

ALBERTA S.C. BOARDS
REPORT. (Page 2)

DR. MACALLAY DIS-
AVOWS "NEW GOSPEL."
(Page 2)

MR. FOOTE ON "THE
SIN OF WAGES." (Page 3)

THE FLOT TO SOCIALISE
AUSTRALIA. (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE

PRICE—FOURPENCE

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 9 No. 43 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29, 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).

Great Post-War Possibilities—And Dangers

Lessons of the Present and the Past

During the recent Budget Debate in Federal Parliament, some striking facts and figures were revealed by the Treasurer, Mr. Chifley. Some of the implications of these and other matters, in relation to post-war "reconstruction," were stressed by Mr. James Guthrie, B.Sc., in a broadcast from 7HO on October 17. This is what Mr. Guthrie said:—

During the Budget Debate at Canberra last month, on September 29, certain interesting figures were revealed by the Treasurer, Mr. Chifley. According to "Hansard," No. 16, pages 155-156, Mr. Chifley said:

"The use of man-power and woman-power is the best evidence of the magnitude of our war effort. Since the outbreak of war the total working population has risen from 2,750,000 to 3,370,000 persons, an increase of 620,000. This has been achieved by bringing into work 250,000 persons previously unemployed and 220,000 persons who do not normally seek work. The natural growth of the working population accounts for the remaining 150,000.

"Of the present working population 1,370,000, or over 40 per cent., are engaged in the fighting forces or in defence construction and the manufacture of munitions. In addition, a substantial number of workers is producing food, clothing and other essential supplies and services for both our own and Allied forces. Including these, more than 50 per cent. of the entire working population is engaged in the war effort.

"Nearly the whole of the remainder of our workers is engaged in essential work—feeding and clothing the civil population and producing the essential minimum of other goods and services. . . .

"This great diversion of the working population from civil requirements to war needs has about reached its limit. For some time past, the increased numbers available have been small, even with the most determined combing-out of unessential industry. Supplies required for our own forces and Allied forces, for our commitments for food for Britain, and of essential civil needs are together getting greater than our capacity to produce them, and shortages of essential supplies have been developing in various directions."

Mr. Chifley also said that 30 per cent. of men formerly working on farms have joined the forces or entered other work.

We see from this statement that more than 50 per cent. of the working population is engaged on the war effort. This does not take into account those that are feeding,

clothing and providing the various necessary services required by munition workers and those not actually in the fighting forces. All such people have to be fed, clothed and transported to their work, and their children educated, etc.

Since there are practically no houses being built, and very little furniture made; since there are practically no cars for sale, and petrol and clothes are rationed, we can say that practically the entire working population is engaged in war work, or in keeping those who are in war work fed, clothed and entertained, etc.

The first fact of importance to notice is that although 40 per cent. of the working population, or one-and-a-third million people, are in the fighting forces or in munitions, the Australian people are still being fed, clothed and entertained, and at the same time are supplying the American forces with food and other materials.

These one-and-a-third million men and women consist of most of the young and virile section of the nation; they are directed by the best organising brains of the community, and all their work is directed towards destruction of the enemy and his equipment.

These facts bear out the remarks made by members of our organisation again and again, namely: that our community can produce more food, clothes, houses, etc., than we can use, and that the ridiculous position we find ourselves in in peace-time (when most of us have to scrape and plan and cheat to provide for the necessities of existence) is not reasonable, nor is it dictated by the physical or economic necessities of this country.

When people speak about plans for post-war reconstruction they make me smile, because the poverty, restriction and frustration which was our lot in peace-time was all part of a great plan.

There is no difficulty in making motor cars to-day; the difficulty is in designing motor cars that won't last too long! In the same way, there is no difficulty in supplying people with food and clothes, and the needs of a decent life. That problem was solved many years ago. The problem of the Planners is to prevent people get-

ting access, without their permission, to the abundance the world can produce.

The great key centres of wealth have been gradually cornered, and the Big Idea behind the World Planners is to control this wealth and to ration it out in dribs and drabs, so that none of us shall get very much, and so that we shall always be pre-occupied as to how to get sufficient.

It has been ordained by the great ones of the earth that it is very good for you and me to expend a great deal of time and emotion over the details of mere animal existence.

Only in war-time is the energy, resourcefulness and imagination of our race permitted to drive the machinery of production, and then only provided that the goods are not used by the civilian population.

Many of the men of my generation, who brought victory to our arms in the last war, never had a man's job again until this war.

The British people were chiefly responsible for beating the Germans in the last war, but they lost the peace; they were sold into bondage to the international money gang. And we will be sold again if we allow secret agreements to be rushed through before we have time to consider them.

Mr. Chifley, when introducing the Budget, gave the figures for war expenditure last year. In that year £562 million was spent on the war effort; that is, about half the national income. Less than a third of this money was obtained by taxation. £188 million was created by the Commonwealth

Bank in the form of Treasury Bills; this was £30 million more than was obtained by taxation.

I remember reading a statement written by a leading economist before the last war providing that the Germans could not find enough money to keep their army in the field for six months. Germany kept her army in the field for four years, and could have left it in the field much longer if her people would have stuck it and she could have found the materials.

The strange thing about professional economists is that they never seem to guess right even by accident. By the law of averages it would seem that some of their guesses should be right. That they are so often wrong seems to show that there is some powerful inducement which encourages them to keep on being wrong.

Field Marshall Lord Wavell is reported to have said: "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." Very likely Lord Wavell could have said a great deal more if he had wished, and no doubt he, like a lot more of us, will say a great deal more after this war is over.

But the significant fact for us to notice is that of all the great changes promised us by the World Planners there is to be no change in the control of finance. We find that the men who controlled finance

(Continued on page 4)

NOTES on the NEWS

Commencing with subtle inferences hidden in reported speeches, then small-print solo items, the idea of the World "Police Force" has now been projected into bold big print by the sponsors behind the Press—and we are told now that the plan was discussed at the Quebec Conference. However, the bankers' plot to have control of the only armed force in the world is apparently becoming more widely suspect, because it is now suggested that "the plan would only operate between the period described, as 'between the end of hostilities and the written peace.'" This form of gradual application is simply "the thin end of the wedge," and should be resisted to the utmost.

TRAIN TANGLES The Melbourne "Age" of October 22 tells a refreshing story of a revival of the British spirit of the people insisting on their rights. It appears that although there was insufficient accommodation for the people (who "own" the trains), a special carriage was provided for Justice Halse Rogers and some members of the press. Well, the people just tumbled in, turned a deaf ear to the threats and pleas of the railway officials, and insisted on their right to use their "own" trains. (The upshot was that another carriage was hooked on for the "chosen few"—and police, military provosts and railway officials combined forces to see that, this time, the few triumphed over the many.) Anyway, it's an illustration of an awakening spirit.

LYONS LOGIC Dame Enid Lyons, M.H.R., because she has had a Government pension of £1000 p.a. (half for her children and half for herself, seemingly can be compelled to resign when required. However, the overwhelming Labor majority in Federal Parliament makes her vote worthless, so the Labor bosses are satisfied to leave her there for the present and to overlook the law of the land. Incidentally, this kindly Dame believes in a wider child endowment—but would probably balk at the idea of £500 p.a. for the children of her constituents. She also believes in contributory payments for "ordinary" mortals like her employers—but, of course, not for DAMES.

FOOD FRONT The wonderful results of our socialistic "planned economy" can be seen in the following summary taken from the Melbourne "Sun" of October 18: "Housewives had difficulty in obtaining their meat and potato supplies. Cauliflowers, beans, peas were dearer and in short supply. Queues formed at the Victoria and Prahran markets. Tomatoes were almost non-existent, fruits were scarce, and oranges were rationed." One could understand this state of affairs in occupied European countries, but in a country like Australia there is no justification for such a situation. The war, instead of being a reason for it, is a most vital reason why it should not be. Adequate food is the first essential of war.

CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE Vague generalities, sometimes called "Christian principles," were by-passed in favour of "objective results" required by followers of Christ at the Newcastle (N.S.W.) conference of the Christian Social Order Movement, reported in the Melbourne "Age" of October 22. Mr. Walker, the Methodist minister for Cessnock, criticised the Beveridge Plan because it added nothing to the wealth of the world, but simply re-distributed the available income without lifting

living standards. He further suggested that "it was a dead-end street which would eventually reach the sign, 'No Thoroughfare.'" Some twaddle about unemployment and birth-rate decline, of course, accompanied this analysis; but, generally speaking, the contributions to the discussion showed reasonable signs of realism.

GARNISHEE GRABS Another stage on the road to Hitlerism has been reached by a regulation empowering the courts to issue garnishee orders on behalf of the "Crown" against workers who absent themselves from work. As taking the workers' money (mostly for interest payments) is the orthodox financial policy, the option of imprisonment will most likely require a special pleading. From this and other measures it should be apparent to workers that it was not accidental that Evatt, the legal luminary, was planted in the Labor ranks. Incidentally, this garnishee stunt may be designed to cover the situation of taxation being illegally deducted from pay-envelopes. However, Parliament has not yet sanctioned the garnishee trick; it will be interesting to note if our Parliament contains one man prepared to uphold the British tradition and the workers' rights.

ACCUSATION ANSWERED Replying in the Victorian Legislative Assembly to an accusation by Mr. A. A. Hughes (the recently-elected Member for Caulfield), to the effect that Mr. J. M. Mullens (Footscray) had offered an insult to a brave ally (Russia), the latter said that although he had the profoundest admiration for the Russian soldiers, his first loyalty was to our own soldiers fighting and dying in New Guinea. He then caused a stir by accusing Mr. Hughes of being "a secret Communist." Mr. Mullens, who seems to understand Communist strategy backwards, is causing some consternation among the local Red Fascists.

TAX TABLES The following comparison of taxation burdens partly indicates the ex- (Continued on page 2)

Local Loyalty

"We begin with a loyalty to little things, a loyalty we should never relinquish. . . . There is nothing inconsistent between a local patriotism and a patriotism of humanity. Indeed, I think the second is impossible without the first. There is no value in a thin international sentiment which professes an affection for humanity at large and shows no affection for the humanity immediately around us. The wider loyalty can only exist if the smaller loyalty is strong and deep."—John Buchan.

An Example of V.P.A. Activity

"The primary civil right of a democracy is its right to decide what results shall be provided by the social organisations which exist to serve its individual members."—
"The Case for Alberta."

Members of Voters' Policy Associations who understand that democratic action now is the alternative to future submission in a Servile State backed by an international bombing squadron, will be pleased to read and inwardly digest the following correspondence taken from a local Council report in NSW:—

SUTHERLAND VOTERS' POLICY ASSOCIATION, (15/9/43): Re questions put by St. George Technical College Advisory Committee, and discussed at last Council meeting:—

With due deference to admittedly bona-fide intentions of Council, and with respect for the more than one sound view expressed, in their opinion one salient fact was overlooked, i.e., that Council is elected to represent. Councillors are not elected as experts; when experts are required Council employs them. No sane person expects councillors to decide technical questions connected with health, sanitation, electricity, architecture, etc. Why, then, should Council be obliged to answer such questions as those referred to? Even did Council consider itself collectively competent to deal with the questions, the matter is still outside their sphere, because it is a matter connected with policy, and determination of policy is purely a public function. It is definitely no part of a representative's duty to decide policy or to advocate any course of action or agree to any course of action

except such action as has the constituents' consent. A councillor should have no mind of his own in council. His own personal opinions, no matter how sound, should be set aside and have no bearing whatsoever on his work as a representative.

There is another aspect which needs attention—the purpose behind the questions. There is at the present time a plot to abolish State Parliaments and centralise control in the hands of a remote but all-powerful group, as seen from the Uniform Tax Legislation and the Greater Powers Bill. Education has been a State function up to the present. As they see it, the questions were designed to secure a form of sanction for transference of that function to the central Government. That the attempt is being made under the guise of post-war reconstruction is no argument in its favour. Postwar works could be undertaken quite readily by: (1) State Governments; (2) Councils; (3) Private enterprise. All that would be needed by way of assistance from the Federal Government would be finance.

They were surprised and disappointed to learn that in the interim between ordinary Council meetings a special meeting was held to discuss Post-War Reconstruction. To their knowledge no mention of this meeting was reported in the press and no notices given. From this and the fact that Council meetings are but sparsely attended, they come to the conclusion that although the meeting may have been theoretically public it was in effect a meeting in committee. They are not willing to ascribe anything but the best of motives, but find it difficult to understand why Council should conduct its meetings on these lines.

"Guided" Socialism

The Theosophist, Mr. Jinarajadasa, is said to be advocating the representation of technicians in Parliament, trade by trade and profession by profession, at the same time "drawing attention to Major Douglas's Economic System." In other words, Guided Socialism, or the accrediting of (perhaps) sounder technical opinions rather than the accrediting of a common (Social) Policy.

ALBERTA S.C. BOARD'S REPORT

Hereunder we conclude the Annual Report of the Alberta Social Credit Board, presented to the Alberta Parliament at its 943 session:—

PREPARE NOW FOR FUTURE.

It is agreed now by thinking men the world over, that the time to prepare for our post-war economy is NOW. It is clear to all, too, that the people of Canada want to see no more war, after the present conflict is over. Therefore, our post-war economy must be devised in such a way as to ensure our people of two things of major importance:

1. The causes of war must be eliminated.
2. The people must be assured a full measure of economic security with a maximum of individual freedom.

In order that this can be effectively accomplished, the people must exert their democratic rights as they have never done before. Democracy so far has been rendered ineffective by the controllers of international finance who have used every means at their disposal to divide the people over questions that do not matter, while they have deliberately blinded the eyes of the public on major issues.

As evidence of this fact, we submit the following quotations from reliable sources:

"Democracy has no more persistent or insidious foe than the money power. That enemy is formidable because he works secretly, by persuasion or deceit, rather than by force, and so takes men unawares. He is a danger to good government everywhere." (The late Lord Bryce in "Modern Democracies.")

"The money power preys upon the nation in times of peace and conspires against it in times of adversity. It is more despotic than monarchy, more insolent than autocracy, more selfish than bureaucracy. It denounces as public enemies all who question its methods, or throw light upon its crimes. It can only be overthrown by the awakened conscience of the nation." ("The Power of the Common People"—W. Jennings Bryan.)

"Some of the biggest men in the United States, in the field of commerce and manufacture, know there is a power so organised, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it." (President Wilson in "This New Freedom.")

"We have been dreading all along the time when the combined power of high finance would be greater than the power of the government." (President Wilson.)

Surely it is evident to all, then, that the very first step which a government must take to establish a democratic post-war economy is to take back the sole right to create currency and credit. This can be done without any serious dislocation of our present economy.

ESTABLISH RESPONSIBLE BODY.

The government will establish a National Finance Commission composed of technical experts in the fields of economics and finance. This Commission will be made responsible to the sovereign people through Parliament and the Minister of Finance. It will be the responsibility of this Commission to:

1. Regulate the supply of money and credit in such a way as to reflect "the true

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

Friday Luncheons: Friends and supporters are reminded that on each Friday, between 12 noon and 2 p.m. an attractive lunch may be obtained at our rooms. Make this your opportunity of keeping regularly in touch with the movement. The time between 1.20 p.m. and 1.50 p.m. at the luncheons is devoted to a discussion or a presentation of aspects of the Social Credit philosophy.

Four Freedoms: We have a good stock of reprints of a speech by Wm. Stones, entitled "The Four Fundamental Freedoms." These can be recommended as an excellent method of introducing our philosophy to "outsiders" and may be obtained for 4d. per dozen.

N.W.R.M. Broadcasts: We recommend that the broadcasts by this movement, from station 5AD on Sundays, at 12.45 p.m., be listened in to by as many people as possible. Do your bit. Get your friends to listen.

Referendum: The Executive has decided to write to as many commercial organisations as possible encouraging them to oppose the granting of additional powers to the Federal Government. Copies of "Power Politics and People's Pressure" will be sent to as many State M.P.'s as finances will permit.

Books to Read: "Power Politics and People's Pressure," by L. S. Bull, 1/-; "Why Big Finance Backs Socialism," by Jas. Guthrie, 6d. (Both plus 1/4d. postage.)

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

LEISURE

"Every hour of human life freed from enforced toil by the machine is a potential treasure for the race. To seize upon these new opportunities and convert them into the joys of the mind, body and spirit they might be—what else can we learn that is half so vital to ourselves, to society."

—Dorothy Cranfield Fisher.

picture of the country's production. (This would involve the abandonment of the present arbitrary restriction of money supply based upon a false gold standard.)

2. See to it that money is no longer treated as a commodity.

3. Equate purchasing power with the prices of available consumable goods by:

- (a) Reducing prices to consumers with out involving a loss to retailers, or
- (b) Increasing the purchasing power of consumers, or both.

4. Make financially possible whatever is physically possible and desirable.

5. Abolish usury.

6. Reduce rationing and regimentation to an absolute minimum.

7. Devise ways and means of financing government expenditures without the creation of huge public debts and the consequent interest burdens they engender.

8. Devise methods of reducing and ultimately eliminating taxation.

Amongst many of the vital problems to be dealt with in our post-war economy will be the following:

1. The problem of rehabilitation of the returned members of our fighting forces.
2. The plight of our agriculturists.
3. The question of unemployment, work and wages.
4. The transfer from wartime to peace time industries.
5. The liquidation of public and private debts.
6. The health question.
7. The menace of monopolies.

While many more could be enumerated these will serve to show the immensity of the problems facing the people and their governments. Who would dare suggest that these problems can be satisfactorily solved by the use of a money system which proved so inadequate in pre-war depression days?

MONEY THE CRUX

All of the schemes being suggested to date as a basis for post-war reconstruction are based upon the assumption that money will be available in required quantities. This is like saying, we will do all of these things if we have the money. The crux of the whole matter is money.

We are told by orthodox economists and bankers that we will be deeply in debt when the war is over. In reality, we will be richer than we have ever been before. All individuals, as a result of present conditions of work and wages, will have a larger amount of economic security than they have had for many years. Our industries

DR. MACAULAY AND HIS NEW GOSPEL

To the Editor: Sir,—Before the "New Times" was first published I was a subscriber, and so continued until your office ceased to send it to me. I still buy it as regularly as I can. A recent comment or two, followed by "Stirrem's" article, under the above heading in the October 5 issue, have made me wonder whether all its articles have been as misleading as his. Your correspondent presumably has some newspaper report on which he has built up his remarks. It is true that I have not had time or opportunity to read every press report of my speeches, but those which I have seen contained no foundation for his criticisms.

For example, "Stirrem" quotes the word "directions" in inverted commas, as if he were quoting me. In fact, he says, "Dr. Macaulay calls them 'directions'." I have not used that word in these speeches, and if I had it would have made nonsense in view of my other statements that it was not our business to lay down hard-and-fast rules, but to suggest some principles.

"Stirrem" remarks that, "had the recommendations of the Princeton conference been similar to those of the Malvern Conference," then publicity would have been denied them and me. At my first meeting, and several times since, I have stressed the fact that the Princeton conference began where Malvern and the others left off. It assumed these other conferences and asked what remained to do to create public opinion to give effect to its findings and to go "at least one step further" in the matter of practical application.

The whole of "Stirrem's" article is based on a radical misreading of my reports, or perhaps on abbreviated reports. But I can find no warrant for some of his statements. They are clever twisting of my words so that they sound as if they represent my speech, but are in fact a caricature of it. Let me repeat that neither I nor the Round Table gave any "directions." The Round Table limited itself in two ways. It did not go back on Malvern, or Delaware, or the other conferences whose findings it assumed. It did not propose to give a complete account of how the statesmen must make peace. It professed only to suggest a "Christian contribution." But it did believe that the day of national anarchy is over. For good or ill we have to find some way of international co-operation. One of the problems discussed and stated frankly was how far nations can go, will go, or may safely go in the matter of mutual self-limitation of political and economic independence without risking the tyranny of control by larger powers. "Submission to a world dictatorship" was the very thing we saw as a danger of any new organisation, and many of our suggestions were aimed at that very danger. So most of "Stirrem's" article grossly misrepresents the Round Table. Perhaps the most remarkable statement of all is this (I quote his words): "... the Princeton World Conference"—which, according to Dr. Macaulay,

will be operating at full capacity, and will be in a position as never before to turn out goods in mass quantities to meet the needs of all the people. Our young men and women, as a result of rigid training will be better equipped physically and mentally to take their places in society, and to contribute services to the betterment of our material well-being. The private debts of our people, as a result of better economic conditions during wartime, will be at a lower level than they were in September, 1939.

Why then should we be poor? Had we produced goods and services to prosecute the war without the use of a financial system, every individual in Canada would have contributed goods and services, and would have received in return the goods and services he required to meet his own needs. In effect, this is all that has happened, but the whole process has been facilitated by the use of a financial system. In other words, the bankers have acted as the public bookkeepers, keeping a record of the transactions as they occurred. Does it not, therefore, seem strange that when the war is over, their books will show that we, the public, owe them billions of dollars? They have contributed books, pens and ink together with their services, but no one in Canada has done less. Why, then the immense debt?

The answer is simple. The money they created, they look upon as their own, when in fact it is nothing more than a reflection of the productive capacity of our people. As they have a complete monopoly over the control of money, they issue it as a debt to the people to be repaid at some future date with interest. The result is that so long as this system is retained just so long will our people remain in economic bondage.

Abraham Lincoln once said "The creation of money is not only the government's supreme prerogative, it is its greatest creative opportunity."

The people of Canada must be aroused to this fact. They must unite and demand of their representatives that they work to this end, of placing once more in the hands of the government the complete control over the issuance of money and credit. Unless this is undertaken as the very first step in a programme of post-war reconstruction "democracy" will become an idle word and "economic security with freedom" a dream.

The members of the Social Credit Board recommend the foregoing to the earnest consideration of the members of the Legislative Assembly.

Signed: A. J. Hooke (chairman), N. B. James (secretary), A. V. Bourcier, R. E. Ansley, and F. M. Baker (members of the Board).

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

tent of the bankers' stranglehold in the respective countries included. These amounts (in sterling, to nearest £) are central Government taxes only, and exclude State and municipal taxes and private taxation levied by the financial gangsters: Great Britain, £52 per head; U.S.A., £41; Germany, £41; Canada, £40; Australia, £28; Italy, £10; South Africa, £7. The figures are taken from an official statement in the British House of Commons on June 22, 1943 by the late Sir Kingsley Wood, Chancellor of the Exchequer. Sir Kingsley had been asked to include the figures of Russian taxation, but he said they were "not available." Perhaps they were omitted out of respect for our socialistic ally.

POWERS PLOT: The Melbourne "Age" of October 20 says that Mr. Curtin is likely [inside information?] to tell the coming Federal Labor Conference that "the day of isolationism [local management] has passed for Australia, whose most urgent interest will be to have a voice in international councils." It is also suggested by the "Age" that "the Government will probably be guided in its approach to the Powers Referendum" by the Conference. "It is more likely that the Conference will be used to further the plot to centralise political power in the Federal Government—so that it in turn may surrender control to the international plotters."

—OBH

THE COMPULSORY MILK PASTEURISATION BILL

(To the Editor)

Sir,—Mr. Corrigan, M.L.A. (Port Melbourne), is reported (in Victorian "Hansard," No. 13, 12th Oct., 1943) to have taken strong exception to the efforts of those electors who have presumed to let their elected representatives know what they think about this Bill to bureaucratise the milk industry, and has stated that Parliament should not allow their literature to be circulated. In this and elsewhere during the Parliamentary debates, he exhibits the typical member's worship of the omnipotent "Party."

He objects to doubts about the object of the Bill and states that, "we know that the Minister of Agriculture brought in the Bill with the perfectly honest motive of safeguarding the health of the people."

Electors need not, however, concern themselves about the "intentions" of the sponsors of the Bill (the road to a well-known place is paved with good intentions). Electors should rightly consider the probable results of the measure.

In "Hansard," No. 12, page 776, we read: Mr. Mutton: "What will be the position of persons desiring to buy raw milk?"

Mr. Martin: "There will be no raw milk." So, mere electors are not to decide what they want! They are to take what the party bosses decide is good for them.

I have spoken to many milkmen about this Bill and have not met one who is in favour of it, and, in fact, have heard of none, except those with pasteurisation plants, who can see any good in the measure. My relatives are milkmen in Bendigo, and they inform me that all milkmen they know in that city are opposed to the Bill, except the Bendigo Certified Milk Co., which has a pasteurisation plant.

I have discussed the matter with many electors and find that a great number are indifferent, some not even being aware that such a Bill has been introduced in Parliament.

The position was similar with regard to the "Grapple and Despair Fraud"—pardon me—the Apple and Pear Board; but electors were forced to take notice of the results arising from it.

Electors may be sorry afterwards that they did not take sufficient interest in the Bill before it became law. Experience of production of food under the control of Boards scarcely leads us to expect as good service as from private enterprise under reasonable government supervision. We may not only be unable to obtain raw fresh milk, but, as in the case of fruit, we may not be able to obtain sufficient milk of any kind, and we certainly shall have to pay more for what we can obtain.

—Yours faithfully, T. S. McEncroe, Hon. Sec., Consumers' Protection League.

A PRESIDENT OF U.S.A. ON FEDERAL POWERS

"No method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty could be divorced from self-government. No plan of centralisation has ever been adopted which did not result in bureaucracy, tyranny, inflexibility, reaction and decline.

"Of all forms of government those administered by bureaux are least satisfactory to an enlightened and progressive people. Being irresponsible they become autocratic, and being autocratic they resist all development. Unless bureaucracy is constantly resisted, it breaks down representative government, and overwhelms democracy. It is the one element in our institutions that sets up the pretence of having authority over everybody and being responsible to nobody.

... We must also recognise that the national government is not and cannot be adjusted to the needs of local government. It is too far away to be responsible to local needs; it is too inaccessible to be responsive to local conditions.

"The States should not be induced by coercion or by favour to surrender the management of their own affairs. The Federal Government ought to resist the tendency to be loaded up with duties which the States should perform. It does not follow that because something should be done the national government should do it."

—President Calvin Coolidge, in 1926 replying to a deputation which urged the granting of greater powers to the Federal Government of the U.S.A.

MR. FOOTLE ON "THE SIN OF WAGES"

Has anyone noticed what a popular turn the Commonwealth Bank is becoming on the air? At one time, I seem to recollect, even to mention the existence of the Commonwealth Bank was a breach of taste not to be too strongly deprecated both by the "House" and all those solid citizens who owned a stake in Australia. It was a more serious offence, even, than talking about women in the officers' mess. It was felt that we should entertain only private thoughts about the Bank. Which many of us did—to such tone and colour that our thoughts had, perforce, to remain private.

Not so to-day. The Governor of the Bank in person—I will not say rushes to the mike—but I will say that, in broadcasting, is showing little of the reluctance of his predecessors. His recent talk more or less coincided with the publication of the Bank's annual report; as a matter of fact, it was a couple of weeks subsequent to the latter. Which I find suggestive. The report—or so it seems to my untutored understanding in these matters—is written for readers of such reports, whoever they may be. At any rate bank reports are not for ordinary folk. To get at the meat of them you have to be thoroughly versed in understanding why a credit is a debit; why industrial activity always brings scarcity and why the surest road to starvation is to produce, a lot of food.

The thing we have most to fear in this life is not the machinations of the Axis powers; it is a power of a different kind. In short, it is purchasing power. Purchasing power is something to be got rid of at all costs. The obviousness of this occurs with such frequency in the annual report that a man would have to be both dull and mischievous to miss the point.

The report states in connection with the increased purchasing power in the hands of the community as a result of Government war expenditure: "This increased purchasing power should, of course, be drained away as far as possible by the heaviest practicable taxation and the maximum encouragement of individual savings."

Of course. How stupid of me. I see it all now. Alas for my wasted years and bad upbringing. Why did my father allow me to keep my first earnings and thus set me on the downward path? Why did he not, knowing that it would be years before I could keep myself, confiscate the lot and redeem part of the National Debt with it?

And, by the way, what is the "heaviest practicable taxation"? It appears to leave an amount still to be cajoled from the wage-earner. Oh, well. Don't bother. I don't suppose anybody knows—not even the writer of the report.

There are other safeguards should any money remain in anyone's pocket. Rationing is mentioned; so is control of prices and costs. But these are not sufficient. We have in the past been so long without money that we must be deprived of it as soon as we get it if we are to survive. The Bank's great concern is to prevent any harm coming to us from the inexperienced use of money. And as this situation may conceivably crop up again, it proposes to put the bulk of our surplus out of harm's way for keeps by taking it from us by "the heaviest practicable taxation," and let us fool around later with the bit that's left over.

The directors feel bound to explain what has caused the increases in purchasing power. They say these "have been due partly to the growing number of men and women in employment and in the Services, but partly to increases in average wage earnings." Well, that's clear enough. I don't think anything has been left out—except, probably, the value of the wages. On the whole, I don't feel inclined to criticise the proposition that two people should receive more wages than one, though bankers appear to regard the practice as a dangerous tendency.

The directors then refer to weaknesses in the "Economic Organisation Regulations." I am unfamiliar with these, but they appear to have been responsible for an increase in the amount of overtime in industry. These weaknesses "should be corrected and resolute steps taken to avoid any unnecessary overtime."

There are, I believe, some people who regard all overtime as an evil from the point of view of the welfare of the race. But at all events most of us would agree that unnecessary overtime should be avoided. It should be the duty of every employee to inquire on being requested to do overtime, "Are you perfectly sure, sir, that this is necessary?" His patriotic spirit

MORRISON'S MIRAGE

Mr. Herbert Morrison, speaking to the Fish and Fabian Society, said that Socialism really means "full employment." "There are other industries which need the guiding and stimulating hand of the State."

—Clarence, Let's go down to the Post Office and be guided and stimulated!

One of the curious effects of power on even capable men like Mr. Morrison is that they come to regard the intelligence of the people who allow themselves to be governed by them with contempt. Mr. Morrison evidently supposes that the picture in his mind of a world in which everyone had to belong to a Trades Union, and politics would consist of a series of "deals" between the Trades Union bosses and the Managing Director of Imperial Chemical Industries, can be put over to an enthusiastic, or apathetic (who cares) electorate. He's wrong. But he's perhaps "taking the oath" for Chancellor of the Exchequer. —"The Social Creditor," England, June 19.

could not fail to pass unnoticed

There is also another way; one which would probably make overtime acceptable to the bankers and that is for the employee to insist on doing it for nothing. It must be remembered that the primary interest of the Bank is to "drain away" purchasing power.

I feel the more sure of the acceptability of free labour to the bankers because they have no suggestion to offer concerning the gap which would undoubtedly occur in production if overtime were to cease. The directors state, "The economy is now in a condition of full employment." They, therefore, show their awareness—if only in a subconscious way—that in the world of things and actions we, as a people, are extended. Perhaps they are over preoccupied with the shadow show; the shadows being in faulty projection and out of relation both to the things they represent and to one another.

One can't escape the impression, however, that the Bank Board is worried. Speaking for myself, I find it depressing to be surrounded by worried people, and I am sure many members of the Government must feel the same.

I don't expect anyone to take the slightest notice of me, but it does appear that it would be an act of charity to lift the burden of responsibility from the shoulders of such a Board as that.

—"Footle."

THOSE FEDERAL POWERS

Action to Ensure Fair Play

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—Your readers have already been suitably advised of the urgency of conveying to their Parliamentary representatives their request that Dr. Evatt's proposed Constitutional Amendments should be opposed, and it is hoped that all who realise the peril have duly communicated with their representatives, both Federal and State.

In view of the Federal Government having "threatened" State Members with a referendum unless its demand for the signing away of the rights of the people is acceded to, we must have regard to the possibility of a referendum being taken. In that event, we need have no doubt but that the air and the press will be flooded with a spate of misleading propaganda designed to induce the people to take the bait. I therefore suggest that all electors should communicate with their Federal Member, asking him to take action with a view to ensuring that the network of the national broadcasting stations should be made available to speakers who wish to put to the people the case for rejection of Dr. Evatt's proposals. It should be stressed that to restrict the use of these stations, which are maintained by license fees paid by the people, to spokesmen who are prepared to advance only the official point of view is flagrantly unjust, as well as being indicative of a further retreat from democracy.

I trust that all your readers will themselves take action, also urging their acquaintances to do likewise, as recommended herein.

—Yours, etc., J. BRADSHAW, Sth. Yarra.

AUSTRALIA'S POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir,—We have seen that there is a definite plan in process of execution to continue and intensify the enslavement of the people of the world; that this plan involves the destruction of the sovereignty of the British Empire; and that behind the plan is a philosophy and the "few men" referred to by Sir Victor Sassoon.

The idea is that everyone should be kept forever at the grindstone of physical toil. Work for all, even though comparatively few of us could do all the "work" that is really necessary. "Employment" was also Herr Hitler's great "objective" for the German people, and being put forward as it was in the period known as the "depression" (originated in Wall Street), it "got them in" and led to the establishment of the Fuhrer. Since 1933 we have been experiencing the "benefits" of this wonderful objective in the killing of our people and the destruction of our material resources. This is not surprising, as when everyone is "employed" the volume of production is so great that we have to throw it at one another in order to get rid of it! Parliaments are to be controlled through "budgets" more severely than ever, and the people in general are to be kept in regimented subjection through a system of finance based on gold.

By way of record, and to assist those who may be studying the subject, I quote the following from the "Sydney Morning Herald," dated 11/10/43:—

"The planners' disapproving reference to loans to countries indulging in careless budgetary practices provoked cynical comment from champions of public spending and debt creation as an essential feature of a full employment programme in times of trade recession."

Two comments should be made on this. The first is that "careless budgetary practices" will not be allowed by the planners, regardless of what Parliaments may think; and the second, that trade recessions could not occur if finance were not manipulated to cause them. The technique used by the Bank of England in this latter regard is explained in paragraph 93 of the report of the Australian Monetary and Banking Commission.

As to the so-called "careless budgetary practices," we should remember that after the visit to Australia, in 1930, of Sir Otto Niemeyer and Professor Guggenheim, Professor Copland and other experts were employed to prepare a plan FOR BALANCING THE BUDGET, not for giving food to the hungry, or clothes and shelter to the destitute. Budgets have been one of the means for implementing financial policy, and for keeping parliaments under the control of the financiers. But it would seem that even professors are forced by events to admit they were mistaken in their past actions, for in the "Farmer and Settler," of 2/7/43, this very same Professor Copland, who, in 1931, recommended that everything be made to fit in with a criminally-reduced supply of money, wrote this:—

"What we actually do, the men we employ, and the goods and services we produce, are determined solely by the resources available and our will and ability to use them, and are not at all limited by our ability to pay for them."

That, Mr. Editor, is worth bearing in mind, especially as we have been called lunatics for saying the same thing.

Now, this plan of Employment and Regimentation is being implemented in the British Empire by the Bank of England (which controls the British Treasury), the London School of Economics (which produces the graduates to take charge of, the "planning" in the several countries constituting the Empire), and the Empire Parliaments (which submit to budgetary control and treat their peoples as "govim" or cattle). Readers of the "New Times" are already aware that, in the words of Montagu Norman himself, "the difference between the British Treasury and the Bank

of England is the same as the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee." In addition to this, a director of the Bank of England has recently been appointed to supervise all Treasury expenditure! It has been shown in previous letters that the men who have been "selected" to prepare plans for postwar "security" in England, Canada, and Australia, are boys from the London School of Economics. And as to Parliaments, every one of them is so tied by constitutional provisions that, except in time of war, they must balance the budget, if so required by the financial authorities, who are thus more powerful than sovereign governments!

Because of this serious situation, it is most important that we should try to get a clear understanding, not only of the nature of the Master Plan, but also of the identity of those responsible for it. In the course of inquiries into this it will be necessary to mention the names of men who are not of British origin, and, if past experience is any criterion, this may lead to the criticism that I am making a dirty attack on everyone of similar origin. Such, however, is not the case. Millions of members of the same race are suffering just as acutely as the rest of us from the things we condemn, and it is my hope that they will repudiate unworthy members of their own fraternity, as we ourselves should do in the case of our compatriots who are acting against community interests. Anyhow, what is written herein is either true or untrue, and our personal reactions do not alter FACTS.

First of all then, what is this Master Plan? From a remarkable article written by C. H. Douglas, in 1921, entitled "The World After Washington," I quote the following:—

"The necessity, inherent in the Doctrine of Original Sin, for providing means to keep humanity in the straight and narrow way, involves the existence of both a negative and positive mechanism—a machine for permitting human beings, on terms only, to achieve certain amenities, such as economic prosperity, on the one hand, and to prevent them from doing things, by the imposition of active discomfort, on the other. The agency of the first is Finance, with its concomitant of employment as the condition of bed, board, and clothes; the agency of the second is Law. . . . The real objective is the stabilisation and centralisation of the present World Order of Finance and Law, and the hegemony, or final permanent and indisputable control of that Centralised Order by the powers represented by Wall Street and Washington."

Note particularly that that was written in 1921, after the so-called representatives

AN AMERICAN'S TRIBUTE TO THE R.A.F.

"The leaders of the R.A.F. hoped to stage two or three 1000-plane raids a week on Germany through the fall [European autumn] of 1942. This hope was based on the belief that the American bombers would participate . . . but during the first year of American participation in the war, not a single U.S. Air Force plane dropped a bomb on Germany. . . . Up to now [early 1943] they have made experimental short-range raids [most of them with as many as twenty (British) fighters escorting each bomber] on targets in Occupied Europe, but they have not once pushed their attack into Germany. . . . On October 9, 1942, 110 Fortresses and Liberators claimed to have driven a total of 102 Luftwaffe fighter planes from the skies of Northern France. . . . They were escorted by 460 Spitfires and Hurricanes. . . . The bombers claimed 56 German fighters "destroyed," 26 "probably destroyed" and 20 "badly damaged." The R.A.F., after careful consideration of these claims, refused to issue a joint communiqué on that day with the U.S. Air Force, a fact that was apparently missed in America. . . . Veteran pilots of the R.A.F. who were along in the raid, told me afterwards that the Americans actually claimed to have shot down more enemy fighters than were in the air—a fact that the Germans lost no time in announcing."—Allan Michie, an American aeronautical commentator in the forthcoming book, "Germany Can Be Bombed To Defeat." Condensed in "Readers Digest" (an American periodical), and quoted as above in the "Social Creditor" (England), March 20, 1943.

ENGLISH COUNTRY HOUSES

"If these English houses of ours were all to be turned into institutional buildings, schools, asylums, hotels and the like, something of our national heritage of pride and beauty would be gone. Museums? A museum is a dead thing; a house which is still the home of men and women is a living thing which has not lost its soul. The soul of a house, the atmosphere of a house are as much part of the house as the architecture of that house or as the furnishings within it. Divorced from its life it dies. But if it keeps its life it means that the kitchen still provides for the inhabitants; makes jam, puts fruit into bottles, stores the honey, dries the herbs, and carries on in the same tradition as has always obtained in the country. Useful things, practical things, keeping a number of people going throughout the year. So much for the house itself, but there is the outside life, too; the life in which the landlord is a good landlord, assisting his farmers, keeping his cottages in good repair, adding modern labour-saving improvements, remitting a rent in case of hardship, employing woodmen to cut trees for his own hearth and theirs. The system was, and is, a curious mixture of the feudal and the communal, and survives in England to-day. One wonders for how long?—V. Sackville-West, in "English Country Houses."

John Bracken, National Progressive Conservative Leader (Canada), speaking at Ottawa, said the failure of democracy in the past was in not providing "full employment." Sounds like community singing, doesn't it? Now, let's all be National-Progressive - Conservative - Socialist - Commonwealth-Communists. Anything but Social Crediters!

of the so-called sovereign people had ignominiously surrendered to the International Financiers. If anyone doubt the truth of this, tell him or her what Lloyd George said, after the Peace Negotiations, in his official capacity as Prime Minister of England. Here it is again:—

"The international bankers swept statesmen, politicians, jurists, and journalists all to one side, and issued their orders with the imperiousness of absolute monarchs who knew that there was no appeal from their ruthless decrees."

In view of what is said above about Wall Street and Washington, it becomes a matter of more than passing interest that our "brilliant" Director-General of Post-war Reconstruction has recently returned from "conferences" in the United States, and that he should have lost no time in telling us that, in future, EMPLOYMENT is to be the objective of economic activity. Hence we see why it is that our efforts to get the people freed from their financial chains and relieved of the burden of life-long physical toil is meeting such fierce opposition.

The next question is, Who are at the back of this business? A very interesting letter on this question recently appeared in the Launceston "Examiner," which I think will be worth quoting next week.

—Yours faithfully, Bruce H. Brown, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, 24/10/43
(To be continued.)

"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 226 G.P.O., Melbourne.

THE PLOT TO SOCIALISE AUSTRALIA

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

We now come to the third phase: the debates on the Powers Bill in the State Parliaments and the widespread action by electors in expressing their opposition to the Bill, thus encouraging their State Members to fight it. Thousands of letters poured in to State Members, urging them to do all in their power to fight this subtle threat to their liberties. It is impossible to gauge the service these thousands of electors rendered the cause of democracy in this country. They certainly played an effective part in having the Powers Bill smashed in South Australia.

The widespread campaign against the Bill caused considerable concern among Dr. Evatt and his fellow-socialists. Running true to form, they described all those who opposed the transfer of powers as "reactionary." Their indignation was soon evident.

Mr. Curtin's dictatorial attitude towards the campaign was frank. The following report appeared in the Melbourne "Sun" of January 2, 1943.

"A campaign which has been begun in several States to procure the rejection by State Parliaments of bills to transfer additional constitutional powers to the Federal Parliament was criticised by the Prime Minister last night. The Constitutional Convention, which was composed of public men with much knowledge of public administration, should have much greater influence in guiding public opinion than the purely sectional interests which were seeking to prevent the Federal Parliament from being equipped with adequate powers, said Mr. Curtin."

Note the phrase, "guiding public opinion." Mr. Curtin considers that he and others of his kind, who are not sectional, of course—oh, dear, no!—should tell us what is good for us. All these socialists are would-be dictators.

A few months after this outburst, Mr. Curtin went even further. Speaking at Perth, early in May, 1943, he said:—

"If, in the years to come, the authority and responsibility of the Government for the ordering of the people's minds was not acknowledged, it would be easy for democracy to end in turmoil and disorder."

So, in order to save "democracy," we must allow Mr. Curtin, Dr. Evatt, and all other socialists to order our thinking. And yet some people who are political babies bleat that socialism means democracy!

Socialism means more power for the centralised Government. Both the socialists and their "opponents"—opponents on methods of how to obtain centralised control, not opponents on policy—have been telling us for years that our State Parliaments should be abolished. "Too many politicians," has been the cry. But never, "too many irresponsible bureaucrats." During the debates on the Powers Bill, many State Members stressed this point very well. The fallaciousness of the argument that Australia is "over-governed" and that the State Parliaments are an expensive luxury, was ably dealt with by Mr. Macgillivray in the South Australian Assembly on February 2, 1943. He said:

"... they (the people) have been frequently told by different political bodies that Australia is over-governed, that a little community of 7,000,000 cannot possibly carry the expense of thirteen Houses of Parliament. There is an article in this week's Sydney 'Bulletin' dealing with the matter.

"I have taken out the cost of Parliamentary government to the people of Australia and, if my statement could be placed in the hands of every elector in Australia, they would have a different approach from what they have at present. The ANNUAL cost of Parliamentary Government in New South Wales is 18 per head of the population, Victoria 13 Queensland 21 South Australia 33 Western Australia 411 Tasmania 42. The cost of the Commonwealth Government is 16 and the averaged total for the Commonwealth and State Governments is 37."

"If the State Parliaments are abolished the Commonwealth must set up departments to carry out its administration. Members of Parliament in this State receive £400 per annum, but I will guarantee that if State Parliaments were abolished and the Commonwealth Government administration operated here a stenographer in its employ would get that much. Heads of departments would rake in thousands of pounds and the cost of administration would go up by leaps and bounds."

DOUBLE-HEADED PENNY

The shadow of the coming Presidential Election is rousing the American vote fixers, if not the American voter. Soon we shall be told that the heart of the Great American Public is torn with the problem of whether God's Country needs a white cat with black markings, or a black cat with white patches. In the first case, the G.A.P. will clearly have voted for an American World Government, and in the latter, for a World Government of Americans.—"Social Creditor," July 10.

Canada is beginning to feel the effects of having had a "Washington Post," in the person of Mr. McKenzie King, for a Prime Minister. It was a lovely idea so long as it was generally understood that the British were finished, and Great Britain was to be a Wall Street holiday resort. But it isn't working so well, now. The Minister of Defence, Mr. Power, and the Minister of Finance, Mr. Isley, wouldn't be much missed, either. They might all join Mr. Curtin, of Australia.

—"The Social Creditor," June 12.

Anyone who looks at what is going on in Australia must agree that the above statements are based on facts. But facts are the last thing the tricksters want electors to see. The same men who are loud in their promises of what results will accrue from centralisation at Canberra, were telling us similar things about the benefits of centralised taxation before their Uniform Tax Scheme was introduced.

Sir Walter Duncan had a few forceful words to say about this matter in the South Australian Legislative Council on March 10, 1943.

"I am certain that because of statements made by the Government from time to time, practically nobody believed it. Twelve months ago, when uniform taxation was introduced by the present Commonwealth Government, we were told that it would not result in increased taxation, but was just an amalgamation of the Federal and State departments to save man-power, office accommodation, printing, and trouble to everyone concerned. Putting it plainly, that statement was a lie. More people are now employed in the department, greater accommodation has been used, and I leave it to the public to decide whether

PROGRAMME FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

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

Through the courtesy of a correspondent, I have received an extract from an article by Mr. Harold Laski, which was published in "The New Statesman" of June 5, 1943. So far as my mental digestion will permit, I endeavour to read the views of people with whom I disagree. But my position in regard to the weekly journal in question is that of the deaf old lady whose nephew wished to introduce his friend, Schnozzlewitt, to her. After many efforts, with and without her trumpet, the old lady said sadly, "It's no good, Johnny; I'm getting deafer every day. It just sounds like Schnozzlewitt to me."

I gather that the article is entitled, "1848 and Ourselves," and the extract I have received is as follows:

"... The main issue the Left has to decide is when it will co-ordinate its forces for the victory that is its historic right. It can build forthwith a full understanding with the leaders of the Soviet Union and its people; in that event it gives to the revolution a creative power against which the forces of reaction will hurl themselves in vain. Or it can wait to make its treaty of friendship until the gangsters of Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo are finally overwhelmed. In that event the Left accepts the risk of losing the favourable moment and giving its enemies the chance of consolidating their strength anew. ... If, in the light of an experience so massive" (that is, from the 1848 revolutions, the reasons for the failure of which Laski had explained) "our leaders do not act while there is still time, we can be sure only of two things; there will be a third world war in our own generation, and the Left will find new leaders more apt to its opportunity."

This is the one moment in time when Man the Rebel could become Man the Creator. To let that moment pass unused is a betrayal that will never be forgiven by posterity."

For the reason I have indicated, I am unable to state what further pearls of wisdom Professor Laski has embodied on this occasion, but both the title and the quotation are perhaps worth attention, not so much as news, but as exhibits.

Until recently, most Jews have repudiated any historic continuity in revolution, and any specific relationship between Jews, as such, and the French, German and Russian Revolutions. Professor Laski appears to have discarded this attitude. "The Left" has an "historic right" to "victory." "It" can do thus and such, "concluding arrangements with Foreign Powers," and the result will be this and that. We have the familiar suggestion of an intangible collectivity which will have its way "in war, or under threat of war."

To understand how it is possible for a Professor of Political Economy in an English University to write in the style of a Hyde Park rant, it is, I think, necessary to realise his background and its implications.

Professor Laski is a Manchester Jew; I should imagine of the third generation, although of this I am not sure. Three generations would take us back to the revolutions of 1848 to which he refers, and it is probable that the arrival in this country of his progenitors was not unconnected with the failure he laments.

Now, Manchester has a very important place in English, and indeed world, history. At the beginning of the nineteenth century it was the focus of probably the largest body of rich, and for this reason powerful, Jews not merely in Great Britain, but anywhere outside Holland and Germany. It was also, whether by coincidence or not, the focus both of the industrial revolution, the factory or Gentile Ghetto, and of labour rioting, of which Peterloo is the best remembered incident.

While its slums, as Mr. Austin Hopkinson has pointed out, were perhaps the worst in the country, its better suburbs, such as Cheetham Hill and the nearby fringe of Cheshire, were dominated by mansions, amongst the owners of which it was diffi-

the Government's action has not resulted in increased taxation. It is possible to catch the people once or twice—I have done it myself—but you cannot go on lying month after month and year after year. ...

I'm afraid, Sir Walter, that some people—Hitler is one of them!—believe that it is possible to numb the people's minds by high-pressure propaganda, particularly if a campaign of distortion is continued long enough. We all appreciate, of course, the benefit of "our" Australian Broadcasting Commission! A classical example of "public ownership." But just let anyone who wants to oppose the socialists try to obtain even a tenth of the time on the air that pro-socialists receive!

We all know that every "emergency" tax, such as on stamps, etc., is never taken off. Mr. Mair, Leader of the Opposition in the New South Wales Assembly, and supporter of the Powers Bill, candidly told us about the Uniform Tax plan:

"Mr. Hamilton: The uniform income-tax legislation is merely for the duration of the war and one year after."

"Mr. Mair: 'If the hon. Member had an eye in the back of his head he might be able to see some way in which the Commonwealth would deal with the position, but standing face to face with the question we have to admit that this uniform taxation arrangement is here forever.'" (N.S.W. Legislative Assembly, December 5, 1942)

And still we were told that the Powers Bill would, only be for a limited period! But even worse, some people actually believed that!

(To be continued.)

CASUALTY CONTRAST

The total U.S. casualties (population, 130 million), Army, Navy, and Air Force, all theatres of war to June 3, 1943, were 86,852 of whom 14,119 were killed.

British casualties (population, 45 million) in the North African campaign alone were for the British Isles over a quarter of a million, and for the British Empire over half a million. About seventy thousand British Islanders were killed.

—"The Social Creditor," England, June 19, 1943

ARRANGING ARMAGEDDON?

According to a pamphlet received from The Moray Press, 21 George-street, Edinburgh, the Belgian Nationalist paper, "Renovation," of October 26 and November 2, 9, and 16, 1935, stated that the Grand Supreme Council of International Freemasonry, of New York, issued the following instruction to the National Grand Lodges of all countries:

"Do everything possible to bring about a European War before the next harvest in Germany is gathered in."

—"The Social Creditor," June 19, 1943

Great Post-War Possibilities—and Dangers

(Continued from page 1.)

during the so-called peace and during the depression are still going to control it after the war; and not only that, their control is going to be increased and consolidated, it is going to be backed by armed force, called an International Police Force. And nobody is going to be permitted to have any Army or Navy or Air Force. We shall probably have to change our Constitution in order to fit into this new scheme for world domination—but whether the people of Australia will be stupid enough to permit it is another matter.

Of recent years there has been much discussion of matters financial; and a great deal of ballyhoo has been written. But there is one fact which emerges, and that is the industrialisation of this world—the roads, the factories and bridges, etc., of Australia, of America and Russia. Very little of the cost of these was financed out of the savings of the people. Anyone who says it was is simply not telling the truth. These great new works were financed out of brand-new money—created for the purpose—money created by the banks merely by writing figures in books. The money for most of the modern wars was created in the same way. Any person who tries to dispute these facts is merely being perverse, or else he doesn't know the facts.

It follows, therefore, that the great assets of this and the previous generation erected upon the face of this earth started their career as debts to the Credit Monopoly, and this Credit Monopoly, because of this power, has a monopoly in practically everything else. Before the last war this monopoly operated from London; it now operates from New York.

This monopoly acquired its great power through international trade and international banking exchanges. Through its link-up, and its hold over news agencies and syndicated articles, it could cause a crisis when and where it wanted. The power of the great international monopoly would have been broken by now had it not been able to exploit its gains by using misguided people in various organisations. The London School of Economics, the League of Nations and the Communist Party and the Left Book Club seem to be its main sources of propaganda among the half-educated masses.

What the post-war world will be like few can tell, but unless men who are experienced and trained face up to realities and play a much more important part than they have done hitherto in public affairs, the post-war world will be a good place to get out of.

can Civil War and its relation to Egypt, and on every major feature of nineteenth century policy. England became the head office of every plotter in Europe—and "Manchester" provided a great deal of the funds they required.

The point I am concerned to make at this time is simply this—that probably at no time in history has a body of immigrants come into an established country and obtained so much power and so effectively dispossessed the natives, as did the Jews in England between the time of William of Orange and the emergence of Joseph Chamberlain as a tariff reformer. In that situation, "Manchester" was central. And it is profoundly important to enquire why there appears to be something which leads Professor Laski to fear that the "victory which is its historic right" is being filched from what we will agree with him to call "the Left."

Before passing to this, we may note the fact that Manchester's leading newspaper probably had a larger circulation amongst the "Left" in every country, and particularly in the United States, than any similar periodical, and that the sedulously-propagated idea that "What Manchester thinks to-day, the world will think tomorrow," was taken with surprising seriousness by its admirers.

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