

MYSTERY OF
COMMUNISTS? FINANCES.
(Page 2)

ARE WE SERIOUS ABOUT
RECONSTRUCTION?
(Page 3)

ADJUSTMENT OR
DISASTER? (Page 3)
"SOAKING THE POOR."
(Page 4.)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 9 No. 17. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 1943

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for
transmission by post as a newspaper.

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).

Scathing Indictment Of The Beveridge Plan

"Cart-horse Conditions For All" Says English Paper

With one voice (the Banker's) the Australian daily papers have strenuously boosted the Beveridge Plan as a great reform, and have conveyed the impression that all well-informed and progressive people in Great Britain acclaim it as the millennium. Thus have the credulous been doubly deceived—once again!

In England the "Social Creditor" recently devoted four pages to an expose of the Beveridge Plan and its background, under the headings, "Cart-horse Conditions For All," "There's No Want In A Work-house" and "Sir William Beveridge's Plan To Impose Perpetual Poverty 'Without Want'." We quote the following passages from the article:—

This war, which began before the last one finished, this war which the Bank of "England" assisted the puppet villain, Hitler, to prepare for while every effort was being made to secure that whoever got ready for it Great Britain didn't, this war which no people began and no power can stop, has a purpose behind it. . . .

The stripping from every sovereign nation of the world of all power over a hidden political junta; the subordination of every people on the earth's surface in regimented, planned obedience to the will of a few, wielding, without the possibility of its ever being wrested from them, absolute autocratic power.

And so we come to Beveridge's bribe.

Judas got thirty pieces of silver, and hanged himself.

The price has been advanced to forty, and if they take it, the people of England will have betrayed themselves and their heirs for ever, and there is no saying what they will do.

"Only in war or under threat of war will a British Government embark on large scale planning." The words appeared in a publication of one of Sir William Beveridge's "Research Committees," Political and Economic Planning, an organisation of vast industry, kept quiet for many years, presided over by Mr. Israel Moses Sieff.

Hence the war itself and the Beveridge Greenwood Report.

Sir William Beveridge's "Committee," be-

ing paid servants of the public, were precluded from signing the document because of the "issues of high policy" with which it dealt.

All the same most of these departmental experts had some acquaintance with the London School of Economics over which Sir William Beveridge formerly presided, which according to the late Lord Haldane, Sir Ernest Cassel, who founded it, intended as a "training ground for the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State."

So their "Advices" and "Assessments" may have been as well "planned" as the Report, and who signed it will not make much difference. The "planning" has gone on a long time.

On the very day the Report was issued, a Member of Parliament, Mr. MacLaren, told the House of Commons he "loved these gentlemen who write vast tomes on poverty and unemployment, who usually find their professors in that incubation of nonsense," the London School of Economics.

The same member remembered Sir William Beveridge's proposals in 1906 when he suggested employment exchanges. But then Sir William Beveridge came face to face with . . . this problem of recurring cycles of depression in trade. Sir William Beveridge and many other economists cannot understand what is the cause of it. . . . So Sir William Beveridge said, "I cannot explain this phenomenon, but I must get over it somehow, so I suggest a tripartite

contribution." . . . That was the beginning of what I call Fabianism. . . . That was the beginning of the destruction of the liberty of the individual, because it was as clear as noonday that once that step was taken, the upas tree of bureaucracy was bound to grow and expand."

If Sir William Beveridge's Finance-inspired remedies produced the detested labour queue, the means test, and heavier and heavier taxation, every penny of which was sheer robbery by the State at the instigation of the money power, why should the mere ironing out of some of the tests, even accompanied by bigger "doles," promise a richer harvest of satisfaction? Is a mess really any better because we are all in it? And, as Mr. MacLaren wanted to know, Why the mess?

Sir William Beveridge, who foresaw so little in 1906, now knows (after the event) some things which less eminent men, and many of them, knew all along:

(1) "Want could have been abolished before the present war by a redistribution of income within the wage-earning classes, without touching any of the wealthier classes." (Beveridge Report on Social Insurance and Allied Services, page 165.)

(2) "Abolition of want just before the

war was easily within the economic resources of the community; want was a needless scandal due to not taking the trouble to prevent it." (Report, page 166.)

(3) "It is clear that abolition of want by re-distribution of income is within our means." (Report, page 167.)

(4) "Want could have been abolished in Britain (n.b. No longer 'Great?') just before the present war. It can be abolished after the war. . . ." (Report, page 168.)

How does he reach this conclusion? Easily! If you have a stable, with ten stalls, and a cart-horse in each stall, and if you feed hay to eight of the horses, and they all leave some, you can take what they leave and feed it to the other two. This abolishes "want" (in cart-horses.)

Sir William Beveridge, the Fabians and Planners, P.E.P., are now ready to concede cart-horse conditions for all. But human beings are not cart-horses. The re-adjustment of "income" effected by our Social Stableners is to be an initial charge against the public of £86,000,000, at present the equivalent of 1/- in the £ on the income tax.

The expenditure of money under the scheme is tentatively estimated at £697,000,000 rising to £858,000,000 in 20

(Continued on page 4)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Arising from alleged resentment against "high pressure" appeals for U.S. aid, the following appeared in the Melbourne "Sun" of April 19: "If this pressure went on much longer, there would probably be rather a pointed PRIVATE reprimand delivered to Canberra." And this: "Washington is not satisfied because Australian conscripts are still restricted to Australia, while U.S. conscripts are sent around the world, including Australia." It was not stated that we did not ask for conscripts. And then this: "The insistence of Australia on the return of the Ninth Division against strong protests from Washington and London is distinctly OUT OF ORDER." Surely the reverse is the case!

UNION UNITY: Mr. Lazzarini is reported as deploring the "spirit of anarchy" developing in some trade unions, and suggesting that unless trade unionists disciplined themselves the Union movement would be killed. He complained that when officials' actions did not meet the approval of the rank-and-file they attempted to take control away from the executive. Presumably in his reckoning it is "anarchy" for the Union members to dismiss officials who do not obey their employers (Union members)! He then suggested that Unionists who did not obey their paid Servants (Union officials) were scabs. That sounds mighty like the Red Fascist philosophy.

PUNK PARTIES: In U.S.A. a Gallup Poll on "whose party is more likely to bring prosperity after the war," discloses that 32% said "Republicans," 27% "Democrats," while 21% said "it does not make any difference." Another "Poll" on "which party would handle peace negotiations better" found 33% of the opinion "that it does not make any difference." These "Polls" at least indicate that from 21% to 33% of Americans have realised the folly of Party Politics.

BANKERS' BRAWLS: A report in the Melbourne "Sun" of April 17 may indicate the bankers' "hidden hand" in the dispute between the French factions in Africa. The position, purely financial, is this: "General De Gaulle has stabilised the franc in the colonies under his control at 43.5 to the dollar, whereas General Giraud with American aid, has the North African franc at 50 to the dollar. General Giraud will not collaborate with De Gaulle unless he merges his economy with North Africa." This sort of financial haggling extends into the wider international sphere, where one set of bankers' mouthpieces demand a world-currency on the gold-standard basis, and the others demand the same thing—but with variations! While public attention is focussed on these brawls over which brand of poison would be best, the objections to being poisoned at all are apt to receive scant attention. Very convenient—to the poisoners!

UNION UNREST: The arrest of Union Secretaries who allegedly called stop-work meetings at certain Allied Works Council jobs is causing grave concern in Union circles. It appears that the Secretaries of the Carpenters' and Plasterers' Unions were arrested under provisions of the National Security Act. The action did not prevent the stop-work meetings, so it may be presumed that the rank-and-file had instructed their officials to call the stop work meetings as a protest against some infringement of principle. The Government can surely find a better way out than using dictatorial methods, which can only lead to further dislocation of the war effort.

FEDERAL UNION: At times it seems that the Federal Union plot is not working to schedule. For example, latest reports say that "Britain and U.S. will not make territorial commitments in wartime, yet two spheres of influence—Russian and British and American—seem to have been staked out." However, there are persistent reports to the effect that "President Roosevelt and Mr. Eden reached an agreement on American support of Britain's pro-Russia policy, Britain's backing of U.S. policy towards France, and the elevation of General Giraud (who favours 50 francs to the dollar) over General De Gaulle (who favours only 43.5 francs to the dollar)." In regard to that last bone of contention, no doubt the French fighting forces would rather split the difference of 6.5 francs—and get on with the job.

PRESS POWER: An extraordinary illustration of the power of the daily press was reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of April 3: "Fifteen big New York stores were fined £25,000 for allegedly boycotting, the advertising columns of the New York Times." As would be expected the "New York Times" did not initiate the action—but presumably encouraged the Government "anti-trust" department to discipline the advertisers, whose boycott was directed against a proposed increase in advertising rates. It was claimed that their boycott denied the people knowledge of available goods. Fancy that, now! This example of "freedom of advertisers" being restricted should be of special interest to press-magnate Murdoch.

NEW ORDERS: An informal poll of U.S. Senators discloses a hopeful sign in so far as it indicates that the Senate is unlikely to formally commit the U.S. to some specific kinds of post-war folly. It appears that a two-thirds Senate majority must approve all treaties before they are effective. 32 Senators opposed the idea of "an international police force," whilst 24 approved, and others would not express an opinion. Senator Taft commented that "such a 'Force' could as easily bomb New York as Berlin."

REFUGEE RUMBLES: Reports to hand indicate that the refugee conference at Bermuda, envisages Planning on a large scale especially by and for Jews. The idea looks very much like the Allied Works Council on an international scale. One report stated that "nobody in authority has yet mentioned the possibilities of re-settlement in Australia or New Zealand." Under the circumstances, it would be as well for electors to impress on the minds of their Parliamentary representatives that they, the Australian citizens, are the only ones with legitimate authority to decide such an issue.

—OB.H.

Beware "Divide and Rule" Tactics

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

I recently took part in an Army debate. The title of the debate is not important—it concerned the liquor question—but one or two points mentioned during the debate are worthy of elaboration. My opponent, a man who was very concerned about the "other fellow," advanced some very subtle arguments regarding compulsion of civilians because soldiers have to do certain things: "Soldiers at Buna couldn't get beer; therefore, why should civilians have beer?" And much more in similar strain.

As I pointed out in reply, this argument could be extended: "I am living in a tent and eating quite a lot of bully-beef and dog-biscuits; therefore, why shouldn't my wife live in a tent and eat bully-beef and dog-biscuits?" Needless to say, there is no necessity for civilians to endure the hardships of soldiers. I mentioned that we cannot win a war for democracy by turning totalitarian ourselves, and that, irrespective of what Hitler and local planners may think, there is only one satisfactory way of getting civilians to throw their maximum energies into the war effort: voluntary inducement and the minimum of sacrifice commensurate with realities. I also had a little to say about bureaucracy, pointing out that bureaucratic madness is far more dangerous to this country than people getting drunk. The conclusion of my address stressed the fact that we are fighting for the liberty of the individual, and that morale among the fighting troops was not improved by planners reducing their families at home to their temporary standard of living. I was pleased to note that only two men didn't vote for me at the conclusion of the debate. And one of those was of the opinion that "we" had to tell the people what was "good for them." I presumed that he was one of the "we"!

Since this debate I have been reading how certain people are concerned about using the hard conditions under which the men in New Guinea and elsewhere are fighting as an excuse to regiment further the civilian population. There seems to be a sinister campaign to drive a wedge between our fighting forces and civilians. "Smith's Weekly," for example, has been printing letters from soldiers who complain about strikes and other troubles in industry. I would say that "Smith's" is doing more harm than good. Why isn't a positive policy adopted and some attempt made to reveal the CAUSES of troubles in industry? The fundamental cause is deeply rooted in our treacherous economic system, and trouble in industry will continue until that system

is exposed as the common enemy of soldiers and munition makers.

Sir Charles Marr, a U.A.P. Member from N.S.W., recently stated that all munition workers should be reduced to the same rate of pay as the soldiers. Unfortunately, this argument appeals to the emotions of many people. How the financiers must smile to hear such misguided nonsense. They adhere to the old, old strategy: "Divide and Rule." We don't want the munition workers levelled down to the soldiers' pay; we want the soldiers levelled up to the munition workers' pay. When Sir Charles Marr and others abuse munition workers and civilians, they want to remember that there is no fundamental difference between munition workers and soldiers; they are all products of the same country, and the same economic conditions. Put the munition workers up in New Guinea, and they would fight as well as the men there now; put the present soldiers into munitions under existing economic arrangements, and they would be no better or worse than the present munition workers. They would all be forced to join a Union, and they would strike if the Union dictators said so. A few would, like some of the present munition workers, indulge in a little "bludging." But let me say, as an Army Sergeant, that "bludging" is not confined to munition workers!

We must stop this dangerous practice of comparing civilians with soldiers. Unity against our common internal foe is required. Oppose all "levelling down" movements. Both munition workers AND soldiers can be paid well. The money to do this can be manufactured by the same firms manufacturing it now—i.e., the private banks. I haven't noticed Sir Charles Marr or "Smith's" suggesting that the robbery of both soldiers and munition workers by these firms, through indirect and direct taxation, to pay increasing interest bills, should be stopped. Perhaps someone will be energetic enough to tell them?

ARE SOCIAL CREDITERS DIFFERENT?

(Translated and condensed from "Vers Demain," Sherbrooke, Quebec.)

At a time when the Social Credit movement was still in the propaganda phase, when the experimenters went from one parish to another explaining the money system and the ill-effects of the debt foundation of money, we remember how citizens often looked upon us as heralds similar to all other heralds of useless revolutions or new "parties." Actually, the Social Crediters have acted less and less as have others; rather the opposite of others.

Others: Generally had men of good academic standing, or perhaps eloquent speakers, or men who preached a doctrine, to speak to audiences without really instructing them.

Social Crediters tended to be work people, men of the field, who never before had thought of speaking from a platform, but did have something realistic to say, something which the simple people have understood, and have in turn communicated to others.

Others: Sought to have prominent leaders, who, when they arrived, expected a flair of trumpets and civic receptions, who expected citizens to act as subjects visited by a sovereign.

Social Crediters: Went about, often in pairs, as humble colporteurs, well received by the small people, but looked at askance by the big-wigs of the village. Often they were ignored, if not scorned, by those who prided themselves on having an education above that of the primary school.

Others: It was "my chief," "my party," "my party programme or platform or policy."

Social Crediters: Had means of demonstrating what was wrong, and could suggest positive remedies.

Others: Said in effect, "When we are in power the favoured ones will have assured positions of prominence," and they said this while waiting at the hotel for a good dinner.

Social Crediters: said in effect: "If you want to pull yourself out of a mess, then you must expect to devote energy and money to the job." A regular small subscription will bring you the means of instructing yourself.

Others: Encouraged a great agitation for, say, a month in four or five years, and in between on a few grand occasions of appearance.

Social Crediters: Always on the job—in

DEFEAT DEBT

All the world immersed in it!
Every mortal cursed by it!
Men are at their worst through it!
Is there no salvation from this debt,
debt, debt?

Debt! Debt! Debt! Debt!
Who began the cursed thing?
Can no leader, hero, king,
Freedom from its thralldom bring?
Oh, to be set free in full from debt,
debt, debt!

Debt! Debt! Debt! Debt! Men may
pour their life-blood out
Putting tyrannies to rout
Vainly. Why not set about
Shaking off the tyranny of debt, debt, debt?

Debt! Debt! Debt! Debt!
When this war is ended, we
Howso'er it ends must be
In more awful slavery
If no one can rescue us from debt,
debt, debt.

Debt! Debt! Debt! Debt!
Men were always fools and blind.
Given victory, they find
Debt has followed up behind.
Vanquishers are vanquished, still,
by debt, debt, debt.

Debt! It sucks all life away!
God, in mercy, show the way
To defeat it—send the day
When men may at last forget
Life as we have known life, choked
with debt, debt, debt.
—"John A. Lee's Weekly," Auckland, N.Z.

every season, 365 days a year, after as well as before elections, in time of peace as in time of war.

In party politics it is the winning of power which constitutes the motive. A bogus programme is presented in order to climb to power, but the real programme is that of furnishing the plate with butter, of distributing favours, and of fattening the interests of the big-wigs.

Social Crediters have no faith in the success of a noble cause by means of party politics. Some did think at the early stages of the movement that they would arrive more quickly at results by placing their own candidates in Parliament. Their actual contact with the political machine quickly made them realise that thus they were wasting their time.

Social Crediters as social "research" workers look on at the political hubbub and carefully note what is being said and done, but always keep aloof.

Social Crediters will know better than most citizens what they will do in time of election, but they do not count on elections or on law-making, or on Parliamentary recipes or menus of any kind to establish Social Credit.

Social Crediters of the Quebec Province have been wise enough to avoid political parties, and have made no liaison arrange-

ments with them. The directors of the movement have always resisted any idea of having a political chief, or of forming clubs for supporting candidates, or for concocting anything in the nature of cabals. They have even sometimes broken with adherents of note who would have pushed them in these directions, and are far from regretting this kind of conduct. Experience pushes us further and further from party politics, for the pursuit of the cause.

Now, it is never Ministers, nor deputies, nor functionaries of Governments who produce grain; vegetables, fruit, oats, firewood, etc., etc.—though they certainly consume their own personal share.

Why has one need of these officials? To institute some accountancy system which will keep the relation to men and things straight.

And why has one need of the retention of mental confidence (of those who use it) in the system?

All money draws its acceptability from the confidence which goes with it. All money draws its value from the presence of products which it can buy. Products are not the business of politics; confidence is not the business of politics. Blind confidence may, perhaps, be a matter of hypnotism. Hypnotism is maintained by the exploitation of finance and of politicians; but reasoned confidence is a matter of intelli-

FRENZIED FINANCE

(To the Editor)

Sir,—I trust that the following extracts from "The Crisis in Australian Finance, 1929-31," may prove of interest to your readers:—

"At this stage it should be pointed out that the nominal rate of 35/- per cent. is what is known as above 'gold point.' That is to say that it would be cheaper to export gold from Australia to London rather than pay 35/- per cent. exchange. In view of the situation which I have just outlined, a position arises where those who require London credits and are unable to obtain them from the usual banking channels may present notes at the Commonwealth Bank, obtain gold against same and ship it overseas to obtain outside credit. The position which I am now outlining to you is not merely a possibility, but the actual state of affairs referred to has now arrived and the Board, after exhausting every possible expedient to meet the situation now finds itself definitely faced with proposals which must have the effect of depleting the reserve of gold and further taking the control of the situation out of the Board's hands. It has, therefore, become necessary to lay the matter before your Government for such action as you may deem it wise to take, and at the same time offer your Government such advice as seems to the Board wise. Whilst this legislation in itself would not prevent exportation of gold from Australia, it would place the gold in Australia definitely in the control of the Bank. Once placed in this position there would be only one authority in control of the gold in Australia. The development of the position had reached a point at the time the present Government came into office, which, in the view of the Board, had become so pressing that advice was immediately tendered to the Government to bring in legislation on the lines before referred to. The recommendation of the Board with certain simplifications which the Government thought necessary, were embodied in the Bill which was finally passed on November 28, 1929." Apparently the above is a good indication of why bank-notes, which could previously be exchanged for gold at head office, were cancelled, and substituted with the legal tender notes.

The total assets, total deposits and advances of the private banks from 1914 to 1930 are given on page 132, as follows:—

Year.	Advances.	Assets.	Deposits.
1914	£114,337,465	£168,656,036	£157,039,480
1918	130,686,841	192,434,334	177,142,417
1922	168,106,871	238,637,794	222,359,245
1926	213,252,020	292,523,291	264,792,151
1929	267,831,631	355,400,684	300,274,716
1930	284,283,139	369,449,432	285,194,939

—Yours etc., A. S. Ingham, 104 Grey-street, South Brisbane.

BOOKS TO READ

(Obtainable from the United Electors of Australia, Room 9, 5th Floor, McEwan House, Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.I.)

"Federal Union Exposed": A book you MUST have. By Barclay-Smith. Price, 1/-.

"Banks and Facts": How to Finance the War for an All-in War Effort. By Bruce H. Brown. Price, 6d. each.

"Money": What it is and how the Money System Works. By S. F. Allen. Price, 1/-.

"Answer to Tax Slavery": Explains the Taxation Racket; and shows WHY we Really Pay Taxes. By Barclay-Smith. Price, 1/-.

gence brought to bear upon facts. A law, even the best of laws, will not grow a potato, nor turn up a furrow, nor irrigate the least part of a field; it can recognise and protect a good thing, but it cannot make a good thing.

The law of "Popular Funds" has existed for 30 years in Quebec, but this law has not established a single fund. The funds have been produced and guarded in progress by the societies themselves.

It will be thus with Social Credit. Social Credit will be established by Social Crediters themselves. In Alberta it was not the vote of 22nd August, 1935 which established Social Credit. Even the opening of the Treasury branches has been but a useful link. It is the reasoned confidence that 30,000 families of Alberta show in using the facilities offered by the Treasury branches which makes the gradual development of Social Credit certain.

MYSTERY OF COMMUNISTS' FINANCES

The following interesting article appeared in the April 2 issue of "The Century" (Sydney), the Labor weekly run by the Lang section of the A.L.P.:—

Last Saturday in the Fairfax "S.M. Herald" appeared the following advertisement:—

"WANTED: Modern Office Premises. Suite 14 offices, space about 2000 square feet, centrally situated, 1st or 2nd floor. Apply Communist Party of Australia. Telephone, MA 5097. Box 35, Haymarket P.O."

City rentals to-day are around 8/- per foot. That means the Commos will have to find up to £800 a year for rental of office premises. That makes no provision for meeting halls for the proletariat or the suckers who swallow the opiate prepared by the polit-bureau.

Apparently there are to be 14 offices for 14 big-wigs.

The Commos have money to burn. Recently they brought the faithful from all over Australia to their Comic Congress. There was no trouble about rail priorities. Or about fares.

Everything was carried out in the approved Communist deluxe manner. Sydney Town Hall—dearest in the Commonwealth—was hired for the occasion. Newspaper advertisements, including half-pages in the local newspapers, as well as picture slides, heralded the event.

Then there was the inter-State radio hook-up with speeches by Miles, Sharkey, and the elite.

In addition, Adam Ogston has his regular paid broadcasts on 2UE, and a network of stations; the Communist book distributors have a 2GB session with country relays, while printing presses pour out books.

U.S. PAPER ADVOCATES PRESSURE POLITICS

Extract from "Christian Science Monitor," Boston, U.S.A., September 12, 1942—

Housewives who protest loudly at the dinner table about the rising cost of living have a big opportunity to do something about it right now.

Sit down and write President Roosevelt and your Senator and Representative, telling them that you want swift and clear-cut action to curb both farm prices and wages—if you do.

While President Roosevelt and Congress argue as to who shall brave political disfavour by moving to curb the earnings of the farmer and labor, the housewife has a real opportunity for leadership in the matter of price control.

Most farmers say they will be willing to accept ceilings lower than those fixed in the present price control if a ceiling is also put on city folks' wages. Thus far the only

It is the transactions effected through the Treasury branches which directs the production and distribution towards the satisfaction of the needs of the consumers.

This same process is going on now in the Quebec Association of well-informed people, which opened its first branch at Sherbrooke on 23rd, March, 1942. Already we have 14,000 members amongst whom its transfer vouchers circulate. When the Social Crediters shall have learned to make full use of a system whereby 5 per cent. of the purchasing power is their own credit, they will be able to extend the bookkeeping process and circulate 100 per cent. of their own credit entries in relation to their own purchases. And the more they thus enjoy the benefits of the system, the more will the citizens of the community generally enjoy indirect benefits.

Will not readers agree that Social Crediters are quite different from all "the others?"

magazines and pamphlets in an unending stream—and without newsprint difficulties.

Where does the money come from?

That is the question every Labour supporter should ask the Commos.

The Labour Party has never been able to hire the Town Hall for protracted periods. But the Commos, with their microscopic membership, can.

Further, how can the Commos staff a suite of 14 offices? What does Mr. Bellemore have to say about that?

The Secretary of the British Labor Party, J. S. Middleton, in a letter rejecting the Commos' request for affiliation, wanted to know something about the finances.

He pointed out that Labour, with a membership 40 times greater, could never spend on such a scale:

"This, with the fact that the Communist Party never publishes balance-sheets, justifiably creates lack of confidence in the Communists' claim to financial independence," says the Labor Party's letter.

"The Labor Party cannot believe that the Communists' intentions towards British Labor are any more honest than in the days when Britain stood alone against Nazi and Fascist aggression," the letter says.

"The Labor Party does not believe that the blood sacrificed either by French Socialists and Communists or by the Red Army, relieves the British Communist Party or the Communist International of its share of responsibility for the breakdown of democratic government and the extension of Fascist rule."

The same applies to Australia. But Curtin is flirting with the Commos. They are sneaking in the back door of the Labor Party.

action on wage ceilings taken either by Congress or by the President are in wage stabilisation agreements that affect only a few thousand workers thus far.

SOCIAL SCIENCE LECTURES

A series of fortnightly lectures on Social Science will commence at 8 p.m. on Wednesday, May 5, at the rooms of the United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street (a few yards from Elizabeth Street), Melbourne.

The lectures will be delivered by Mr. F. A. Parker, B.A., Dip.Ed, and are designed to clarify and amplify many aspects of social problems. "The Rules Of The Game" is the title of the first lecture. Discussion will be invited, not only after the lectures, but at certain stages during each lecture, thus providing opportunities for thorough examination of all the important points as the lecture proceeds.

YOU are invited to come along—and bring one or more friends.

WHAT IS THE MORAL OUTLOOK?

This is a troubled moment in world history. Yet the present is as spiritually-minded in the widest sense of the term as any period in modern times, and one reason why it looks so troubled is because standards of moral judgment ARE becoming high. For what are the rights of man, which are foremost in everyone's thoughts to-day—what are they but concrete evidence of spiritual awakening?

The animating impulses of modern thought are high-minded. Even the forces of ruthless oppression pay lip service to the theme of social justice. The ideal of Communism is superb, although its practice is bloody. The demagogues of Italy and Germany also talk in the exalted strain of uplift.

And the popular conception of international morality is high. The proof of it is the stunned horror and indignation of the world when a callous nation cynically violates the moral code. Unprovoked conquest for gain is to-day universally condemned. In spite of prevalent forces of evil, we are not living in a period that is spiritually dead. When there are no cries of "Shame!" the time will have come for lamentation.

No one should expect too grand a show of spirituality from the human race. For the unenlightened compose the compact majority, and a great many of the en-

lightened are tired, morose and greedy. Faint hearts relapse into a state of despondency at the first sign of opposition, and their immortal spirit is drowned in groaning. But if the legions of darkness destroy civilisation, it will not be because the world is without vision. In spite of the practical difficulties that lie in the way of decisive action, the modern ideals of social and private conduct are high-minded.

While hopeful people patiently await a spiritual awakening, they are in grave danger of overlooking the irradiations of the spirit right under their noses. The spirit is not something imposed from without by a church, a government or an economic system, but something nourished from within the private man, and it is common property.

—Brooks Atkinson. (Condensed from the "New York Times.")

ADJUSTMENT OR DISASTER?

A series of addresses delivered on the Sunday nights of Lent at St. Clement's Church of England, Elsternwick, on the general subject, "The Progress We Seek," was concluded by Mr. J. Bradshaw, A.F.I.A., an office-bearer at St. Paul's Cathedral, and a member of the Executive of the New World Reconstruction Movement, who spoke on Social Credit, with particular reference to the present world crisis:—

Basing his address on St. John 10, x.—"I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly"—words which, he suggested, might be regarded as epitomising the life and work of The Master, the speaker indicated that every existing economic system has a philosophy of life as its foundation. He stressed the truth that Social Credit is not, as is so often falsely represented, merely a monetary reform system, but that it is essentially a philosophy of life, the monetary reform aspect of its programme being but a means to the grand and ennobling objective envisaged by its adherents, namely, the fullest expansion, growth, and development of the individual personality. He further stated that the philosophy of Social Credit estimates the human personality as the expression of an ideal that is seeking incarnation. Because of the foregoing, Mr. Bradshaw claimed that the philosophy and objectives of Social Credit correspond to the teaching and philosophy of Christ as expressed in the words of the text quoted.

Referring to the days of crisis through which the world and its peoples are passing, he emphasised the great perils which lie ahead of every nation, including Australia, unless the individual citizen, realising the diabolical nature of the plans for his future being concocted by the evil forces represented by the International Financiers who control all Governments, took a much more positive stand in relation to questions of public policy and the government of the country than he has done up to the present. By allowing control of our Parliamentary institutions to be usurped by those to whom St. Paul refers as "the rulers of the darkness of this world," instead of asserting our own right as citizens acting in association, to map out our own destiny, we not only face the certainty of having imposed on us a "New Order" that will be worse than the old order, but we also resign ourselves to being led inevitably to a third world war—a war in which the science of slaughter and destruction will have been advanced to such a degree as will render highly probable the extinction of the human race. Mr. Bradshaw quoted the Cambridge historian, Wingfield Stratford, whose words, in this connection, sound a grave warning which we disregard at our peril:—"From the biologist's standpoint, man is a species of animal that, like other species, is faced with the perpetual necessity, of adapting himself to his environment under pain of extinction." The individual giants of the ice age, like the giant lizards, have long since perished, overwhelmed by the changing conditions of life. So, in the most literal sense, the species turned to fossils. The attempt to meet situations such as that with which we are confronted to-day with old answers to new questions, has proved fatal all along the road of evolutionary development. We simply must adjust or perish.

Regarding the question of post-war reconstruction and plans relative thereto, concerning which we read a great deal in the daily papers, we should never forget the words uttered by Mr. Lloyd George, who was Prime Minister of Great Britain during the 1914-18 war: "They (the international bankers) swept statesmen, politicians, jurists, and journalists all on one side, and issued their orders with the imperiousness of absolute monarchs who knew that there was no appeal from their ruthless decrees." Mr. Lloyd George was referring to negotiations following the 1914-18 war when he made that statement.

Notwithstanding assurances that the same errors and iniquities would not be perpetrated after this war, there was every indication that the same interests as those denounced by Mr. Lloyd George still controlled our Governments, and that they were determined at all costs to preserve the present effete and discredited financial system. Unless the requisite changes were made in the financial system, it would be impossible to fashion any "New Order" which did not contain the seeds of its own destruction. That is so, because the financial system—as can be demonstrated—generates costs against the community more rapidly than it can distribute purchasing power wherewith to liquidate such costs. Because of this fundamental flaw in the system, not only is it a matter of impossibility to distribute to the people, children of the Most High, the abundance provided by His bounty of all things necessary for the fullest expression, growth and development of the individual personality, but also, because the people's governments are held in thrall by the mighty banking houses of New York and London, the Governments continue to obtain their financial requirements by borrowing from those institutions which have usurped the prerogative of the Crown to issue all money and credit in the name of the people. This evil policy is the progenitor of the fierce and confiscatory taxation being imposed on the people quite unnecessarily.

That such taxation is unnecessary is evidenced by the findings of the Royal Commission on Banking. The Report of that Commission explicitly stated that the

Commonwealth Bank had power to issue to the Government the full amount required to meet all obligations and commitments free of debt and interest charges. In an article written by him and published in the "Locomotive Journal," of December 4 1939, Mr. Curtin had made the following pronouncement:—"Everything in the war must be paid for by the use of the national credit. As a prerequisite to national defence the Commonwealth Bank must have restored to it, its original charter. When we are in power, we shall proceed to redeem the national bank from its slavery. The costs of the war can be met without piling up huge debts and incurring interest payments that suck our national life blood." That was only one of the many statements to the same effect

(Continued on page 4.)

ARE WE REALLY SERIOUS ABOUT "RECONSTRUCTION"?

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

(Continued from last issue.)

Sir, Before we can give intelligent consideration to the question of reconstruction after the war, it is necessary for us to get a clear understanding of the nature, origin, and control of money, as that is the thing which dictates what we may do. The point at which we finished last week was that all money used in Australia is made in Australia, and that when the Australian banks permit the issue of additional cheques, they increase the supply of money according to the volume of the cheques issued. These cheques become bank deposits, and are therefore quite as effective as Commonwealth notes.

Now, control over the issue of paper money is really the prerogative of the Commonwealth, vide Section 51 of the Constitution Act, and pursuant to that power it is quite competent for the Federal Parliament to require the issue of sufficient money to purchase the whole of the products of Australia. In that event, it would be of little concern to us whether overseas prices rose or fell. If we did not wish to give it away to some country whose people are badly in need of it, we would send our surplus abroad and take what we could get for it. Japan, for example, was supplying England with bathing costumes at 2/6d. and shirts at 1/3d., and it is quite a mistake to assume that this remarkable result was mainly due to poor working conditions and long hours. The explanation is to be found in the fact that the Japanese made use of somewhat unorthodox financial methods, and I could never understand how it was that Sir John Latham, our "goodwill" man who, shortly before his appointment as Australia's representative in Tokio, had returned from an allegedly triumphal tour of the East, was so silent on this particularly important point. Are we less capable than the Japanese?

Not only from the point of view of those who have been exporters, but also because of the million men and women who will be released from war activity at the termination of hostilities, we have to face the fact that the local market is much more important than the export market, and that consequently it is definitely the responsibility of the Federal Parliament to see that funds are provided to ensure the distribution and consumption of the maximum quantity of goods within our own borders. And just as the private trading banks finance our exporters without necessitating the printing of additional notes, so also can the Commonwealth Bank finance our public works and provide the necessary aids to consumption and shorter hours of labour without

THE LITTLE NATIONS

Now that certain sinister forces are attempting to destroy the small nations of the world by robbing them of their independence, the following extract from a speech by Mr. Lloyd George, at the Queen's Hall, London, when he was Britain's War Prime Minister in 1917, is interesting:—

"The world owes much to little nations—and to little men. (Laughter and applause.) This theory of bigness, this theory that you must have a big empire, and a big nation, and a big man—well, long legs have their advantages in a retreat. (Laughter and applause.) The Kaiser's ancestors chose his warriors for their height, and that tradition has become a policy in Germany.

"Germany applies that ideal to nations, and will only allow six-foot-two nations in the ranks. (Laughter.) But, ah! the world owes much to the little five-foot-five nations. The greatest art in the world was the work of little nations; the most enduring literature of England came when she was a nation of the size of Belgium fighting a great Empire. The heroic deeds that thrill humanity were the deeds of little nations fighting for their freedom."

—"New Era."

THE COMMUNIST "PRIESTHOOD"

John Maynard, author of the Left Book Club volumes, "The Russian Peasant and Other Studies,"* in a cold analysis of "Party leadership" in the Soviet, leaves no room for doubt that the Communist Party sees in the priesthood a dangerous rival; all the more dangerous because—astonishing discovery!—there are many important resemblances between the priesthood and the Party. We give the passage in full (emphasis ours):—

"Even the 'Party'—that unique misnomer of the vocation of leadership—is not really new: but rather a new application of an ancient institution: the **priesthood**. Think of it as a **lay Church**: beside which all rivals are but **heretics**: having a monopoly of teaching, supplying the personnel of many **offices of State**, as the mediaeval Church did: bound to certain **abstentions**, as were the mediaeval Churchmen: **accessible to ability** from all social strata, as was the Church: marked off from the rest by the dedication to particular tasks, as were the priests: liable to be **unfrocked**, as perhaps the Churchmen were not. The parallel extends even to such insignificant details as the marking of the head by the shaving of a portion of it. The Communist shaves the face as the **priest shaved the crown**.

"Like everything else, the 'Party' is in

flux, and it has seemed to me during recent years that the direction in which it has been moving is towards a stricter **authoritarianism**. The loopholes remaining for freedom of discussion have been narrowed and the occasions for its exercise have been limited. There is nothing corresponding to the attitude of Lord Acton bitterly opposing the dogma of Papal Infallibility after its establishment by the Vatican Decrees, and yet declaring in private that it had never occurred to him to doubt any single dogma of the Church. He distinguished between the authority and the authorities of the Church, and respected the former, but questioned the latter. I do not think the present-day Communist makes any such distinction. The fact that a particular decision **comes from the office of the Third International** is sufficient: he must accept and obey, even though acceptance and obedience involve the eating of yesterday's words.

"This is not of good augury for freedom in Russia, if we are thinking of the political half of freedom when we use the word.

"The 'Party' is the leader of the Russian people, and the 'Party' is bound to obey—not a Congress of its members, for such meetings are rare but—a bureaucratic machine: which in turn takes its directions from the **Head of the Russian State**."

* * * * *

Rather a joke, isn't it? Stalin, after all, is just the Red Pope, the five Million Party members are Red Priests, the Third International is the Red Ecumenical Council, which occasionally sends round "Encyclicals," which absolutely must be obeyed (until the Third International thinks fit to change the Party Line, when it can order you to think and do just the opposite), the OGPU is the Inquisition (long defunct in the Catholic Church, which shows how reactionary Communists can be when it suits them), Solovetsky Island is the Communist Hell, out of which there's no redemption; the perpetual fear of a Purge is the Communist Purgatory. Why, they even have a Hierarchy, if we use that word, inaccurately, to mean the Bench of Bishops. The humorous Russian people have invented a new word, "Sovburi," as a nickname for the Soviet bureaucrats who pontificate in politics. It wouldn't be a surprise, when one recalls the enthusiastic laudation of Stalin in the Soviet press, to hear that they call him the Holy Father. Haven't they even their Sign of the Cross—a hammer crossed upon a sickle?

But don't wonder, since they have set up a Supreme Being of their own; yesterday, before yesterday, it was Marx; yesterday, Lenin; to-day, Stalin. The Pope acknowledges a God above him. The "Party" can conceive of nobody above Stalin.

—"Holy Name Monthly."

*Vol. I., page 20, 21.

THE COUNTRY PARTY AND MONEY REFORM

"COUNTRY PARTY CONFERENCE: Conference decided by a small majority to postpone, until the end of the conference, all motions, of which there were several, dealing with monetary reform or the national credit method of financing the Government. The mover said that at the last two or three conferences discussion on these subjects had so monopolised the time of conference that important branch motions were given scanty consideration or none at all."

—Melbourne "Age," April 8.

Rally of True Democrats

to Support the Candidature of

Mr. L. H. Hollins, M.L.A.,

at the HAWTHORN TOWN HALL (near Glenferrie Station), on

FRIDAY, 7th MAY, at 8 p.m.

Vested Interests are determined to unseat Mr. Hollins because of his fearless stand for a functioning Democracy.

THIS IS YOUR FIGHT!

Don't Leave it to the other fellow! Your Help is needed now.

—Authorised by Melbourne Owen, 126 Auburn Road, E.2. (Advt.)

"SOAKING THE POOR" IN U.S.A.

"Soaking The Poor" is not, of course, a procedure peculiar to the U.S.A. Apart from variations of detail, the article reprinted hereunder applies equally to Australia—and other countries—UNDER ORTHODOX FINANCE. "Soaking The Poor" is NOT a temporary war-time expedient (we have purposely selected this article because it is pre-war), although orthodox war-finance intensifies the process during—AND AFTER—the war. The writer of the following is apparently ignorant of the ALTER-NATIVE to Government-borrowing and increasing taxation; but he is to be commended for his concluding suggestion, as well as his clear and concise presentation of the facts:—

The amount of hidden taxes imposed on the things we buy is incredible. Tobacco in all forms, wines, beers, whiskies, matches, lubricating oils, gasoline, electricity, tyres, inner tubes, toilet preparations, fur articles, jewellery, automobiles, trucks, motor cycles, radio sets, phonographs, records, sporting goods, cameras, candy, chewing gum, soft drinks, telephone calls, theatre admissions, oleomargarine, and other things are all taxed by the Federal Government, and these taxes are all paid by the consumer directly or indirectly.

Heads of families who earn less than 2000 dollars are considered "tax-free" because they do not have to pay income taxes. But studies by the Twentieth Century Fund show that the "tax-free" working man who earns only 1000 dollars a year pays an average of 190 dollars in concealed taxes in Illinois, or 181 dollars in New York. That's 19 per cent of his income. If he earns and spends 2000 dollars a year, he pays 359 dollars in Illinois or 334 dollars in New York. A 5000 dollar salaried worker in New York pays 1061 dollars in taxes. That's 20 per cent.

But this is nothing compared with what is yet to come. For the past five years the Federal Government has borrowed at least

half of what it has spent. Borrowing, of course, can't go on forever. Thereafter we must raise all the cost of government by taxes, and we must raise in addition enough to pay interest and principal on the 20 billions we have borrowed from the banks. This means that taxes will be laid on. The rich, to be sure, will be soaked. But if the government confiscated by taxation all incomes over 25,000 dollars a year, it would still be 600,000,000 dollars short of its expenditures. Therefore, the poor must be soaked, too.

The end of all this would seem to be that the poor and the near-poor ought to be given the privilege of knowing how much they are being soaked. When the tax levier taxes a dollar out of their pockets, he should be forced to take it away while his victim is conscious, not extract it from his glass of beer, from the rouge on his wife's cheeks, from what the whole family wears and eats. Taxes should be labelled taxes all the time. Then we will know what we are paying and we will be a good deal more exacting as to what we are getting for our money.

—John T. Flynn. (Condensed from "The Commentator," New York, October, 1937).

Scathing Indictment of the Beveridge Plan

(Continued from page 1.)

years, though the cost would still be increasing substantially then.

In 1965, £161,000,000 would fail to be met entirely from the Exchequer, a charge equal to nearly 2/- in the £ on the income tax. Wage-earners and employers would all the time be "contributing" £179,000,000 between them, the employers' portion a perpetual charge on the cost, and therefore the price, of goods.

Sir William Beveridge's mind works that way. It is perhaps easier to see its workings when he says that "while one Bristol family of nine in the year 1937 was in sheer physical want, two families out of every five had half as much again as they needed for subsistence. . . . In East London, the total surplus of the working-class families above the minimum was more than thirty times the total deficiency of those below it."

Take it "off them"! Rob Peter to pay Paul, and Paul to pay Peter, and what neither Peter nor Paul receives pay to the little boys of the London School of Economics for doing the robbing good and proper!

This, too, helps to "cure unemployment," and thus encourages expressions of satisfaction from "The Times" and "The Daily Herald" (Labour) alike on the ground of

"incentives" the Plan provides to persuade an enlightened democracy to walk boldly into the Work State—and go far enough in never to be able to get out.

Only the "popular" newspapers share Sir William Beveridge's idea that his proposals are "revolutionary." They are, of course; but not in the sense that is understood in "popular" circles.

"The Times" does not by any means admit their revolutionary character. The newspaper says the implications of the proposals "involve no new departure in principle from the policies and methods which have characterised the development of the British social services during the last half-century."

You didn't know that England had been walking into perpetual slavery for fifty years, did you? When will the people of England learn that a revolution may be only another name for turning a somersault in a prison, while someone is busy fortifying the walls and strengthening the doors? "The term 'social insurance' . . . implies both that it is compulsory and that men stand together with their fellows." Pool your poverty!

But pooling" poverty is not abolishing it. Pooling poverty, in a world so potentially rich that it can blow more wealth to bits in war than it is permitted to produce in peace!

International Currency and the "New World Order"

(To the Editor)

Sir,—The much-vaunted Atlantic Charter is a back number, the Casablanca Conference is receding into the background, Churchill's first instalment of a projected "New World Order" is forgotten, Britain is toying with the Beveridge Plan, even the beginning of the end of the war is certainly not in sight, and in the Press Arena only we are being regaled with two "brand-new" Currency Plans—one "British" and one "American." That of "Britain", per Lord Keynes, is called the International Clearing Fund, that of "America", per Mr. Harry D. White, is known as the United and Associated Nations' Stabilisation Fund, both have the same end in view, and both emanated not very far apart and from much the same source. The "British" plan envisages, not a fixed fund, but rather a relationship between world's currencies. The "American" plan envisages the active manipulation of a fund, embodying the buying and selling of gold currencies, securities, bills of exchange, etc.

We are entitled to ask who is to have control of these "active manipulations," and to what end and on whose behalf the said manipulations are to take place. Mr. Morgan, an American financier, died recently; and in describing his career and activities the comment was made in the press that the present-day trend of events would never again permit so much financial power to be amassed and wielded by one individual. The comment may be correct as far as one individual is concerned, but it does not follow in practice

ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

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

"THE ENEMY WITHIN THE EMPIRE," A short history of the Bank of England. Price, 6d. Postage 1½d. (4/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price, 9d. Postage 1½d. (6/- per dozen, post free.)

that a group of similar-minded gentlemen may not attain as great, or even greater, power, and wield it to the detriment of whole communities or nations. The same sinister impelling and guiding force that is behind the agitation for Federal Union, with a World Parliament and an International Police Force to impress its will upon the peoples of the world, is also behind the definite agitation for a compulsory return to the Gold Standard by Britain and America. Regarding the American plan it is absurd to speak of united and associated nations; we see the difficulty of one nation being united in itself, how then are we going to unite nations?

All the plans advanced up to date for a New World Order all savour very much of the same old brand of compulsion. No such idea as the choice of the people concerned is even mentioned in the scheme of things at all. Lord Keynes, Sir William Beveridge, Montagu Norman, Harry D. White—to mention only a few of the so-called financial experts—are concerned only with preserving money values as known to orthodox finance, not the preservation of human values. To those who agree that the time is ripe for a "New Order," one asks, "What relationship will active manipulation of currencies, dealing in securities or bills of exchange, bear to a "New Order"?"

President Roosevelt recently stated that he envisaged a "New Order" entailing economic security from the cradle to the grave. That sounds very good, as far as it goes, but even the farmers' cows have economic security—providing they are fulfilling the functions for which he keeps them. In our own Federal Parliament recently there was a very animated and bitter debate with regard to preference for returned soldiers. We are entitled to gather from the debate that those who took part are visualising the same old order in full swing, with no end of claimants for the one available JOB: hence the "preference" (!) for the returned soldier. Is this the new order these men and women are fighting to attain?—Yours etc., F. G. Carton, West Coburg.

ADJUSTMENT OR DISASTER?

(Continued from page 3)

made by Mr. Curtin and his colleagues before they gained office, and it is in marked contrast to what these gentlemen tell us to-day.

In addition to the control exercised over our Governments by the little heard of men "who lurk in the shadows behind the beflagged and besloganed rostrums," there is the further factor of the control of our "free" press which is exerted by these same forces. How "free" and veracious the daily press is was indicated by a statement made by Mr. John Swinton, a former editor of "The New York Times," at a banquet given in his honour when he retired. Were any Government to attempt to carry out the financial policy advocated by Mr. Curtin and his party when they were in opposition, the daily press, which is the puppet of vested financial interests, would wage a campaign of vilification and falsification designed to create a panic among the people, so that the people, instead of supporting the Government in its efforts to liberate them, would be hoodwinked by cries of "inflation." Although we were constantly being warned of the dangers of inflation by certain politicians, it was not generally recognised that alternating periods of inflation and deflation were inseparable from the operation of the financial system which these men served so zealously. It was imperative, therefore, that the truth regarding the nature of money, and the source and manner of its production, should be clearly understood. No progress could be made by the community in advance of the people's knowledge and understanding of the problems of society.

The Beveridge Plan, represented as the means whereby economic security might be guaranteed and the living conditions of the people improved, would be found, on examination, to be nothing better than a plan for the redistribution of poverty, for a levelling down instead of the levelling up which is well within the limits of physical possibility. The men who extol the merits of the plan point to the advantage which would be gained by those whose income is derived from wages and salary (these, of course, preponderate) as a result of the arrangement whereby the plan would be financed by contributions from the employee, the employer, and the Government. The truth is, however, that the employee would, indirectly, pay the employer's and the Government's contributions also. He would pay the employer's share in the form of higher prices for everything he purchased, for the simple reason that no business undertaking can continue to operate unless all costs are recovered in the price charged for its products. He would then pay the Government's contribution in the form of heavier taxes. In return, he would, if married, receive the "liberal" payment of £2 per week when eligible for "benefits" provided under the plan. As indicating how far the scale of benefits falls short of what is physically possible, Mr. Bradshaw cited the finding of a Commission of expert technicians appointed by the United States Government prior to the war to investigate the productive resources of the country. This Commission, on completion of its enquiry, issued a brochure entitled "The Chart of Plenty," in which it was stated that the then existing productive capacity of the country made possible the distribution to each family unit of a share in the production, which, expressed in terms of money, was equivalent to £900 per annum on the most conservative estimate. That did not take into account the far greater potential productive capacity. Needless to say, the productive capacity of every country would be considerably increased as a result of the technical advances made during the war.

There could be no salvation for the people of any nation until they cease to tread the pathway that is surely leading to destruction, and which, as stated earlier might result in extermination. The financial system, because it is out of harmony with the law of our being and the physical facts of plenty, is the greatest existing enemy of mankind. There could be no compromise between falsehood and truth. The alternatives which confront the human race and between which a choice MUST be made are adaptation to our changed and ever-changing environment—or . . . extinction. What is the choice to be?

Mr. Bradshaw concluded by drawing attention to the solemn week just being entered upon, and urged that these grave issues should be pondered deeply. We faced Good Friday; and, on the following Sunday, in addition to celebrating Easter Day, we would be commemorating the sac-

rifice of the Anzacs. The only worthy monument to the sacrifices of the past is a people dedicated to the cause of social justice and well-being." Australia has a unique opportunity of raising such a monument. Only by so doing could she adequately discharge her debt to the men who gave their lives in the last war, and to those who will have made the supreme sacrifice in this: only in this way could we hope to prove in any way worthy of the sacrifice of Him who said: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." . . . dead eyes keep watch: you shall not sleep nor rest.

We died. And now you others who must live
Shall do a harder thing than dying is—
For you shall think! And ghosts shall drive you on!"

WEST AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From THE ELECTORAL, CAMPAIGN, Room 6 81 Barrack Street, Perth, W.A.)

Members and supporters of the above movement will be gratified to hear that our appeal for funds, for broadcasting, is beginning to bear fruit.

We now have in the vicinity of £30 towards what we hope will be a sustained effort in the right direction. There are many difficulties to be surmounted, apart from finance, and we hope that interested people will not find the time taken up in preparation too long. Our main object is to make the talks a success, and if there is any delay in starting, it is not that we are not doing anything. Our talks will be advertised over the air, by "scatter ads," prior to broadcasting; so take a note of the time and the station. They are coming.

We take this opportunity of thanking all subscribers to the fund, but point out that it is a very costly business (in terms of money), and a constant flow of cash is in urgent request to make these talks the success we feel sure they will be.

We have a good stock of literature on hand now, and a fine display can at all times be inspected at our rooms. "Alberta's Road to Freedom," is still selling very well, and we have sold over 4000 to date. They have gone to all parts of the Commonwealth and New Zealand.

As our rest room is becoming better known, it is being used more, and we are frequently congratulated upon its comfort and convenience.

The circulating library is also expanding, and many books that are unprocureable elsewhere are included in our catalogue. Membership of the library is 2/- per year and 3d. per book per fortnight. Country members pay postage both ways.

Every penny of money received on account of the library goes into buying new books. The books are not purely technical, but embrace a wide field. We have such books as "Windsor Tapestry," "Spanish Arena," "Coningsby," by Disraeli; Douglas Reed's books, and many others too numerous to mention.

"New Times" Subscription Rates

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

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. (HALF rates for members of the A.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F., etc.)

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

NEW PAMPHLET

What is Democracy? What is Totalitarianism? What is Communism? What is Socialism? What is National Socialism? What is Fascism? What is the choice before us?

All these questions are answered, briefly and clearly, but in a fundamental way, in the excellent pamphlet, "DEMOCRACY AND THE ISMS," the substance of which appeared in the "New Times" of November 6. Copies are now available from The United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.1. Price: One shilling per dozen (postage 1½d.).

Every democrat should get at least a dozen copies, and circulate them as widely as possible. ORDER NOW.

THE "NEW TIMES" IS OBTAINABLE AT ALL AUTHORISED NEWSAGENTS