

DR. MACAULAY AND HIS
NEW GOSPEL (Page 2)
ALBERTA GOVERNMENT'S
POLICY (Page 3)
GAOL-WITHOUT-TRIAL IN
GREAT BRITAIN (Page 3)
AUSTRALIAN POST-WAR
PERIL (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 9, No. 45 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 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).

An Open Letter to U.A.P. & U.C.P. Supporters

Where Are They Being Led?

Dear Fellow Australians,—You have no doubt reflected deeply on the results of the Federal election; you must be concerned about the future and your own positions. But most of you have undoubtedly missed the crux of the political and economic situation. The hard fact must be faced that you have been sadly misled by the very people who should be fighting your fight. There is a growing belief that powerful groups are working to socialise this and every other British country while we are fighting the external enemy. Your U.A.P. and U.C.P. leaders have never really fought these groups; in fact, as I will show, in many cases they have actually condoned their activities.

Now, the idea has been cunningly fostered for many years, that business men, manufacturers and primary producers should "economise" into bigger and bigger units, all in the sacred name of "efficiency." Ample evidence has been brought forward by practical business men, manufacturers and primary producers that if organisation is taken beyond a certain point, actual results decline. There is only one major reason why when store monopolies selling shoddy goods were flourishing before the war, while sound business men, attempting to give service and quality, were steadily being pushed out of business: the economic position of the people was such that people were forced to buy cheap, shoddy goods. They couldn't afford to buy quality goods. Did the business men ever stop to consider WHY people couldn't afford to do so? You manufacturers know that there was no practical reason why you couldn't concentrate on manufacturing ample, first-class goods for all the people. Your U.A.P. "representatives" supported the very financial system that was forcing taxation higher and higher—growing interest bills on our increasing indebtedness to financial institutions had to be met—thus reducing the purchasing power of the people. I trust that you have noticed that since the war, we have been able to GIVE hundreds of millions of pounds of materials to our military enemies. This has been done in spite of the fact that we have approximately 800,000 men in the Armed Forces, men who are being paid and fed while they produce nothing. Have your "leaders" ever told you how we are now able to "afford" for war what we couldn't "afford" for peace? They have not.

What the economic system was doing to business men and manufacturers before war, the socialist planners are intensifying under bureaucratic regulations, which have little

to do with the successful waging of war. Fellow Australians, you have been tricked. You don't realise that some of the most powerful financial groups in the world are working for socialism under various names. These groups favour the monopoly idea, finally leading, of course, to one supreme monopoly—The State. Let me give you evidence of what I say. You have, of course, heard of the London School of Economics. Why, isn't Sir William Beveridge, whose famous scheme is only socialism specially dressed up for British consumption, a product of this institution? And, of course, Sir Keith Murdoch, whose papers are always talking about "private enterprise" while advocating policies which are destroying private enterprise. The London School of Economics was founded by the Fabian Socialists, with money supplied by the German-Jew, Cassel. The following extract is from the "Quarterly Review," of January, 1929:

The London School of Economics was founded by Mr. Sidney Webb and his Socialist Fabian Society, with money obtained through Lord Haldane from Sir Ernest Cassel, international financier, which endowment, Lord Haldane told Mr. J. H. Morgan, K.C., had been provided to 'raise and train the bureaucracy of the future socialist State.'

Now let us have a look at another product of this institution, Professor Harold Laski, the noted international socialist. Laski is author of the statement that the Throne is the main obstacle to the introduction of socialism in British countries. Loyal Australians must be interested in this, because Dr. Evatt is a close friend of this man. "I am also under obligation to Professor Laski of the London School of Economics . . . for much encouragement and advice," writes Dr. Evatt in the preface of his book, "The

King and His Dominion Governors."

You will all recall that it was after his first trip abroad that Dr. Evatt attempted to alter the Australian Constitution with a Bill which would have prepared the ground for complete socialisation of everyone. This scheme was defeated, fortunately. But Dr. Evatt and his fellow socialists are going to try again. I hope you noticed that practically all your so-called "conservative" leaders supported the very Bill which would have meant your extinction as independent men. They are making no real fight to save you. It seems the height of irony that Mr. W. M. Hughes, ex-leader of the U.A.P., once wrote several of the most specious booklets advocating socialism! And, of course, he agrees with Dr. Evatt that the Constitution must be altered!

You primary producers will, I hope, remember that Australia was first inundated with Boards by a Government composed of U.A.P. and U.C.P. leaders. There is no fundamental difference in the policies of any of the parties. No honest person can deny that.

Some years ago a group known as the Political and Economic Planning Group was brought into being in England by powerful financial interests connected with the Bank of "England." (This was the institution, you will recall, which sent Niemeyer and Guggenheim to Australia during the depression to tell us that we must starve because we were producing too much!) The chairman of P.E.P. is a Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, head of the biggest chain store monopoly in England. This group put out a tremendous amount of propaganda in America and the British Empire.

I commend the following gem to business men, manufacturers and farmers: "Whether we like it or not—and many will dislike it intensely—the individualistic manufacturer and farmer will be forced by events to submit to far-reaching changes in outlook and methods." That's what Mr. Sieff says. The work advocated by P.E.P. was spon-

sored in America by one of the most powerful bankers in that country, Mr. Paul Warburg, of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., the international banking firm.

Our socialist Professors in this country, men like Professor Copland, who has advised all Governments, socialist and "conservative" alike, are keen advocates of more highly centralised control. These socialists, backed by radio and press propaganda, are determined that socialism must be introduced for all time. There is big money behind the policy of monopoly, and the sooner our business men and farmers refuse to be misled by their party "leaders" and face up to the issue, the more chance they have of saving themselves.

Too much power is being centralised into the hands of centralised bureaucratic boards. The big task is to oppose all suggestions for the further centralisation of power. We must get control back to the people. History warns us about centralisation of power. There are many faults in our present economic structure. Unless the real conservative elements in our community attempt to have those faults remedied; unless they fight and expose the forces behind socialism, they are doomed.

I trust, fellow Australians that this letter has caused you to think deeply. I write as an Australian who loves his country and wants to see it saved from the evil groups now threatening it.

In my next letter I will deal further with this question. I hope that you will be sufficiently interested to obtain and read it, and pass on to your friends.

—Sincerely yours, ERIC D. BUTLER.

[Note.—This is the first of a series of open letters to be issued by the Association To Defend British Culture. Supplies of the above letter may be obtained from 71 Jordan-street, Malvern, Victoria, at 1/6 per dozen, plus postage. Help the fight to preserve Australia's position as a sovereign member of the British Empire. Get a dozen or more copies of this open letter and circulate them among supporters of the U.A.P. or U.C.P.]

NOTES on the NEWS

The first official presentation in Parliament of the international bankers' plot is contained in Evatt's speech ("Hansard," No. 19 for October), viz.: "I shall now refer to certain SPECIFIC arrangements either MADE OR IN THE MAKING. With most of this, my recent mission was in some way concerned." He then mentioned the "world food bank," and said: "The Government proposes to IMPLEMENT the recommendations of the conference." So, that's that! Then, dealing with the "world currency," he said: "Each currency plan is in the process of careful examination by the Australian Government." And so, to the fight—the People versus Evatt and the Money Power! Don't delay one second in writing to your Federal Member about this. Get others to do likewise.

CRIPPS'S CUNNING. Evidently realising that the "world police" idea is becoming suspect, Sir Stafford Cripps is reported in the daily press of October 29 as suggesting that "it should be organised on a regional basis." Needless to say, such regional groups would not determine policy, but would merely administer policy determined by the central bunch of armed bandits. Advocates of "world government" and "world police force" are either cunning, ruthless bankers, their henchmen or their dupes. The plotters will twist or adjust their propaganda to fool the people. The short-cut to defeat them is to keep your Federal Member deluged with objections. Will YOU "back the attack"?

MUNICIPAL MICE. In Victoria the State Treasury, presumably as agents for the Federal "Reconstruction" body, is inviting municipal councils into the "debt trap" by asking them to submit their programmes for post-war work—so that the Planners can say "go" or "whoa" by operating the purse strings. The position is quite in line with the mouse and the cheese. The Geelong Council has fallen for the bait by submitting proposals involving debt of £110,000. However, the Richmond Council appears to have some experienced mice, because they have decided that "before considering any such proposals the Treasury should be asked to arrange all finance for these works by the use of national credit, free of interest." Here's an idea for a municipal objective campaign which YOU—just YOU—can start.

GOLD GRAB. According to the Melbourne "Sun" of November 3 U.S. Congressman F. Smith describes the world-currency proposal as "a British plot to seize control of U.S. gold." He suggested that British and American Treasury officials nurtured the scheme in the darkest secrecy to extricate Britain from her debt position. It doesn't seem to have dawned on him that the finance riggers in both countries are engaged in working out a situation of permanent debt-slavery for both nations, through the Gold Standard. However,

Smith's outburst is useful in so far as it will direct public attention to the plot.

JOURNALISTS AND JEWS: It appears from a Melbourne "Herald" report of October 26 that some New York journalists had accidentally (?) reported that the Australian Commonwealth Government had agreed in principle to a Jewish settlement in the Kimberleys, W.A. Dr. Steinberg, President of the Free Land League for Jews, publicly expressed regret for this false propaganda, but seemingly could not explain just how it occurred. Perhaps it was a doubtful kind of joke, which would have been O.K. if it had "gone over." More pro-Jewish propaganda was contained in the same issue of the "Herald," to the effect that a Jewish colony was to be established in Palestine as a memorial to the late Sir John Monash. The general idea seems to be to establish Jewish settlements in every (Continued on page 2)

Victimisation by "Red Fascists" in Unions

The remarkable story published under this heading in our last issue had a more remarkable sequel, as indicated by the following report appearing inconspicuously in last Friday night's Melbourne "Herald":—

"The Victorian Central Executive of the Australian Labor Party is to be asked by the State president of the A.L.P. to urge the reinstatement of a woman suspended from her employment this week by the Department of Labour and National Services. Recently the Manpower Appeals Board ordered that the woman concerned (Mrs. Baxter) be reinstated in her employment in the canteen at the munitions area with full pay for the period of her suspension. Mr. Lovegrove said to-day that the Department refused to obey this order, and had assigned her to another position. When she refused to accept the alternative position she had again been suspended by the Department this week."

Discrimination in Quebec

"Vers Demain" of June 15, 1943 reports that on April 21, Mr. Norman Jaques, M.P., asked Mr. Louis St. Laurent, Canadian Minister of Justice, five questions about prosecutions on account of breaking the regulation, introduced in Canada only since the war, that all printed matter on political, social or religious subjects must bear the printer's imprint.

The answers were communicated on May 31. They showed that only five cases had been brought under this regulation, all by the Attorney-General's Department in the Province of Quebec, and that they were against M. Louis Even, Mlle. Gilberte Cote, and MM. R.-J. Bedard, Raymond Bourgault and Arthur Giroux—all Social Crediters of the town of Quebec.

The numbers of leaflets involved in each case were, Louis Even, and Mlle. Cote, about eight thousand; R. J. Bedard, between seven and eight thousand; Raymond Bourgault and Arthur Giroux, about 250. "Vers Demain" notes that this refers to the number of copies of the same leaflet.

Mr. Jaques's fourth question was, "Have prosecutions been instituted in all cases of violation of this law?" Reply: "No. In those cases there were serious doubts as to whether the law should be applied. In others a warning was given."

Mr. Jaques's fifth question elicited a list of the cases in which warnings were given; It was thought sufficient to give warnings to: The International Union of Miners of Kirkland Lake, Ontario, in June, 1942.

*The quotations given are a translation of the French text.

Dangerous Fallacy

"The idea that a national government is strengthened by concentrating all powers in one assembly at one centre is a dangerous fallacy, which constantly impedes the growth of the Commonwealth. The reasons why one organ of Government cannot control all the affairs of a great community are many. It suffices to mention one, which, like other facts that are obvious, are constantly overlooked. In an hour are 60 minutes, in a day 24 hours, and in a year 365 days. The amount of business which any human being can transact is inexorably limited by these facts."

—Lionel Curtis: "Civitas Dei," p. 419.

DR. MACAULAY AND HIS NEW GOSPEL

To the Editor: Sir,—In your issue of October 29 last, the Right Rev. Dr. W. Macaulay replies to my comments on the recommendations of the recent International Church Conference at Princeton, U.S.A., and charges me with misrepresentation, twisting and caricaturing his words, etc.

My answer to this is, that not only do I deny his charges, but I intend in this letter to furnish convincing proofs of the accuracy of my statements. In the "Argus" (Sept. 23 last) there appeared a summary of the findings at the Princeton conference, which appeared to have been furnished by Dr. Macaulay himself in the course of an interview. A report of an interview is generally accepted as being more authoritative than a report of a public speech, which usually has to be considerably condensed. This report states: "Rt. Rev. Dr. R. Wilson Macaulay . . . discussed the results of this significant conference on his return to Melbourne yesterday." Then followed a fairly lengthy resume of the Princeton resolutions, and that summary formed the basis for my criticism.

No doubt, Dr. Macaulay has not, as he states, "had time or opportunity to read every press report" of his speeches, but it would be more than passing strange if he has not read that "Argus" report. So far as I am aware, he has never challenged or denied the accuracy of the "Argus" article, perusal of which effectively disproves his charges against me.

Owing to space considerations, my article had to be curtailed, and "cutting down" has its dangers. (To save space—and misunderstanding—I wish it to be understood that the emphasis used in this article is mine.)

As to Dr. Macaulay's charge that I twisted his "words so that they sound as if they represent my speech," reference to my article will prove that whenever I quoted him, or any other speaker or writer, I put the quotation in inverted commas. (There is one seeming exception to this toward the end of my article, which will be alluded to later on.)

Taking Dr. Macaulay's charges seriatim—he states: "Stirrem quotes the word 'directions' as if he were quoting me," then further on, he says, "I have not used that word in these speeches." The "Argus" reports him as saying: "The main object of the conference was to give the world DIRECTIONS for the establishment and maintenance of peace." I submit, Mr. Editor, that the above effectively disproves that particular charge against me.

Dr. Macaulay next claims that there is no contradiction between the Princeton and Malvern (Eng.) findings, as was stated by me. He says: "It assumed these other conferences and asked what remained to do to create public opinion to give effect to its findings." If, as he states, they "began where Malvern and the others left off," it is clear that they very soon executed a complete right-about-face movement. In regard to the monetary system, Malvern did not urge that control of our currency should be handed over to some outside authority, but this is exactly what Princeton suggests should be done.

Again, as previously stated by me, Malvern affirmed that "Nations have the right to independence," but Princeton says that the independence of nations should be limited, and that they should submit "to some international authority." On these particular issues, Princeton is not giving effect to the Malvern findings. It repudiates them.

In a subsequent paragraph of his letter Dr. Macaulay makes a most revealing statement. He writes: ". . . It (Princeton) did believe that the day of national anarchy is over. For good or ill we have to find some way of international co-operation." If international co-operation is for good, that is certainly the path we should pursue, but why co-operate if it is for ill? Princeton evidently doesn't know if it is for good or for ill, but airily recommends the world to take a leap in the dark. Temporary international co-operation may, and will, be necessary in some matters, after the war ends, but, as will be shown later, Dr. Macaulay favours a universal and permanent world order. He further states that they discussed the problem of how far nations "may safely go in the matter of mutual self-limitation of political and economic independence without risking the tyranny of control by larger powers." Surely, even the ranks of Tuscany, in Wall Street, could scarce forbear to cheer this suggestion. World domination through control of finance has long been the aim of the international finance ring, and the Princeton suggestion would certainly make accomplishment of this much easier for them. The proposal is like playing with dynamite, and national self-limitation in the matters referred to would really mean national self-suicide.

In this connection I wish to draw particular attention to the contradiction in which my critic has involved himself.

"New Times" Subscription Rates

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home or elsewhere 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.)

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

In his letter he states that they discussed the problem of how FAR they could "safely go in the matter of MUTUAL SELF-LIMITATION of political and economic independence without risking the tyranny of control by larger powers." In the "Argus" he is reported as being in favour of submission to "some international authority." What, it may be asked, becomes of the mutual self-limitation of nations when they are merged in a universal order under international authority? When this is accomplished their limitations will be fixed, not by themselves, but by the international authority. The advocates of "Federal Union" seem to have a clearer idea of what this involves than Princeton does. Without power to enforce its decrees "authority" is a misnomer. Federal Unionists, therefore, advocate the formation of a world police and air force, to bomb and blast freedom and democracy out of existence if they resist international authority's decree.

Dr. Macaulay states in his letter that Princeton recognised the dangers of a world dictatorship, and that "many of their suggestions were aimed at that very danger." In my article I stated in my summary of the Princeton recommendations that they advocated "submission to a world dictatorship," and Dr. Macaulay states in this connection that "most of Stirrem's article grossly misrepresents the Round Table." Again, let me refer to the "Argus" report, with reference to the price of peace, which it states was put in the form of four questions. Two of these refer to this matter. No. 1 is: "How far are nations prepared to go in the limitation of their independence and submission to some INTERNATIONAL AUTHORITY." No. 2 is: "How far will nations go in limiting or reducing their tariffs and in the CONTROL of their currency," etc. Further on, under the heading "Moral Principles," No. 1 is: "National isolation be repudiated as a policy contrary to WORLD ORDER." No. 2 "Temporary collaboration among the Allied nations should give way to a UNIVERSAL ORDER as quickly as possible." No. 4 deals with "regional organisations," and No. 5 states: "If such regional organisations arise it be made clear from the outset that they are part of an ULTIMATE AND EXCLUSIVE WORLD ORDER."

In view of the above, Mr. Editor, I leave it to your intelligent readers to determine whether or not I "grossly misrepresented the Princeton conference. A statement by Mr. Calvin Coolidge, ex-president of U.S.A., seems particularly apposite to the matter under discussion. He said: "No method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty could be divorced from self-govern-

GIRAUD AND DE GAULLE

"Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres" (All Gaul is divided into three parts) said Caesar. To understand the Giraud-de Gaulle controversy, which may be vital, it should be realised that there are three real divisions in France—(1) The Big Business oligarchy; (2) the peasant-conservative-traditionalists, who include the genuine aristocracy; and (3) the radicals. The Big Business oligarchy includes the "Haute Bourgeoisie" and is as unpleasant a body as it is possible to find anywhere. It controls the "Comite des Forges" and the Banque de France, and would sell its grandmother. The oligarchy is represented by General Giraud, who is of petit bourgeois extraction.

General de Gaulle, who is an aristocrat of birth but not of money, represents the peasant-conservative-traditional element, and, what is superficially but not really remarkable, the radicals. It is not too much to say that his general outlook is that of the Social Creditor.

—The "Social Creditor," England, July 24, 1943

U.E.A. NOTES

(From the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.)

During the past few weeks literature sales have increased tremendously, and, unfortunately, due to supply difficulties, many orders have been held up. The "Big Idea" in particular is very difficult to obtain; therefore supporters waiting on this and other books are asked to understand that we are doing our best under the circumstances. Headquarters desire to congratulate the stalwarts at Yallourn, Geelong, Ballarat and Sunshine on their splendid efforts in stirring up local interest in the milk and housing questions. Getting on committees of Progress Associations, etc., is a splendid idea, which has produced worth-while results; this action will be useful in the big fights ahead. Copies of replies received from Members of Parliament—especially unsatisfactory ones—will be welcome at headquarters for examination. Don't let up on these letters. Rest assured that the cumulative and sustained pressure on Members is being felt. "Back the Attack."

—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

ment. No plan of centralisation has ever been adopted which did not result in bureaucracy, tyranny, inflexibility, reaction and decline.

In my previous article I commented on the remarkable silence of the Princeton conference in regard to democracy's greatest foe—the money power. This may be due to their evident intention to abolish democracy, or perhaps, to the presence there of an economist. No doubt, he was a strictly "orthodox" economist, but it would perhaps be safe to surmise that he was not there to lead their devotions—at least, in the accustomed way. Probably, like a policeman at a sports gathering, he didn't need to say anything, as his mere presence would tend to quell any possible unseemly allusions to the god of finance. Of course, in some of the very best circles there, such things are simply "not done." A statement made by the late President Wilson probably explains this. He said: "Some of the biggest men in the U.S.A., 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."

The next charge brought against me is one which, I admit, seems at first sight to have some substance. In my previous article a statement appears that ". . . the Princeton World Conference—which, according to Dr. Macaulay, was made possible through the generosity of some anonymous citizens of U.S.A.—" When I read it I was as much dismayed as Dr. Macaulay probably was, and realised that some mistake had occurred in connection with my manuscript. I at once got in touch with you, Mr. Editor, to secure an appointment, and later called on you with the view to having a correction inserted. I then learned that Dr. Macaulay had sent a reply, and it was decided that the correction be made in the course of my answer to him.

On re-reading my first article, I can find no justification for Dr. Macaulay's charge that I linked a (most estimable) widow with "the International Finance gangsters." I linked neither widows, spinsters, nor any citizens of U.S.A.—whom I highly esteem—with them. Like ourselves, the American people are the victims of the Financial Gangsters. . . Before this war, there were some twelve millions of unemployed in U.S.A.—victims of High Finance.

Dr. Macaulay has asked that I withdraw my article, and either explain or apologise for my (alleged) misrepresentations. Readers of the above will perhaps agree that I might justly make a similar request. It seems to me, Mr. Editor, that Dr. Macaulay's request should properly have been addressed to the writer of the "Argus" article, as my comments were based on his report—which, by the way, Dr. Macaulay has never contradicted. However, if the "Argus" writer explains how he was misled, and apologises for his (alleged) misrepresentations, I will undertake to follow suit.—Yours etc., "STIRREM."

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

Debate re Proposed Referendum: We wish to call attention again to a meeting to be held in our rooms on Thursday, November 18, to gather debating points against granting Canberra extra power "for post-war reconstruction," with a view to staging a series of debates on this subject. All social crediters are invited to attend this meeting and help in this matter.

Books to Read: "The Answer to Tax Slavery," by C. Barclay-Smith; price 1/-; "The Story of the Commonwealth Bank," by D. J. Amos; price 1/3. "The Money Power Versus Democracy," by Eric D. Butler; price 9d. (All plus 1/4d. postage.) —F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

BREAKDOWN INEVITABLE

"LOCAL GOVERNMENT: In all civilised countries, whatever the previous course of their constitutional history, the persistent and rapid growth of the functions of the central government, with repeated assumptions of new and onerous responsibilities, have rendered some attempts at decentralisation and some form of local government essential. Without such a relief, a national administration could be carried on with success, only with great difficulty, if at all. Experience, ancient and modern alike, has demonstrated that a completely centralised bureaucracy—that is, a body of officials working from one centre and responsible only to itself—cannot indefinitely carry on the administration of a large country; such a body tends to ignore the varieties of local conditions, to become stereotyped in its ideas and methods, and sooner or later breakdown is inevitable."

—Commonwealth Year Book, 1906-7, p. 803

JUST OUT!

Leaflets for mass distribution are now available:—

(1) "Loans, Taxes—and You."
(2) "The Churches and the Money Changers."

The latter gives the appeal recently made in England to the heads of the Churches (recently published in the "New Era"). Send 3/6 to the Social Credit Movement, 88 Pitt Street, Sydney, for a bundle of these.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

country. As an aid to this end, horror stories of persecution of Jews are heavily featured in every unit of the daily press. Persecution of non-Jews is almost ignored.

SENATE SENSE: The bankers' war "aim, Federal Union, has been pushed with great speed in the U.S., Senate. There are, however, signs that the plot has met with some opposition; for example, Senator Vanderberg is reported thus in the daily press of October 26: "Yesterday's enemy is today's ally, and it seems to me that we must wait on the ultimate event before we presume to deal specifically with it here and now." The soldiers contributing the sweat and blood are certainly not doing so to enthrone a "world dictatorship" in the form of an unholy trinity of Gold Standard, World Government, and a World Gestapo Gang.

PLANNERS' PARADISE: Another bird of the "economy" species has recently been added to the collection, constituting the "post-war reconstruction" group. Senator Brand evidently recognised a "commo" strain in the new addition, when, according to "Hansard" No. 19, he asked "if Dr. Lloyd Ross, formerly secretary of the N.S.W. branch of the Australian Railways Union who was recently appointed to the Department of Post-War Reconstruction, is a Communist? And is it true that he is to take over the duties of the Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction, "Dr. Coombs?" Senator Keane, who replied, ignored the last question, and denied that Lloyd Ross was a Communist. If this is so the Ross specimen may be in for a rough time from the other birds housed in the "reconstruction" menagerie.

LAND LOGIC: In the daily press of October 22, Mr. A. Meaklim was given considerable space (free) to advocate land settlement and ownership on a co-operative group basis. He evidently is too young, or has overlooked the tragic returned-soldier land-settlement after the last war. This chap also said that "farmers often believed that banks or other combinations owned the land." He could have been more positive about this, because farmers know who holds their "deeds." Moreover, the Farmers' Debt Adjustment Act disclosed who owned the debts, because most of the cash settlements went to the banks. If the farmer-soldiers fall for the land settlement confidence trick again they cannot have learnt much during the so-called peace years.

TRADERS' TRIALS: The road to Hitlerism via the economists' "planned economy" has been considerably shortened by an order gazetted and dated December 20, 1943 which delegates certain powers to State rationing (socialising) officials to "register traders, and from time to time to reject, cancel or vary such registrations." This simply means that any bureaucrat appointed (not necessarily by the Government), and presumably one superior to the State Government, will be empowered to permit or prevent any individual from trading. Unless this sort of thing is stopped, the nearer we get to military victory the nearer we will be to slavery. Heil the New Order!

PROPERTY PROBLEMS: The cutest form of official blackmail is seen in the latest socialistic edict "that permission will not be given to invest in property unless the Treasury is satisfied that the prospective buyer has, in the opinion of the Treasury, invested reasonable amounts in the war loans." Doubtless those capable of such a dictatorial act will, if a purchase is permitted, then point the gun at the seller, while he has the cash. The march to Hitlerism has become a gallop.

INFLATION INDEX: In the midst of some bankers' boloney contained in the Melbourne "Herald" of November 3 it was pointed out that, to date, the Allies have, in terms of money units, spent three times as much as was spent by the Allies in the 1914-18 war to end wars. The article also publishes a table showing the note-issue increase in 21 countries; the major countries being—Germany, 193%; Canada, 187%; Australia, 147%; U.S., 125%; and Britain, 83%. As usual, Russian figures were omitted. These figures were supposed to indicate inflation trends, but as they only dealt with "legal tender" increases, and omitted "price indexes," they are quite useless. It should be noted that all inflation propaganda comes from financial quarters, and on that account should be suspect.

—O.B.H.

COMPULSORY PASTEURISATION

It will be possible to purchase raw milk in "special cases."

"The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Martin) assured Mr. Mutton (Coburg) that in special cases it would be possible to purchase raw milk."—Melbourne "Age," 3/11/43.

This is an improvement on Dictator Martin's earlier decree—"There will be no raw milk."

All electors who feel that they are "special cases" (each individual is a special case, anyway), should write to their local M.L.A.'s, M.L.C.'s, and also to their local milk suppliers, if they want raw milk.

—T. S. M.

BROADCAST BY S. F. ALLEN

Tell your friends to tune in to 2GB, Sydney, on Sunday, November 21, at 6.30 p.m., when Mr. Stanley F. Allen, F.C.A. (Aust.), will broadcast. The subject will be: "The World We Want—and How."

THE ALBERTA GOVERNMENT'S POLICY

The speech of the Social Credit Premier, Ernest Manning of Alberta, successor to the late William Aberhart, delivered at Edmonton on June 11, 1943, defining Alberta Government policy, has been published by the "Edmonton Bulletin," by whose courtesy we reproduce the complete text as follows:—

In view of all that has transpired during the past few weeks it seemed a right and proper thing to my colleagues and myself that I should address this special message to you, the citizens of Alberta. I am deeply conscious of the fact that I am speaking to thousands to-night in whose hearts will dwell for many a day a sense of irreparable loss. The solemn truth of the poet's words has been brought home to us all:—

The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power,
And all that beauty, all that wealth
e'er gave
Await alike the inevitable hour;—
The paths of glory lead but to the grave!

It is unnecessary for me to repeat the countless tributes to the "life and work of Premier William Aberhart that have poured in from all over Alberta and Canada, and even from the far corners of the world. The sentiments expressed in those tributes may be summarised in a few simple words. In his passing the people of Canada, and especially of Alberta, have lost a brilliant statesman, a great reformer, a courageous public servant, and a faithful and true friend. The Grim Reaper, whose command all must obey, has stilled in death a voice which gave fearless and eloquent expression to the crying needs and the just rights of the under-privileged and oppressed. One voice that spoke with the clarity and the certainty of unshakable conviction amid the din and babble of political confusion and strife—one voice which all the combined opposition of men could not silence or cause to waver in its expression of those things which he knew to be true and right. Truly, the cause of human freedom has lost a valiant champion.

But it is not my purpose to-night to make this message a eulogy to his memory or to his great work. Let that be expressed throughout the years in deeds rather than words, in the lives of those thousands who will be stronger and better men and women because of the great and good influence of his life, of his Christian ministry, and of his public service.

He fought a good fight—He finished his course—He kept the faith. Now to us the torch is thrown.

My desire, therefore, is to talk humbly and simply to you, the citizens of this great Province, of those matters which concern your welfare, both now and in the days to come.

It has fallen to my lot to assume at the invitation of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, the high office of the Premiership in the government of your affairs. I assure you that I feel and appreciate more deeply than words can express the honour which has thus been conferred upon me. Particularly do I cherish and appreciate the confidence which was so generously expressed by the Social Credit members of the legislature in the unanimity of their request that I should assume the leadership of the government. Their attitude as your representatives in this matter is something which I will always remember. It has already been to me a treasured source of confidence, encouragement and strength. May I take this opportunity to express my humble, but sincere, thanks to the hundreds who have so graciously wired or written me their congratulations and good wishes and the assurance of their co-operation and support.

Both my colleagues and I appreciate your kindness very much indeed. But, more than the honour which attaches to the office to which I have been called, I am conscious of the great responsibility to you, the people of this Province, which it is my solemn duty to discharge. That duty will never be treated lightly. It will be my constant and earnest endeavour to discharge it faithfully and efficiently, ever keeping in mind your best interests and the good and welfare of this Province as a whole. To that end I have enlarged and reorganised the Executive Council, and have redistributed the work of the various departments of government in such a manner as best to ensure the maximum of efficiency in the administration of your affairs.

But what I want particularly to say to you is that my colleagues in the Cabinet and myself, together with all of your elected representatives on the Government side of the House, are in complete and absolute agreement in our unshakable determination to adhere to the three-fold policy of government which we are convinced represents the will of the overwhelming majority of the citizens of this Province.

THREE PHASES OF POLICY.

May I outline briefly the three phases of the policy which we are determined to follow:—

1. We regard it as our prime duty to the citizens of this Province and to Canada and the Empire as a whole, to do everything in our power to assist in the successful "all-out" prosecution of the war. To that end we will bend our every effort and will continue to co-operate in every way possible with the Federal authorities for the furtherance and intensification of the national war effort. I do not mean

by this that we will blindly acquiesce in all matters which arise in respect to the conduct of the national war effort. If and when proposals are advanced or policies advocated which, in our honest opinion, would be detrimental, rather than advantageous, we will not hesitate to point out wherein they fall short of what the citizens of this country have a right to expect in the prosecution of a war in which their very existence is at stake.

2. On the "home front" we are determined to continue unrelentingly, and with renewed vigour the fight to secure for each and every citizen of this Province the permanent social and economic security and freedom which are rightfully theirs. Let there be no misunderstanding about this. If there are those who cherish the vain hope that the people or the Government of Alberta will now turn back in their crusade for social justice and economic security, let me disabuse their minds.

As long as my colleagues and I have anything to do with the government of this province we will see to it that Alberta continues to lead the world in the great

fight to secure for every man, woman and child complete and permanent freedom from fear and worry and from social and economic insecurity. I am satisfied that the issues involved in this matter daily are becoming clearer to an ever-increasing number of people throughout the entire dominion.

Canada's vast war-time production has proven beyond question that the productive capacity of this country is sufficient to provide every one of our people with a standard of living far above anything which the average family enjoyed in the pre-war years.

No one would dare to question the ability or the initiative of Canadian workmen to continue and, if necessary, to still further increase that production after the war. The only barrier that remains to prevent the people of Canada from enjoying in the post-war era the high standard of living made possible by their productive genius and their initiative is the scarcity of money in the hands of the people as a whole. That this chronic shortage of purchasing power is unnecessary has been amply demonstrated during the war years. That such a condition exists in peace-time is due entirely to the monopolistic control of the monetary system by private interests who deal in money as a commodity and who, therefore, regulate its volume and distribution in terms of financial gain, rather than in terms of public need.

(To be concluded.)

GAOL-WITHOUT-TRIAL IN G.T. BRITAIN

Speaking in the House of Commons on July 15, in a debate on continuance of the Emergency Powers (Defence) Act (1939), and referring particularly to the notorious Regulation 18B, Mr. R. R. Stokes, Labour Member for Ipswich, and several other Members, showed that the spirit of Magna Carta is not dead—yet. Mr. Stokes said:—

Whatever may happen this House will be held responsible after the war for any injustice that may be proved to have been done to people who have been so detained. It is up to us on the only occasion when opportunity offers to pay great attention to what after all is the main principle for which we stand—namely, the liberty of the subject, and to impress upon the Government the necessity for taking measures to cut short injustices. I also submit that when these Regulations were passed it was never contemplated—it was not in my mind, and I took a pretty gloomy view of the war—that the war would go beyond 1943. Well, the Prime Minister himself has told us that it will probably go on until 1947. That being so, I do not believe that any hon. Member, of any political colour, if he was asked in 1940 whether he was prepared unconditionally to offer the Home Secretary, whoever he might be—and I make no imputation against the right hon. Gentleman, who, I am sure, does his best to administer the Regulations in the right spirit—these unrestricted powers, would have agreed. Suppose the House did not at that time "mean to hand over those powers? What do they intend to do about it now?

Nothing is more terrible or more devastating to the soul and mind of a man of integrity than being wrongfully detained, without any possibility or chance of stating his case. I think we are sliding over our obligations, and because we do not happen to be bombed hard at the present time we think everything in the garden is lovely and that it does not matter how many people are detained. It is no answer to say that when the right hon. Gentleman took office 1600 people were detained and that that number has now been reduced to about 450. That is no argument. I am reminded of a story which I had better not tell here and which is perhaps more appropriate for the smoking room. Of the 465 cases which are still detained 68 of them were

THIS LEADERSHIP TALK

A Scotsman's Log in the "Scotsman" says that an immense amount has been heard recently on the importance of leadership and of training leaders.

"The chief argument for the public schools appears to be their success in exporting competent leaders.

"This general veneration of the fuhrer prinzip is all very well, but it presupposes a lot. It takes for granted that after the war our country will be full of people eager to be led. In a nation which simultaneously declares its belief in individualism it is at least doubtful whether so many people will want to be led or will even recognise born leaders when they are pointed out. A tough social problem will undoubtedly present itself if we turn out regiments of leaders with nobody to lead. There is no saying what a mob of frustrated leaders might do.

"We therefore suggest that it is high time that some attention was paid to the importance of submissiveness. If there is a type of school which turns out boys who worship authority and who are essentially biddable then it ought to command the support of the enlightened. And if we seriously want to manufacture leaders then we ought to talk much less about the importance of individualism. It is simple logic that a land full of people exuberantly insisting on their right to individual expression and development will not be fit for leaders to thrive in."

detained after the Minister had gone against the recommendation of his Advisory Committee. With great respect to, him—and I am sure he exercises his judgment in the best possible manner—I question whether it was ever the intention of this House that the Home Secretary would ever go against the recommendations of the Advisory Committee which was set up under the Regulations.

I propose to refer to two—I will not say notorious—prominent cases. It has always been very much on my conscience that an hon. and gallant Member of this House should be detained in prison. I believe that had the circumstances been different when his arrest was first announced in this House the grave event might have been totally different. It was a strange concatenation of circumstances with which the Patronage Secretary is well familiar. I do not believe that the hon. and gallant Member for Peebles and Southern (Captain Ramsay) would do anything consciously against the interests of the country. I know he has odd views, but, if people are going to be locked up for having odd views, quite a number of Members of this House are in danger. His views about race or religion have nothing to do with whether or not he should be locked up. He was in the last war, and he has three sons in this. However cracked his views may be on one particular point, I do not believe he would do anything contrary to the national interest. I suspect other motives. I should be most interested to hear whether his knowledge of certain telegrams which passed between high officials in this country and America had anything to do with his detention. Other people are detained for the same reason. One was tried under the Official Secrets Act and acquitted on all points, but is still detained under the Regulation and, as far as my knowledge of the case goes, for the same reason. My right hon. Friend knows well enough to what I am referring. I think the House is failing in its duty and has always failed in its duty on this point by not demanding that the hon. and gallant Gentleman should come to the House and state his case. Whether he is in a fit state to do it after three years of detention, I do not know. . . .

The second notorious case—this may be quoted against me by unscrupulous persons outside, but I do not care twopence—is that of Sir Oswald Mosley. I would deal with him in one of two ways. I would either shoot him or let him out. . . .

Some evidence with regard to Sir Oswald Mosley was laid before me at the time of the Debate on December 10, 1940. The view had got about that large amounts of money were coming in from outside and that Sir Oswald Mosley and his gang were likely to do things which were not patriotic. This is what happened when the Advisory Committee invited his solicitor to appear before them to discover whether foreign money was coming in. After an exhaustive search, in which all the banks took part, it had to be admitted that no foreign money was coming in to that organisation.

[Mr. Morrison then objected that Mr. Stokes was "purporting to quote" from the proceedings of an Advisory Committee, which have always been recognised by the House as private. After a stormy discussion it was brought home to members that he was quoting from a "Hansard" of 1940.]

Mr. Stokes: . . . In certain instances people are having a terrible time when they are released with apparently no stain on their character. They have great difficulty in getting employment. It is no use

NAZI-PATTERN MEDICAL SERVICES

A Patients' Policy Association has been formed in Newcastle, England, the object of which is to guard patients against the arbitrary imposition of any centralised and authoritarian medical and health service and to make known the wishes and desires of patients on this subject to their elected representatives. The association appeals for support to all those who value the direct and private approach of patient to doctor, through which the maximum freedom and satisfaction for both is to be obtained. In a letter to the press, the hon. secretary, Mr. W. A. Barratt, pointed out that doctors themselves had formed an association to protect the freedom of their relationship with their patient, an aim also very much in the true interests of the patient.

Any scheme for the control of the medical profession and health services, whether set up by the State, or by some body advocated by—e.g., the British Medical Association, will lead to the same results: doctors will be responsible not to their patients, but to the authority, and one of their chief "duties" will be to safeguard sickness funds. Patients are more likely to appreciate this point and its effect on the service they command than are doctors, and patients who do appreciate it can bring it home to doctors and others.

Any centralised plan such as is foreshadowed in the Beveridge Report and elsewhere would inevitably entail the formation of a bureaucracy, whether staffed by doctors or laymen, engaged chiefly on administrative work, organised on the seniority principle—i.e., each officer would be responsible to the next senior, but would be responsible for those junior to him. A memorandum issued by a group of English doctors concerned about this matter comments:—

"This is the most effective method known for destroying personal responsibility. It is sometimes known as the "Fuhrer prinzip." . . . In this way responsibility to higher authority would be substituted for responsibility to patients. The theory is that the highest authority in a given area (or region) is responsible to the central authority for what happens to the patients."

saying they are out and ought to be able to get jobs. I have had cases come to me, and I have tried to help people, but it is not possible to do so. It is an obligation on the Government to do what they can to put these people on their feet again. They have wives and families dependent on them who have been deprived of their means of livelihood during detention without trial. When these people come out their identity cards are marked, and it makes it very difficult for them to get any work. I am not concerned with what their political beliefs are. The Home Secretary has seen fit to release them, and they are entitled to live and have a fair opportunity to work. I ask that something should be done to help some of these poor people. . . .

I still believe, however, that persons detained are not being given the precise grounds for their detention. It is no use the Home Secretary saying they are. In certain instances he may have seen fit to give further information to some particular person, but I would remind the House and the Home Secretary of what Mr. Justice Humphreys said on May 27, 1941, in his judgment:

"A person detained under Regulation 18b is entitled to know at the outset the precise grounds for his detention."

I have examined a great number of documents, because British nationals and a great many others have written to me about their cases, and I have not found those precise particulars given. . . .

I want to appeal to the Government and the Home Secretary particularly to review this matter. I do not ask the Home Secretary to do anything which is contrary to his conscience or what he considers to be the best interests of the country, but I do ask him to pay no attention to political prejudices. I think that political prejudices do exist. This is not a debating matter but a matter of very high and great principle. It is the thing for which we really stand, and I ask him that this most arbitrary Regulation, for that is what it is, should be, having regard to all the circumstances to-day, administered in the most generous way possible. (Our emphasis throughout.)

[Other members who spoke strongly against Regulation 18b were Mr. Fickthorn (Cambridge University), Mr. Boothby (Aberdeen East), Commander Sir Archibald Southby (Epsom) and Commander Bower (Cleveland).]

PUBLIC DEBATE

"SOCIALISM v. SOCIAL CREDIT."

At 109 Flinders Lane, Melbourne, on Tuesday, November 16, at 8 p.m.

Mr. C. Sanders (Australian Socialist Party) will affirm Socialism.

Mr. J. McKellar (Douglas Credit Movement) will affirm Social Credit.

AUSTRALIA'S POST-WAR PERIL

(A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown. Continued from last issue.) Sir,— There is ever-increasing reason to fear that we have already been delivered into the hands of our enemies. The purpose of this series of letters is to assist in identifying those enemies so that we may be in a better position to protect ourselves from them. Notwithstanding the illuminating facts which have been published in this respect, men who have been placed in positions of great trust and responsibility are still acting as though they are the paid agents of our enemies instead of the faithful servants of their fellow citizens.

For instance, in the September issue of the journal published by "The Institute of Public Administration" there are the notes of an address given in Sydney on 1/7/43 by J. G. Crawford, M. Ec. Mr. Crawford is the "Director of Research" in the Department of Post-War Reconstruction. The "Notes" cover almost every aspect of rural conditions, but the one that really matters is hardly mentioned. The problem of the man on the land is not how to produce goods. He has already shown himself to be quite capable in that direction. His problem is how to get sufficient regular income to meet his financial costs, obtain his necessities, and clear off his financial debts. All of which is a question of Australian money in Australia.

Although the "Director of Research" admits in his notes that since 1911 there has been an increase of more than 50 per cent in the volume of production, with less than half that percentage increase in the number of rural workers (he would find the figures since 1921 even more impressive), he told his audience that our plans for post-war rural reconstruction must be based on "FULL EMPLOYMENT AS A WORLD POLICY." After producing the clearest evidence that labour is a diminishing quantity in production, he thus immediately proceeded to ignore the fact! Everything is at hand to provide the people with increased leisure, but this man, flourishing the high-sounding title of "Master of Economics," tells us that labour should be converted into an increasing quantity in production, and that a slave State is preferable to a leisure State. By his public declarations he has thus shown himself, like his Director-General, to be working for the objective of the International Financiers, and not for the welfare of the men and women of Australia.

Further evidence of this was given in the Melbourne "Argus" of 3/11/43. A whole column of matter "supplied by the Department of Post-War Reconstruction" was given prominence. It related to problems of post-war land settlement. This material reflected the same old lack of understanding of the simple realities of the situation as has always been so much in evidence where specially-conditioned academic "experts" have been put forward as authorities. Fortunately, some men have not allowed themselves to be used in this way, and it is as well for us to be reminded of the treatment meted out to Economists who did try to be realists. Mr. W. L. Bardsley has told us that more than 20 years ago the writings of C. H. Douglas caught the attention of a group of economic students and their professor at the Sydney University. Two years later the Professor (Irving) was to place two of Douglas's books on the list of supplementary reading for the degree in Economics, and after his refusal to remove them from the list he was to resign his post. Since that time few professional economists have openly expressed their agreement with the works of Douglas as such. On the contrary, they have received substantial emoluments for NOT doing so. "Another group of people of quite a different kind had not failed to grasp the significance of what Douglas was writing, and in the autumn of 1919 he was invited to visit the United States, where he was entertained by associates of the Schiffs and the Warburgs. So far from questioning any of his premises or conclusions, this group was interested in one thing only—what was he going to do about it." Mr. Bardsley went on: "... the sale of literature in the U.S.A. was effectively blocked, and several professors of economics who showed favour to the new ideas found themselves superseded." ("The Social Creditor," 21/12/38)

A fortnight later we were also informed that a member of an international Jewish banking family said, "It is the only proposal which would save civilisation, but civilisation is not worth saving." This lines up rather sweetly with the outlook of Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of "England." Some years ago it was suggested to him that the policy of the Bank of "England" made it arithmetically impossible for the British people to be prosperous. He is stated to have replied, "I don't believe it is good for a people to be prosperous." And so we may see why it is that only men and women of "suitable" outlook have been selected for planning our post-war lives. Our lives are to be fitted into conditions. It would be too sensible to make conditions fit our lives.

The column in the "Argus" of 3/11/43 finished in this way: "The task of rural planning is not easy, but Australia can do much to reconstruct her present rural economy by her domestic policy. Whether we can do more will depend upon the men who make the peace terms in London, Washington, Moscow, and Chungking." So there you have it. Our conditions are not to depend upon physical resources and intelligent use of them, but upon the ideas and "objectives" of the men who constitute the "Peace" Conference! As we said last week, what may be done in Australia with Australian resources and Australian men and women is to be determined by persons outside Australia. The policy is to be a

the control of the International Financiers with headquarters in New York.

Seeing that so much is to depend upon "the men who make the peace terms," it is about time we paid more attention to their identity and their "objectives." Who made the last peace terms? And where are those men now? Whom did they serve then, and whom do they serve now? Most people blame the politicians for the Treaty of Versailles, "but the politicians who took part in the Peace Conference know quite well that they were hardly more than rubber stamps on a document moulded by advisers."

Who were these "advisers"? During the last war Paul Warburg, as "Grand Treasurer of the United States," was financial adviser to President Wilson. He was also a director of the international banking house of Kuhn, Loeb, and Company. In addition, he was the originator of the world-wide system of Central Banks (part of the plan for World Hegemony in Finance), and founder of the Federal Reserve Bank. His brother Max was the financial adviser to the Kaiser! Paul was one of the chief representatives sent by America to the Versailles Conference, and Max was one of Germany's leading representatives! And, according to the "Encyclopaedia of Jewish Knowledge," Max "is one of the few Jews holding a banking office since the advent of the Hitler regime." Paul has since died, but Israel still has its agent in the person of Mr. Morgenthau as Treasurer of the United States. Bernard Baruch was also at the Peace Conference, and it was he who wrote "The Making of the Reparation and Economic Section of the Treaty"! He was the most powerful man in the United States. He still is; and if we don't watch out the international bankers will again "sweep statesmen, politicians, jurists, and journalists all on one side and issue their orders with the imperiousness of absolute monarchs, who know that there is no appeal from their ruthless decrees." If they do, then our future living conditions WILL depend on "the men who make the peace terms." We must see that they DON'T.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2.
7th November, 1943.

THE PLOT TO SOCIALISE AUSTRALIA

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

Every method of propaganda is being used to "persuade the Australian people that there will be chaos after the war unless a strong Central Government has the power to ensure that all men are then provided with WORK. This means that the Federal Government, or the powers behind the Federal Government, are now prepared to house, clothe, feed and pay over 800,000 Australians at an average cost of not less than £5 per week for producing nothing at all—in fact, they are actually GIVING the Japanese hundreds of millions of pounds worth of material in the form of high-explosives, etc.; but the same powers are NOT prepared to allow the 800,000 men to go home to their families at the conclusion of the war and still draw at least five pounds per week until they find an acceptable job.

It's no use the Government saying this cannot be done. We are proving right now that it can be done. Men would gradually reinstate themselves in primary or secondary production, providing the present volume of money was maintained in order that people could walk into a shop and buy adequate supplies of butter, eggs, fruit, etc., without breaking some regulation. If the people have adequate purchasing-power, private enterprise (not to be confused with private monopoly, the result of money restriction) employing men at reasonable rates of pay, can provide adequate quality goods. I challenge anyone to deny this.

But Dr. Evatt and other socialists don't attempt to deny these facts; they merely mesmerise the people by a subtle and persistent campaign of distortion. Hitler proved what can be done to the human mind by propaganda. People gradually lose the ability to discern even elementary facts.

People who shout themselves into a frenzy about "common ownership," along with the rest of the public, are robbed to the extent of millions of pounds per annum by "our commonly-owned" post office. And they can't even tell us how they propose to stop this robbery!

Our "commonly-owned" Apple and Pear Board ruined thousands of apple growers, cost the taxpayers millions of pounds, and supplied apples which often could hardly be classed as such. Our "commonly-owned" railways rob us of millions every year and we don't seem to be able to do anything about it.

Surely the results of "common-ownership" have proved that we must have personal responsibility, and control by electors. To do this we must break down monopoly in whatever form we find it. The powerful financiers of the world have been smashing small-scale enterprise and building bigger and bigger monopolies. They can control a few monopolies more easily than a large number of small businesses. Further, it is much easier to get the people to accept the socialisation of these few monopolies. We will then all work for one monopoly—the State. Needless to say, the big executives of the monopolies will merely transfer to the State's pay-roll—only they will be paid

PROGRAMME FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

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

While there may be room for much difference of opinion as to the factors which go to make up social direction, I do not think any competent observer can dispute one of them. It is simplicity itself:—

IF WAR, AND PARTICULARLY MODERN MECHANISED WAR, IS INHERENT IN SOCIETY, THEN ALL SOCIETY MUST TAKE ORGANISATION FOR WAR AS ITS PRIMARY OBJECTIVE, AND THAT IMPLIES A SLAVE STATE.

I do not propose to discuss this proposition at length because anyone can see for himself not only that individual interests are swept into a functional policy of "everything for the war effort" but also that "the surrender of our freedom" is taken to be axiomatically inherent in SUCCESS in war, so that we can say that the shortest way to enslave a society, is—"only in war, or under threat of war."

At this point, a short digression on the fashionable phrase "over-simplification" seems to be desirable. It may be noticed that all really respectable comment on matters of moment is at some pains to disclaim anything of this nature, and the more complex the comment, the more certain it is to be accredited as respectable. When an explanation of any phenomenon is so complex, and takes so many factors into consideration that no one of them, if subjected to modification, can be expected to produce much alteration, it can be predicted with some certainty that it will be commended as a solid contribution to the solution of world problems.

All problems are, however, just as complex as you care to make them. Let us suppose that you wish to explain the light by which you are reading. You may say that it proceeds from a heated wire enclosed in a glass bulb, which could not operate without thus and such arrangements of rubber-covered wires. Someone is sure to say that the rubber shortage will inevitably threaten your lighting system. When the supply of power from the Grid fails, a considerable body of opinion will blame the Japanese invasion of Malaya and the shortage of rubber. But if you say that your light proceeds from the transformation of one kind of energy into a different manifestation of the same energy, you are not only more generally accurate, but you set up a more useful train of thought, and cut out many irrelevancies.

In general, a cause is more likely to be comprehensively identified if you consider it a long way back from its effect, and the attribution of an effect to a

complexity of causes is, "a priori," a suggestion of a shallow analysis. It may not be, but in relation to public policy, it generally is so. Or to put the matter another way, a political effect rarely has only one immediate derivation, but it generally has one primary cause.

Bearing this in mind, it is true to say that the cause of war is economic—that men do not want to fight, but they will fight if they believe that otherwise they will starve, just as it is indisputable that revolution always relies on a promise of economic betterment, although it rarely or never fulfils that promise. But exactly at this point, we come to what may be a newly identified factor in world history. We have evidence of two major revelations.

The first of these is that the accepted idea that the poor are poor because the rich are rich has no foundation in fact and therefore class ECONOMIC war has no factual justification. Poverty amidst plenty was not, and quite possibly never has been, due to the circumstance that supplies were inevitably limited, and only some could get enough. And the second revelation, the final proof of which we owe to the Social Credit Government of the Canadian Province of Alberta, is that THERE IS AN ORGANISATION CONSCIOUSLY DETERMINED AT ANY COST, OF WAR OR REVOLUTION, TO UPHOLD THE ECONOMIC WAR (of which military war is only one phase) and to use it as a weapon in the CULTURAL war. That is why Mr. McKenzie King, the Federal Prime Minister of Canada, disallowed Bills which, if translated into Acts, would have demonstrated that the ECONOMIC standard of the poorest can be raised without impinging on the economic standard of the richest.

Now we are perhaps able to see to where this revelation is going to lead us. Is there a traceable link between the power which disallowed the Alberta legislation, financed Hitler, emasculated British military power, and ushered in the Second World War with a determined attempt to turn Great Britain overnight into a State Capitalist undertaking with an unknown board of directors? We have beyond peradventure to find out, and if it exists, to identify it.

And this information has to be obtained, and the individuals have to be identified, in the spirit, not of propaganda, but of a judicial trial which will be followed by a sentence. That trial, if its impartiality could be assured, would desirably be an official trial. But the Riom Trials were intended to be that kind of enquiry, and we know what happened to them. So it may have to be a trial organised outside the usual legal structure.

If the responsible individuals during the years 1915-1940 are identified and punished, we may avoid a Third World War. If not, we shall have a Fourth and Fifth. (To be continued.) (All rights reserved.)

The name of the President of the "Independent"—independent only of the people's will—Citizens' Association of Alberta (the coalition formed by all the finance-backed political parties except C.C.F. to oppose Social Credit) is A. G. Baalim. Well, well, well!

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

"Thus we were as zealous in seeking to disarm Britain (sic) as Japan, and from 1914 to 1916, and again from September, 1939, to June, 1940, American policy professed to see no vital American interest in whether Britain (sic) or Germany won the war. . . ."

"In the preparation of the Monroe Doctrine, the Founding Fathers made their great decision after negotiations in London by which they were assured of the armed diplomatic support of Great Britain." (Our emphasis.—Ed.)

—"U.S. Foreign Policy," by Walter Lippmann

THOSE RIOM TRIALS

The "Jewish Chronicle" notes the "exit" of Riom, reported in daily newspapers. It says: "The Riom Court, set up by the Vichy Government in 1940 to try Daladier, Blum, and Gamelin among 'those responsible for the defeat of France,' has been abolished, says the Berlin radio. It was, in fact, a fiasco, and was suspended in April, 1942." —"The Social Creditor," June 26, 1943.

REFORMERS

"Men reform a thing by removing the reality from it, and then do not know what to do with the unreality that is left. Thus they would reform religious institutions by removing the religion. They do not seem to see that to take away the creed and leave the servants of the creed is simply to go on paying the servants for nothing." —G. K. Chesterton in "Generally Speaking."