

AUSTRALIA'S POST-WAR PERIL. (Page 2.)
 THE PLOT TO SOCIALISE AUSTRALIA. (Page 3.)
 PROGRAMME FOR THIRD WORLD WAR. (Page 3.)
 CANADIAN M.P. ON RECONSTRUCTION. (Page 4.)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 9, No. 39. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1943

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).

How To Get Real Democracy In Australia

What Is Our Main Job?

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

In a recent article in these columns, "Money Reform or Social Credit?" I stressed certain aspects of our work, which I believe are fundamental. At the request of a correspondent, I am dealing still further with these fundamentals, with a view to appropriate action in the immediate future:

I will start by asking the following question: "Does any thinking person suggest that, at the conclusion of this war, the people of this country would tolerate any Government that said we must suffer a depression because of a shortage of finance?" I doubt it. The overwhelming majority of the people know that millions are being found for war, and there seems to me to be little doubt that they would sweep from office any Government that supported a depression. (That is, of course, providing that rule by an international police force, which Mrs. Roosevelt appeared to be sponsoring while in Australia, were not introduced first.) It seems to me to be obvious that the real banking powers of this world are going to organise a mediocre security after the war. Sir Claude Reading may have other ideas, but I don't think the Wall Street bankers are much worried about him. He is a mere "stooge." What we should be concerned about is: On what terms and under what conditions are we to receive this mediocre security? That, to me, is the most vital issue before this country today.

A widespread and rather vague demand for monetary reform can lead us straight to a hell on earth. Early this century in America a widespread agitation against the bankers led to the formation of the Federal Reserve Board of America. I'm inclined to think that we are progressing in a similar direction. The thought of the Central Bank taking over all banking in Australia, and the possible removal of, say, Sir Claude Reading in favour of Mr. Chifley, or some other socialist, makes me shudder; mainly because so many money reformers would consider it a move in the right direction. The Labor Government desires to obtain control of the banking system in order to introduce its particular "vested interest"—socialism. Remember that clearly.

An example of how the international conference of Protestant Church leaders at Princeton (U.S.A.) was used to further the Federal Union plot is to be seen in the following items placed first and second on their agenda: (1) How far are nations prepared to submit to some (unknown) international authority? (2) How far will nations go in reducing tariffs and the control of their currency? Although the conference did not make a pronouncement on item (2) regarding currency, in respect of the first they found, "National isolation is repudiated as a policy contrary to world order." Large type featured this news in the Melbourne "Argus" on September 23—the day after we read of the U.S. Congress passing the resolution favouring participation in a World Government scheme. Readers should lose no time in telling their Federal M.P.'s that they will not stand for any foreign authority having any say in the management of our local affairs. Don't delay!

DEDMAN'S DELUSION: Mr. Dedman suggests that the regimentation of the people during the war proves that the depression was unnecessary, and that regimentation, if continued, would ensure a decent, self-respecting existence in the post-war years. He even stated that this idea of a "managed economy" would usher in another "Elizabethan era." Ye gods! If a socialistic theorist had dared to interfere with the practical, daring, real he-men of the Elizabethan period his neck would soon have been an inch longer and his bones interred. Dedman has certainly mixed up history, and his "logic" as to the value of regimentation is equally mixed.

BAD BEGINNING: A glimpse into the mind of Dame Enid Lyons is given in a report contained in the "Age" of September 17, which indicates the super ego peculiar to most politicians, viz.: "One thing that worried her was the post-war period, in which young people were going to be very impatient of any restraint. That must still be imposed, as it would not be sufficient to allow them to step out of the Army into any kind of job." Note the "superior planners' attitude towards men who fought their way through peace and war, without, as the Dame had, a subsidy of £500 per annum contributed by taxation from "inferior" beings whose lives she apparently now hopes to plan.

MORGENTHAU'S MATHEMATICS: Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, in combating what he describes as "childish and criminal over-optimism" (vide Melbourne "Sun," September 17), tells the world the stark fact that the conquest of Sicily cost the Allies material losses of up to 54%, including 13% of all howitzers.

There are many ways of controlling people. The average person feels that this is so, and he has always regarded those who blamed the money system for all his worries as a bit of a crank. Most apple growers regarded the Apple and Pear Board as a more immediate threat than the banks. And a growing number of intelligent people regard the threat of socialism as their immediate worry. We must try and understand our fellow electors and help them with their immediate problems.

After close contact with all sections of the Australian people over the past seven years, during which time I have addressed upwards of 700 meetings, I do not believe that a majority of adults in this country will ever understand the workings of the present financial system. I once suffered from the delusion that several hundred people applauding what I said about the banking system indicated that they understood the issue clearly. But I learnt as I went along. Most money reformers suffer from the fault that they believe that what is clear to them should be clear to others. This is not so, and the sooner it is faced the better. But the fact that a majority of the electors will never understand the banking system doesn't mean that they cannot alter or control the financial system.

The great majority of car owners know little or nothing about the mechanism of their cars, but that doesn't prevent them from controlling and driving them. Mechanics can be hired on a results basis to fix any faults. It's about time our financial experts were hired—or "fired"—on a results basis.

The real fight at the moment is to prevent the loss of more of our liberties, thus retaining our liberty of action. Every piece of restrictive legislation against any section of the community is a defeat for us.

Material losses also included tanks and a vast quantity of secondary material, such as 1100 miles of copper wire. Expressed in percentages, apparently this information is of no use to the enemy, and presumably the same would apply if the human losses were expressed in the same terms. The mothers and fathers of the human "material" would be more interested in this aspect than those dealt with; but apparently the financial mind quite overlooks, or is not interested in, the human element.

WAVELL'S WISDOM: The Melbourne "Argus," "Age" and "Sun" of September 17 reported Lord Wavell thus: "It has always seemed to me curious that money is forthcoming in any quantity for war. No nation has ever produced money on the same scale to fight the evils of peace—poverty, lack of education, unemployment and ill-health." Well, it shouldn't take long for a practical-minded military strategist to discover the "why" of this, and it is to be hoped he will be encouraged to put his mind to examining the matter.

GROWERS' GROWLS: Timely and forceful opposition to regimented agriculture was expressed by representatives of primary-producing bodies meeting at Box Hill (Vic.), when they unanimously carried a resolution "opposing any extension of power by the Commonwealth Government over primary producers." Another resolution "requesting abolition of compulsory marketing of primary products" was also carried with acclamation. None know better than these practical growers the extent of the sabotaging of our food production by the interference of theoretical socialistic bureaucrats, and they are determined that these bunglers

(Continued on page 2.)

Now, I have heard many money reformers speaking as follows about various socialistic attacks upon certain groups in the community: "Why waste time and energy on these side issues? We must get on with the big issue. These people will now learn what the money system can do for them." Then they proceed to lecture this group suffering from some attack—about the banking system. And they become irritated and depressed because they don't get a better hearing. Now, surely it is obvious that any section in the community being attacked by bureaucracy is much more immediately interested in how it can fight than in academic discussion. A man whose home is threatened by a bush fire is much more interested in practical and immediate action to save his home than in a discussion on what was the cause of the fire. And if a friend helped him to save his home and talked about causes afterwards, he might get a good hearing.

Social crediters should be able to show any group in the community how to take action and get results. Some people may scoff at the small fights, but a large number of small victories over a large front help to stiffen the resistance of those groups—and there are many of them—opposed to any further restriction of individual liberty and initiative. The "enemy's" tactics have been to attack and destroy the various sections of the community one by one. Our job is to help those who are fighting, instead of trying to get people to help us

fight. Whenever these tactics have been adopted, success has been obtained. Practically every campaign, from the National Insurance issue to the Commonwealth Powers issue, didn't cost the social credit movement in this country more than a few pounds. We found people who wanted to fight and gave them direction. They found most of the money, which is only right. Mr. James Guthrie, of Hobart, was recently instrumental in preventing the centralisation of Hobart's milk supply. He supplied the right advice and information to those who were keen to fight centralisation. Those people paid all the costs of the campaign.

As a result of these small campaigns, it will be found that a few individuals desire to know more of our work. These are the people who will probably understand fully what we are trying to do. They can be helped in order that they in turn can give advice and guidance. But we are never going to get more than a small percentage of the people as interested as we are. C. H. Douglas said some time back that he was no longer concerned so much about "converting" people as with finding out what people want and showing them how to get it. Once people find that they are getting results by acting on our advice, their confidence in us will increase. We must regard ourselves as social engineers, willing to give advice and help to electors who are in trouble.

(Continued on page 3.)

International Currency Dangers

The following article, by R. Gaudin, which appeared in a recent issue of the "Social Creditor," England, was originally written for members of the British public who are specially interested in the export trade; but it is non-technical and should be of equal interest to the general public in any British country:—

1. INTRODUCTION.

There is no doubt that the emergence of the willing buyer and the willing seller is only possible under conditions, which make both parties satisfied with the transaction. In the case of international trade we have, for example, the lately published "Proposals for an International Clearing Union" and "The United States' Proposal for a United and Associated Nations' Stabilisation Fund."

Before even placing these proposals before experts, I think it most desirable to envisage the real policy behind them and satisfy ourselves whether, on the face of it, the underlying motive is what it purports to be, or whether there is in these suggestions a hidden danger which, if appreciated, no freedom-loving person would tolerate. There are very grave fears that they will not be so appreciated and before we realise it this country may find itself committed to a policy, which would mean the complete disintegration of the British Commonwealth of Nations, let alone the sabotage of our export trade. The reasons for these notes are therefore quite clear.

2. NO SATISFACTORY SCHEME FOR DOMESTIC CURRENCY HAS EVER HAD THE SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCIERS.

Up to the present, we have never had any financial scheme sponsored by eminent economists or bankers, which would foster harmonious conditions. The cause is not difficult to find, for if any specific scheme proved successful it would transfer power from the few who now hold it to the many, and in all history there has never been a voluntary surrender of power by those who hold it. We find, therefore, that they even go so far as to sabotage proposals by misrepresentation through every channel of publicity and action. If, therefore, these people have failed in the smaller sphere, are they likely to succeed in the larger?—"By their fruits ye shall know them." I believe Mr. Norman of the Bank of England has confessed he does not fully understand how to solve the problems associated with a smooth and satisfactory money system; satisfactory, that is to say, from the point of view of the people of this or any other country. At the same time, he is reputed to have expressed the view that, even if the dogs bark, the caravan goes on. In other words, whether you like it or not, we are proceeding with the bankers' policy, and I doubt whether Mr. Norman is really serious when he confesses to bewilderment.

3. THE PROMOTERS OF THESE SCHEMES CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE POLICY THEY ARE PURSUING.

From the observations in the foregoing paragraph I would be the last to concede that the real promoters of the schemes do not know what they are doing. I am con-

vinced that centralisation of power by any means is the true aim and these proposals will, if implemented, consolidate it in the hands of the very people who have undermined our civilisation. This regimentation and control has been applied mildly and slowly at first, and then, as it was found that the technique succeeded, with increasing rapidity, through the use of the various tools (e.g., the press, pulpit, cinema, and radio), which are more and more under their control. Soon, unless we are very careful, we shall find ourselves so enmeshed in mental inhibitions and physical prohibitions that we shall be as slaves controlled by anonymous rulers. They will propagate the highest "moral" principles, and to support their action, the principles of sacrifice (jam tomorrow but never today), the virtue of employment and the nobleness of austerity, and, should these methods fail, then control ultimately by the use of irresistible physical force. Contrast this with Christ's words, "I come that ye might have life and that more abundantly." Significantly, just after the postponement of the second bloody phase of the World War, P.E.P.'s journal, "Planning" (October 4, 1938), said: "We have started from the position that only in war or under the threat of war, will a British Government embark on large-scale planning."

(Continued on page 4.)

This Price Fixing

The "Christian Churches" apparently have donned the livery of the World Directorate Pty. Ltd., having signed up on the dotted line at an international conference in Princeton, U.S.A.

The Rt. Rev. R. Wilson Macaulay, one of the two Australian representatives at that conference, said ("Argus," 23/9/1943) that the main objects of the conference were to give the world DIRECTIONS for the establishment and maintenance of peace, and to arrive at the minimum basis on which the world could BUY peace, which had a price that HAD TO BE PAID.

Considering the venue of the conference, it is not surprising to find that the chief item of the price there fixed is "limitation of national independence and submission to international authority." Ten steps toward peace were commended to the Governments and Churches of the Allied nations, the first step being repudiation of national isolation (independence, really—see chief item of price) as a "policy contrary to world order."

So, as liberty is the price of peace and eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, it follows that peace is the price of eternal vigilance—wherefrom peace and freedom can never co-exist, even amongst Christians!

TO YOUR CHAINS, O ISRAEL!

—F. H. Ault.

AUSTRALIA'S POST-WAR PERIL

(A Letter to the Editor from BRUCE H. BROWN. Continued from last issue.)

Sir,—As you said last week, there IS peril for the people of Australia in the plans which are being formulated to control them after the war. This peril threatens not only the people of Australia, but also the people in other parts of the British Empire. That this is no figment of the imagination will become clear, I think, from what follows. The menace lies basically in the objective of the masterminds behind the plot to secure the enslavement of humanity, but it is also showing itself in the type of persons who have been "selected" to prepare the instruments or measures for executing the plot.

Dr. H. C. Coombs, Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction and member of the Commonwealth Bank Board, is one of these persons, and it was the declaration he made a few days ago, to which I referred last week, that has led me to have a look at the developments of the past. You remember his words:

"In planning the post-war period it was important that employment, instead of being a by-product of economic activity, should be in future the objective."

This clear-cut declaration provides evidence that the Australian Department of Post-War Reconstruction has been established, not to give the people the full benefit of their wonderful resources and productive ability, BUT TO CARRY OUT THE POLICY OF THE CONTROLLERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL SYSTEM. The implications of this are exceedingly serious, and I trust that every reasonable Australian who may read what I am writing will bring it directly to the notice of his or her representatives in Parliament.

Twenty-two years ago, C. H. Douglas warned us of what was afoot. In an article entitled "The World After Washington" he wrote this:

"Only a few years ago the proposition that the object towards which the High Priests of the Financial Temples of Wall Street were working was the raising of the standard of living and an increase in the amenities of life, passed without more articulate and reasoned dissent than was contained in sporadic strikes of disgruntled 'workers,' mostly on pretexts which could be shown without difficulty to be either illogical or absurd. But one veil after another has been torn from this fairy-tale by patient, acid investigations into the methods of Financial Sabotage, the investigations being carried on almost independently by widely separated persons and groups, mostly engineers, in the great industrial and financial countries; and it has become quite clear that the object of the Financial System under which we live IS

NOT THE DISTRIBUTION OF GOODS AND SERVICES UP TO THE LIMIT TO WHICH THEY CAN BE PRODUCED. IT IS EMPLOYMENT—EMPLOYMENT FOR ITS OWN SAKE. The street-corner orator, who always exaggerates, calls it Slavery, but of course that is absurd. No one is forced to compete for employment who is willing to starve, although the converse is not true."

The world was to be brought "under the sway of the purveyors of EMPLOYMENT." "Economic work" is to be the only title to life, and employment in this sense means the fight to find someone who can PAY us for working—dependence upon the supply of money! Dr. Coombs has publicly admitted that he is planning for the perpetration of this insanity. This means that, although he is theoretically employed by the people he is actually working for the people's enemies.

It is beyond argument that, despite our increasing ability to reduce dependence upon employment or work-for-wages, it is the purpose of the controllers of financial policy to prevent our escape from the burden of toil. Our own experiences in the last 20 years and one look at the men who have been "selected" to advise our governments are sufficient to identify the Black Hand at the back of them. The present trio of "expert advisers" consists of Professor Giblin, economic adviser to the Federal Treasury; Professor Copland, controller of prices; and Dr. Coombs, Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction. Coombs recently replaced Giblin on the Board of the Commonwealth Bank. Each of these men has taken an important part in imposing financial poverty in the midst of material plenty, and each has been conditioned to have the mental outlook that wealth should be made to serve finance, instead of finance being made to serve wealth. Each believes that finance should control the community instead of the community controlling finance. Each puts WORK before leisure, and debt before credit. It was the great Copland who said

that a country can only grow richer as its debts grow greater!

Each of these men has had direct contact with representatives of the foreign POWER, which for many years has been responsible for the sufferings of humanity, and each has put himself and his talents at the service of that alien, international Power. In considering vital matters of this kind it should always be borne in mind that Professor Copland attended the World Economic Conference fiasco in London in 1933; that at one time he was adviser to the Bank of New South Wales; that he visited Basle, where he had the great "privilege" of talking with the Governor and economists of the Bank for International Settlements; and that he has been to America and the Financial Temples of Wall Street. Dr. Coombs has just returned from the United States, and immediately informed us that the objective of the International Financial Gangsters is now also the objective of the post-war planning being done on behalf of the Commonwealth Government.

Dr. H. C. Coombs is a graduate of the

London School of Economics, where he was trained to become one of those selected to control the people under the conditions of regimentation then being specially planned without the people's knowledge. He and the others mentioned are local agents for the interests behind the London School of Economics, and if we are to get a proper conception of what is going on we must get to know a little more about this "school" and those connected with it. It is no coincidence that Sir William Beveridge, a director of the London School of Economics, was "selected" to plan the "social security" measures for the people of England; that Dr. Marsh, a graduate of the London School of Economics, was "selected" to plan the "social security" measures for the people of the Dominion of Canada; and that Dr. H. C. Coombs, another graduate of the London School of Economics, was "selected" to plan the "social security" measures for the people of Australia.—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, 26th September 1943.

(To be continued.)

EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY

(Continued from last issue.)

The following is part of an address by the Principal of the University College of the South West, Exeter, England (Mr. John Murray), to the Incorporated Association of Head Masters, at London, in January:—

It is better to conceive our democracy as a form of citizenship than as a form of Government. Starting points determine most arguments. Start out from the idea of Government and the State, and you may easily slip into totalitarianism, mistaking government for an end in itself and the State for an absolute. You may easily have too much of either.

The truest democracy is a nation of friends. Of citizenship, of fellow-citizenship, of friendship there can hardly be enough, let alone too much. With this political orientation our English schools, striving after community, as I have described, chime in well.

In these days of reconstruction we are threatened with an entirely new order in education. Equality is the keynote; equality of opportunity for children, guaranteed by all-round standardising, by equality of status for schools, and of salaries, I suppose, for teachers. Farewell to freedom and variety! "Parity of esteem" is the slogan. The easiest parity of esteem to achieve is, of course, parity of disesteem. But parity of esteem is a false idea. It is not in human nature to concede such parity to persons or institutions. Take husbands and wives, who might well have benefit of parity. But who ever esteems them alike? Take the Houses of Parliament, or government offices, or churches, or clubs, or Oxford Colleges, or railways, or butchers or barbers or candlestick makers. The human mind has a voracious instinct for differences. If they are there, it will find them. If not, it will invent them. When confronted by two persons or two groups of the same species, the natural man—and that is every one of us—believes the one to be better, if only he knew how, than the other. Esteem is the most discriminating thing in human life. Parity of esteem is a fable, the fancy of an arithmetical psychologist, an idea fit for statistics. It is certainly not a human motive. Esteem is always desired

in the comparative degree. To be esteemed equally with another is as good as no esteem at all; it is, in fact, parity of disesteem.

I wish to put a question to the equalitarians. The fathers of democracy are the ancient Greeks, and among them chiefly the Athenians. Have the equalitarians, I wonder, considered the two books on Friendship in Aristotle's Ethics? He there sheds light on a novel angle on Athenian life, on the society for which no political framework but democracy could suit. Why did the Athenians need so much freedom? (There was so much of it at Athens that you couldn't tell a slave from a freeman in the street, which shocked many from other parts of Greece.) It was because the Athenians were gifted, diverse, enterprising and versatile, above most, above any; and unless they were free they could not be or do all that was in them to be and do. Friendliness was the substance of their working citizenship. Aristotle's emphasis on "philia" comprehends every sort of contact, those of sport, of business, of culture, the nobler ties, deep and lasting, or the brief, banal and trivial. Aristotle emphasises pointedly the entire range of contacts between unequals. Athens rejoiced in differences; and the warmth and force of her citizenship easily saved the differences and inequalities from becoming complexes. The pioneers of democracy were not equalitarians. Equalitarianism is not democracy, but the pedantry of democracy; and against such declension buoyancy, vitality and tolerance make the best defence.

The method of the proposed New Order is administrative simplicity and uniformity in unit areas of considerable size. Educational effort within those areas is to be bureaucratically subordinated to local committees and their officials. The signs are that both committees and directors would be masterful. The extreme voices in the movement threaten to abolish all governing bodies of schools, or at least to neuter from employment in the public services all those who have not been educated in the bureaucratic system of schools. The movement as a whole disregards the rights of parents.

All this can be studied in the orange sixpenny of the directors of education, "Education: A Plan for the Future." Administrative uniformity in a broad scheme of centralised power is, of course, a distinctive ambition of bureaucrats. I don't blame them altogether; for that, besides being their ambition, is the key to good administration in certain spheres. Strong central control with hierarchical subordination of staff and labour is often the basis, and the only basis, of effective working. But this hierarchical scheme would not suit English education, or the English. It may have its uses elsewhere. It is the German system; it was, long before the Nazis came into power, and it has lent itself admirably to their purposes. Without it they could hardly have made such a conquest of German education. It is, in fact, the totalitarians' opportunity.

But let us confess that the working of our democracy has occasioned, though it does not excuse, the bureaucratic ambition. The County Councils, themselves somewhat political bodies, can hardly be said to fill their education committees with a single eye to the fitness of the members for work on education. As the work steadily extends and diversifies, the laymen naturally find themselves at a growing disadvantage. They are tempted, and indeed obliged, to rely more and more on their chief official. It is the system, of course, that is wrong; so wrong that it ought to be altered. The current conceptions have been too simple. The nation has assumed that a uniform style of bureaucracy will answer equally in all branches of administration, as if what suited the bus system of a city, or the Streets Committee, would also suit the schools. The misfit is just as glaring in Whitehall. The responsible organ at the Board of Education ought to be a body

(Continued on page 3.)

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

will be put out of harm's way. May their growls grow into a roar, which will compel their paid political servants to rid us of these food bunglers.

DUMPING DEMONS: The willful dumping of military equipment in the form of hats, uniforms, blankets and other equipment, a large quantity of which was new was described as disgraceful by Judge Clancy, as reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of September 16. He said he intended to find out "who ordered the burning of army equipment at Moore Park incinerator." The Judge has certainly taken on a job here. He'll have his work cut out—when each one concerned passes the buck on to the other fellow, in accordance with bureaucratic practice. It will be interesting to note all the alibis that are sure to be forthcoming.

RUSSIA AND RELIGION: Further to the propagandised revival of religion in Russia, the daily press informs us that the Archbishop of York is visiting Russia to express the Church of England's sympathy with the Orthodox Church of Russia in its sufferings—at the hands of the Germans, not the Communist Party. The visit is strictly non-political—neither Governments being in any way involved. The report concluded with this rather intriguing comment: "Only his (the Archbishop's) sister and secretary knew the secret of his visit."

SLUMS SHUNNED: Speaking on the housing problem at the N.S.W. Returned Soldiers' League conference, Mr. Gillies pointed out that "Mrs. Roosevelt was not allowed to see the slums during her visit to Sydney." Of course, Mrs. Roosevelt need not leave America to see slums, so presumably she was looking for places without slums. Under these circumstances it must have been a very trying job for those who managed her tour to confine her to the few streets in carefully selected areas where slums do not exist. If, as she stated in a radio talk later, she "had not seen in Australia any sign of real slum conditions," it reflects great credit on the tour managers—or else she had in her mind as the usual standard some super-slums prevailing elsewhere.

STATE SOCIALISM: Some idea of the actual results of State control of health institutions can be obtained from the following facts given at the enquiry into the conditions at the Lidcombe (N.S.W.) State Hospital and Old Men's Home, viz.: "The inmates received only one ounce of butter each week, given to them on Sundays (when visitors were around). A former inmate recalled that some years ago there were seven deaths at the institution following an epidemic of diarrhoea and dysentery in ward 11." That is the treatment handed out to these flesh-and-blood pioneers of Australia—and under Labor Government. Incidentally, this institution was not included in Mrs. Roosevelt's tour.

O.B.H.

PERTINENT PARAGRAPHS

According to the German News Agency, a meeting has taken place in Algiers between Litvinoff (Finkelstein), the Russian Ambassador to U.S.A., and General Giraud. At the Alliance Universelle pour l'action Maconique, we suppose.

Princess Elizabeth has made a special study of Land Tenure.

According to an overseas news agency, General Montgomery put the Jew correspondent of the "New York Times" in gaol for ten days for trying to send a dispatch to his paper which alleged that British Generals in North Africa used the American and French troops to do their dirty work.

We've always liked General Montgomery, but we think he made a mistake. It ought to have been ten months.

John L. Lewis, a typical Labour gangster, is obviously acting as an agent provocateur to enable the U.S. Bureaucracy to demonstrate its supremacy over the right to contract out. The coalminers have been manoeuvred into an absolutely indefensible position in relation to both "public opinion" and the conscripted forces, and they will be broken, and then paid what they ask. That is to say, they will be allowed to pay themselves.

It is part of the technique of the New Despotism to "take powers" to prevent you from doing anything for yourself, while at the same time giving no undertaking to do it for you. For instance, the Scottish Hydro-Electric Development Bill.

Trespass is a theft of responsibility.

According to the "B.B.C." General Giraud, speaking from Algiers, said that our modern civilisation is derived from the French and American Revolutions.

We accept his apology.

"Made in Wall and Pine Streets" is stenciled on the Argentine "revolt." Nothing could be worse for British interests.

According to information from Canada, the "Saturday Evening Post," the American magazine claiming to have the largest circulation in the world, which came under Jewish control some time ago, has violated a hard-and-fast agreement between the Canadian and U.S. Governments regarding secrecy in respect of the Great Goose Bay airport in Labrador. In addition to the breach of censorship, the article is a glaring attempt to depict the base as a U.S. project, whereas it was started a year before the U.S. entered the war, and was mainly built by Messrs. McNamara Limited, a Toronto firm. Representations to Washington have been made by the Canadian government on the subject.

—The Social Creditor, June 12.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

Torrensville Shop: As promised last week the address of the shop in this district, under the direction of Mr. R. K. Menzies, is 208E, Henley Beach-road. This shop is the focal point for the Voters' Policy Association in the Jervois Ward, but any of our friends in the neighbourhood are advised that they can secure literature or advice from the shop.

Friday Luncheons: In order to encourage members to invite their friends to these gatherings we have decided to devote the time between 1.20 and 1.50 to the discussion of some aspects of Social Credit philosophy, commencing from October 8.

Next Cultural Meeting: This was fixed for Wednesday, October 13, but, owing to the urgency of the situation we have decided to devote this evening to a discussion in connection with the proposed referendum for increased power for the Federal Government.

New Member at 89 Years: Mr. W. Upton, of Norwood, has recently become a member of our organisation. He never misses an opportunity of spreading our philosophy, and does his part in keeping his parliamentary representatives on their toes. We are proud publicly to acknowledge him as a member.

"Social Crediters": We still have a few back numbers on hand, and offer them for sale at 3d each.

Books: Have you read the following books? "The Tragedy of Human Effort," by C. H. Douglas. Price 6d. "The Money Power Versus Democracy," by Eric D. Butler. Price 9d. "Red Glows the Dawn," by Michael Lamb. (A revealing history of the Australian Communist Party). Price 6d. (All plus 1d postage). We have stocks on hand. Perhaps you would care to send copies to friends in the country or the services.

—F. Bawden, Hon. Secretary.

PROGRAMME FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Crediter," England. (Continued from last issue.)

About four years before the outbreak of the second world war, seven broadcasts on "The Causes of War" were delivered from London, one of which it was my fate to give. The seven broadcasts were summed up by Sir Austen Chamberlain. Each of the broadcasters had a different cause, but all, together with Sir Austen, some by implication and others in so many words, agreed unanimously on one thing. Major Douglas was wholly wrong. War was a very complex thing, and the more causes you gave, the more likely you were to be right.

I notice that none of the complex causes have received any attention since the broadcasts, but that energetic action was taken on the first day of war to institute measures which would make war as attractive as possible to large numbers of people who would have preferred peace, but not the kind of peace they were getting. The measures bear, I think, a recognisable relationship to the matter of the derided broadcast.

I suppose that about two thousand millions of individuals are affected by the present war. I should place the number of individuals who would be quite unable to say with approximate accuracy what it is about at roughly nineteen hundred millions, so that we are left with this simple alternative: Either the total population of the world likes war, without knowing what it is about; in which case it is obviously absurd to do anything to abolish it; or, on the other hand, we can find the causes of war if we examine the actions of a minority hidden amongst less than a hundred million individuals.

It appears to me (but, of course, I may be wrong) to be elementary and incontestable that it wouldn't really matter much what this minority did or thought, if they were not in control of mechanisms which enabled them to force the other nineteen hundred millions to take part in a war they didn't understand and didn't want. If I am not wrong in this, it appears equally incontestable that you can prevent war among the nineteen hundred millions if you destroy the power of the small minority over them.

For my own part, there is no spectacle I should applaud more heartily than the outbreak of war amongst the minority, and I should do everything to see that it lasted as long as possible and broke out again with the shortest possible intervals.

Now, it is equally incontestable that every effort possible is being made to increase, and, in fact, render impregnable the power of this minority over the majority.

Unless there is some flaw in the argument, which has escaped me, war is even more certain, and more certain to be universal and devastating, as a result of this increased concentration of control, than it was in 1939. Fascism and Bolshevism only enter into it as the two parties enter into a Parliamentary contest. As Lionel Gerber says in his book, "Peace by Power": "Power never vanishes. If you do not wish to retain or wield it, somebody else will. You may feel the effects of power as a passive recipient; you may deal with it as an active agent. There is no escape, no immunity—none so far above the battle that by it he, too, is untouched."

And, to interpolate one word into Lord

EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY

(Continued from page 2.)

recruited from educational practitioners of distinction, especially those from the highest levels of education, and from the educated professions and other persons of distinction. The best local thought and experience in education should similarly be organised into the local control of education, and not least the universities. If no reform on these lines is undertaken, the bureaucratic trend will strengthen, and the Directors of Education will have won. But that victory might itself lead to a reform on novel lines. If a highly placed official is to be virtually supreme in the control of education, he ought to hold his power direct from the electors, and not by the appointment of a body not well fitted to instruct or guide him. America offers good examples of chief executives by election. In a broad view the election of Directors of Education by the popular vote would break no democratic principle.

I have pursued the two topics of equalitarianism and bureaucratism at considerable length. The danger that threatens, on the one hand from an exaggerated and morbid view of the place of equality in the democratic ideal, and on the other by over-reaching claims and encroachment by one of the elements in the technique of governing, can be summed up easily. It is freedom that is endangered, the freedom of parents and schools, and the freedom to experiment. The crisis extends far beyond the sphere of education, for it may be said to have reached that sphere from general politics. The challenge to lovers of freedom is no momentary or local diversion. This gathering is specifically concerned with the challenge in education. But you and your organisation are not alone in this danger. Many organisations and many individuals are only too well aware of it. They nurse their fears, and their courage, in isolation. They would be stronger, both for defence and for offence by joining forces. A lead is needed. A lead, even a powerful lead, of course, would only be a beginning. I look round this room, and wonder whether the beginning might not be made here. You have behind you a large and diverse body of schools, a comprehensive constituency. I ask myself whether you might not hopefully and advantageously give a lead for all defenders and lovers of freedom in education to unite. I leave you, if you like this question, to ask it of yourselves.

Acton's famous observation, "All (delegated) power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." To which the Chat-ham House gang would no doubt reply, "So what?"

Really, this matter is quite simple if we can condescend to even a moderate extant from our "education." It is not necessary to rely upon such statements as that of M. Francois Coty, that "the world is governed by less than four hundred men, every one of whom knows all the others." Such a statement has its value, because it suggests a source from which to obtain the names of the specific four hundred. But the general fact is observable by anyone. Take the "fetish of efficiency," to give it a technical name, and put it alongside "the problem of full employment," to give that another. Take the "peace comes from Law backed by overwhelming force" racket, and put it alongside our declaration of war to preserve the sovereignty of Poland. Take the statement of the Secretary of the Royal Institute of International Affairs ("Chat-ham House"), Dr. Arnold Toynbee, at Copenhagen in 1931, that "we are working discreetly but with all our might to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations," and consider that this egregious

THE PLOT TO SOCIALISE AUSTRALIA

By ERIC D. BUTLER. (Continued from last issue.)

It is generally believed that Federal politicians are superior in ability to State politicians. I have made it my business to closely read every debate in every State House in Australia on the famous Commonwealth Powers Bill. I have no hesitation in saying that many State Members revealed knowledge of affairs in this country far superior to that of most Federal Members. During the debates many State Members showed a clear knowledge of the principles of social organisation, and they refused to be cowed by Evatt's high-pressure tactics.

I think it important that the general public be better acquainted with what their State Members said during this campaign to cripple the States and socialise Australia. I am sure that we must agree, as we continue with our investigations, that Evatt's tactics were designed to trick the unwary. No honest politician should ever need to resort to trickery.

Let us now proceed to study the story. There were three distinct phases in the fight to defeat the electors:

(1) Dr. Evatt prepared the way with propaganda on a liberal scale—for which I presume the taxpayers paid—and put forward his first Bill at Canberra in October 1942. It was met with a storm of criticism by State Members of all parties. (I will examine Evatt's main propaganda booklet later.)

(2) A Convention was arranged at Canberra in November 1942, and State representatives were invited to attend. No sooner had the Convention met than Evatt caused a sensation by dropping his first Bill and producing another one. A Labor Member in the Western Australian Parliament openly admitted what Evatt's opponents were alleging about trickery:

"Mr. W. D. Johnson: 'the criticism of Dr. Evatt and of the Convention was quite all right, and that first Bill was political technique. Such technique is practised in Great Britain during wartime. It is practised in America and it is practised by the military.'"

"Mr. Warner: 'You mean that it was a good try out?'"

"Mr. W. D. Johnson: 'It was military strategy. It was a good try out.' (West Australian "Hansard," No. 20, p. 2260.)

Further on in his speech, Mr. Johnson said: "The Bill is not unification but it can be called socialisation."

But even the new Bill was too much for many of the State Members at the Convention. When it appeared that an impasse had been reached, the Labor Premier of Tasmania, Mr. Cosgrove, very conveniently put forward the proposition that the States transfer powers to the Commonwealth for a limited period. The argument was used that we couldn't afford a referendum during wartime—although we did have a Federal Election! The truth is, of course, that Evatt knew that his proposals would be defeated if a referendum were conducted. The suggestion of granting power for only a "limited time" was, in my opinion, designed to get around the will of the electors. Mr. Jefferies, a supporter of the revised Bill, speaking in the South Australian Assembly on February 16, 1943, admitted, perhaps inadvertently, that the transfer of power could be extended indefinitely:

"Mr. Jefferies: 'Many of these matters could be transferred for a limited period, and if, at the end of or during that period the Commonwealth Parliament then thought that it was in the best interests of the people of Australia that those powers should reside in the Commonwealth Parliament permanently, then it could take steps to have a referendum and allow the people

collection of pink intriguers was carefully evacuated to Oxford at the beginning of the war, and its staff is being paid by the British public, which is spending fourteen million pounds a day, and has already had a million casualties to preserve that sovereignty which Dr. Toynbee boasted of attempts to destroy.

Consider the statements of such publicists as Mr. Douglas Reed, that their dispatches warning the British public that Germany was feverishly re-arming were consistently suppressed. Consider the amazing fact that, not only did the Maginot Line terminate "in the air," but the hastily fortified line from its termination to the sea was held by the worst quality troops, with the worst officers, in the French Army. Consider the newspaper control, which is almost openly admitted, and the ownership of the main newsagencies without which no newspaper can function.

Consider that "class differences," as distinct from cultural differences, are almost solely a question of money, yet official Socialism and Communism, which the international press of every country advertise and favour in every way, never attack bankers or the money ring, or question the credit system. Consider Viscount Snowden, Socialist Chancellor of the Exchequer, the darling of the "City," a soured exponent of an inferiority complex if ever there was one, and his ecstatic remark that "The Bank of England is the greatest moral force in the world." (God help us!) These are evidences of the forces, which have been dominant in the past. Is anyone simple enough to suppose that they are all ranged on the side of Fascism, or Bolshevism? Or that the elimination of one of these modern names for the Liberal and the Conservative would destroy the controllers of the other? Consider the German, Herr Menne: "The large-scale industrialists had two powerful allies on their side, two surprisingly dissimilar allies—the Kaiser and the German Socialists."

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

... to decide whether it would be in the best interests of Australia that those powers should be permanently transferred." "Mr. Macgillivray: 'Has not your experience in this Parliament been that we often pass Bills for a limited period and then have to extend them?'"

"Mr. Jefferies: 'Yes, in the interests of the people. If, during the period of five years, this Parliament thought that it was in the interests of the people that these powers should reside in the Commonwealth Parliament for a further period, it could pass another Bill.'"

Mr. Jefferies must have a peculiar idea of democracy if he favours giving the electors' rights away by a mere extension of Bills. I have not the slightest doubt that that is what would have happened if the States had unanimously agreed to transfer power.

(3) The third phase of the fight was the effort to get the State Parliaments to unanimously agree to the transfer of power. It became evident that Evatt and Co. had failed when the Legislative Council in Tasmania rejected the Bill to transfer power, and the South Australian Assembly, feeling the wrath of the aroused electors, so altered the Bill that it was far removed from the original. I believe that the people of Australia should thank the people of South Australia for their magnificent fight. The speech by the Independent Member for Chaffey in South Australia, Mr. Macgillivray, delivered on February 2 and February 3 of this year, was, in my opinion, the most outstanding contribution made by any Member of the State Houses. His facts could not be denied.

(To be continued.)

GREAT KREMLIN MYSTERY

Behold two cables of the one-day; one from London and one from New York, and both A.A.P.:

"London, May 26: At a great banquet at which Marshal Stalin entertained the United States Director of War Information (Mr. Elmer Davies) and 46 other British and American representatives, the menu included caviar, dried sturgeon, herring, roast beef, cold ham, galantine, salads, then wild fowl, chicken soup, Siberian salmon, snipe, turkey, strawberries, coffee, cheese, fruit, sweets, nuts, liqueurs, red and white Georgian wines and vodka with hot pepper and champagne."

And "New York, May 25: The chairman of the Russian delegation to the International Food Conference at Hot Springs (Virginia) stated that Russia was not getting enough food from America through the Lease-Lend Agreement. He declared: 'The devastation and impoverishment of Russia as a result of the war will reach vast dimensions. Russia needs food now and will need it the entire period of restoration of Soviet agriculture.'"

HOW TO GET REAL DEMOCRACY IN AUSTRALIA

(Continued from page 1.)

It is an indisputable fact that the work of any Government is trimmed and shaped by the resistance of small sections of the community. Many people look upon these various campaigns of resistance as mere negative action, but it is the traditional means by which the people exercise control over the actions of their Government. The right of veto is regarded as the most powerful weapon of the Crown. And so it is with the sovereign people. So long as they have the freedom of action to veto any legislation, they possess a power, which is a deadly threat to all power-lusters. Negative action is, I believe, the only action we will be able to take for the next few years. But don't forget that the contour of the hard parts of a country decide the course of the greatest rivers.

I have never subscribed to the view that the work of social crediters can only be gauged by their numbers. Small groups comprised of individuals who are united in knowing what to do and how to do it, can do far more effective work than great numbers of people who have no clear idea of what they are about. As soon as the social credit movements in this country stopped talking and got down to action, thousands of people dropped out. The remainder has done far more effective work since that time, work that can only be properly assessed in years to come.

Have we enough social crediters in Australia to defeat the "enemy"? Yes. But more action is required. I believe that TWENTY actionists in every Federal Electorate could, by consistent and right action, change the entire political scene in Australia within the next three years. I suggest that a mere twenty social crediters, working in close association with each other, could do the following things:

(1) Each write a personal letter to State and Federal Members regularly—say, once a month—bringing important issues before their notice. An attitude of trying to help them should be adopted if possible.

(2) Have copies of Members' replies published in all papers in the electorate. Also see that personal copies are sent to "key" citizens, such as councillors.

(3) Help all those electors who have a grievance to contact the State and Federal Members. Electors must be encouraged to realise that Members are their servants, and should be used.

(4) Keep important issues before the public by letters to country and suburban press. Some papers will gladly reprint articles.

(5) Watch for any opportunity to start an electoral campaign on local objectives.

(6) Read "Hansard" and keep fellow electors advised on what the local Member is saying and how he is voting.

Surely the above is not very difficult. What about social crediters getting in touch with one another and starting to work? Many, of course, have been at work for years. But they want support. Find out the issues your fellow electors are interested in. The Constitution issue is, I believe, going to become of vital importance before long. Get to work on it right away. Supply information to those who seek knowledge about banking, but remember that Dr. Evatt's Constitution proposals are the biggest menace confronting this country today. If they aren't beaten the future will be even harder than it is going to be in any case.

BOOKS TO READ

(Obtainable from The United Electors of Australia, Room 9, Floor 5, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.)

"The Tragedy of Human Effort." By C. H. Douglas. Indicates how to make democracy work. Specially recommended for distribution at the present time. Price, 7d posted.

"Federal Union Exposed." Exposes the international bankers' plot to dominate the world through World Government. A complete analysis—and a most important reference book. Price, 1/1d. posted.

"Alberta's Road to Freedom" is the answer to false statements about Alberta's attempt to overthrow the bankers' tyranny. Describes the Treasury Branches schema. Price, 9d posted.

"Red Glows The Dawn." A well-documented record of the disruptive anti-British activities of Communists in Australia. Price, 7d posted.

"Banks and Facts." A remarkable presentation of the banking swindle. The banker states his own case—and is answered paragraph by paragraph. Price 7d posted.

"The Story of the Commonwealth Bank." By D. J. Amos, F.A.I.S. Price, 1/4d posted.

"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.

The contradictory aims of the "One Parliament for Australia" Movement are (a) the abolition of State Parliaments—for the sake of economy; and (b) decentralisation.

CANADIAN M.P. ON RECONSTRUCTION

Hereunder we continue the speech delivered by Mr. Norman Jaques during the Debate on the Budget in the Canadian House of Commons: —

Mr. Jaques: The other day in the committee on reconstruction and rehabilitation the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) asked this question of Doctor James:

"There is one question I should like to ask Doctor James. Doctor James, you referred to a number of programmes that had been put forward for post-war reconstruction by various organisations. You did not, however, refer to—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has no right to quote from a report of a committee now sitting.

Mr. Jaques: Doctor James was asked either in or out of committee, what he thought of the report of the London Chamber of Commerce. And, mark you Doctor James is Chairman of our Committee on Reconstruction. His reply, in so many words, was, "Well, I really do not know; I have not bothered to read it, or, if I have read it, I have not bothered to remember it."

I hold in my hand a copy of the report of the London Chamber of Commerce. In its preface it states:

"The London Chamber of Commerce has a direct membership of 9000 firms and companies. Thirty-nine industrial and commercial associations, with an approximate membership of 50,000, are affiliated to it and are represented on its council. The chamber is therefore vitally concerned in the nature of the framework within which industry and commerce will be called upon to function after the war."

This report was printed word for word in the Congressional Record at Washington on July 17 of last year. Upon introducing the report to Congress, congressman Voorhis used these words:

"I wish to draw your attention to paragraph 26."

I shall read that paragraph presently.

"The distribution internally of the purchasing power necessary to consume the whole of their own production. Upon that principle the most solid hope of the future of mankind can be built, and it is applicable not only to England but to the United States and every other nation."

Let me now quote the paragraph to which reference is made:

"26. The fundamental problems then, which a satisfactory system must be designed to solve, are:

"(1) The elimination of the fear and hostility resulting from the struggle of all nations to obtain an 'active favourable balance of payments,' the penalty of the vanquished being economic servitude to the victor. This struggle has resulted in attempts by all the nations to restrict imports by barriers to trade, and to increase exports by subsidies and other artificial means, and by the use of political and economic pressure.

FIRST WOMAN M.H.R.

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —It should be of particular interest to your many readers in Tasmania to know that Dame Enid Lyons (Australia's first woman M.H.R.) says that she "intends to give wholehearted attention to the problems of her constituency" (Melbourne Herald, Sept 22). According to the report of her statements, she "would like to see the basis of the basic wage altered," and she "would like to see the child endowment extended," because "people with large families were being handicapped." Dame Enid should know! As a mother, I would suggest that unless one received a generous annuity (at least equivalent to the sum allotted to, say, a former Prime Minister's widow), the prospect of having a reasonable-sized family would spell penury. Under the prevailing system of interest, debt and taxation, I cannot see how it can be otherwise—"women to Canberra" or not. That is why we pay 12/6 for a pair of shoes for a baby of eighteen months—if we can get hold of the 12/6.

However, in spite of her assertions on the urgency of reforms, Dame Enid "believes that new members should go quietly, but IF SHE SHOULD FEEL IT NECESSARY TO SPEAK AT ALL she may break her present resolution." (Possibly with the permission of her "Party"?)

The great Melbourne evening newspaper continues: "At her room at Parliament House Dame Enid was snowed with congratulatory telegrams." (The telegrams came either from the people in Tasmania whom she has gone to Canberra to represent, or—seeing that she may be a mute member for some time—from those who seek to represent HER.) But after the snow comes flood, and I sincerely trust that the flood will take the form of an avalanche of letters (they're cheaper than telegrams) from her own constituents. I suggest that if this IS a Democracy, the people of Darwin (electorate) will use a little initiative and insist that their Federal Representative gets on with those "URGENT" jobs IMMEDIATELY. Far from saying nothing, Dame Enid's turn has come to emulate the spirit of she who wrote: "When I think, I MUST speak—for I am a woman!" —Yours, etc., MRS. NORMAN ROLLS, Clarinda, Vic.

P.S.—This letter is prompted by memories of much physical and financial expense in working for Mrs. Weber's election as my representative in the Victorian State electorate of Nunawading. I trust that Darwin women will not also be let down!

"(2) The distribution internally of the purchasing power necessary to enable the nations to consume the whole of their own production; if, this were done they could equally consume the goods of other nations which they might exchange for their own production. This problem is closely connected with (1) because an excess of exports over imports furnishes an excuse for increasing effective demand within a country (through the distribution of wages) without increasing the number of goods awaiting consumption in the domestic market.

"(3) The unwillingness, consequent upon their industrialisation, of primary producing countries to receive, after the war, imports of certain manufactured goods which previously they had imported freely.

"(4) Nations with different internal economic systems must be enabled to live in the same world without those differences constituting a threat to the continued existence of one another's internal systems.

"(5) The movement of people from over-populated to under-populated countries. The objection of the latter to receive im-

WAHABI KING ON PALESTINE

The London "Time's" correspondent in Cairo has seen fit to report at some length an important pronouncement by the Wahabi King of Saudi Arabia on the question of Palestine. The statement was made originally last March, when it took the form of an interview granted to the special correspondent of an American magazine. The "Time's" correspondent comments:

"For his own reasons, on June 11, the Wahabi King republished the declaration textually in his own newspaper, 'Om El Kura,' which appears at irregular intervals. As the statement contains the first categorical pronouncement the King has made on the Jewish question, and in view, first, of the immense authority attaching to this great Moslem leader's opinions, and, secondly, of the fact that there are already signs that the problem will be among the foremost post-war preoccupations in the Middle East, it is of the highest interest to the Moslem world, in which it is now obtaining prominence."

In the course of the statement the Wahabi King said: —

"First, I do not know that the Jews have any justification for their claims in Palestine on the grounds that for centuries before the Mohammedan mission Palestine was Jewish land. The Romans had conquered the Jews, killing and scattering them so that no trace of their rule remained. The Arabs conquered Palestine over 1300 years ago, freeing it from the Romans, and since that time it has remained Moslem. The Jews therefore have no right to the country, because all countries of the world have been conquered by people who have made undisputed homes in such lands. If we were to follow the Jewish theory, many of the settled peoples of the world would have to leave their countries.

"Secondly, I am not afraid either of the Jews or of their having a State or authority in Arab countries or anywhere else, because of what the good God told us by the tongue of his prophet in His holy Book; but I see that the Jews' insistence on Palestine cannot be justified (a) because it is unjust to the Arabs and Moslems, and (b) because it only creates friction between the Moslems and their friends, the Allies. If the Jews need a place in which to live, there are countries in Europe, America, and elsewhere that are larger, more fertile, and more convenient to their interests. This is justice, and there is no

COMPULSORY PASTEURISATION

The Bill to impose pasteurised milk on Victorian consumers will soon be before the State Parliament again. In order to provide an opportunity for those who desire "undocored" fresh milk to protest against this undemocratic move, a letterform, attached to an informative leaflet showing the dangers of pasteurisation, is now available. Every Victorian supporter should send for at least 100 of these combined letterforms and leaflets. Price, 1/- per 100 posted. It is urgent that they be circulated and signed immediately, and sent direct to State Members. Don't "Leave it to George." Send NOW for supplies to the Secretary, Consumers' Protection League, Room 9, Floor 5, McEwan House, Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

The demand to Pantellaria to surrender was signed by General Carl Spaatz. Doubtless the garrison thought he was bringing reinforcements.

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 lid. (4/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price 9d. Postage

migrants is due to the unemployment of their own people, and will disappear when that problem is solved, assuming, of course, that the would-be immigrants are of the right type."

I could read more, but I shall not take up the time of the House in doing so. The London School of Economics was founded by international socialism, and was financed by international finance. There is no possibility of contradicting that statement. Why is it that their ideas and planning are accepted when the ideas and wishes of 50,000 business firms and manufacturers in Great Britain are entirely ignored? What can be the reason? There can be only one. It is that the new order is to be an international dictatorship by finance. That dictatorship will not be concerned with the welfare of the people; its concern will be money, usury and debt, whereas the London Chamber of Commerce is concerned with real wealth, real profits and real thrift. Many members of this House, especially in the Conservative and Liberal ranks, have with in the last two or three weeks criticised the ideas of my hon. friends to my right. Many of them seem only too glad to swallow any idea provided there is a sufficient amount of gold on it, as long as it is gold plated. That is what the gold standard means.

(To be concluded.)

BISHOP ON NATIONAL DEBT

The Anglican Bishop of Bradford has written a remarkable book, entitled, "If Christ Came to London." He points out that the British National Debt was increased by the last war by £7000 millions; that it is now being increased by at least £2000 millions a year, and that it looks as if Britain's interest bill on war debt after this war will be about £600 millions a year. He proceeds:

"It is clear that we shall either have to give up all chance of radical reconstruction—of better homes, more food, more leisure and more fun—or boldly decline to pay the interest.

"That is called repudiation, and it would be denounced by all the hitherto comfortable and prosperous as immoral, but, from the Christian point of view, it would be infinitely more immoral to leave the slums standing and the children's stomachs half-filled."

Surely these grave reflections by a Bishop ought to warn the Australian public that it is full time to consider to what perdition orthodox finance will inevitably lead both Australia and Britain.

—"The Voice," Hobart, September 4.

INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY DANGER

(Continued from page 1.)

Just so, the Planners' disappointment, at that time, appears to have been amply compensated by subsequent events, a few of which are the passing of panic legislation undermining the basic principles of British liberty (e.g., Section 18b), the closing of small businesses, the appropriation of larger ones by bureaucratically controlled departments, and the issue of thousands of "S.R. and O.s" until we are tied hand and foot. It is realised, of course, that some centralisation is necessary in wartime—hence the satanic policy is helped by war. Who really engineered the war?

These remarks are not a digression, but are necessary to give a background to my subsequent discourse. If the reader thinks I have over-stated the case or that I am an alarmist, he had better stop reading further—but he must not blame me, if, through incredulity, he fails to face up to the situation and do something about it.

4. THESE SCHEMES DO NOT NECESSARILY PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL TRADE.

We know that international trade can revive—not because it is or can be an end in itself—but because it is a means of enabling the people of the world to lead a fuller and more satisfying life; yet I fail to see anything in these schemes which will automatically maintain healthy international trade and will enable the fruits thereof to be enjoyed by the inhabitants of these islands. I will admit that they may prove a means of starting such trade, but the very apparatus envisaged appears to amount to a Bank of Central Banks. Banks, particularly central banks, are powers for good as well as evil, and whether the power they exercise be beneficent or not depends ultimately, not on the apparatus in the hands of the controllers, but the policy pursued. Of course, an unsound apparatus would preclude the use of a suitable technique to implement any policy, but I for "one have too much regard for the technical skill of bankers and their advisers to fear any breakdown on that score.

5. WHAT IS THE POLICY WE WANT?

Surely the policy we want is the policy our men are suffering death and torture to obtain—freedom to live without regimentation, without being compelled to do anything unless the well being of the people of the country depends on it. People want to be able to live their own lives in their own way. The word freedom in this connection means an active enjoyment of life. It means, "Love thy neighbour as thyself," and with this as a frame of reference it is easy to understand that interference with the lives of individuals by regimentation and employment-for-all as an end in itself is a gross misrepresentation of the ends to be sought in a civilised world. As C. G. Dobbs puts it in a verse of his beautiful poem, "Against the New Order":

"We who in the ashes dwell
Want no planned and ordered Hell,
Fight no wars to be policed
When the bombs and fires have ceased;
Life's too precious far to give
For any freedom but to live."

It has been suggested, of course, that "freedom" is incompatible with security (by which I mean sufficient food, clothing, housing, and all the amenities possible in a modern world). I believe, except within the meaning I have indicated above, such statements to be utterly untrue and pernicious propaganda calculated to make the people submit to further centralisation of power. They are put about to create the impression of "either or," if one may coin a phrase: "Either submit to this regimentation or there will be chaos again and the supply of necessities in a world of potential plenty will be impossible." It will, of course, be your fault if that is so, not that of the Planners. Remember the Planners wanted to plan and welcomed war. (To be continued.)

NEW BOOKLET

"Power Politics and Peoples' Pressure"

A timely exposure of the conspiracy for international control of your country.

This booklet is fully documented, with some disquieting information.

To work effectively, social crediters must keep abreast of the facts. "Power Politics and Peoples' Pressure" is a valuable contribution to this end.

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW, Price, 1/1, post free, from The United Electors of Australia, 5th Floor, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

MEN TO BE CRUCIFIED ON SAME OLD CROSS OF GOLD

It was announced from Washington on Wednesday morning that Lord Keynes, "the British monetary expert" (and now a Director of the Bank of England), has arrived there "to discuss his plans for post-war international currency stabilisation and the alternative United States plan with the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, and Assistant Secretary, Mr. H. D. White."

This is a highly suspicious event, and the results will require to be very closely watched.

The same old gold standard is today being wrapped up in a new package for re-sale to the public in the Morgenthau and Keynes currency plans for the post-war world.

In Britain in 1925 Mr. Churchill, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, restored the gold standard, following on five years of preparatory deflation by the Bank of England, accompanied by unemployment by the million, bankruptcies, suicides, low prices and trade depression.

Mr. Churchill at this date was busy writing his many-volumed book on the last war, and he seems to have taken the Treasury advice on trust. Speaking in the House of Commons on April 21, 1932, he thus described the result:

"When I was moved by many arguments and forces in 1925 to return to the gold standard, I was assured by the highest experts that we were anchoring ourselves to reality and stability and I accepted that advice. But what happened?"

"We have no reality and no stability. The price of gold has risen by more than 70 per cent. Look at the enormously increased volume of commodities, which have to be created to pay off the same mortgage debt or loan. This monetary convulsion has now reached a pitch when I am persuaded that producers of wealth will not tolerate indefinitely so hideous an oppression."

It is to be hoped that the move to restore the gold standard after the present war will find Mr. Churchill more alert to the wiles of orthodoxy than in 1925.

—"The Voice," Hobart, Sept. 18.