

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. 12, No. 13. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, APRIL 5, 1946

"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.

Undemocratic Set-Up of Nationalised Radio

The "A."B.C. "News Commentators

(A Broadcast by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc., from 7HO, on March 31)

In the "Mercury" of Friday, March 22, appeared the following statement:—

"News broadcasts, reviews and commentaries broadcast by the Australian Broadcasting Commission should be inspected before being put on the air, Mr. Fraser (Labor, N.S.W.) said in the House of Representatives today. He quoted a recent statement by Mr. H. D. Black, an A.B.C. commentator, that he regarded his task as being to insinuate his ideas into the minds of his listeners. The Minister for Information (Mr. Calwell) undertook to refer the complaint to the Postmaster-General."

And in the Melbourne "Herald" of the previous day appeared this statement:

"The Director-General of Information (Mr. E. G. Bonney) has refused to make available to Australian newspapers texts of speeches and commentaries broadcast to the world through the national short-wave station. Mr. Bonney said the Department was too busy to make available copies of this information. Mr. Bonney's decision means in effect that the Department has decided that the people of Australia must not know what the Department of Information broadcasts on their behalf to the world; because Australian listeners cannot follow a big majority of the broadcasts."

It is a healthy sign that members of both political parties are taking some interest in what is said over the national network.

The names of these commentators are Mr. H. D. Black, Mr. Kurt Offenburg, Mr. Emery Barks, Dr. Clunies Ross, Dr. Frank Leuar and Professor Julius Stone.

When Mr. Fraser, M.H.R., objected to the statement of commentator Black that "he regarded his task as being to insinuate his ideas into the minds of his listeners," he had every right to object.

The word "insinuate" means, according to the Oxford Dictionary, to introduce indirectly or by devious methods, to introduce by imperceptible degrees or subtle or artful means. This, then, is Mr. H. D. Black's description of his own methods; it is also a description of the methods used by other regular A.B.C. commentators.

It is quite obvious that all of these commentators are speaking to the same

policy, and that they are picked for a very definite purpose.

Mr. Black has every right to say what he believes, and it is just possible that he believes in what he says; but to have him on the whole national network every week, and to have Mr. Black followed by Kurt Offenburg and then by Emery Barks and then by Julius Stone, week after week, is not fair and is not reasonable.

It would be much better to have a one hundred per cent Communist on the air, to be followed by somebody who believed in the British people and the British way of life; we would then know where we stood with these people, but few people know where they stand with men like Professor Julius Stone; few people will find out what he has been driving at before it is too late, and the damage has been done.

These commentators know they are being carefully watched; they know there is a strong rise of opinion against the continuous attack being made on the British people.

People are beginning to realise that these attacks are designed to break up the British Empire, and the commentators are more careful now some of them have even gone so far as to praise the British war effort, especially since there has been a Socialist Government in England. But these are only isolated incidents to ward off the gathering storm.

The position of Julius Stone is peculiar. He recently obtained a key position in the legal faculty at Sydney. The University wished to keep this position vacant for a returned soldier; Stone's fellow-professor of the faculty refused to work with him;

the Registrar of the University resigned because of the appointment; the Law faculty objects to him, and so do the students—yet word came from abroad that this man, Julius Stone, was to be given the job, and now he is in the Sydney University. And because he is in the Sydney University we find him giving a weekly commentary over the entire national network.

That is a very strange thing for a man recently arrived in this country.

Julius Stone has a right to his own opinions, but he certainly has no right to be speaking over the national network every week, insinuating his poisonous doctrines into young minds. Also, if men like Julius Stone are paid £1 a minute to talk over the air; then those who object to his ideas should have the right to reply.

After all, our money is being used to pay Julius Stone, and it is pretty hard on us that we have no right of reply.

Julius Stone knows he is being watched, and he is becoming more and more cautious and more devious—so devious, in fact, that few people can now follow him. This is all to the good. But these men still remain in positions of great influence, ready to fling their weight when the next crisis arrives.

Julius Stone and the rest may have every right to admire Russia, and Russian methods, and I think it is only right that the Russian point of view should be heard; but how long would a commentator last in Russia if he gave the British point of view, or how long would he last if he gave the truth about the outside world to the poverty-stricken millions in Russia?

This question has only to be asked and the outrageous position of these commentators is immediately seen.

Mr. Ward's recent broadcast denunciation of Bretton Woods, as an international financial dictatorship almost akin to Hitler's set-up, has at least caused Liberal Members to indicate their attitude in this matter. Apart from a statement attributed to Mr. Menzies, they had been discreetly silent; but now it is clear that they favour ratification of this plan to undermine Australia's financial sovereignty.

A press report of March 28, in this connection, quoted Mr. Chifley and Dr. Evatt as also favouring acceptance. The idea seems to be that if some minor modification of Bretton Woods is effected, that will be sufficient reason for accepting the proposals. Electors should maintain their pressure against this plot.

The fact is that the British peoples have been subjected to a very vicious and insidious attack by both America and Russia. It is absolutely essential for the survival of the remains of our civilisation that the British people hold together in this crisis—probably the biggest crisis in their history; there is no other people capable of carrying the world through this crisis, and yet what do we find? We find a man arrives from abroad, forces himself into an important position in the Sydney University, and immediately starts to give weekly commentaries over the entire national network. And that man, Julius Stone, has as much interest in the British people and British culture as a cat has in a mouse.

The position is serious, because there is no doubt that England today, after six years of colossal war-effort, is being deliberately starved to her knees. This would have been quite impossible if the Australian and Canadian Governments had played the game.

And the chief task of the A.B.C. commentators is to hide this very vital fact by discussing everything under the sun except that which would help us to help ourselves.

I know there have been one or two exceptions in the commentaries, but that has been due to outside pressure. And the sordid business still goes on. I ask all listeners to write to their representative in Canberra or to the Director of Talks, A.B.C., Sydney, asking that someone occasionally should be permitted to talk on the British point of view—and for preference let him be a returned soldier who has been in Germany and met the Russians—or perhaps Mr. Maloney could give us a few talks—I wonder!

Significant Political Pointers

Judy Barden, North American Newspaper Alliance correspondent, recently returned to America after six months in Berlin and London, gives evidence of the manner in which the British people, after winning the military war, are being defeated in the economic war.

She says that German girls have far more to eat and wear than British girls. "Britain might just as well have lost the war," she says. "Miserable little shacks are being provided for the homeless; the food ration is inadequate; famous English tweeds are being exported, while English women have to be content with one dress a year . . . But in Berlin every woman wears stockings—the older ones cashmere or woollen types and the younger ones full-fashioned silk, and even nylon hose. Fraulein has shoes, furs and warm clothes. Her eyes sparkle and she walks with a springy step."

It was always obvious that those who promoted the second part of the World War, which started in 1914, would do all in their power to ensure that Germany did not lose the peace, whoever "won" the war. It is reported that the German Communists are already seeking to gain more support by strongly nationalist appeals against any detachment of the Ruhr. Hitler was used to advance exactly the same policy. And Stalin has said that there must be no decentralisation of Germany. Which means that Stalin visualises himself using Germany to further his own aims.

Mr. Abbott, M.H.R., at Canberra on March 6:

"Yet the Government does nothing to remedy the (housing) position except to make lavish promises. In today's 'Canberra Times' there is an advertisement calling for eleven more economists. Does the Government think that houses can be built merely by appointing economists?"

"Belgium's wealthiest surgeon, Dr. Pierre Depage, who recently joined the ranks of the Belgian Communist Party, has been elected a Communist Senator, and is now tipped to become a Minister in the next Belgian coalition government."—Melbourne "Argus," March 28, 1946.

A lot of "American" opinion as printed in Australian papers is taken from the New York "P.M.," a semi-Communist paper owned by the millionaire, Marshall Field, a well-known Leftist.

The story about the Communists and Socialists representing the "working-class" is starting to wear a bit thin.

There is no evidence to hand from Great Britain to suggest that the millennium is arriving as a result of the nationalisation of the Bank of "England." Lord Catto, who succeeded Montagu Norman as Governor, supported the nationalisation of the Bank and is still Governor. Australian Labor voters who recall how they suffered during the Great Depression as a result of Niemeyer's "advice," will no doubt be interested to know that the British Socialist Government apparently thinks so highly of this man that he is being retained as one of the Directors of the nationalised Bank of "England!"

Having given us the atomic bomb, the scientific planners appear to be determined to bring us still further "progress." A Dr. David Trout, psychologist at Central Michigan College, Detroit, Canada, says that some day parents will require to have licenses to have children. "Licensing," he told the Detroit "Free Press," "is the only means of controlling childbirth so as to ensure competent parents." No doubt Dr. Trout and his colleagues want to decide which parents are "competent." But who will decide the competency of the scientific planners to make such decisions?

The "Union Now" idea has been revived. This plan for world hegemony was put forward as soon as World War, Part II, was under way. International financier, James Warburg and other influential internationalists openly advocated the plan, but it was criticised so severely that it was put away. U.N.O. is obviously regarded as a transitional step towards the ultimate objective of rigid world control by a few men. General Smuts, whose close connection with the groups, which have reduced large portions of this planet to a shambles is well known to regular readers of this journal, says that Europe cannot "save itself" (Continued on page 2)

TAX TREACHERY: Although the Federal Government is hastening to bring in the necessary legislation to implement the treachery of State Labor Governments in surrendering taxing powers, this issue is far from settled. Ex-Premier Dunstan is on the warpath, and urges another appeal to the High Court, and, if necessary, to the Privy Council, to nullify Uniform Taxation. In a debate on this matter in the Victorian Parliament, he said: "The Government had no right to sell these important principles for a handful of silver. The Government was the trustee of the rights of the people, and no Government had the right to give them away." He was supported by Mr. Oldham, Mr. McDonald, and Mr. Holloway. Electors should seek an assurance from Federal candidates that they will restore State-taxing rights if returned. There is a vital principle involved in this question.

CHINA'S CAST-OFFS: The first of a large contingent of Jews, not wanted by the Chinese, has arrived in Australia. This news was accompanied by the usual persecution propaganda in the Melbourne "Herald" of March 20. On the following day, the Melbourne "Sun" quotes Mr. Calwell as saying that "Jewish immigrants who had been granted permits would not arrive for about three years," and that "2000 permits had been issued." Which of these two reports are we to believe? Further, what powerful influence is able to obtain permits for alien Jews when our own kith and kin are stranded overseas? It looks as though it is the Gentiles who are being persecuted.

SNOOPERS SNUBBED: Attacking the British proposal to spend £165,000 on a Royal Commission on population, Mr. W. J. Brown, M.P., said: "We don't want snoopers going from door to door asking others why they have not had more children. The whole idea is crazy. I can, tell you why women do not have more babies. There is no room, no food, and no clothing for them—and not enough maternity wards." That sounds like plain common sense, which our local busybodies might observe to advantage; there is far too much prying into private affairs, especially such matters as procreation. Nature has attended to this matter right down the ages, and there is no reason to assume

that busy-bodies who quite often are themselves childless or nearly so, can improve matters by prying into other people's affairs. They should all be told to mind their own business.

VISCOUNT'S VISION Viscount Hinchinbrooke, British M.P., during the last national savings campaign, evoked criticism from Members of all Parties for urging his constituents not to contribute. However, he is determined to speak his mind, and he reiterated this: "If the Government wants your savings for political purposes which you don't like, I urge you to withhold them . . . No Government had the right to use the hard-earned savings of the people for political purposes which the people as a whole did not endorse." Those realistic remarks also apply to Australia, where the Government uses the taxpayers' money for unwanted purposes, including the 1944 Referendum, which the people rejected. They now propose to ignore that decision and to spend more taxpayers' money on a 1946 Referendum. An emphatic "No" will be a suitable protest.

BRITAIN'S BEEF: Australia and New Zealand have almost doubled their meat supplies to Britain since the end of the Pacific war, but no increase in the British ration has resulted (Melbourne "Herald," March 13). That should interest those who are fooling the people into believing that Great Britain is receiving more meat when we send more. The "Herald" article then informs us that the reason for this is that these increases "had been almost exactly offset by the diversion of South American meat to France, Belgium and Holland." It is thus apparent that someone is working a gigantic swindle on unsuspecting people, a swindle that aims at imposing unnecessary hardship on Britain. Public men who have been a party to this stunt should immediately track down whoever is responsible, so that their own names may be cleared from the stigma of this treachery.

PERSIAN PLOT: Captured German documents, now in the hands of the U.S.A. State Department, set out Russia's expansionist plans, which they tried to achieve by arrangement with Germany in 1941. Apparently

(Continued on page 3.)

MENTAL CONFUSION OF AN EDITOR

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

Sir, —There is a newspaper in Tasmania called "The Tasmanian Trader," and it is described as "the official organ of the Retail Traders' Association of Tasmania." The name of the Editor is Roger W. Winspear, and in the issue for March 1946, he has signed an editorial containing pathetic evidence of mental confusion.

He refers to indirect taxes as "Government barnacles," and says "they are only tolerated by the taxpayer because he does not realise he is paying them." A barnacle is a natural thing, but taxation is quite unnatural. Barnacles naturally adhere to things, but taxation is put upon us. It is not true that taxes are tolerated because the taxpayer doesn't realise he is paying them. They are submitted to because men like Mr. Roger W. Winspear have helped to mislead the taxpayer into believing that taxes are unavoidable. The taxpayer KNOWS that he is paying DIRECT taxes of a confiscatory nature, but that doesn't stop him from tolerating them. Most of the taxpayers are only too well aware of this position, but they do not recognise it as a swindle, and Mr. Roger W. Winspear, unwittingly perhaps, excuses the swindle instead of exposing it.

He says: "As our industry expands we must seek markets for our surplus production."

In the first place, there is at the moment an acute shortage of many items of production, and there is a local market seriously under-served. And when the local "market" is fully served, where shall we look for others? U.S.A. is closed. The United Kingdom is under United States' control. Russia is shut in. The people of India and China are poverty-stricken, and we have not yet obtained means of transport to the Moon or Mars.

The editorial finishes with the suggestion that politicians of all parties should be told clearly that "the future of our country depends on opportunity for work, with a ready and unhampered sale for goods or services associated with that work; that we must have the right to retain a reasonable portion of hard-earned money for a rainy day; that such a policy will lead to good wages, fair profits, greater security, and better living; and that sounder budgets will come when based on an enhanced national income, earned by a nation geared up to the highest pitch of production—free from Barnacles."

Well, I for one am not prepared to tell my representative in Parliament anything of the kind. The future of our country does NOT depend on an opportunity for work.

It depends upon our natural resources and our ability to use them. If we use mechanical means and solar energy as we should, the need for "work" will become less and less and the opportunity for LEISURE more and more. It is leisure I am after, not work.

It is not possible to have a ready and unhampered sale for goods unless the quantity of money supplied to the people is at least sufficient to cover the total prices of the goods available. Not only is that NOT usually the case, but a large portion of the money distributed to the people is diverted to other purposes. Furthermore, it is an impossibility for sufficient money to be provided for the people under the present financial system, for the simple but adequate reason that industry generates costs faster than it distributes money. A supplementary distribution of money is an absolute necessity for the assured success of retailers, but in this regard it would appear that Mr. Roger W. Winspear's mind is a blank.

And who has actually asked for "the right to retain a reasonable portion of hard-earned money for a rainy day"? I do not seek that right at all.

What I do seek is a state of society in which all the people will receive incomes, which will enable them to purchase the goods available at the time they are available.

The idea of putting money aside now to purchase things, which MAY be available

ECONOMIC POLICY IMPOSED ON GREAT BRITAIN

From the "Social Creditor," England: The done thing nowadays, Clarence, is to see how little you can get out of a day's work. You take an industry, nationalise it, think of a number, double it, make that the basic wage, put in a "working party" to see that no one does any work, say it's in need of reorganisation, nationalise it, fill it with refugees from Hitler's tyranny, and then announce that the Government Policy is Austerity. If anyone accidentally does make something, our dear old friend, The Necessity for Increased Exports, will enable you to keep the populace where it belongs until the outbreak of the next war.

IT IS YOUR FIGHT!

You Can Help To Double The Circulation Of "The New Times" By The End Of 1946.

How? By Obtaining One More Reader.

Why Not See How Many New Subscribers You Can Get Before The End Of The Year?

in future years, while things which are available today remain on the shelves, is an idea suitable only for a lunatic asylum.

What is the difference between "hard earned money" and easy-earned money? The people who don't "work" but get large incomes are much more comfortable than the poor mugs who do work but get small incomes. It is not the WORK that makes the difference—it is the INCOME. Easy-earned money is just as good for buying things, but, like hard-earned money, is not much good to anyone when it is "retained."

This "rainy day" business is a funny story of the past, and it is more than pathetic to find an editor openly signing his name to such rubbish. The "rainy day" is, of course, the day on which there will be plenty of goods in the shops but a shortage of incomes with which to purchase them.

The remedy for this absurdity is to make the incomes such that they will fit the goods.

In other words, the availability of goods should determine the people's incomes, whereas Mr. Roger W. Winspear, while professing to advance the interests of the retailers, subscribes to the notion that arbitrarily restricted incomes should determine the saleability of the goods in the hands of the retailers.

Instead of leading to good wages, fair profits, greater security, and better living, the policy put forward in the name of the retailers could only lead, under present financial conditions, to an intensification of the never-ending struggle for wages to catch up with prices, to bigger and bigger monopolies to stifle competition, to less and

less security in the true sense, but more and more servitude and servility, and to a deterioration in the living conditions for the 90 per cent. of the people who have wages as their only source of income.

But perhaps the most absurd statement of all was that "sound budgets will come when based on an enhanced national income, earned by a nation geared up to the highest pitch of production."

What is a budget? What is a sounder budget? Who controls the national income, which controls the budget?

As Mr. Roger W. Winspear speaks of the national income as the basis for the budget, we must assume that it is the National Budget to which he refers. The National Budget is a financial instrument for keeping the Federal Parliament under control. It is not an instrument designed to facilitate getting things done. It is prepared on the basis of the financial conditions operating at the time of its preparation, but these financial conditions have not hitherto been under the control of Parliament. They have been imposed by the controllers of financial policy. This means that the Budget is the instrument by which Parliament is forced to observe a policy imposed upon it from outside.

We were geared up to a high pitch of production in the years 1929, et seq., and our "earning" capacity was at its peak.

But apparently Mr. Roger W. Winspear did not know that our national income fell rapidly and alarmingly. I would go further and say that he does not even know why it fell or how the fall was arranged. And yet he is accepted as an official mouthpiece for the Retail Traders of Tasmania. What a pity!

And supposing that ALL the nations do become geared up to the highest pitch of production and all have a "surplus," what will they do with the surplus? Another war to destroy the industrial capacity of some of the nations? If not, what?

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, Blackmans Bay, Tasmania, 31/3/46.

SOCIAL CREDIT ACTIONISTS' MEETING IN MELBOURNE

Speaking at a well-attended meeting in the Australian Church Hall, Melbourne, last Tuesday evening, Mr. Eric. Butler outlined the following three-point policy, which, he suggested, Australian social crediters should vigorously pursue between now and the next Federal Elections and the Referendum:

(1) A campaign to expose and oppose the new attempt to persuade the electors to give increased powers to Canberra at the Referendum; (2) Endeavour to make the reduction of the Federal bureaucracy the main issue at the Federal Elections; (3) Where no candidate at the Federal Elections will undertake "to make the reduction of the Canberra bureaucracy his primary concern, as many electors as possible to vote informally, stating why publicly, rather than vote against themselves.

The meeting was held under the auspices of the Victorian Social Credit Action Group. Mr. W. J. Carruthers, Hon. Secretary of the Group, took the chair.

In reviewing his activities since he came out of the Army three months ago, Mr. Butler said that the most pleasing results obtained were the very considerable increase in the circulation of the "New Times" and the large sale of literature at country meetings. He pointed out that experience proved that there is no reason why the drive to double the circulation of the "New Times" by the end of this year should not succeed.

"But," he said, "it is necessary for every present reader of the paper to realise that he must accept his responsibilities and play his part—even if he only obtains one new reader before the end of the year. Surely this is not too difficult? Some social crediters become discouraged, when, after introducing the "New Times" to a few people, they are told that it is too hard to read. Let us be frank and admit that there is only a limited section of the people who have the desire or the capacity to grasp fully all the implications of what social crediters have to say. It is our task to get our information to this section in order that they can provide correct advice and guidance for their fellow electors prior to and as each crisis occurs. We can merely explain carefully to people where present economic and political policies are leading, and suggest to them what they can do in every crisis.

"Every advance in civilisation has been initiated by a minority. Social crediters should always remember this fact, and not suggest, as I have heard some people suggest, that we should attempt to get circulation for the 'New Times' by adopting the same tactics as the monopoly press. A reader who will not take the trouble to understand the material being published, is not likely to prove an effective exponent of Social Credit, if he has to be 'spoon-fed' on slogans and catch-cries. It is far better to have 10,000 readers thoroughly grasping Social Credit and giving correct advice than it is to have 50,000 readers with a hazy idea of Social Credit giving wrong advice and creating confusion. We have got to go out and find the people who can appreciate the significance of what we have to say. There are tens of thousands of these people in Australia. I am meeting them every week."

RADIO CAMPAIGN

Mr. Butler dealt briefly with the radio campaign over 3CS, Colac, and 3MA, Mildura.

"As far as I can learn, we are reaching a wide public with both these stations, although it is hard to judge direct results. You are no doubt all aware that our negotiations for the use of the Melbourne 'Argus' station, 3SR, Shepparton, one of the

most powerful commercial radio stations in Australia, failed. This was a setback, which probably could have been overcome if sufficient pressure had been brought to bear on the 'Argus.' I am pleased to say that a large number of protest letters went in, which caused 'Argus' circulation representatives to call on many social crediters. But, as usual, many 'New Times' readers did nothing about the matter! They must realise that, if they will not associate for specific results, they cannot blame their fellow electors if they will not associate in action. It is unfortunate that most of the radio stations in Victoria, which would be most suitable for our purposes are controlled by Melbourne or provincial papers. However, we are investigating the matter further. In the meantime, we are continuing weekly broadcasts over 3CS, Colac, and 3MA, Mildura."

COUNTRY CAMPAIGNS

Mr. Butler dealt briefly with the results of his country meetings, and gave evidence of the sound progress of Social Credit. He pointed out that there were hundreds of centres in Victoria where there were no Social Credit "contacts."

"If only I and Mr. Johnstone can get the physical and financial co-operation, we will guarantee to carry the Social Credit message into every part of Victoria. One or two readers of the 'New Times' in every centre in Victoria could permeate the entire State with Social Credit ideas."

ELECTION AND REFERENDUM

After clarifying some Social Credit fundamentals, Mr. Butler went on to say that it was obvious that no worthwhile reform can be introduced in the face of political and economic centralisation. He outlined the manner in which the centralised bureaucracy has been built up to supplement and, eventually, to supersede financial control.

"This bureaucracy must be attacked and destroyed. There can be no question about the vital necessity of refusing the bureaucracy all the powers being sought at the Referendum. But we must do more than this. We must campaign against every candidate at the Federal elections who will not give a written undertaking to place first on his programme the reduction of the number of Federal civil servants to the 1938 level or less."

Mr. Butler outline how all Federal Parties are in favour of further centralising, resulting in further government by bureaucracy.

Dealing with what electors should do where none of the candidates will sign the anti-bureaucracy pledge, Mr. Butler pointed out that it was high time electors challenged the idea that they should be dragged to the polls to vote against their own policies.

"We must make it clear in such cases

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

unless all European countries surrender their sovereignties to a European Union. Smuts say that a European Union on the lines of the Pan-American Union is "inevitable." That is interesting, because we know the groups who brought about the Pan-American Union. When he is not too busy organising Europe and other parts of the world, Smuts may care to answer the following simple questions:

Who or what is Europe to "save itself" from?

Have the Americans a higher standard of living, greater security and more freedom since being organised into the Pan-American Union?

Pan-Americanism is the policy of the same philosophy, which gave rise to Pan-Germanism. This policy is the result of the will-to-power.

Readers have no doubt noticed that British social crediters usually refer to the London "Times," generally regarded as the mouth-piece of financial interests, as the three penny edition of the Communist "Daily Worker."

In an article in the Melbourne "Herald" of March 18, Trevor Smith writes:

"Mr. Bevin was recently a guest at a function at which a representative of 'The Times' sat on one side and a representative of the Communist 'Daily Worker' on the other side. He had the gathering rocking with laughter when he said, 'I read both newspapers through and through, and sometimes I am blanked if I know which is which.'"

An editorial in the West Australian "Wheatgrower" of March 13 criticises the Bretton Woods agreement and concludes as follows:

"Rather than pass out from exasperation when the meaning of this calamitous agreement dawns on them, farmers are advised to write to their Federal Members . . . before other pressure causes Australia to fall unwillingly into the sorry line of victims."

The Social Credit idea of electoral pressure is spreading.

Significantly enough, the following extract from General Sir Frederick Morgan's statement early this year, concerning the Jewish exodus, from Europe, was not published in the Australian daily papers—in fact, the present writer is not aware of it appearing in any paper:

"Morgan said he was becoming more and more convinced that reports of pogroms and atrocities against the Jews in Poland were based less and less on fact. He charged that such stories were by-products of an organised Jewish plan to force the United Nations to take some action giving the Jews a permanent home." (vide "Edmonton Bulletin," January 2.)

—E. D. B.

SOCIALIST SABOTAGE OF FOOD SUPPLY

"J.R.D." from the N.S.W. South Coast: For 25 years our village got its milk from a man with a farm on the outskirts, carrying well-bred milkers regularly tested and certified free of T.B. During the summer months the population is often trebled by tourists and campers, and they were glad to have fresh milk and cream.

Then the Sydney Milk Board stepped in. It decreed that all this must cease forthwith and ordered the farmer to deliver all his milk to the factory seven miles away, telling him that if he wished to continue supplying residents he must buy his milk back from the board—presumably after it had been to Sydney and back. In "flush" months, when the board gets more milk than the metropolis requires, he would, come in with all other dairy-farmers in the district; deliver only half of his output as milk and separate the balance, selling the cream to the board at 10d per lb and disposing of the skim-milk as he pleased. That meant running it into the creek, for a neighbouring milk powder plant is standing idle—though Britain would take as much milk powder as it could get.

Last week that dairyman broke up his herd. He sold the milkers at auction, along with all the farm implements and machinery. Thus Socialism goes forward (or does it?) and private enterprise takes the knock again.

—Sydney "Bulletin," March 27.

that we are voting under protest, and that we are deliberately voting informally. Even if we vote for whom we consider the best of a bad lot, we are voting against ourselves, we are voting for a policy decided by the controllers of the Parties. This merely strengthens our opponents. A lead by only a few hundred electors would be a refreshing tonic for many other electors."

MORE FUNDS REQUIRED

Mr. Butler said that he hoped to cover the whole of Victoria before the Elections and the Referendum. "But, to conduct this campaign, we need more physical and financial support. A comparatively small number of social crediters have contributed sufficient finance to do what we have already accomplished. I want to appeal most earnestly to all those who have not contributed as yet to do so immediately. It is not honest to allow the few to continue carrying the entire financial burden."

Some important points were raised and discussed at question time. There was an excellent response to the appeal for further financial and physical assistance.

SOCIAL CREDIT & POLITICAL ACTION

In our issue of March 15 we published a contributor's comment on press reports that the secretary of "The Social Credit Movement of Australia" had announced the formation of a Social Credit Party to contest seats at the Federal Election. We have since received from the secretary in question an official letter enclosing a reply in which, inter alia, formation of a Party is denied.

This correspondence, preceded by a reprint of what our contributor originally said and followed by his further comment, is published hereunder:—

The public statement by a spokesman of "The Social Credit Movement of Australia" that a Social Credit Party has been formed to contest seats at the next Federal elections calls for some comment.

First and foremost, the grandiose term, "The Social Credit Movement of Australia," has no relation to realities. The policy of this group, who formerly called themselves "The Social Credit Movement of Australia," Wales, is neither endorsed by the majority of leading social crediters in New South Wales nor in any other State in Australia. Social Credit has nothing to do with Party politics in any shape or form. Those ideas grouped under the label of Social Credit have been given to the world by Major C. H. Douglas, and, to say the very least of it, it is not very ethical to pervert a man's ideas by applying his terms to other ideas. Spokesmen for this Social Credit Movement of New South Wales have consistently stated that "the State" should have "exclusive" control over the issue of all money. They are entitled to this viewpoint, but they are not entitled to call it Social Credit.

The writer of these notes has an open mind on the question of political action. But he points out that any political action not based on a non-party electoral pressure in each individual electorate is doomed to failure. There is no necessity for a Party in order to obtain this electoral pressure. But there is necessity for hard work by individual social crediters between elections. This work will yield far greater results than spending much hard-earned money in trying to compete with the big established Party machines just prior to elections. Furthermore, if members of the Social Credit Movement of New South Wales desire to enter the political arena, why haven't they confined themselves to their local sphere of State politics, where the possibilities of getting some results are immeasurably greater than in the Federal sphere? Have they succumbed to the idea that centralisation can only be defeated by centralisation?

—E.D.B.

* * * * *

THE SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT OF AUSTRALIA, N.S.W. DIVISION.
(ADVOCATING DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT.)

88 Pitt Street, Sydney.
19/3/46

The Editor, "New Times,"
McEwan House, Melbourne.

Dear Sir,—May I claim the privilege of replying, on behalf of the above Movement, to the strictures gratuitously offered by your correspondent, Mr. Eric Butler, in your Political Pointers column of issue March 15th.

While there is no desire to enter a controversy, my Council thinks that the comments referred to call for some rejoinder. Thanking you in anticipation,

(Sgd.) E. S. CARR, Gen. Sec.

The Editor, Sir,—The deliberate assault on the integrity of the N.S.W. Division of the Social Credit Movement of Australia by Mr. Eric Butler, in the "Political Pointers" column of the issue of the "New Times" of March 15th ill becomes one espousing the cause of Social Credit.

The quibble about our name we pass as puerile. Enough to know that there is a Social Credit Movement in Australia, and that we are the N.S.W. expression of it. The "Movement" is political, as distinct from other propagandist groups, of which there are many, all of which we wish "God speed."

No "Social Credit Party" has been formed to contest seats at next Federal elections that we know of.

We as a Movement have elected to support known and proved Social Crediters as candidates, not for a "Party," but for the community as a whole. Mr. Butler knows quite well that the Social Credit administrative formula embraces every citizen in its prescribed benefits.

Now, as to Mr. Butler's arrogant assumption that he (and, presumably, a few others), are the anointed High Priests of Social Credit, and that they only have received the "commandments" from the hands of their divinity, is so absurd that it only invites ridicule.

Are we to assume that Social Credit is only a theory to be forever banded about as a mental exercise by the elect?

Are we to believe that those who see economic salvation in the application of Social Credit principles are to be proscribed and denounced for presuming personally to attempt to translate them into the laws of the land?

Are we to believe that while treating Social Credit as a solution of economic problems that calls for some mental effort and especially demands an unflinching moral attitude—it must be left to "Party" politicians to operate? that those who advocate it fear to descend from their Olympus, mingle with men, and demonstrate it?

That is about as sensible as the nursery rhyme:—

"Mother, may I go out to swim?
Yes, my darling daughter;
Hang your clothes on a gooseberry bush,
But don't go near the water!"

Now, we say that whilst the preliminary preaching of Social Credit has been necessary, that stage has passed. The people are now ready to trust men who can expound the doctrine with its administration.

As to Mr. Butler's half-truth that we say "the State should have exclusive control over the issue of all money." We say the State must assume its sovereign right to issue, recall, and cancel all money, and we say how—by creating an "Authority" to carry out this function as laid down in the Douglas formula we have adopted.

How else will it be done? Will these self-anointed ones ignore the State and set up their own Parliament and Courts? If not, what? There must be constitutional power and delegated authority.

What is the matter, Mr. Butler?
—Yours faithfully, E. S. CARR, General Secretary.

* * * * *

The discerning reader will note how Mr. Carr's letter completely ignores the real issues raised in my criticism republished above.

While I am pleased to learn that the press reports relating to the formation of a Social Credit Party were erroneous, might I refer those concerned with the policy of the Social Credit Movement of New South

AN OPEN LETTER TO MR. CHIFLEY

Dear Mr. Chifley,—We have read with considerable interest Mr. Justice Davidson's voluminous report on the coal industry in New South Wales. It is not without significance that very little publicity has been given to what the report has to say about taxation and absenteeism.

Reviewing absenteeism, the Board of Inquiry found that the burden of taxation was the most active of all agents causing it. The report states that both the amount of the fortnightly taxation deductions and the uncertainty as to their extent, undoubtedly reduce the incentive of contract miners to work a full number of shifts. The same factor operates among workers on a daily or weekly wage.

This report on the coal-mining industry confirms beyond all argument what we have been saying for years: that high taxation kills incentive, slows up production, and causes such shortages that officialdom has a pretext for greater and greater control of everybody and everything.

The fact must be faced, Mr. Chifley, that the taxation monopoly and the bureaucratic monopoly are sabotaging our production system. We have not the slightest doubt that the major policy of those concerned with this sabotage, is to destroy and discredit private enterprise as the preliminary step towards centralised control of all economic activities under the guise of nationalisation.

Nationalisation means, of course, monopoly. And monopoly places the individual at the mercy of those controlling the monopoly.

The coal-miners' principal enemy today is the taxation monopoly, not the "boss." The coal-miner's problems will not be solved

Wales—most of whom I know personally and regard as friends—to the material concerning Social Credit in Quebec published elsewhere in this issue. Surely we must take some notice of the experiences of the strongest Social Credit Movement, outside Alberta, in the world?

The crux of Mr. Carr's letter concerns my alleged "arrogant assumption" that I am one of "the anointed High Priests of Social Credit." So far from me and others being "High Priests," we are merely attempting to bring before our fellow electors certain ideas grouped under the label of Social Credit. Social Credit ideas are given to us, and, from time to time, clarified, by Major C. H. Douglas's journal of policy, "The Social Creditor." Major Douglas has made it perfectly clear that Social Credit has nothing whatever to do with "the State . . ." (assuming) its sovereign right to issue, recall, and cancel all money. . . . I use Mr. Carr's exact wording here. As a social creditor, I therefore have the right to point out this fact. Mr. Carr and others of the same opinion have every right to advocate State control of the money system; but, having had it pointed out to them that their ideas are not Social Credit, as defined by Major Douglas, they should cease calling themselves social crediters. They have every right to disagree with Major Douglas—if so, let them say so—but they have no right to distort his ideas by applying his terms to ideas, which he has denounced.

This issue, and it is a very important issue, is not one of my opinion versus anyone else's opinion. Facts are facts, and that is all there is to it. If those "social crediters" advocating State control of the money system are not aware of Major Douglas's condemnation of this idea, I will supply them with innumerable statements upon request.

—E.D.B.

A NOTE ON REVOLUTION

From the "Social Creditor," 12/1/46: Redhead Yorke was imprisoned in Dorchester Castle from 1795 to 1799 for being "a man who had been concerned in three revolutions already . . . and who will continue to cause revolutions all over the world." When he was released, he hastened to France to continue his revolutionary activities. He was evidently an honest man, and he wrote a book, "France in 1802," in which he admitted to complete disillusionment. As an instance of the difference between the vicious romanticism of Carlyle and the facts as seen, not by an unbiased, but a very reluctantly converted, witness the following passage (p. 28) is instructive: "The Revolution, which was brought about ostensibly for the benefit of the lower classes of society, has sunk them to a degree of degradation and misfortune to which they were never reduced under the ancient monarchy. They have been disinherited, stripped, and deprived of every resource for existence, except defeats of arms and the fleeting spoil of vanquished nations."

COAL OUTPUT IN GREAT BRITAIN

In the British House of Commons on January 22, 1946, Commander Marshall asked the Minister of Fuel and Power the output per wage earner in the coalfields for 1938, 1941, 1944 and 1945.

Mr. Shinwell: "The average annual output of saleable coal per wage-earner employed in the coalmining industry during the years 1938, 1941, 1944 and 1945 was 290.4 tons, 295.8 tons, 259.2 tons and 245.3 tons respectively. The figure for 1945 is provisional."

Commander Marshall: "Can the right hon. Gentleman give any reason for the fall in output for 1945?"

Mr. Shinwell: "It is the fact that we are not getting the output."

LESSON FOR LIBERALS

Those anti-Socialists in the community who place their faith in the "Liberal" and Australian "Country" Parties, which are merely the right wing of the Socialist Party, cannot be very enthused about the results of the by-election in Henty last Saturday. Unless something unforeseen happens in the meantime, there seems to be little prospect of Labor's "opponents" causing them much concern at the next elections.

The sooner the rank-and-file of the Liberal and Country Parties realise that they are being led to the Socialist slaughter by their own leader, the sooner they will take more serious note of what the social crediters are telling them. But they haven't an indefinite period of time left to them.

EVEN WORMS MAY TURN

Monsieur Felix Guoin, the Grand Orient [Masonic] Premier of France, says the French require "a psychological shock" which he proposes to give them by "rigorous austerity."

We are disposed to believe that the psychological, and other shocks, both in France and elsewhere, will be administered to the austerity merchants.

—"The Social Creditor," 9/2/46.

ON THE RECORD

We are indebted to a review in "The Tablet" (London) for the information that the grandmother of Mrs. Sidney Webb [leading Fabian Socialist] was a Jewess. That explains a lot.

And we are indebted to Mr. Randolph Churchill in "Today in Europe" for the information that conscription was the child of the French Revolution. That explains a lot more.

—"The Social Creditor" (Eng.), 19/1/46.

PRODUCTION OF A GENIUS

"Society cannot contribute anything to the breeding and growing of ingenious men. A creative genius cannot be trained. There are no schools for creativeness. A genius is precisely a man who defies all schools and rules, who deviates from the traditional roads of routine and opens up new paths through land inaccessible before. A genius is always a teacher, never a pupil; he is always self-made. He does not owe anything to the favour of those in power. But, on the other hand, the Government can bring about conditions which paralyse the efforts of a creative spirit and prevent him from rendering useful services to the community."

—"Bureaucracy," by Ludwig von Mises (p. 21).

"THE MONEY SYSTEM AND ITS POLICY."

Hear—

MR. P. M. IRELAND,
Thursday, April 11, at 8 p.m.

at the

Douglas Social Credit Movement of Victoria, "The Block," Melbourne.
(Entrance through grille in Elizabeth Street.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

these were unsuccessful, otherwise Russia would have been Germany's ally. Among other conditions, Russia was to receive "a free hand in Persia and Irak, and enough of Saudi-Arabia, to give the Soviet control of the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Eden." And so, now we learn what a slender thread decided the matter of allies in the recent war. We can also see Russia's determined policy of imperialism, a policy that is so loudly denounced in respect of other countries. As long as Uncle Joe does it, all is well and justice is done—according to Communist gospel!

* * * * *

BREAKFAST BARS: The evil of accepting things as they are is illustrated in a recent article in the Melbourne "Herald's" women's section. The contributor comments (without lament or regret) on the modern kitchen without space for a table or chairs, and then suggests a "buffet" idea; that is, a shelf along the wall long enough to accommodate the family. She says we are accustomed to this idea in public snack bars and should adapt it to the home. God forbid! Again, without lament, this female scribe says: "Few families have time for a leisurely breakfast, in which case even chairs are not a major consideration." If this is a fair sample of what women have to contribute to current problems, it's a very poor lookout. It is an unfortunate fact that so-called kitchens are skimmed, and that in our mad rush for work we have lost the art of real living; but this situation is not inevitable, so why condone it by not condemning it?

* * * * *

FASCISM FADING? Owing to strong public pressure the proposed tax-financed National Socialist "free" medical scheme has been abandoned in this country for the time being. The Fascist bread zoning is

also to be abandoned, thanks to Electoral Campaign strategy. The next bureaucratic racket, which needs to be eliminated, is price fixing, which is restricting production and robbing the workers, some of whom foolishly believe it to be a benefit. Generally speaking, it may be said that the tide seems to be slowly turning against the bureaucrats and their fascistic controls in Australia, but to place the issue beyond doubt an emphatic "No" is required at the coming Referendum. It is wise to regard all political moves for the present as mere bait to fool electors.

STALIN'S SEIZURES: Since 1939 Stalin has seized Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and he now regards Poland, Jugoslavia, Roumania, and ultimately Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria and eastern Germany, as members of the U.S.S.R. So, it will be seen that Hitler's aspirations were not remarkable by comparison. Commenting on this, the American "Mercury" recently remarked, "the view that Stalin might become democratic was futile and self-deluding" (Melbourne "Herald," 29/12/45). The same article quoted Stalin as expressing the opinion that "the liquidation of British Labor leaders and American Socialists would be necessary to the rise of Communism." That should serve as a warning to our local Socialists, who are busy centralising power for their own destruction. None of these dupes is likely to occupy a box seat in Stalin's New Order.

—OB.H.

MARXIAN MENTALITY

"The French need a thrashing. If the Prussians are victorious, the centralisation of power of the State will be useful to the centralisation of the German working-class." — Marx to Engels, July 20, 1870.

QUEBEC SOCIAL CREDITERS FORMING "PRESSURE PARLIAMENTS"

(From "The Canadian Social Crediter," 24/1/46.)

On the 29th and 30th of December, the district leaders of the Quebec Social Credit organisation met in Montreal, to revise the political standing of their provincial movement and devise appropriate means to make the best use of the Quebec Social Credit forces. The provincial leader, Mr. Louis Even, summed up the situation as follows:

"Ours is the strongest political movement in the province of Quebec. We have three big assets:

"1. The most dynamic political doctrine in the world in Social Credit.

"2. Our Official newspaper, 'Vers Demain,' with 45,000 paid-up subscribers, which is more than three times the highest level ever reached by any straight political organ in the province of Quebec;

"3. A large body of men, convinced, peppy and determined to carry on the fight to a finish.

"And yet, in spite of these unparalleled forces, we have been heavily defeated at the polls in two general elections, in 1944 and 1945, and again in the by-election of Beauce, on the 21st of November last.

"Moreover, I feel sure that the same fate would overtake us again if we have to enter a field where money wins and where corruption is master of the day—unless we devise some means for making our electoral campaigns effective, so that the people will act rationally when they have their heads on their shoulders and when the party machines are in storage."

A NEW PLAN was then submitted, discussed, and enthusiastically acclaimed by all present. These represented the various districts of the Province of Quebec.

Social Crediters want a functioning democracy. They want their elected representatives to carry out the electors' policies. In order to know their electors' policies, the representatives must hear the electors. They should also place before their electors the great questions that come before Parliament, and determine what action their electors want them to take on such questions.

Nothing of the kind has been done in the past. When the Union of Electors of the Province of Quebec holds political meetings and invites the members of Parliament of the interested constituencies to be present, as a rule these members either do not answer, or they find an excuse to be absent. The prevailing concept of democracy is that the electors have their say only on election day, and that the members of Parliament can do anything which those in control of the party ask them to do, feeling sure they will have the help of the party machine to get elected again on the next occasion.

Social crediters cannot accept such a perverted idea of democracy. The same may be said of our Canadian Governments under the sham democracy, as Major C. H. Douglas wrote of the British Government:

"British Governments now hold office by a trick: no British Government has any genuine mandate. Our whole political system is not only irrational, it is a fraud and a usurpation."

Quebec Social Crediters, therefore, have decided to help the people to organise themselves to elect their own "Pressure Parliaments"—provincial and federal—as soon as they can organise the constituencies on a sufficient basis to have representative conventions.

These will be "parliaments" in which the representatives will be obedient to their electors' wishes and under their electors' control.

The members of the "parliaments" will be called "mandatees"—men with a mandate. And the mandate will be clearly defined by the people organised as the Union of Electors of each constituency.

THE ELECTORS WILL INSTRUCT their representatives in both the federal and provincial "Pressure Parliaments" to do anything which representatives of the people are supposed to do: to make known to the actual Governments, at all times, the prevailing will of the electors, and to bring all possible pressure to bear on the Government to obtain their obedience to the will of the people.

Of course, the "mandatees," not being recognised officially by the present Government, may at first be without much weight in shaping legislation. Yet they will keep on pressing and doing everything in their power to proclaim loudly the will of their constituents, and to put pressure on the elected members in the Provincial and Federal Houses and on the respective Governments.

The people will soon learn to recognise who are their better representatives: the official members of Parliament or the Union of Electors' mandatees.

The mandatee will be elected to service at the will of his electors and for so long as he gives faithful service. But, as soon as a mandatee refuses to obey his electors, the organised Union of Electors of his constituency will take steps to replace him without delay.

Social Crediters do not care what political labels may be paraded by the mandatees. Whether these call themselves Liberals, Conservatives, Bloc Populaire, or any other name is immaterial; as long as they undertake to carry out the Union of Electors' policies, they may be appointed. And if any of them disregards his mandate, he will be dismissed.

Present members of Parliaments would be approached to that effect. Alternatively, men with a good standing among their fel-

low-citizens and with a fair education, even while not active Social Crediters, may also be chosen for nomination. More likely, several will be approached by a delegation of the constituency, and will be asked to sign a pledge. The Convention will select the final mandatee among those candidates having signed the pledge.

The Union of electors has drawn up a formula, which will be submitted to each candidate. It runs something like this:

The Union of Electors requires a provincial or federal mandatee to give an unqualified undertaking:

1. That he shall, at all times, be at the disposal of the electors of his constituency, to listen to their common demands and to receive their instructions upon his public stand on the political questions of the day;

2. That, to this end, he shall attend such electors' meetings to which he will be duly invited by the organised Union of Electors of his constituency;

3. That he shall make himself conversant with all Parliamentary affairs: Bills, motions, etc., and that he shall keep the electors of his constituency informed on such matters;

4. That he shall be ready to take all necessary steps to convey to the Government and win support for the common and

legitimate demands of his electors, as expressed to him by the organised Union of Electors of his constituency;

5. That he shall report to the organised Union of Electors of his constituency on the result of his missions;

6. That he support, by all means at his disposal, the immediate demands of his electors.

(Then follows a short list of the immediate demands in the federal and provincial fields.)

The candidate is then asked to sign the following:

"I accept without qualification the concept of political democracy and the immediate programme of results required by my constituents, as defined above, and I am ready to do my utmost at all times to carry out the will of my constituents as conveyed to me by the Union of Electors, and I hereby undertake to continually press the Government and the responsible elected representatives of this constituency to carry out the will of the people, and to take such other legitimate action as may be necessary to that end."

It will be up to the mandatee to help the Union of Electors in any way he can, in order that, when an official election is declared, his mandate may be endorsed by the majority and he may become a member of the official Parliament.

When such an election is declared, the Union of Electors will not have to look for candidates; all its work will consist in getting the voters at large to ratify their choice.

But, whatever the result of such an election, the Union of Electors will continue, with increasing effectiveness, to exert pressure on the Government to obtain its obedience to the will of the people.

(Continued from last issue.)

DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS ON DECEMBER 12 AND 13, 1945, AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS' DEBATE OF DECEMBER 17, ON "BRETTON WOODS" AND THE U.S. LOAN. THE FOLLOWING FURTHER EXTRACTS ARE TAKEN FROM THE BRITISH "HANSARD":—

HOUSE OF LORDS: DECEMBER 17, 1945.

ANGLO-AMERICAN FINANCIAL AGREEMENTS

LORD SEMPILL: Just two hours ago a telegram was handed to me which, with your Lordships' permission I will read, as it is addressed to your Lordships' House, my own name being merely tagged on as an appropriate person to submit it to your Lordships:

"Australian Women's Party believe that American Loan to Britain and Bretton Woods Agreement if accepted would result in economic slavery and disintegration of British Empire. —Pauline Budge, President."

That shows how people Down Under are thinking on these matters

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD: If a loan had to be obtained from America at all—which personally I doubt—I am not convinced that there was not a case for trying to negotiate a commercial loan for those goods, and those goods only, which we could not possibly obtain from anywhere else, and yet which were vital to our country's needs. If the proposal was turned down, I think that it should still have been left on offer, and I believe that, for reasons with which I shall deal a little later, in time, perhaps with a certain amount of grumbling, the American Government would have come to accept our proposal. I am convinced that if as much time and energy had been devoted to trying to mobilise the resources of the Empire and of other countries not under Wall Street domination as has been devoted to trying to negotiate the American loan, we should have ended up in a far more satisfactory position.

The British Empire, armed with a thoroughly sound financial and economic system, could, I believe, produce sufficient to meet its own needs

The other important cause of shortage is investment. Whenever you take money distributed in the form of wages, salaries, interest or profits by existing industries, and use it either to set up a new industry or to extend an old one, then as soon as the new industry or the extension gets going and puts new goods on the market there will be a shortage of consumer money, for the simple reason that you cannot buy the increased amount of goods with a fixed amount of money. Some years ago I put this point to one of our leading economists—if my memory has not failed me, it was the noble Lord, Lord Keynes—and, when he discovered that it was not the usual Social Credit ninepin which he was in the habit of diverting himself by knocking over, he fled incontinently from the field of economic discussion

Then we were told that one of the aims of the Bretton Woods scheme is to secure full employment. Full employment is impossible in an age of labour-destroying inventions. You can only get full employment during a war. If the Bretton Woods experts said they were out to get a maximum production and maximum satisfaction of human needs they would be showing more intelligence.

Then there is the very grave objection indeed that we are proposing to hand over the control of our economic life, in a very large measure, to a gang of representatives of Wall Street finance, who are responsible to no one and are above every Government.

America will have more votes on the Bretton Woods board of management, as it were, even than all the component parts of the British Empire put together, and, either by economic bribery or by economic intimidation, it is obvious that her representatives will always be able to sway that body in whichever direction they desire

Possibly, I do not know, the Labour Government might feel tempted to punish us by political extermination, but even in that dire event, I would say that we at any rate will have gone down fighting for the deliverance of our country from economic servitude, and indeed for the protection of the whole world from the most impudent attempt history has ever known to establish an economic and financial dictatorship

LORD TEYNHAM: To vote for this Motion would be to accept fully the monetary policy set forth. Mighty Empires of the past have been swept away through weaknesses, which have developed after great wars, and I hope we are not on the threshold of a similar catastrophe, which might still be hastened by the financial and commercial agreements causing a strain on the financial link that binds our Empire together

DECEMBER 18, 1945.

LORD KEYNES: The long-term blue print invites us to commit ourselves against the future organisation of world trade on the principle of tying the opportunity of export to import by means of bilateral and discriminatory arrangements and unstable exchanges such as are likely to involve in practice the creation of separate economic blocs. It is argued that this is premature and unreasonable until we have found means to overcome the temporary difficulties of transition and have more experience of the actual conditions of the post-war world, in particular of how a full employment policy works out in practice in its international aspects

It is a complete illusion to suppose that in Washington you have only to mention the principle of equal sacrifice to get all you want. The Americans—and are they wrong?—find a post-mortem on relative services and sacrifices amongst the leading Allies extremely distasteful and dissatisfying

During the whole time that I was in Washington, there was not a single Administration measure of the first importance that Congress did not either reject, remodel, or put on one side

Is it not putting our claim and legitimate expectations a little too high to regard these proposals, on top of Lend-Lease, as anything but an act of unprecedented liberality? Has any country ever treated another country like this, in time of peace, for the purpose of rebuilding the other's strength and restoring its competitive position? If the Americans have tried to meet criticism at home by making the terms look a little less liberal than they really are, so as to preserve the principle of interest is it necessary for us to be mistaken?

The balm and sweet simplicity of no per cent, is not admitted

It is not easy to have patience with those who pretend that some of us, who were very early in the field to attack and denounce the false premise and false conclusions of unrestricted laissez-faire and its particular manifestations in the former gold

"THE COMMON GOOD" RACKET

From "The Social Crediter," England, of February 9, 1946:—

Mr. Sol Bloom ("Sign-on-the-dotted-line-Solly") is attending U.N.O. in the interest of an impassioned appeal for other people's money and goods for U.N.R.R.A., the organisation headed by his co-racialist, Mr. Lehmann [since replaced by another co-racialist, Mr. La Guardia].

This passionate desire to do good at other people's expense is a well-marked policy of the Jew. It can be seen in the local Council, where the extension of the water-supply to new areas at the expense of a disproportionate rise in the rates of the old ones will be found, curiously enough, to have benefited chiefly the owner of cottages just bought before the project was pressed. Not by the Councillor, perhaps. Just a friend of his who has mysteriously come into a little money he has invested in cottage property.

"The common good" racket is, perhaps, one of the most contemptible extant. But it is one of the most lucrative in both cash and credit, and it is having the run of the ages at the moment, from U.N.R.R.A. to Hydro-Electric Schemes.

standard and other currency and commercial doctrines which mistake private licence for public liberty, are now spending their later years in the service of the State to walk backwards and resurrect and re-erect the idols which they had played some part in throwing out of the market place. Not so. Fresh tasks now invite. Opinions have been successfully changed. The work of destruction has been accomplished, and the site has been cleared for a new structure.

LORD PIERCY: Within these two twin institutions—the International Monetary Fund and the United Nations' Bank—we have two of the most hopeful pieces of international machinery that have been invented in our time, or for a very long time indeed

I make one last observation, which is this: The head of the Swiss Bankverein, Felix Somary, very early in the thirties at Chatham House made what struck me then as a remarkable prediction and seems to me still more remarkable as I recollect it. It was in the very early thirties, and he pointed out that the accumulated economic strains and stresses in Europe were very likely, if they could not be relieved, to give birth to a monstrous political progeny which might disrupt Europe. He had no foresight, I am sure, of Nazi power, but his predicting nevertheless in a remarkable way has come true

VISCOUNT BENNETT: It must not be forgotten that during all these years we have been hearing talk of equality and sacrifice in every quarter, and no one who has crossed the Atlantic Ocean during the last five years will have any doubt as to the inequality of sacrifice

I am not disclosing any great secret by saying that the United States has consistently endeavoured since 1933-1934 to destroy the preferences.

I submit that to have these family preferences settled by other countries than those within the family is wrong. It is essentially wrong, and it is because of that that I find it so difficult to agree to these proposals. It will be recalled that this document that is circulated with the Agreement contains a provision that we will discuss certain matters at a conference, which is to be held hereafter. And it is important to recall that those discussions are not limited in any sense, but every country in the world that attends—Greece, and the Balkans generally, and the South American countries—will all take a hack at our family preferences.

I submit that that is not right or proper, and that we should not by any possible chance have submitted those matters to such a gathering

I have had some experience with an international conference myself. I was asked to call a conference of the wheat consuming nations in this country in 1932, and I think we had fifty-five delegates there altogether. We were unanimously agreed upon our conclusions, but did they last? They certainly did not. I always like to keep in mind the ideal. That is perfectly true, but, on the other hand, does anyone think it is possible to create the world conditions mentioned in the Agreement? Do any of your Lordships think it is possible? It may be a movement towards a desired end. But if they think it would, I would not like them to go through the experience we had in the wheat conference in which we all agreed on a certain line of action and the result was complete disaster.

(To be concluded.)

"THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIAL CREDIT"

By ERIC D. BUTLER

Price 1/1d posted.

We are pleased to announce that, having overcome certain unforeseeable printing difficulties, copies of the above booklet will be available in just over a week. All orders already placed will be attended to immediately supplies come to hand.

Those readers who have not already ordered a copy of this important booklet should do so immediately. Order from New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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