

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 (1807-1807)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 11. No. 37. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, SEPT. 21 1945.

"NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES

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

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. HALF Rates for Members of the A.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F.

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

Federal Undermining of the States' Rights

South Australian M.P. on Danger of External Affairs Power as New Weapon

In a recent statesmanly speech, the Hon. R. J. Rudall, M.L.C., South Australian Minister of Lands, explained and gave evidence of the original interpretation of the Commonwealth Constitution, with particular reference to Canberra's "external affairs" power. He went on to deal with the reversal of that interpretation in Federal circles—a reversal initiated by Justice (now Sir) Isaac Isaacs.

Furthermore, he drew attention to the provisions of Articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations' Charter, and Dr. Evatt's connection therewith, as indicating the use that is apparently about to be made of the "external affairs" power. He concluded by sounding a warning of the danger ahead, and urging the utmost vigilance.

In view of the great importance of the issues involved, and the clarity with which Mr. Rudall presented matters that are apt to seem dry and obscure to the non-legal mind, we shall publish the full text of his speech, as recorded in the "Hansard" report of proceedings in the S.A. Legislative Council on July 31, 1945. Mr. Rudall said:—

The Commonwealth Constitution provides in Section 51 (29) that the Commonwealth Parliament shall have power to legislate over external affairs. The problem I wish to discuss is what interpretation will be given to this power and how far this interpretation will affect the powers of the States. There is no doubt that the treaty making power in the Commonwealth rests with the Commonwealth Government. In the exercise of this power, the Commonwealth may enter into a treaty with another country on any subject. How far does this treaty then enable the Commonwealth Parliament to legislate upon this subject matter? There can be no question that if the subject matter be one upon which the Commonwealth Parliament is given express powers of legislation, then the Commonwealth Parliament can legislate to implement the treaty. The question is—How far does the making of a treaty by the Commonwealth give powers of legislation in the implementation of that treaty over subject matters, which, apart from the treaty, are outside the power of the Commonwealth? If the answer to this question is that the Commonwealth has this power, then it is equally obvious that by the use of it, the Commonwealth can widen and extend its powers of legislation to an extent limited only by the necessity of bringing it within the boundaries of an agreement with some other country.

Sir Arthur Keith, in his classical work, "Responsible Government in the Dominions," says this on page 1125:—

"It is clear that no treaty can be adhered to except with the assent and at the request of the Commonwealth Government. Nor does it seem doubtful that in matters within the legislative competence, whether exclusive or paramount, of the Commonwealth Parliament, it would be legitimate to adhere to any treaty at the request of the Commonwealth Parliament alone. On the other hand, it is impossible to be certain what is the position in cases in which the Commonwealth has no direct legislative power, of those cases, while the assent of the Commonwealth to any adherence is obviously constitutionally necessary, could the Commonwealth adhere without the assent of any particular State, and if so, would it have legislative power of adherence under Section 51 (29) to make good its adherence? It appears that where the Commonwealth has not exclusive or paramount power it might adhere for some States who so desire, and not for others; but where the Commonwealth has power, presumably it would adhere as a whole, or not at all."

I think it is clear from this quotation that Sir Arthur Keith was of opinion that where the subject matter is one not within the legislative power of the Commonwealth, the consent of the States should

Significant Political Pointers

Lindsay Clinch, Melbourne "Argus" correspondent in New York, writes: "U.S.A. will drive a hard bargain in return for economic aid to Britain. This is becoming evident in press comment and in bitter attacks against Britain in Congress since the British-American economic talks opened at Washington.

And so our great "Allies" demand their pound of flesh! The present writer said early in World War 2 that one of the greatest menaces to the British Empire was the German-Jewish dominated Washington Government.

An article in the Melbourne "Argus" of September 15 has the significant title: "U.S.A. Steps Into World Leadership." The author of the article is the Jew, Walter Lippman, who helped to ensure that we lost the peace after World War 1.

Dr. Evatt's concern about Japanese war criminals does not appear to have extended to the international crooks who were primarily responsible for the trouble and used Japanese aggression for their own ends.

The first of a special series of articles on "American Trends In Resource Planning" started in last Saturday's Melbourne "Argus." The wonders of the Tennessee Valley Authority and other socialistic ideas are extolled. It is just a "coincidence" that we are now being inundated with special articles on socialistic planning in the "capitalist" press. The Big Idea becomes clearer every day. But a little correct ad-

vice and action can still work wonders in the community. We are not all completely mesmerised; and that is the basis of our belief that we can still make successful issue with the arch-planners and their noisy stooges.

Very few Jews appear to be capable of understanding what real freedom means. They appear to be unconsciously attracted to collectivist ideas a la Russia. It has been claimed in the past that Professor Albert Einstein, the German-Jewish author of the theory of relativity, who left Germany for America when Hitler came to power, had no interests in politics. But Einstein has now put it on record in the London "Picture Post" that he is a Socialist. His views on Russia are particularly significant: "There will be a great economic upheaval in the world. As in Russia, the intellectuals will emerge from the war on top. They will be the important people . . ."

If these "intellectuals" hold the same views as Einstein, then God help the remnants of civilisation. The Professor also believes in a World Government advised by a few super-intellectuals. In other words, he advocates the very objective that Hitler advocated.

There is no doubt that the Socialists have effectively captured the universities, where the Professors of Economics (some of whom frame the Federal Government's policies) condition students to believe their dangerous and fantastic theories. Much evidence could be brought forward to support the above statement, but we will content ourselves with one example: Dr. Wood, lec-

(Continued on page 4).

he given before such a treaty becomes effective, and if the treaty requires legislation to carry it out, that legislation should be passed by the State Governments. The view of Professor Harrison Moore, is quite clear:—

"The power to give effect to international arrangements must, it would seem, be limited to matters which in themselves concern external relations; a matter in itself purely domestic and therefore within the exclusive powers of the States cannot be drawn within the range of Federal power merely because some arrangement has been made for uniform national action. Thus there is, at the present time, an international movement for the amelioration of labour conditions and the International Union has arrived at some agreement for uniformity of legislation. It is submitted that the Commonwealth could not, by adhering to an international agreement for the regulation of factories and workshops, proceed to legislate upon that subject in supersession of the laws of the States."

That is, I think, the view that was generally held, and I am confirmed in that opinion by the fact that it was the practice adopted by the Commonwealth Government.

The position was set out in a letter from the Prime Minister to the Premier of South Australia dated May 14, 1924.

In this letter, the Prime Minister pointed out that Australia was a member of the International Labor Organisation set up by the Treaty of Versailles, and that in accordance with Article 388 of the Treaty, this organisation consisted of a general conference of representatives of the members

and an International Labor Office controlled by the governing body described in Article 393, and also that this governing body was charged with the duty of drawing up the agenda for all meetings of the conference. His letter continues:—

"The governing body is charged with the duty of drawing up the agenda for all meetings of the conference.

"When the conference has decided on the adoption of proposals with regard to an item in the agenda, it will rest with the conference to determine whether these proposals shall take the form—

(a). Of a recommendation to be submitted to the members for consideration, with a view to effect being given to it by national legislation or otherwise; or

(b). Of a draft International Convention for ratification by the members.

"In the case of a Federal State, the power of which to enter into conventions on labour matters is subject to limitations, it shall be in the discretion of that Government to treat a draft convention to which such limitations apply as a recommendation only, and the provisions of Article 405 of the treaty with respect to recommendations shall apply in such cases. The first conference of the International Labor Organisation was held at Washington in October and November 1919, and six conventions and six recommendations relating mainly to industrial matters were formulated. Certified copies of these conventions and recommendations were communicated to the various members of the organisation by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, for (Continued on page 2)

The totally inadequate tax reduction sop indicates that the Labor Party has no intention of helping the workers in any worthwhile manner. The sop will be readily recognised as an attempt to forestall the growing loss of faith in Labor's promises. In addition to having a majority in both Houses, the new Commonwealth Bank set-up is now operating, so Labor has no alibi left to explain the sustained taxation burdens.

LASKI'S LEANINGS: Recent published statements by Professor Laski, Chairman of the British Labor Party, make it quite clear that the troubles of the British workers are of little interest to him. Laski's concern is the affairs of Spain, Italy, France and Russia. Quite off his own bat, he threatens Spain with economic sanctions, promises Italy and France every assistance, and special economic preferences to Russia. Isn't it queer how these global-minded people think like that? The general idea is to look after the other fellow's affairs. It is in line with the idea of letting somebody else rear your child, while you rear theirs.

AIRLINES BILL: The sham of our political Party system was illustrated when the Liberal Party refused to debate the Airlines Bill because of the futility of so doing in view of the Labor voting strength. Curiously enough, the same argument applies to any and all Bills brought on where the Government has an effective majority. In these circumstances the Opposition members need not attend Parliament except to draw their pay and to perpetuate the Party racket. Of course, in this case the Opposition (and also the Labor Party) knew quite well that the Bill was a sham, because it was unconstitutional; that's how the Labor politicians fool their supporters. When the Bill is declared ultra vires by the High Court, there will be another sham howl against the Judiciary. It's a wonder anybody regards these men as honest.

MASTER MONOPOLY: As expected, it is now proposed that the much-boasted atomic bomb be a monopoly of the World Government. All such bombs would be kept at a central point and other nations would be forbidden to make "atomics" for their own use. Those who accept this idea childishly presuppose that the World Government is the personification of integrity and high ideals—that it can, of course, do no wrong. It would be much wiser under present circumstances to have a number of smaller gangsters keeping each other honest, than to have one master gangster with a monopoly of all the means of destruction. If every nation had the atomic bomb, it would be an even break—a situation much more likely to deter the big nations who, in the last analysis, are the instruments of the real warmongers.

LANG'S LEADER: The Sydney "Century" of August 31 contains an interesting commiseration of Menzies' fight for a "lost cause." The writer reminds R.G. that while he is fighting the cause of big business, Labor Ministers and big business are in charge of the ramparts. In simple words

he says that Labor Leaders and so-called capitalists have cashed in and taken over Socialism. Lang's "leader" also points out that despite the lip service paid to "private enterprise," Lord MacGowan and similar bigshots are inviting, nay begging, the Government to put up some of the capital and share some of the control of the great monopolies. Assuming that regimentation has come to stay, big business has taken over regimentation.

CONSUMPTION CONUNDRUM: The Chairman of the U.S. Federal Reserve Board (Mr. Eccles) was credited with some mixed financial proposals in the Melbourne "Herald" of July 7. He does not look to exports to solve the unemployment problem, as he thinks the home market is far more important (what a body-blow for the export maniacs!). Further, Mr. Eccles

(Continued on page 2)

The Hoko System in Australia

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—The press informs us that the Japanese have a spy system known as "Hoko," whereby every Japanese is ordered to spy on his neighbours.

"Hoko" was probably copied from this country, for we appear to have excelled in the creation of super Gestapos.

Under the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act, Section 12, the Director-General or his delegate may:

(a) Summon witnesses;
(b) Receive evidence on oath, and
(c) Require the production of documents. Failure to appear invites a penalty of £20.

Clause 3 of the same Section informs us that a person shall not:

(a) Refuse to be sworn as a witness;
(b) Fail to answer any question;
(c) Fail to produce any document.

Failure to comply with this part of our local "Hoko" system invites a penalty of £50.

In addition to the above, a man's employer is invited to make a secret report on his worker, which is not produced for the worker's perusal. This is made on a special form.

As though the above was not bad enough, the Re-establishment and Employment (Soldier Preference) Act contains all the above evil features, word for word, in Section 68.

So, in defeating the Japanese our soldiers escaped the Japanese "Hoko" system, only to be enmeshed in the Australian "Hoko" system!

—Yours, etc.. VIVIAN JAMES, Ascot Vale

The Hitler Technique

As the London "Patriot" remarks, "We are witnessing a series of demands from the Soviet Government which inevitably bring to mind how Hitler's similar treatment of Europe finally brought about this devastating war."—The Social Creditor." 27/7/45

AN ENCOURAGING SIGN IN A CHURCH

(A letter to the Editor from BRUCE H. BROWN)

Sir, —On Sunday evening, September 9, I was pleased to be a member of the congregation at Scots Church, Melbourne. Rev. Alec. Fraser was the preacher. His address was excellent, and, I venture to think, required some courage to give it. He spoke of the attitude of the Church in the past towards men who gave utterance to ideas apparently not in harmony with current Church dogma, and instanced the treatment meted out to such men as Galileo, Booth, and an Australian Professor "who was one of the best men who ever entered the Church." He warned us against the serious consequences of continuing that attitude, and made an eloquent plea for better understanding, more tolerance, and recognition of reality.

I felt like telling him of another glaring example in our own day. C. H. Douglas is a man who has given the world the opportunity to put Christian principles into practice, but perhaps nowhere has he encountered greater misrepresentation or apathy than in the very place where Christian principles are given lip service. The deadweight of Church inertia has too often been a terrific loading against the welfare of mankind.

This inertia cannot be excused on the ground of ignorance, for responsible officials and representative committees have pointed to the cause of the unchristian state of affairs and indicated what is necessary to rectify the position. The Pope, the Archbishop of York, the Anglican Primate of Australia, the Presbyterian Assembly, the Methodist General Conference, and many individual clergymen recognise that causes must be discovered and removed before it is possible to eliminate bad effects.

But strange as it may seem, far greater concern is usually displayed about what are called national sins than about the father of these sins; i.e., effects are denounced while the cause goes unnoticed.

So-called national sins arise from the monopoly control of the money supply, and it is encouraging to see that recognition of this FACT is beginning to break through. Some years ago the Presbyterian Church of Victoria officially called attention to the fact that "the monetary system is not performing its proper social function . . . and that consequently the control of the policy concerning the creation, issue, and cancellation of money should be re-vested in the community so that it may be directed to social ends." That is clearly a first necessity towards securing a more adequate distribution of the world's bounty, but how few Presbyterian pulpits are used to emphasise the fact and to call upon their people to demand it? I have personally had the pleasure of hearing such men as the Rev. Wilson Macaulay, the late Rev. J. T. Lawton, and the Rev. Ashby Swann raising their voices against the Money Monopoly; but what of the hundreds of others?

Too much attention is given in pulpits to the "high convictions and wonderful ideals" of so-called "statesmen" operating overseas, in total disregard of the fact that these men have actually done nothing to give effect to the high falutin sentiments they express. On the contrary, they are doing the work of the devil. Never do they denounce the usurers who keep the children of God in financial servitude, and never do they lessen the burdens the usurers have placed on the people. They all continue to borrow privately manufactured money for governmental purposes or close their eyes to the swindling practice.

"MAJORITY RULE" & PARTY POLITICS

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

That the present method of voting governments into power is a very thin democratic veneer, hiding the totalitarians, was made evident by the eagerness and the glee with which our so-called representatives clutched at the tremendous power of authority which war brought to them.

No one who has not come into contact with the arrogance and ruthlessness with which this power was used can imagine just what tremendous dangers are facing the whole civilised world today.

There was a time when Kings of England ruled by what was called Divine Right—they claimed to be the Chosen of God—the King could do no wrong—his word was law. Many thought that this doctrine had died a natural death, but in our time we have seen it resurrected under various guises.

The "divine right" of the King has become the "divine right" of the "State"—the "State" being those few who by various means have captured the machinery for manufacturing laws and regulations and who by control of the armed forces, if need be, are able to enforce obedience to their arbitrary laws.

In so-called Democratic countries the small group in control of the State have actually more powers than Kings had—because Kings who attempted to extract heavy taxes or to meddle with the private affairs of citizens—to the extent practised by modern Governments—quickly found themselves minus their heads.

Those in control of the modern State can, and do, penalise each minority because they claim that they represent a majority—the fact being overlooked that we are all, at one time or another, members of this or that minority. Parents are a minority; farmers are a minority; the country dwellers are a minority; skilled men are a minority; the politically wise are a minority—and so on.

But so-called Democratic Governments demand the "right"—and they continually exercise it—to overrule every minority, although, together, they are a majority. In

Congregations do not need eulogies of men of this type, particularly when such eulogies are of questionable warrant; but they DO need to be informed of the CAUSES of the shocking world conditions, and of the urgent need for ACTION ON THEIR PART to have the causes removed.

For instance, they need to be wakened to the fact that it is lack of money—and that alone—that has stood between millions of God's human family and God's wonderful provision for their physical needs; also that this stuff called money is controlled by the banking system so that the utilisation of God's free bounty can only be effected through increasing indebtedness to the controllers of that system, for "unless someone will BORROW MONEY FROM BANKS there will be no money in circulation." That word "someone" includes the supposedly sovereign Governments, too!

Although conditions in many countries are dreadful in the extreme, how many realise that they were dreadful even before the destruction caused by war? No less a person than Mr. Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State in America admitted in 1938 "nearly 80 per cent. of the world's population of 2,000,000,000 persons are living below the poverty line." If war is the explanation for the conditions of today, what was the explanation for similar conditions when there was no war? Is it any wonder that agitators and revolutionaries find so much fertile soil for the propagation of ideas of revolt?

Some good people believe that pain and suffering are sent by God for our spiritual benefit or as punishment for sins. That may be so. I do not know. But whatever may be said regarding the natural pain and suffering, surely it is contrary to fact and reason to extend this so-called "blessing of pain, sorrow, and suffering" to include the artificially imposed financier-made distress, mental insecurity, and world unrest which have been added to nature's pain and suffering!

Difficulties connected with incomes, food, clothing and shelter are all artificial and unnecessary, and—apart from bureaucratic restriction—are caused by the theft of the people's credit by monopoly, the forgery of the nation's credit as bank credit, and the arithmetically false money-costing-price system.

The Rev. Alec. Fraser should be supported in his plea for less attention to creeds and more attention to reality and actual goodness; and it is about time the pulpits were used to spread understanding of the practicability of Christian principles as made possible by the discovery and genius of the man Douglas.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2.
September 16, 1945.

fications and consequences barely understood even by a very small minority.

A large number of the voters have learnt that nothing of value will come out of this avalanche of words; a great many more are not even interested. But it would be disastrous to the illusion of democratically given authority of the Party Bosses if the people refused to go to the polling booths because they realised that, as carried out, this voting business was of no practical use to them.

Therefore, the Party Bosses have been obliged to compel the people to go to the booths by threat of fines. They have also had to hold out bribes to the voters in the form of various alleged benefits—"benefits" which in reality are paid for by the voter himself.

We see, therefore, that at a general election the people have not had a free choice of candidates, and that they have been forced into taking part in a legal contract by means of threats, bribes and misrepresentation. This is the legal basis on which the Party in power exercises the right to penalise every minority in this country. It seems to me that the legality of his contract is suspect.

The contract appears to be very one-sided. The "representative" seems to be able to do just as he pleases; he can do exactly the opposite to what his electors want him to do, and can draw his salary just the same. And the electors seem to have no power to stop him until the next election comes along.

At the next election the other Party goes into power, but the taxpayer gets no relief. The same old game is carried on in the same old way.

We find, too, that the one-time Opposition, when in power, does exactly the same things which it has bitterly attacked the previous Government for doing. In fact, the same speeches would do for both Parties—all that is required is to change the name and the date.

The change-round of Parties, however, serves a very definite purpose. When it is decided to tax and regiment the lower income groups a "Labour" Government, or "Labour" Leaders, can be found to do this much more easily than a "Conservative" Government. When the whole social structure is to be undermined by Socialistic legislation the country accepts it more painlessly from a "Conservative" Government. Probably no "Labour" Government in existence brought in more socialistic legislation of a destructive character than the so-called "Conservative" Government in England.

It seems, therefore, that the two names "Conservative" and "Labour" are all part and parcel of the great game of politics; they are used merely to deceive.

Which Party the people vote for at election times makes very little difference to the course of events. The polling booth has become merely a device to legalise a policy already decided upon by a small group of men. The last Referendum is proof of this. The majority of voters voted "No" in that Referendum, but the Government went on as if nothing had happened. The sanction of the majority would have been useful, but the Government can find other means of legalising its actions.

A democratic country is a country where the people can and do control the actions of their government; but it has come to mean a country where the government has obtained power by collecting a majority vote.

A government, once elected, proceeds to penalise every minority, and it does so because it claims to represent the majority. The fact that it has had no mandate from the people to do what it has done doesn't seem to matter very much; the government calls itself democratic, and the popular writers seem to acquiesce in this view.

But the governments in office today take a rather peculiar view of their powers; they not only claim the "rights" of Kings and Emperors of old, but they claim more "rights"! And because, by low cunning and subterfuge, they have managed to acquire a majority vote, they say they are exercising this tyrannical right democratically!

This counting of noses is used as an excuse by a small group of men to do anything they like, and to claim that anything they do, therefore, must be "Democratic."

This horrible prostitution of the democratic method has got to be exposed by all thinking men who have the welfare of their country at heart, and it has got to be done quickly.

BENJAMIN DISRAELI KNEW

"I think," said Sidonia, "that there is not error so vulgar as to believe that revolutions are occasioned by economical causes. They come in, doubtless, to precipitate a catastrophe, but rarely do they occasion one. I know no period, for example, when physical comfort was more diffused in England than in 1640. England had a moderate population, a very improved agriculture, a rich commerce; yet she was on the eve of the greatest and most violent changes she has yet experienced. . . . Admit it, the cause was not physical."

—"Coningsby," by Benjamin Disraeli, p. 290.

"THE MANAGERIAL REVOLUTION"

Note of wording on a British Labour Party election-campaign poster, under a portrait of a "managerial" type in horn-rimmed spectacles:—

"National control of industry means greater scope for managers, technicians and administrators."

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

thinks it is the responsibility of "the State" to see that total demand is maintained at the level necessary to induce the production of the fully employed population. If this chappie could throw off the employment mania he might even realise that the best way to equate consumption with production is through the mechanism of a national dividend paid unconditionally to every individual.

POST-WAR PROBLEM: The Melbourne "Herald's" finance expert adds some interesting comments to excerpts from overseas economic reports of July 28. For example, while U.S. experts are concerned with post-war unemployment, the writer points out that during the war, "soldiers and munition workers contributed no more to real national income than if they were standing idle in the street." In effect, he reminds us that these millions are, economically speaking, unemployed in war-time—but it is not a "problem" in these circumstances: therefore leisure of this nature is only a problem in peace-time. However, the "Herald" scribe does not emphasise the fact that soldiers (unemployed in the productive sense), are in receipt of an income, whereas, in the case of post-war unemployment, the income is cut off, so that it is really a case of unemployment. This chappie has made one or two intelligent observations in his column; now that spring is in the air he may see the vision splendid—then he will get the sack.

—O.B.H.

FEDERAL UNDERMINING OF STATE RIGHTS

(Continued from page 1.)

consideration with a view to action in the direction indicated in paragraph 4 hereof.

"These conventions and recommendations relate to matters within the ambit of control of the various State Governments, and the latter therefore become the competent authorities in connection with them (except insofar as application to Commonwealth territories is concerned). It is incumbent upon each member to bring the conventions and recommendations before the competent authorities for the enactment of legislation or other action, and, in accordance with this obligation, I forward herewith copies of the conventions and recommendations adopted at the first conference, for any legislative or other action your Government may see fit to take."

To give a specific example, the question of night work in bakeries was considered by the International Labor Conference, and at its sixth session, held in 1924, a proposed draft convention was provisionally adopted. This was forwarded to the Premier of South Australia by the Prime Minister, and the concluding paragraph of his letter is as follows:—

"As the matters to which the proposed instruments have reference are under the control of the State Government, I should be glad if you would kindly furnish me at the earliest possible moment with any comments you may wish to make in this connection, so far as your State is concerned, for transmission to the International Labor Office."

At the International Labor Conference held at Geneva in May 1925, the Draft Convention was adopted. Later in 1925 a Day Baking Bill was introduced into the State Parliament, but did not become law.

It is obvious therefore, that with regard to conventions of the International Labor Conference, there was a recognition of the difference between a Federal State like Australia and other countries with a unitary form of government.

Not only was that recognised, but in matters coming within the exclusive power of the State Parliaments it was the State Parliaments who were consulted on the matter by the Federal Government and the question of implementing a convention on any such subject matter was left to be dealt with by the State legislatures.

The position today is, however, not clear, for the question has come before the High Court, and the interpretation given to the external affairs power by the High Court puts in very grave doubt the view originally held with regard to the matter.

The Goya Henry case, which is reported in 55 C.L.R., page 608, arose out of a convention which was made in October, 1919, between the heads of the States of the allied and associated powers, including the Commonwealth of Australia, and which was ratified by His Majesty King George V on behalf of the British Empire on the 1st June, 1922.

The Air Navigation Act, 1920, was passed by the Commonwealth of Australia, and by Section 4 the Governor-General was authorised to make regulations for the purpose of giving effect to this convention. The regulations were duly passed, and in 1934 Goya Henry was charged with a breach of them. The case was finally decided on the point that the regulations were invalid because they did not carry out and give effect to the convention. The importance of the case does not rest in the actual decision, but in the views on the external affairs power expressed in the judgments that were delivered in the case. It was a strong Bench, consisting of Chief Justice Latham and Justices Starke, Dixon, Evatt, and McTiernan.

(To be continued.)

By MAJOR C. H. DOUGLAS. (Address at Swanwick, England, in 1924.)

THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM IS THE WORKS OR FACTORY SYSTEM OF THE WORLD, CONSIDERED AS AN ECONOMIC UNIT, JUST AS THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT OF A MODERN FACTORY IS OF THAT FACTORY.

No discussion of the financial system can serve any useful purpose, which does not recognise:

(a) That a works system must have a definite objective.

(b) That when that objective has been decided upon it is a technical matter to fit methods of human psychology and physical facts, so that that objective will be most easily obtained.

In regard to (a) the policy of the world economic system amounts to a philosophy; of life. There are really only three alternative policies in respect to a world economic organisation:

The first is that it is an end in itself for which man exists.

The second is that while not an end in itself, it is the most powerful means of constraining the individual to do things he does not want to do—e.g., it is a system of Government. This implies a fixed ideal of what the world ought to be.

And the third is that the economic activity is simply a functional activity of men and women in the world; that the end of man while unknown, is something towards which most rapid progress is made by the free expansion of individuality, and that, therefore, economic organisation is most efficient when it most easily and rapidly supplies economic wants without encroaching on other functional activities.

You cannot spend too much time in making these issues clear to your minds because until they are clear you are not in a position to offer an opinion on any economic proposal whatever.

In regard to (b) certain factors require to be taken into consideration:

(1) That money has no reality in itself. That in itself it is gold, silver, copper, paper, cowrie shells, or broken teacups. The thing, which makes it money, no matter of what it is made, is purely psychological, and consequently there is no limit to the amount of money except a psychological limit.

(2) That economic production is simply a conversion of one thing into another, and is primarily a matter of energy. It seems highly probable that both energy and production are only limited by our knowledge of how to apply them.

(3) That in the present world unrest two entirely separate factors are confused. The cry for the democratisation of industry obtains at least 90 per cent of its force from the desire for the democratisation of the PROCEEDS of industry, which is, of course, a totally different thing. This confusion is assisted by the objective fact that the chief controllers of industry get rich out of their control.

I do not myself, believe in the democratic control of industry any more than I should believe in the democratic control of a cricket team, while actually playing, and I believe that the idea that the average individual demands a share in the ADMINISTRATIVE control of industry is a pure myth.

The present world financial system is a Government based on the theory that men should be made to work, and this theory is considerably intermixed with the even stronger contention that the end of man is work. I want you to realise that this is a statement of fact, not a theory. More than 95 per cent, of the purchasing-power actually expended in consumption is wages and salaries. It will therefore be seen that there are two standpoints from which to examine its mechanism. The first considered as a method of achieving its political end of universal work, and the second as a means of achieving some other political end—for instance, the third alternative already mentioned.

Considered as a means of making people work (an aim which is common both to

ISSUE THAT EMERGED FROM THE BRITISH ELECTION

"We believe the Election has done much more harm than good to the standing of politicians and political life in the eyes of the great unpolitical majority. It has been undignified, not very scrupulous, and full of irrelevancies thrown forward in the hope of exciting prejudice. But there has emerged from the welter a very real and lasting issue—the relationship of political Parties to Parliament and the Electorate. It was the genius of the British Parliament in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and well into the nineteenth, that the Party organisation was always relatively weak. The strength of the institution was the individual Member, a representative and not a delegate, not responsible to any outside body except his constituents. In the latter part of the nineteenth century there came in the Caucus, and the Party organisation, which the Socialists, as is but natural, have carried much further than anyone else, until the position of an M.P. has become something entirely different in their eyes to what it was a hundred or even fifty years ago. The over-organised and over-ambitious Party has been the affliction of so many Continental countries that the burden of proof is very much with those who claim any merit for this progressive denial of individual responsibility and reliance upon majority executive decisions. In this country we talk very easily about parliamentary government, and forget how many pitfalls there are and in how many ways parliaments can be ruined."

—"The Tablet," London, July 7.

the Capitalist and Socialist Party Politics) the existing financial system as a system, is probably nearly perfect.

Its banking system, methods of taxation and accountancy, counter every development of applied science, organisation, and machinery, so that the individual, instead of obtaining the benefit of these advances in the form of a higher civilisation and greater leisure, is merely enabled to do more work. Every other factor in the situation is ultimately sacrificed to this end of providing him with work, and at this moment the world in general, and Europe in particular, is undoubtedly settling down to a policy of intensive production for export, which must quite inevitably result in a world cataclysm, urged thereto by what is known as the Unemployment Problem. To blame the present financial system for failing to provide employment is most unfair; if left alone it will continue to provide employment in the face of all scientific progress, even at the cost of a universal world-war, in which not only all possible production would be destroyed, but such remnants of the world's population as are left will probably be reduced to the meagre production of the Middle Ages.

Considered as a mechanism for distributing goods, however, the existing financial system is radically defective. In the first place, it does not provide enough purchasing power to buy the goods, which are produced.

I do not wish to enter at any great length into the analysis of why this is so, because it is always a matter of some heated controversy. I have, however, no hesitation whatever in asserting not only that it is so, but that the fact that it is so is the central fact of the existing economic system, and that, unless it is dealt with no other reforms are of any use whatever.

And the second feature of equal importance is that considerably less than the available number of individuals, working with modern tools and processes, can produce everything that the total population of the

world, as individuals, can use and consume and that this situation is progressive, that is to say, that year by year a smaller number of individuals can usefully be employed in economic production.

To summarise the matter, the principles which must govern any reform of the financial system which will at one and the same time avoid catastrophe and re-orientate world economic policy, along the lines of the third alternative, are three in number:

1. That the cash credits of the population of any country shall at any moment be collectively equal to the collective cash prices for consumable goods for sale in that country, and such cash credits shall be cancelled on the purchase of goods for consumption.

2. That the credits required to finance production shall be supplied, not from savings, but be new credits relating to new production.

3. That the distribution of cash credits to individuals shall be progressively less dependent upon employment. That is to say, that the dividend shall progressively displace the wage and salary.

I may conclude by a few remarks on the position of the banks, in respect of this situation. It is becoming fairly well understood that the banks have the control of the issue of purchasing power to a very large extent in their hands. The complaint, which is levelled at the banks, is generally that they pay too large a dividend. Now, curiously enough, in my opinion, almost the only thing, which is not open to destructive criticism about the banks, is their dividend. Their dividend goes to shareholders and is purchasing power, but their enormous concealed profits, a small portion of which goes in immensely redundant bank premises, etc., do not provide purchasing power for anyone, and merely aggrandise banks as banks.

But the essential point in the position of banks, which is so hard to explain, and which is grasped by so few people, is that their true assets are not represented by anything actual at all, but are represented by the difference between a society functioning under centralised and restricted credit and a free society unfettered by financial restrictions. To bring that perhaps somewhat vague generalisation into a more concrete form, the true assets of banks collectively consist of the difference between the total amount of legal tender, or Government money, which exists, and the total amount of bank credit money not only which does exist, but which might exist, and which is kept out of existence by the fiat of the banking executive. (World Copyright Reserved.)

QLD. SOCIAL CREDITERS PREPARING FOR STATEWIDE CAMPAIGN

As recently announced in these columns, the Queensland Electoral Campaign has definite plans for an intensification of activities in all parts of Queensland.

It is felt that the end of the war is the signal for a much bigger effort, particularly in Queensland, where resentment against centralised control by the Canberra bureaucracy has reached the stage where powerful New-State Movements have obtained considerable support in North and West Queensland. The Brisbane Electoral Campaign states:—

"We believe that we should help in every-way these growing demands for more local government. Queensland is a wealthy State, much of it suitable for further development, and it is ridiculous that Queenslanders, who could house, feed and clothe themselves even if the rest of Australia did not exist, should be compelled to seek permission from Canberra to develop to the full their own resources. We believe that we must encourage Queenslanders to take greater interest in their State Government. We want to flood Queensland with the story of Alberta, and urge electors to emulate the Albertans. Power must be decentralised, so that the electorate will determine policy. It is easier for this to be done in State electorates. We are therefore encouraging Queensland electors to demand through their State Members those results, which they require. We are hopeful of having an autonomous Social Credit group in every State electorate, headquarters in Brisbane merely acting in an advisory capacity and supplying literature when necessary.

"Our sole interest in the Canberra Government should be to ensure that it obtains no more power, in fact, to help in every way to reduce its power. We are therefore backing wholeheartedly the Anti-Bureaucrat Campaign in the Federal sphere; at the same time preparing for positive steps to bring the State Government under control. For those desirous of getting the Anti-Bureaucrat Campaign under way, we recommend Mr. Eric Butler's booklet, 'Sack The Bureaucrats And Win The Peace.'"

CAMPAIGN FUNDS REQUIRED.

The Brisbane Electoral Campaign states further: "In our first circular concerning proposed future activities, in which we appealed for funds, we mentioned the sum of £200. It has since been suggested to us that we should seek at least £500. Only 500 individuals would need to subscribe £1 each to obtain this amount. But we again appeal to all Queensland social crediters to send us immediately a donation, large or small. The response to our first appeal has not been as great as we would like.

"But more than money is required. Social crediters have got to get down to individual action. We urge all those who can help to organise meetings or help in getting local groups established, to get in touch

with us as soon as possible. If we get sufficient support, and we must get it, to have several campaigners in the field, we want to stress the fact that these men will not be organisers in the usually accepted sense of the term; their job will be to help and give advice to local supporters, make suggestions for further action, and take our message into new territory. They will also be making a special effort to obtain new readers for our two social credit papers, 'The New Times' and 'The New Era.' We believe this to be most essential.

MR. BUTLER EXPECTED NEXT YEAR.

"The above ideas have been discussed with Mr. Eric Butler, who, until recently, was training troops in Queensland. Mr. Butler is very impressed with the political situation in Queensland, and has agreed to visit the State next year if sufficient co-operation is forthcoming. He is particularly keen to visit North Queensland. All supporters in that area who can help in any way are urged to immediately contact The Electoral Campaign, 142 Adelaide Street, Brisbane."

"BRITISH" BUREAUCRACY

From the "Social Crediter" (Eng.), 26/5/45:—

The Registry is the Intelligence Department, or Gestapo, of a Government Department. All correspondence goes first to it and is opened, read, and distributed. All files of internal memoranda are kept by it.

From an interesting article on the wartime building in the Mall known as the "Citadel," in the "Sunday Times" of May 13, we learn that the Admiralty Registry is in charge of Mr. H. D. Samuel.

ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

(Obtainable from New Times Limited, Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.)

"THE ENEMY WITHIN THE EMPIRE." A short history of the Bank of England. Price 9d. Postage 1d (6/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price 9d. Postage 1/2d. (6/- per dozen, post free.)

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the UNITED DEMOCRATS' Headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.) Report on meeting between the executives of the three Social Credit bodies in South Australia:—

The purpose of the meeting was to obtain greater co-operation between the three bodies and to eliminate possible confusion in the minds of the public as to why there should be three distinct Social Credit movements. It was decided by all delegates, after considerable discussion, that each movement should keep in front of it the following definition of Social Credit:—

Social Credit is not merely an economic plan, nor a political doctrine; rather it is a way of life, which can be realised through the application of Christian and Democratic principles to every aspect of organised society. It is based on the simple belief that in all people that through association and co-operation they can achieve results, which would otherwise be impossible.

The reason for there being three bodies is the result of Social Crediters having different ideas as to how to arrive at the objective of security in freedom.

The United Democrats believe that the first essential is to establish a proper relationship between the people and their elected representatives. They are therefore working along Electoral Campaign lines.

The Social Credit League believes that the quickest way to the objective is to have Social Crediters elected to Parliament, who would then establish a National Credit Authority, inaugurate the Compensated Price mechanism and issue National Dividends.

The Social Credit Movement is an educational body stressing financial reform along the lines of the Douglas proposals.

Delegates agreed that their movements would co-operate on all issues of mutual concern, as they had done in the past.

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

THE HOUSING SITUATION

We should place few limits to the ineptitude of a bureaucracy outside the very narrow field of its usefulness, but the handling of the housing situation is much too bad to be true. It is clear enough that the fostering of unrest, discontent, and, if possible, unreasoning resentment is an essential to the political situation which the Plotters are working to create—in fact, such an atmosphere is the "peace" equivalent of P.E.P.'s postulate that "only in war, or under threat of war" would a British Government do thus and such.

Everyone knows the remedy for the housing situation—it is to permit, or assist, individuals and builders to build houses.

But of course, if that were allowed, the unrest would subside, and the opportunity to break down the safeguards of private property by the seizure of somebody else's house, if it is empty for five minutes, would disappear. The technique is exactly that of Bolshevism in Russia and Poland—to egg on the landless to seize and partition the property of the landlord, give the small proprietor about six months' possession, accuse him of "inefficiency," and then collectivise him, which leaves the bureaucracy without an effective opponent.

Anyone can read for themselves the appropriate atmosphere in process of creation in those curious illustrated news tabloids specially produced for mass-mind conditioning. And, of course, the "B."B.C. we have always with us.

—"The Social Crediter," 28/7/45.

All of which has its counterpart in Australia.

MR. J. B. PRIESTLEY

From the "Social Crediter" of July 7:— The American military authorities have issued a sharp denial to the story given publicly by Mr. J. B. Priestley, that, in the interests of the profit system, hospital bedding and equipment had been burnt, and crockery pulverised by driving tractors over it.

We have been disappointed with Mr. Priestley. There was a time when it appeared that the monopoly of credit might be faced with a novelist who would dramatise the subject for the novel-reading public; and a novel of the merit of "The Good Companions," with the drive which Harriet Beecher Stowe put into the absurd but melodramatic "Uncle Tom's Cabin," would be no mean weapon. After one or two not very inspiring brushes with the subject, however, Mr. Priestley mounted his horse and rode off furiously in all directions, and appears to have arrived everywhere at once.

CANADIAN CAPERS

With that attractive approach to political problems for which he is always to be trusted, Mr. MacKenzie King announced that in order that the Canadian delegation to the San Francisco Conference might be fully representative of all shades of Canadian opinion he would take with him (which he did) a Member of Parliament from every Party in the House except Social Credit. Lest there might be any misapprehension, he took Mrs. Casselman, the Liberal Member for East Edmonton, to represent Alberta, which has not had a Liberal Government for twenty-five years, and is unlikely ever to have another. Mrs. Casselman was unseated at the General Election by P. H. Ashby, a Social Crediter and a Rhodes Scholar.

—"The Social Crediter," 21/7/45.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF "JOHANNESBURG" TO WORLD "PEACE"

By B.J., in the "Social Crediter." (Concluded from last issue.)

The first "British" High Commissioner of Palestine was, as we know, the "Liberal" Sir Herbert Samuel, who, as Postmaster General, had been involved, with Lloyd George and the brothers Isaacs, in the Marconi scandal. In 1929 his former "Liberal" colleague, Lord Melchett, who as Sir Alfred Mond had done so much for the Zionist cause, received the monopoly of the mineral deposits of the Jordan Valley, while General Smuts had the gratification of having one of the Palestinian settlements named after him. As for the British themselves, they paid for the venture both in money and loss of prestige, not only in the Arab-speaking world, but also as Sir Ronald Storrs noticed, among vast numbers of people in the U.S.A.:

"Visiting America a year or two later, I was struck by the thoroughness with which the caricature of the British officer had been disseminated." ("Zionism and Palestine," p. 86.)

To return to Paris: Throughout the Conference Smuts appeared to many observers as decidedly pro-German. Mr. Howden Smith remarks ("Mr. House of Texas," p. 257): "Smuts and Botha persuaded the British delegation of the folly of breaking Germany to pieces" and the same writer informs us that the German protests on the publication of the terms of the Treaty had an immediate effect upon Smuts "who by the 16th was telling Mr. House that he and his South African colleague, Louis Botha, were considering refusal to sign, unless the Conference revised the terms to meet some of the German objections." (p. 323.)

At Paris, Smuts had continuously stressed that the League was the most important decision before the Peace Conference, and it is an odd reflection that his beloved League should, some years later, have demanded a report from the South African Government on the occasion when Smuts's Government had attempted to crush a native revolt by bombing a tribe from the air, and that the League should have refused to accept as valid the explanation given.

Andre Cheradame in "The Mystification of the Allied Peoples" (Ch. Herissey Press, Evreux, France), p. 144, says:

"After hostilities ceased, General Smuts showed that he was very decidedly pro-German. He gave this impression as early as April 1919, when Mr. Lloyd George sent him on a mission to Budapest, where Bela Kuhn was in power at that time. General Smuts showed an extremely benevolent attitude towards the Magyar Bolsheviks and an altogether hostile one to the Czechs, Roumanians and Yugoslavs, as befitted a man whose mind was made up to favour the German interests in Central Europe."

With a few short intervals, Smuts was constantly in office during the long Armistice. His policy was the stereotyped one pursued by all world-politicians during the same period: "collective security" abroad and "full employment at home." In 1933, when Roosevelt began the final socialisation of America and Hitler was appointed for the same task in Germany, Smuts received in South Africa the Very Rev. Dr. Herz, now the Chief Jewish Divine of the British Empire, and on this occasion he said of the Jews: "Let them bring their resources and talents to this country. We are sadly in need of such. ... they are a great factor in South Africa, and are going to be a greater factor."

In 1919 Smuts had been painted, like his brother-politicians Wilson and House, by Sir William Orpen. In 1939 Sir Henry Strakosch, the Russo-British Jewish gold-magnate, presented this portrait, on behalf of Mr. Bernard Mannes Baruch, the present Prince of Israel, to the South African Parliament, and in the same year Smuts was once again appointed Prime Minister of South Africa, and the war broke out.

Early in the war Major James de Rothschild, M.P., suggested in the House of Commons that the African continent, which had experienced a new Unity during the war, should be welded into one vast Federation, which might suitably be administered by a British [sic] official resident in Washington. Smuts, taking the hint, has since proposed several "regional" arrangements for Africa with a view to "tidying up our show" as he expressed it. Every one of his suggestions would, if acted upon, tend to weaken the ties that bind together the British League of Independent Nations, and to strengthen the agencies masquerading behind that so obviously Masonic label "the United Nations."

In 1943, at a moment when it looked as though the Second World Peace was about

LORD BRADBURY ON BRETTON WOODS

Lord Bradbury's letter on Bretton Woods to the London "Times" of July 11 is written in the best manner of the Oxford or Cambridge Union, which demands that an attitude of light and amusing cynicism must at all costs be maintained in regard to subjects of political import.

Nevertheless, it seems possible to draw two deductions from it. The first is that the one-time Secretary to the Treasury is a little doubtful whether the Bretton Woods proposals have really come down from Mount Sinai; and the second is that it is not even necessary to mention the detachment of the proposals from the realities of production and distribution. Well, after all, it is doubtful whether any monetary proposals would now be in time to stop the next world war; so perhaps Lord Bradbury is right to keep us amused.

—"The Social Crediter," 21/7/45.

to break out, we find General Smuts sending the following message to the South African Biennial Zionist Conference:

"The United Nations, in this last year before victory, realise, I feel certain that Jewry has played its part in hastening the end of one of the bitterest periods of human history. Your loyalty to a cause in defence of which so many nations have joined together in the creation of that splendid whole, the United Nations, has never been in doubt."

The term "the United Nations" was officially coined by the late President Roosevelt, reputedly a Freemason of the 33rd degree, who exhorted the world to spend New Year's Day, 1944, in contemplation of the remarkable concept to which it refers. Like President Wilson, the first World War President of the U.S.A., who was equally a High-Initiate of the Craft, Franklin D. Roosevelt continuously consulted Mr. Bernard Mannes Baruch, who ever since he gave up his seat on the New York Stock Exchange in the memorable year of 1917 has been permanent confidential advisor to the august occupants of the White House.

However, 1944 did not bring Peace to the world, but saw, on the contrary, the culmination of the "Zionist" policy outlined by Schiff in 1917; the spiritual centre of the Czarist Pale of Settlement had been successfully transplanted onto Palestinian ground; the "beautiful ideas of Judaism" such as "Labor Zionism" and "the religion of Labor" (vide "Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge") had, exactly as a generation

MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

The Promoters of the Russian Revolution

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

Mr. Wickham Steed, one of the most outstanding figures in twentieth century British journalism, had some very interesting things to say about International Jews and the Russian Revolution in his book, "Through Thirty Years."

Steed knew what he was writing about. He was acting correspondent of the "Times" (London) at Berlin, 1896; correspondent at Rome, 1897-1902; correspondent at Vienna, 1902-1913; Foreign Editor of the "Times" (London) from 1914-1919; editor of the "Times" (London) from February, 1919, to November, 1922; lectured on Central European History at King's College, London, from 1925 to 1938; editor of "Review of Reviews" from 1923 to 1930; engaged in propaganda in enemy countries in 1918; and was head of a special mission to Italy, March to April, 1918.

And now for Steed's accusations:—

"But, before matters could proceed far, a flutter was caused by the return from Moscow of Messrs. William C. Bullitt and Lincoln Steffens, who had been sent to Russia towards the middle of February by Colonel House and Mr. Lansing, for the purpose of studying conditions, political and economic, therein for the benefit of the American Commissioners plenipotentiary to negotiate peace. Mr. Philip Keir" (later Lord Lothian), "and, presumably, Mr. Lloyd George, knew and approved of this mission. Mr. Bullitt was instructed to return if possible by the time President Wilson should have come back to Paris from the United States.

"Potent international financial interests were at work in favour of the immediate recognition of the Bolsheviks. Those influences had been largely responsible for the Anglo-American proposal in January to call Bolshevik representatives to Paris at the beginning of the Peace Conference—a proposal that had failed after having been transformed into a suggestion for a Conference with the Bolsheviks at Prinkipo. The well-known American Jewish banker, M. Jacob Schiff, was known to be anxious to secure recognition . . .

"On the afternoon of March 26 an American friend inadvertently gave me a notion that a revival of the Prinkipo proposal, in some form, was in the air. That evening I wrote to Northcliffe: 'The Americans are again talking of recognising the Russian Bolsheviks. If they want to destroy the whole moral basis of the Peace and the League of Nations they have only to do so.' 'And, in the 'Paris Daily Mail' of March 27, I wrote strongly against any proposal to recognise the desperadoes whose avowed aim is to turn upside down the whole basis of Western Civilisation."

"That day Colonel House asked me to call upon him. I found him worried both by my criticism of any recognition of the Bolsheviks and by the certainty, which he had not previously realised, that if the President were to recognise the Bolsheviks in return for commercial concessions his whole 'idealism' would be hopelessly compromised as commercialism in disguise.

"I pointed out to him that not only would Wilson be utterly discredited, but that the League of Nations would go by the board,

earlier in Czarist Russia, inspired the Jewish proletariat with a fanatical belief in the right of Israel to terrorise the world into submission to their ideals; the long series of "political" outrages perpetrated against the British administration by Zionist zealots during the last decade reached its climax with the murder of Lord Moyne, Resident British Minister in Cairo.

The previous year Lord Moyne had been imprudent enough to suggest in the House of Lords a more realistic solution of the Jewish problem than that provided by the Zionist experiment in Palestine, and had even gone so far as to mention a possible Promised Land—Madagascar!

His murderers were the agents of a professional terrorist gang, whose members insisted on speaking that Hebrew language which Rothschild, Samuel, Sieff, Simon, etc., had imposed on the Jewish population of Jerusalem in the spring of 1918. Eliahu Hakim, aged 23, declared: "I admit that I know Arabic, but I can only express my ideas properly in Hebrew."

In the spring of 1945, when at last "Peace" has come to the harassed peoples of Europe, Field Marshal Smuts is the Chairman of the General Assembly Commission of the United Nations Conference on International Organisation, and as such is in charge of the drafting of the New World Charter. For the opening of what the ready British wit has already dubbed the Sham Francisco Conference, the newly elected President of America, Mr. Truman, broadcast the following message. "You members of this Conference are to be the architects of the better world. In your hands rests our future."

Similarly, before flying to America, Field Marshal Smuts warned the world in his usual gentle way that this was its last chance of Peace. Perhaps we are justified in taking the venerable Federator of Nations to mean that the Conference at the Golden Gate is the last chance for our world-politicians, and their no-longer-so-hidden backers, to "architect" the sort of peace-arrangements to which they have accustomed us, and from which we can expect nothing but ever bigger and more devastating wars.

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1)

turing at the Melbourne University on April 12 of this year (Economics I lecture) spoke about the necessity of planning the land and our water systems. He cited with favour the Tennessee Valley Scheme in America, and Russian collectivised farming. But his most significant statement was to the effect that land and resources holders in this country would have to be overcome as they were in Russia. Now, won't that be lovely! It is estimated that upwards of 7,000,000 Russian landowners died as a result of their objection to being planned "scientifically." But, never mind. Let's have some more university "education"!

The following quotation from Professor Julian Huxley's book on the Tennessee Valley Scheme, "T.V.A., Adventure in Planning," is particularly interesting, as it comes from an avowed disciple of planning:

"The trouble is not all on one side. The rugged individualists and the still more rugged monopoly capitalists, who find their interest threatened by planning in the interest of general welfare, will assuredly make difficulties; but so may the over-enthusiastic planners. The planner placed in charge of the destinies of a region finds himself in a position not unlike that of Jesus when the devil took Him up into the high mountain to tempt Him with all the kingdoms of the earth and the glory of them: 'All these things will I give Thee, if Thou wilt fall down and worship me.' So the planner sees the grandeur and beauty of his plan, and thinks of all the happiness that he will be able to confer. But what really tempts him is the lure of power. It is his plan and he wishes to impose it and resultant happiness on his subjects. But he forgets two things—that happiness cannot be imposed, and that power, even when as intellectual and beneficent as his, corrupts."

The report that the Bank of "England" is to be nationalised brings to mind Montagu Norman's statement that he would welcome nationalisation. In commenting on the British Labor Government's banking proposals, he significantly said, "they could be much worse." No doubt!

Labor spokesmen in Britain are making it perfectly clear that the Bank of "England" is to pursue the same policy as previously—i.e., the policy of Wall Street, New York.

There is no doubt that nationalisation of banking is being introduced in British countries as quickly as possible, in order to make it harder for the people to obtain a change in financial policy. Every centralisation of power makes it more difficult to make reforms. That is why we must destroy the power of the Canberra bureaucracy within a reasonable period of time. Act NOW.

—E.D.B.

JUDAISM AND SOCIAL CREDIT

That the antagonism between Judaism and Social Credit is fundamental and religious could hardly be better expressed than it is in the following quotation from a review of Wernher Sombart by Dr. Jacob Fromer, in "Die Zukunft" for October 28, 1911, p. 113:—

"Nothing in the Jewish religion is done for nothing; everything has its reason and object. This original trait of cool-headed piety runs from the Patriarchs by way of Mosaism and Talmudism uninterruptedly down to the present day. There are no essential differences between the service of Abraham to Jehovah and the religiosity of the pious men who predominate in the Ghetto. Both are based on a 'do ut des' system, and are diametrically opposed to the Christian Doctrine of unearned grace."

Now graft a national dividend, or the theory of unearned increment, on that stem!

—"The Social Crediter" (Eng.), 26/5/45.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Annual Meeting of the S.C.M. of S.A. will be held in the United Democrats' rooms, 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide, on Thursday, September 27, at 8 p.m., to receive the chairman's annual report, elect officers and decide the policy for the ensuing year. Members are reminded that annual subscriptions are now due, and early payments will save postage. All interested friends are welcome to attend.

—J. E. BURGESS, Hon. Secretary.

mentioned persons addressed themselves to several financial men, who for their

part addressed themselves to our representatives. We are ready to support the agitation and propaganda projected by them in Russia on the (one) absolute condition that the agitation and propaganda noted (planned) by the above-mentioned Messrs. Zinovieff and Lunacharsky will touch the active armies at the front. In case the agents of the Imperial Bank should address themselves to your banks, we beg you to open them the necessary credits, which will be covered completely as soon as you make demand on Berlin. — (Signed) Risser.

"(Addition to document): Zinovieff and Lunacharsky got in touch with Imperial Bank of Germany through the bankers, D. Rubenstein, Max Warburg, and Parvus. Parvus and Warburg both figure in the Lenin and Trotsky documents."

(To be continued.)

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