." Writing on the topic of party government ("Mechanism of Democracy"), he remarks interestingly that "In 1938 a well-known member of the Red' Clyde group, once led by Messrs. Wheatley and Maxton, assured me that no important issues now divided the political parties. All, in short, was as, more or less, it had

ever been." The "business of Christians, as Christians, is to denounce the social evil, and to insist that the politicians must get rid of it—not to commit themselves in detail to one particular remedy." Why "in detail"?

As distorted echoes of what may be called "correctitude" these citations are remarkable, and make a remarkable list. But how is it that the author, who on page 9 can say that we may not know certainly what was the meaning of the war until long after it is over, although "it must have a meaning," can, four pages from the end of his book, assert: "This is the inmost meaning of the war; the opportunity of that victory over ourselves without which we shall not be worthy to survive, or shape a new age. This is the hardest of all our tasks, for it is not the reform of others, but of ourselves; not the suppression of other people's privileges, but the surrender of our own . . ."? It is "we" who are wrong, and there ain't no Schiff's and Warburgs! Why did not Lord Elton pause a little longer before he slid so easily from a fact to a theory here and there? The assault upon morale!—who made it?—The weeklies and the great newspapers were "intimidated"—who intimidated them? A chapter heading is, "Production and Distribution—For What?" Well, why does he not tell us "for what"? Lord Elton advocates the surrender of privileges. He is advertised as a well-known broadcaster. If he has no other privilege, why not let him forego this one, in the interest of self-consistency? How is it that for those who seem least capable of turning anything but a blind eye upon the really dark (hidden) forces at work in the world, "ourselves" invariably means "yourselves"?

Our friends do not say right things about wrong topics, or wrong things about right topics. The formula for a Social Creditor is the elaboration of the connection between a policy and a philosophy. Words do not matter. They may be merely portentous, as, we believe, this book is portentous. What matters is the connection. Lord Elton asks for "Ends as well as means." What is wanted is the laying bare of the means which have led to the ends we have (unfortunately) got; and the laying open for human use of the means to ends chosen by men, for their (own) ends. Moloch was a Phoenician god, partial to human sacrifices. He has been well fed; and is still eating. While he has waiters, he will go on eating. But a Christian waiter! Ye lambs! Our Lord said: "Feed them"—not sacrifice them!

—T. J.

"lower classes" down. This takes the minds of the economically secure class off their real enemy. Finally, they are destroyed. Cobbett realised this to some extent:—

"Upon leaving the park, and coming over the hills to this pretty vale of Uphusband, I could not help calculating how long it might be before some Jew would begin to fix his eye upon Highclere, and talk of putting out the present owner, who, though a Whig, is one of the best of that set of politicians, and who acted a manly part in the case of our deeply-injured and deeply-lamented queen. Perhaps his lordship thinks that there is no fear of the Jews as to him. But does he think that his tenants can sell fat hogs at 7/6 a score, and pay him more than a third of the rent that they have paid him while the debt was contracting? I know that such a man does not lose his estate at once; but, without rents, what is the estate? And that the Jews will receive the far greater part of his rents is certain, unless the interest of the debt be reduced. Lord Carnarvon told a man, in 1820, that he did not like my politics. But what did he mean by my politics? I have no politics but such as he ought to like. I want to do away with that infernal system, which, after having beggared and pauperised the labouring classes, has now, according to the report, made by the ministers themselves to the House of Commons, plunged the owners of the land themselves into a state of distress . . ."

The position is a thousand times worse today. Cobbett was, unfortunately, wrong when he wrote that the money system was nearly beaten. But, we can safely say that it would have been defeated long before this if Cobbett's great work had been carried on.

The following extract is applicable to the present time, when we are again hearing talk of a post-war depression:—

"During the war [Napoleonic War] no importations distressed the farmer. It was not till peace came that the cry of distress was heard. But, during the war, there was a boundless issue of paper money. [See my book, "The Enemy Within The Empire."] Those issues were instantly narrowed by the peace. . . This was the cause of that distress which led to the present Corn Bill."

"The Tax-Eaters"

Right throughout "Rural Rides" Cobbett never once loses an opportunity of lashing the tax system;—

"The weather is fair and warm, so that the public houses on the road are pouring out their beer pretty fast, and are getting a good share of the wages of those thirsty souls. It is an exchange of beer for sweat; but the tax-eaters get, after all, the far greater part of the sweat; for, if it were not for the tax, the beer would sell for three-halfpence a pot, instead of five pence. Of three pence-halfpenny the Jews and jobbers get about two pence-halfpenny."

"Over-Production"

One could mistake the following extract for one coming from a contemporary writer: "The crop of hay is very large, and that part which is in, is in very good order . . . So that here the evil of 'over-production' will be great indeed! Whether we shall have any projects for taking hay into pawn is more than any of us can say; for, after what we have seen, need we be surprised, if we were to hear it proposed to take butter and even milk into pawn? In after times, the mad projects of these days will become proverbial. The oracle and the over-production men will totally supplant the March-hare."

But when, oh, when? Over one hundred years have now elapsed!

Revolution

Cobbett realised clearly that there are two types of revolutions; but they both obtain the same result, the dispossessing of people of their property:—

"But what a strange thing it is, that there should be men at this time to fear the loss of estates as the consequence of a convulsive revolution; at this time, when the estates are actually passing away from the owners before their eyes, and that, too, in consequence of measures which have been adopted for what has been called the preservation of property, against the designs of Jacobins and Radicals! [We see this even more so today. So-called Conservatives are helping every attack on private ownership.]

"Mr. Drummond has, I dare say, the means of preventing his estate from being actually taken away from him; but I am quite certain that that estate, except as a place to live at, is not worth to him, at this moment, one single farthing. What could a revolution do for him more than this?"

On Socialism

Cobbett's views on "public ownership" (whatever that means) can be recommended to all those who advocate the introduction of collectivised, State-controlled farms in British countries. Cobbett was a practical farmer; he knew that Government officials know and care nothing about farming:—

"Poor, however, as this district is, and culled about as it has been for the best spots of land by those favourites who have got grants of land or leases, or something or other, still there are some spots here and there which would grow trees; but never will it grow trees, or anything else, to the profit of this nation, until it become private property. Public property must, in some cases, be in the hands of public officers; but this is not an affair of that nature. This is too loose a concern; too little controllable by superiors. It is a thing calculated for jobbing above all others; calculated to promote the success of favouritism. Who can imagine that the persons employed about plantations and farms for the public are employed because they are fit for the employment? Supposing the commissioners to hold in abhorrence the idea of paying for services to themselves under the name of paying for services to the public; supposing

(Continued on page 8.)

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

From the United Democrats, 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide.

"Victory Road" Campaign. —A letter form is now available at this office for the use of interested electors to arrange for a discussion with their Parliamentary representative on certain aspects of the political situation. The letterform quotes John Gordon:

"You cannot have a crusade without a burning purpose behind it. Plant a seed of hope, plant the dream of a great destiny in the hearts of the people, and I doubt not that you will see such an awakening as will startle the world. Give them a great ideal to fight and work for, not just hazy words, but a New Charter of Life."

It concludes thus: "Inspired by this ringing challenge, and conscious of the need to develop a war-winning morale, I believe the duty of our Federal Parliament is to assist individuals to obtain real freedom, by adopting a policy similar to that outlined in the ten points of C. Barclay-Smith's booklet, 'The Victory Road,' which concludes with the statement that the ultimate aim of all legislation be the freedom in security of every citizen, living in conditions which make for his greatest health, wealth and happiness. I therefore ask you to take part with me and other electors in a frank discussion of this problem with the object of assisting you to take action for our national and personal well being."

As soon as sufficient electors request this conference they will be notified when it has been arranged to take place with their representative.

A REMINDER—Have you supported us financially by renewing your membership? Moral support is welcome and inspiring, but financial support gets things done.

—M. E. Dodd, President.

"THE NEW WORLD CHARTER"

(Continued from page 5.)

bourne, and they had let the city "grow like Topsy"—no bridges, no streets, only bush tracks or cattle tracks, no sewerage, electric light or gas, etc., etc.—would we not have cause now to get to work and do something about it? This applies more so to the child or individual—there can never be a really sane world until people are trained to think. The great weakness today is that there is no background of the science of life: no real basis for reasoning, no real knowledge of true history or social dynamics. We, therefore, ask you: What is wrong with this early training, especially as it is not training to think a special thing, but training how to think, and, above all, to at least, Think. Could we suggest that you yourself are striving to your utmost to mould opinion and thought, —good work, we say, and keep it up, but do not split hairs!

POINT 6: You state: "I must disagree with the following statement: Economic Insecurity—Poverty amidst plenty and depressions are the direct by-products of the selfish profit motive, the private banking system, the private control of production, distribution and exchange, making man always slave to money and those who control money." (P.32.) This unfortunate tendency towards Socialism, which, significantly enough, the bankers are also encouraging, is further emphasised in the definite statements, 'Land shall not be privately owned.' (P. 33, and elsewhere); 'The Means of production, distribution and exchange, key industries, natural resources and public utilities to be publicly and co-operatively owned and operated for the public good, under a system of Public Ownership known as Co-operative Trusteeship'; 'Control in Industry to be exercised by Representatives of the State on behalf of all the people.' (P.41.)"

Without going into any lengthy discussion, we would point out in this respect that the whole philosophy of the Charter must be taken into account when considering this point. Again, Mr. Butler, you appear to be concerned at the word "socialism," rather than the philosophy, which we feel, could bring us nearer to the brotherhood of man. You, and not us, have labelled this particular section, for the Executive are strongly opposed to State-Socialism or Finance-controlled Socialism as much as you are. The difference is as follows: Under State-Socialism, a small group of men, either controlled by or relying upon International Finance, proceed to control the people from the top down. Individual liberty is usurped and regimentation or dictatorship follows (still controlled by the International Financiers); but, here is the point: Under the framework of the plan, as outlined by the Charter, the people would nominate their representatives, the people would have control of their representatives, the people or community would have the benefit and control through Co-operative Trusteeship (representative of the producers, consumers, the Commonwealth, and the staff) of key industries and monopolies generally, and, if it is found advantageous, of production, distribution and exchange.

We would point out that since the power would be taken from money and the Commonwealth would be using its own bank (a people's bank), and since International Finance would not be wanted or used under the framework of the plan, the question of the bankers wanting Socialism or the danger of the bankers' control of the proposals set forth in the New World Charter would not come into the picture at all. In all the proposals set out, the initiative and control is to be vested in the hands of the people, and therefore the control comes from the people upwards, and not from a State Executive downwards; this is a very fundamental distinction, and, associated with the other principles enumerated in the Charter, forms the basis of a co-operative Commonwealth.

POINT 6. You say: "Every action by every individual in this world is

done for a profit. It is natural; kill it, and society will crumble. Individuals must have an incentive or inducement, which brings them personal gain. Abstractions, such as 'the public good,' mean nothing. There is only individual good, the desire for profit —i.e., progress—has been the driving force which has produced the world of plenty."

You say that every action by every individual in the world is done for a profit. We feel that many will disagree with this, for, although the profit motive is the main motive of life today, we have only to cite the multitude of social and welfare workers and other selfless individuals who have toiled for little or no return at all (let alone profit) through this and other centuries despite the lure of money. Incidentally, our Executive understands "profit" to mean an amount over and above fair returns for services rendered, and not the returns themselves. Men will work in a local football team, tennis team, or cricket team, for the good-will and esteem of their fellows and the progress of the team as a whole, much

You Were Not Taught This at School

(Continued from page 7.)

them never to have heard of such a thing in their lives, can they imagine that nothing of this sort takes place while they are in London eleven months out of twelve in the year? I never feel disposed to cast much censure upon any of the persons engaged in such concerns. The temptation is too great to be resisted. The public must pay for everything a pois

ACT NOW!

The Debt-Money Factory is cracking up—"so keep on keeping on."

A new and cheaper edition is being printed (the first being sold out) of—"A NEW CHARTER FOR AUSTRALIA and a Policy for the People," written by Stanley F. Allen, F.C.A. (Aust). Price, 3d each, or 2/6 a dozen (plus postage).

EDUCATE, PLAN, ACT—Now is your opportunity.

Send your orders for the new issue to Social Credit Movement, 88 Pitt-street, Sydney. —Advt.

d'or. Therefore, no such thing should be in the hands of the public, or rather, of the Government; and I hope to live to see this thing completely taken out of the hands of this Government."

I wonder what Cobbett would say if he were alive today, and read an article in a recent issue of "The Weekly Times," a Melbourne "Herald" publication, on collective farming in Soviet Russia? He would probably have the cheek to ask how many practical farmers are on the "Herald's" staff!

"Winning" the Battle of Waterloo

Cobbett's observations on the "winning" of the Battle of Waterloo are worth noting. I wonder what he would have written if he had known that, in over a hundred years' time, the English taxpayer would still be paying the interest bill on the debt arising from that battle?

"They would fain have us believe that the calamities they endure do not arise from the acts of the Government. What do they arise from, then? The Jacobins did not contract the Debt of £800,000,000 sterling. The Jacobins did not create a dead weight of £150,000,000. The Jacobins did not cause a pauper-charge of £200,000,000 by means of 'new inclosure bills,' 'vast improvements,' paper money, potatoes, and other 'proofs of prosperity.' The Jacobins did not do these things. And will the Government pretend that 'Providence' did it? That would be 'blasphemy'

harder and more conscientiously for no return or profit than they would at an every day job for a handsome return or profit, provided, of course, they had economic security (and, in some cases, even without this). It is this very team spirit that we lack in our society today, and there is no doubt that if every action by every individual was improving the common lot of us all and the service rendered by individuals was the standard that would adjudge them as a citizen of the New Society, we would be getting nearer to the brotherhood of man, a commonwealth of co-operative nations, and a society in which human personality would have free expression in its most creative and instructive sphere.

Allow us to say, in conclusion, that much thought has been provoked by the suggestions you have offered, and the revised edition of the Charter will contain many amendments which we trust will fit it to become the basis of reconstruction for which we are all working. —Trusting that we may all work together in this common cause, with a unity that will shatter the enemy once and for all, We are, Yours faithfully, New World Reconstruction Movement, Charles K. Cutting, Hon. Sec.

indeed—Poh!! . . . They laid out, in the first place, six hundred millions which they borrowed, and for which they mortgaged the revenues of the nation."

No wonder Cobbett is not taught in the schools! He is a real historian.

Cobbett's real place in English history will be recognised. Of course, certain "progressives" want us to forget all about the past, all about the real British culture, which they seek to destroy. But I understand that the Association to Defend British Culture has as its main object the study of great British citizens. I recommend them to study Cobbett, who, in my opinion, breathes the spirit of the real England we all love and admire.

Machiavelli Outdone

(Continued from page 3.)

well how to disguise this characteristic, and to be a great pretender and dissembler; and men are so simple and so subject to present necessities, that he who seeks to deceive will always find some one who will allow himself to be deceived. A prince ought to take care that he never lets anything slip from his lips that is not replete with the above-mentioned five qualities, that he may appear to him who sees and hears him altogether merciful, faithful, humane, upright and religious. There is nothing more necessary to appear to have than this last quality (religious) inasmuch as men judge generally more by the eye than by the hand, because it belongs to everybody to see you, to few to come in touch with you. Every one sees what you appear to be; few really know what you are, and those few

Dietitians Win First Round, Etc.

(Continued from page 1.)

claimed in America, had used diet in effecting her cures, Mr. Tunnecliffe interjected that she would be prosecuted under this Bill if it became law. Mr. Holland then went on to state that he was prepared to see that justice was done to men and women who had given long service to the community, and, by specialising in their various arts of healing, might know more than a general medical practitioner, protected under this Bill.

All naturopathic practitioners who heard the debate must have felt deeply gratified by the generous acknowledgment, made by so many members, as to the value of their work. In the general harmony, only one discordant note was struck, by the member for St. Kilda, who valiantly took the field in the cause of public morality. Ignoring the vast body of naturopathic practitioners, of good repute and unimpeachable character, he directed his remarks towards certain people of "immoral character," against whom the general public should be protected. Mr. Michaelis is probably unaware that no reputable naturopathic organisation or dietetic association accepts for membership people of this type, nor can they claim any status amongst the consulting dietitians now in practice. It might be pointed out that if personal morality should be made the test in conferring the right to practise upon professional men, the ranks of other professions might be depleted.

The member for St. Kilda should also realise that the general public has become very discriminating of late, and that the day of the charlatan and unscrupulous quack is practically over. We have reason to believe that he, too, in common with other members of the Assembly, has received personal letters from many reputable citizens, who resent the term "quack" as applied to men whom they have proved to be honest, trustworthy, and highly proficient in the practice of their own chosen profession.

From the general tone of this debate, naturopathic practitioners may rest assured that those members of the House who showed themselves ready to give honour where honour is due will also strive to ensure that the interests of practising dietitians are adequately protected, by subsequent rejection or amendment of the proposed legislation.

dare not oppose themselves to the opinion of the many who have the majesty of the State to defend them." If Machiavelli were to return to earth today I wonder what he would think of the many exponents of his gentle art of deception. Probably he would be horrified and retire, in a state of "religious indignation," and when he saw the people standing in queues waiting to pay their taxes he would say with disgust, "This is chicken's feed."

TO OUR READERS

You may obtain your copy of the "NEW TIMES" from any authorised newsagent. Should your agent not have supplies, please ask him to communicate direct with New Times Ltd., Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne, C.I. Tel.: MU 2834.

If you wish to have your copy posted direct from this office, please complete the form below and mail it, accompanied by remittance payable to New Times Ltd.

Subscription Form

To New Times Ltd,
Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne, C.1
Please forward me the "New Times" for.....

Months, beginning with issue dated..... 19....
cheque

I enclose postal note for the sum of.....
money order

Name.....

Full Postal Address.....

Date.....

Please fill in name and address in block capitals.

The subscription rate to the "New Times" is £1 for 12 months; 10/- for 6 months; 5/- for 3 months. Post-free.