

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. 27. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JULY 13, 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.

Urgent Problems for Australian Democrats

The Question of Majority Rule"

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

For the House of Representatives every man and woman of 21 years of age and over has a vote, and this is called a democratic vote. Since this democratic vote has been in existence in Australia and in England for a good many years now, and since the result of this vote has been increasingly distressing and unfortunate for the poor taxpayer, it may be that this thing they describe as democratic may be like many of our other modern institutions—exactly the opposite to what it pretends to be.

It might prove profitable, therefore, to examine more closely what is called the "Majority Vote" and "Majority Rule." In Trade Union circles and kindred organisations, men have been taught to believe that by putting a question to the vote and obtaining a majority ruling that they are doing something very democratic; that they are settling a problem in the only possible way, and that they have obtained the right answer. But I would put this one question to those of you who have had some experience in the affairs of life:

How often have you, when amongst friends, put a VITAL question to the vote?

I should say seldom, if ever.

In small compact groups, a vote is only used to register a practically unanimous opinion of people who are prepared to shoulder the responsibilities of their decision. But when a large organisation takes a vote of its members, either the question does not affect the members vitally—and then the question usually could be left to executives to decide—or, if it concerns the members vitally, and the voting is not unanimous, then the minority must be severely hurt.

In a free democratic community, the minority can withdraw from the organisation and start a fresh one where there is unanimity of opinion and policy; but where the minority is not free to withdraw and is compelled to submit to a policy of which it heartily disapproves, then the majority vote is merely a thin disguise, or a cloak, to hide the policeman's baton.

This should never be forgotten, and the various reformers in our midst who wish to compel you and me by law to do what we have no intention of doing, are merely attempting to use brute force on us.

Significant Political Pointers

All the international planners—perhaps plotters is a more appropriate term—have one thing in common: they seem to think that their plots are so successfully advanced now that they can be as blatant and arrogant as they like.

Dr. Evatt, who made it perfectly clear immediately after the Referendum last year that the people's decision meant nothing to him, has since worked hard to make use of international agreements to increase the Central Government's powers. Should there be any doubt in anyone's mind concerning the Doctor's intentions, the following statement made by him at San Francisco will dispel it—

"It is, of course, quite clear that every international agreement we make places an obligation upon Australia to fulfill it. For this reason it may well be that in certain circumstances the existing external affairs power can be used by the Commonwealth Parliament for the purpose of carrying into effect in Australia the precise terms of the international agreement" (vide Melbourne "Argus," June 16).

The blatancy of the plotters will yet be their undoing. Consider the Jew, Laski's, recent utterances in England!

In a very engaging article by Professor Walter Murdoch, "Our Vanishing Annals," published in the Melbourne "Herald" of June 9, the following passage is worth quoting:

"Memory is the very foundation of human life. A man who has lost the power of remembering what happened a moment

Bureaucratic Menace

"A comparatively small body of officials, coherent, having common interests, and acting under central authority, has an immense advantage over an incoherent public which has no settled policy, and can be brought to act unitedly only under strong provocation. Hence an organisation of officials, once passing a certain stage of growth, becomes less and less resistible; as we see in the bureaucracies of the Continent."

—Herbert Spencer, in "Man versus the State."

The majority vote, therefore, is only democratic when the minority have some means of escape from victimisation. Where this is not the case, then the majority vote can by no stretch of the imagination be called democratic.

I have been in an organisation where members, by contributing 2/6 a year, but giving no time or thought to the work, could, and did, out-vote those who worked solidly practically every day throughout the year. You can understand, therefore, that as an organisation becomes very large and the members have various interests, a vote usually becomes a weapon used by unscrupulous men to give legal sanction to their own actions and purposes. This is particularly the case in political elections and in large trade unions. A snap vote is the device of the devil, which the dictator uses as a "democratic" screen, thus escaping responsibility.

It should be remembered, too, that when the general vote was given to the people of England it was introduced by the great industrialists and financial interests long before the Labour Party was pushed into office. It was probably realised then that the popular majority vote could easily be manipulated to out-vote and to destroy by taxation the few independent men who make the life of tyrants so uncomfortable.

How many voters know the man they vote for? How many know how those men are picked, and for what reasons? Those of us who do not like either party, how do we vote? Many people who vote Labour like that party probably less than I do, but they won't vote for the Opposition. The Labour leaders know this—that is why they do not require to do anything for their supporters—except, of course, for the picked few. The same applies to the Opposition.

before has lost the power of thinking. In the individual memory is the basis of intelligence; in the nation, it is the basis of civilisation."

Professor Murdoch has touched on something very important here. Douglas has expanded this matter in "The Big Idea." He writes:—

"But there is a type, of history which is four-dimensional . . . this memory-history, over the period of a lifetime, has a practical value out of all proportion to anything available in print. It forms the basis of effective ability. We call it experience."

Accurate memory of the past is certainly, as Professor Murdoch puts it, "the basis of civilisation." No doubt that is why the "Protocols" state that people must be "educated" in such a manner that they will have no accurate memory of the past. The phrase, "the good old days," often used by people over fifty years of age, is worthy of more serious consideration by some of our smart young things. They might discover that the "good old days," with all their obvious faults, were more comfortable for the majority of people to live in than are these days of the "progressive" New Order.

Mr. Arthur Calwell, M.H.R., would no doubt be very indignant if he were told that he believes in tyranny. But he does. He has told us so himself. During the debates on the Banking Bills, Mr. White asked Mr. Calwell whether socialism is democracy, and Mr. Calwell replied:

"Of course socialism is democracy. Anything the majority wants is democratic."

And so, if, by high-pressure blah, any political party can persuade 60 per cent, of the electors to vote for that party, it can then go ahead and attack the other 40 per cent—all in the name of democracy!

C. H. Douglas has commented on this majority-rule racket. In "The Big Idea" he says this:—

(Continued on page 4.)

At election times the voters are caught in a cleft stick; the voters are given the same choice as Henry Ford gave his customers when he made his first car; he said: "You can have any colour you like as long as it is black."

In a democratic election, the voters are supposed to have a free choice of candidates: what you are actually given is the privilege of deciding for yourself whether you will be boiled in oil or hanged by the neck.

And after the great "democracy" has spoken, and the "will of the people" has prevailed, then the permanent army of bureaucrats, officered by permanent Commissioners, carry out a permanent policy interrupted by which way the people have voted. If you do not consider this a reasonable analysis of the political set-up in this country, ask yourself these questions: When in the history of Australia did the people ever give permission for the increasing of their taxes? When have they ever been given permission to decide this question so vital to their existence?

When Labour was the Opposition in Canberra they violently attacked Professor Copland and Mr. Essington Lewis and others. Labour is now in office—why are these two men still in power? When the Opposition was in office, Labour violently attacked the Man-power Regulations and Industrial Conscription; now Labour is in office and they want to continue industrial conscription after the war!

Or, to go further afield, why did the so-

GROWING GESTAPO: The Acting Prune Minister (Mr. Forde) in a written reply to Mr. Holt, M.H.R., published in the Melbourne "Sun" of July 4 admitted that Commonwealth Officers investigating the private activities of Australians totalled 1058 in addition to 847 members of the Post and Telegraph section. These snoopers are attached only to particular Ministers; that is, they are the Minister's personal snoopers. Mr. Holt pointed out that the object of his questions on this matter was to elicit the extent to which a possible post-war "Gestapo" had been planted in Government organisations. This is, of course, the obvious development of Bureaucratic Government, and, unless responsible democratic government is restored, complete Serfdom is inevitable. It is a potent reason for pressing on with the Anti-Bureaucratic Campaign, the purpose of which is to reduce the personnel of the bureaucracy at least to the pre-war level.

DAIRY-FARMERS' DEBTS: A member of the Dairywomen's Organisation, at a meeting held at Mount Larcom (Qld.), protested against the exploitation of women and children in the dairying industry. Presumably a strike was mooted, judging by the following comment by a member: "The recent statement that farmers could not strike because 90% were heavily mortgaged showed clearly the appalling state of the industry." It is refreshing to note women realising the power of finance over primary producers. This problem of financial slavery is common to all, it is known and identifiable. All that need be done is to insist that our present system of debt-finance be replaced by one of credit-finance. Most politicians are aware of the alternative financial policy, and electors should place the responsibility on their local Member to produce this result. Voters are foolish to place faith in any one Party, they should be wise enough to continuously use their local Member, whatever Party happens to be in office.

PETROL PRICES: Mr. Dedman, in his second reading speech on the Motor Vehicle Manufacture Bill, said: "The Bill was brought down to provide cheap and reliable transport." So much for mere words! He and his Party, like the others, continue to mulct the people by increased charges, via the petrol tax. This tax was imposed without reference to the people in 1926 in order to obtain £2,000,000 to finance the "Roads Agreement Act." The tax has steadily increased, and over the years has robbed motorists of £40,000,000 ("Smith's Weekly," June 23). Only a small part of this rake-off has been used for the purpose for which it was raised. This action, like many others, can only be described as a political confidence trick. From this it will be clear that Mr. Dedman is not sincere in his professed intention of providing cheap transport.

MEANS TEST: After many years, during which thousands of thrifty citizens have been robbed of their reward by the "Means Test," Mr. Chifley is reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of June 25 as saying that "the Means Test would have to be continued in the future." Through superannuation and savings, many people have attempted to provide security in their old age; in addition, they have been compelled to pay taxes for pensions, yet when their pension was due, their thrift prevented them from obtaining their reward because of the Means Test. These people would have been better off had they enjoyed their youthful years by spending their money. It is a wicked provision that penalises thrift,

called Conservative Party in England bring in more socialistic legislation than Labour Parties did, and tax the landowner practically out of existence?

These questions have got to be answered, and they can only be answered by stating that the party system is a fake, that the political fights are mostly sham fights hiding the real issue; that the policy of both party bosses is the same, and is imposed upon them by a permanent government not elected by the people. And this is all made possible by the "Majority Vote."

The permanency of key permanent officials and their advisers, and the source of their power, can be seen from the fact that they have nearly all been trained at the London School of Economics—a school endowed for that purpose by a millionaire; and the disruptive nature of their work can be seen clearly in Otto Niemeyer, of Depression fame, and in Professor Copland, the Price Commissioner.

What the members of the present Federal Government think of the Majority Vote can be seen in their attitude to the Referendum.

The Majority Vote in Australia and in the majority of States went against the Government's proposals, but that didn't make the slightest difference; the Government still goes ahead with the policy which the majority refused to sanction. So that those who shout loudest about Democracy and the sanctity of the Majority Vote are the very people who treat it with the utmost contempt. This should be a warning to you, if any is needed.

and one that should be abolished forthwith. There are many thousands of people with a vital interest in this question, who, if introduced to Electoral Campaign tactics, would become a strong force. Here's an opportunity for YOU to start the ball rolling, instead of asking, "What can I do?"

RATIONING RACKET: Those trusting people who believed the alleged reason for clothes rationing—a shortage of materials—will be surprised to learn that, "stocks of knitted wear are piling up in factories and warehouses, because people have not enough coupons to buy up the increased production." That statement, made by a director of a knitting and textile factory, was reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of June 7, and none of the bureaucrats contested it. He also said that, "the Mill was now considering putting off some of the staff because it could not sell what it was producing"—and yet clothes rationing continues. Tea is another example of adequate supplies and continued rationing. It should be rather obvious that much rationing now exists for no other purpose than to assist black marketers, and to pro-
(Continued on page 2)

Nth. Queensland Astir

One part of this continent where the people are up and doing with plans for their own advancement after the war is North Queensland. From Rockhampton to Cairns and out as far as Winton there is a great stirring, and public meetings are being held all over the place. The inspiration comes from the belief that in all the dreams of the Canberra post-war planners there is no place for the North (North Queenslanders are not alone in that belief), and the North, knowing its own capabilities, is flat out to do something for itself.

There are proposals for meat works, ship-building, railway and bridge construction, housing, electricity and mining; for expansion of the land industries and of fishing and timber-growing. There is, too, a strong movement for a new State.

This is a healthy sign and an example to other areas. It is naturally and directly opposed to the habit of relying on distant city Governments and of placing too much power in their hands. For half a century it has been obvious that the chief cause of centralisation is the location of Governments in bloated cities with predominant voting power, influence and ignorance.

—Sydney "Bulletin," 4/7/45.

MR. R. (A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown.)

Sir,—Last week brief reference was made to the attitude of the Right Honourable Robert Gordon Menzies, K.C., M.P., in connection with the "debate" on the Banking Bills. In the course of his remarks, as reported in the press, he repeated the statement that "monetary reformers" are propounding the idea that by some magical financial trick we can have goods without taking the trouble to produce them.

This is dangerous talk and should be challenged. If any persons of his acquaintance ARE talking that rubbish, then they ARE cranky, and should be medically examined. Those people, if they exist, are either known by Mr. Menzies or they are not known by him. If they ARE known by him and he thinks it proper to quote them, then it would also be proper for him to name them. If they are NOT known by him, and he is merely acting on hearsay, then it is evidence of personal deception and irresponsibility. In either case, however, the repetition of such stuff is unwarranted and improper, and it is high time the sober-minded residents of the Kooyong electorate took him to task on the subject.

To consciously misrepresent is in my view worse than straight out lying, and in view of Mr. Menzies' claims to personal integrity and intellectual honesty, we must assume that his misrepresentation is not conscious misrepresentation. If that be so, then his consciousness or lack of consciousness should be put right, and that is a job for the electors whose servant he is.

Our claim, as promulgated in this journal, is simple and clear: If we make greater use of solar energy, then we will have less need for the utilisation of human energy.

Under present conditions, human energy is compensated by what is known as "wages," and to ninety families in every hundred wages are the power to buy things. Our claim to goods is determined by our power to buy, and our everyday experience shows that when a family has the wages cut off it has no claim to goods, however plentiful the goods may be.

And so it is obvious that the more we increase machine production the less we will have of manual production, and as manual production decreases so will the volume of money distributed as wages decrease. Thus, in the natural order of things, we must depend less and less on wages, and more and more on some supplementary distribution of purchasing power; otherwise the machines will produce food and clothes, etc., while the people starve and perish because they have not been supplied with the means with which to buy.

Provision to meet this situation does not involve anything magical: it merely calls for intelligent understanding and readiness to act rightly.

The simple truth is that if we do not

monetise the work of the machines and the sun, and distribute that money to the people at large, then the fathers and mothers of the ninety families in every hundred cannot possibly obtain better standards of living whilst rearing their families, and they must inevitably be doomed to financial anxiety throughout the evening time of their lives.

Now if Mr. Menzies is even half the man some people believe him to be, he could not be in favour of imposing a never-ending condition of heart-breaking struggle-to-live upon most of the people when it is physically within our power immediately to ease that struggle and progressively to eliminate it. Will someone in the Kooyong electorate challenge him directly to indicate whether he favours keeping the people in physical and financial bondage or whether he favours releasing them from it. If he is in favour of the former, then he should publicly say so; if he says he favours the latter, then he should be called upon to show how he proposes to obtain their release from bondage if he adheres to the old financial principles, which also increase the community debt and inevitably lead to higher and higher taxation.

Production is not the problem. He knows that. Our difficulties have come, and will continue to come, from failure to distribute. He also knows that. Distribution is controlled by money. One can hardly imagine a Privy Councillor and a K.C. not understanding that, too.

This being so, where is the sense of a man of Mr. Menzies' status assuming blindness to the need for monetary re-organisation, or deceiving himself about the attitude and the activities of the so-called "monetary reformers."

As a professedly honourable man he should at least be careful not to misrepresent what is said and done by other honourable men, and residents of the Kooyong electorate can perform a service to the community in general by requiring that standard of conduct from the man who has been chosen to speak for them in the National Parliament. He may succeed for a while in deceiving himself, but it will not be long before a majority of the people will be sufficiently informed on the subject to see through the deception.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2.
8th July 1945.

CHEMICAL FERTILISERS UPSET THE LIFE CYCLE

[From the "West Australian Wheatgrower," June 21.]

Life springs from the soil; so if the soil is worn out, ill nourished, unhealthy, how can man be anything else—notwithstanding free medicine, or even free doctors?

A recent technique demonstrates with powerful conviction that the life cycle is upset by the use of chemical fertilisers instead of organic manures.

E. Jeremy, hon. secretary of the Australian Organic Farming and Gardening Society, writing in the "Burnie Advocate," gives food for thought and stimulus to action in this article:—

A few years ago Dr. E. Pfeiffer had conferred upon him the degree of doctor for his brilliant work in connection with blood crystallisations. These crystallisations reveal the shape of the formative or life forces of the particular type of blood peculiar to each individual, and they also vary in the blood from each part of the body. This work carries the knowledge of the blood a step beyond chemical analysis, and this process has been suggested as a means of diagnosis.

This technique has been extended to embrace plant sap, and juice crystallisations.

In this field many experiments have shown the formative forces in plants fertilised with chemicals (sulphate of ammonia, superphosphate, nitrates, etc.), to be inferior in symmetry and development with those radiating in plants organically fertilised.

FORMATIVE FORCES

The simplest way to convey an idea of these forces is to visualise a tree. The chemically fertilised product results in a design in which the foliage does not completely cover the tree, and numbers of bare branches are in evidence, whilst the organically fertilised product reveals complete symmetry of outline with full foliage.

Another picture is that of a grub-eaten cauliflower in contrast with one that is healthy and fully developed.

These radiations can be regarded as the vital life forces in all living forms. All life is dependent on other forms of life for existence.

Transmitted to each successive form, there is this thread of life-giving nutritional force, and in conformity with the oft-expressed idea that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link, so in this chain of various life forces the whole is only as healthy as the unhealthiest. If we

interfere with this life cycle at any stage, we introduce disease.

ABUSE OF THE SOIL

Mankind cares for himself and his livestock to the best of his ability, but when it comes to the soil—the source of all life—well, that just does not matter; and during the past 100 years it has been subjected to every conceivable abuse imaginable.

Nothing in our universal system can be abused without Nature exacting the penalty, and no legislation, whether communistic, democratic, autocratic or otherwise, can absolve man from soil erosion and the numerous diseases in agriculture.

These evils have been brought about by a disregard of the life or biological factors in agricultural practice and reliance upon a physio-chemical conception decreed by a materialistic philosophy.

Whether a man's ideas be atheistic or religious, he must acknowledge the wisdom of Nature, which has devised the connection between all forms of life so that provision is made for the gradual transformation of animal and vegetable remains by the activity of numerous small insects, fungi, bacteria, to humus for the nourishment of plants, and so to animals and man.

THE EFFECT OF FOOD

Even the fungi and bacteria responsible for the conversion of waste products to soluble humus are affected by the type of food, which is available.

This is indicated by the fact that manure from cattle, which are heavily fed on food concentrates does not decompose as easily as manure from organically pastured animals.

So the cycle goes on, and if we have healthy, humus-filled soil we produce healthy herbage and vegetables, healthy animals and healthy human beings.

Interference with this cycle at any stage causes interference with the life processes.

and the balance of Nature, and disease must inevitably follow.

We have meddled with this cycle by introducing chemical fertilisers which poison the soil, and either kill or drive away the earth worms. Darwin stated that if it were not for the earth worms there would not be soil for agriculture. On healthy, humus-filled soil it has been estimated that worms pass through their gizzards as much as 25 tons of material to the acre per annum. They are the soil's natural cultivators.

UPSETS THE SOIL.

By the activity of the various organisms in the soil, mineral elements in naturally organic form are made available to plants, but when these elements are placed in the soil in chemical form for plant assimilation, chemical reactions take place which create foreign compounds in the soil, and which further upset the plant's natural metabolism.

Sulphate of ammonia precipitates out of solution in the soil 50 per cent, of its own weight in calcium. This reaction may explain in part why dental caries in Australia is nearly 100 per cent. Our foods are deprived of their natural organic calcium by the use of such fertilisers.

Artificial fertilisers produce artificial foods and artificial people.

Experiments have revealed that there is a vitamin deficiency in chemically grown foods in comparison with organically fertilised foods. Livestock fed on hay grown on chemically fertilised soil developed vitamin B deficiency, which was corrected, when the animals were fed on hay grown on similar soil organically fertilised.

PROTECTION FROM PESTS.

Dr. Earp Thomas, bacteriologist, America, when discussing the apparent immunity of organically grown fruit to insect pests, etc., pointed out that on most fruits there is a wax covering on the skin, and this is thickest on the organically fertilised product, but so thin on the chemically fertilised fruit as to be almost imperceptible.

It could not be said whether the wax film acted as a protection against insects, etc., or whether the more pungent aroma of the healthier fruit kept them at a distance.

During an address to a women's organisation Dr. Picton, England, produced a basket of guinea pigs which the women found great delight in fondling. These had been raised on chemically fertilised foods.

But when a similar number were released from another basket there was considerable excitement and consternation because these latter animals darted everywhere, and possessed far too much energy and vitality to have any desire to be caught and petted. They had been fed on organically fertilised foods. This demonstration spoke volumes.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

vide jobs for bureaucrats to boss us around. Readers should discuss these examples with everyday contacts with a view to harnessing them up to the Ban-the-Bureaucrats Campaign.

RELIGIOUS REVIVAL: The Rev. W. P. Wyle, an English chaplain, stated, "there was no sign anywhere of a religious revival." Dean Langley was reported as agreeing that there was no substantial improvement in Australia, and as uttering this gem: "What troubles me is that men who have the attitude of detachment from organised religion are good citizens." Of course the Dean's idea of a good citizen is unknown to us, but in the widest sense of religion and good citizenship there could be very little difference, if any. But it is very strange indeed when the Dean infers that organised worship has any higher value than unorganised worship. No known or recorded utterance of Christ substantiates such a view.

ALIEN ALARM: "Since the beginning of the year, 32 new businesses had been opened in St. Kilda (Vic.) by persons of non-British nationality, although not one permit was granted to an Australian" ("Smith's Weekly," June 9). In the issue of June 30, "Smith's" pointed out that they had received protests from readers for making this disclosure, and published a criticism from the Rev. F. Byatt, of Essendon (Vic.). This chappie extolled the virtues of these aliens and commended them for their enterprise and courage in opening shops; he laments the exposure, which he describes as "working up a hate campaign." Presumably pleading for a fair deal for Britishers is to be distorted to mean "racial discrimination"; such distortion can only be regarded as intellectual dishonesty. Good luck to "Smith's" in this matter.

PRESSURE POLITICS: A report contained in the R.A.C.V. "Radiator" is of special interest to Electoral Campaigners: it concerns advice given by Lord Brabazon to those Britons who seek the removal of petrol restrictions, viz.: "The only way to get things done is to badger the authorities, until you get what you want. Twenty-four years in Parliament have convinced me that there is nothing like a steady arrival of letters on an M.P.'s desk to make him take action." That should encourage campaigners to greater efforts; it should also stimulate the R.A.C.V. to utilise the many thousands of members who belong to the organisation, to generate in this country the pressure advised by Lord Brabazon. Readers of this journal who are members of the R.A.C.V. could help this idea along by commending it to the R.A.C.V. executive. Such a move may lead to quite important developments.

—O. B. H.

WHAT DEMOCRACY IS AND IS NOT

It is a fact that human beings do tend to form nations. Why?

The answer is, I think, quite simple. Human beings associate together originally IN ORDER THAT EACH INDIVIDUAL MAY BENEFIT BY ASSOCIATION.

The simplest example is pulling on a rope. MEN DON'T PULL ON A ROPE FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE ROPE; they provide the rope for the benefit their associated effort brings to each of them.

Now, there is definitely a form of Government, which is associated with this conception—genuine Democracy. No one takes seriously the verbiage prevalent about the struggle between Democratic and Totalitarian Government—there are no Democratic Governments.

But there might be. Perhaps I might be permitted to touch on a few of the things that Democracy is not.

While it is inconsistent with arbitrary special privilege, economic or otherwise, it does not mean equalitarianism. It would be just as sensible to say, without amplification, that everyone had a right to a place in the Eleven.

So they have, if they have the qualifications, and it is recognised that the number of places is by general consent limited.

Neither does Democracy mean a referendum or an election on every detail of day-to-day national management. On the contrary, a realistic conception of democracy insists that a community is sovereign, but it is not technical.

It has a right to demand results but not to dictate methods, the word "right" being used in the pragmatic sense.

But if the results desired are not being obtained, it has a right to an explanation, and, if necessary, the replacement of its administrators.

So far as Great Britain is concerned, I am inclined to think that the divergence from Democracy is not difficult to indicate. Easily the most glaring feature is our money and credit system, which is indefensible. The information it affords us is illusory, and no security is possible until it is drastically modified.

The Parliamentary System has been perverted to purposes for which it was not intended and all real power has been taken from it by the Cabinet.

Finally, our legal system has been exalted to a semi-divine omnipotence, and invested with sanctions, which make it a Master and not a Servant.

Obviously, it would take much too long to examine each of these aspects of our decadence at length.

I do not believe that any of them will really be put right until there is a much wider consciousness of the natural relationship between the individual and his institutions.

If that can be obtained, and not until it is obtained, we shall dispense with a type of statesman who, in spite of Abraham Lincoln's warning, still hopefully tries to fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, and, instead, obtain men who recognise that the advice, "If any would be greatest among you let him be your servant," was not sentimentalism, but a brilliant maxim of social and political organisation.

—C. H. DOUGLAS: "Persons and Nations," 1938.

INTERNATIONAL CONSPIRACY

The Bretton Woods Conference was deliberately befogged so that the general public should not know how they were being sold out, but it has eventually leaked out by the indiscretion of some of those taking part that the objective was the return to the worship of Nebucadnezer's Golden Statue—or in other words—the return to the gold standard that has been such a dismal failure in the past.

The Dumbarton Hoax, while agreeing with the conclusions arrived at by the Babes of Bretton Woods, carried the conspiracy a lot further.

In addition to the return to the gold standard, these self-styled and synthetic "experts" decided that each must sell out its sovereignty to the International Gang that has so long been conspiring for this very result.

Once again let me remind my readers, at the risk of wearying them, that the ultimate objectives are as follows:—

1. A return to the Golden Calf. (You can hear its bleating already.)

2. To give up our sovereignty to an International Financial Ring, and hand over to them the ONLY army, navy, air force and police in the world.

3. To secure to these gangsters FULL control of Finance so that not only every nation, but every individual in the nation, shall be a complete slave (through dictatorship of our buying power) to this bunch of racketeers.

The San Francisco Conference was called to co-ordinate, ratify and everlastingly weld the chains, so that there will be no breaking them.

—N. B. James, in "The Canadian Social Creditor," 12/4/45.

CANADIAN M.P. ON PEACE PROBLEMS

(Continued from last issue.)

Mr. Norman Jaques, the Social Credit member for Wetaskiwin in the Canadian House of Commons, made a notable speech in the House recently when the then impending San Francisco Conference was debated. Here is a fourth and final extract, taken from the "Hansard" report:—

Now what about Bretton Woods? My friend the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) and Acadia (Mr. Quelch) have stated their objections to the Bretton Woods proposals. I should like to add just one or two statements of my own. I might say that I brought the matter up in a speech on this subject, which I made in this house on July 12, 1943. On that occasion I quoted Mr. White, who was a member of the United States Congress. He said, speaking of the plans:—

"Both contemplate the surrender by the individual countries to the international monetary power of a large part, if not all, of the very heart of national sovereignty—that is, mastership over monetary and credit resources.

"Section 8 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall 'coin money and regulate the value thereof.' . . . If Mr. Morgenthau and the forces back of him should be able to get around this provision of the Constitution, then the last vestige of our great Charter of Liberty will have disappeared. All hope of restoring it would be gone, and the Totalitarian State would be complete.

"No, I cannot believe that the American people have as yet been beaten into such abject submission that they will allow this to happen."

Then recently a statement was made, I believe in the British House of Commons, and given to the English press, by Mr. Robert Boothby, M.P. I quote from the report in the London "Evening Standard":—

"It was American Big Business, not the United Nations, which won the great victory at Bretton Woods. For that agreement was a victory for gold over goods. And practically all the gold of the world is at present buried in the vaults of American banks.

"If the House of Commons accepted Mr. Morgenthau's advice and ratified the Bretton Woods agreement, it would deliver this country, bound hand and foot, to the money power represented by the vested interests of International Finance.

"It would prevent us from ever making any attempt at carrying out an internal expansionist policy designed to achieve full employment.

"It would deprive us of all the weapons with which we could protect ourselves from the consequences of an American depression.

"It would prevent us from developing the sterling area into a regional group of nations with similar economic interests and objectives, and a complementary trade—which is our greatest hope for the future.

"Last, but not least, it would subject us permanently to the economic domination of the United States; for the whole basis of the agreement is in favour of the creditor, against the debtor nation.

"Mr. Morgenthau gives the game away when he says he wants to increase his exports 'provided his customers are in a position to find dollars to pay for them.' We don't want to have to 'find dollars'—which, under the Bretton Woods agreement, means finding gold. Still less do we want to borrow them. We want to pay for our imports with goods of our own.

"Bretton Woods does nothing to help us to do this.

"Always it is the same old story—this insane American passion for 'exports.' . . . The main purpose of trade is not to get goods out of your country at all at any cost. It is the mutually advantageous exchange of goods. If you cannot do this, it is far better to make, and consume, the stuff at home.

"Here is an organisation,' says Mr. Morgenthau with enthusiasm, 'which has teeth in it.' It has indeed. Nasty, sharp teeth, which can bite. Under the Final Act of Bretton Woods, if we don't do what we are told by an international authority situated in the United States, we can have penal charges imposed on us, for the payment of which we shall have—somehow—to 'find the dollars.' We may even be blockaded by our own Dominions!

"I am all for co-operation between Great Britain and the U.S.A. But not at this price.

"One final point: The present British Government has no mandate from the electors to jeopardise the economic future of this country by putting us back on a Gold Standard, and attempting to resurrect the economic system which was one of the prime causes of the war."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from an article by Mr. Paul Einzig, one of the world's best-known economists. The hon. member for Lethbridge has already put part of the statement on record, and I shall not repeat it. But this particular statement by Mr. Einzig was published by the "Daily Express," which is owned by Lord Beaverbrook, and more than three million copies were printed and distributed in Great Britain. At the end of the article is this warning:—

"On this page today is an article that should be studied closely by the vast 'Daily Express' public, even while the news of victory in battle fills the imagination, even while the pleasures of the August holiday month tempt the multitude into more light-hearted distractions.

"The article deals with the decisions reached at the Bretton Woods monetary conference. It established clearly that those decisions would enslave Britons to gold, and are even liable to imperil British

good-will with the other nations in the Empire.

"The future of every man, woman, and child in this country is involved. Surely there will be a mighty national protest. Surely there will be a firm rejection of these proposals when they are submitted to Parliament."

May I remind hon. members that, apart from all sentiment, Great Britain is by a long way the best market we have. I would like the hon. member who has just taken his seat to tell us where he proposes to market the produce of Canadian farms if the standard of living in Great Britain is lowered. Will he dispose of it in the United States? Or perhaps he will market it in Soviet Russia? I do not know, but I know that "Bretton Woods" is going

POLISH "TRIAL" AND "SETTLEMENT"

"Another stage in the tragic history of Poland, the first country to fight Nazi Germany," is well summarised as follows in the Sydney "Bulletin" of June 27:—

The Moscow "trial" of anti-communist Polish leaders had the usual Soviet features, except as to the sentences. The news, which came out of Russia about it, was only what Russia's iron censorship wished the world to know.

Among the accused were the secretary-general of the Polish Socialist Party, the secretary-general of the Peasant Party and one of the executive members, the chairman of the Christian Democrats, and General Okulicki, who commanded a Polish division of the Eighth Army in Italy and had been wounded four times. They were, of course, tried as a "bloc" on charges of espionage, "diversionary and terrorist acts" causing the death of Russians, proposed collaboration with the enemy and sending out with a secret radio from behind the Russian lines "false and tendentious information to enable the London Poles to misinform the British Government."

The story begins with the invasion of Poland by Germany in September 1939. The Russian Government had claimed for many years to have no illusions about the nature of the Germans. It had frequently referred to them in terms of which "blood-drunk fascists" is only a mild example. It had accused them of torturing prisoners in concentration camps and of all descriptions of inhuman brutality and oppression.

When, however, Germany overran Poland, Moscow uttered no word of protest. On the contrary, by agreement with the "blood-drunk fascists," it seized half of Poland. It was content to allow the other half to remain in the hands of the "blood-drunk fascists" or Nazi butchers, its people, as it seemed, forever subject to their tortures, their Belsens and their Buchenwalds. Its attitude then was that, Poland having been divided up, there was nothing left to fight about in Europe.

The British blockade of Germany was characterised by Moscow as an act of brutality particularly directed against innocent women and children. The exiled Poles behind General Sikorski were denounced as "imperialist lackeys" for continuing to fight the Germans, as they did in France, in Africa and wherever they could find a Hun. Vast masses of Poles were deported to Russia. The bodies of 10,000 Polish officers were found in Russian graves—murdered, Moscow said, by the Germans.

When Russia was attacked Communists alleged that the exiled Poles, whose divisions were still fighting fiercely and proudly wherever they could find a German to fight—in Tobruk, at Cassino, on the Adriatic coast, at Caen and in the bloody battles of Belgium and Holland and across

to reflect on the prosperity of the farmers of Canada just as it did before.

I remember hauling grain for seven cents a bushel when it cost me six cents to thresh it, and I remember selling hogs for two cents and shipping a carload of cattle and getting a bill back for part of the freight. That was due to the imposition of the Gold Standard, and the same men who imposed it then are in power today. They have never been discredited, and the power behind it is International Finance and Totalitarianism. You cannot separate them. That is the situation we face.

With regard to this San Francisco Conference, legally I am not trained sufficiently to get the full appreciation of what the motion (before the House) really means, what it really implies. Perhaps, before the vote comes we shall be enlightened, but at the moment I will say this: I cannot support any proposal that might weaken the ties between the various sovereign Dominions of the British Empire, and I can have nothing to do with any proposal to re-establish the Gold Standard, not even "in the interests of peace," because I know very well that it would destroy the possibility of any permanent peace, as it did before.

the Rhine—were doing the work of Hitler and were German collaborators.

Attempts to arrange a friendly settlement strained the conciliatory resources of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt. At Yalta, however, an agreement was made for a meeting on Russian territory at which the Polish Underground Army, which had been fighting Germans with a sullen lack of co-operation that had cost it an awful loss of life in the heroic Warsaw battle, was to be represented.

The Russians apparently guaranteed a safe conduct in a letter to General Okulicki, who had replaced General Bor as C.-in-C. of the Polish Underground Army, and M. Janowski, Deputy Premier, from an officer of the High Command of the Red Army on the White Ukrainian front.

"On my part, as an officer of the Red Army . . . I guarantee you upon my word as an officer that . . . after your arrival at our headquarters you will be absolutely safe. I reckon on our early meeting and send you my regards."

The 16 Poles thereupon went to Russian H.Q. They disappeared for weeks until M. Molotov casually announced at San Francisco that they had been arrested and charged with the "crimes" which have been the subject of the peculiar hearing in Moscow.

Chief Judge Ulrich said that though the accused deserved death, "we are living in days of victory" and "these men are no longer dangerous to the Soviet Union, which is now mightier than ever." So General Okulicki, the gallant leader of fighting Poles in Western Europe, will have "ten years' deprivation of liberty"; M. Janowski was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment; the others, with three exceptions who were acquitted and a fourth "too ill to be tried," received sentences of four months to five years.

Immediately the "trial" was over it was announced at Warsaw that the accused must still answer to a Polish "people's court" for "crimes committed against their own country." Announced also at Moscow that an agreement for a "Polish Provisional Government of National Unity" had been reached and that a representative of the "Government" would sign the charter at San Francisco. Meanwhile a Communist-controlled Polish army seized Teschen, which was given to Czechoslovakia at Versailles. Another drawback to the "settlement" is that the Poles serving in the British forces and many thousands of other Poles in the Anglo-American zone of occupied Germany refuse to return to their country until it ceases to be under Communist control.

WHAT IS THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA?

(Continued from last issue.)

Beverley Nichols' new book, "Verdict on India," is the result of a recently completed first-hand investigation. It presents conclusions in striking contrast to some current views on India. Here is another interesting extract:—

TO QUIT OR NOT TO QUIT

There is no doubt that most of the British electorate, when they think of India at all, which is seldom, have a vague and generous feeling that we should quit, and they would probably vote accordingly even though they knew that they were voting against their own interests.

On moral grounds there can be no other choice. Yet, equally on moral grounds, our quitting must be conditional on the recognition of the equal sovereignty and independence of the two great Indian nations—the Muslims and the Hindus. Otherwise, we shall be in danger of giving freedom with one hand and taking it away with the other, of letting 250 million Hindus out of what they are pleased to regard as gaol in the morning and shutting up 92 million Muslims in what they are quite certain is gaol in the afternoon.

Only a wildly irresponsible person, however, would suggest that we can quit overnight; India would be left almost completely defenceless from aggression.

This quite fundamental matter of defence has received scant consideration from those

who claim that "India is eager to defend herself, if only she gains her freedom."

"Defend herself with what?" one may reasonably inquire. There is, for example, practically no such thing as an Indian navy. At the beginning of the war the entire Indian navy consisted of a few small patrol ships. This toy navy would have been totally inadequate for a country the size of Denmark, let alone an area the size of England, France, Germany, Scandinavia, Italy, the Balkans, and then some. Even the craziest optimist would hardly suggest that a navy could be built in much less than 20 years.

The same argument applies to the Indian army. Nobody will deny the bravery which Indian troops have displayed in the present war, but it would be ludicrous to suggest that these same troops are capable of undertaking, on their own, the defence of India. There is only a handful of Indian officers who have ever been entrusted with any wide powers.

And yet—presumably—in one way or another, we shall quit. Maybe in haste, which would be an unredeemed tragedy, maybe in comparative leisure, which would at least

THE COMPLEAT PLANNER

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—"National, Regional and Local Planning" was the subject of a lecture given by Mr. W. O. Hurt to the Royal Victorian Institute of Architects, and which, has been distributed in pamphlet form.

The lecturer pleads strongly for "planning at all levels," and tries hard to dispel objections held by people who do not like the idea of being planned, placing them in four categories—selfish, ignorant, politicians and "panacea fanatics." The latter class is "usually most vocal," and consists mainly of Social Crediters, for Social Credit gets sole mention and is dismissed, rather sneeringly, in these words: "One small dose of Social Credit—easy money from the printing press, or some such other cure-all, will transform the world over-night." It seems a pity that an otherwise well-educated man should display so much ignorance, as Social Credit is neither a medicine nor "easy money."

Many others object to Government planning because they don't like the word "must." These people, he says, "are inherently 'agin' the Government. It is their habit of mind." He does not realise the fact that this objection is universal, and is a prerogative of every individual rather than a habit of mind, whereas the itch to say "you must" to other persons IS a habit of mind, and is cultivated by nearly every planner!

Mr. Burt realises the validity of such objections and proposes Commonwealth Planning Authorities with advisory functions only, but laments the popular verdict on the "Powers" Referendum as imposing "constitutional limitations" to the establishment of Advisory Authorities, notwithstanding that there are not, and never have been, any such limitations, as witness the Commonwealth Council for Scientific and Industrial Research.

The whole lecture indicates a most obvious attempt to sugar-coat the planning pill, yet Mr. Burt fully appreciates all valid objections, for he prefers the term "plan-making" to "planning," with its usually implied power of enforcing obedience to the plan. Further, he leaves us with the impression that he firmly believes the public should have no say in the origin of public policy, but should function merely as controlled producers and consumers of the manna falling from the planned heavens!—Yours, etc., F. H. AULT, East Kew.

ESTABLISHMENT OFFICER AND FABIAN

"I have heard recently from W. A. R. Webster, Establishment Officer, Imperial Censorship, Trinidad. Until he took his post two years ago, Webster was a Staff Officer in Taxes and the I.R.S.F. Taxes Honorary Secretary . . .

"Webster has been making contact with the local Socialists with a view to advancing the cause of the Fabian Society in Trinidad. He was, however, unable to make much headway. This is what he said about the local progressives:—

"They are not very thrilled with the Socialist Party's lack of leadership on Colonial questions and all politically minded people here are concentrating on the self-government issue. The self-government groups contain a strangely assorted mixture of Conservatives, Socialists, Communists, etc., and we shall not see any party line-up until there is sufficient self-government to uncover the economic divisions among the people."

—An Observer's Diary in "Taxes" (Eng.), April, 1945.

LIBERTY AND SECURITY

"Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."
—Benjamin Franklin.

A NEW LEAFLET

A notable article on the front page of the "New Times" of May 4, reprinted from the trade union journal, "Aircraft News" (Melbourne), under the title, "The Burning Question of Soldier Preference," has now been reprinted in leaflet form.

Added to this article, the leaflet has a demand form to send to Members of Parliament, with three appropriate demands.

Samples are available for distribution, and further supplies can be obtained for 1/6 per hundred from the Secretary, Full Distribution Movement, Box 45, St. Kilda.

give ourselves and the world a chance to adjust itself to the immense changes—racial, strategic and economic—which our withdrawal will entail.

But whether it is tomorrow or a day a little more remote, there will be one sense in which the British will never quit India and that is a spiritual sense. With all our faults of omission and commission, our occasional outbursts of temper, our frequent lack of imagination, we gave India peace, and it was not the peace of the desert; we gave India law, and it was not the law of the strong; and—in the final judgment, we gave India liberty, for it was the ideals of Milton, of Locke, of Wilberforce, Mill, Bright and Gladstone that first kindled the Indian mind to an understanding of what liberty really is.

(Concluded.)

(Continued from last issue.)

When Eric Johnston, President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, was invited to visit Russia last year, his party included William L. White, one of the war's most realistic and entertaining reporters. Mr. White here recounts his observations of the way of life of the Soviet people and their masters: —

I have just been pricing food in the Moscow government-run stores and in the uncontrolled free public markets, and at last I understand how and what these people eat.

In America, a worker who lost his food coupons could still live magnificently on unrationed goods—milk, eggs, fish, poultry, bread, fruits and vegetables. In the Soviet Union everything, which has any food value, is rigidly rationed or is unobtainable except at fantastic prices.

There are several categories of rationing corresponding to different strata of the Soviet caste system.

The Red Army is extremely well fed, particularly in the front lines. Soviet officers are given a 50 per cent. discount at the "commercial" stores. The Kremlin is luxuriously fed through its own commissary. Foreigners are about as well fed as the top Bolsheviks. They get ample meat and bread rations, may buy four pints of vodka a month, and so on. Writers, actors, singers, musicians and other artists are also in a special luxury category, not only for food but for clothing and living quarters.

In Moscow, a first-class war worker gets a bread ration, for example, of 600 grams a day—which is more than a pound. A second-class worker gets 500, an office employee (not an executive) gets 400, and dependents (old people, children, cripples) get 300 grams.

A war-plant worker who exceeds her production quota makes about 1000 roubles a month; at the cheap diplomatic rate of exchange, which I enjoy, this is 80 dollars. But the quantities, which she can buy on the ration, are so meagre that she can't spend more than about 6 dollars and 50 cents a month for rationed food.

The Soviet food ration, which she must buy at her assigned grocery store, gives the worker about nine-tenths of what she must have to keep alive and working. For the other tenth, and for any food delicacies she wants, she must look elsewhere.

The first place to look is in the free market, or Rynok, where farmers bring produce for sale.

The farmer lives on a Collective or State farm, where he does his share of the common work. Nine-tenths of what the farm raises must be sold to the State at the low-pegged official price. The rest is distributed among the farmers, who are free to eat it or bring it to town and sell in the free market at any price they care to ask.

In America, commission men visit farms in trucks, buying surplus vegetables for resale in town. In the Soviet Union both the farmer and the commission man would get a five-year sentence, because that is "exploitation," since the commission man hopes to sell what he buys at a profit, and

is thus "guilty" of "exploiting" both farmer and buyer.

To avoid this "crime," the Soviet farmer must take time to hitch up and journey to market, where he sells personally what he raises, and the hungry housewife may go by subway clear across Moscow to find him.

The Moscow Central Rynok is a large pavilion resembling a farmer's market in any fair-sized, American town. I translate its rouble-per-kilo prices into American dollars and cents to see what our 20-dollars a week Russian war worker gets here for her money.

She may buy all the eggs she wants at 13.10 dollars a dozen. She probably can't afford a whole loaf of bread, but may buy what she wants at 5.67 dollars a pound. Here is some mutton (or perhaps goat), a bargain at 11.34 dollars a pound—more than half her week's wages. Chunks of sugar beet are 80 cents a pound; honey is 15 dollars.

An old lady selling a calf's head and its four knuckles wants 18 dollars for the collection, with hair on and the glassy eyes open, attracting a few flies. Potatoes are 1.05 dollars a pound.

A queue is waiting to buy milk at 2.65 dollars a quart. These people can't afford more than a glassful.

Is it inspected? Who knows? Most of the customers bring American-made tin cans to carry the milk home in.

However, remember that these food prices are exceptional; our 80-dollars-a-month Soviet war worker has already bought with her ration book at the government-controlled store about nine-tenths of the food she uses and has paid only 6.50 dollars per month for it at low-pegged State prices.

In the yard outside a girl offers some stockings—used and carefully mended. She wants 6.25 dollars for the cotton ones and 25 dollars for the rayon pair.

A man is offering his extra pair of shoes, somewhat worn but fairly stout, for 1000 roubles—a month's salary for our war worker. If she wants a pair of new evening shoes they would cost her 333.3 dollars per pair.

Here are a couple of big strapping girls who are obviously selling something else. They are all fixed up with lipstick, red shoes, red pocketbooks and red ribbons in their hats, their eyelashes are smeared with stove blacking, and they are giving the farmers the eye. Of course, prostitution has been abolished in the Soviet Union; woman's most precious gift is no longer to be had for money. But, friend, do you happen to have an extra quart of milk, a pound of pork or a pack of cigarettes?

—"Reader's Digest," February. (Condensed from the book, "Report on the Russians.") (To be continued.)

MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

By ERIC D BUTLER (Continued from last issue.)

Here is the next passage in the ninth of the "Protocols of Zion": —

"I am in a position to tell you with a clear conscience that at the proper time we, the lawgivers, shall execute judgment and sentence, we shall slay and we shall spare, we, as head of all our troops, are mounted on the steed of the leader. We rule by force of will, because in our hands are the fragments of a once powerful party, now vanquished by us. And the weapons in our hands are limitless ambitions, burning greediness, merciless vengeance, hatreds and malice. It is from us that the all-engulfing terror proceeds."

COMMENT: —

The best comment on the above is a considered statement made by Dr. Oscar Levy, after he read Pitt-Rivers' book exposing the Jewish interests behind the Russian Revolution: —

"We have erred, my friend, we have most grievously erred. And if there was truth in our error 3000, 2000, nay, 100 years ago, there is now nothing but falseness and madness, a madness that will produce an even greater misery and an ever wider anarchy . . . we are today nothing else but the world's seducers, its destroyers, . . . We who have promised to lead you to a new heaven, we have finally succeeded in leading you into a new hell . . . And it is just our Morality, which has prohibited all real progress, and—what is worse—which even stands in the way of every future and natural reconstruction in this ruined world of ours. I look at this world and I shudder at its ghastliness: I shudder all the more, as I know the spiritual authors of all this ghastliness."

In 1928, a Roumanian Jew, Marcus Eli Savage, a member of the staff of the Jewish-owned "New York Tribune," wrote as follows in "Century" (America) magazine:

"We are intruders we are subverters. We have taken your natural world, your ideals, your destiny, and played havoc with them. We have been at the bottom not merely of the last great war, but of nearly all your wars; not only of the Russian, but every other revolution in history."

In a revealing article in "The Statesman" of June 5, 1943, Professor Harold Laski threatened that there would be a third world war unless the "Left" were conceded "the victory that is its historic right." This indicates that there is a continuity of policy in all revolutions and wars. Laski made this very clear in another article in "The New Statesman" (July 11, 1942):

". . . For this war is in its essence a stage merely in an immense revolution in which the war of 1914, the Russian Revolu-

tion and the counter-revolutions on the Continent are earlier phases."

And so the "Left"—i.e., in the last analysis, the Jewish hierarchy—must strive for its "historic right," just as the "Protocols" claim, by the use of "all-engulfing terror."

No doubt Sir Stafford Cripps, one of Britain's leading Socialists, also had something of the above terror in mind when he said, back in 1935:

"If war comes, as come it may, that war has to be used for the destruction of capitalism. It will have to be used by the workers of this country to undermine the whole system" (vide "Daily Telegraph," October 14, 1935).

Isn't it strange how so many people looked hopefully to a war to achieve their aims!

Protocol No. 9 continues as follows: —

"We have in our service persons of all opinions, of all doctrines—restoring monarchists, demagogues, socialists, communists, and Utopian dreamers of every kind. We have harnessed them all to the task: each one of them on his own account is boring away at the last remnants of authority, is striving to overthrow all established forms of order. By these acts all States are in torture; they exhort to tranquility, are ready to sacrifice everything for peace: but we will not give them peace until they openly acknowledge our international Super-Government, and with submissiveness."

COMMENT: —

The "torture" of the First World War wasn't sufficient to obtain the "Super-Government." World War 2 was necessary. Now it is suggested that even World War 3 may be necessary!

In view of the fact that the World Organisation created as a result of World War 2 is claimed to be an attempt to carry into practice the ideas which gave rise to the League of Nations after World War 1 (note President Truman's remarks concerning President Wilson at the San Francisco Conference), it is essential that we examine the real history of the first League. A close examination of the facts concerning

this League leaves no doubt that the idea of a World Government was German-Jewish in origin. Lord Acton once said, "Few discoveries are more irritating than those which expose the pedigree of ideas." How true!

The Zionist leader, Dr. Nahum Sokolow, in his book, "The World Crisis," said that the League of Nations was "a Jewish idea." He should have known!

We know that President Wilson was merely the tool of the powerful Jews surrounding him—Baruch, Schiff, the Warburgs, etc. And there was the notorious Colonel House, another member of the "gang."

In that remarkable book, "Geneva versus Peace," written by M. de Saint-Aulaire, a former French Ambassador to Great Britain, who had considerable first hand knowledge of international diplomacy before, during and after World War 1, the following appears:

"The League of Nations was conceived at Berlin . . . We learn this fact from von Bulow, who relates that in 1917 he wrote to a high official of the Wilhelmstrasse, saying to him that 'without a doubt in these days of extreme crisis he no longer found a minute for rest.' Here is his correspondent's reply: 'It is true that we have much to do; we are busy elaborating German proposals for the League of Nations which, it is to be hoped, will be the best fruit of the war.'"

And the Berlin Government was virtually a Jewish Government!

M. de Saint-Aulaire also quotes a conversation he had with one of the international Jewish bankers associated with the Revolution in Russia. He quotes this Jew as saying:

"In the management of the new world we give proof of our organisation, both for revolution and conservation. Our organisation for revolution is evidenced by destructive bolshevism, and far construction by the creation of the League of Nations, which is also our work. What is the end? It is already determined by our mission. Israel is a synthetic and homogeneous nation . . . We are a League of Nations, which contains the elements of all others." The man who uttered those words knew all about the Protocols policy. Commenting on this Jew's statement, M. de Saint-Aulaire wrote:

"The brotherhood of bolshevism and the League of Nations was no novelty for me . . . Those who look for the truth elsewhere than in the official documents know that President Wilson, whose election had been financed by the Great Bank of New York, rendered almost complete obedience to its beck and call. They know the famous telegram, or rather the telegram which was destined to be famous, addressed on May 28, 1919, from New York to Mr. Wilson by Jacob Schiff to dictate to him concessions for Germany on the five following points: regime of reparations, Upper Silesia, Sarre, Dantzic and Fiume, UP TO THE RECEIPT OF THIS TELEGRAM MR. WILSON HAD VIGOROUSLY SUPPORTED CLEMENCEAU'S POINT OF VIEW, BUT HE AT ONCE CHANGED HIS ATTITUDE IN ORDER TO CONFORM TO THE WORD OF COMMAND FROM THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE LEAGUE OF FREE NATIONS, DIRECTED BY JACOB H. SCHIFF AND FIVE OTHER AMERICAN FINANCIERS, an association in the name of which the telegram was sent. His change of direction having determined a majority against France, the treaty of Versailles on these five grave questions was dictated by Jacob H. Schiff and his co-religionists."

We are never taught the above facts in the schools and universities, are we?

(To be continued.)

NATIONAL DEBT INCREASES

The British national debt on March 31 was £22,398,100,000, or £14,234,900,000 (174 p.c.) more than on March 31, 1939.

On March 31, 1913, the debt was £649,800,000. Britain's National Debt has therefore increased by 3,345 per cent. in 32 years.

The interest and management charge on the debt rose from £19,300,000 in 1914, to £216,800,000 in 1939, and £414,900,000 in 1945.

The average interest rate was 2.97 p.c. in 1914, 2.66 p.c. in 1939, and 1.85p.c. in 1945.

The public debt of the Commonwealth and States on March 31 last was £2,588,762,000 or £1,289,581,000 (99 p.c.) higher than on September 30, 1939. The average interest rate on the debt was £3/0/8 p.c., against £3/15/10 p.c.

—"New Era," July 6.

A DEAN ON EDUCATION

"What education can do to the mind and character is nothing short of alarming . . . I say that with greater conviction than I might have said it a fortnight ago, for in the last fortnight we have been shown all the bestial atrocities that have been going on in Germany . . . How have they all come about? If you get down to it, it is the result of Education. Education debased—education from which all religion has been excluded. Education can play the part of the devil, and that is the part it has been playing for a good many years in Germany."

—The Rev. C. Mayne, Dean of Carlisle, "Yorkshire Post," April 25.

WHO'S AFRAID OF THE TRUTH?

Here's freedom to him that wad read, Here's freedom, to him that wad write; There's nane ever feared that the truth should be heard

BUT THEM THAT THE TRUTH WAD IN-DICT.
—Robert Burns.

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

"Majorities have no rights and are generally not right. They are an abstraction to which it is impossible to impart the qualities of a conscious human being. The attempt to construct a system of human relationships on the 'rights' of majorities is net democracy. . . Genuine democracy can very nearly be defined as the right to atrophy a function by contracting out. . . The power of contracting out is the first and most deadly blow to the Supreme State."

If Mr. Calwell or any of his fellow socialists can tell us some method by which any individual can contract out of their New Order without being penalised for doing so, we will be extremely interested to learn about it. Mr. Chifley's refusal to delete the Means Test from the Government's "Social Security" schemes indicates just how much contracting out there is going to be.

Socialism makes use of political majorities, usually by bribing them, to destroy the legitimate rights of minorities.

A close reading of the debates at Canberra on the Banking Legislation reveals just how far the whole farce was divorced from realities. Many Labor Members spoke in terms, which revealed that they have gathered a few facts concerning banking from Social Credit literature, but even the presentation of these facts was a peculiar mixture. Even Mr. Menzies and some of his following tacitly admitted the fact of credit creation. Mr. Lazzarini, whose famous booklet on finance misled so many sincere but misguided monetary reformers, confirmed our expressed doubts about him by saying that no one on his side of the House expounds Social Credit. We are interested to have this confirmation of our viewpoint.

Mr. Alex. Wilson's contribution to the debates was pathetically weak. He assured the House that the Labor Movement has been in the "forefront" of the fight for banking reform. Well! Well! Not a word about the Social Credit Movements!

The speech by Mr. Bowden, M.H.R., on June 6, was obviously that of a man trying to be honest without getting too far out of line with his own party, the Australian Country Party. Just how his leader, Mr. Fadden, reacted to his admission that he believed that banking reform is necessary, but not political control of the money system, and that he has quoted extensively from Social Credit literature, would be interesting to know.

Mr. Bowden said that Government Members had made statements "which they have learned by heart in their reading of Douglas Credit pamphlets," but that they had not been honest enough to mention the "safeguards" in the "Douglas credit scheme." Mr. Bowden's partial confusion should be cleared by social crediters in his electorate (Gippsland, Victoria). They should point out to him that control of the money system by "the State" is not Social Credit; that the Federal Government's banking legislation is one of the greatest threats to liberty yet seen in Australia, simply because it takes the issue and collecting of the people's money even further away from them than it is now; and that the arguments between the local bankers, who, in their pathetic ignorance, are defending a position which the international plotters retired from long ago, and the socialistic banking "reformers," is the necessary camouflage for the taking over of the assets of this country—lock, stock and barrel—by the internationalists.

It was only fitting and proper that Mr. Coles, of chain-store monopoly fame, should associate himself with the proposals to make banking a bigger monopoly than ever.

Mr. Lazzarini's statement that, because an individual "has no choice now as to where he will buy a postage stamp," one should have no choice of alternative banks with which to do business, indicates beyond all reasonable doubt where we are being pushed—straight into the Servile State. —E. D. B.

THE PROBLEM OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

The remarkable series of articles under this heading, which appeared in our columns recently, is now available in booklet form. The booklet not only deals admirably with the topical and vital question of medical services, but, in doing so, also gives a most lucid and interesting exposition of the principles of real democracy. Every effort should be made by social crediters to circulate the booklet as widely as possible. The price of a single copy is one shilling (plus 1d if posted), but individuals wishing to circulate several copies should take advantage of the concession rate for this purpose—i.e., six copies for five shillings, post free. The special rate to groups, etc., for larger quantities, is eight shillings per dozen, post-free. Postal orders should be sent to United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne, C.I.

SOCIALISTIC SERVICES

"Loss on operations of Government-run guest houses, the Hotels Kurrajong and Ainslie and Gorman House, was £6987 for the last financial year, says the Auditor-General's report. Coupled with the loss disclosed is the fact that those people who have to stay at the premises referred to never cease to complain of the poor food and service supplied."
—"Journal of Industry," Adelaide, June 1945.

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