

The "New Times" is a really independent, non-party, non-class, non-sectarian weekly newspaper, advocating political and economic democracy, and opposing totalitarianism in all its forms.

Now, when our land to ruin's brink is verging,
In God's name, let us speak while there is time!
Now, when the padlocks for our lips are forging,
Silence is crime.
—Whittier (1807-1892).

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 11, No. 9. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1945.

"NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home or elsewhere every week are as follow:
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.

Beat Bureaucracy at the Federal Elections

Correct Action Must Begin Now

How can the growth of National Socialism in Australia be arrested and set back before it is too late? That question is agitating the minds of democrats from one end of Australia to the other. There is an enormous amount of bitter criticism of the Power-lusting Planners and the Big Bureaucrats, and some spreading tentacles of the totalitarian octopus are being resisted. That is all to the good; but how can democrats take common action on a non-party basis to strike a mortal blow at the menace?

Before Christmas the Social Credit Secretariat in England suggested a line of action, which we earnestly and urgently recommend to Australians. The first special article about it in the "Social Crediter" is reprinted hereunder, preceded by an item from the "Regional Industrial Bulletin," which provided an early indication that the proposals had "scored a bull's-eye with the first round": —

"On November 25 the Social Credit Secretariat published its proposals for dealing with Bureaucracy (see the "R.I.B." No. 143, 4/32/44). The first unmistakable counter-move on the part of the Party-Political triumvirate was manifested in the "Evening Standard" on December 21, where Sir Herbert Williams put on record a near libelous and 95 per cent. inaccurate statement estimated to besmirch C. H. Douglas. Commenting (but without soiling its pages with the actual word, Douglas) the "Daily Express" recommended every reader to acquire Sir Herbert's article, and to study it as a document specially significant to the coming general election. It sure is! —as Lord Beaverbrook's Canadian friends would exclaim, and C. H. Douglas's Canadian friends would echo. If for no other reason, one cannot help admiring the man who has succeeded in maneuvering the boycotters of his policy into a position where they cannot attack him without either admitting to the reality of the policy or making fools of themselves."
—"D.D." in "Regional Industrial Bulletin," January 1, 1945.

ELECTORAL CANVASS FOR AN ANTI-BUREAUCRATIC REPRESENTATION

"If any suppose that, when an election comes next year, as announced by Mr. Churchill, unless they take a very effective hand AT ONCE and on clearly understood principles, they will do anything but rubber-stamp an arranged plan, then the lessons of these calamitous years are lost upon them."
—"The Social Crediter," November 18, 1944.

There is a worldwide, conscious, coalition of High Finance, Grand Orient Freemasonry and Communist-Socialism to bring about world revolution.

The Mond-Turner conference was the first open step in Great Britain.

The present Ministries and Controls are a further progression,

By the agency and complicity of a House of Commons which is an object of contempt wherever its character is known, including the alien quarters whence its stultification has proceeded, the Press (i.e., virtually all of current printed matter, newspapers, magazines and books, for the controls are multiple, ubiquitous and inescapable), the "education"

Significant Political Pointers

Significant steps are being taken to merge Socialist Dedman's W.O.I. into a permanent post-war organisation. One of the most dangerous doctrinaires in the Federal Labor Party, Mr. Dedman was a "monetary reformer" when first elected to Parliament! It is to be hoped that social crediters are noting carefully where some of these "monetary reformers" are leading us.

Mr. Dedman believes in the World Bank scheme, thus providing further evidence that socialists are prepared to collaborate with any group which will help to "organise" — i.e., regiment — mankind on a world scale.

It is of interest to place on record that Mr. Dedman, in a recent letter to one of his constituents, declared that the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act "does not give power to regiment, conscript or compel anybody. Debates in the House show that nobody expressed the opinion that it would." Because members of the Opposition didn't deal with the Hitlerian parts of the Act mentioned, Mr. Dedman would have us believe everything is nice and democratic.

Mr. Dedman must be given to understand that it's the expression of opinion by his electors, which really matters. But Mr. Dedman also told his constituent referred to above, that there "is no machinery whereby a majority of electors could make known to me their wishes . . ." Social crediters in Corio should enlighten Mr. Dedman on this point immediately. They should also be stiffening up all local opposition to Mr. Dedman in preparation for

War-Surplus Disposal

From "The Social Crediter," Dec. 9, 1944:
We trust that our readers will not allow the question of "surplus disposals" to recede from their attention. The whole of this surplus already belongs to the taxpayers, but powerful influences are hard at work to sabotage it either by actual destruction, or by smuggling it abroad under the cloak of U.N.R.R.A. or some other international racket.

Apart from the realistic usefulness of much of the material which will be available—material which is urgently needed, and which cannot be quickly obtained from any other source than surplus—its distribution will have a powerful effect in keeping prices down.

The racketeers are determined that prices shall not be kept down. If they have their way, the consequences may easily be (as perhaps they wish them to be) catastrophic.

his removal at the next Federal Election. There is much to be said for the remark recently passed by one social creditor: "I am not interested in working to get men into Parliament; I am interested in working to remove men who have shown themselves to be dangerous."
* * * * *

In a recent broadcast talk on constitutional monarchies in the modern world, Mr. D. G. M. Jackson, M.A., made a pertinent and thought-provoking comment on the Australian dailies and their failure to give us "a clear account of why the institution of Royalty is important to Great Britain herself and to the Commonwealth of Nations: why it may be called truly 'The Keystone of the Arch' of their political and social structure . . ." He said: —

"The only sane attitude for the responsible press of a Constitutional Monarchy to take is one which shows sympathy for legitimate Royalty elsewhere, while denouncing all tyranny, whether it is exercised in the name of a King, or—as is far more commonly the case today—in a land where hereditary monarchy no longer exists. Any other attitude . . . is simply undermining the very loyalties on which our own fundamental institution rests. If Monarchy is universally overthrown and discarded broadly, do these people really believe that our own traditional Monarchy will long remain alone in the world? If they do, they show little commonsense; if they do not, their profession of loyalty can only be regarded as so much empty hypocrisy."

The monopoly press is engaged in something more sinister than "empty hypocrisy"; it is wholeheartedly supporting the creation of a World State in which our loyalty to our very symbol of sovereignty, the Crown, must be submerged. The evil influence of the monopoly press must be broken completely before we can hope to achieve the fuller life based on the liberty of the individual. Every possible weapon should be used to expose the monopoly press in this country as one of the principal instruments being used to destroy our traditional Anglo-Saxon way of life.

(Continued on page 3.)

system, and agencies of communication and information, the citizens (electors, "sovereign people") are forced into a challenge of the whole idea of "government" as it operates at present.

This idea is that, on the "result" of an "election," which is not truly an election of anything at all even in the most corrupted sense of the word, the whole substratum of men's lives is to be swept from underneath their feet; that by the spinning of a controlled and weighted roulette wheel the objectives of a civilisation are to be frustrated and the fruits destroyed.

The kingpin of this plot is the Bureaucracy itself.

There is no time to lose in pulling it out.

We are assured that, in its essentials, this view, which our journal has been almost exclusively devoted to clarifying since its foundation, is now clearly perceived and accepted by many members of the community.

Their frankness in admitting so much varies directly as the fearlessness of their tempers. Many say they await a "movement"—i.e., something external to themselves. Doubtless that, too, is envisaged, though not as a means for the satisfaction of their hopes but rather for the thwarting of them.

It is not enough that "something" should be done.

It is of paramount importance that the right thing should be done, and at once.

THE FOLLOWING COURSE OF ACTION IS ADVISED: —

SOCIAL CREDITERS IN EVERY PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCY SHOULD

BEGIN TO CANVASS FOR AN ANTI-BUREAUCRATIC REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

(1) Make known your own refusal to vote for ANY candidate who will not agree to put the reduction of the Civil Service staffs to 20 PER CENT. BELOW THE 1931 FIGURE as the FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA.

(2) Wherever you meet the question, "But, what can we do?" say what you have done.

(3) Wherever you meet with the claim that any public agency, whether a candidate for public office or a political organisation, is "fighting bureaucracy," enlist its support. Bureaucracy cannot be "fought" in the abstract, but only in the concrete, end for the purpose of overcoming it with out a peradventure. THE POWER OF BUREAUCRACY CAN ONLY BE REDUCED BY REDUCING IT.

(4) By all means urge that the displaced bureaucrats be paid (if necessary); but insist that the country cannot stand the added cost of their functioning as well. The bureaucracy may not, of themselves, advance convincing reasons why they should be the first members of the community to receive a National Dividend. It is permitted to do good to them that hate you.

This is not an appeal for the setting up of "organisations," but a recommendation to such action as will develop organisation as, when and where it may be required.

Further information will be distributed as the campaign develops.

NOTES on the NEWS

A heartening sign of awakening is seen in the report in the Melbourne "Sun" of February 23, in respect of a British Gallup Poll which asked the question, "When goods are in short supply, would you agree to England selling them overseas to enable us [?] to buy abroad, or should the goods be sold in Britain?" The result of the Poll was that 46% said that the goods should be sold in Britain; 39% favoured export, and 15% said they had no opinion, and a majority opposed exports after the war. The chief opposition to exports came from women and working-class people. And so, it is being realised that the export racket is merely a device to keep up prices and to prevent workers from having access to their own production. The planners and the propagandists will now have to play another record.

ABSENTEES' ALARM: A new slant on "absenteeism" is contained in a letter to the Prime Minister published recently in the Press. It relates to soldiers absent from home, away in the forces, having quite enough to do in defeating the external enemy, without having the added worry of political plotters converting their homeland into a National Socialist State by nationalising airways, extending "controls," breaking down living standards, regimenting their work-mates, and imposing tyrannous taxation which they will have to carry as a reward for their service. The letter-writer concludes on the note that these soldiers are fighting for their country, and it is only fair that they shall have a say, which the needless haste denies them. It is a simple yet a very forceful appeal which takes a lot of answering.

SCARCITY COMPLEX: Some signs of realism were apparent in a recent leading article in the Melbourne "Age" to the effect that "never again were intelligent people likely to listen with patience to public men or economic theorists who preached doctrines of artificial scarcity and deliberate restriction of food in such a country as Australia." Commenting on this, the Victorian Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said that "Australia was now suffering grievously as a result of the short-sighted policy of deliberate limitation of primary products, against which repeated warnings had been issued only to be ignored by some who posed as national food production experts, but whose doctrine of interference with production had resulted in chaotic conditions on the food front." It is good to know that the warnings repeatedly uttered in these columns have permeated through the community; however, Australia will not be safe until those responsible for these conditions are stripped of their power.

WAR WARNINGS: Sir Miles Thomas, vice-chairman of the Nuffield Organisation, is reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of February 22 as saying that "industrialists who warned the British Government that Germany was preparing for war were ignored." He also pointed out "Britain would have been in a far worse plight in 1940 if the industrialists had not gone ahead on their own initiative to prepare the manufacture of war materials." As an example, he quoted the preparation for making "Bofors" guns in 1938 both in England and Australia; later, experience gained in this connection was used in Canada and America. Gradually the truth is beginning to

leak out as to the activities preceding the war, and the guilty part played by those in responsible positions, especially some of the financial Molochs, some of whom have strangely enough been honoured instead of being hanged.

FITZPATRICK'S FRENZY: Brian Fitzpatrick uses his column in "Smith's Weekly" of February 17 to deal with the banking brawl, and laments the fact that the Government permits the Sound Finance Association to use paper, manpower and the G.P.O. services to carry on their attack against the Government's banking proposals. And so it is clear that Brian would not be unduly alarmed if the Government played the Gestapo trick and suppressed all such criticism. Here we plainly see the totalitarian mentality, and in a member of the so-called Council for Civil Liberties! Readers of these columns have no sympathy for the Sound Finance Association, as they know it is merely a bankers' stooge; but when it comes to agreeing with fascistic methods of stifling them, that would have to be left to Brian and his friends. (Continued on page 3.)

Settling Lead-Lease

In the British House of Commons on November 28, 1944, Sir W. Davison asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer 'what progress is being made in the settlement of Lend-Lease negotiations with America after the war, and, in reaching any settlement, will full allowance be made to Great Britain for her war inventions, such as radio-location, the jet aeroplane, etc.?'

Sir J. Anderson: "The principles to be followed in the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the U.S.A. by his Majesty's Government in return for Lend-Lease Aid are laid down in Article VII of the Agreement of February 23, 1942 Cmd. Paper 6341. The time has not yet come for detailed discussion of the arrangements to carry out these principles."

Sir W. Davison: "Do the American Government recognise that the value of the British inventions referred to in the Question, and of others, is considerably greater, as regards winning the war, than the value of the goods and supplies actually received from America?"

Sir J. Anderson: "I can only say that all due weight will be given to every relevant consideration at the proper time."

"WATCHMAN" ATTACKS SOCIAL CREDIT

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

Sir, —Every paragraph of the "Watchman's" broadcast address of 11/2/45 contained inaccuracies. He opened his address by speaking of "those who have been carried away by new-fangled economic fallacies" trying to decry and discredit the "British" banking system.

Surely no man in his right mind would say that those who declare that if a thing is physically possible it is also financially possible are lunatics giving voice to a new-fangled economic fallacy. Yet that is the clear intention of the words used by Mr. Mann in his 71st year.

Would it not be far closer to the truth to say that those endeavouring to perpetuate the idea that things, which are physically possible, are NOT financially possible are either lunatics or liars and traitors? All that Social Crediters postulate in this connection is that society should be built on the foundation of physical realities, and not on the basis of financial mumbo jumbo. Any artificial hindrance to the building of that state of affairs in which citizens (particularly the aged and the infirm) will have financial independence, the hours of labor will be fewer, the retiring age earlier, the school-leaving age later, and the fruits of production fully distributed to all the people, should be removed; and any men preventing or delaying that removal should be exposed. This is the objective towards which genuine Social Crediters are working, and they are determined to do everything possible within constitutional means to achieve it. They aim to have eliminated from the financial system anything that checks progress instead of aiding it. That is neither new-fangled nor fallacious.

These people "who have been carried away" are said to have been trying for a long time to decry and discredit the "British" banking system. What is the "British" banking system, and in what way does it differ from the "American" banking system? What was the "British" banking system called before it was introduced into Britain in 1694? And how was it that in 1931 the so-called "British" banking system had to take orders from the "American" banking system? And if the "British" system is separate and distinct from other banking systems, how does it come to be so inseparably tangled up with the worldwide system of "central" banks of German-Jewish origin imposing a privately dictated policy? Social Crediters have not at any time been engaged in an effort to decry or discredit the banking system. Their whole concern has been to explain how it works, and to show that those who dictate its POLICY are the rulers of the world and the real criminals behind wars, depressions, and needless human suffering. If the "Watchman" was better informed in this vital respect he would feel ashamed for the rest of his days of the unworthy part he has taken over a great number of years in condoning the actions of these people and shielding them from the just wrath of outraged and crucified humanity.

The second paragraph of the broadcast was as follows: —

"At last, however, they thought they had found a joint in the armour through which they could mortally wound the banks. They pounced on the subject of 'Credit', which they said was being abused by the banks; as a matter of fact, they seemed to confuse 'credit' with 'money.' It is untrue to say that Social Crediters desire to destroy the banks. They have made it crystal clear that they recognise the very efficient manner in which banking as such is administered, and the justice of such institutions being adequately recompensed for their services as bookkeepers.

No social creditor to my knowledge has ever said that the banks were "abusing" credit. What they have said is that it is through the manipulation of the VOLUME and direction of credit that the financiers impose their POLICY on the community. Even the supposedly sovereign Governments are subservient to them.

Social Crediters also say that, as the real credit of the community consists of its physical resources and productive capacity, the monetisation of that credit should be done FOR the people, and not by the trading banks as for themselves. In other words, there should be no private monopoly of the public credit. On this subject, however, "The Watchman" is hopelessly uninformed and shockingly misinformed, and thus thoroughly unqualified to speak.

The last few words of the paragraph are priceless. Without being conscious of the absurdity of his remark, he blissfully put forward as a fact something, which merely "seems" to be! It is not the Social Crediters who confuse credit with money, but men of the type of "The Watchman," who pose as authorities but who do not understand the meaning of the word "money", or the origin and nature of the stuff which functions as money. All overdrafts are issued in the form of credit, and anyone who believes they are not money is a simpleton of the simpletons.

Credit is of two kinds—real credit in the form of physical wealth, and financial credit in the form of money. Money itself is of two kinds—Legal tender and bank credit, the latter being mostly in the form of bank deposits not covered by legal tender. Social Crediters are very clear on these terms, and if there is confusion about them then it is entirely in the minds of the irresponsible and incompetent fellows who pose as experts, but who in fact are blind leaders of the blind.

I would remind Mr. Mann that it is impossible for him to radiate what he does not possess, and would ask him to think deeply on the fact that any person who lacks an understanding of the nature, origin, production, ownership, and control of the country's money supply, is not competent to take any intelligent part in discussions relating to our community problems or what should be done to solve them. Before we come to the position in Alberta it is necessary to comment on "The Watchman's" understanding of Social Credit. This is what he said:

"In order that everyone should have more money than they had earned, they evolved a conception of 'Social Credit' (as distinct from bank credit) which, as administered by the State, would give everyone 'credit for nothing' and so put in the hands of citizens certain payments or 'free gifts' of credit in the form of currency from the community or State bank which should be established, so as to increase each individual's purchasing power. This is the real meaning of the agitation of which we hear so much, that the 'people's bank should be controlled by the people.' The outstanding attempt at exposition of this idea was that propounded by one, Major Douglas, and known as the Douglas Social Credit System."

For a garbled distortion this would take some beating! The purpose of the Social Credit monetary proposals is not to give the people more money than they have "earned," but to see that the money supply is equated with the goods and services available. If, in effecting this equation, we must have supplementary distributions of money which do not carry a burden of interest and can thus improve our family incomes without imposing any charge on industry which would increase prices, then that surely would be an occasion for congratulation and thanksgiving, not one for ridicule and misrepresentation. Money distributed to represent the "wages of the

machine" will be money "earned" by the organised community and will thus be a dividend from the inventions of our forefathers. The simple question to be answered is this: If machinery displaces human labour and causes a progressive fall in the amount distributed as "wages," how is industry to dispose of its products unless we adopt some new method of distributing money to the community? Obviously, we must depend less and less on wages, and more and more on dividends. Instead of helping to bring about these desirable and necessary conditions, "The Watchman" allies himself with the madmen shouting for full employment, harder struggles for markets (money), and consequently greater and more terrible wars. God forgive him!

The idea that social credit is similar to, but distinct from, "bank credit" indicates just how hazy the "Watchman" is on the subject. Social credit simply means the credit of society, whereas "bank credit" is merely the financial representation of a very small portion of it. To say that social credit is a different form of finance to be "administered by the State" is to talk rubbish. State administration has no place whatever in the proposals, and there is not much wrong with the present form of money. What is claimed is that the existing credit of society in the form of its physical wealth and productive potential should be monetised and used.

No Social Creditor has ever suggested that a Community Bank or State Bank should be established to distribute "free gifts and credit in the form of currency," and I know of no one who would not gladly accept a Treasury cheque without involving an increase in the currency (legal tender). It is quite easy to increase purchasing power without altering either the nature or the volume of the currency, but evidently the poor old "Watchman" doesn't understand the difference. Yet he tells his listeners that the real reason for the Government's banking proposals comes from Social Credit agitation and is to place the people in charge of the Commonwealth Bank so that they can help themselves to currency. That is not true, and to say that Major Douglas has been an outstanding advocate of such an arrangement is also not true.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2.
March 4, 1945.

(To be continued.)

ANOTHER MOSCOW MYSTERY

In the British House of Commons on November 28, 1944, Major-General Sir Alfred Knox asked the Secretary of State for War "what is the strength of the military mission at present at G.H.Q. in the U.S.S.R., and are there British military representatives with each Russian army in the field?"

Sir J. Grigg: "The strength of the British Inter-Service Mission in Moscow is at present 26 officers and 32 other ranks. There are no British military representatives with the Russian forces in the field, but a few visits to the front have been made."

Zionists in respect of Palestine. Fortunately the Turk was too stupid to understand or too sluggish to move . . . The Germans were equally alive to the fact that the Jews of Russia wielded considerable influence in Bolshevik circles. The Zionist movement was exceptionally strong in Russia and America . . . The support of the Zionists for the cause of the Entente would mean a great deal as a war measure . . . at any moment the Allies might have been forestalled in offering this supreme bid [to the Zionists]."

Note carefully the term, "supreme bid." Both sides were desperately bargaining to gain Jewish support, which was to be obtained by the highest bidder. We can thus see that powerful Jews were able to dictate one of the real objectives of the last war, as they are doing again in this war. In "Grey Steel; J. C. Smuts, a Study in Arrogance," by Captain H. C. Armstrong, the following appears:

"Weizmaui [Zionist leader] went to Smuts, the Christian, who welcomed him with enthusiasm. 'One of the great objects for which we fight this war,' said Smuts, 'is to provide a national home for the Jewish people.' . . . Smuts, German in outlook, said, 'I look upon the Germans as the most cultured race in the world.'"

Smuts is one of the world "leaders" now telling us about the "new order" to emerge after the war. There will be a new order in British countries, but it must be based on British principles. The British people are not fighting this war for Jewish aims, and an increasing number are beginning to believe the power of International Jewry far from being "invincible." International Jewry is only invincible so long as its aims and methods are not exposed.

Protocol No. 3 continues as follows: —

"It is the bottomless rascality of the goyim peoples, who crawl on their bellies to force, but are merciless towards weakness, unsparing to faults and indulgent to crimes, unwilling to bear the contradictions of a free social system but patient unto martyrdom under the violence of a bold despotism—it is those qualities which are aiding us to independence.

"From the premier-dictators of the present day the goyim peoples suffer patiently and bear such abuses as for the least of them they would have beheaded twenty kings.

"What is the explanation of this phenomenon, this curious inconsequence of the masses of the peoples in their attitude towards what would appear to be events of the same order?"

"It is explained by the fact that these dictators whisper to the peoples through their agents that through these abuses they are inflicting injury on the States with the highest purpose—to secure the welfare of the peoples, the international brotherhood of them all, their solidarity and equality of rights. Naturally, they do not tell the peoples that this unification must be accomplished only under our sovereign rule."

COMMENT:—

It is the practice of so-called progressive people today to talk about the tyrannies of the past under various Monarchies, while they themselves are living under a tyranny more soulless and inhuman than many monarchical tyrannies. The author of the "Protocols" anticipates the very argument used by Mussolini, Hitler and other "premier-dictators" to regiment the people. Everything is done "for the good of the State," or for the "common good," or for some nice-sounding, abstract "new world order." The British people have been inundated with insidious suggestions similar to the above ever since the Second World War broke out. So far as "unification" is concerned, pages could be filled with statements by various publicists, many of them socialists, claiming that Hitler and the Germans have inadvertently done an excellent job of unifying Europe, and that this unification must be maintained after the war! Wasn't it "lucky" that there was a Hitler and a German General Staff to start another war! How else could the people be persuaded to "unify." And isn't it remarkable that since France has been liberated from the Germans it has been discovered that the French Jews haven't been "exterminated" after all; and that Blum, the former Jewish millionaire Premier of a "Popular Front" French Government has been looked after by the Germans, during which time he has written a book advocating a United States of Europe!

Protocol No. 3 concludes as follows: —

"And thus the people condemn the upright and acquit the guilty, persuaded ever more and more that it can do whatsoever it wishes. Thanks to this state of things the people are destroying every kind of stability and creating disorders at every step.

"The word 'freedom' brings out the communities of men to fight against every kind of force, against every kind of authority, even against God and the laws of nature. For this reason we, when we come into our kingdom, shall have to erase this word from the lexicon of life as implying a principle of brute force which turns mobs into blood-thirsty beasts . . ."

(To be continued.)

MASTER-PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

"Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion"

With Commentary by ERIC D BUTLER (Continued from last issue.)

PROTOCOL NO. 3. (Continued.)

"Ever since that time [French Revolution] we have been leading the peoples from one disenchantment to another, so that in the end they should turn also from us in favour of that King-Despot of the blood of Zion, whom we are preparing for the world.

"At the present day we are, as an international force, invincible, because if attacked by some we are supported by other States."

COMMENT:—

Unfortunately, history proves that last contention beyond dispute.

The result of Hitler's attacks on some Jews—attacks which have been grossly exaggerated by the world's press, as demonstrated by the famous English publicist, Mr. Douglas Reed, in his book, "Lest We Regret"—has been the increasing campaign all over the world in favour of Jewish aims.

Some Jews have boasted that they won the last war. It is certain that prominent Jews have for centuries regarded wars as inseparable from successful pursuit of their objectives. In a contemporary Jewish publication, the book entitled "The Jewish National Home," Dr. Franz Kobler writes as follows under the significant title, "The Historical Antecedents":

"Lastly, in the second half of the same century someone approached Moses Mendelssohn, the philosopher, with a project for the Restoration of the Jews. Mendelssohn, in his reply, dated 26th January, 1770, though critical of the scheme, pointed out prophetically that a general European war appeared to him to offer the only chance of the scheme ever being realised, thus showing an astonishing foresight, as well as a deep understanding of the Jewish Question as an unsolved problem of world politics."

This statement is worthy of the closest study. The detachment from the sufferings of the victims of "a general European war" is really touching! It will be noted that it didn't matter which side "won" the war; the Jews would still achieve their objectives!

Without dealing with the Russian Revolution here, it may be of interest to recall the accomplishment of two other major Jewish aims as a result of the last war. The first was the financial enslavement of the British Empire by the Jewish financiers of the British Empire. Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador to Washington during the early years of the First World War, complained time and time again that the Jews were practically controlling the American Government and desired a German victory. He mentioned particularly Jacob Schiff and the Warburgs, of whom we shall learn more later. The following is an extract from a letter he wrote to Sir Edward Grey on November 15, 1914:

"The Jews show a strong preference for the Emperor (German), and there must be some bargain. Since Morgan's death, the Jewish Banks are supreme, and they have captured the Treasury Department . . . forcing upon him (the Secretary of the Treasury) the appointment of Warburg, the

SECURITY-FOR THE INSTITUTION, OR FOR THE INDIVIDUAL?

An Address by C. H. DOUGLAS, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 9, 1937

The matters on which I propose to speak to you tonight are so simple that, were it not for one fact of human experience, I should hesitate to trouble you with them. The fact is that it is the simplest matters that always form the subject of the most profound misunderstanding, and in regard to which the average individual is the most difficult to convince of any error in his belief.

You will remember that it was a matter of common certainty for many thousands of years that the sun revolved round the earth, and when the astronomer Galileo produced quite unshakable evidence to show that, on the contrary, the earth revolved round the sun, he was regarded as a blasphemous heretic and was severely punished.

Now, the first of these very simple matters, which I propose to bring to your attention, is the difference between POLICY and ADMINISTRATION, together with the primary importance of policy. If a man is standing on the platform of Newcastle Central Station, it is obviously of primary importance whether he decides to go to Edinburgh or Darlington. The question as to whether he goes by a fast or a slow train, whether he finds that the railway is well or badly operated, or whether he decides finally to go by motor-car is of secondary importance to the question of his making up his mind WHERE he wants to go.

A POLICY OF WORK

In all the discussions, which are allowed to obtain wide publicity on the affairs of the world at the present day, every effort is made to concentrate attention upon questions of administration, on HOW to make the railway in my allegory better, or HOW to improve the road or the motorcar.

The point I want to impress upon you at the outset is that we are having a policy IMPOSED upon us, and that policy is the cause of our troubles. Any discussion as to how that policy shall be administered, whether by a dictatorship, so-called democracy, Fascism, Bolshevism, Nazi-ism, or otherwise, is merely irrelevant.

This policy, which is practically identical everywhere, whether in Russia, Italy or Germany, is the gospel of work. "If a man will not work neither shall he eat." It is not for nothing that Paul, the Roman Jew, is the patron saint of the City of London.

I must emphasise the point that the policy is NOT "If a man does not work there will be nothing to eat." To the extent that such a statement is true, the other statement is reasonable. But to say that all men have to work in industry at trade union rates for trade union hours before it is possible for all men to eat, is flagrantly untrue and becomes less true every day, except as a policy.

I propose to bring as forcibly as possible to your attention that it is not the prime object of existence to find employment. I have no intention of being dogmatic as to what IS the prime object of existence, but I am entirely confident that it is NOT comprised in the endless pursuit of turning this originally very beautiful world into slag-heaps, blast-furnaces, guns and battleships. It is just at this point that the extreme simplicity of the dilemma in which the world finds itself becomes evident, and it is at this point that it is so difficult for most of us to grasp what is equally simple, which is that the mere fact that some of us may earn our living by building a battleship does not in itself mean that it would not be possible for us to live much better, more comfortably, and more safely, if that battleship were not built.

Do not misunderstand me. This is not an address on pacifism. On the contrary, I think the determined opposition of the oligarchy, which rules us to any effective financial reform, has made war nearly inevitable and rearmament imperative.

What I am endeavouring to explain is that the fact that you are paid wages for designing and building a battleship, and that with those wages, salaries (or, if you are shareholders in the companies that build them, the dividends), you buy yourself the amenities of life, does not mean that it is written in the law of nature that you cannot get those amenities unless you build a battleship. If, in addition to having your energies diverted to building a tool of destruction instead of a tool of construction, you are going to be taxed to pay for it and for the money the banks create out of paper and ink to pay your wages, you will be a triple loser.

PASSPORTS TO PROSPERITY

But you have no doubt noticed—though you have perhaps not noticed it so much on the North-East Coast as we have noticed it in the South—that the setting to work of a large proportion of the industrial population of this country on the manufacture of things intended to kill or wound or otherwise inflict pain and misery upon other human beings, has been accompanied by what our lords and masters refer to as a revival of prosperity. And they are already explaining that their best efforts are being devoted to finding methods by which we shall be kept busy, when, if ever, we have enough battleships. The most hopeful avenue, they consider, is to capture further export markets.

But they do not explain that other countries also, under this remarkable system of ours, wish to capture export markets—that this effort to capture further export markets will, therefore, require the building of further battleships, so as to keep other people in what we consider is their proper place.

If you were to say to an intelligent child that the aim or objective of the average human being was to live in a pleasant

house, have sufficient to eat, and to be well-clothed, I think that child would say at once that what you ought to do was to build sufficient pleasant houses, grow sufficient food, and weave whatever clothes you require—and then stop and enjoy yourself. But most of us, I am afraid, are not intelligent children. Some of us are even economists! And to an economist it is impossible, apparently, to imagine a state of affairs in which, if you want something, you proceed to make it. The economist says it cannot be done that way—if you want a loaf of bread you must obtain employment making radio-sets, or machine-guns, or something else!

Once again, do not misunderstand me. I am not saying that you should not make radio sets or machine-guns. What I mean is that it is not fundamentally necessary to make radio sets or machine-guns in order to obtain a loaf of bread. An easier and shorter way is to grow and grind the wheat and then bake the bread. (The radio set, which you do make, will probably be used for the purpose of misinforming you in regard to the true price of bread, and the machine-gun will probably be used to shoot you down. But that is entirely your business.)

Now if you say this sort of thing to an orthodox economist or to your bank manager, he will probably look at you with pity for your simplicity, and will say, "Ah, but this country cannot support its own population." The first reply which I think most of us would make to this remark is that it

this full employment becomes increasingly difficult to insure in respect of what is called the home market; therefore, foreign markets, which it must be remembered are equally desired, under this insane system, by every country, and, therefore, are matters for fierce competition, are stated by our bank chairmen to be essential to our prosperity.

Since these foreign markets are equally matters for the competition of every country, sooner or later this competition leads to friction, and from friction to the threat of war, with the result, which is very much to the advantage of our lords and masters, that we have to build large and expensive navies and air forces to deal with the situation which our competition for foreign markets has brought about

Of course, the building of these fleets provides more employment, and therefore the system is carried on a little further towards the inevitable catastrophe.

If you have followed me so far, you will begin to see that all the efforts which we make towards so-called security at present are merely action taken to preserve, for a little longer, institutions, and notably the financial and industrial institutions, and that in working to preserve these we only insure ourselves, as individuals, further hardship and anxiety and eventual catastrophe.

CORRECT ACTION THE ONLY SAVIOUR

It is not too much to say that the whole future of the human race depends, if not upon an understanding of the problem which I am trying to put before you tonight, at any rate upon correct action in regard to it.

I can at once imagine that you will say, "How is it possible to obtain correct action in regard to this problem until a very large proportion of the people concerned understand what the problem is?" Well, the answer to that is really very simple, too.

If you could only persuade people to ask for what they want, instead of for some method through which they think that what

SIGNIFICANT POLITICAL POINTERS

(Continued from page 1.)

The world centralisers have already struck trouble with their first new major world organisation U.N.R.R.A. Even Dr. Evatt has been forced to admit that over-centralisation of U.N.R.R.A. has had disastrous results.

It appears rather obvious now that U.N.R.R.A. is providing the means of training staff for the intended world-bureaucracies. When U.N.R.R.A. finishes, all its trained personnel could take jobs with permanent world organisations. Dr. Evatt himself has supplied us with evidence to support this idea. Speaking of U.N.R.R.A. in the Federal House on November 16 of last year, he said:—

"... there is a close link between the food and agriculture organisation and relief. The effects of relief will often be of a long-term character, and it is important to establish continuity between war-time organisation, the relief organisation, and the permanent Food and Agriculture Organisation."

does not support its own population very well at the present time; and the second comment one would make is that if it is a question of feeding the population, how is it that the amount of home-grown food which is produced is steadily decreasing, rather than that efforts are being made to increase it?

The point which I am endeavouring to get you to realise is that what is called full employment is always put forward as being the aim of our modern society, and it is assumed, and never argued about in official circles, that without full employment it is impossible for the population of the country to be fully supported in food, shelter and clothing, and that it is better to have full employment making poison gas, than any unemployment.

INSTITUTIONS FILCHING SECURITY

I do not propose this evening to go over the well-known fact of the startling increase in productivity per unit of human labour during the past 150 years. I am going to ask you to take it from me that it is only the diversion of a very large percentage of human activity to ends which either do not conduce to its health and happiness, or are even a direct threat to those desirable ends, which prevent us from supporting ourselves in great comfort and security—with the accompaniment of an amount of leisure which would enable us to make the fullest use of our opportunities.

Employment as an end in itself is a concerted policy to be found in practically every country. It is an international policy, and it proceeds from the great international power in the world—the power of finance. It is conscious, and it is sustained by every argument and force at the disposal of that great international power, because it is the means by which mankind is kept in continual, if concealed, slavery.

May I ask you to divest your minds as far as possible of every political preoccupation and to consider whether the fundamental policy of Fascist Italy, so-called Communist Russia, the United States, Germany, and Great Britain is not identical, and that it is, by varying methods but with identical objectives, to force people to subordinate themselves, for a number of hours per day greatly in excess of those really necessary, to a work system?

It is a matter of common observation that

In September of last year, Pope Pius XII said in a broadcast:—

"The Christian conscience cannot admit as just a social order which either denies in principle or renders impossible or nugatory in practice the natural right to property, whether in the consumption of goods or in the means of production."

This journal is non-sectarian, and the present writer is not a Catholic. But surely anyone not completely blinded by bigotry must admit that the above statement is fundamental. There can be no real liberty without private ownership of property.

The world's press, with comparatively few exceptions, can be relied upon to give wide publicity to the views of any "progressive" international planner who desires to destroy still further the rights of the individual.

Pope Pius's speech, in which the above statement appeared, was almost completely ignored by the world's press. Why? No prizes for the correct answer.—E.D.B.

they want can be given to them, the problem would be half solved already.

Nothing is more dangerous than inexact knowledge. It is the man who thinks he can sail a boat who wrecks a boat, not the man who knows he can't and doesn't try, but merely says, "Let me out." At the present time the affairs of practically every country are at the mercy of a small group of people who know exactly what they want, which is NOT what YOU want. This small group manipulates much larger groups, who don't know what they want, but think they know how to get it.

The working man of this country has been taught by propaganda of all kinds that it is a meritorious thing for him to say "I want work," but a contemptible thing to say "I want money." Once again, please do not think I am suggesting that there is anything virtuous about laziness. Far from it. There is nothing especially virtuous about work, either. I have worked at least as hard as most people, and most of the time I did it because I liked it.

The healthy human individual requires work of some kind, just as he requires food; but he is not a healthy individual, mentally at any rate, if he cannot find work for himself, and probably find work, which he can do far better than that which is arranged for him by somebody else. If he cannot, he ought to be in a mental institution, which, in fact, is where most of us are, the headquarters being the Bank of England.

There has been a cant-phrase in politics in this country since the days of Mr. Asquith that the will of the people must prevail. Mr. Asquith was probably one of the greatest experts in modern history at arranging that the will of the people did NOT prevail. And the method which was followed, though not initiated by him—a method which still appears to be successful—is to divide up the population into warring sects, each of which imagines that it has a complete set of blueprints for the construction of an immediate Utopia. Since practically all these Utopias are schemes for penalising somebody else, you have only to adopt each in turn and eventually you will have reduced everyone to a dead level of slavery—which is what is happening.

(To be continued)

(Copyright)

(All rights reserved)

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

WHEAT WORRIES: The New York "Journal of Commerce" comments that "although the drought has eliminated Australia from the 1945 wheat and flour export market, there is ample surplus for world needs which can be met by other exporting countries. Canada, Argentina and U.S. enter 1945 with a combined surplus of 1075 million bushels, of which they could export 630 million bushels in the first half of the year; these countries are also expected to increase their acreage. This means that our wheat growers have well and truly done their job, in return for which they are pauperised by low prices and taxation as well as being browbeaten by meddlesome bureaucrats. However, it may be a good opportunity to rest some of our wheat lands in order to arrest erosion and to restore fertility. Of course the income of the farmer would have to be provided during this recuperative period.

RUSSIAN RESOURCES: An article in the Melbourne "Herald" of January 27, commenting on Lease-Lend, says that "apart from front-line transport, where American machines predominate, the greatest bulk of Russia's supplies have been home produced by women, of whom the writer says: "You see women, young and old, working on railways, driving trucks, loading supplies; and in the grey early hours of the coldest winter nights in Moscow, you will see them literally in thousands with small iron picks cleaning the ice from, the city's streets a few square inches at a time. You see them in long lines waiting for many hours to buy a few hundred grammes of bread or a litre of milk or a pair of shoes." It is an amazing story of courage and backwardness, which surely deserves a better New Order than socialism can offer them. Maybe a little knowledge of the outer world, made possible by the war, will speed their cause.

GREEK GANGSTERS: When asked by Sir Walter Citrine, "whether they agreed with the opinion widely held in England, that the E.L.A.S. was a democratic body with the highest principles and purpose," British troops in an Athens cinema replied, "They are thugs and terrorists." Delegates of the British T.U.G. each personally questioned 200 men to get information on the activities of these treacherous Communists posing as Greek liberators. Chapter and verse was demanded by Sir Walter Citrine, who said, "soldiers one after another testified that members of the E.L.A.S. abused the white flag and shot stretcher-bearers." The meeting endorsed the remarks of one soldier, that "they are the filthiest and lowest crowd that ever were." And yet local Communists cabled the British Government in defence of the E.L.A.S. gangsters!

PROBLEM PARADES: Army regulations A.M.R. and 0289 (2) provide that a soldier who has a problem or grievance can demand progressive parades—that is, before his company commander, commanding officer, brigade commander and formation commander. The regulations also restrict the authority under which a soldier can be penalised, demoted or deprived of any special pay or privileges. These provisions may be useful in minor matters. However, soldier readers of this paper would employ a much simpler method of having major grievances rectified—by writing direct to their Federal Representative, thus bringing criticism from the top rather than following red-tape proceedings from the bottom.

PETROL PROFITS: Our anti-profit socialistic politicians provide another illustration of fair words and foul action in the matter of petrol profiteering. Most trusting people thought, when the Government acquired a 51% controlling share in the Commonwealth Oil Refinery, that this move would keep the other petrol combines honest by its competition; but, alas, it was another empty dream! The latest figures of the C.O.R. trading activities disclose that since 1942 its profits have been more than 1200%. If it were a private company, the principals might expect to be lynched. Of course, while the Government sets the standard of profiteering, the other companies follow suit. In addition to this mulcting, petrol prices are loaded by millions of pounds through sales tax, which constitutes an attack on the people's living standards. No Government that takes part in or permits this form of legalised gangsterism can lay any claim to honesty.

—O. B. H.

IF YOU HAVE HAD ENOUGH—

of the erstwhile "Nationalist" Party, with its attempts to emulate the chameleon—of the Labor Party, with its oscillations between Communism and private monopoly—of the banking sham-fight—of the centralisation of power, and real government by remote control—

READ THE "PROGRAMME OF THE AUSTRALIAN PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT." Obtainable at City Book sellers or Hon. Secretary, Melbourne Branch, 203 Tooronga Road, E. Hawthorn. (Price: one shilling.)

AN IMPORTANT BROADCAST

"NAILING BANK LIES"

3AW, Saturday, March 10, at 6.45 p.m.

HEAR THIS REVEALING BROADCAST, WHICH WILL GIVE THE REAL TRUTH ABOUT THE BANKS. Authorised by New World Movement, 300 Little Collins St., Melbourne.

—Adv't.

ORIGIN & AIMS OF ZIONIST MOVEMENT

By N. F. W., in the "Social Creditor," England.

"He that plots to be the only figure among cyphers is the decay of the whole age."—FRANCIS BACON.

With the threat of "Technical Peace," along with all its tremendous problems, assuming, visible proportions on the international horizon, I think we should attempt to get some general idea at least of one of the most, if not THE most vital issue that will be presented to us; and that is, the question of political Judaism, the effective spearhead of which is wrapped up in what is known as the Zionist Movement.

We are likely to make most headway in dealing with anything connected with the Jewish race, if we face certain facts concerning it as our starting-point, and accept them without rancour.

The Jew, notwithstanding the inhuman treatment his behaviour has evoked all down the centuries, is a human being, and the problem he presents, no matter how exaggerated and acute it is in his case, is only an accentuation of something common to humanity. To Nature, the Great Physician, and from the standpoint of perfect balance, we are all of us more or less "pathological cases." Where the Jew differs from the rest of us is in presenting a case of collective racial neurasthenia.

It should not be necessary to elaborate this point. We are all familiar with individual cases of neurasthenia; we have noted its exaggerated touchiness and egotism, the rapid reaction from one extreme to the other, and, above all, the persecution mania, which makes every event appear like a threat to existence. We all know what a tragedy it is, and how upsetting, not only for the individual concerned but for the whole household, when one member gets, so to speak, on the wrong foot in the Dance of Life. It is obvious, when the same thing happens to a race, and that race is dispersed as the Jews are, throughout all the civilised nationalities of the world, that the tragedy and the upset will be exactly the same, only swelled to international proportions.

That, I think, is the chief conditioning factor as to what is popularly known as "the international situation." And when settlements and adjustments come to be made after the present military phase of world affairs is over, all signs indicate that there will be a tremendous resurgence of the "problem of Palestine," and that it will dominate, and colour, and distort, the situation out of all geographical and national proportions, as it did during, and at the end of, the 1914-18 phase.

All the more reason, then, to have some general idea of what constitutes Zionism—its background and history and, if possible, its implications.

Has the British House of Commons, one wonders, any clearer attitude to the matter than it had in 1918, or does it still oscillate between a gentlemanly "anti-Semitism," and sentimentality of the type represented by the late Lord Wedgwood? Has British statesmanship learned anything in the intervening years, or are Churchill and Eden still where Lloyd George and Balfour were then? Lloyd George imagining he could intrigue, and ally himself and his country, with the International Jew and come out unscathed; and Balfour, the sentimentalist, with, as he imagined, detached, experimental sympathetic interest in the Jewish problem. Has England learned anything during this last unhappy quarter of a century? It is profoundly to be hoped so.

What IS Zionism and the Zionist Movement? Ostensibly it is the organised desire and need of the Jewish race for a National and Territorial Home. Were that all, there could be no justifiable opposition to it, except that its realisation in the specific manner demanded by the Jews involves the territorial rights of another nation—the Arabs.

It is hardly possible, however, in view of its history that the Movement represents no more than that. So, leaving the matter here, let us glance at the origin of Zionism in its present form.

It is of comparatively recent growth. Officially it dates only from the First Zionist Congress held in Basle in 1897, when Theodore Herzl was elected first president.

That event, however, according to L. Fry, * was the co-ordination of a number of more or less similar movements in different countries under the same impulse. She cites five founded between 1864 and 1869, beginning with the Brotherhood for the Awakening of Slumbering Jews, in Moscow, and including the Alliance Israelite Universelle, at Paris. The common object was to warn Jewry of the danger of racial extinction, through the natural process of assimilation by the Gentile nations! Nineteenth-century humanitarianism and enlightenment, it appeared, "threatened" to solve the abstract Jewish Problem by absorption into the Gentile body politic—the only reasonable way of escape, it would almost seem, open to those who, for whatever reason, elect to have no body politic of their own. That it would be the only happy solution for the individual Jew, there can be little doubt; though how the Gentile economies would stand the meal is, of course, another question.

However, with those who control any considerable association of individuals, and in proportion as they are not its openly declared (democratically elected) heads, the inevitable tendency is for the interests of the individuals composing the association to come second—and often a very bad second—to the preservation of the associa-

* "Waters Flowing Eastward," by L. Fry. (British-American Press.)

tion, the Kollektivismus, to give it its ugly Continental name.

This is one of the innate weaknesses of dictatorship or centralised control, and when it is allied, as it is in the case of the Jewish race, with Occultism; where the national organisation is on the lines of a Secret Society, in which the policy of the high-ups is completely hidden (occult) from the low-downs and even the middles, the weakness is fatal—to individual happiness, that is. What we are dealing with here is, of course, just human nature, and it constitutes the comprehensive and imperative reason for keeping Collectivism—all excessive centralisation really, and "Socialist" theory—strictly in its place. The safety of democracy, on the other hand, lies in its comparative unsecretiveness. If there is corruption, as there must be, it is more or less open and winked at. That is deplorable, of course, from the point of view of the doctrinaire, the puritan, but it does allow the decomposing gases to get away and serious explosions are thus avoided. Continentals never can understand Anglo-Saxon cynicism because they are incapable of appreciating the above natural fact.

This urge towards self- and racial-preservation among the members of the Jewish Kahal, or Council, during the latter half of the 19th century, which was signalled by the sudden appearance of these widely dispersed but politically similar organisations, such as the Brotherhood for Awakening the Slumbering Jews mentioned, was closely followed by "events" calculated to remind the rank-and-file, should they be liable to forget it, of their racial distinction.

Whether one regards the suggestion as far-fetched or not, one must admit that the most effective means to that end were undoubtedly Gentile "anti-Semitism" and persecution.

However it arose—and the assassination of the Tsar Alexander II in 1881 was one immediate cause—a wave of pogroms and persecution swept Eastern Europe at this time, and in Russia in particular the plight of the individual Jew was desperate. To quote from a book by an ardent Zionist† referring to this Russian situation:

"Hints were given from high places that the Western frontier was open . . . and seized by a mass psychosis, and impressed by the ominous utterances of their national poets" (my emphasis), "the Jews began the greatest migration in their history. Between 1880 and 1913, 2,359,476 Jews arrived in the United States. . . . In 1880 there were in America about a quarter of a million Jews, mostly of Sephardic and German origin. Today there are almost 5,000,000. The rise of the Russian Jew in America in such a short period is one of the most amazing phenomena in history. . . . The same story repeats itself, though on a smaller scale . . . in England, Canada, South Africa."

THE IMPORTANCE OF QUEBEC

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Creditor."

It may, or it may not be adventitious that Quebec has been the scene of certain historic conferences.

It is a not unimportant effect of the Federal Constitution of the Dominion of Canada that, in the mind of most of the inhabitants of Great Britain, and of the sister Dominions, the significance of Quebec, and the bearing of its relationship to the rest of Canada is either underestimated or altogether missed.

As it is, Ottawa presents Canada to the world in much the same guise of homogeneity as does the picture we conceive of Australia or New Zealand; and the Federal mask obscures the fact that both in area, and possibly in total population, the largest province of Canada and that containing the largest city is mainly French-speaking, and in its non-urban areas is far more akin to seventeenth century Auvergne than it is to Glasgow, Toronto, or New York.

The distinction between the "habitant," the French Quebec settler, and the predominantly Anglo-Saxon Canadian of Ontario and the West goes much deeper than language.

In the first place, the social structure of Quebec is probably the most genuinely Catholic culture under the British flag; whereas Ontario and the West are predominantly Protestant and work-ridden. The habitant is a hard worker, but only because he has to be, and never, if he can help it, indoors. He is merry, a great singer and dancer, and a hardy pioneer. He invariably begets a large family, and both he and they appear to enjoy it.

He is a Canadian, but he is definitely a French-Canadian, not a Canadian "tout court." He has never had a Government, which dealt with London on equal terms, and while French-Canadians have been amply represented at Ottawa in ministerial offices, they have generally been corporation lawyers, and, with the exception of Sir Wilfred Laurier, a man of outstanding ability, they have not commonly dealt with external and inter-imperial business.

But there could be no greater mistake than to suppose that therefore the habitant's only link with the outer world is through Ottawa.

In this period of tension and turmoil arose Theodore Herzl. As a foreign correspondent of the Jewish-owned Viennese paper, "Die Neue Freie Presse," in Paris, he reported the Dreyfus case, which, it is said, "made a Jew of Herzl." His book, "The Jewish State," was published in 1896, and the next year saw the First Zionist Congress.

Between that date and the first phase of the World War, the battle of Zionism raged, not against the Gentile, however, but among the Jews themselves.

The Western, mainly Sephardic, Jews, whose theory and inclination regarding the problem of their race was termed Assimilationism—Gentile absorption—being not so badly off, particularly in England and France, were, naturally enough, for letting well alone. But the size and squalor and acuteness of the "problem" in Eastern Europe, and the streaming westward exodus from Russia and Poland, proved too much for the theory of Assimilation. In the end the Zionist won out, with the help of Kaiser Wilhelm's battalions, and Zionism as an active political organisation, with a usefully appealing exterior—a National Home for the outcast and the homeless—was established.

There can be no doubt, I think, as to the astuteness of the move, of the Movement. It holds, of course, no real solution of the Jewish problem in the Gentile sense, which is the assumption that some decent compromises must be found; some mutual reconciliation of the respective position of individual Jews and Gentiles living together on this globe, such as the theory of Assimilation propounds—whether we agree with it or not.

There is no compromise in Zionism; its success, from the point of view of its instigators, is the absolute supercession of Gentile policy EVERYWHERE by Jewish policy.

Here is a useful definition of Zionism aims from the pen of Professor Brodetsky, of Leeds University, and a member of the original British Committee of the Movement, which appears in a very useful symposium,‡ contributed to by the majority of present-day leaders of Zionism in Britain: "Reduced to its uttermost limits of simplicity," says the Professor, "our policy contains two principles: civic equality in all lands, and free national life in Palestine." (There is more than a hint there of the Atlantic Charter, or of its origin.)

It will be seen that the Zionist demands, like those of all abstractionists, are for two incompatibles. For the Jews, being internationalists—"civic equality in all lands"—are committed to regard the entire world as their "home," actual and potential; a fact which automatically debars them from the geographical and physical reality of a National Home.

Palestine, therefore, to the real instigators of Zionism, is intended to be no more than a window-show—no real home in the sense that no doubt a number of sincere and enthusiastic Jews regard it—but a H.Q. from which to conduct the International Campaign.

It looks as though there is every reason for the Awakening of the Slumbering Jews—but not quite in the sense intended by the promoters of the original Brotherhood!

(To be continued)

† "The Jewish Struggle," by Ben Jacob.

(Geo. Allen and Unwin, 1942.)

‡ "The Jewish National Home," edited by Paul Goodman. (Dent.)

COMMUNISTIC CONFIDENCE TRICK

The most extraordinary thing about the Communists (not the simpletons who fall for it, but the "big shots"—the shrewd-heads who sell the idea)—is their colossal impudence.

The confidence trick is worked with such effrontery as to disarm suspicion. For instance, they bark, "Fascist," at anyone who opposes them; yet it is precisely Fascism they are trying to set up. They pose as defenders of "Democracy"; in reality they condemn it and are bent on its destruction.

So successfully have they got away with it, that people think you are just playing at paradox when you say that this gang is Fascist and is bent on the destruction of Democracy. Yet nothing is easier than to prove this on the four fingers and the thumb.

Look at this. A circular recently issued by the Central Committee of the Australian Communist Party says this: "The difference between a Fascist regime and a democratic regime is the existence of freely elected parliaments and councils—and, most important—the existence of free peoples' organisations, like the Labour Party, the Communist Party, and the trade unions."

If the "existence of freely elected parliaments and councils" is the mark of democracy, then the Soviet is most surely not a democracy; nor could any Communist regime be a democracy.

In the Soviet you choose between voting for Communist A or Communist B; but you cannot choose between a Communist and a non-Communist, for the Communist Party is the only one that is allowed to exist. The Soviet makes no bones about this.

Thus the "Moscow News" (November 7, 1936, page 19), in an article on the new Constitution of 1936, declares: "We desire to give the Soviet people absolute liberty of voting for those they desire to elect," but explains in the same column: "In the Soviet Union there are not, and cannot be, any other political organs than the Communist Party."

Pat Sloane, one of our leading Reds and author of "How the Soviet State is Run," explains on pages 58 and 59 of his book just how all schools of political opposition are liquidated.

The Labour Party would very swiftly be "liquidated" as Fascist reactionaries, the moment the Reds gain power here.

You see now the colossal impudence. It is they who are the Red Fascists on their own showing.

No wonder the general council of the Labour Party and Trades Union Congress of Great Britain declared as far back as March, 1933: "If the British working class toy with the idea of dictatorship, Fascist or Communist, they will go down to servitude such as they have never suffered."

Make no mistake about this: the Australian Communist Party is out to set up its own dictatorship; it is essentially Fascist, through and through; its leaders are political gunmen. —"New Era."

DON'T MISS THIS!

YOU may obtain, free of charge, a small parcel of assorted recent back numbers of the "New Times" if you simply write and ask for it. Our postal address is Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne. If you live in or near Melbourne, you may prefer to call at our office in McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.

YOU can spread our ideas and help us to increase our circulation by distributing some of these specimen copies to fellow-citizens. What about it?

an able Dominican, Pere Georges Henri Levesque, published a short book entitled "Credit Social et Catholicisme," the tenor of which may be gathered from his conclusion: "Si vous ne voulez ni du communisme ni du socialisme, opposez-leur le Credit Social: il met entre vos mains une arme terrible contre ces ennemis."

("If you desire neither Communism nor Socialism, place against them Social Credit: it puts into your hands a terrible weapon against these enemies.")

Like all such books written by the clergy, it was "permitted." About this time, a number of public-spirited French Canadians, notable amongst whom was, and is, Monsieur Louis Even, began to popularise the conception of Social Credit as the one policy which met the needs of the French-Canadian. Their energy was immense and their success immediate and impressive.

Clearly, this would not do at all. The Canadian Bankers' Association deputed a Mr. Vernon Knowles to enlighten those whom it might concern as to the "real" nature of Social Credit.

(To be concluded.)

THE COMMONWEALTH STORIES

Owing to many requests received, Mr. D. J. Amos is reprinting these Stories. The following numbers are now procurable from Mr. Amos, c/o 17 Waymouth St., Adelaide:—

No. 1 — The Story of the Commonwealth Bank.

No. 2 — The Story of the Commonwealth Fleet of Steamers.

No. 6 — The Story of the Commonwealth Wireless Service.

The remaining three numbers will be published as funds and paper are procurable. —Advt

Printed by M. F. Canavan, 25 Cullinford-road, Hartwell, for the New Times Ltd. McEwan House Melbourne.