

DR. G. L. WOOD
AGAIN! (Page 2)

ANTI-CONSCRIPTION
ACTIVITIES. (Page 3)

SOCIAL CREDIT IN
ALBERTA. (Page 3)

IN BRITAIN'S PARLIA-
MENT. (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY **THE** PRICE—FOURPENCE
NEW TIMES

Vol. 9 No. 12 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 1943

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for
transmission by post as a newspaper.

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).

A Canadian M.P.'s Survey Of The Situation

The Socialists, Conservatives and Liberals Unite Against Social Credit

No Popular Support For Federal Union In Canada and U.S.A.

Mr. Norman Jaques' home is in Alberta, and he is a member of the Canadian House of Commons. He is also a well-informed advocate of the New Economics. Therefore, his survey of the politico-economic situation in Canada, in a recent letter to Mr. D. McInnes, of Melbourne, is both interesting and informative. Inter alia, he wrote as follows:—

Mirror, Alberta.
December 30, 1942

Dear Mr. McInnes,—

Many thanks for your letter, "Hansards," and papers, which are full of interesting and encouraging things. In my last letter I thanked you for Lang's "Why I Fight"; the book will be a veritable mine of information for reference and quotation. I promise you to make the best possible use of all the news which you have sent me, and, in exchange, I will send you anything of interest from Ottawa, after the House opens on January 27. I am glad you agree with me about gold, the mining of which in war-time is a question of fundamental importance.

Soon after I entered the hospital, a year ago, I came on an extract from an address by Dr. Cyril James, before the American Bar Association—"The value of the 30,000 tons of American gold is at stake. If Britain wins, gold will control the world's money, but a German victory will render gold valueless."

Dr. James is Principal of McGill University, and Chairman of the Post-War Reconstruction Committee set up by the Dominion Government. At the time I had been forbidden to move, owing to my heart, and this quotation so enraged me that it is a wonder I lived to tell the tale. I managed to write a "resolution" demanding an end to gold mining for the "duration," and sent it to the national convention of the Monetary Reform League in Winnipeg.

where it was defeated!! However, a week ago I moved a similar resolution at the provincial conference in Edmonton, and it was carried without a single adverse vote.

Dr. James is a graduate of the London School of Economics, which, as you know, was founded by Fabian Socialists, with money (£1,000,000) obtained from Sir E. Cassel—German-Jew international financier—"for the purpose of training the bureaucracy of the future world Socialist State." I doubt if there is a British, Christian name on its staff.

Now, if the Alberta experiment has done nothing else, it has proved that "money" is fundamental to all other questions, and that the "faithful" and orthodox, of all races, creeds and parties, will unite in its defence. "Money" is a religion, and has been seriously challenged only in Alberta. The reactions have been amazing. All political divisions have been wiped out—Liberals, Conservatives and Socialists are united in mutual defence of their faith—as "independents," whose slogan is: "Anything to defeat Social Credit."

With two Social Credit friends, my wife and I attended a mass meeting of these "Independents." Two thousand of the "faithful" had gathered from far and wide, and were addressed by the provincial Conservative leader, and by former Liberal and C.C.F. (Socialist) Members of Parliament. As the Socialist put it, while the three speakers stood, arm in arm, on the platform—"in the past we" may have had differences of opinion, but when we consider

the threat of Social Credit Government to our fair province, to our women and children, our differences sink into insignificance," etc. Finally, a scurrilous resolution, demanding the impeachment of the Government, and the deportation of their British economic advisers, was put to the meeting, and a standing vote taken, during which the cheering was deafening. Finally, silence was restored until "all those opposed stand," when we four stood up, which so enraged the "independents" that they "boomed" and hooted—pandemonium—for several minutes. That was the year before the war. At that time Canada was defenceless, a million Canadians were on relief, and the majority of farmers had been ruined. But, to these "independents," nothing mattered but "sound" money.

Our Social Credit following contains people in all walks of life, including many business men, to whom "discretion must be the better part of valour," and I know more than one bank manager to be quite tolerant. But the fact remains that in Alberta, Social Credit has united Liberals, Conservative's and Socialists in mutual defence of "sound," orthodox finance—an opposition blind to truth and reason, or common, "horse" sense.

And when the war came, what was the Socialist policy?

1. "Canada is well fitted to make an important contribution through economic assistance. However, in the interests of her people, and economic future, the expansion

of war industries must be strictly controlled" (that is, limited).

2. "Reasonable provision should be made for the defences of Canada's shores."

3. "No military participation overseas."
—(C.C.F. Statement, "Hansard," Sept. 9, 1939, by M. J. Colwell, C.C.F. Leader.)

Not a hint there of any realisation of the true situation. Profits to be confiscated, but no mention of using National Credit or of controlling interest rates.

During the Budget debate I said—"The Minister of Finance has stated: 'The real costs of war must come out of current production.' That is true. A war is paid for with blood, sweat and tears. When that payment has been met the bill has been paid. The real costs must be paid during the war, therefore post-war debts are not real, but artificial. Nothing I have heard has lessened my faith that war can be financed without adding to the nation's debt." ("Hansard," Sept. 11, 1939)

Mr. Coldwell having spoken for the "pinks," Mr. "Jim" Buck issued a Communist manifesto: "This is the most criminal war in history. Demand peace for Canada. Not a man must be sent to the capitalists' slaughter. Strike for higher wages, and hinder the war effort."

Social Credit fought the general election of 1940 on the issue of total war, which was opposed by all other parties, and, as a result, we lost half our seats. (And little or no effort was made until "Dunkirk.")

(Continued on page 4.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Provided the following comment by Mr. Churchill on post-war international relationships is not a smokescreen, it represents a body-blow to the Federal "Union plot: "Whilst we wish to maintain close touch with our great Allies, the Government is convinced that the administration of British Colonies must continue to be the sole responsibility of Great Britain." Notwithstanding any black spots, the British peoples have for centuries led the world in many worth-while matters, and there is no reason to believe that other countries, who have failed to manage their own affairs any better, can improve matters by meddling in British affairs.

BUS BUNGLER: Melbourne tramway officials have reported that 40 defective buses were already in the depots, and could not be repaired because of army call-ups; unless eight or ten mechanics were released immediately, 60 to 70 buses would be off the road within the next two months. If this is true, it can only mean that the man-power bunglers, after sabotaging our food supplies, have now turned their attention to transport—another essential war service. Our socialistic planners seem more concerned with abstractions than real war necessities, such as food, clothing and transport. Morons who mistake abstractions for real things are a positive menace.

RUSSIAN RESERVES: The Melbourne "Herald" of March 8 quotes the New York "Herald-Tribune" as saying that "four million Russians have been killed in battle, and that another 12 million have died in German-held Russia." If this New York report is true, it will be a great surprise to readers of the local daily press who have been led to believe that the Russian losses were comparatively slight. Moreover, it would mean that the Russian man-power reserves are not nearly as great as local dailies have indicated. Both versions of the position cannot be correct. It is very regrettable that irresponsible journalists and newspapers should distort the facts in such a confusing manner.

FUNERAL FAMINE: Owing to man-power call-ups, some cemeteries have reduced the depth of graves from 11 feet to 9 feet to save labour. Undertakers are also short of men for coffin-making and removing bodies. The Funeral Directors' Association reports that "if the record death rate of July, August and September of last year was equalled this year, they would be unable to cope with funerals." Can it be that the socialistic muddlers responsible for this potentially dangerous situation are even prepared to let the people run the risk of the deadly diseases likely to arise from such a situation? Can the people risk leaving these theoretical bunglers in charge of affairs?

RUSSIAN REWARDS: In advocating that Russia's post-war aims be defined, some unspecified persons, described in the daily press as "realistic Washington observers," are reported as saying "that the fate of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia depends on the Soviet; this is also true of Poland, Finland and perhaps of the Balkan nations—and not inconceivably—all of Europe." Such observers seemingly overlook the fact that Russia, like U.S., is officially in the war only to beat the Nazis and liberate enslaved peoples—not for spoils as suggested

in the above report! Incidentally, Russia has accepted the "Four Freedoms" specified in the "Atlantic Charter," but apparently has not insisted on the missing freedom: the right of the individual to choose or refuse.

GOLD GOSSIP: The London conference on post-war matters "is expected to produce a post-war currency plan envisaging some sort of international gold stabilisation, although there is no question of returning to the old type of gold standard." This issue is forging to the front. It is surrounded by other issues so that the public eye will not be clearly focussed on it. Doubtless other less known descriptive terms will be substituted for "gold"—but realists will keep their eyes on the ball.

FEDERAL UNION: Proposals to be considered by the proposed U.S. Senate sub-committee would include a suggestion put forward by a group of (un-named) Senators "to take a lead in forming a permanent military and political post-war organisation." Senator Connally, presumably one of the group, said: "I also prefer military sanctions to enforce the body's decisions." The Federal Council of Churches of Christ is said to be supporting this concentration of power. Thus the bankers' plot for more direct world control gathers speed, along with their War Aim Number Two—return to the gold standard.

WILY WITNESSES: The authorities appear to be in for a spot of trouble in legally defending their interference with the religious activities of "Jehovah's Witnesses." Firstly there is the question of "freedom of worship"—guaranteed in our Constitution and in the much-discussed Atlantic Charter. The "Witnesses" in all countries where they operate denounce all organisations—except their own! Still, if that is one form of "religious worship," that's what the Constitution and the Atlantic Charter guaranteed. However, our legal luminaries are rather efficient at defending Government action—so all should be well.

STRIKE STRATEGY: It is very significant that every strike is used as an argument for socialisation of the industry concerned. The coal strike is an example. The idea is to imply that socialisation would prevent such strikes. (Needless to say, they are fomented by socialistic theorists from below while those at the top pretend to lament such direct action.) The falsity of the proposition is best realised by remembering Government railway strikes, the strikes at the State-owned Wonthaggi mine—and even the police strike.

—O.B.H.

The World-Government Plot Takes Shape!

By Eric D. Butler.

Upon the outbreak of war the peoples of the British Empire and America were inundated with propaganda for a World Government, to be brought into being, if possible, before the conclusion of hostilities. Mr. Anthony Eden told us that we—whoever we are—were going to build the "New Order" through war. Presumably, the "New Order" envisaged by Mr. Eden couldn't be built without a war!

Hitler was financed by Mr. Montagu Norman through the Bank "of England." And the Wall Street Bankers were also helpful.

Once the war started it was necessary to endeavour to force British war aims into channels suitable to the world planners. This has been practically achieved. Mr. Eden said in the British House of Commons on December 2 of last year that Britain was committed to the establishment of an international organisation after the war, to keep "world peace" by the use of armed force. Needless to say, the British people have not been consulted about this matter. Our own Dr. Evatt has informed us that Australia is committed to a similar policy, but the Australian people have not been consulted, either. Apparently, the first foundations for the "New Order" were laid down at the famous Atlantic meeting between Churchill and Roosevelt. There the vague Atlantic Charter was signed. And one of the men present was Mr. Montagu Norman. Very significant!

Since then all the "leaders" of the Allied countries have been featured in the press whenever they have advocated the establishment of an international government backed by armed force. The campaign is growing as the war proceeds. Federal Union is no longer advocated too openly, although Federal Union organisations are working vigorously. Following his admission in December that Britain was committed to the establishment of an international organisation backed by armed force, Mr. Eden was reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of Jan. 21, 1943,

as having said that "a common programme of post-war economic co-operation" was being prepared by the Governments of the Allied nations. As the bankers have successfully dominated all national governments, there is little doubt that they are certain they can dominate one international government—particularly making certain that no national government will have any armed forces at its disposal.

Sir Stafford Cripps has been reported at length by the finance-controlled press whenever he has advocated an international government and an international air force.

In the Melbourne "Herald" of January 2, 1943 much space was devoted to New Year statements by the "leaders." The "leaders," including Mr. Henry Ford, all advocated an international government to keep "world order" after the war. Sir Stafford Cripps expounded his usual thesis, stating that this war was being fought by "the common people." Whenever I hear of the "common people," I wonder who the "uncommon people" are. How the internationalists love the abstract terms, which sound nice, but mean nothing.

Mr. R. G. Casey, unfavourably known to all Australians opposed to the private banking racket, made a very revealing statement three weeks after the New Year statements by the "leaders": "Speeches made recently by three different men—M. Stalin and Mr. Sumner Welles (U.S. Under-Secretary of State), and Mr. Anthony Eden (British Foreign Secretary), are worth study. You will see they are not unrelated. They produce a series of very healthy signs for the post-war"

(Continued on page 3.)

" SPES ALBIONIS"

For four centuries after their expulsion in 1290, England for all practical purposes was entirely free of the Jews. Their place in finance had been supplied to some extent by Italians (Lombards) and the Dutch. By one means or another the country "managed" (the process labelled by those who both condemn and envy its exponents, as "muddling through"), as Britain has always had a way of doing. The period under review did, however, evolve to a great extent what we term the Anglo-Saxon type or mentality, and without any alien assistance, except perhaps from Italy. And it did culminate in one of the greatest epochs in human culture—the England of the Tudors.

Gradually during the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, "Christianised" Jew refugees from the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisition, known as Marannos, began to accumulate in the City of London. How much influence they had on "events" in the reign of Charles I., and to what extent, if any, they financed the Roundheads, is not easy to determine. That they would be bitter opponents of any revival of Roman Catholicism in England or anywhere else, is obvious. Organised agitation for their re-admission began in 1648. The proximity of revolution and civil strife seems always to have had an agitating effect on the Jews. A dispossessed (as they believed) minority, when party strife disturbs the settled order, whether world or national, they are to be observed immediately manoeuvring for position and the occupation of temporarily vacant seats, and adding to the general tensivity of the situation.

The Reformation in England was a comparatively orderly and constitutional affair. Even in Elizabeth's days it still allowed of a United Front against Judaism. But as the Sectaries grew and increased during the early part of the Seventeenth Century, and with them the study of the Bible, particularly the Old Testament, interest in Judaism increased in the country. This was particularly so under the Protectorate. The times were generally regarded as apocalyptic, and agitation, begun in the middle of the century in Amsterdam, no doubt under Jewish pressure, by Joanna Cartright, an expelled English Baptist living in Amsterdam, was sufficiently influential and intense as to deserve a reply from the British Parliament. This in part took the form of An Agreement of the People, an act that reserved religious freedom to those only "who should profess faith in God through Jesus Christ"—a not unrealistic distinction!

But there was "pressure" of other kinds than mere agitation. About this time a book appeared, "Spes Israelis," by Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel, a noted Jewish writer and theologian on the Continent. This dealt mainly with the urgent need—Jewish needs are always urgent—for the Jews to return to England in order to fulfil the prophecy in Daniel xii, 7, to be dispersed to all lands before their final redemption. The case appeared thin, but its putting was sufficiently telling, or the pressure behind it, to elicit an official rebuttal from the English Parliament.

Nothing daunted, Menasseh came to London in 1655 and presented a petition framed on his book in person to Cromwell. The Protector, according to Mr. Roth,* was more than favourable. To what extent he was already beholden to the Jews for finance the author does not state. But the Protectorate had always been in close touch with the Netherlands and Amsterdam, the then world-centre of Jewry and finance, as also of Continental Protestant resistance. In any case, Oliver's heart had long been set on foreign trade and Empire development, and the part the Jews had played in the case of Spain and Portugal and Holland was obvious. As Mr. Roth puts it, there was nothing in his (Cromwell's) eyes to choose religiously between Jews and Papists, and everything as concerned with finance and foreign trade and useful international connections. With their habitual inter-locking propensities the Jews held the key to this last.

The Protector put Menasseh's petition before his Council without delay, thinking to have it agreed to out of hand, much as the Chancellor of the Exchequer expects his important and far-reaching measures to be hurried through Parliament to-day. But the Council demurred at the haste, and asked for time to get outside opinion. Pending this, a tense atmosphere developed, as it is apt to do when Jewish interests are impeded in any way. Wild rumours began to circulate. The Jews had made an offer to buy St. Paul's! Searching enquiries were being conducted in the Eastern counties as to the Protector's genealogy, to ascertain if he might not be the promised Messiah!

This was the state of affairs when the Conference met at Whitehall. No decision could be reached. The ecclesiastics boggled over the religious aspect and the merchants over the economic, and finally Cromwell disbanded them, saying that he and his Council must decide the matter. Menasseh and his following were jubilant. Ignorant of the strength of English public opinion, they expected a decision in their favour, at once. But nothing was done about it, except that those Jews already established were permitted to worship unmolested.

Pressure, however, persisted, and finally, on November 13, 1685, by a new order in Council, Edward I.'s Order of July 18, 1290, was reversed, after four centuries in which the Jew had had neither part nor

* Cecil Roth: "History of the Jews in England."

lot in English history. Within five years of that date, James II. had fallen irrevocably at the battle of the Boyne, where France and Catholicism were both defeated. As Trevelyan says: "In 1690 Ireland was the pivot of the European crisis. The fate of Britain depended on the Irish Campaign, and that of Europe on Britain." James's French forces were defeated largely by William's continental mercenaries, financed, according to Mr. Roth, "free of interest" by the Jew Antonio Lopez Suasso, of The Hague. From now on England was not to lack the "sinews of war"—on a rather less disinterested basis. "The Glorious Revolution," says Mr. Roth, "had . . . sent to England a handful of Army contractors—a characteristic occupation of the higher economic strata of Continental Jewry." Harley, the Whig Prime Minister, was accused of conducting English foreign affairs for the benefit of the Jews instead of the English—just as New Yorkers complain of their city's affairs to-day. One Solomon da Medina was the principal contractor for Marlborough. It was popularly said he slipped the great Churchill £5000 a year for the bread contract alone. "A Jew and a G-n-1" sang the crowd, "both joined a Trade. The Jew was a Baker. The G-n-1 sold the Bread."

The historical canvas has grown bigger and more complex by a lot than that of Plantagenet England. But it is not to be supposed that the Jews, now firmly re-established where they wanted to be, in

a position to develop their "Spes Israelis," had changed their ingrained habits. Commercialism (the Industrial Revolution) under the Whigs, after the founding of the Bank of England in 1694, developed its financial counterpart to the spread of the Anglo-Saxon race all over the world, in a network of financial indebtedness centering in London.

Over all this side of the business Mr. Roth keeps a discreet silence. It is, so to speak, too contemporary; whereas the England of the Plantagenets is "history," past and done with, and therefore of merely academic interest. Things are very different nowadays, he would imply; human nature, and particularly Jewish human nature, is not what it used to be. But is that so? Individually the Jew presents an unchanging front. And if individually the same, then collectively so—the same policy and the same effects. I feel the only difference between the Thirteenth and Twentieth Centuries is a difference of scale; one of degree, not kind, and that the smaller scale and simpler environment is the one to study profitably, applying the rules there learned to the more complex occasion.

Certain it is that taxation embroils Governments and rulers with their people; plants a gulf between them; makes Governments defend "the system," and those who operate it, against the people, as Edward I. and his Council discovered. So divided (disintegrated), nations cannot move towards cultural integration; cannot express themselves, and like individual neuroathenics, present to the world a divided front, incapable either of resistance or co-operation.

What, one might ask, is the Spes Albionis? Could not someone write a counterblast to Menasseh ben Israel's celebrated treatise? Or has it, perhaps, been written?

—Norman F. Webb, in the "Social Creditor," England.

DR. G. L. WOOD AGAIN

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

Sir,—Did you notice that Dr. G. L. Wood, Dean of the Faculty and acting Professor of Commerce at the Melbourne University, has come forward again to tell us what he thinks is the root of things? He is an old hand at that, and even though repeatedly wrong, he keeps on popping up without a blush. His public assertions during the period of the Depression have been carefully preserved, and in the light of subsequent events provide sufficient evidence, in my opinion, to warrant a charge of treason against society.

Instead of that, however, the Wesley Pulpit was made available to him on Sunday, March 14, to speak about Postwar Reconstruction, and, as usual in the case of mumbo jumbo artists, was given generous press publicity the following day. It seems that nothing can stop the Rev. C. Irving Benson from allowing the Wesley Pulpit to be misused in this way, and it is doubtful whether any other pulpit in the world has been used to a greater extent in perpetuating the present financial system, and thus preventing the establishment of the Kingdom of God.

It is perhaps reasonable to suppose that a man who took a leading and entirely unworthy part in pre-war DE-struction, should wish to show some interest in the opposite direction sooner or later, and what could offer a better opportunity than post-war CON-struction? But if a fellow did not know how to distribute plenty at a time when most people were hungry, ill-clad, and poorly housed, and actually helped to destroy the plenty, how comes it that he is now competent to advise not only on the self-same question of distribution, but also of production, after the war? To me the idea does not make sense.

According to the Melbourne "Argus" of March 15, Professor Wood declared that "present super-prosperity" was forcing people to think along the lines of the Beveridge plan; that the Beveridge plan was not one for "giving everybody something for nothing," but one to secure income up to a subsistence level; that this minimum subsistence level was given as a right; that the facts upon which we would have to build our reconstruction plans were at present not known; and that whatever Australian critics might say of the Beveridge plan, it must be regarded as "a long step towards ensuring freedom from want, and making democracy something more of reality and less of a sham."

Mr. Editor, do you know anyone in Australia who regards his present position as super-prosperous? Taxation is outrageous, cost of living is rising, it takes £5 to buy what in 1939 could be bought for £4; we are obliged to be beasts of burden, our sons are in the fighting lines, we are confronted daily with nerve-racking demands for contributions to all sorts of "funds," and our net incomes are actually and relatively lower than before the war. Even the wealthy are being deprived of their wealth, and it is being placed in pawn by the Government on the advice of men like Professor Wood. Do you know anyone who has paid all his debts, can meet his current needs without going into further debt, and is actually receiving more income than he wants? If this is the happy case with the professors then it may be assumed that they are handing the whole of their surpluses to the Government as a gift towards the war effort. If they are doing this they should be publicly thanked; but in the period of the Depression they did not even accept the cuts they had imposed on others.

Any public man who bandies around the hackneyed phrase "something for no-

thing" in discussions relating to better standards for the common people is intellectually dishonest. Indeed, in my judgment he is a conscious deceiver seeking to confuse and mislead those who have been trusting him. If it is wrong to get something for nothing, why do we not kill all babies at the time of birth and all those who depend upon "investment" for their income? Every human being breathes the atmosphere in order to live, and we get it for nothing! A baby obtains its material subsistence from its mother's breasts, and gets it for nothing. What a demoralising procedure that is! The baby has not "earned" anything, yet it gets air and food for nothing. Scandalous! If a machine produces a heap of food it would be madness to allow people to eat the food unless they had first "earned" it by digging holes or something!

And is a thing GIVEN as a right when it has first been stolen from us? The income for the Beveridge plan, OR FOR ANY OTHER SIMILAR PLAN, is to come from "the worker, the employer, and the Government." The worker's contribution will be taken direct from his pay; the employer's contribution will be taken from the worker through higher prices; and the Government's contribution will be taken from the worker through direct and indirect taxation. The good old worker pays the lot. After that, "a minimum subsistence level is given to him - as a right!"

To say that the facts upon which our reconstruction plans should be built are not known is to state a falsehood. We do know our resources, we do know our productive ability, and we do know that the purpose of any planning should merely be to ensure that the people are given full access to the goods and services. All the other abracadabra is intended to make the "problem" appear super-difficult and thus provide a let-out for incompetent and unworthy professors who have consistently lent themselves to the spread of misleading propaganda and helped to crucify the great mass of the people.

How can an income of £2 per week for a man and his wife provide freedom from want? Do you, Mr. Editor, know any man or woman who could live together without want on a total income of £2 per week? It would, of course, depend largely upon the meaning given to the word "want." In any case, why limit the income to £2 when our production is sufficient to give £10?

Will someone kindly explain how an

SOCIAL CREDIT IN ALBERTA

The following letter was published in "Truth" (England), on January 15—

Sir,—While the personal attack on the founder of the Social Credit movement made by Sir Ernest Benn in your issue of December 11 can safely be left to be answered by Major Douglas himself, may I be allowed to express my surprise that a reputable paper of the calibre of "Truth" should have published statements, ludicrously wide of the mark, concerning the technical proposals of Social Credit. These proposals have for years formed the most important political issue in at least two of our Dominions, and one Canadian Government has been elected, and re-elected, exclusively in order to translate them into the sphere of action.

While every major piece of legislation passed by the Provincial Government of Alberta towards the implementation of Social Credit has been disallowed by the Federal Government, or rather by the international agencies who dominate it, agencies of whom Sir Ernest cannot be completely ignorant, the Abernethy administration has carried out an interim programme which has succeeded in considerably raising the general standard of living in the Province.

In the first three years of the Interim Programme the provincial debt fell by three million dollars, while the debts of the other provinces (and of most other countries in the world, for that matter) were increasing. New roads were built, Educational and Health Services improved (in 1938 Alberta had the largest tubercle-free area in the Empire), employment increased by 20 per cent., industrial pay-rolls rising from 62 million dollars in 1934 to 75 million dollars in 1938. Many farming families who had been beaten by the debt-system were re-established and became self-supporting in four years. The governmental revenue rose considerably but there has been no increase in taxation. Space forbids me to go into further details, but, the issue being one of paramount importance bearing directly on the successful prosecution of the war, may I refer your readers to a small pamphlet, "How Alberta is Fighting Finance," obtainable from the Social Credit Secretariat, 49 Prince Alfred-road, Liverpool, 15.—I am, etc., W. L. RICHARDSON, Mansefield, Killin, Perthshire.

ENGLISH PAPER ON U.S. ELECTIONS

The United States elections have gone decisively against Socialism, Communism and the New Deal. The vote for Socialism and Communism has been cut in half as compared with the last elections! The failure of, and bitter enmity to, the bureaucracy-New Deal policy of Mr. Roosevelt is the best news that has come out of America for a long time, and will have world wide repercussions, not least in this country. The red light is up for the Planners, and it is to be hoped that they will receive the rough treatment which they are obviously going to get in the United States.—"The Social Creditor" (England).

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT (Lectures and Studies Section) DIPLOMA OF ASSOCIATE.

The Social Credit Secretariat, England, of which Major C. H. Douglas is Advisory Chairman, has authorised the holding of an examination for the Diploma of Associate.

It is proposed to hold the examination in June, 1943. Entry is open to all at a fee of 10/6, whether enrolled students of the lecture course or not.

Copies of two earlier examination papers may be obtained from the undersigned on receipt of a stamped, addressed envelope.

Registered students are required to enrol for a special course of study based mainly upon 20 lectures supplied by the Social Credit Secretariat. These are available from March 1 onwards. The fee for such lectures is one guinea.

The examination will be held by correspondence, and application to enrol for this should be received by May 10, accompanied by 10/6.

All correspondence in reference to the above should be addressed to: Miss G. Marsden, 6 Harden-road, Artarmon, N.S.W.

income of £1 per week per person will make democracy more of a reality and less of a sham? Does the great professor mean that such an income would inspire the people to take a greater personal interest in public affairs and force them to keep a closer eye on their political servants in Parliament? If not, how would democracy then be any different from democracy now?

In the light of the foregoing, and seeing that we may expect more publicity for Dr. Wood and his "expert" views, readers may be interested to know some of the brilliant things said by this brilliant man when he was associated with Professors Copland and Giffin during the period of the Depression. That will be the subject of the next letter.—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham St., East Melbourne, March 21, 1943.

ANTI-CONSCRIPTION ACTIVITIES

Hereunder we reproduce a circular issued last week by the No-Conscription Campaign, Room 4, Temperance Hall Buildings, 172 Russell Street, Melbourne. Following that, we reprint a leaflet and attached letter-form issued by the Sydney Anti-Conscription Committee, Room 309, Rawson Chambers, Rawson Place, Sydney:—

That the Militia Bill is now law does not mean that our campaign is over. On the contrary, it means that we have just begun to fight.

Not only were the people of Australia not consulted before the bill was passed, but it was passed in spite of the opposition of the people as expressed at the last election.

Accordingly, we are launching a "Repeal the Militia Act" campaign. Besides publishing literature, carrying on a pressure campaign, holding public meetings every Sunday, and sending speakers to other organisations, we plan to hold a series of public meetings in the suburbs.

You can assist in this important propaganda work by forming local groups in your suburb to publicise and arrange these meetings in co-operation with your central committee.

Therefore, we are calling a general membership meeting at our headquarters at the above address, on Wednesday, March 24 at 8 o'clock, to elect local organisers.

Your attendance is imperative if this campaign is to be effective. Show your support of this campaign and your determination to fight for democracy on the home front, by your presence here next Wednesday night.—Fraternally yours,

Ruth Greenwald, Sec.

Bring your friends to the Yarra Bank on Sunday afternoons, at 3 p.m. Hear our speakers at Temperance Hall Bldgs., Room 11, Sundays, at 8 p.m.

DEMAND A REFERENDUM ON CONSCRIPTION

The Federal Parliament has passed the Bill to extend conscription for overseas service. All the parties in the House were pledged against conscription, but every politician, except Maurice Blackburn, violated this solemn undertaking.

In 1916 and 1917 the people of Australia, by referendum, twice rejected conscription for overseas service. Now a handful of politicians, yielding to overseas pressure, and incited by vested interests, expansionists, reactionary newspapers and draft-dodgers of the pseudo-Communist Party, have overridden the popular vote.

The immediate result of this betrayal

is an intensified comb-out of man-power. Industries which have been laboriously built up over the years will be strangled, if necessary, to provide reinforcements. Even those war workers who imagined that they were outside the scope of conscription are due for a rude awakening. Further layers of the middle class will be uprooted.

OUR FUTURE IS AT STAKE!

It is not too late to strike a blow for freedom by demanding a Referendum on Conscription. The new Conscription Act must be repealed! Force the politicians to let the people have a say!

Fight to preserve what remains of our scanty population! Fight to save the industries of Australia, without which there can be no material or cultural advancement, neither jobs nor decent living!

Write at once to your Federal member! Meetings at Trades Hall, Fridays, 8 p.m. Domain, Sundays, 3 p.m.

To.....

Parliament House, Canberra, A.C.T.

Dear Sir,—I desire to enter an emphatic protest at your action in violating the Anti-Conscription Pledge given by your Party at the last Federal elections.

I demand that you work for a Referendum on conscription for overseas service and for the repeal of all laws providing for military or industrial conscription.

Yours against Conscription,

Signed.....

Address.....

Ernest in Blunderland

If someone were to tell Sir Ernest Benn that Major Douglas is the "alter ego" of Sir William Beveridge, he would fail to experience any acute sense of surprise; for, he says, "apart from the three hundred pages of statistical detail and bureaucratic reorganisation of which Sir William's Report is composed, the basic idea is the discredited Social Credit of the elusive Major Douglas."—"Truth," England, December 11, 1942

THE FEAR OF LEISURE

Extracts from an address to the Leisure Society, England, by A. R. Orage. (Continued from last issue.)

Let us now turn to the task of making Leisure palatable to the Unleisured—to making them really desire and demand it. I wish we had a few Swifts and Cobbetts alive to draw up and present our case for us. A Blatchford would do at a pinch, though a Dickens would be better. "We need an appeal that would at once allay the fears and stimulate the hopes of the "masses," who, for untold centuries, have been fed on the one and disappointed in the other. Confidence in a happy future is a plant of slow growth in an age-old servile class.

Well, then, it seems to me that our first task would be to convince the present Unleisured that Assured Leisure is possible for everybody, that is to say, that our actual productive resources easily permit of it. A vivid propaganda to this effect is highly desirable.

Next, I think, it would be wise to lay particular stress upon the inevitability—in the absence of an epoch of world-wars—of Leisure for an increasing number of people, either in the form of Unemployment or in the form of Leisure proper. The wage-earning classes of this country have not yet begun to realise, I think, how superfluous to modern industry they are rapidly becoming. And certainly they have not realised that the whole aim of Applied Science is to dispense with their labour as fast as possible. There are, for example, many millions of unemployed in peace time; and at least half of those in nominal employment are, strictly speaking, superfluous. In another quarter of a century, the proportion of both Unemployed and Unemployable will be far, far greater. Unless, therefore, the present Unleisured "masses" are prepared to demand Leisure for everybody as a right, the rosier prospect I can see for them is an ever-widening circle of Unemployment, embittered or relieved, according to taste, by doles of Bread and Circuses.

Then I should not say that an argument from the history of Labor would be altogether lost. There have been, and particularly noticeably within the last fifty years, two spontaneous and parallel demands made by the articulate section of the Unleisured "masses"—a demand for shorter hours of labour, that is to say, for more Leisure; and a demand for increased facilities for education, including, of course, the primary facility of financial means. Both these movements derive, in my opinion, from the profoundest impulses in Man as Man—the impulse to Leisure and the impulse to "make the best use of it; in a word, to the impulses of Liberty and Progress. It would be one of the greatest ironies of history if the Labor Movement were to be buried on Pisgah, in sight of the Land of their Promise, which they had not the courage to enter and possess.

We can, many of us, sympathise with the apprehension of Labor that, in the absence of prescribed work, they may find

THE "LAND FOR THE (Chosen) PEOPLE" RACKET

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Crediter," England.

When the land-"owner" has paid say 25 per cent. Estate Duty, which at twenty years tenure represents (if paid at once without interest) the capitalised value of ABOUT HALF THE INCOME FOR THE WHOLE OF THE PERIOD OF TENURE, Schedule A Income Tax WHICH REPRESENTS THE OTHER HALF, Schedule B, which probably represents about three times the GENUINE profits which can be made by WORKING, as distinct from speculating in the land, he can consider where to get the "Tithe" somewhat facetiously paid to Queen Anne's Bounty. Tithe is, of course, simply a Financier's tax, with only the most tenuous connection with the Church. Instead of being a tenth of the PRODUCE it is more generally about a quarter of the assessment, whether there are any earnings or no. And there is Land Tax, the incidence of which is so erratic that no one could, or is intended to, understand it.

We have thus brought our "owner" to the point where he is paying about thirty shillings a year nationalised rent on property worth £1, doing his own repairs, paying his own insurance, and having no recourse to a landlord, as his own tenants have to him. That is to say, the "owner" renders service to the State, gets no return, and pays for it. We can come to his "mineral rights" which have now been acquired by the "State" at about one third of their estimated value.

Valuable minerals are not widespread even in these islands, which were unusually rich in them until we gave most of them away. The consequence of this was twofold; mineral owners were few in number, and so politically weak; and the largest of them were the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, who paid no Estate Duties; and owing to the immense quantity of mineral obtainable from a small area, individual owners gave the illusion of being "rich," more especially as most of them were abysmally ignorant of the idea that they were living on capital in the most literal and wasteful way it is possible to conceive.

Now, it is, of course, possible to reduce

any discussion about the rules, conventions, and practice either of society, business, or even a game, to a mere brawl, by introducing the word "ought." While I am not able to see, myself, just exactly what "the People," and more particularly the Chosen People, did to produce the coal deposits under these islands, these comments have nothing whatever to do with the word "ought." It is not merely possible, it is easy, to raise the standard of living of the legitimate population of these islands to a point considerably exceeding that of any Socialist State; but that has nothing to do with "the minerals ought to belong to the Nation," or the results of the expropriation of mineral owners, which, to make the matter clear at once, have been to mortgage them to the international Jew, via the various forms of Debt.

To understand the main lines of the position, if we take the pithead price of coal at a token price of £1 per ton, the miner gets about 18/6 of this sum, the colliery proprietor gets about 1/4, and the royalty owner gets about twopence. It is clear at once that the royalty has no ascertainable effect whatever on either the ultimate selling price of coal, or the miner's wages.

The object of the fantastic misrepresentation in regard to taxation on minerals has been neither to benefit the public which now gets much worse coal at a much higher price, or the miner, who would scoff at an increase of twopence per ton in coal mined, in any one of the dozen mining disputes of the last ten years. The object was to destroy the principle of property in relation to individuals, centralise it, and transfer it abroad.

As I have mentioned elsewhere, it was freely stated in Washington in 1919 that a bribe of £10,000 was paid to a certain witness before one of the well-known commissions on the Coal Industry to recommend the nationalisation of coal. I feel sure the £10,000 will appear in the bill, if not recognisably.

Coal royalties while obviously and indisputably payments in respect of capital, and taxed on that basis in Death Duties, were again taxed as income. They were again taxed by coyly worded bribes to further attack, such as Mineral Rights Duty, Miners' Welfare Levy, etc. At which point we come to the interlocking with surface "ownership," and it may be becoming clear that whoever "owns" the land, the Big Idea in regard to it is that it shall be rented from the World Debt Holders.

(All rights reserved.) (To be continued.)

"UNHAPPY COMBINATION"

We quote the following from the Editorial comments of "The Drapers' Record," England:—

"Knocking' Millinery.—Last week Lever Bros., makers of Sunlight soap, inserted an advert, in the London "Evening News" to praise a woman who (according to their story), not having bought a hat for ages, refrained from buying one which captivated her, and instead lent the money to a neighbour so that he could visit his sick child. While her action was commendable on 'good neighbour' grounds, the same cannot be said of soap makers, who go out of their way to extol the non-buying of headgear. We purposely refrain, in the interests of hygiene, from advising readers not to purchase soap, but hat makers and milliners might bear that advert, in mind when next using their coupons."

This is an example of the growing tendency to employ the whip of morality for self-interested purposes—to paraphrase: "the unhappy combination of business and morals." The classic instance perhaps is Mr. Spedan Lewis's speech from the Chair to London and Provincial Stores' shareholders, in which he condemned the small trader as dishonest, traditionally and by reason of his "smallness"; contrasting him with those who were fortunate enough to be salaried employees in the rarified, ethical atmosphere of big trading amalgamations and chain-stores. It is publicity employed negatively, as propaganda, rather than positively, as announcement.

Similarly, when the Socialists cry-up the need for "sacrifice," they are simply voicing a moral slogan useful to High Finance for its own ends: its logical conclusion is the suppression of all minor vested interests, i.e., individual private property, at the behest of the Arch-vested Interest—Mammon.

The World Government Plot Takes Shape!

(Continued from page 1.)

world. I found people in Britain and America already planning how they can perpetuate in the post-war world the concept of the United Nations. Britain, the United States and Russia are all thinking along the same lines." (Melbourne "Herald," January 20.) Knowing the people whom Mr. Casey meets, there is little need to inquire about the identity of those doing all the planning. And isn't it a wonderful coincidence how "Britain, the United States and Russia are all thinking along the same lines"? Needless to say, it isn't the British, American, or Russian people who are planning along similar lines. But the planners hope that, as a result of the war, they will be prepared to accept any plausible scheme offering—particularly if that scheme is "boosted" by every means which money can command. The propaganda is being intensified almost daily. The plot is now taking a clearer shape. Australians must tell their parliamentary representatives immediately that this nation must not be committed to any international government scheme without the consent of the Australian people. Every move to take government further away from the people must be resisted while we still have time. The immediate and urgent matter is to retain and make use of our State Governments. Have you written that letter to your State member, telling him that you desire him to fight Evatt's centralisation scheme? If we cannot control our State Governments now, how can we control a World Government at Geneva, or Wall Street—or Jerusalem!—in the future?

ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

(Obtainable from New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.)

"THE ENEMY WITHIN THE EMPIRE." A short history of the Bank of England. Price, 6d. Postage 1/4d. (4/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price, 9d. Postage 1/4d. (6/- per dozen, post free.)

"New Times" Subscription Rates

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home every week are as follows:—

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. (HALF rates for members of the A.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F., etc.)

Payments must be made in advance and sent direct to New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.

A CANADIAN M.P.'s SURVEY OF THE SITUATION

(Continued from page 1)

Time has confirmed the Social Credit stand in 1939-40 which, apart from any question of loyalty, is proof of the essential soundness and rightness of the S.C. viewpoint. Our opponents have since stolen our thunder, and now vie with one another with demands for sacrifices for the war!

For geographical reasons the question of "Union Now" probably means more to us than to you in Australia. I do not know the actual percentage of American-born people in Alberta, and in W. Canada, but it must be very large, and, as an Englishman, representing many Americans in the Canadian Parliament, my position is rather unusual. There is not, and never has been, the slightest ill-feeling between British and American settlers. Most of the latter came from the Western States, and the dividing line between East and West means as much as, and is more obvious than, the one North and South. We are "Westerners" and, as such, have more in common with one another than with those from the East side of the continent. Further, I feel safe in saying that a greater percentage of former Americans in Alberta are Social Crediters than any other nationality, and I believe there are fewer American Socialists, most of whom come from the old countries.

The reason for this, undoubtedly, is that the spirit of the West always has been one of individualism. Our struggles have been natural ones—against the forces of nature—which united the people in a true spirit of co-operation. That is still, more or less, true in the rural districts, but in the larger communities, cut-throat competition and class hatreds have replaced the old spirit of the West. The point I wish to make is that the line between Social Credit and our opponents roughly separates the "nationalists" from the "internationalists"—money being the only thing, and the Jews the only race, that can be said to be international. Among the directors of "Union Now" are a former Communist mayor of a great city; the conservative "runner up" for the Conservative Party leadership, while another is a well-known Liberal. I have corresponded with all of them, and, without exception, they admit either entire ignorance of, or complete faith in orthodox finance, and exhibit indifference, or hostility, to its reform. This applies also to the "League of Nations Societies," and "Associations for International Affairs," made up of "Reds," "pinks," orthodox financiers, and "gold-standardists." (A Canadian President of the "League" is Secretary of the Bankers' Association.)

Bracken, the new Conservative National Leader, poses as a "progressive" and farmers' friend. The last time I met him was in 1941, while I was campaigning for a Social Creditor in Manitoba. I was told before leaving Ottawa that the orders were to defeat this S.C. member of the Legislature, and both the Dominion and Provincial Governments combined their efforts so to do. The local Liberal M.P. was made a Minister of the Dominion Government, and recently a Judge of the High Court, following the defeat of the Social Creditor. I attended one of his meetings, and he devoted his whole speech to misrepresenting Social Credit, and the Alberta Government. Several times I challenged his statements as deliberate lies. Bracken, who was then Premier of Manitoba, and campaigned for the Liberal, now is Conservative National Leader. "Anything to beat Social Credit."

"Union Now" has failed to appeal to the general public in Canada, still less in the U.S.A. It is being camouflaged. National "sovereignty" is to be "restored" to the conquered nations, and maintained in our own, but there will be set up a world sovereignty of gold—as Dr. James has stated. (Otherwise, why are they mining now useless gold?) "Let US have a world trading bank to ration industry as WE have a world central bank (B.I.S.) to ration currency. WE will put a stop to overproduction, not by increasing consumption but by restricting production to those financially first class firms in all countries who have taken shares in the bank." (—Montague Norman, New York 1931.) "Taken shares in the bank" should read "controlled by the bank." WHO are "WE?"

Those who "fall" for "Union Now" demand sovereign independence for India and justify the American War of Independence on the grounds of democracy. Why reverse the policy after 150 years of peaceful friendship? Why grant sovereignty to the nations of the British Empire and now take it away?

The Beveridge Plan comes from the London School of Economics, which was financed by German-Jew financiers. It is an extension of the plan, originating in Germany, and introduced by Lloyd George in 1909. Being entirely orthodox, and entailing taxation, and control from cradle to the grave, naturally it was hailed by the opponents of Social Credit as Utopia.

Meantime our Minister of Finance has decreed that tea, coffee, milk and oranges be sold below cost, and the retailers compensated to the amount they are out

of pocket. Owing to the severe rationing it will not make much difference, and no doubt the compensation-money will come from taxation; but, all the same, the idea is the Douglas Just Price, and its intention is the same—to increase purchasing-power by LOWERING retail prices. In contrast with the Beveridge Plan, it was announced without any "ballyhoo." Anyway, it contains the germ of a financial revolution.

With best wishes to you, and to all workers for "Economic Democracy," who inspire us in Canada to "carry on."

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) NORMANJAQUES.

IN GREAT BRITAIN'S PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS: DECEMBER 8
Ministry of Information Speakers
(Political Issues):

Mr. Pearson asked the Minister of Information whether he is aware that speakers supplied by the Ministry, who address either public meetings or meetings arranged by various organisations, have been advised that they cannot speak on post-war reconstruction; and does he intend to raise this ban upon speakers engaged by the Ministry?

Mr. Bracken: In deferment to the wishes of this House, speakers on behalf of the Ministry of Information have been discouraged from dealing with political issues that are still in controversy. Most reconstruction questions inevitably raise such issues. For this reason Ministry speakers are requested to avoid the subject of post-war reconstruction except in so far as it is covered by declared Government policy. I see no reason to alter this rule.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: DECEMBER 9
Palestine (Importation of Chemicals): Mr. Henderson Stewart asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware of the resentment felt by independent British importers of chemicals into Palestine at the recent order imposed by the Palestine Government requiring all importers to send shipping documents through Imperial Chemical Industries (Levant), Limited; why has this advantage been given to this firm; and whether he will reconsider the present position, in view of the damage likely to be caused in this way to the business of other importers? Colonel Stanley: The purpose of the Order to which

ODD ITEMS

(From the "Social Creditor," England.) "Undoubtedly Hitler was very friendly with Erik Jan Hanussen (whose real name was Hermann Steinschneider), the Jewish vaudeville clairvoyant, seer, and fortune teller . . . from the end of the First World War until the beginning of 1933. Germany was simply 'alive' with fortune tellers, seers, clairvoyants, astrologers, occultists and mediums—many of them Jews."

—Mr. Harry Price in "Search for Truth: My Life for Psychological Research." Pp. 175-6.

Yes, Clarence, we sympathise with your confusion, but the fact that the once-great British Army in North Africa is commanded by General Eisenhower and the effete R.A.F. by General Carl Spaatz doesn't mean that they are fighting for Hitler. It only means that they will do most of the fighting.

There is a noisy minority of individuals, largely coterminous with the people who opposed every attempt at rearmament and then shouted, "Down with the Men of Munich," who like to hear British Generals and the men they command, disparaged. They are saying that it doesn't matter who gets the credit of beating Hitler, so long as he is beaten. If the British Army is led by aliens, we know who has helped to that end. If they were told that this is a war for credit, and that credit will win the peace whoever does the fighting, they would no doubt answer as foolishly as they have done on every major occasion on which their voice has been heard.

Comment of the R.A.F. on the "American" invasion of North Africa: "Never were so few commanded by so many."

Mr. Oliver Gollancz, cousin of the publisher and son of the late Sir Israel Gollancz, has been appointed organising secretary of the Fabian Society in succession to Mr. Gwynn Jones.

BRITAIN'S BURDENS: New York and Washington correspondents are at last recognising the modesty of British propaganda in the production sphere, and are now featuring "the unrivalled wonders of Britain's war effort." They illustrate the point thus "that £125 millions in 1940 alone was spent in the creation of American production facilities." They also criticise the fact that the British Ministry of Information was forbidden to circulate figures relating to British lease-lend aid to U.S.—but they do not state who silenced the Information officials. Slowly but surely the fact is leaking out, that Britain provides action not words.

"THOU SHALT NOT-"

From a speech of Mr. George Hicks Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the British Ministry of Works and Planning, as reported in "The Times" of January 12—

"MINISTRY OF WORKS ACHIEVEMENTS."
" . . . Work to the value of approximately £24,000,000 had not been permitted to start. . . ."

"The Committee on Building Materials Standardisation had done most useful work. Over 400 types of doors had been reduced to three types in seven sizes. The 17 kinds of bricks in common use throughout the country had now been reduced to two. There were now only 30 types of metal windows instead of 300."

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

From THE UNITED DEMOCRATS, of 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.

Fighting Forces Protection League: This League was formed following a suggestion by an old supporter of the United Democrats. Whilst we have not been conducting the campaign, we have given it every support. We are striving to be, and to produce, "actionists on issue politics." The result of the Central Market Campaign, on March 12, proves that, given an issue that instantly appeals, plus the right method of directing the pressure, success is assured. On the above occasion, when the demand was "STOP TAX ON SOLDIERS' DEFERRED PAY" people formed queues to sign. (This produced well over 2000 signatures for the day.) It is impossible to calculate just what effect this has had on the change-of-front among tax advocates in Canberra, but from past experience we know that this kind of pressure bears fruit. Mr. Harvey tells us that signed forms are still coming in well. Keep them coming in. Forms are available.

Quarterly Meeting: Saturday, April 10. Keep it in mind.

—M. R. W. LEE, Hon. Secretary

The Birth of a Notion

"In the slumberous caverns of public ignorance an idea is stirring: There is always enough money for killing; there must be enough for feeding. We are witnessing the birth of a notion. Those who are concerned with the maintenance of the national dumbness are profoundly disturbed. As one prominent banker said to our representative 'A cloud, no bigger than a taxpayer's brain, has appeared upon the horizon of the public unconscious.'—'Yaffle' in 'Reynolds News,' London, August 9.

WEDGWOOD BLUES

Lord Wedgwood in a recent speech:—"Do let us realise that it is an enormous and generous act on the part of America at a time when security, especially security for private enterprise, is extremely low. . . . You have a state of affairs coming at the end of the war when we shall be in a far more real sense than ever before all 'members one of another,' all starving, and transactions such as we are envisaging to-day [relief measures for Europe] will have to be transactions between Governments supported by the overriding financial unity of the trading world. It will not be the Bank for International Settlements; the conquering Powers will have their financial organisation so arranged that they will control expenditure and at the same time control the production of the country to which the expenditure goes. It will not be so much Socialism as a super-national Socialism, and we, I hope, will be tied close enough to America to cooperate with it in this great work."

A BLIND SPOT?

The Archbishop of Canterbury is getting all het up about the alleged atrocities being committed against the Jews by "Hitler." The Jews themselves say that there are only fifteen million of their race in the world. Of those, about five million are in the United States, and a large proportion of the rest in England and the "B.B.C. Thirty million Russians were murdered or died as the outcome of the Jewish Bolshevik revolution. If the Archbishop of Canterbury got hot and bothered about them, it escaped our notice.—"The Social Creditor" (England).

Minority Rule

"This victory of a minority—and a Puritan one at that—had rankled the more with the mass of Englishmen subjected to it [Cromwell's Government] because the iron grasp had not seized them at a blow, but only after repeated attempts to free themselves from the stranglehold. . . . All the native amenity and comfortable air of England had been poisoned; all the common habits of Englishmen, their recreations, their intimate domestic life, had been outraged."—H. Belloc, "The Last Rally."

When Charles II. brought the nightmare to an end, ten ringleaders were hanged on successive days.

GOVERNMENT GIVES WAY

It has been announced that the British Government has decided to abandon its scheme for the compulsory concentration of the paint and varnish industry. This will mean a reprieve for a number of small firms. The central compensation fund for firms closed down will not now be necessary.

A modified project will be operated. Details are being worked out by the Board of Trade and the Ministries of Labour and Supply in consultation with the industry.

Drink Up!

Quaff a Beverage to the dawn
When every soul will be in pawn,
Pledged in gold (redeemed in dross)
And Three Brass Balls replace the Cross
—Excalibur.