

THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne for transmission by Post as a Newspaper.

VOLUME 14, No. 1.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 1948

FOURPENCE WEEKLY

The Food Racket in Britain

The food racket, with the deliberate starvation of the British, continues unabated. One of the organisations which is opposing and exposing the iniquitous "international" control of food is the Liberator Council. From one of their "Bulletins" we quote the following pertinent extracts:

FATS

We are desperately short of fats, and lack of these above all things, leads to semi-starvation. Many millions of pounds of YOUR money—the taxpayers' money—is now being sent to create the grandiose Kenya ground-nut scheme. Yet when the ground-nuts are grown, we must apply to the International Food Office, situated in New York, for instructions as to how many of our ground-nuts we may have, although British capital and British labour will have produced them on British territory.

BUTTER

Butter is heavily rationed, yet we have ample stocks in hand, at least six months' supply in cold store, so that all the butter we get is de-natured, and much of its goodness gone by long storage.

The Government has contracted to take the entire New Zealand butter exports, yet much of it never reaches this country at all, but is diverted to American forces in China and the Pacific, and also large quantities to Canada, which already exports over 5,000,000 lb. a year.

Meanwhile, New Zealand housewives are fraudulently asked to give up butter rations voluntarily and go short themselves, to help Britain. These facts are admitted by the Ministry of Food in writing.

WHEAT

Canada could supply us with ALL the wheat we want, and for years we took 75 percent to 80 percent of our total wheat imports from her. Yet this year the Canadian farmers were instructed by the Government to grow less wheat. Meanwhile British bread is rationed, the loaf is of very inferior quality, and a further cut is threatened.

MEAT

Both Australia and New Zealand are ready, and anxious, to send us more meat, yet we refuse to take it under the false pretext of "shipping space shortage." Recently we flatly refused a voluntary offer from Australia of over 5000 tons of meat, with the strange comment by Mr. Strachey that "it did not fit in with the existing British rationing system."

OUR POLICY

1. The preservation of Australia's sovereignty as a part of the British Empire, and the exposure of all internal and external groups which attack that sovereignty.
2. The preservation and extension of genuine local government.
3. The preservation and strengthening of all Constitutional safeguards for the purpose of protecting fundamental individual rights.
4. The encouragement of all activities designed to bring Governments under more effective control by the electors.
5. The preservation and extension of genuine free, competitive enterprise and private ownership, and opposition to all Monopoly, whether it be "private" or State.
6. The support of a financial policy which will (a) permit free enterprise to make available to all individuals an increasing standard of living and greater leisure for cultural pursuits; (b) result in no further increase in the community's indebtedness and the sound business practice of gradually reducing existing debt.
7. Recognising that the basis of any sound economy is agriculture, the encouragement of agricultural policies which will ensure the preservation and building up of soil fertility by organic farming and gardening; and the prevention of soil erosion and the protection of forests and watersheds.

CHEESE

WHY is cheese still rationed? There is plenty available in the world, apart from British cheese, which is apparently no longer made. Canadian imports have been cut down; New Zealand cheese factories turned on to making casein for plastics; Holland has ample cheese that we do not take; Denmark is sending surplus cheese and other dairy products to Russia.

1938 Imports, 2,927,326 cwts.

(NO rationing).

1945 Imports 3,825,203 cwts.

(Ration 2 oz. weekly.
reduced from 3 oz.).

BACON

Before the war we used to import vast quantities of Danish bacon of best quality, which she is still willing and anxious to supply. Yet a deal was refused by our Government on the flimsy pretext that they could not agree the price within about 2d. per lb.! What housewife is there who would not eagerly pay an extra 2d. per lb. for unrationed bacon?

MILK

Thousands of gallons daily are being poured down drains or fed to pigs in the West Country and elsewhere, because the pasteurising plants and milk factories cannot take it all, and the "nationalised" collection system allows it to stand in churns in country lanes for hours in the hot sun; then it is refused and thrown away!

(N.B.—The Camborne and Redruth Town Council have recently unsuccessfully applied for permission to turn surplus milk into butter and cheese. The Ministry of Food prefers that it should be thrown away.)

—From "The Liberator Council's Bulletin," Sept. 1947.

ELB. HUBBARD ON INDIVIDUAL EXPRESSION

Men are not punished for their sins, but by them. Expression is necessary to life. The spirit grows through exercise of its faculties, just as a muscle grows strong through use.

Life is expression and repression is stagnation—death. . . .

Strange evolutions are often witnessed within the life of one individual as to what is right and what is wrong. For instance, Leo Tolstoy, that great and good man, once a worldling, has now turned ascetic, a not unusual evolution in the lives of the saints. Not caring for harmony as expressed in colour forms and sounds, Tolstoy is now quite willing to deprive all others of these things which minister to their well-being.

There is in most souls a hunger for beauty, just as there is a physical hunger. Beauty speaks to their spirits through the senses; but Tolstoy would have his house barren to the verge of hardship, and he advocates that all other houses should be likewise. My veneration for Count Tolstoy is profound, but I mention him here simply to show the danger that lies in allowing any man, even one of the best, to dictate to us what is right.

Most of the frightful cruelties inflicted on mankind during the past

have arisen out of a difference of opinion arising through a difference of temperament. The question is as live today as it was two thousand years ago—what expression is best? That is, what shall we do to be saved? And concrete absurdity consists in saying we must all do the same thing.

Whether the race will ever grow to a point where men will be willing to leave the matter of life expression to the individual is a question. Most men are anxious to do what is best for themselves and least harmful for others . . . if the self-appointed folk who govern us for a consideration would only be willing to do unto others as they would be done by and cease coveting things that belong to other people. War among nations, and strife among individuals, is a result of the covetous spirit to possess either power or things, or both. . . .

-From "Little Journeys into the Homes of English Authors," by Elbert Hubbard.

HA, HA!

Mr. Lazzarini (Werriwa, N.S.W.), House of Representatives, October 24:

Honorable gentlemen opposite who know anything at all must know that no advocate of financial reform in any part of the world, so far as I know, except the advocates of the Douglas Credit system, and I discard their theories as fantastic, contend that credit can be made available by the mere printing of bank notes. Such statements are pure stupidity.

"IMAGINATIVE SOLITUDE"

"Fitzgerald is a perfect specimen of those who have lived, do live and will continue to try to live for intimate friendships and the delicate pleasures of imaginative solitude—by no means the least noble or the least useful kind of human being. Without such men no civilisation, however healthy, scientific and equitable, is likely to rise above the platitude of a cheery monotony." - Mr. Desmond MacCarthy.

Colac Radio Talks

We have been asked to publish the wave length of 3CS Colac, Victoria, over which regular weekly Social Credit talks are given every Friday at 8.45 p.m., Eastern Standard Time. Wavelength: 1130 K.C.

FIGHTING FUNDS FOR ACTION GROUP URGENTLY REQUIRED

The Hon. Secretary of the Social Credit Action Group, Mr. P. W. Keogh, 54 Millswyn Street, South Yarra, Victoria, urges all supporters of the Action Group to forward their contribution to the 1948 Fighting Fund IMMEDIATELY.

Bigger and better offensives are being planned. They must not fail because of lack of "ammunition."

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

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

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1.

Payments should be made in advance and sent direct to New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

(Registered Office: 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne, C.1. Phone: MU2834.)

EX-COMINTERN CHIEFS IN KEY POSITIONS

Here is the list of members of the praesidium of the executive committee of the Communist International who signed the dissolution of the Comintern, with a note on their present positions.

Zhdanov—One of the key men of the Politbureau and regarded as possible successor to Stalin. The new Cominform was established under his directions.

Dimitrov—Now Premier of Bulgaria.

Gottwald—Now Premier of Czechoslovakia.

Kolarov—Now President of the Bulgarian National Assembly and Acting President of the Bulgarian Republic.

Kuusinen—Now Premier of the Karelio-Finnish Republic of the U.S.S.R. His daughter is leader of the Communists in Finland.

Manuilsky—Now Premier of the Ukrainian Republic of the U.S.S.R.

Koplenig—Member of the Austrian Council of State and leader of the Austrian Communists.

Pieck—Joint leader of the Socialist Unity Party in Germany.

Marty—A Communist leader in France.

Thorez—Leader of the French Communists, until recently Vice-Premier of France.

Ercoli—Returned to Italy and became known as Togliatti, leader of the Communists in Italy, until recently a member of the Italian Government.

Florin—Died in 1044 after returning to Italy.

In addition the following signed as representatives of national Communist parties:

Bianco—Italy. No later information.

Ibarruri—Spain La Passionaria of the Spanish Civil War, still active in international politics.

Lehtinen—Finland. No later information.

Pauker—Rumania. Leader of Rumanian Communists. One of the founders of the Cominform.

Rakosi—Hungary. Now Vice-Premier of the Hungarian Republic.

"The Catholic Times." Oct 24, 1947.

THE CONTROL OF THE PRESS

. . . The Viscount Camrose has recently published an interesting book, "British Newspapers and their Controllers," which, carefully studied may reveal more than the author actually intended. Chapter Eleven, for instance, is devoted to the "News Chronicle" and "Star." Amongst other details we are told this:

"To-day, in conjunction with members of the Cadbury family, Lord Layton, while not actually editor of either the 'News Chronicle' or the 'Star,' is the editorial and business chief."

Now, if Lord Layton is indeed the editorial and business chief of these two important London newspapers (and Viscount Camrose ought to know) we are given furiously to think. For when the noble lord was Sir Walter Layton, he was one of the earliest associates of Israel Moses Seiff in that thoroughly subversive anti-British racket known as P.E.P. Israel is one of the high lights, if not the very highest light in Marks' and Spencer's, the subject of a note in our August issue: ". . . the question asked in the House of Commons on June 4, by Mr McKindlay:

"Is my right hon. friend (Mr. Strachey) aware that his Department is still giving instructions to local food control committees to extend the activities of Messrs. Marks and Spencers and the like in selling points goods which they never sold before the war?"

Mr. Strachey did not answer.

Therefore, we think what we like. Is there any connection between this fact and the next one?

Speaking at the annual General Meeting of Marks and Spencer. Sir Simon Marks said: "It is with satisfaction that I am able to report an increase in the profits for the year." These profits, according to the "People's Post," amounted to no less than 2,576,000, providing a dividend of 60 percent for the shareholders. Now, as we all know. Marks and Spencers are a Jewish firm. Mr. Strachey, likewise is Jewish. So is Mr. Shinwell.

Taking our fact in relation to the Press entirely from the Viscount Camrose's book, we could extend inferences of this kind much further.

But let us hasten to the Governorship of the B.B.C. The present Governor is, as everybody knows, the Dowager Lady Reading, widow of Rufus Isaacs. The Communists and the "One-Worlders" of all parties cannot grumble at the "man hours" allotted

to them. Members of the Government we shall take for granted, but in addition, there are such mixtures as Harry Pollitt, Professor Joad, Julian Huxley, Harold Laski, Winston Churchill, Earl Russell, Kingsley Martin, and the "Economist" editorial department.

Analysed, we should see that little difference exists between them. They are all either for a world State in which Britain would of necessity have little or no say, and with the resultant loss of our Monarchy or they are plain unvarnished atheists. The connection between atheism and Communism is not far to seek. Have you observed, reader, that the B.B.C. especially in such programmes as say, "Friday Night Forum," always arrange for a wordy individual such as Laski, to be the opposite number of a plain, blunt Englishman such as say, Gen. Spiers? Get the idea? We all know that ostensibly. Zionists are at war with Britain.

Our boys are being shot, and in some cases hanged, in the course of their duty by filthy scum financed from America and even from Britain. Yet the Governor of the B.B.C. was, according to the "Jewish Year Book" for 1940 the President of the World Jewish Congress (British Section), a Vice-President of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, a Representative of the Anglo-Jewish Community on the World Council of the Jewish Agency, etc., etc.. ad nauseum . . .

- "To-morrow" (Eng.), Nov. 1947.

THERE IS A MOVEMENT IN YOUR STATE

Literature and Information relating to subjects dealt with in the "New Times" are obtainable from the following movements:—

The United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne, Victoria.

The Douglas Social Credit Movement in Victoria, 1st Floor, The Block, Elizabeth St., Melbourne, Victoria.

The United Democrats, 17 Waymouth St., Adelaide, South Australia.

The Electoral Campaign, 101 Collins St., Hobart, Tasmania.

The D.S.C.A. of N.S.W. and The Electoral Campaign (N.S.W. Division), 3rd Floor, 296 Pitt St., Sydney, New South Wales.

The Electoral Campaign (Queensland), Room 14, 2nd Floor, 142 Adelaide St., Brisbane, Queensland.

Douglas Social Credit Movement of W.A., 544 Hay Street. Perth. W.A

MONEY POWER AND THE JEWS

"The Jew has emancipated himself in Jewish fashion, not only by taking to himself financial power, but by virtue of the fact that with and without his co-operation, money has become a world power, and the practical Jewish spirit has become the practical spirit of Christian nations. The Jews have emancipated themselves in so far as Christians have become Jews. "--Karl Marx "Selected Essays," London.

1926, page 89.

. . . .

" . . . the Boer war was the first avowed capitalist war waged publicly for the possession of wealth. It revolutionised, or rather capitalised, what is called 'society.' the passport to which ever since has been money. Park Lane took the place of Whitehall. . . . As credit became more and more international, men thought that nationality would no longer be a fighting issue, because it would not pay. The Jew was emancipated."—Austin Harrison. "English Review," December. 1919.

. . .

" It was necessary to return to the deep sources of Western civilisation, which experienced its zenith in the chivalry of the Middle Ages. A still more difficult task as the masses intoxicated by Jewish propaganda show themselves to be fanatical defenders of the ideas which have led them to their ruin."—L. de Poncins "Juifs Maitres du Monde," 1932, page 99.

None So Blind . . .

There is only one major field in which the Americans do not as yet seem to understand what is taking place and why.

They do not understand how big is the Soviet part in the organised Jewish illegal emigration from Europe: how, in the guise of Zionists, Soviet agents and Terrorist instructors have been passed through Europe, how in the camps in Cyprus, Stalin and Lenin are the heroes whose portraits are displayed, and how the whole movement is intended as a powerful weapon to divide Britain and America and to weaken Britain in the Middle East. . . .

—"The Tablet," Nov. 1, 1947. "New Times," January 9, 1948 — Page 3

THE NEW TIMES

Established 1935

Published every Friday by New Times Limited, McEwan House,
343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.

Postal Address: Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne. Telephone: MU2834.

Vol. 14.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 1947

No. 1

PROSPECT AND RETROSPECT

Since the inception of this journal over twelve and a half years ago it has borne witness to the principles of Social Credit, and every major political event of that period has confirmed our belief in those principles. Not only that, but the nature of events has led us to a much closer and more penetrating study of various aspects of a very comprehensive subject. And it would be poor indeed if the experience gained over those years had not led to a deeper understanding and maturity.

We shall continue to invest that experience in future action. If perhaps the profit to be gained may not always be immediately obvious and the way may sometimes appear unaccountably hard, we shall remember that if it had not been for the past action of practising Social Creditors the totalitarian menace would be much more securely entrenched in this country.

Over the past twelve months we have seen the political situation deteriorate rapidly. But the "planners" have not had it all their own way, and, apart from more conscious resistance from other quarters, the developments within the Social Credit Movement itself have been considerable.

In particular we may refer to the increasing awareness of the value and present importance of such matters as the Common Law and what may be summed up in the word—constitutionalism. There is an urgent need for a great deal of clarification in the public mind on these matters.

For example, the function of the Crown. The King's Representative in Australia, the Governor-General, theoretically has certain responsibilities, but from a practical point of view it must be admitted that, for the greater part, these functions have fallen into disuse. If, as we believe to be essentially sound, there is to be a division of power in the political structure, with the Crown acting as a final court of appeal to redress the grievances of individuals against governmental tyranny, then it must either be made to work, or scrapped.

For that reason we have during the past several months supported the Petition to the Governor-General, promoted by the League of Rights, for a double dissolution of the Federal Parliament. This office is one of the ancient and venerable institutions built up with great care in order to serve the individual. No one would seriously contend that the office of Governor-General is at the moment anything but a farce. How long is it to be allowed to continue?

Probably the most effective barrier the totalitarians in Australia have had to contend with is the Federal Constitution. The Referendums of 1944 and 1946 provided adequate testimony as to its great value in protecting the rights of the individual. But its safeguards are being surmounted or circumscribed and we suggest that some effective measures to strengthen the Constitution are required, and should provide a basis for sound action in the immediate future.

If at times the way of the Social Crediter appears unduly disheartening we suggest that any view taken in retrospect of the development of the Movement since its beginnings must concede the remarkable strides that have been achieved, in the teeth of powerfully entrenched opposition. We have progressed, as is done in all things, by a process of trial and error, and while our tactical errors have probably not been inconsiderable, they are being eliminated.

We are confident that our activities will bear yet richer fruit during 1948.

"POWER TENDS TO CORRUPT"

I quote it [Lord Acton's dictum] again, to give it to you in full; and in its context. Acton was not only a great historian—one of the greatest of modern times—but he was also a very sincere and consistent Christian.

The Famous sentence occurs in a letter he wrote to Bishop Creighton about the latter's "History of the Papacy," which Acton had reviewed in a periodical edited by Creighton, Acton had found in Creighton's history what he called "a spirit of retrospective indulgence find reverence for the operation of authority," and he insisted that historians "maintain morality as the sole impartial criterion of men and things, and the only one on which honest minds can be made to agree."

In his letter to Creighton, Acton was explicit. He said, "I cannot accept your canon that we are to judge Pope and King unlike other men, with a favourable presumption that they did no wrong. If there is any presumption it is the other way, against the holders of power, increasing as the power increases. Historic responsibility has to make up for the want of legal responsibility. Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men, even when they exercise influence and not authority, still more when you superadd the tendency or the certainty of corruption by authority. There is no worse heresy than that the office sanctifies the holder of it."

— Extract from "The Ethics of Power," by Herbert Read, writing in "The Listener," March 27, 1947.

PETROL RATIONING IN ENGLAND

The Administration's fairly narrow escape from defeat in connection with the abolition of the basic petrol ration confirms the observations of a Scottish political observer in whose judgment, as well as sources of information, we place much confidence. Before giving these at some length, it may be emphasised that the leit motif of petrol rationing, or the withholding of it is primarily tyranny, politely called control. We doubt whether an appreciable quantity of petrol will in fact be saved, just as we doubt whether there is urgent need to save it. But a whole new series of crimes will be created, and selected criminals will be taught that it is better not to incur the dislike of political bosses, even minor ones.

—"The Social Crediter," (Eng.), November 8, 1947.

THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By C. H. Douglas

(From "The Social Creditor," Eng.)

Some years before the termination of the First Armistice, it was arranged that with the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Hewlett Johnson, who I was assured was both a Christian and a Social Creditor, I should address a large meeting in a leading South Coast town. The meeting was crowded, and as was proper, the Dean of Canterbury took the honor.

The general idea of the meeting had been to stress the contention that the policy embodied in Social Credit proposals was in consonance with, and was intended as far as possible to derive from, the philosophy of the Christian Church.

Somewhat to the disruption of this idea, however, Dr. Johnson delivered a somewhat comprehensive lecture on the A + B theorem, a subject which, however treated, is not easy to adapt to the needs of a general audience.

Our very able Chairman, feeling no doubt that enough is enough, thanked him warmly, and suggested that Major Douglas would now speak on Christianity.

It may be felt that the subject of this article has been suggested by the various pronouncements of the Archbishop of Canterbury and York on the problems of industry and social structure. But in fact, not only should I not object to the interest of the Church dignitaries in the matters of the everyday life of this world, but it appears to me axiomatic that a religion must have a politics, although not a technical politics. But as an individual of, I hope, ordinary commonsense as well as a member of the Church of England, I feel that I am justified in asking that its politics shall be coherent and not in conflict with Christian philosophy as I understand it when it is put forward under the prestige of high office in the Christian Church. I cannot object to, although I may dislike, anything Dr. Hewlett Johnson says or writes in admiration of a regime founded on massacre and perpetuated in tyranny and marauding; but I can and do protest when it is done by the Dean of Canterbury, without a disclaimer of its fundamentally anti-Christian philosophy, principles, and practice.

This is, I think, much what most people feel about the Church of England as a whole; they love its exquisite liturgy, the mirror of a nobler day, and they would agree that it holds many good and able men; but it simply does not register. It is so tolerant that it is difficult to name anything to which it objects; its clergy in the main purr with satisfaction at every fresh robbery by taxation, it is so democratic that if you don't like its principles, and can get a majority vote, more particularly

of the people, it will change them; and its only slight aversion appears to be from England and the English.

There is a reason for this, and it is this reason which I feel brings the sub-



C. H. DOUGLAS

ject within the orbit of constitutionalism—a subject which must have attention, if we are to survive, as a preliminary to better things.

To indicate what I have in mind, consider the famous First Clause of Magna Carta: "Quod Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit et habeat omnia sua jura integra." which is translated by Mr. Ashton: "That the Church of England shall be free, and enjoy her whole rights and liberties inviolable."

It has been claimed that this clause, the importance of which must be realised as something basic to social life, was a claim for independence of the Pope which is just plain nonsense. It was imposed upon King John, not upon the Pope who is expressly stated to have confirmed it, and was a declaration of independence in certain well defined areas from interference by the King or any other power in matters proper to the Church and religion—matters which are more familiarly known as Canon, and also to some ex-

tent Common, or Natural Law. We have here, in fact, an unequivocal declaration against monarchy.

It should be noticed that three partial sovereignties were present on that little island of Runnymede on a June morning in A.D. 1215, and it is important to note that Magna Carta strengthens and confirms all of them—the Church, the King, and a much more real democracy than anything we have nowadays. It is patently false to suggest that the barons acted only for the nobility. They were the spearhead; bill the preamble to the document expressly states that it is framed by the advice of the Archbishops of Canterbury and Dublin, inter alia.

The contrast in the spirit of the law with that of current legislation is fundamental. The over-riding intention is to establish every man, of whatever degree, in his rights, not to take them away. Clause 69 states that "All the aforesaid custom, privileges and liberties . . . as much as it belongs to us towards our people, all our subjects, as well clergy as laity shall observe as far as they are concerned towards their dependents."

The entire document may be searched without success in identifying a portion of the population which does not matter a tinker's cuss; the names of spivs and drones are happily omitted; and even the Jews, while mentioned without enthusiasm, are by implication confirmed in their rights where they have not encroached upon excess. And it will be noticed that these rights and liberties are not contingent on the success of the export drive.

Now, in order to constitute a sovereignty there must be present form, substance and sanction. To say that the Church of England is the same church, and has the same kind of sovereignty, as the Church in England at the time of King John, is simply to ignore history. I am not at the moment discussing doctrinal matters, which are clearly outside my competence. It is the constitution and its nature with which we must come to grips. And the post-Reformation Anglican Church owes its origin and existence to a series of Statutes which clearly indicate that it is a State institution and a State vassal. It has no sovereignty.

(II.)

It should be fairly clear from the argument of the preceding paragraphs that the question, which I believe, is technically known as "the validity of

THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Anglican Orders" has a highly practical aspect for the ordinary man. The basis of the claim to a particular kind of sovereignty by the Christian Church must, beyond dispute, depend upon its origin and its allegiance; to say that a church which is established by statute, can be disestablished by statute, and has its higher officials, archbishops, bishops and principal deans, appointed by the secular government of the day is the same thing as a Church which assists in forcing a king to sign a document declaring it to be free and inviolable from himself or any secular authority, and appoints its officials from outside and without reference to his jurisdiction, is infantile.

With some hesitation, I suggest that the question arising out of the Christian Church, is not the same, either in nature or decree, as that involved in the acceptance of what is vaguely called Christianity which for the most part is merely Liberal Judaism. It is the Doctrine of the Incarnation. At bottom, what we have to make up our minds upon is whether human political action is subject to the same kind, or some kind, of some compulsion to be "right" as we accept in doing a multiplication sum, and if so, whether the Christian Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, is the living incarnation of that "right"-ness. Magna Carta remains as a witness that this conception was inherent in English life seven hundred years ago.

Tempora mutantur, mutamur nos in illis. In 1917, Lord Sumner in the House of Lords said, "My Lords, with all respect to the great names of the lawyers who have used the phrase 'Christianity is part of the law of England' it is really not law, it is rhetoric." And in the same connection, Professor Holdsworth, "But, like many other parts of the law and Constitution of England, there are survivals of an older order, from which all real meaning has departed with the abandonment of that mediaeval theory of the relationship of Church to State, in which they owed their origin" (Holdsworth, vol. 8, p. 403).

And so we arrive at Professor Laski, "The core of the British Constitution is the supremacy of Parliament." King, Church and Commons have all gone, although their ghosts remain, and we have monocratic government by what Mr. Laski quite incorrectly calls "a Committee of the Legislature."

The nature and gravity of the situa-

tion with which we are confronted will be almost wholly missed if we do not give full recognition to the essential falsity of our current institutions. The average U.S. citizen cannot be persuaded that England is not a mediaeval feudalism because we still retain the titles of King, Lords and Commons, and the Horse Guards, to his great delight, still wear armour. If he could understand it, he would be astounded to learn that it is exactly because this country ceased to be a feudalism more than four hundred years ago that the American Colonists revolted against the British Parliament. For convenience, perhaps I may repeat here the quotation from "Origins of the American Revolution." John C. Miller, p. 216: "In rejecting natural law. Englishmen" (i.e., the post-Reformation Englishman) "also denied the colonists' contention that there were metes and bounds to the authority of Parliament. The authority of Parliament was, in their opinion, unlimited; the supremacy of Parliament had come to mean to Englishmen an uncontrolled and uncontrollable authority. Indeed, the Divine right of Kings had been succeeded by the Divine Right of Parliament. . . . 'This unlimited and undivided supremacy is expressly excluded from the United States Constitution.

The Colonists were in fact contending for one of the fundamentals of feudalism, which, as Professor Holdsworth points out, "has departed with the abandonment of that mediaeval theory of the relationship of Church and State to which they owed their origin."

If there is one thing more than another which history teaches, it is that Governmental systems do not change human nature, but they can, and do foster various aspects of it. Mediaeval systems may not have eliminated robbery and oppression; but it is certain that they did not legalise it. Had a fourteenth century English King seized land as our contemporary Government seizes land through Agricultural Committees, and otherwise, on any flimsy pretext, or extorted taxes without representation (our contemporary Parliament is neither representative nor possessed of authority), the country would have been aflame with revolution in much less time than the American Colonists required to organise their resistance.

Now, it is obvious that while the authority of "Parliament" (really, the Cabinet) may in one sense, as the mid-

Victorian Liberal. Lord Courtney of Penwith, proclaimed it to be, "absolutely unqualified, embodying the supreme will of the State" to which "every partial authority must yield" ("Working Constitution of the United Kingdom," 1901), it should be recognised just what that means. For all practical purposes, a man has "unqualified supremacy" to jump off Beachy Head; but he cannot avoid the consequences. A Cabinet can pass laws confiscating, under the name of taxation, the work of that man's lifetime or the land his family has dignified for centuries; but it cannot avoid the consequences. The crucial issue is what will those consequences be? Or to put the matter slightly otherwise, is there a moral "law" connecting political transgression with national punishment? Contemporary Governments clearly think that there is not; that they are free to legislate in a moral vacuum. Can anyone point to a pronouncement of the Church of England, as such, which contests that idea? Assuming that so-called nationalisation of this or that has any virtues, which is far from self-evident, has the Church ever criticised the methods by which it has been achieved?

(III.)

The reader will probably have by now suspected that we are coming to grips with the preamble to the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion," "The political has nothing in common with the moral. . . . Our right lies in force. The word 'right' is an abstract thought, and proved by nothing. . . . The result justifies the means."

Or, as Frederick of Prussia, the so-called Great, put it slightly differently: "Above all uphold the following maxim 'that to despoil your neighbours is to deprive them of the means of injuring you.' ("Political Testament," pp 8-9, Boston Edition, 1870).

It is unnecessary to waste time on the "forgery" issue in regard to the Protocols. The Protocols have existed for at least 40 years; and they are certainly one of two things—either a Plan or a Prophecy. Someone or some group either drew up the most able and cold-blooded scheme, which requires and has obtained worldwide and powerful co-operation; or someone or some group was and is gifted with a clear insight into what it is the fashion to call "trends," surpassing anything in history, and more precise and unequivocal than anything recorded and historically proved of the "old testament" prophets.

But at the moment, this issue is not vital. What is the philosophy, and, in consequence, the policy embodied in

THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

the Protocols, and in Frederick of Prussia's "Political Testament"?

The first point to which due weight must be given is that there is a great deal of realism in both of them. Protocol No. 1 premises that men with bad instincts are more numerous than those mainly actuated by good; that everyone would like to become a dictator if he could, and rare are the men who would not be willing to sacrifice the welfare of all for the sake of securing their own welfare. The quantitative estimates may be excessive; but the general statement is not unjustified. It is not necessary to go outside the experience of an ordinary lifetime to learn that the doctrine of original sin has a real meaning, while anyone who has penetrated even the fringe of Big Business and world politics cannot fail to have sensed something of the spirit which the Protocols embody. It is not the everyday transactions of commerce which are objectionable, such as the abused profit system, or the "capitalism" of the local garage proprietor. For the most part, the wickedness of the world is not even understood by the masses who are affected; and it is never attacked in Party Politics.

It is important to notice that the "Elders of Zion," whoever they may be have certain premises in common with their irreconcilable antithesis, Christianity.

Both philosophies explicitly and implicitly condemn and discredit the idea of human equality. ("In my house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you." "Doth a bad tree bring forth good fruit?" "He that would be greatest among you, let him be your servant.") There is no essential difference in the premise; there is every difference in the policy as we can see when we come to examine that aspect. There is nothing in the Protocols so devastating as the injunction: "Cast not your pearls before swine, lest they turn upon you, and rend you," although the same idea is emphasised.

But the agreement on premises goes further. Both Christianity and the Protocols recognise the primacy and formative nature of ideas. "My Kingdom is not of this world." "There is nothing more dangerous than personal initiative" [the pursuit of an inborn ideal, Protocol V, par. II, Marsden Translation.

Christianity, moreover, does not scorn this world. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and all these things

shall be added unto you." It is not improper to say that Christianity is inter alia a technique by which a man, by control of his ideation, may gain such part of the world as in the nature of things appertains to him, and there is no injunction of which I am aware against that. But there is a warning. "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul." The objective of the Protocols is to gain the whole world.

It would be possible to pursue this aspect of the matter to much greater length. The objective I have in mind, however, is to establish the fact that the Protocols are a Book of the Bible of Anti-Christ, and that its policy, Communism and Socialism, which can be easily linked with Frederick of Prussia as their first prominent and identifiable exponent, are essentially the policy of a religion, of which the energising factor is physical force and the fear of it. And the policy of that religion is plainly labelled in the names Communism and Socialism—it is the treatment of men as a collectivity. The civilisation which results from that policy is exemplified in Russia and in that to which we are fast moving in this country, the Police State, with its "direction" of "labour" (notice the collectivity). Its essential characteristics are fear and violence—cf. the Protocols. The civilisation of Christianity was incompletely embodied in the culture of mediaeval Europe, and is exemplified in Magna Carta. Its essential characteristic is courage, allied to "love," cf. "Perfect love casteth out fear" (a rather unsatisfactory translation). The knight of chivalry, the militant Christian ideal, watched his armour alone in the chapel through the night, and then went out to do battle alone for love against fear and oppression—a very complete allegory. The "mass" is unsavable, just as a mob is insane ("without health"); the object of Anti-Christ is to keep mankind in ever larger mobs, thus defeating the object of Christ, to permit the emergence of self-governing, self-conscious individuals, exercising free will, and choosing good because it is good. The energising factor is attraction, inducement.

With such apology as may be necessary for this incursion into theology, we can return to the unsatisfactory part which the Church of England plays in the world drama, and the altered attitude which seems to be essential to its survival. It appears to be axiomatic, as the Roman Catholic Church

contends, that Socialism and Communism must be fought by any church which calls itself Christian, whatever may be the difference of opinion as to the weapons to be employed. A church which cannot see that Europe was free and attractive to just the extent that it was Christian, and is torn with dissension and is losing its charm to the extent that it is Socialistic, has betrayed its vocation.

(To be Concluded)

Books On Social Credit and Politics

Send for Our Latest Lists.
Also General Literature and
Antiquarian Books. Personal
attention to Overseas Clients.
ESSENTIAL BOOKS
5 CHRISTMAS STEPS,
BRISTOL 1, ENGLAND.

"SOCIAL CREDIT AND CATHOLICISM"

By George-Henri Levesque, O.P., Professor of Economics, Laval and Montreal Universities, Dominican House of Studies, Ottawa.

Introduction by Eric D. Butler.
Price 1/1 (post free). Order now from:
New Times Ltd., Box 1226L G.P.O., Melbourne.

Why Not Visit Our Office?

Since the present Board of Directors of the "New Times" started its expansion drive, the "New Times" office has been completely reorganised.

Those who have seen the new layout of the office will agree that a great improvement has been effected. A wide range of Social Credit and general literature is attractively displayed on the special bookshelves built by Social Credit enthusiasts in their spare time.

Readers are urged to call in at the office and examine our wide range of books at their leisure. They are specially invited to bring their friends.

A receptionist is in attendance to handle any inquiries about literature, while the present Secretary and Manager, Mr. John Weller will be pleased to see readers at any time.

Get the habit of calling at the "New Times" office. Keep in touch with developments. And don't forget, when you or your friends, Social Credit or otherwise, are wanting books, make inquiries at the "New Times" before going elsewhere.

IN FEDERAL PARLIAMENT

Bank Shares

House of Representatives, November 6:

Mr. Archie Cameron asked the Treasurer, upon notice—

1. If the Commonwealth Bank is entitled to hold shares in private banks, is that bank entitled to purchase shares in other companies?

2. If so, what is to prevent nationalisation of an industry or company occurring by the purchase of its shares on the share market by the Commonwealth Bank either on its own account or by the direction of the Treasurer?

3. Does the Commonwealth Bank today hold shares in any companies other than private banks; if so, in which companies and to what amount?

Mr. Chifley: The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1 and 2. It is not the practice to furnish advice on questions of law in reply to questions.

3. Yes; the Commonwealth Bank holds shares in companies other than private banks. Those shares were acquired in the ordinary course of business, but names of the companies and the amounts concerned, cannot be given as it is not the practice to disclose the affairs of customers of the bank. It is pointed out that the shares may be acquired by the Commonwealth Bank, in the ordinary course of business, otherwise than by purchase on the stock exchange, as, for example, by realisation of a security comprising or including shares.

French Socialism

Mr. Harrison (Wentworth, N.S.W.) House of Representatives, October 30:

Let us examine the effect of nationalisation generally in France. The following quotation is taken from the "Journal of Industry" for the month of September, 1947—

"It is over two years since large sections of French industry, banking, insurance, aircraft production, electricity and gas were nationalised.

"The results are now available in balance-sheets as at the 31st December, 1946. Coal mines have reached normal production, but the State has to continue its subsidies. It costs about 1,570 francs to raise a ton of coal. The coal

sells at 1350 francs - a loss of 220 francs.

"Even at 1350 francs it is very dear — beyond the reach of many consumers. At 1570 francs it would be prohibitive. No early solution appears possible. The taxpayer must continue to foot the bill.

"Before the war electricity and gas undertakings were prosperous. It was argued that the profits should go into the nation's purse."

That is precisely what honorable members opposite say about the profits of the Commonwealth Bank—

"Now, it is announced that the deficit is 18,000 million francs!

"To meet these huge losses the prices of gas and electricity must be raised or the taxpayer must fork out.

"In the aircraft and automobile enterprises the complete flop of nationalisation is obvious. Renault, for instance, shows a trading loss of 343 million francs! . . ."

Honorable members, who have a knowledge of State enterprise in Australia, will recognise, in that description, a complete forecast of what is likely to happen here if this first step towards the nationalisation of our industries continues.

Financing Primary Production

Mr. Aldermann (Maranoa, Queensland), House of Representatives, 30th October:

If prices for primary products fall, how is the Government going to keep the economic position stable in Australia? If we may judge from experience, the Commonwealth Bank will not make advances if there is a surplus of production and no markets are available I can speak from my experience of the peanut industry.

During the depression, no advances were made by the Commonwealth Bank to this industry unless a State Government guarantee was forthcoming, and this attitude was persisted in right throughout the thirties.

It might be suggested that the Commonwealth Bank Board was at fault, but I remind honorable members that in 1928 we erected storage accommodation at Kingaroy. On the strength of a State Government guarantee, we obtained an advance from the Commonwealth Bank for a period of ten years, and repaid the debt in eight years.

In 1938, we obtained another advance on the same terms, and repaid the money in eight years.

Then, last year, when the Commonwealth Bank was no longer under the control of the board, but directly under the control of the Treasurer, we again applied for a loan. Was it forthcoming under any more liberal terms than before?

No. The Commonwealth Bank still insisted that the State Government should guarantee the loan before an advance was made, and this attitude has been adopted with an industry which is worth over £1,000,000 a year to the country.

AT LAST!

ERIC D. BUTLER'S

BOOK ON "PROTOCOLS"

NOW AVAILABLE.

We are very pleased to announce that Mr. Eric Butler's long awaited book on the "Protocols" is now available.

It has been published under the title of "The International Jew" and the retail price will be 2/8 (post free). Wholesale rates will be £1 per dozen, post free.

Copies are being sent immediately to all those who ordered last year. In view of the great difficulty in getting this book published, it is probable that there will only be one edition.

Another ENWITE Specialty

[Regd.]

SOLVIT

For Clean, Easy Stripping

of

PAINT, LACQUER, VARNISH

Etc., from Any Surface

**NO DIFFICULT NEUTRALISATION
WILL NOT HARM FABRIC OR WOOD**