

MONEY REFORM OR SOCIAL CREDIT? (Page 2)
MILK SUPPLY PROBLEM. (Page 3)
AN ABERHART BROADCAST. (Page 3)
DOLES OR DIVIDENDS? (Page 4)

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

Vol. 9. No. 35 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, SEPT. 3, 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).

The Elections and the Electoral Campaign

Where Do We Go From Here?

By NORMAN F. ROLLS.

I would like to congratulate both the writer and the "New Times" on the splendid action article contributed by Eric D. Butler, which appeared on the front page of the last issue. I commend Mr. Butler's facts and logic to all who are not yet disillusioned in the matter of "election" trickery and party treachery, to say nothing of the unhappy inconsistency of certain "Independents" and the woeful treatment of constituents by former State M.'s.P. in their disgraceful bid for higher "honours."

The election distractions and abstractions, with the consequent results, plus the introduction of further obstacles to productive individualism and initiative, in the main indicate anything but a clear definition or even understanding of democratic policy and practice in the minds of a vast number of the "leaders" and "led."

Recent experiences indicate that the attitude adopted by many electors was one of taking the line of least resistance—only the intelligent minority drawing their own line. The burning question was not "who will win the elections?" but "what will the people gain BY them?" What COULD they possibly HOPE to gain? Each Party, and many of the "Independents," talked of unity to a population the majority of which never has been united except upon certain issues known to "New Times" readers, when RESULTS and not METHODS or PLATFORMS were all that mattered. Apart from the courageous—though possibly foolish—few, no candidate offered a policy based on Democratic lines nor proffered the real reason why they preferred not to give real Democracy a chance to express itself. Either these candidates do not know the meaning and purpose of Democracy, or for the safety of their political hides they refused to offer the electors the knowledge and privilege of democratic action by assisting in forming their own policy. Therefore the position resolved itself once again into frustration for the would-be reformer and a further stalemate for the electors generally, UNTIL a far greater number of people wake up to the "divide and rule" racket which Mr. Butler has been at such pains to point out to those who cannot lead themselves aright, yet expect to lead others!

Now we can expect a further dose of bureaucratic socialism, with its government by regulation instead of by legislation, and enacted not by popular vote, but by the few who train the horse to do just what they want WHOEVER HOLDS THE REINS.

It is obvious that the reactionary forces are using every device and every occasion and every human weakness, even to wartime exigencies and the delicate "peace" which will follow, to establish a machine-like society, in which each person is no longer an individual unit with an individual conscience, but rather a cog operated by a centrally-controlled clutch.

Thousands of erstwhile conscientious Australians have thus been caught up in the

tide of almost irresponsible mismanagement, and are being swept into the various whirlpools to the tune of "eat, drink and be merry, for to-morrow....?" I use the "whirlpools" metaphor because everything points to one grand centralisation of existing centralised conditions, and whilst to the unwary the as yet small-scale decentralising of this concern and that appears promising, it is of little help to those who want real Democracy in this country WHILST CONTROL OF POLICY IS BEING FURTHER CENTRALISED. The Ship of State sadly needed "trimming"; but changing the crew, or attempting to change it, DID NOT alter the course.

The tide must sooner or later reach its full, and must ebb again—leaving what? It will undoubtedly leave an increasing number of the people "on the rocks"—metaphorically and perhaps metaphysically, but certainly physically. Our "leaders" have been busy spilling temporary oil on the troubled waters, and a spark may spell disaster, unless we can increase public knowledge of positive electoral activity on Electoral Campaign lines.

An opposite swing in the political field will be engineered at the appropriate time, and unless the electors are really active and assertive on a non-party pressure-politics basis, the position—which will be strongly influenced by pressure from overseas—may become critical. I am not a prophet, and I hope my anxiety is misplaced, but I feel that unless we discontinue the practice of expending our energies in negative fields, we may very soon find ourselves deprived of the very democratic privileges which we still retain, and which, if taken full advantage of, WILL GET THE PEOPLE WHAT THEY WANT.

Certain of the new Parties are obviously a "blind"; a mere sop to satisfy the party-minded and lead astray would-be reformers. Others appear to offer nothing but "plans" and "patterns," and their followers would eat out of the hand of the Socialist and interpret the term "B.C." to read "Before Communism," whilst swelling the ranks and the propaganda purses of the local Reds, who see in the present set-up the first signs of that ebbing tide. Despite their pleas for political respectability, the latter cannot be expected to stop at politics, and here lies the danger.

I venture these opinions without any personal animosity; but with something akin

to pity for the "follow-the-leader" misfits whose ignorance has well-nigh dragged politics into the gutter and given reform organisations a continual weeding-out problem. We either have a Democracy which we will set in motion by each putting his shoulder to the wheel, or we have a state of affairs in which any Tom, Dick or Harry, from Wall Street, the City of London, or perhaps Moscow, will be permitted to dictate our peace terms to us. Many of us have had our gloves off for a long time and others are joining in, but as Mr. Butler points out so frankly, the electors must be approached and encouraged on a grand scale to take constructive ACTION. Failing that, the many threats to remove our Parliamentary institutions from the control of the electors will result in the loss of the last trench on the really Democratic front. Those who grasp the glaring truth of the Electoral Campaign, and who appreciate its enormous potentialities, realise, too, what the prevention of its prosecution would

mean. On the other hand, its acceptance, even on minor issues, may well turn party despair into political hope; faith in the continuance of British Parliamentary Institutions will follow if we make correct use of them. Personally, I know of no better system of government if it is USED and not ABUSED. I intend to use it now and for as long as my fellow-electors, in association, keep it functioning—through the Electoral Campaign.

[Editor's Note: As is well known to our regular readers, the writer of the foregoing article does not base his advocacy of the Electoral Campaign on mere theoretical considerations. At considerable personal sacrifice, he has spent a great deal of time "in the front line" since the inception of the Campaign. Hard experience has evidently strengthened his conviction, because when forwarding his article he enclosed what he modestly described as a "small" donation to the U.E.A. fighting fund.]

NOTES on the NEWS

Latest information from the International Currency Front is that Mr. Morgenthau (Secretary, U.S. Treasury) will soon disclose a new bankers' scheme. Financiers consider that it will provide an acceptable compromise between the "Bancor" proposals of a Bank of England director and Wall Street's "Unita" plan. Thus, behind the smoke-screens provided by military and political wars, the international bankers' plot to restore the Gold Standard goes on. Have YOU written to your newly-elected or re-elected Federal Member, asking him to fight tooth-and-nail to keep Australia out of any such scheme?

MALLOCH'S MISTAKE: Major Malloch, one of the candidates for Batman, who was passed out with a mere 7000 odd votes, was given considerable free publicity in the Murdoch Press of August 8 which reported his tirade against "letters from organisations asking certain questions and seeking certain assurances which would be placed before their members to assist them in their election decisions." Major Malloch, in blustering militarist style, described this common sense action as "holding an axe over his head," and said he "would not tolerate it." Well, fortunately for him—and especially for the electors—he doesn't have to, now. It's a safe bet that any election candidate who objects to answering questions and giving or refusing assurances in writing is unsuitable to be a political employee.

COUPON CONTRASTS: During the course of another of his diatribes against critics of unnecessary shortages and the inefficient coupon allocation, political employee Senator Keane had a spasm of childishness, and suggested that such critics should remember that in such places as Sweden, "when a housewife went shopping she almost needed assistance to carry her ration books, which numbered 90." Such a comparison is about as relevant and sensible as asking a man who has been starving for 10 days to take heart by observing another person who has been starving for 20 days. In the first place, most shortages in Australia are unnecessary and are due to Government bungling. In the second place, why not compare our crazy multiple-coupon system with the British "all-unit" interchangeable coupon system, in which the coupons have an "all-points value" and are usable for all or any rationed goods, according to the individual's choice.

LAWYER'S LAPSE: Dr. Evatt's plan to alter our Constitution (which as it stands happily prevents Australia being submerged in the bankers' Federal Union scheme) was helped along recently by Mr. J. V. Barry, K.C., who was reported in the daily press of August 4 as telling the Old Paradians that "since the Constitution was adopted in 1901 there have been two wars and a depression." Readers should note the unjustified inference apparently intended—blaming the Constitution for the bankers' crimes. He then had a lot to say about population for defending the country—another matter not in any way connected with the Constitution. The biggest nigger in the wood-pile peeped out and winked when Mr. Barry went on to say: "We must join with other nations on the basis of one international authority [Federal Union] to prevent the agony of another war." These specious pleas, although often uttered by presumably innocent mouthpieces, are merely confidence tricks inspired by the international bankers.

POLITICAL POLICIES: Under the heading, "What Do Electors Want?" the sponsors of the "Gallup Poll" pointed out in the Melbourne "Herald" of August 21, that in addition to ascertaining (incorrectly) how people would vote, they had recorded opinions on leading election issues, such as overseas military service, compulsory union-

ism, all-party government, financing national insurance, and government ownership of factories. It was also stated that "findings on these questions will be published in the 'Herald' next week (after the elections), one each day from Monday." So far, strange to say, none of these findings have appeared. Such findings (if correct) would demonstrate that even though so many votes are recorded for a successful candidate, it does not necessarily mean that so many electors support or accept his entire policy. Probably many of them were merely choosing the lesser evil. Strange as it may seem, it could mean the very opposite to the general interpretation applied. Anyway, why were the findings withheld?

COMMO COMICS: The Chairman of the Communist Party in Victoria explains the Party's election debacle thus: "We gained our main objective—the return of the Curtin Government." It's a wonder the U.A.P. didn't think of that alibi; but perhaps they didn't need one—having regard to the army of voters (apart from the armed forces) on the Labor Government's pay-roll, who in effect, would be voting against their job if they voted against Labor. If Labor can keep hundreds of thousands engaged in the numerous Departments, we'll probably have a Labor Government for ever and ever!

PENSIONER'S PLIGHT: The evils of centralisation and the inelastic socialistic clothes-rationing scheme is seen in the plight of an old-age pensioner, as reported in the Newcastle "Morning Herald" of August 8. The victim lost clothes, ration-book and identity-card through fire. Of course, this unfortunate then had to go through the bureaucratic ritual of firstly applying for an identity card. This accomplished, he had to send his application for a ration-book through the "proper channels." After the due departmental delay (possibly days or weeks), when his new ration-book came to hand, he might get some clothes—provided he had the money to purchase them. A foretaste of the delights of socialism!

HUSH, HUSH: The Melbourne "Age" of August 24 quotes Hanson Baldwin, of the "N.Y. Times," as commenting on the withholding of the news of the U.S. occupation of Kiska thus: "It is obvious that a censorship, not only of the Pacific, but of the world, is keeping from the American people many facts which they are entitled to know and covering up mistakes and inefficiency. Coming from this source such comment is interesting, but surely such a man should realise that covering up the errors of centralised bureaucratic operations is a reason for censorship."

PAWNBROKERS' PANGS: A New York report states that "owing to war conditions, pawned deposits are lower, and such goods are nearly always redeemed." The article says that "Ikey's" business has been cut in half, and that moneylenders "await the return of the good old days of hard times." This would indicate that whilst war-time boom assists the "upper-ten" Jews it hurts those lesser Jews engaged in the retail money-lending business (where the final kick is given to the victims of Finance).

(Continued on page 3)

Dietitian on Milk Pasteurisation

Mr. F. G. Roberts, well-known Melbourne dietitian, has sent the following letter, dated August 26, to the Victorian Minister for Agriculture (Hon. N. A. Martin), who is now endeavouring to pilot the Milk Pasteurisation Bill through the stormy waters of the State Parliament:—

Dear Sir,—The Rev. Glyn Jones handed me your published speech on the Milk Pasteurisation Bill, which I have read with great interest. After a careful survey and study of the subject over a period of 30 years, I would be very, very sorry to see such a Bill made law.

What the community needs is good milk, fresh milk, certified milk (which is obtainable in most advanced countries from tuberculin-tested herds under strict supervision controlled by the Health Department).

You have explained very fully the value of pasteurisation from your point of view; but there is another side of the picture. The harmfulness of pasteurisation, when studied without prejudice and vested interest, will I feel sure, outweigh pasteurisation.

1.—The bacterial count of cow's milk varies, as does the character of germs, depending upon the source and conditions under which it is collected and kept. Contamination occurs through the hands of the milkers, stable dirt, unclean utensils, etc. When the milk is pasteurised, many kinds of bacteria and germs are killed or destroyed, leaving pathogenic soil behind. This means that disease-producing soil is fed to

our young children, and then we read an account of over 4000 children stricken with infantile paralysis or typhoid fever, etc., etc.

2.—Pasteurisation means raising the temperature to between 140 degrees and 145 degrees Fahrenheit, which destroys Vitamin C (anti-scorbutic), lowers the resistance to disease, and, with the added pathogenic condition, is a source of the high infantile death-rate, and the mal-nutrition among our children.

3.—When milk is pasteurised, most of the lactic-acid-producing organisms are destroyed, but certain proliolytic spore bearers survive. This putrefactive growth produces pathogens. These organisms are capable of producing specific infectious diseases, such as bacillus abortus and bacillus diptheriae.

A lengthy epistle could be written in favour of raw milk, but I hope these few lines will help you to see the true picture from both sides. From a nutritional health standpoint, raw milk, obtained and distributed under strict hygienic supervision, must outweigh pasteurised milk.

—Yours sincerely, (Sgd.) F. G. ROBERTS, Consulting Dietitian.

MONEY REFORM OR SOCIAL CREDIT?

By ERIC D. BUTLER

In a recent issue of a Victorian country newspaper, a correspondent, in the course of some criticism of an article of mine, said that he was a "monetary reformer" and had been a reader of the "New Times," but that he discontinued reading it when more and more space was devoted to issues other than monetary reform. At the risk of boring some people, I want to reiterate certain points which no real Social Crediter can afford to ignore—points which are directly related to the remarks of that former reader of this journal.

It is a fact that, over the past few years, more and more space in the "New Times" has been devoted to issues not directly concerned with money reform. And the reason for this policy is obvious: Under the cover of war, the interests directing the policies of the international banking groups have been able to intensify various plans for restricting the initiative and freedom-of-action of electors—particularly in British countries.

Some people do not appear to grasp the fact that a monetary reformer is not necessarily a Social Crediter. Hitler is, I believe, a monetary reformer of a kind. There are many Socialists in this country who are monetary reformers. Even Sir Keith Murdoch thinks that we will need a "liberal credit" policy after the war. But such monetary reformers only desire to alter the money-system in order to impose their own philosophies on the people. We all know why Hitler wanted to improve his money system.

Mere monetary reform can lead direct to slavery. I am not very enthusiastic about Socialists advocating debt-free and interest-free money in order that I can be put to work building State roads in the Socialist "new order." I recently attended an Army Education lecture, during the course of which I heard that we are all going to be given economic security after the war. I believe that the powers-that-be intend to provide us with a mediocre brand of economic security after the war; but I also believe that we are intended to forego certain precious rights in exchange. The utterly false idea being sedulously fostered is that we can only obtain economic security by submitting to various types of planning by State bureaucrats. We are intended to have the economic security of a slave who is well fed, clothed and housed by a master. Bearing the above in mind, it must be admitted that a monetary reformer need not necessarily be a Social Crediter.

Social Crediters are primarily concerned with a philosophy, a philosophy of life based on the belief that, in association, electors can get what they want (providing it is physically possible). They believe that all institutions should only exist to serve individuals. They believe that any institution preventing individuals from getting what they want should either be abolished or have its policy altered.

Social Crediters attacked the banking system because it was, they believed, one of the biggest anti-social institutions imposing a policy of destruction and frustration on the people. But they also realised that there was one important institution the people had to control before they could control the policy of the banking system. That "important institution" is Parliament. Social Crediters set out to show electors how, in association, they could control their political institutions, and, through them, their financial institutions. Anyone who cannot see that economic security AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM OF ACTION are impossible without the primary necessity of control of Parliament, is only deluding himself and others.

Suppose we continue to talk and advocate monetary reform to the exclusion of everything else; which means that we are going to allow "the enemy" to increasingly restrict and finally destroy the institutions through which real democracy can be established. What then? What good would be achieved even if all citizens became monetary reformers?

It is still possible for electors, advised by a small group of Social Crediters, to take action to get tangible and worthwhile benefits from banking institutions, without the electors knowing very much about monetary reform. But it would be virtually impossible for a people who had all become monetary reformers (a very unlikely prospect within a reasonable period of time) to achieve results without suitable political institutions and in the face of control by machine-guns. It is perfectly clear that control by "Law" and direct force is intended to supplant the control by money. (Note the powerful propaganda for a World Air Force!) Education on the monetary system is still vitally necessary, but ACTION to expose and effectively oppose the main strategy of "the enemy" is, at the moment, even more important.

What about it, reader? Have you ever tried to establish direct contact with your political representatives? If not, start tonight. And get all your friends who hate the increasing bureaucratic menace to do likewise. The man who fights bureaucracy to-day is paving the way for real economic democracy to-morrow. First things first.

WHAT IS THE NEXT URGENT MOVE?

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

Sir—Last week I suggested that it is now the job of the PEOPLE to have the agents of the PRIVATE BANKS removed from positions in which they can control either the policy or the administration of the Commonwealth Bank. I said that Australia has hitherto been controlled by three monopolies; that these three monopolies include the whole of the Australian trading banks; and that the monopolies are directly represented on the Commonwealth Bank, which is supposed to belong to the people. The general set-up is as follows:—

1. SUGAR, GAS, and TOBACCO MONOPOLY, dominating the industrial and financial life of New South Wales and Queensland, exercising domination through banks and insurances. Its three banks are the Bank of New South Wales, the Queensland National Bank, and the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney. Principal rendezvous of directors is at the Union Club, Bligh-street, Sydney. Represented on Commonwealth Bank Board by Sir Claude Reading.

2. METAL MONOPOLY, dominating the industrial and financial life of Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania, exercising domination through banks and insurances. Its three banks are the Commercial Bank of Australia, the National Bank of Australasia, and the Bank of Adelaide. Principal rendezvous of directors is at the Melbourne Club, Collins-street, Melbourne. Represented on Commonwealth Bank Board by Sir Clive McPherson.

3. OVERSEAS GROUP, dominating land and natural resources on behalf of British interests, exercising domination through British banks and British insurances. Its three banks are the bank of Australasia, the E.S. & A. Bank, and the Union Bank of Australia. Principal rendezvous of Australian directors is at the Melbourne or the Athenasum Clubs, Melbourne. Represented on Commonwealth Bank Board by J. H. Ashton, whose family is also connected with the Sugar Monopoly.

It seems to me that if we are to become a functioning democracy, acting with intelligent understanding, one of the very first tasks is to spread enlightenment on this question of financial control, as up to now most people are mesmerised stiff on the subject. And, believe it or not, to keep them in a condition of mesmerism is part of the plan of the controllers. A well-informed community is their greatest enemy.

Quite frequently the things we write and say are described as "fantastic," and in one sense they ARE fantastic, but none the less true. There is no need to take our word for it either. Let Sir Frank Clarke, of the Metal Monopoly and Overseas Group, be

brought into the witness box. At the annual meeting of the National Bank in 1934 he said this:

"The Commonwealth Bank, the Australian trading banks, the mutual insurance companies, the pastoral companies, the wholesale houses, and the storekeepers constitute an interlocked system of finance that has put Australia in the van on the road to recovery and created an invaluable credit overseas for us. The system which, ALIKE IN ENGLAND AND AUSTRALIA, HAS KEPT THE FINANCES SOUND in a time of unexampled stress, should not be altered by inexperienced men without very much greater cause than any which has up to now been put forward." ("Argus," 31/5/34)

"An interlocked system of finance, alike in England and Australia, kept the finances sound," but sacrificed the manhood and womanhood of both countries. You will have noticed that our Governments, whose members have been so fond of talking about "the sovereign rights of the people," are not even mentioned in the "interlocked system," and it should be borne in mind that Sir Frank himself was at the time mentioned vice-chairman of the bank and President of the Victorian Legislative Council. Just previous to that, another leading "authority" (the late Mr. C. H. Tranter, of the Commercial Bank of Australia) unblushingly said that politicians do not worry bank shareholders, but merely amuse them. We had plenty of evidence of that in the Depression and the Premiers' Plan! Governments were agents only, not principals, and it was Hilaire Belloc who said: In theory Parliament is stronger than the banks, but Parliament no longer counts as a real governing power. The banks are far more powerful than Parliament." As one Australian to another, let me ask you to think that over. Bankers have been allowed to usurp the power of the people and the prerogative of the King!

Military power ALONE is greater than money power, and whether we hesitate to believe it or not, the controllers of money were the controllers of ARMAMENTS. Think that over calmly too.

And if Sir Frank Clarke spoke the truth,

when he said the finances were sound, then the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and the Premier of every State spoke falsely when they asserted that the "UN SOUND" finances necessitated the confiscation of the incomes of the aged and the infirm. The almost unbelievable truth is that the Prime Minister and the Premiers acted in that shameful way at the dictation of the controllers of the money supply, and were given an ultimatum that if they did not do so all supplies would be stopped.

Such orders came from the hidden bureaucracy controlling Australia, and the elected representatives of the people had no say whatever in the matter. It was a repetition of the technique followed at the Peace Conference after the first world war when, in the words of the Rt. Hon. Lloyd George, "The international bankers swept statesmen, politicians, jurists, and journalists, all on one side, and issued their orders with the imperiousness of absolute monarchs, who knew that there was no appeal from their ruthless decrees." Instead of putting these fellows in their place, most of us were content to transfer the responsibility to God, by offering prayers that HE would provide a "just" peace. In precisely the same way, instead of putting the members of the Bank

Board and their "advisers" in their proper place in 1930 and 1931, most of us were content to transfer the responsibility to God by offering prayers for the poor and needy and asking that HE would lift the burdens from us. Nice people, weren't we? Sir Claude Reading, of the Sugar and Metal Monopolies, and of the Commonwealth Bank Board, has now told us that a similar line of action is being contemplated for after this war! Let us not make a similar mistake again, but instead, let us press our representatives in the Federal Parliament to insist upon the removal from the Bank Board of every man who represents, or has interests in, the present system of financial control.

Next week I hope to show how these three monopolies have their directors, their greatest beneficiaries, and their chief executives in places where influence can be effectively exerted, such as exclusive clubs, Parliaments (particularly the "Houses of Review," where the "hasty" legislation is blocked), Chambers of Commerce, Chambers of Manufactures, and Press Associations, all of which are unremittingly used to facilitate the exploitation of the people.

—Yours, faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2
29th August, 1943

WHAT THE ELECTIONS MEAN TO ME

By FOOTLE.

Crowds of people keep asking me what I think of the elections. I don't suppose I'm singled out really. I expect they all ask each other the same question, and so often at that, that no one remembers whether he's answered fifty people or the same chap fifty times. Of course, I don't tell them what I think. I daren't I've tried it, and I know that the only place I can freely voice my opinions aloud is in a silence cabinet. I don't know why people want to know my opinion. They used to get annoyed when I did tell them, and always went away with their own opinion—a much worse one—absolutely intact.

I counter them now. I pucker my brows and make a clicking noise with my tongue and declare I can't figure it out at all, and couldn't they manage to enlighten me. To date I've received a lot of opinions, but I would hesitate to say that they amount to enlightenment.

One chap says it was the army business.

"The people," he said, "are afraid that if there were one army it might be exported anywhere." Another chappie who heard him said that was all rot, because what was to stop the Government from extending the defensive area of Australia to a line running through Yokohama and Tokyo, he'd like to know.

Another chap informed me that it was because Mr. Menzies offered tears and sweat, having observed the success Mr. Churchill had achieved with those plentiful commodities, but that he couldn't resist slinging in his own pet idea about a depression to follow.

My old friend, Pongo Pyke, without the slightest hesitation, asserted that the trouble was Mr. Fadden's post-war credits.

"People don't understand 'em," he announced.

That seemed so likely that I didn't say anything.

"I'll bet you don't, either," he ventured.

I admitted the impeachment. I had seen them mentioned in my daily newspaper, and had received the impression that by a reduction of present taxation or something you accumulated a profit to be applied as an easement to post-war misery. The idea was too elusive for me. As a matter of fact, my education in matters financial is so primitive that I always have a difficulty in understanding the sense in which the word "credit" is sometimes used. "Credit" has a very definite meaning for me, but I very seldom talk about it. I find, however, that my notion of its association has to be enlarged. And there I am a dismal failure. In fact, as I said to Pongo Pyke, I couldn't even get the right slant on double entry bookkeeping.

"What's your difficulty?" asked Pongo.

I pointed out that if one as a business man received a sum of money, one had perforce to call it a "debit."

"For the purpose of the cash book, yes."

"And if you part with cash, that's a credit?"

"Naturally!"

"Kind of upside down, isn't it?"

"Depends how you look at it."

"Possibly! If I stood on my head and looked at you, I might easily form the theory that the only thing which prevented you from falling into the sky was your adhesive feet."

"It's quite easy to see why you fail to understand every-day propositions," said Pongo grimly. "You have no focus point."

"I merely assert," I replied stiffly, "that it's no use attaching arbitrary meanings to every-day words. If you say to me, 'How's your credit?' I take you to mean, 'Have I the wherewithal to buy you a dinner or something. And you're trying to tell me I would be more correct if I replied, 'Splendid, old fellow! I've got rid of every bob.' Isn't that right?"

"You're talking the utmost drivel," declared Pongo, "and you know it. You must be unique in your conception of credit."

"Oh, no! indeed," I protested. "The experts on national economy bear me out. Look how miserable as a nation we used to be when foreigners were pouring their goods into our country and how elated we were when the reverse operation took place. At least, the economists and the professors said we were, and they were paid for knowing. So I claim that I am not unique in believing that a credit is a debit for all practical purposes."

"That is why I am not keen on post-war credits. If credits mean simply that I have to

fork out I don't want them, and that's all about it."

"I feel you're too flippant to understand these things," grumbled Pongo.

I agreed. I had no choice. The balance of evidence was, and is, too strong against me. Where profits are made I am a back number. With my primitive tribal outlook I could not be expected to anticipate that making things to destroy or be destroyed could ever yield a profit to anyone in the whole creation of cussedness.

Nevertheless, I must be wrong. The past and the future are ready to bear witness against me. When we made things for peaceful use we were dead broke almost to a man. Now we are busting things up to a magnificent tune there is light at the end of the social security tunnel. If the thing keeps on long enough we shall inherit a secure old age, those of us who are shrewd enough to achieve old age, of course.

So you can see for yourself that it really isn't much good asking me what I think of the elections. The only thing I feel safe in saying about them is that a party called "LABOR" appears to have won a competition, though what reason should be assigned to this I do not know. It may be that people on the whole would prefer to fight the war without soldiers if possible, or it may be they prefer, as Pongo says, to take the cash in hand and let the post-war credits go.

Neither of these possibilities is contrary to human nature. Family feeling is still stronger than "civic sense," and our hold on life still such as to cause us to discount the future for the cash in hand.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

CONTROL YOUR MEMBER: We hope that by now most of our supporters have got over their immediate surprise at the election results, and that they have written to their Member of Parliament congratulating him on his election (or re-election, as the case may be), and endeavouring to establish a healthy relationship with him. If you haven't done so, we urge you to get on to the job. DON'T SIT BACK AND LEAVE IT TO LABOR." Get advice from our office if you need it—its free. We will be most interested to hear of any response that our supporters obtain from correspondence with their members.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: Unfinancial members are reminded that our funds are getting low. Donations, however small, will be put to good use.

CULTURAL EVENINGS: Following last week's announcement we remind supporters of a cultural discussion, based on articles from the "Social Crediter," to take place in bur rooms on Wednesday, September 15, at 8 p.m. Come along and bring a friend.

HAVE YOU READ: "TRAGEDY OF HUMAN EFFORT?" Price 6d.

"DEMOCRACY AND THE ISMS." Price 1d: (All plus 1½d. postage.)

We have stocks of these books on hand.

—F. Bawden, Hon. Secretary.

SOCIAL SCIENCE LECTURES

The next of these informal and instructive lectures will be held at the rooms of the United Electors of Australia, 5th Floor, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, on Wednesday evening, September 15. The subject will be "Characteristics of Organisations." This should have a special significance to campaigners. YOU are invited to come along and help to make it a success.

THE PROBLEM OF THE MILK SUPPLY

In view of the interest that has recently been aroused in this subject, and the fact that a Milk Pasteurisation Bill is now before the Victorian Parliament, the following broadcast by Mrs. Barbara Guthrie, heard from 7HO on June 13, should be of special interest to our readers:—

During this last week a Committee has been sitting to enquire into the supply of milk for Hobart and district. On Wednesday, I visited Parliament, where the enquiry was being held, and listened to the evidence given.

The supply of fresh milk of good quality at reasonable prices is something that affects every family in Hobart, and I hope that the citizens of this town will keep their eye on this Committee to see that a good job is done. It is absolutely essential that a group of citizens be formed for that purpose, as I don't think in any other way will they get the results they desire.

A feature of modern life is the habit of relegating our difficulties to experts to solve, which is quite reasonable up to a point. But this lazy habit can go too far. A point to remember about all enquiries is that the witnesses mainly answer questions—leading questions—flung at them by members of the Committee.

Here is a sample of the kind of questions asked of a dairy farmer:

"Are you in favour of a central depot for pasteurising milk?" Answer, "No, I am not." He was then asked, "If a central depot was essential for pasteurisation, what body should control it?" Of course the dairy farmer, not suspecting the nature of the question, fell into the trap and said: "The Agricultural Department was the best body for the job."

This farmer's name, therefore, could be used, if required, as "saying that he favoured the State running a central depot, in spite of the fact that witness said in a most emphatic manner that he was not in favour of a central depot."

It became fairly evident early in the piece, by the pointed questions being asked, that the Committee were looking for witnesses to say that they wanted a central depot for milk, and that they wanted all milk pasteurised.

Now, if a central depot and pasteurisation of milk will give us better and purer milk, then let us have it, and have it quickly. Some experts say it will do this, and some experts say the reverse. It is up to us, therefore, to find out from results where the truth lies—especially as the reports printed in the "Mercury" are very unsatisfactory and misleading.

I am going to read to you evidence submitted to the Committee on Wednesday morning, and not reported in the papers. The evidence is by the chief medical officer of the Barnado Homes, Dr. A. H. MacDonald. He said:

"We have found that pasteurised milk lowers the children's resistance to tuberculosis. In most of our Homes the children are given raw milk, and tuberculosis is practically non-existent. Professor Sprawson, our dental expert, has found that the children's teeth tend to decay with pasteurised milk."

Now this is the report of experts who were able to keep records over long periods under conditions that could be controlled; that is valuable evidence, but not necessarily conclusive evidence.

Evidence over a wider area and over larger numbers would perhaps be more helpful. Such evidence was given in the British House of Commons by Dr. Russell Thomas, on February 10 of this year. Dr. Thomas took the case of three counties in England which had received 60,000 refugee children, and in spite of this fact, the death rate from non-pulmonary tuberculosis decreased by 29 per cent, in the county of Huntingdon; 30 per cent, in the county of Dorset, and remained stationary in the county of Somerset. These figures were comparisons between the years 1938 and 1941. There was practically no pasteurised milk in any of these counties.

On the other hand, in cities where the child population had been reduced, and where pasteurisation was extensively carried out, the death-rate increased. Dr. Thomas gave the cases of three towns. In Liverpool, approximately 76 per cent, of the milk was pasteurised, and the death-rate between 1938 and 1941 increased 85 per cent.; in Glasgow, 60 per cent, of the milk was pasteurised, and the death-rate increased by 37½ per cent.; in Manchester, 60 per cent, of the milk was pasteurised, and the death-rate increased by 36 per cent. This in spite of the reduction in child population of at least 170,000 in these three cities. I am not an expert on these matters, but I do think that we should be cautious about accepting any scheme which is favoured by so-called experts employed by large Organisations. If the medical experts employed by the Government are anything like the so-called economic experts, then I think we have a great deal to fear from them.

Nobody has ever attempted to prove, nor do I think they would try to prove, that

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 1½d. (4/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY," The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price, 9d. Postage 1½d. (6/- per dozen post free.)

fresh milk coming from good herds and clean dairies has given disease to a single person. It is our right, therefore, to get fresh milk in this way, and it is the duty of the Government to see that we get it.

When milk is pasteurised in a central depot, then there will be no serious attempt made to deliver fresh milk. Stale milk, two or three days old, will be dumped into the depot; good milk will be mixed with bad; nobody will worry, because nobody will be able to tell whether it is good or bad—it is going to be pasteurised, you know. And the farmer producing high quality milk will get the same as the farmer producing low quality milk.

Pasteurisation doesn't make stale milk fresh; it doesn't make bad milk good. It may prevent it from going sour; it doesn't prevent it from putrefying. I certainly would never dream of drinking milk from a central depot. With raw milk you can tell whether it is fresh or stale, but you can't very readily with pasteurised milk.

It might be suggested that pure, fresh milk of good quality and from good herds only would be accepted at the central depot. That could be done if it were closely watched by a Citizens' Committee. And if it can be done for a central depot, it can be done now to give us fresh raw milk—and we want to know why it isn't done.

The people are entitled to fresh milk of a good quality, and it is the job of the City Council and the Government to make sure that they get it. There is no mystery about supplying good milk, but there are certain factors necessary for its success. These are:

1 That the milk is fresh, and delivered within approximately twelve hours.

2 That demands good transport arrangements and the milk being collected from the farms twice a day.

3 Every dairy farmer should have a good breed of cows available to him at reasonable prices.

4 It is essential that dairy farmers should be given reasonable prices for milk, so that they can buy the best cows, can afford to pay decent wages for labour, and afford to produce high quality milk.

5 All cows should be examined for disease periodically.

6 The prices to the consumer should be reduced so that much more fresh milk can be given to the children.

7 The only-known method of giving high prices to farmers and lower prices to consumers is by means of a Government subsidy. This is the very best use that Government money can be put to, as long as it is new money and not collected by taxation. Subsidising prices by taxation solves no household difficulties.

When Great Britain went to war with Germany, one of the first tasks of Government was to find ways of getting supplies of food to the people. Britain's main supplies of butter, wheat and sugar came from overseas, and a great deal of butter and cheese came from the Scandinavian and Lowland countries, now occupied by the National Socialist armies of Germany.

It was essential, therefore, for Great Britain to grow most of its own foodstuffs, and so lessen the gigantic problem of finding shipping space to feed 45 million people.

The majority of families in England, as in Australia, live, of necessity, on the cheapest foods, mostly consisting of bread and other cereals, tea, jam, sausage and potatoes, and a little butter and milk. Butter and milk, fruit and vegetables, are expensive compared with bread and jam, and for this reason are used very sparingly by the great majority of families.

It has been suggested by many authorities that children should have over a pint of milk a day, but few children get this. The average consumption, both in Australia and England, was a half pint per person a day. Milk and butter cost too much for the ordinary family to use them in adequate quantities. The price of milk and butter, therefore, is of the very utmost national importance; it is the key question on all problems on national health.

Because people cannot afford to pay for adequate quantities of butter and milk, the dairy farmer cannot get a reasonable profit for his labours, and he cannot afford to pay attractive wages; and, worse still, he has to produce down to a price by producing the lowest passable grade of milk; he has to go in for cows of large milking capacity, which are essentially producers of low cream-content milk.

The conditions of the dairy industry in Australia are such that dairy cattle are being slaughtered and men are walking off their farms to get jobs in the city. At the inquiry in Hobart one dairy farmer said only fools and half-wits would take on the job of dairy-farming under present conditions.

The job facing the British Government was this: How could they induce farmers to not only keep producing, but to produce more? The problem was solved by giving the farmers profitable prices and at the same time keeping the prices low enough to fit the pockets of the people. The British Government, knowing the technique for doing this, did not need to waste time wondering what to do; they set to work to do it. The need was desperate, and under such conditions the Government has to fall back on the real experts of the country.

Accordingly the British Government used

what is called the "Compensated Price," and last year it spent over £200 million keeping prices down and guaranteeing profitable returns to farmers and others producing essential commodities used by families. This has kept down prices and prevented the need for increasing wages, and helped very greatly in preventing discontent. Agriculture in England is booming, and production

has gone up by leaps and bounds. This is a remarkable achievement, considering the tremendous demand war has made on the men and materials. It shows beyond all manner of doubt that if the Government honestly wants to help farmers, the way is wide open to do so. The way the dairying industry has been treated in Australia has been one of the scandals of the war.

THE PLAN FOR WORLD CONTROL

Reference has been made in these columns to the broadcast addresses of the late Mr. William Aberhart, Premier of Alberta, on post-war problems. These, recorded for serial distribution through Canadian broadcasting stations, were still being transmitted a few weeks ago through six Canadian stations, including Ottawa, CKCO (1310 M.). The following is the full text of No. 28 in the series, transmitted on May 3, the day of the first announcement of the late Premier's illness:—

A few nights ago I was listening to one of those "quiz" programmes which have become so popular with radio stations; and it struck me very forcibly that it was but another example of how people are being taught to-day to guess rather than to think for themselves. The kind of questions being asked were: "Who is the Minister of Agriculture?" "Is Moscow further North or further South than Quebec?" and so forth. The participant either knew the answers or he had to guess them. I cannot recall a single question that would have the effect of making people think. Has it ever occurred to you that it is becoming very much the same in regard to all phases of our National life?

For example, you will recall the famous plebiscite we had recently in Canada. In it the people were asked a question, the answer to which would not commit the Government to any particular course of action. The Government refused to indicate what they would do if the people voted either yes or no, hence the people themselves could not possibly tell what would be the result of their decision. They had to guess.

Or take election time. As a general rule the candidates of all parties came forward with their platforms all nicely dressed up to catch votes. The people are not asked, "What do you want? Do you want security in terms of more goods and better homes? Do you want these without regimentation and bureaucracy so that you may enjoy the maximum of freedom? Do you want freedom from debt and over-burdening taxation? Oh! No, no! they are not given the opportunity of voting on anything so straightforward as that. They are asked to vote on tariffs or free-trade, on compulsory unemployment insurance under one party's bureaucracy or another party's bureaucracy, or whether they want industries nationalised, or whether they prefer an international police force. In this way complicated and technical questions are put before the people, without giving them the proper information upon which to form sound opinions regarding what the results would be for them if these things were done. In other words—they have to guess.

That is the kind of thing that is going on all the time. People are being discouraged from thinking. We are being drilled into becoming a Nation of guessers—and as the men who manipulate the situation behind the scenes know all of the answers, and the necessary information is carefully withheld from the people, the manipulators are always right and the people generally guess wrong.

Nowhere is this more strikingly demonstrated than in regard to the stuff that is dished up to us as news. To-night I propose to deal with just one example, to show you the dangerous intrigue that is being perpetrated right under our noses.

Suppose that you pick up your newspaper some evening and read bold headlines such as these: "World Totalitarian Dictatorship by Finance Proposed as New Post-War Order—Confidence Expressed British Empire and American Governments Will Be Hoaxed Into Acceptance of Plan." What would be your reaction to that news? Would it make your blood boil? Would you feel indignant that anybody should dare to put forward treason like that while your son or your brother or your husband is over there risking his life for the ideals of democracy and our traditional British freedoms?

Well, my friends, let me tell you frankly, you have read that news in your papers, but it was not stated nearly so boldly. Possibly because what you read was complicated or was couched in altruistic language, and since you had no definite information on which to form an opinion, you just had to guess what it meant. And you probably guessed that there was nothing very sinister about it. That is what you were intended to do.

A short time ago you may remember reading in your newspaper that plans for an International Monetary Reform were published on the same day in both London, England, and in Washington, by the British and the United States Governments. These two plans were presented in the newspaper reports as simple and innocent expedients for making it easier to re-establish international trade after the war—a most desirable and worthy objective.

Strange as it may seem, though the so-called British and American plans were supposed to have been drawn up independently, they were basically similar, and both were made known to the public on the same day. This would tend to impress the people with the spontaneity of agreement and the unanimity of purpose in the whole matter. It was another of those strange coincidences like the similarity of the Beveridge, Marsh and N.R.P.B. plans of social security which were offered to the public within a few days of each other and

were identical in their main features. Well, I tell you frankly I don't believe in coincidences of that kind. They are too weird to be genuine.

Let me draw to your attention some of the main features common to both the British and the American plans for an international money system. Both advocate setting up an international unit of money, based on gold. In one case the name "Bankor" is suggested; in the other the term "Unitas" is put forward. But what does the name matter anyway, since both plans involve control of the international money system by an international authority, which will likewise control international trade? You see, it is all international-centralisation of power, etc. Both plans suggest that some such system should be set up in a hurry. Both plead its necessity on the grounds that it is essential for the purpose of averting confusion in world trade after the war. How plausible! How persuasive! "Will you come into my parlour said the spider to the fly," sort of manner.

Lord Keynes, a director of the Bank of England, is reputed to be the author of the British scheme. He is reported as having stated that such an international monetary system might be used to finance a World Police Force. All Totalitarian Powers evidently need a Gestapo. We are not told who was the author of the American plan.

On the face of it there seems to be nothing in those schemes to unduly alarm people, does there? But that is only because the people haven't the information which would enable them to understand what an international money system controlled by an international authority, backed up by an international Police Force, would mean to them. (To be continued.)

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

TIN TANGLE: One very good reason for the restriction or non-development of tin production in Australia may be found in the following report appearing in the daily press of August 9. It is estimated that Australian investors have more than £12 millions at stake in tin-mining companies in Thailand and Malaya. The report also states that "the Thai Government decided last week to cancel our rights and leases." This information was presumably held back until those "in the know" could get full control over tin deposits here. We should soon hear of workable deposits being mysteriously discovered. The Press never releases any information which plain John Citizen can make use of. In the matter of investments the public is only invited when the big gunmen have the treasure well guarded.

MINERS MISLED: Usurpation of the British legal code has been carried a step further along the road to totalitarian Communism in Britain by the setting up of miners' courts, which have taken unto themselves the power to impose fines on the miners for absenteeism. This means that if a miner absents himself from work a bunch of would-be Hitlers can rob him of his pay without reference to the regular courts. An extension of this would be greatly accelerated by the introduction of compulsory unionism if the local Red Fascists succeeded in mesmerising Australian workers.

PASTOR'S PASSION: A strange case of religious mania is reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of August 2. Thomas Tregaskis, pastor of the N.Z. Commonwealth Covenant Church, was charged with whipping his seven-years-old daughter. The senior pastor, Mr. E. D. Wilson, was also charged with having counselled and procured the assault, which occurred in the church during service. Prayers were conducted during the ordeal. Decision was reserved, and the magistrate commented that he "always thought there was only one perfect Man, and He died on the Cross; but, judging from Wilson's statement, there is another. All this goes to show that the "power-mania" disease is not always confined to bankers and politicians. Quite a number of people labour under the delusion that they are God-sent to wreak their evil will on others. Beware of all of them!

—O. B. Heatley.

Frank Devlin, ladies' and gentlemen's tailor, 2nd floor, 340 Little Collins St., Melbourne, announces that Christmas booking for tailoring-to-order is now complete. He advises readers to order now for January. [—Advt.]

Responsibility for all unsigned election comment in these columns is accepted by H. F. Ailsop, 343 Little Collins St, Melbourne, C.I.

PROGRAMME FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Creditor," England. (Continued from last issue.) The curious myopia (possibly resulting from the exotic interpretation of Genesis, which was supposed to indicate the date of creation as about B.C. 4000), which regards history as the events subsequent to the landing of Norman William, with his select body of Jews, in A.D. 1066, enables the statement that "Christopher Columbus discovered America at the end of the fifteenth century" to be accepted as accurate. Apart from the fact that Columbus never saw America, the mainland of which was "discovered" by John Cabot, who sailed from Bristol in 1497, there is strong reason to believe that various Scandinavian peoples had fairly constant intercourse with the North American Continent hundreds, if not thousands, of years earlier. Their traditional name for it was Markland.

There are, however, certain features in regard to the rediscovery of America which are worth attention. Christopher Columbus was a Jew, and John Cabot, although his ship and crew were English, was a Venetian. But the extraordinary and significant fact is that there was in Bristol at that time a secret Jewish community "who handed on their tradition by word of mouth" (Lord Melchett, "Thy Neighbour," p. 90).

It is obvious that both Columbus and Cabot had information of a fairly definite character to guide them. Both of them set a compass course which was approximately correct and both of them had connections with banking—Columbus with Jewish banking, and Cabot with the banking-City-State of Venice; and almost certainly with this secret Bristol Jewry. The essence of banking has always been what in military circles is called "intelligence"—information in its widest sense, spying being an important component, and it seems highly probable that the existence of the American continent was known in banking circles when it was quite unknown outside them. If this was so, it is reasonable to assume that when action was taken in regard to this knowledge it was considered action.

Quite a different type of individual is required to pioneer a new country from that required to develop it subsequently, and it is not without significance also that the original British settlers were followed by a wave of Dutch, who for the most part remained on the Atlantic seaboard as traders and bankers. One of the real effects of the American War of Independence was that although a facade of the original settlers of British stock held most of the titular offices of Government, the control of development and policy rapidly passed to a tiny Dutch minority (not to be confused with the much larger German element frequently called Dutch in the United States by a corruption of the word "Deutsch"). Such names as Roosevelt, Astor, Vanderbilt, Van Ranselaer, Van Cortlandt, etc., immediately occur to anyone in this connection. The Dutch were the Chosen Instrument of Finance.

This is not an attempt to write a history of the United States. It is a suggestion that the United States is a definite and very important item in a plan which was interrupted by the expulsion from England in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries of the Jews and their associates whom we now call Freemasons, but who were then called Knights Templars.

By common consent, the real framer of the Declaration of Independence was Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson's mother was a Randolph—probably, with the Lees of Virginia, the most aristocratic family of the New World. There is quite indisputable evidence that Jefferson was an international Freemason, and that the revolutionary elements in America, who were greatly in the minority, were the same elements who were fomenting trouble in France (Jefferson was actually United States Ambassador to France at the time of the fall of the Bastille).

The famous phrase, "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness" originally read, "Every man is entitled to the possession of life, liberty and property," and Jefferson in person struck out "property" and inserted the quite meaningless abstraction, "the pursuit of happiness."

"JEWISH PROBLEM" AND SOCIALISM

By ERIC D. BUTLER

In a recent article in these columns, entitled "Red Fascists Show Their Fangs," I had a few hard things to say about the local Communists and their tactics. I desire to add a little more this week, mainly to impress certain important facts on my readers' minds—facts which can never be stressed sufficiently.

The first is that both the followers of Hitler (advised and brought to power by powerful and influential Jews) and the followers of Karl Marx, the German-Jewish lawyer, are determined, either consciously or unconsciously, to obscure the real issue concerning the "Jewish Problem." I have spent considerable time in an endeavour to make the real issue clear to the public. That my efforts, along with the work of social creditors everywhere, have been somewhat successful is evident by the abuse heaped upon me by the Communists. They falsely accuse social creditors of being "Fascists" and desiring to use Hitler's tactics against the Jews.

Now, the whole basis of Fascism and Nazism is centralised power, wielded by one strong Party. (Incidentally, the Communists also believe in this idea.) But every honest person knows that there is no social credit movement in this country seeking power. Social Crediters are striving to show the electors how to fully control their political and other institutions. How can anyone say that this is being Fascistic or pro-Hitler? It is exactly the opposite.

It is a fact that Social Crediters, and, I must add, many others, are convinced that there is a "Jewish Problem." Social Crediters object to Judaic philosophy.

Jefferson was almost a perfect example of the aristocratic abstractionist—the man who is born with a power complex which he inherits and disdains apprenticeship to his constitution-making. He was a student and a lawyer from the age of seventeen, and nearly every one of his policies was in direct conflict with his own mode of life and fundamental sympathies, and conveys the suggestion of outside influence on inexperience. Although he was President (a very different office to that now attached to the title) and is credited with the Louisiana Purchase, the picture presented of his Administration is that of a man with an inherited aptitude for dealing with large matters, but taking his instructions on them without much consciousness of the reality they embody.

Perhaps the most indisputable evidence that I am not unduly fanciful in this matter is provided by the Great Seal of the United States, which was the work of Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin, all Freemasons, the obverse of which consists of a truncated pyramid, with the headstone bearing a picture of the All-Seeing Eye, the symbol of Freemasonry, suspended above the Pyramid. The motto is "annuit cœptis"—"he prospers our origins."

The pyramid is the symbol of world-government. The rest of the symbolism is obvious. Seen in the light of this clue, the history of the United States is consistently bound up with Whiggism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, and with the "mergers," financial buccaneering, and political corruption of the super-capitalism which accompany Judaeo-Masonry. The political corruption is not adventitious—it is essential. The type of Government, and the type of legislator in the main prevalent in this country during the last half of the Victorian era, although very far from ideal, would never have tolerated for a week the financial piracy of the Vanderbilt-Harriman era, which co-existed with it in the United States. It is not brains of which the Plotters are afraid—it is integrity. This type of British Government was definitely one of tradition, not of expediency, and traditional Government imposes certain standards in much the same way that a Gothic Cathedral discourages ribaldry.

In 1935, a year which probably marked the disappearance of any real prospect of peace, the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury announced that in future the obverse of the Great Seal would be printed on the back of all U.S. paper money.

I should like to emphasise, for the benefit of those to whom it is necessary, that not only is the mass of the modern American people unconscious of the part it has been billed to play, but is very uneasy as to its part in world affairs.

Whether leading American statesmen understand the situation is also not plain. I rather doubt it. But that there is a small inner ring which does, I am confident. I have met at least one of them.

One of our nineteenth century statesmen begged Englishmen to cultivate the habit of studying large maps. With a world war on our hands, we require above most other things, to realise that evil designs can be, and are, built up from innocuous components, and, in consequence, short views of history may be very deceptive. (All rights reserved.) (To be continued.)

well-disposed of all nations" to come and live under his scheme. Not many practical men arrived; only a lot of theorists. The scheme held together only so long as Owen bossed it. But the whole idea fell through after two years. The first attempt at making Socialism work had failed.

The second attempt was on a much bigger scale—Soviet Russia. Every honest investigator knows that the results were appalling; that slowly, but surely, the Russian leaders have had to come back nearer to reality and admit that schemes must take into account the fact that human beings have personalities.

Now, under cover of war, we have a lot of woolly-minded theorists trying to

plan us. The results are becoming more obvious every day. Socialism won't work. Social Crediters must push on with their work of advising their fellow citizens how to get results in association, how to work in accord with reality all the time. We have big forces against us, but we have reality on our side. Like Owen and his followers, the opposition may challenge reality, but they will eventually be found out. It is a pity that, in the meantime, so many people should be hurt in the process of the diabolical experiment now in progress all over the world: the experiment of trying to make individuals fit a system.

BRITISH M.P. CONDEMNS BANKSTERISM

(Speech in House of Commons by Mr. R. Stokes. Continued from last issue.)

The object also of this Debate was to enable some of us to put to the Chancellor the desirability of ensuring that people by the end of this war are not deceived and robbed of the efforts they have made to bring it to a satisfactory conclusion.

I want to dwell on the humbug of talking about paying for the war financially. Wars are never paid for financially. As an hon. Member said the other day, the Battle of Waterloo has not yet been paid for financially. When my right hon. Friend was asked to give a figure of what is standing in the books as a debt on the Battle of Waterloo, he said he did not know, as they did not keep their books that way at the Treasury.

Actually wars are paid for in one way only and that is by the sweat and the blood of the people who fight, whether they fight in the workshops or on the battlefield. You pay them money for fighting the war and then in effect this is what the Chancellor does when he collects taxes from them.

What happened last time? We started the last war with a National Debt of £700,000,000. We had four years of nice war, and at the end of it the Debt was £7,000,000,000. We then started to pay it off, and at the end of 20 years' straining and struggling we found we had added another £1,000,000,000, making the total £8,000,000,000 but meanwhile had paid out £5,600,000,000 in interest on loans.

If this war goes on to the end of next year, the National Debt will be anything up to £20,000,000,000, with a service charge of £600,000,000 a year which is equal to the whole of the National Debt prior to the 1914 war. That is why I suggest that we ought to finance the war by interest-free money as far as we can and not fall, as the Chancellor falls far too frequently, under the influence of the City of London and the moneylenders. There is one class of people we shall have to dispose of if we are to have a just and lasting peace and that is the moneylenders.

What my right hon. Friend the Chancellor, does not explain to the people when he gets their money is that the 2½ per cent. War Loan may stand at 100 now, but in fact they have no guarantee that when the war comes to an end the manipulators in the city will not put the Bank Rate up to 4 per cent, or higher and that the value of the War Loan will then go down to 50 or lower.

This is the easiest way of getting money away from the people, and that is what the ruling class of any country always try to do. They realise that it is most dangerous to let the people be rich and that the less purchasing power left in their hands the better. If they were left rich, they would begin to be free and would not be so easy to manage as under an impoverished economy.

One of the problems we shall have at the end of the war is changing over from war-time to peace-time economy. One of the difficulties will be the distribution of purchasing power. Everybody is planning everybody else.

We have all seen absurd schemes which we would be much better without. I would like to see the people free, and I suggest that the way to ensure that they will be free is to leave more purchasing power in their hands, so that at the end of the war they will be able to demand the goods which they are restricted from having now.

What I want to say is that never, never again are we going to be the slaves of the money barons. The Chancellor would be the most popular Chancellor on the face of the earth if he would take steps to restore to the people their sovereign right to create money and credit.

Let me say one word about the export trade. I am one of those who think that the method which existed prior to the war of aiming to create a "favourable" balance of trade was nonsense and led to a great deal of trouble. Somebody has described it as "exporting our unemployment."

I have four points to put. The first is that I hope that when next the Chancellor presents us with a Budget he will give us a national balance-sheet and not an expenses account. It is an astonishing statement that we get every year. Apparently we have no assets; they do not exist! All we get is an expense account.

My second point is that whereas in the last war people saw that money did not matter, that in wartime there was no dif-

ficulty about making any quantity of munitions to carry on the war, when the war came to an end everything was changed round. We were told we had to go in for restrictions and the people were thrown on the scrap heap. We are told now that this is not to happen again.

I would quote no less an authority than my right hon. Friend—if I may call him so—the Prime Minister on this subject. In his book "World Crisis" he says, talking about the change that occurred at 11 a.m. on November 11, 1918:

"A requisition for half a million houses would not have seemed more difficult to comply with than those we were in process of executing for 100,000 aeroplanes or 20,000 guns . . . but a new set of conditions began to rule from 11 o'clock onwards. . . . The money cost which had never been considered by us to be a factor capable of limiting the supply of the armies, asserted a claim in priority from the moment the fighting stopped."

I want to make it clear to whoever is Chancellor when the war ends that we shall never allow a shortage of money to stand in our way. This point was put very aptly in a little verse that came to my notice the other day and which, with the permission of the House, I will read. It is:

"Sing a song of plenty, a planet full of fools,
Everybody starving, by sound financial rules,

The banker in his counting house was counting out his money.

The land was overflowing with bread and milk and honey.

The shops were full of good things, the factories likewise

The banker shuts his books and said,
"We must economise."

That is typical of this revolting and stupid monetary system which we follow in modern times.

DOLES OR DIVIDENDS?

Paltry Post-War Plan

(To the Editor)

Sir.—Listening to a broadcast talk on National Stations the other night, entitled "The National Minimum," in the series "After The War—Then What?", in which was briefly outlined the Australian counterpart of the Beveridge plan, I became so incensed at the outrage, at the intention to introduce again the infamous dole system after the war, that I determined that something would have to be done about it without delay. For the speaker was an official of the Department of Post-War Reconstruction, and his proposals are, presumably, in broad outline, those that will be accepted and acted upon by the Government.

Briefly, the Plan that is to "abolish want" in Australia is this: Work for all, but failing this, a minimum subsistence allowance of 30/- a week for a single adult male, or £2/10/- for man and wife, either in money or goods, subject, however, to the odious inquisition of the means test; compulsion to work if work can be found—in short, the humiliating, pauperising dole again in all its meanness! The money for this "lavish" scheme (if we can afford it, of course!) to be raised by taxing the wealthier classes. Isn't it great?

I felt my choler rising with every detail of this dastardly plot of the financiers and wily economists to rob the Australian people of their heritage. But the crowning insult was the speaker's allusion to this travesty of economic security as a realisation of "Economic Democracy"!!! (Thus are our enemies purloining our phrases and perverting their meaning.)

As I fumed I saw clearly our duty as Social Crediters and democrats. We must be up and doing to foil these plans before they are even under way. We must redouble our efforts to tell the people by every means open to us how they are going to be cheated. We must show them, simply and convincingly, that what is physically possible is financially possible, and that nothing short of National Dividends will do them justice. I believe we should succeed if we start now a nation-wide demand for Dividends—not Doles. Let us speak now, or forever hold our peace!

—Yours etc., MARY H. GRAY, 68 Fin-don Road, Woodville, Adelaide.