

ON OTHER PAGES:

THE DAIRYING  
DILEMMA. (Page 2)  
SOCIALISM IN BRITAIN  
(Page 4)  
SENATOR DARCEY ON  
THE FREEDOM OF  
THE PRESS. (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

# THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 8 No. 41. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, OCT. 16 1942 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).

## CANADIAN M.P. ANSWERS FEDERAL UNIONISTS

### Says International Federation Plan is inspired By International Financiers

The Canadian newspaper, "Today and Tomorrow" (Edmonton) which is endorsed by the Premier of Alberta (William Aberhart) recently published the following letter from Mr. Norman Jaques, member of the Canadian House of Commons, replying to a director of the "Union Now" organisation:-

You say "you cannot understand why Social Crediters are against Union Now, and the Atlantic Charter."

Well, for one thing we have learned to beware of the Greeks. . . . We were promised an international Utopia after the last war.

And Social Credit is much more than a system of finance, it is a philosophy of government, and of life—the fullest possible individual freedom and responsibility. With regard to economic planning we believe that the individuals comprising the nation could, and should, do their own Economic planning by means of their demands for goods and services, as indicated in the retail market, and that the financial system must be so adjusted as to make their demands effective; whereas, under orthodox finance, consumer demand is less and less effective—hence bigger and bigger depressions. We maintain that the true object of production must be neither work nor profits, but consumption: that it is the privilege of the people to demand the results they want, and the duty of their representatives to obtain the desired results. That is democracy.

Certainly, nobody has demanded depressions poverty and war, but these are the results obtained during the past 25 years.

This has been the negation of democracy. Nor have those responsible

for these results apologised, or repented. On the contrary, the same guilty men are busy planning for our future and, by centralising their power and surrendering that of the people (sovereignty), they can impose their wills on the people without possibility of successful challenge. And that is precisely the object of Hitler and all other dictators.

Now, beyond question, the thing that has thwarted the will of the people to enjoy peace and prosperity is Finance—monetary control; and beyond question Union Now, and similar international plans, are inspired by those who control international finance.

Anyone who undertakes seriously to enlighten the people as to financial facts, and fictions, is soon made aware of the power of finance, the usual channels of communication are closed to him. At all costs the truths about money have been hidden. Why?

Read any history—it is a financial blank. Apparently our ancestors did not use money, but money determined their actions, as it controls ours.

The Secretary of the Association for Adult Education informs me the Association issues no books dealing with the actual facts of finance, let alone any dealing with monetary reform.

Requests to the Association to publish

a resume of the evidence given by the Governor of the Bank of Canada before Parliament are ignored.

The Association is not interested in money, but it is interested in all ideas for centralisation of the control of policy. The Association is linked with the Institute of International Affairs.

In the 1941 report of the Carnegie Institute for International Peace, mention is made "of a meeting attended by 62 persons of great importance and influence." One section of the resolution passed reads—"We recommend the stabilisation of foreign exchange on the basis of gold—with a view to the establishment of a world gold standard." And the report continues—"The Atlantic Charter is an endorsement of, and a supplement to, the principles expressed by the conference."

What does this exchange stabilisation mean? It means that the few who control gold can bring about rapid and drastic changes in internal price levels, thus compelling any would-be independent government to drastically cut wages and to reduce public and social services, as happened in Britain in 1931, leading to the fall of the government, and economic ruin. It should not be necessary further to

criticise gold; it stands condemned as the basest of all tyrannies. As the London Chamber of Commerce puts it—"No government could continue to give effect to its proposals (gold standard); a free people would overturn the government."

But an international government with an international police force could, and would, impose its will on a disarmed, defenceless world.

Up to the last war Finance ruled without challenge, but to-day, thanks to the labours of Social Crediters in the face of opposition and misrepresentation, too many people know the truth about money for Finance to continue to rely on popular ignorance.

Having won the war the people may answer the time-honoured post-war policy of drastic economy—deflation—to "pay" for the war, in reality to inflate the war debts, by demanding all the money necessary to win the peace as was made available to win the war.

We speak of darkest Africa, but the natives of the "dark" continent are not lost in the financial fog in which the democracies have been wandering for more than a century.

When the Governor of the Bank of  
(Continued on page 3)

### GEMS FROM THE DAILY PRESS

By ERIC D. BUTLER

No one can dispute the fact that we are all victims of the centrally-controlled mass propaganda issued by our daily newspapers and other organs of modern "education." Many people are becoming so confused that they are fast losing the ability to see reality. A brief survey of a few news-items, taken at random from the daily press over the past two months, is an entertaining pastime for those who still possess a sense of humour.

We all recall how, in the early stages of the war, we were overwhelmed with material in our newspapers telling us that American supplies and men were literally pouring into this country. Then the press caused confusion by bluntly telling us, early in August, that the facts had been rather exaggerated.

Some press reports went even further: "However justified the move was politically and ethically, the diversion of large supplies to Australia has already proved a strategic mistake." (Melbourne "Herald," August 8.)

What were we Australians to think? Particularly when we also read the following in the same issue of the "Herald": "The Nation (weekly), commenting on the Japanese 'feint' at Australia to disguise its intention to attack Siberia, says: 'The Japanese tactics, which resulted in definite gains, caused the British to rush reinforcements to India, and the United States to employ its best General, a fair-sized body of troops and desperately-needed merchantmen in Australia in an inactive theatre of war, very poorly adapted for serving as a base for offensive operations.'"

I presume that Tojo rang up New York and told "The Nation" that he was only making a "feint" against Australia! Australians who are fighting the Japanese in New Guinea are not likely to be heartened by such reports. Still, we must preserve the "freedom" of the press at all costs. In what other fiction papers or journals could we read a gem like the following:

"When the Germans were trying to break through, women workers at a Stalingrad tank factory leaped into tanks still in the factory yards and drove them against the advancing Germans. They held the Germans until reinforcements of soldiers arrived."—(Melbourne "Sun," September 25.)

and racket-producing situation. The article then suggests that everyone should be encouraged to store an adequate supply. Fancy a sensible proposal like that appearing in the "Herald"!

INSOLENCE: According to public statements of politicians and others, munition workers deliberately absent themselves to lighten their pay roll and frequent hotels to get drunk in order to sabotage the war effort! Added to which, they endanger their health by engaging in such recreations as football, races and "pictures." Never a word of praise is heard from these arrogant windbags for the toilers who actually produce the goods. If these insolent servants of the people received a few letters from their employers along these lines it would SOBER THEM UP.

### NOTES ON THE NEWS

Those who are inclined to belittle Britain's war effort will perhaps be impressed by the following comments published in the daily press of September 16 quoting Senator Truman, U.S.A. "The American Navy is using one plane that is just a joke, American fighter-planes did not compare with Britain's best. He was also emphatic that American designs were not fitted for flying in big League."

NEW VISION: New Economics groups are working effectively in Britain, judging from realistic statements by some members of the House of Commons. Said Sir P. Harris on April 15: "We have to think far less about L.S.D. and much more in terms of manpower, materials and food. Money has now become very little more than a measuring rod." Mr. G.L. Reakes, newly-elected Independent, said: "The first cause of war is the control of the nation's finance by the Bank of England."

HITLERISM: According to the press of October 6 Norway is on the verge of starvation, due to Hitler confiscating the food supply. It is said that fruit has disappeared from the market and that potatoes are unobtainable. So far there has been no destruction such as spraying trees to prevent them fruiting (under the direction or approval of Marketing Boards), nor have potatoes been left rotting in the ground—and there are no restrictions on production by the misuse of manpower. While the Norwegians are spared these latter forms of Hitlerism they may be able to win through.

SECOND FRONT: An interesting point was made in Stalin's plea for a second front when he said that "Russia had drawn upon itself the main forces of the German armies." If this report is correct it will be big news that Russia enticed Germany to attack her. It will be of special interest to those who expected Russia to open a second front to support Britain and France.

BRITISH OIL: In very small print in the Melbourne "Sun" of October 7 is the most important announcement, from a New York source, to the effect that a large flow of the highest grade petroleum has been discovered in the British Isles, and that workers from American south-west fields have already arrived in England, presumably to work them. Isn't it queer how those oil wells, which, in accordance with the bankers' worldwide rationalisation plot, have been suppressed for so many years, can suddenly be discovered? We may even be permitted to discover some in Australia some day!

DISCIPLINE: There is a war poster, which many will have seen, depicting an undisciplined British workman at his bench industriously turning out war equipment, and also a German workman with a Gestapo agent, baton in hand, standing over him. This poster is vividly brought to mind by the following words reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of October 6: "Some form of discipline may be devised to keep workers at their benches." Those words were uttered by Labor's super-democrat, Herr Makin.

NEW ORDERS: Another "New Order" has been devised by economist Sir William Beveridge. It provides pay for everybody, even if unable to work; which, of course, is only common sense. The interesting points not discussed in this case are: "Where's the money to come from and on what terms?" and "Why all the anti-liberty (controls) which hedges all the proposals?" There is no evidence as yet to indicate that the finance would be free from the bankers' debt-and-interest racket, through which they have controlled the people and brought the world into the present mess. Another bad aspect of such "New Orders" is that they emanate from official sources, instead of from the people.

BUTTER SUBSIDY: Although the subsidy of up to £2 million is hedged with limitations in respect to different districts, along with a threat of butter rationing, it does represent an admission of the principle that producers can receive additional income without added costs to consumers. The subsidy will, like the British plan, be paid from revenue (taxation), but if it were provided by additional credit direct from the Commonwealth Bank, the gap between costs and prices would be bridged to the satisfaction of all. It is the job of all concerned to see that this is done.

HOARDING: In pointing out the ridiculous regulation (not Act of Parliament) that makes it illegal to hold more than three cwt of firewood, the Melbourne "Herald" of October 8 illustrates a dangerous



# The New Times

A non-party, non-sectarian, non-sectional weekly newspaper, advocating political and economic democracy, and exposing the causes, the institutions and the individuals that keep us *poor* in the midst of plenty.

Published every Friday by New Times Ltd., McEwan House, Elizabeth and Little Collins Streets, Melbourne, C.I. Postal Address: Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne. Telephone: MU 2834

Vol. 8

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 16 1942

No. 41

## THE DAIRYING DILEMMA

The Federal Government has shown discretion in deciding to pay a subsidy to dairy farmers instead of increasing the price of butter, but the inadequacy of the subsidy is to be deplored. Furthermore, payment of the subsidy from taxation and/or borrowings means that the financial burdens of the general public will be proportionately increased—indirectly, the effect on the purse of the average housewife will be much the same as an equivalent increase in the price of butter.

Naturally, there is still much dissatisfaction among dairymen, and the housewives will be even more dissatisfied when they wake up to the fact that their "austerity" household budgets are to be further encroached upon, indirectly. A way out of this dilemma was indicated in these columns a fortnight ago, and the Goulburn Valley Dairymen's Association has incorporated the idea in demand-letters they are circulating, which, we understand, are being eagerly sought and signed by electors in the Goulburn Valley, and are being forwarded to the appropriate members of Parliament. Others might well follow this sensible lead by taking individual action and, in dairying districts, by urging such action upon local dairymen's organisations. The demand-letters read as follows:

"In view of the national crisis arising from the decline in food production, I draw your attention to the fact that dairymen, however patriotic, are unable to carry on the production of vital butter and cheese unless the present inadequate butter-fat returns are increased substantially. As the crux of the situation is finance, I require you, as my Federal representative, to immediately urge in the House the need for a subsidy sufficient to cover cost of production plus a reasonable profit, and that such subsidy shall be provided by the Commonwealth Bank free of debt and interest charges as indicated in Para. 504 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Banking. In order to protect the consumer from increased food prices and to ensure that post-war export is not prejudiced by increased money costs, I further require that such subsidy shall not be charged into prices. Kindly advise if you are not sympathetic with my requirements."

## IT CAN ALSO HAPPEN HERE

As the same kind of National Security Regulations operate in this country, the following facts, related by George Hickling in "Reality," England, could also happen here:

In a recent debate in the House of Commons on the Defence Regulation 18B (July 22), Mr. Richard Stokes gave a few details of a case in which he investigated: "... One, in which a man was kept in prison for two years and could not get particulars of the information laid against him or of the source of the information. Finally, his solicitors got hold of the minutes of the evidence before the Advisory Committee. It was found that there was only one person who gave evidence against him, and that he was a German refugee who, when he came to be cross-examined in the matter, admitted that every single thing he had said before the Advisory Committee was untrue. In that case, the man's immediate release was recommended, after nearly two years' detention..."

That statement, which was not challenged by the Home Secretary, shows up the insidious weakness of 18B, which is the complete absence of any real protection of an innocent man. It cannot be denied that, in fact, 18B has deprived everybody of the protection of law and order. If an innocent man is made the victim of a mistake he has no real redress, no means of proving the truth, no claim to be heard according to the rules of evidence on which real and impartial law and justice must be based.

Granted that in time of war emergency

measures enabling the authorities to act quickly are essential, that is no bar to the provision of adequate safeguards against mistakes being made. Yet the Government refuses to make those provisions. The opinion or the personal attention, or the sincerity, of one man, in the person of the Home Secretary, is no safeguard, especially if that one man may, if he chooses, keep secret the alleged facts upon which the arrest was ordered.

Under 18B the Home Secretary can apply his own rules of evidence, may change them or even ignore them altogether. This is not law, but bureaucratic lawlessness, and we have arrived to this state exactly as was foretold by Lord Hewart in his book, "The New Despotism," and the prime motive behind it is exactly where he located it—namely, in the philosophy of High Finance, whose henchmen are well used to framing legislation that supersedes real law, and whose policy is, and always has been, opposed to fair, open and full investigation.

Whether the Home Secretary abuses his power or not is not the question. The sinister thing is that 18B itself abuses all law—is, in fact, lawless; and whilst some excuse may be made concerning the urgency of emergency in which it was born, yet the strong, silent, persistent opposition behind the Government to remedy its weaknesses and give protection to the innocent—as could easily be done without impairing the national defence side of the measure—is one of the most appalling facts that exist before the country at the present time.

## SOCIALISM IN BRITAIN

"We have started from the position that only in war, or under the threat of war, will a British Government embark on large-scale planning."—"Planning" (Organ of Political and Economic Planning), October 4 1938

That the good work of P.E.P. under the Chairmanship of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff (Managing Director of Marks & Spencer Ltd.) goes on apace is everywhere evident. In a recent number of the "Drapers Record" in a paragraph headed "Hosiery Manufacturers Face Complete Regimentation," is given an account of interviews between the representatives of the Trade in Leicester and the Director of Civilian Hosiery, Mr. L. Foyster (of Marks & Spencers Ltd.) who has commandeered a local hotel as a base of operation.

Mr. Foyster's plan involves, according to the "Drapers Record," "Destruction of Goodwill, the forcing of numerous firms out of business, and replacement of practical men with a lifetime of experience by hordes of officials headed by a chain-store representative. . . ."

"Utility" is now the operative word, not only in the Hosiery Trade, but in the world of dress. Utility means large scale planning (see above), and plays inevitably and straight into the hands of the big,

centrally organised concerns. Designation—that is, the licensing of those firms chosen to deal with the making-up of 75 per cent. of all the available cloth supplies—is done officially by the Board of Trade at Millbank.

Designation seems to be a matter as mysterious as the holding of War Loan or the controlling interest in popular newspapers. As the editorial in the same number of the "Drapers Record" puts it: "Whom have the B.O.T. designated? For some reason unknown, we are told their names will not be published. That is strange, because lengthy official lists of firms registered under the Limitation Orders are available. One hears in certain quarters sinister suggestions to account for this secrecy—suggestions which, if in the slightest degree warranted, would call as the first step for a thorough comb-out at Millbank."

The tragic shortage of raw material is undeniable and so is the need to apportion it in some way. But let us make the right inferences. If "Socialism," as Miss Ellen Wilkinson says—and she ought to know—is what we are tasting now in the organisation of the Home Front, then one or other of two things follows. Either it is being introduced under cover of the war, or else, if the war situation is not consciously being used to socialise the

## SENATOR DARCEY'S BUDGET SPEECH

(Continued from last issue.)

Mr. Graham Towers said that not only should the Government bank lend money for public works, but there would be no need to repay it, because the Government indirectly recovered what it spent on public works, because whatever benefited the country benefited the Government. I noticed the following statement published in 1933, about a Loan Council meeting, and I will quote it because it has a strong bearing on what is occurring to-day:—

"The last Loan Council meeting (in December, 1932) showed some difference of opinion as to policy. The Premier of New South Wales (Mr. Stevens) developed an argument for the continuance of Treasury-bid finance for a further period. The Commonwealth Government, together with the chairman of the Commonwealth Bank (Sir Robert Gibson) and the Premiers of the other States, favoured the flotation of a £20,000,000 public loan (to be underwritten by the banks) at 4 per cent, some considerable portion of which was to be used for the retirement of Treasury-bills, and the balance for public works. The discussion became acute and public. A compromise was reached and a public loan of £8,000,000 at 31 per cent, was attempted. It was a partial failure."

I remember what happened on that occasion. The Government tried to float a loan of £8,000,000 and got only £4,850,000. When I asked in this chamber how the loan of £8,000,000 was made up, I found that the banks had supplied £3,750,000 by forwarding a cheque to the Treasury for that amount. I asked the Minister representing the Treasurer the cost of raising various loans. The cost of raising the first war loan, this year of £35,000,000 was £134,432, out of which the banks received as commission £32,678, simply for making applications on behalf of their clients. They were paid 5s. per cent. That £32,678 was a very good return for writing applications, especially when there was no necessity for it at all because the loan could have been raised through the Commonwealth Bank and the whole of the £134,432 saved. That is well known to honourable senators, and I have quoted authorities for it over and over again. We are told that the profits of the banks are not to exceed a certain amount. The Treasurer said in reply to a question, "The banks can make only 2.9 per cent, interest." Yet they are still borrowing at 2½ per cent, and lending at 8 per cent, and there is no way of telling from a bank's balance-sheet what profits it makes. I quoted the profits made by the five big banks in Great Britain. Barclay's bank's profit was £1,375,000, of which it paid only £175,000 in dividends. The balance, less its overhead, went into secret reserves, but its dividend worked out at 14 per cent., and the four other big banks paid up to 18 per cent. I wonder what the British Tommy thought of that. It was announced over the air recently that there was an agitation to pay him more. I should think that he ought to be paid more, when the banks are making profits of at least 18 per cent., and no one can tell what the actual profits are. The present Government has no more control over the banking system than had the previous Government, which suggested that the first £20,000,000 loan be underwritten by the private banks. I asked how the money was to be raised, and was told that it was to be raised through the agency of the Commonwealth Bank and the private banks. After the loan was raised I asked how much came through the Commonwealth Bank and how much through the private banks, and the Government refused to give the Senate the information, which, in fact, has never been given; but

Mr. Gillespie, the manager of one of the private banks, addressing the shareholders at annual meeting, spoke of the patriotism of the private banks, and the way they were sticking to the Government and added, "I can assure you that the whole £20,000,000 of the first war loan was raised by the private banks." That is why the Government would not tell honourable senators how it was raised. The annual interest bill on that loan was £600,000. If members of Parliament did their duty they would stop the perpetuation of that wrong. I asked Mr. Menzies when he was Prime Minister if his Government would consider getting the necessary credits for the war from the Commonwealth Bank. He replied, "Yes, up to the point of safety." I asked him where that point was, and he would not tell me. I also asked him how long he intended to raise war credits through the private banks at 3½ per cent interest when practically the same accommodation could be obtained interest-free from the Commonwealth Bank. His answer was, "Senator Darcey, if you can tell me where I can get money without paying interest I will do so." That was a desperate evasion of which no man who was interested in the welfare of this country would have resorted.

Senator Spicer.—What has the present Government done about it.

Senator Darcey.—I am not responsible for the policy of this Government. I am responsible to the taxpayers who have sent me here, and so long as I am in the chamber I shall speak only what I know to be the truth.

I shall deal now with Treasury-bill finance. Over and over again I have pointed out that a Treasury bill is an undated promissory note. The Mr. Gillespie to whom I have referred, complained at the time that the most that could be obtained on Treasury bills in London was 10s. percent. The private banks were then getting 35s. percent from the Menzies Government—more than three and a half times as much. No wonder they complained about how little they could get in London. In Australia, Treasury bills can be purchased only by banks. At one time an attempt was made to allow the public to invest in Treasury bills, but the smallest denomination allowable was £1000, and very few people could afford to invest that amount.

In the course of the examination, Mr. Graham Towers was asked, "Now, as a matter of fact, to-day our gold is purchased by the Bank of Canada with notes which it issues—not redeemable in gold—in effect using printing-press money. . . . to purchase gold," and he replied, "That is the practice all over the world." The next question was, "When you allow the merchant banking system to issue bank deposits—with the practice of using cheques—you virtually allow the banks to issue an effective substitute for money do you not?", and the answer was, "The bank deposits are actually money in that sense." In effect, the banks create credit out of nothing and lend it to the Government at 3½ per cent interest. As a matter of fact, during the regime of the Lyons Government a loan was floated at 6 per cent. On one occasion, a meeting of the Economic Society in Hobart, was addressed by a gentleman from the Bank of England, who said that the Russian system of raising money was to float a loan at 6 per cent and then when the money was subscribed to cut the interest down to 3 per cent. I pointed out to that gentleman that that system was not peculiar to Russia and suggested that perhaps Mr. Stalin had learned it from Mr. Lyons, or vice versa. The next question put to Mr. Graham Towers was, "Then we authorise the banks to issue a substitute for money?" and he replied, "Yes I think that is a very fair statement of banking." I have been telling honourable senators that for many years, but still no attempt has been made to stop this private bank thieving. The next question was "Will you tell me why a Government with power to create money should give the power away to a private monopoly, who then borrow that which Parliament can create itself, back at interest to the point of national bankruptcy." The answer was ". . . we realise, of course that the amount which is paid provides part of the operating costs and some interest on deposits. Now, if Parliament wants to change the form of operating the banking system, then certainly that is within the power of Parliament." That is sworn evidence given by the manager of the Bank of Canada, which is on practically the same footing as the Commonwealth Bank.

(Continued on page 3).

nation then, referring back to the significant quotation from "Planning," war and Socialism are inseparable—the rationing of butter in order to have guns.

In theory nothing can stand in the way of those who commit themselves to an abstract idea as distinct from its results, and theoretically, at any rate, as we see from "Planning," even the unbelievable horrors of a modern war can be contemplated as an opportunity, in fact, the only one, for its achievement in an atmosphere of opposition.

For this reason, if for no other—and keeping in mind what human nature is capable of—it is obviously well so to organise society that no single idealist (that is, large-scale planner) is individually in a position to control sufficient power as to make him a preponderating influence in "events" where large masses of his fellow human beings are concerned.

—N.F.W., in the "Social Creditor," England.

## IN BRITAIN'S PARLIAMENT

Speaking in the British House of Commons on June 17, Mr. Mack under Lyme—Labour) said:

"If it were possible for us to project ourselves 50 years in time and to look back upon this debate I am sure some of us would say, 'How abject, how small, were our predecessors at a time when the four

aims have been enunciated; when we have been told that we are fighting a war not merely for the liberation of mankind but for freedom from want."

"They would say that we were an amazing antediluvian, almost antiquarian assembly of individuals to pose as leaders of a country. They would cast severe censure upon the conduct of a House which still believed that the basic rate for pensions should be 10/- a week!"



## COLONEL HAROLD COHEN

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

**Sir.—You will remember that Colonel Cohen said that Government activities in Australia should be conducted strictly on the basis dictated by Sir Otto Niemeyer, of the Bank of England and International Finance. That basis included the following: No Government to be undertaken unless it will provide a financial return sufficient to cover INTEREST and sinking fund."**

In the course of his address the Colonel said that public works are only legitimate when they earn interest, and that "While I have been associated with public finance I cannot remember one public work which fulfilled those requirements." From this we see that if his attitude is to be given even the semblance of logic he actually says we should have no public works at all. This assumes a sinister and callous aspect when we realise that if we do shut down on Government works we will immediately cause a serious increase in bankruptcies, "unemployment," and suicides. Notwithstanding this, in the past we have calmly sat down and allowed men of this type openly to advocate such a dastardly course and to do it merely to fit in with the dictates of counterfeiters and pretenders who have usurped the powers of Government. Indeed we have trusted these men and accepted them as "leaders". I realise that this is strong criticism, but the impudence of Colonel Cohen has been so outrageous that he should be told straight that no decent Australian will any longer stand for such infamy, and that we reject his "advice."

Take a good look at what happened when Government spending did cease. Between 1929 and 1932 Government spending of loan money was reduced from thirty millions a year to nil. During the same period bankruptcies increased from 2145 to 4645; unemployment increased from 9 per cent to 30 per cent and suicides increased from 85 to 943. The effect on marriages was equally serious, the rate dropping .43 per thousand to 5.96 per thousand. That's the "lesson" of 1931, which gives the self-sacrificing and self-effacing Colonel so much self-satisfaction! He would have us go back to similar conditions.

When Government spending on public works was resumed in 1932-33 however, there was no immediate improvement, and it is a FACT that it is

only when Governments are spending freely that it is possible for industry even to approach solvency. When the bankers are expanding credit (inflating), as they are doing now, business booms; when the bankers are compacting credit (deflating), as they were doing from 1923 to 1931, business slumps; and the period from the beginning of the former to the end of the latter is the "trade cycle"! I believe that Colonel Cohen knows this, and that consequently when he demands that Governments shall balance their budgets and shall not undertake any public works unless they will provide a financial return sufficient to pay interest, he is knowingly seeking to have the community kept under a financial dictatorship privately exercised. The necessity for NEW MONEY to be placed regularly into circulation is no longer a question for discussion. It is an inescapable requirement. Under present methods the money issued is not sufficient to enable goods to be sold at a fair price, to say nothing at all of our increasing indebtedness without being supplied with the means of payment. It is therefore the duty of every Australian to insist that new money shall be regularly supplied to the PEOPLE, and that this new money shall be brought into existence by the Commonwealth Bank AS THE PROPERTY OF THE PEOPLE—i.e., as a CREDIT to them, and not as more debt owing to private financial institutions. When, this is done the question of interest will no longer arise in connection with anything the Governments wish to do in the interests of the community.

From the foregoing it will be seen that if we are to maintain a maximum war effort, and repatriate our men and women of the fighting and munition services, we must insist that men holding views similar to those publicly expressed by Colonel Cohen shall have no part whatever in the control of our public activities, and shall not be given personal publicity at public expense.

—Yours faithfully, Bruce H. Brown, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, 11th October, 1942.

### "A STRANGE POWER"

"The same strange power was used to pervert British newspaper correspondents in Berlin from telling this country about German's rearmament and war-like intentions. Whose is it? Who is it that can override the Prime Minister himself, according to Sir Roger Keyes? . . . I have been told times without number, by Members of Parliament and public men, of this mysterious hidden mechanism . . . I cannot conceive why none of them explains openly where the source of this evil force lies. Who were the men who could send Sir Roger Keyes, before he made this speech in the House, a copy of the Official Secrets list! . . . Sir Roger Keyes was dismissed from the command of the raiders (Combined Operations) he had raised and trained."

--Douglas Reed in "All Our Tomorrows."  
Whose power and what mechanism? Have three guesses if you need that many.

"Lord Portal, Minister of Works and Buildings, has appointed Mr. Lawrence Neal to be Deputy Secretary in the Planning department of the Ministry. Mr. Neal is a founder member and member of the council of P.E.P., and has been actively interested in several of its planning surveys, more particularly those concerning industrial matters. He is chairman and director of Daniel Neal and (?), was a member of the Sea Fish Commission from 1933 to 1936, and is at present a member of the Retail Trade Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Trade."

--"Contract Journal," May 20, 1942.

### Senator Darcey's Budget Speech.

In Australia, the only difference being that the bank was established many years earlier. Honourable senators will recall the fight that was put up by private banks to prevent the establishment of the Commonwealth Bank. In 1924 the Bruce-Page Government attempted to strangle the Commonwealth Bank and partially succeeded.

(To be continued.)

### FEDERAL UNION

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—As there is an active and subtle attempt to now prepare our minds, through wireless and other sources of propaganda, to swallow this "Federal Union" bait of the "International World Planners," let us examine the proposal as set out by their mouthpiece, Clarence Streit, in his "Union Now With Britain."

The number of Deputies elected to the Federal Union from each State shall be determined according to population, a census being taken at least every ten years, and shall not exceed one for every district of 1,000,000 inhabitants, or major fraction thereof. To begin with, the apportionment of Deputies and Senators shall be—

	Deputies	Senators
Australia.....	7	2
Canada .....	11	2
Eire .....	3	2
New Zealand .....	2	2
Union of South Africa .....	2	2
United Kingdom.....	47	4
United States of America	131	10

208 24

So you can see the British Commonwealth and the Federal Union would end in very much the same predicament as the lady and the tiger. Have you heard the story? It is told this way—

There was a voting lady of Niger, Who went for a ride on a tiger, They finished the ride With the lady inside, And a smile on the face of the tiger.

If America desires union with Great Britain, what is wrong with her coming in as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations, just as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and the United Kingdom are equal partners. In such a partnership there need be no written constitution; the bond of common interest and ideals are far more potent. In the British Commonwealth there is perfect freedom for each partner to fashion its own destiny, design its own development and way of life, legislate and administrate its own laws. There can be a common understanding among all dominions concerning interdominion relations and trade. In our British Commonwealth all members without any compulsion, rise spontaneously to action if any danger threatens any part or the whole Commonwealth. There should be no reason why other democracies now coerced, or other nations, when released from tyranny and adopting the same ideal, should not be permitted into the Commonwealth—Yours faithfully WILLIAM AGER, Yamba, Clar

### CANADIAN M.P. ANSWERS FEDERAL UNIONISTS

(Continued from page 1.)

Canada was asked why the French left off building the Maginot Line just where the Germans broke through in 1914, he replied—"They had a financial crisis and had to economise."

Mr. Dunning's invariable answer to demands for bigger and earlier old age pensions was "where is the money to come from?"

In "Good Housekeeping" for January, 1940, "an eminent" economist—"warns the parents of the greatest and richest country in the world of the inevitable results of old age pensions. There is only so much money, and money for pensions must come out of school funds. God help the children of the U.S.A."

An enquiry as to whether the schools were closed and pensions stopped, in order to find money for the war, remains unanswered.

And these people, holding these orthodox ideas of "sound" finance, are to plan the world's future, and impose their will on a defenceless people.

And with the gospel of gold goes the gospel of work. A few years ago Mr. Claris Silcox, editor of "Food for Thought," published by the Association for Adult Education, was "pushing" the sale of propaganda against Social Credit for moral, as well as economic reasons.

He, too, is against pensions. Believing, due to the gold complex, there is "only so much money," and none for pensions, he sneers at the idea of a "leisured old age at the public expense." Says he—"a sound economic structure in peace and war demands full production from all, and parasitism (sic) is intolerable. If work can be provided within, the confines of business privately operated, well and good; if not let the provision of work be a public responsibility. Of course a man of 70 cannot do what he did at 50, nor a man of 80 what he did at 60, but we must use the older people where they can be used, just as we use the younger." Who are we?

It never occurs to these "planners" that, granted the leisure of economic independence, individuals can find occupations to suit themselves without let or hindrance from petty or potential dictators.

No wonder Mr. Silcox is "pushing" pamphlets against Social Credit, which holds that the object of life is—life, not work.

And, mark the narrow sense of work, it must be gainful—paid work, work planned for, not by the individual. In the golden order of the New Jerusalem only the hopeless cripples or centenarians will experience the joyful satisfaction of voluntary, unpaid work.

Having failed to make democracy work on a national basis, the planners are determined to turn their failure into international dictatorship. It is as though the doctors, having failed to cure the patients, proposed to pull down the hospital partitions.

Instead of removing the causes of war, —the drive for foreign markets—to meet the demands of the gold standard—"export or perish"—Union Now would deny the right of free men to defend their liberties. Instead of curing the "itch," the "doctors" would tie the victims' hands behind their backs.

Beyond question the men who are so anxious to plan the future for everybody are precisely those who, by their control of policy, have brought the world to its present ghastly mess.

Sir Josiah Stamp stated—"Never in the history of the world has so much power been vested in a small body of men as in the Federal Reserve Board of the U.S.A. These men have the welfare of the world in their hands, and they could upset the rest of us either deliberately or unconsciously."

Is that democracy? In his book "America Conquers Britain," Mr. L. Denny, an American banking authority, states—"All nations must tremble before our Federal Reserve Board. High money rates in the U.S.A. in 1929, for instance, forced an increase in bank rates in England and in other European countries, and in every case that action restricted business and brought suffering to millions of foreign workers. That blow hit Britain hardest of all."

Is that democracy? Speaking in Congress in 1932, Mr. L. T.

McFadden, then chairman of the committee of banking and commerce of Congress, said—"We have in this country one of the most corrupt institutions the world has ever known. I refer to the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks. This evil institution has impoverished and ruined the people of the United States." Beyond question these "evil and corrupt institutions" inspired Union Now, and they, and not the sovereignties they wish to destroy, are responsible for the present hellish mess in the world.

Nor have they, and their kind in all countries, uttered a word of repentance, or even of apology. Their aim is to destroy any and all opposition.

If the world is to escape enslavement by the "golden calf," sovereignty must be strengthened, and governments made responsible only to the people, and not to national and international money lenders.

And, thank God, there are signs that the "fog of finance" is being dispersed by; the realities of war, in Britain, if not in America.

Speaking in the British House of Commons, a Conservative said—"if a thing can be done the nation can afford it," or, as Douglas put it 25 years ago, "anything physically possible, and desirable, can be made financially possible."

That is the most revolutionary truth since Christianity was founded. It means that, instead of controlling the world, Finance becomes merely the world's book-keeper or at most its auditor.

As Beverley Bexter (of all people) put it in "Maclean's" (of all magazines):—"The war has convinced the British people that capitalism cannot continue as it was. No longer will the Nation's finances be run like a limited liability company. Capacity to produce, and to consume will dominate—not capacity to pay. At the same time the swollen army of bureaucrats inevitable in war, has sickened the people of the idea of state control. State control is a negation of the human spirit, inhuman and incompetent, fit only for a nation of slaves, or for a nation emerging from slavery. The British people would not submit to it in peacetime. This is the paradox of British political parties. The Tories know that Finance is in the dock, and the Socialists know that the people are fed to the teeth with bureaucracy."

And if State control is the "negation of human spirit, inhuman and incompetent," World control must be of the Devil—the Devil being God upside down.

Union Now and Socialism are the "right" and "left" approaches to international control. Economic security—"the right to work"—at the price of individual freedom. Peace with slavery.

The New Democracy of Social Credit would end war by abolishing its cause. It offers economic security and individual freedom—the right to live—based on the will of the people—sovereign above all interests—national or international. Peace with Freedom—human and competent and Christian. —Norman JAUQUES, MP.

## READ

### "TAX BONDS OR BONDAGE?"

By JOHN MITCHELL

With Foreword by TUDOR JONES, ScD., M.D., F.R.S.E. (Deputy Chairman Social Credit Secretariat).

It explains in detail: The Tax Bonds Proposals of Major C. H. Douglas; The Dangers of Federal Union Schemes; The Fallacy of Mr. Keynes' Compulsory Loans Proposals;

★ You need "Tax Bonds or Bondage?" Send a Copy to Your Friends. Send for Your Copy NOW!

Sold By Dymock's Book Arcade, Sydney, the Tax Bond Advisory Association, No. 9, 3rd Floor, 295 Pitt St., Sydney, and The United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne. —Advr.

Your VICTORY SUIT Hand-Tailored to Order



All Wool Worsteds from 7/7/- (30 Coupons)

ELIZABETH HOUSE,  
2nd Floor.  
**340 LITTLE COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE**  
Phone: M 5177

"Fo: STYLE and EASE: FRANK DEVLIN PLEASE!"



## SEN. DARCEY ON FREEDOM OF PRESS

On September 16, in the course of a Speech in the Senate, Senator Darcey said: Recently in Sydney I met Mr. Brian Penton, editor of the "Telegraph," whom I know well. He gave me a cordial shake of the hand, and asked whether I was in the Senate when representatives of the newspaper with which he is associated were excluded from its precincts. I explained that, for the first time in my parliamentary experience, I had missed a meeting of the Senate because the aeroplane by which I was to travel from Tasmania did not keep to schedule on account of rough weather.

When he asked me if I believed in the freedom of the press, I answered, "Yes." He then asked me to write a letter to his Newspaper to that effect, but I replied, "Not on your life. I have spoken in front of your representatives for four years on the subject of finance, which I believe is the most important subject that the Senate could discuss, but your newspaper has not published a line of what I had said."

He left me, saying that he would see me again. Next morning, I sent to him a letter, somewhat as follows: "Dear Mr. Penton: Referring to our conversation last night about the freedom of the press; I believe in the freedom of the press to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth on the political situation, the war situation, and everything of national interest and concern. But what do I find? Politically, the press is strictly partisan. It will never report me. The press sticks only to the party which it represents in politics. Any one else will not get a hearing. That is the freedom of the press." I told him that when the "Argus" newspaper was formed into a company a few years ago, its overdraft was shown at £224,000. Consequently, one can easily understand the financial policy of the "Argus." I asked whether this man's newspaper was in the same category. I told him that the overdraft is a potent weapon in the hands of the banks. It enables the banks to tell the newspapers what they shall say. The press never has been, and never will be, free so long as the overdraft can be dangled over their head. As honourable senators know, I live in Hobart. For some years I have been trying to get a few lines published in the "Mercury" but without success.

Right through the centuries people have fought for freedom of speech. Such names as Hampden and Pym come to the mind. In this fight many men lost their liberty, others their estates, and others their heads. The newspapers exercise a strong influence in the moulding of public opinion. In every country the press is strictly partisan and backs one political party, misrepresenting, or ignoring, other parties. . . . By these means they can sway public opinion, and make and unmake governments. Of course, we know that the press should tell the truth and nothing but the truth; but it is hard to get the truth from a prejudiced press.

I know of a case of a man in Melbourne who used to write for a diocesan paper. His Church was advocating "social justice now." After he had published several articles a note came from the banks to the particular paper that the articles must stop. As the head of the Church was absent

We have come to this pass, if Mr. Israel Cohen and his sponsors of the "New Statesmen" are right—that a man's or

at the time, this gentleman reluctantly stopped writing the articles. When the former returned, he told the gentleman to continue with the articles. That Church leader, whom I thought to be so fearless that he could not be bluffed by the banks, was Dr. Mannix. Later, he got a note from the banks, and as the result he informed the editor that he would have to stop the articles. So disgusted was the gentleman concerned that he gave up his position.

When I was in Brisbane some time ago the Catholic Church was observing what was known as Social Justice Sunday. I was shown a pamphlet dealing with the matter, and I was asked for my comments on it. I replied: "There is no chance of social justice now, or at any time, so long as the present monetary system endures, because that is the cause of all social injustice." The churchman to whom I was speaking replied, "Since I came to this diocese I have expended £2,000,000, mostly by overdrafts from the banks."

Honourable senators will thus see that the banks can silence even the Church. On another occasion, I visited a parish in which a church and a school valued at £30,000 had been built. The school was only half completed. I said to the Archbishop, "Your Grace, you are spending a lot of money here. Where do you get it from?" His Grace replied that it was a rich district. However, the school is only half completed, and the parish authorities know that if they dare to criticise the monetary system the banks will stop their overdraft. Again I say that even the Church can be muzzled by the banks.

The press can lower the dignity of Parliament. It can point the finger of scorn at either branch of the legislature. By doing so it really helps to establish a dictatorship, because by such criticism it says, in effect, "Well, there is democracy for you." Such criticism saps the foundation of democratic government.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the United Democrats, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

"Victory Road" Campaign.—One of our workers in Boothby has collected a number of signatures of electors who are prepared later to meet their Member with a view to frankly discussing our problems. Would other leaders in the various electorates let us have these lists of names as they are collected?

Quarterly Meeting.—This has been arranged for Wednesday, November 4. Our last one was very happy and successful, and this one can be more so if we all put all we know into it. At these meetings we endeavour to cultivate the social side of life as well as deal with more serious affairs. Members are invited to bring friends.

Next Executive Meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 28, at 8 p.m.  
—M. R. W. Lee, Hon. Secretary.

newly-appointed "welfare officers," the chief welfare officer, now an esteemed and distinguished Peer, was a Jew. When

## "ANTI-SEMITISM AND TREACHERY"

By COLLIN BROOKS, in "Truth," England, (Continued from last issue.)

woman's loyalty now to King and Country is to be tasted by whether or not he or she is "sound," from a Jewish point of view, on the Jewish question. What is the Jewish question? It is the question whether an alien race should be allowed to attain more than a limited amount of power, influence and economic command in a community which has given its members harbourage.

What is so loosely called "anti-Semitism" in most countries is actually an emotion of resentment that an alien race, admittedly gifted, comes in time not only to usurp positions of power and wealth, but to take upon itself functions of government and administration, and conducts itself with an air of arrogant possession towards its sheltering land. With every increase of numbers or of influence it begins to change the district of its adoption into something which is not congenial to the native temperament: it warps or violently twists the national traditions. It converts, for example, Cheetham Hill, Manchester, or Roundhay, Leeds, or Golders Green, London, or pleasant up-river residential districts into areas of economic prosperity but of social strangeness. It begins to dominate political parties, so that second or—at best—third generational citizens of Britain begin to lay down the lines on which the political development of the nation must go forward. When Palestine was placed under Mandate to Britain, the first Governor-General representing Britain was a Jew. At a moment of stress the Viceroy of India was a Jew. When for some reason part of the traditional responsibilities of company officers and seconds-in-command in the Army were taken away from those who had hitherto fulfilled them an given to

recently Mr. Herbert Morrison incurred some public criticism about his attitude to Germany and the House of Lords debated the topic, his words were not explained to that Noble House by a fellow-member of the Government but by a spokesman from the Opposition Bench who was a Jew. At the side of each of the great democratic leaders and their Ambassadors in a position of great influence but without public responsibility stands a Jew. To the safest—or assumedly safest—townships of these islands, when London became dangerous, flocked large collections of Jews: on outgoing liners to Canada and America, before Japan entered the war, were always large proportions of Jews. Now in logic and humanity there is no reason why most of these things should not have been so and should not be so—but the fact remains that the race which is native to this land begins to resent the ubiquity of the alien race in positions of power and safety, and agrees with the Chief Rabbi that the Jews have a special responsibility to comport themselves with honesty and humility, which many of them—though doubtless a small fraction of the whole body—do not. For Mr. Israel Cohen to argue that this resentment is akin to pro-Hitlerism is absurd. If the alien race were something quite other, the resentment would still be the same. If, for example, every Jew in Great Britain were a Chinaman or a Lascar—if the highest to the lowest placed Jews to whom our land has given hospitality by some magic were replaced by any other Orientals—the resentment would be the same. It might be unjust and unreasoning, but it would have nothing whatever to do with pro-Hitlerism.

(To be concluded next week.)

## N.W.R.M. Meeting at Hawthorn

The campaign of the New World Reconstruction Movement was advanced a further stage on Tuesday, October 6 when what is hoped will be the forerunner of a series of suburban Town Hall meetings, was held in the Hawthorn Town Hall. Several hundred people attended and gave the various speakers a splendid reception and a most attentive hearing.

Among those present was Mr. A. G. Adams, of the "Sound" Finance League, who was seen to be assiduously taking notes during the speeches. While it might be too wildly optimistic to expect Mr. Adams to be "converted" as a result of even so masterly an exposition of the banking racket as was given by Mr. Bruce Brown, it can at least be hoped that a few rays of light and truth might be shed in the dark places—and remembering how Saul the wolf, when he saw the light, became Paul the shepherd, it is not utterly impossible to envisage the day when Mr. Adams, too, will take his stand on the side of truth and justice. (We wonder?)

Cr. Longfield, in his opening remarks as chairman, referred to the ramifications of International finance, and quoted a number of eminent authorities, including retired bankers who have taken to writing in support of his statement that the banking question is the most important subject calling for the study of intelligent people.

Mr. C. K. Cutting, the organising secretary, who was very well received, gave an outline of the principles enunciated in the

New World Charter.

The State Member for Hawthorn, Mr. L. H. Hollins who was the concluding speaker, was given a vociferous ovation when he rose to speak. He stated at the outset that he had many times been referred to as a "crank" because of his advocacy of monetary reform. But, said Mr. Hollins, "a crank is a necessary part of any machine." In referring to the prominence he has recently gained in connection with the liquor question, Mr. Hollins declared that he had not taken the question up because of a desire to bring about prohibition. "If the people want an hotel at every corner they have a right to have it," he said, "but if they do not then they should not have it imposed on them."

The large attendance at the meeting, in a district which has a reputation for orthodoxy and conservatism, was greatly encouraging to the enthusiastic band of workers who set out to organise the meeting and augurs well for the further suburban Town Hall meetings which are contemplated by the N.W.R.M.

Whilst the N.W.R.M. is to be commended for its outspoken pronouncements on the monetary question, it is to be hoped that its spokesmen at the future meetings proposed will not continue to ignore the vital issue of individual liberty. The ever increasing encroachments on the freedom of the individual, as such, constitute a peril which no true reformers can dare to look upon with complacency.

## ASSIGNMENT IN UTOPIA

(Reprinted from the book of that name, by Eugene Lyons, formerly the United Press correspondent in Moscow, etc.)

(Continued from last issue.)

### BOOK I. PRELUDE TO MOSCOW

#### V. Working for the Soviets.

The so-called "professional revolutionist" has been glorified by Lenin, who considered the overturn of an established order a full-time job and career enough for any one lifetime. Perhaps he was right. His view is shared, curiously, by the most conservative labour spokesmen who favour "professional trade-union leaders," and in both cases the counsel may be that of practical necessity. Certain it is that the professional revolutionist is in a most ambiguous position psychologically when an internal fight develops in his particular party. However earnest and high-minded he may be in his stand on the principles and policies at issue, his livelihood, too, is at stake. Such practical compulsions were operative at the heart of the American extension of the Trotsky-Stalin fight, unavoidably, and were surely influential in driving many leaders into the camp of Stalin as his triumph over Trotsky became more assured.

But overshadowing such personal motives was the genuine anxiety to keep the revolutionary regime in Russia and the international Communist movement intact. The rank-and-file members, especially, watched in mounting panic a clash which threatened to pull down the whole Soviet structure. To prevent that disaster, they rallied to Stalin as they would have rallied to anyone who retained control of the Kremlin, the party machinery, the functioning State. Right or wrong, Trotsky meant schism, a Communist movement minus the first Communist State.

Even we who worked by his side in the same narrow offices—by this time under the roof of the Associated Press—could not guess where Durant's personal sympathies lay in the fight. Perhaps he had none, because his basic loyalties were to the Soviet system of power as such, regardless who might seize control of its instrumentalities. The fact that Jacob Doletzky, the Tass chief in Moscow, was a Stalinist machine politician very early tinged our work with a faint, anti-Trotskyist colour. The further fact that the American Communists were so strongly Trotskyist tended, if anything, to deep that tinge—between our office and the

\*In 1937, strangely enough Doletzky was arrested as an alleged Trotskyist, and attempted suicide.

### U.E.A. ACTION

Home Meetings: A number of these have been held in the metropolitan area, and more are being arranged by Mr. F. Elliott, who is in charge of this activity. He will be pleased to hear from actionists who are prepared to help him by making their homes available.

Action Charts: Campaigners are urged to sign and return same as quickly as possible, as they are part of the group-forming campaign—and the fight for liberty.

Letter-forms: Self-explanatory manpower "Letter Forms" are available at 2/- per 100. These are to be signed and returned to headquarters. Supporters who have already written personal letters to Members of Parliament and received doubtful or helpful replies are urged to advise us of such reactions. If you have not already joined in this campaign, you are invited to contact the Hon. Secretary, United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. —O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

American Communists there was always a tension at times amounting to a feud.

When the die was cast, however, and the Trotsky group indubitably defeated, our office instantly became a Stalinist fortress. Durant's flare for smelling out heresy had new scope. Not only renegades in relation to Russia as a whole, but deviationists from Stalin's "line" now engaged his talents. He scrutinised dispatches from Moscow for traces of pro-Trotsky bias and called such horrors to the attention of the American editorial headquarters involved. Anyone who spared a counter-revolutionary sigh over the fallen leaders, or suggested that the victors' tactics were in anywise questionable instantly became an enemy to be crushed.

In the atmosphere of the Tass office, I sided automatically with the victorious faction. I could not in my heart, however, think of Trotsky, Zinoviev, Radek and others who had been glamorous symbols of a new world in my most impressionable years, as enemies of the revolution. The secret margin of sorrow over their fate gave me a gnawing sensation of sinfulness in the presence of Kenneth's cold, implacable orthodoxy. Nor was I alone in my clandestine grief. Others around me carried a hidden hurt, while we denounced the fallen idols in the name of discipline and unity.

### Abolition of Food Boards

At a meeting of the Coburg Committee for the Abolition of Food Marketing Boards held on 6th inst. it was agreed that the work of the committee should be directed towards informing the local people of the dangers they are facing in respect to their food supply, as the result of bureaucratic planning by Government Boards, and that only with their help in bringing pressure upon their members in the Federal and State Parliaments could the danger be averted.

The secretary, Mr Lewis, stated that in the course of three or four weeks the spring planting season would be gone. Unless Board restrictions were lifted growers would not plant freely. Hence the community might be faced with an acute shortage of food at a time when food could not be imported from other countries. Seed potatoes could not be obtained from an abundance in Tasmania.

### "ECONOMIC TRIBULATIONS"

By VINCENT VICKERS

#### Late Director, Bank of England

Australian edition of this important book now available at 3/6; postage

3d.

Obtainable from F. M. Stapleton  
Social Credit Bookshop  
190 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

THE "NEW TIMES"  
IS OBTAINABLE  
AT  
ALL AUTHORISED  
NEWSAGENTS