

the usurers. "High finance" and "big business" which epitomise unrestricted trade in money without the slightest regard for the other fellow, must become things of the past, something to look back on with wonder that their malignant influence existed for so long. These reforms can come only through the international co-operation of the honestly elected representatives of the people of each nationality.

To allow the nations of the earth to breathe again freely and to successfully plan their national and international economies a definite settlement of debts must be made. This millstone of national debt, with the yearly toll of interest, is an economic and moral cancer which must be removed.

It is manifestly unjust that any person should receive an income of more than £5,000 per annum. For any one to hope to earn more than that sum shows selfishness, greed, and a disregard for the country that has supported him. It is surely unnecessary for me to explain the above statement because it is quite obvious that if one person has a lot, then someone else has to exist on little or none at all.

Even supposing that the motives of a wealthy man were high and that he showed a philanthropic nature—as is so seldom the case with present-day magnates—it is most unlikely that he could dispose of his fortune in the same logical and just manner as could the highly qualified servants of the State.

To suggest that this £5,000 income bar would dampen the ardour of the enterprising individual and produce a nation of drones has been disproved by the outstanding example of the U.S.S.R., where a mighty nation has been vigorously established through the enterprise of a people whose prime motive was the welfare of the State and not the pursuance of any large individual monetary advantage.

It is obvious that where a country bestows social prominence commensurate with the family bank account the lust for wealth is not as much with miserly intent as it is to reach the top-most rungs of the social ladder, together with all the influence and power money commands.

The abolition of large incomes will not, however, decrease the demands for leadership, positions of trust, &c., and the consequent public prominence; the only difference will be that this prominence will be truly justified through honest physical or mental toil—the high positions will no longer be tenable by incompetent or unscrupulous persons whose success has been due to inheritance, roguery, or the mere capacity to make money.

## 2/Lt. S. D. M. Smith

[2/Lt. Smith, on behalf of his discussion group, has asked A.E.W.S. for a C.A.B. on money. Well, A.E.W.S. has the text for a bulletin on money. It runs to ten thousand words. When we find a way of getting it down to three thousand words, the approximate number of words a C.A.B. usually contains, we will publish it.]

## OUNCES TO A PINT

On page 20 of *Korero*, Vol. 2, No. 4, you state that 18 oz. of water is 2 oz. more than a pint. It is *many years* since Wanganui held 16 oz. beer, and even then 20 oz. constituted 1 pint. You must have been thinking of those sad, departed days when you fondly imagined that you drank a full pint of beer in your 16 oz. mug. Is the weights and measures genius in A.E.W.S. working on behalf of the pubs in trying to tell soldiers that 16 oz. make up a pint? Every schoolboy knows that 20 oz. make a pint.

## Unsigned

[Thanks. 20 oz. to an imperial pint and 16 oz. to the United States standard pint.]