

ON OTHER PAGES:

TO WHOM IS NATIONAL DEBT OWING? (Page 2)

PROPOSED CONSTITUTION ALTERATION (Page 2)

BRUCE BROWNS LETTER. (Page 3)

NEW APPOINTMENT TO BANK BOARD. (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 8. No. 44. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, NOV. 6. 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).

“No Going Back to Pre-War Finance”

Lord Strabolgi's Speech and Chancellor's Assurance

Whatever Lord Strabolgi's views may be on some other questions, he has more than once displayed a realistic and intelligent attitude to the vital question of finance. In the course of a debate in the House of Lords on July 22 he made some good points, and drew from the Lord Chancellor a most interesting assurance regarding the gold standard. Here are relevant extracts from the debate:—

Lord Strabolgi: . . . I am going respectfully to suggest to the noble and Learned Viscount the Lord Chancellor that when he comes to reply he should make it perfectly clear that his Majesty's Government and those who advise them have realised once and for all that there will be no going back to the pre-war financial system or anything like it. I think that is realised in all competent quarters.

I notice that your Lordship's House is well graced with angels of high finance and banking, and our debates are sometimes enriched by their contributions, but when my noble friend leads off with a wide Motion of this kind the angels fear to tread, and we do not get any constructive suggestions from the great financial pundits.

I do not propose to make any constructive suggestions myself, but I want to express a very great fear which was aroused in my mind by one passage in the speech of the noble Lord, Lord Perry. He suspects that there is a secret Treasury conclave which is deciding on our post-war financial policy.

I hope my noble friend is wrong. The idea fills me with horror. If the Treasury is secretly deciding what is to be the policy of the country after the war, then I hope Parliament will bring the matter into the open at once.

And may I put this most seriously to the members of the Government present, and especially to the Lord Chancellor? All those who have contacts with the working people in the factories to-day and with the troops serving in the Army, assure me assure me—and I dare say that the same information reaches your Lordships—that the one fear of the working people and the serving men is that they will have to return to pre-war conditions of unemployment so vividly described

by my noble friend in his opening remarks.

If they could be assured that we are not going back to the pre-war financial system and all that that meant, I believe it would take a great load of anxiety from their minds.

I do not know whether the Lord Chancellor knows the grim jest in the Army at the present time when one man asks the other what sort of a job he will get after the war, and the other replies, "Look here, you keep your rifle and 50 rounds of ammunition and you'll get a job all right." It is a grim jest, but I trust that the Government will take this matter very seriously indeed, and I hope for some constructive statement of policy from the Lord Chancellor.

What do we mean by the pre-war financial system? The noble Lord, Lord Woolton, knows quite well what I am going to describe now, because I am afraid he had to endure it—the policy which meant to Lancashire the Cotton Corporation and the Bill that we tried to fight in this House before the war; the Milk Marketing Board, the Potato Marketing Board—I hope the names are stirring some sympathetic chords in the heart of Lord Woolton—the National Security Shipbuilding Corporation.

I hope some of the angels of banking and finance will remember that with some sensitiveness. All these were qualities to reduce output, to limit the supply of goods, to create an artificial market by raising prices through scarcity. Now we are suffering in the attempts to reverse this policy.

How glad would Lord Woolton be now if the operations of the Potato Marketing Board had never been initiated by his predecessor. In my place in your Lordships' House I have protested against friends of mine in Yorkshire being fined for growing potatoes before the war.

All this policy of so-called rationalisation and the limitation of output led, I fear,

ALEX. WILSON'S BUDGET SPEECH

In the course of a short speech during the Federal Budget debate, Mr. Alex. Wilson, M.H.R. Independent Member for Wimmera said:

"The criticism of the Budget has been mostly on the question of inflation or the methods employed to raise the necessary moneys to carry on the domestic policy the colossal war expenditure.

"We have had much advice from honorable members opposite about compulsory loans. I regard loans, whether compulsory or voluntary, as an evil. I have never thought that either an individual or a nation can borrow its way to prosperity or even to victory, because the aftermath of borrowing is such that, not only those who carried arms on the field of battle, but also those who have borne the burden at home on the production side are held in perpetual bondage as a result of those loans."

"Loans become to all intents and purposes a debt on the nation, for ever bearing interest.

"We have been told that the Government has introduced many reforms in the control of banking and methods of finance, but I find it difficult to discern where we have any greater control than we had in the past.

"I am one of those who subscribe to the view that finance is so vital to the nation and to the people that it should not be permitted to be controlled by private profit making institutions.

"I hope that the day is not far distant when the full realisation of this truth will be forced home upon this Government or other Governments, and that the necessary steps will be taken to ensure that the Government shall not be a power secondary to finance. I believe that that is still

the position today. The method that is being used in issuing bank credits to-day is one with which I cannot agree. The issue of Treasury Bills, which on presentation can be converted into currency, is substantially wrong. This money should be issued straight out without any process of this character. Not even the comparatively small rate of interest which is now being paid should be paid. I say, therefore that any undertaking that compulsory loans will be repaid after the war must be dismissed as not factual, because, in effect, the paper which represents these loans is to all intents and purposes a new issue of currency, as the bonds are negotiable always.

"In addition to being currency, it is currency upon which the community has to pay interest for ever and ever. I could go into these matters in great detail, but I have no doubt they have been traversed by other honorable members. I do hope that the Government will have the courage to apply the financial policy, which I for one believe is necessary to save the nation from perpetual debt. I hope that the day is not far distant when those reforms which are urgently necessary will be adopted and that the present system of finance will be abolished for ever. . . .

"I trust that the Government will take the advice of certain honorable members on this side of the chamber and review our methods of finance. It should take its courage in both hands and introduce sound financial procedure.

"If it does so, it will win for itself a measure of immortality in the minds of the people, for it will have done something to restore financial freedom to people who have long been overburdened by the present financial system in operation today.

"It will also release forces which will enable us, by a united effort, to bring to a successful conclusion the tremendous struggle in which we, with our Allies, are involved."

to some of our present difficulties and internationally was one of the causes which brought about the present war.

The discontent brought about by the financial system working internationally and the operation of cartels made it possible for mountebanks like Hitler and Mussolini to rouse their peoples behind them.

I would remind your Lordships of this fact which was also mentioned by my noble friend Lord Addison when he spoke of real wealth. Stated boldly it is rather startling, but I think it is true that in certain circumstances we shall emerge from the war richer than when we entered it.

The circumstances are that we shall not be heavily invaded and have to "scorch" the earth and destroy our wealth to prevent it falling into the hands of the enemy.

Despite air-raid damage and the loss of human life, we shall have after this war more land under close cultivation, and better fertilised, more people loving the country life and prepared to go on working on the land—which is also important

—more machinery for cultivating the land and a greater number of people used to managing tractors and machinery and all that that means.

We shall have more productive capacity and more machine tools, and, above all more skilled workers; and these are the wealth of the country. . . .

May I ask the Lord Chancellor if it is possible for him to reply, with convenience, to a specific question? I have not given him notice of it, but I should be glad if it could be answered. Is there any hankering now in Treasury circles—by which I mean banking, financial, and money-lending circles in the City who all work together—for a return to the gold standard after the war? . . .

Viscount Bennett (R. B. Bennett, ex-Prime Minister of Canada): . . . I hope my noble friend Lord Strabolgi will not misunderstand me when I confess to him and to your Lordships that his speech was not new to me. I have listened so many times in another place to condemnation of (Continued on page 4.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Lord Harlech, British High Commissioner for Pretoria, gives the following information on British exports of war-supplies: "In 1941 Britain shipped 10,000 planes through South Africa to various war theatres, and received only 2000 U.S. machines. She shipped a million tons of war stores and munitions, and 500,000 troops, along with 40,000 heavy guns." Doubtless this is only a fraction of the effort, but it should be noted by those who accuse Britain of decadence.

TRUANCY: This so-called problem has lately provided big headlines for small minds; the crux of the matter, however, is indicated by a press report concerning a 12-year-old girl from Sydney. The fact that she was "haunted by the fear that she might fail in her examinations caused her to play truant and wander in the bush, sleeping in caves for two nights." All this because her fear was not detected as it could have been, if the classes were not overcrowded and the teachers worn out trying to handle them. If school life were made attractive enough, as it can and should be, along with individual attention, there would be no need to call in small-minded busybodies and pompous police magistrates.

S.P. BETTING: A press report says that so far for this year 1200 convictions have been obtained against starting price bettors. In the same issue of the same paper appeared the result of a "Gallup Poll" which showed that only 44 per cent, favoured the law against off-course betting. In this matter, as in many others we see the institutions of law not functioning as the people desire. In other words, a minority, which includes a handful of men calling themselves the "Churches" and the "Racing Clubs", are using the people's institutions to impose their will on John Citizen.

FADDEN'S FADS: Addressing the Brisbane Constitutional Club, Mr. "Artie" Fadden, in a plea for a National Government, also pointed out that living costs had deflated the £1 note by 20 per cent.; which if true, is rather an affront to the economists who have only allowed about 7 per cent, increase in the basic wage during the period referred to. Continuing, Mr. Fadden said that only by having a National Government could the Opposition offer criticism and advice. The inference is that Fadden, Menzies & Co. are withholding their advice. However, having in mind the depression period ushered in by such super-men, if a National Government would be influenced by them—we would be better without it.

BAD ODOURS: Three industrial chemists are reported to have discovered a compound, called O.D.30, which destroys any offensive odours by burning them with oxygen as they float in the air. The first important point in this connection is that the discovery was made by private individuals (not medical bodies or control-boards seeking legislation to permit them to control the accumulated inventions of individuals), and the second is whether O.D.30 will be powerful enough to overcome the stench of party-politics.

NO DICTATORSHIP: "Hansard" for October 2, reports Mr. Blackburn, M.H.R., thus: "The Allied Works Council is creating a great deal of dissatisfaction and causing trouble in the minds of the people. It is a scheme for industrial conscription, and protection against arbitrary treatment by the Council should be provided for in the regulations and should not depend on

the will of the Director-General." Mr. Blackburn is to be commended for pointing out the dangers of this body; but, what's wrong with the Council getting manpower on a voluntary basis?

MILITARY MERGER: Much prominence is being given by daily papers, particularly the Murdoch Press, to urgers advocating the compulsory merging of the A.I.F. and the Militia—despite the fact that militiamen can volunteer for the A.I.F. if they so desire and the fact that these men joined up on certain conditions, which naturally they would not expect the Government to repudiate. Such newspapers and those they report as advocating Government repudiation of its contracts with militia-men are certainly not helping the war effort by such action, which causes friction.

HOSPITAL WOES: A damning indictment of the plight of our public (communal) hospitals appeared recently in the daily press in the form of organised begging appeals for money (pieces of paper). It was pointed out that great difficulty was met in providing treatment, even for dependents of the fighting forces, and all they want to fix the matter is—money, Mr. Holloway, Minister for Social Services, is telling us of the wonderful socialised health services to come as part of the New-Order-to-be. But what about now? Perhaps he would "pass the buck" and say: "That is a State matter, you must abolish State Governments before we can provide money for their services." But the truth is that the Federal Government is the only body legally authorised to provide the nation's money requirements. Attempting to "pass the buck" in this matter is dishonest.

WILLKIE'S WAILS: Willkie's pre-election propaganda drive, featured by the press, rendered the "Freedom Symphony," but was notable for the absence of any specific freedom, such as freedom from taxation, labour regimentation, bureaucratic regulation, marketing boards, and other similar undemocratic socialistic controls. His reference to "Global" Freedom is just another of those vague and useless general terms which befog the mind.

BANKER BANDITS: The Melbourne "Sun" of October 29, reports that powerful unidentified interests are launching a campaign to force the resignation of the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Temple), William Hickey, London "Daily Express" writer, describes these interests as "gunning for" the Archbishop. This situation recalls that of the late King Edward. Doubtless the powerful unidentified interests referred to were also the promoters of the abdication, and since both Edward and Dr. Temple denounced the plight of the people and the unchristian financial system, it is reasonable to assume close association between the unidentified interests and the bankers who control and operate the money mechanism. The burning question now is, will they get away with this? —O. B. H.

TO WHOM IS NATIONAL DEBT OWING?

By D. J. AMOS, F.A.I.S.

According to "Hansard" (No. 16, page 1286), Sir Charles Marr recently asked Parliament how much of our Public Debt was held at June 30, 1942, by: (a) The Commonwealth Bank; (b) the Trading Banks; (c) the Savings Banks; (d) the Insurance Companies; (e) Industrial and Commercial Companies; and (f) the General Public.

Mr. Chifley, in his reply, gave one of the most misleading statements that has ever appeared in "Hansard" for he put the whole of Australia's Overseas Debt, the holdings of all Insurance Companies (except Life) and the holdings of all Industrial and Commercial Companies, under the heading of the General Public! Hereunder are Mr. Chifley's figures and my own:

Holder of Debt	(Chifley) £millions	(Amos) £millions
Commonwealth Bank (including Note Issue Dept. and Savings Bank)	2649	2649
Other Savings Banks	563	563
Other Banks	982	982
Life Assurance Coys	866	866
General Public	11228	(?) 263.4
Other Insurance, Industrial and Commercial Coys.	—	(?) 263.5
Overseas Financial Houses	—	969
	16288	16288

It must also be remembered that a large percentage of the money subscribed by the General Public and by Industrial and Commercial Companies was advanced to them for that purpose by the Trading Banks, who held the Bonds as security for the advances and merely allowed the "investors" the difference between the interest paid by the Government on the Bonds and the interest charged by themselves (the Trading Banks) on the advances.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTION ALTERATION

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—May I direct the attention of your readers to the Bill for the alteration to the Constitution which is being brought before the Federal Parliament by the Attorney-General, Dr. H. V. Evatt. Clause 2 of the Bill reads as follows:—

"2. The Constitution is altered by inserting in Chapter 1, after Part V, the following part and section:—

"Part VI.—War Aims and Post-War Reconstruction.

"60A.—(1) The Parliament shall have power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth its territories and all places under its jurisdiction or control, for the purpose of carrying into effect the war aims and objects of Australia as one of the United Nations, including the attainment of economic security and social justice in the post-war world and for the purpose of post-war reconstruction generally. (My emphasis.)

"(2) Without limiting the generality of the foregoing sub-section, it is hereby declared that the power of Parliament shall extend to all measures which in the declared opinion of Parliament will tend to achieve economic security and social justice, including security of employment and the provision of useful occupation for all the people, and shall include power to make laws with respect to—

"(a.) The reinstatement and advancement of those who have been members of the fighting services of the Commonwealth during the war and of the dependants of such members who have died or been disabled as a consequence of the war; (b) employment including the transfer of workers from war time industries; (c) the development of the country and the expansion of production and markets; (d) the production and manufacture of goods and the supply of goods and services and the establishment and development of industries; (e) prices of goods and services including their regulation and control; (f) profiteering; (g) the encouragement of population; (h) carrying into effect the guarantee of the four freedoms, that is to say— 1: freedom of speech and expression; 2: religious freedom; 3: freedom from want; and 4: freedom from fear; (i) national works and services including water conservation and irrigation afforestation and the protection of the soil; (j) the improvement of living standards in both rural and urban areas; (k) transport including air transport; (l) national health and fitness; (m) the housing of the people; and (n) child welfare."

The United Nations comprise certain nations associated together freely for the purpose of a common war effort against National Socialism (Nazism). The United Nations as a political unit do not exist, nor have they a common political as distinct from a military, objective. Because Russia is our military ally, we do not for that reason accept Russia's political policy. As there is no political unit involved, the phrase, "as one of the United Nations," is quite meaningless unless it implies that the intention underlying it is to incorporate Australia into some political scheme of Federal Union, such as has been advocated by Clarence Kirschmann Streit and others.

It would seem that the ratification of the

Statute of Westminster is already a weakening of our political ties with Britain a fact which all Britishers will ----- if it is intended that we should become a mere unit in some abstract ----- body, backed by an International Police Force or Gestapo, this is something which all Britishers will resist to the ----- Surely this is the very thing we are fighting this war to prevent.

The statements that the power of Parliament shall extend to all ----- which ----- is the opinion of Parliament . . . ----- of employment and provision of useful work for all the people . . . are self explanatory, and need no elaboration at this stage.

The examples of the Irish Free State and the Union of South Africa subsequent to their ratification of the Statute of Westminster do not inspire Britishers with the confidence which Dr. Evatt would like us to have. The lessons to be learned from the course taken by the Irish Free State (now Eire) and certain elements in South Africa against the prestige and interests of the British Empire show clearly the potential dangers of that measure in the hands of any who seek to use it for disruptive purposes. However, despite all the political machinations which have taken place, there never will be any loosening of our cultural relationship with Britain. This is a natural bond which no politicians can sever.

The vague abstractions set out in Dr. Evatt's Bill, such as economic security and social justice, while implying what most people want, are quite meaningless, and carry no rights of Individual Freedom in Security with them. We are fighting for Freedom in Security for the Individual, not merely Economic Security or Social Justice. If legislation by any party or group does not seek to benefit the Individual, then it is of no consequence. A slave may have economic security—he certainly has no freedom. The real test is, has the Individual the freedom to choose or refuse one thing at a time?

The incorporation in the Constitution of the four freedoms of the Atlantic Charter (namely, freedom of speech and expression, religious freedom, freedom from want and freedom from fear), adds meaningless abstractions which give us no greater rights than those we already have without the necessity of including them in a written document. As Dicey states in his "Introduction to the Law of the Constitution": "The security which a Britisher enjoys for personal freedom does not really depend upon or originate in any general proposition contained in any written document. The nearest approach is the 39th Article of Magna Charta. The proclamation in a constitution or charter of the right to personal freedom or indeed of any other right, gives of itself but slight security that the right has more than a nominal existence."

The most potent sections of the proposed amendment are, however, clauses 2 (2) already set out, and 3, which is as follows:—

"3. All the powers conferred upon the Parliament by this section may be exercised notwithstanding anything contained elsewhere in this Constitution or in the Constitution of any State, and shall be exercisable as on and from a date to be pro-

people wanting a democratic way of life and not a dictatorship based on European standards." —"Rail Worker."

YES!—We have no potatoes—No apples for 2d. a pound.

NO!—You can't get what YOU want—Government Boards won't let you.

DO You want FOOD BOARDS abolished? GO to the public meeting at Coburg Town Hall on Thursday, November 12.

Arranged by Coburg Citizens' Policy Association and N.W.R.M. Speakers include Messrs. Bruce Brown and Fred Paice.

DEMOCRACY AND THE "ISMS"

(The substance of a leaflet issued by the Democratic Monetary Reform Organisation of Canada.)

DEMOCRACY: "Government in accordance with the will of the people." This means that the people must be the supreme authority and obtain the results they want from the management of their affairs. Therefore, in a properly functioning democracy, the State and all its institutions exist to serve the people and are controlled by the people. Freedom of the individual citizen is the cornerstone of democracy; therefore, economic security for all should be the basic right of all citizens. Without economic security there can be no real freedom. The home and family life, freedom of religion and unrestricted scope for cultural development are essential features of a democratic country. The basis of the democratic social philosophy was aptly summed up by Abraham Lincoln: "No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent"

TOTALITARIANISM: "The complete subordination of all individual rights to the requirements of the State." This means that the men who control the State are "the State" for all practical purposes and wield absolute power over the lives of the people. Under Totalitarianism, the individual citizen exists to serve the State and its institutions. He may gain some

All present day Totalitarian ideas have their roots in Marxian Socialism, the essential feature of which is the regimentation of the many by a few dictating in the name of the State. Its foundation is the Supreme State.

NATIONAL SOCIALISM: This is more generally known as Nazi-ism or Hitlerism. It is termed National Socialism by the Nazis for the purpose of identifying it with the creed of fanatical nationalism and race superiority which distinguishes it from Marxian Socialism, with its creed of fanatical internationalism and class superiority. Under National Socialism in Germany the individual is subordinated to the State. It is based on the same theory of the Supreme State as Marxian Socialism. Regimentation of the many by the ruling group; ruthless suppression of all opposition; the secret police; State worship and intolerance of all religion—these characteristics of Communism and Socialism are likewise the distinguishing features of Nazi-ism.

FASCISM: This new word was coined by Mussolini, ex-editor of a radical Socialist paper for the Totalitarian State structure established in Italy. Like German National Socialism, and the Communism and Socialism of Karl Marx, the distinguishing feature of Fascism is the Supreme State and the complete subordination of all individual rights to the dictates of the ruling authority. Unlike the Marxian branch of Socialist doctrine, it shares with Nazi-ism the

by the few.

COMMUNISM: Communism is represented as the concept of community life in which all share, on an equitable basis the benefits accruing from the collective efforts of the whole community. However, that is not what modern Communism means. So-called Communism of to-day is based on the Germanic philosophy of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. It teaches that social change can be brought about only by "the class struggle," the violent overthrow of the capitalistic State by the workers, and the establishment of "the dictatorship of the proletariat." But somebody has to do the "dictating" and it can be only those at the top who give the orders. Thus Communism aims at "the Supreme State" under a dictatorship, with everybody and everything controlled by the ruling group calling itself "the State." Communism is hostile to family life and religion. It is essentially materialistic. These aspects of the Germanic Communism of Marx and Engels naturally develop from the totalitarian concept on which it is based and are set forth in the well-known Manifesto of the Communist Party.

SOCIALISM: Socialism is defined by the Oxford dictionary as "the principle that individual freedom should be completely subordinated to interests of the community (or the State)." Thus the basis of both Socialism and Totalitarianism is the same, for the subordination of the individual to the State means his subordination to those at the top who are running the country's affairs. That is dictatorship. Modern Socialism, like Communism, is based on the perverted philosophy of the German, Karl Marx. His "Das Kapital" is the Socialist "bible" and his "materialistic conception of history" their religion. Socialism is but another name for the initial stages of Communism.

claimed by the Governor-General in Council."

It will be readily seen that these confer upon the Federal Parliament an over-riding authority over the lives, freedom and happiness of every Individual in Australia, not merely for the duration of the war, but for all time. They confer upon Parliament the exclusive right to decide whether, in the opinion of Parliament, any measures which they bring in will achieve the results that Parliament thinks are good for the People. They deny the traditional and time-honoured rights of the British to seek an interpretation on Constitutional matters from impartial law courts. They confer, in fact, an absolute dictatorship at remote Canberra.

I feel certain that the good sense of the People of Australia will not tolerate this impertinent attempt to implant such political doctrines upon us at a time when most of our energies are centred on the task of winning the military war. It is imperative however, that all of us who are aware of this move to extend wartime restrictions to our peacetime activities, shall take every possible step to make the people aware of what is happening. I need hardly add that it behoves every reader of your paper who values Individual Freedom in Security to write immediately to his Members of Parliament, State and Federal, his Senators and Local Government Representatives, and tell them that this Bill must not be permitted.—Yours, etc., A. FERGUSON, Carlton, N.S.W.

THE CHOICE BEFORE US: It will be seen that so-called Communism, Socialism, Nazi-ism and Fascism are but different forms of the same thing—namely Totalitarianism. They are all the products of Marx-ism and are based on the Supreme State, dominating and regimenting the lives of its individual citizens under a collectivist economy. Individual rights, the supremacy of the people, the sanctity of the home and family, and the freedom of the individual have no place in the Totalitarian State. All power and control is centralised, inevitably resulting in ruthless tyranny under an all-embracing bureaucracy. This is the opposite of the democratic concept. Individual freedom the control of the state and its institutions by the people, and the decentralisation of power are fundamental to democracy.

Out of the strife and suffering of this war will emerge a new social order. Here in Canada, and throughout the British Empire, the people have still the supreme constitutional authority. You still have the opportunity to choose what form the new social order will take. You have the choice, because the people still have the freedom to determine their destiny. Choice is the essence of freedom. Once that freedom is surrendered to some group of men who wield absolute power in the name of a supreme state, you will have no more opportunity to choose than exists in Nazi Germany or any other totalitarian country.

If you let the situation drift along do you think that you shall continue to have the choice after this war? Consider the propaganda in favour of Socialism. Think of the progressive centralisation of power. Where is it leading? Do you believe for one moment that a virile functioning democracy will emerge of its own accord after this war without any effort on the part of the people? . . . And how do you think we can have a functioning democracy—government in accordance with the will of the people to give them the results they want—unless the people are organised and united to declare their will and to insist on obedience to their wishes?

Surely the answers to these questions are self-evident. And surely it is only too evident as well that unless we face up to this issue and act NOW there is a real danger that we shall win the military war only for our fight forces to find when they return, that we on the home front, have failed them and the hidden forces of Totalitarianism have emerged victorious from another direction.

Think this over, and then join with us in helping the people of Canada to organise so that we can make democracy a vital and functioning reality as the basis of the new post-war social order which will give us not only security, but freedom that is so essential to our British way of life. . . .

[Australian democrats please "follow suit." —Ed., "N.T.")

CHRISTMAS TAILORING

Mr. Frank Devlin, tailor, whose advertisement appears elsewhere in this issue desires to inform old and new clients that it is necessary to place orders for Christmas delivery without delay. A wide range of suitings may be inspected at his premises. Mr. Devlin also specialises in ladies

"POTENTIAL DICTATORS"

"At a recent meeting of the State Branch Council of the A.R.U., a protest was raised against the 'Fascist' (they label everything Fascist which dares disagree with them) tactics of the 'New Times.'

"We do not propose to defend the paper concerned in these columns; they are well able to do that themselves; but we do object to people who, while claiming freedom of speech for themselves, deny it to their critics.

"We make this protest because we believe that Australians are a democratic people

"A NEW DIET OF TRUTH WANTED"

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

Sir -Three men high in ecclesiastical office received good press publicity during the past week for their views on Australia's future needs. These Church dignitaries were Dr. C.N. Button of the Presbyterian Church; Dr. J. D. Simmonds of the Catholic Church; and Bishop Hilliard of the Anglican Church. Here are extracts from the press reports:-

Dr. Button; "Australia is very sick, and it is because people have allowed themselves to be fed on a diet of pretty sentimentalities; half-truths, and lies—lies about work, waste, liquor, politics and even about religion. What is needed is a new diet of truth in every department of life. Australia needed men of prophetic quality to tell the people the truth..." ("Argus," 13/10/42)
 Dr Simmonds; "... the enemy could not be vanquished without great austerity and sacrifice. What is wanted is that Christ's message of peace and good-will should sink into men's hearts." ("Age," 30/10/42)

Bishop Hillard: "If we were pro-God gambling would disappear, intemperance would be banished, and social impurity would disappear." ("Age," 30/10/42)

All three claim to speak for God, and it is not for me to express doubts regarding the propriety of such claims, but I do venture the opinion that God does not desire them to say what He would not say Himself. God is concerned with FACT, not with fiction, and He knows that platitudes are humbug.

Australia IS sick, but that is no new development. It was the same during the last war, and even worse during the de-

pression. The condition of sickness is chronic, and it is NOT because of the people's attitude to God. Atheists are few and far between. The great majority of the people belong to one religious denomination or another, and they have therefore been under the influence of clergymen of one sort or another. There has been no change in the religious truths as recorded in the Bible, and as "taught" by all denominations, so apparently the trouble is that important Biblical "truths" have been neglected or suppressed. For example, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon"; or, "Behold the lilies of the field—they toil not, neither do they spin, yet Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." Notwithstanding these important declarations, we as a community are still serving Mammon, and are still obsessed with toil! Money and Work are still our false gods, and the action of "dedicating" collections helps to maintain the idolatry. Can Dr. Button be right in suggesting that the whole truth will be accepted by congregations only when told by men of prophetic quality, and will be rejected when told by clergymen of ordinary clay?

And if it is true that we have been fed on half truths and lies, then we should be given the identity of those who have been feeding us in that way. We have not asked for that sort of food, and surely Churches, Governments, educational institutions, and the various fraternities would not be parties to such a thing. Someone has obviously IMPOSED it upon us. The fact is that we have been intentionally kept uninformed on the subject which controls all other subjects—viz., FINANCE, and the Church leaders have actually helped persecute the men who have been trying to call attention to the fact. Instead of assisting to spread the truth about the system of finance, which at present is the enemy of God and man, the Churches have helped to keep the people, and particularly

the church-going section of it, in the bondage of ignorance.

One comment on the remarks of Dr. Simonds. Christ's message of peace and good-will has already sunk into the hearts of men, and they are wholeheartedly in favour of it. They earnestly desire it, but the Jewish system of usury under which they are forced to struggle with the dice loaded against them, is not based on anything Jesus said, and will not permit the establishment of peace or the practice of good-will. Pope Pius understood this, but so far has not been adequately supported by the Catholic Hierarchy.

As to the remarks of Bishop Hilliard, who was taking part in a "Back to God" movement, gambling is mostly indulged in because it provides a chance for people to get money. It also provides money for the Treasury. Intemperance, too, provides revenue for Governments, and is largely the result of living conditions which in the main are the produce of finance or lack of finance. There are also the fines for gambling breaches and drunkenness, to say nothing of the associated misdemeanours. Those who think taxes are already high enough should welcome the gamblers and the drunkards, for the help they bring to the poor Treasurers!

Social impurity takes many forms, but in practically every case financial considerations are the basis of it. Politicians have been bought at a "financial" price; shady tricks in business always have the one objective—better financial results; many of the moral lapses can be traced to conditions of glamour not to be found in the homes of the poor, and promiscuous intercourse is a feature of war conditions, which are the result of economic pressure, which is the product of financial manipulation. The things Bishop Hilliard speaks against cannot possibly disappear under present conditions, for

(Continued on page 4.)

SENATOR DARCEY'S BUDGET SPEECH

(Continued from last issue.)
 During the depression a builder in Sydney who had a block of flats valued at over £10,000, and on which there was a mortgage of £1500, was told by his bank manager that the directors of the bank were concerned about his account and desired

which are not revealed by the closest scrutiny of their balance-sheets. Last October I asked how much money had been raised through the private banks for war savings certificates, and I was told that the amount was £13,000,000. When I asked how the money had been paid, I was told that payment had been made by cheque.

Senator Collett.—Are not the private banks doing a great deal to ----- national credit?

Senator Darcey.—They are doing a great deal to increase the national debt. We are paying £-----a week to the banks as

matter over. Later he received a ----- communication from the bank asking him to call. Before leaving home he said to his wife that he might have to sell their house in order to satisfy the demands of the bank. He was met by a smiling bank manager, who placed before him a box of-----The conversation was somewhat as follows: The bank manager said: "Good morning Mr. Brown. How are you?" The builder replied, "I am well but I have no money to reduce my overdraft." The bank manager then said, "Forget all about your overdraft. Are you aware that a loan of £-----000,000 is on the market?" The client replied, "I am not concerned about the loan, as I have no money to invest. I am concerned with my overdraft with your bank." Again he was told: "Forget all about it. I want you to sign an application for £1000 in that loan." When the client asked; "Will that not increase my indebtedness to the bank?" the bank manager replied, "No. We will issue you with a receipt for the £1000, and we will hold the-----on your behalf."

Senator Collett.—I suppose the bank manager threw the cigar?

Senator Darcey.—Possibly. After that, the bank manager became somewhat congenial and said: "The quota which I have to raise in this district is £25,000, and therefore all the Browns, Jones and the -----have been sent a -----similar to that which you have received." Each of the banks clients signed on the dotted line. That was called a voluntary loan.

Senator Aylett.—What did the banker get out of it?

Senator Darcey.—He got the usual 5% commission. In connection with the last war loan the bankers drew £32,878 for services rendered to the Government in applying for war bonds on behalf of their clients. That sounds good business from the point of view of the banks. Is it any wonder the banks pay dividends as high as 18 per cent? They do not disclose their profits, because they are able to put away large-----in secret reserves

men, such as his baker, his butcher, and his grocer, and that he has expended a few shillings on the pictures and in buying a few glasses of beer. That money is returned by the various tradesmen to the banks soon after they receive it. It is not necessary to have a lot of money in order to carry on a banking system. When the last war ended there was no more real money in Australia than when the war started, notwithstanding that the war cost this country £383,000,000. If I were in a position to do so, I should use the national credit to fight the war. That would be quite constitutional; because in paragraph 530 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Monetary and Banking Reform it is stated that, ultimately, Parliament is responsible for finance and everything necessary for the good of Australia, and that the Government acts as the executive of the Parliament. The Commonwealth Bank has certain powers which have been granted to it by statute. Those powers are to be exercised in the interests of the nation. The law provides that should there be any difference of opinion between the Government and the Commonwealth Bank Board on matters of policy, there shall be a free and frank discussion to straighten things out. Should their views still be irreconcilable, the Government can then say that it will take full responsibility for the result and instruct the bank what it must do. Is anything more definite than that required? No money reaches the Treasury when a £20,000,000 loan is floated: all that the Government gets is the right to draw cheques against the banks. When the Australian Mutual Provident Society, for instance decides to invest £1,500,000 in a war loan the procedure is that the manager of the society instructs his banker to apply for bonds to that value. A cheque is sent to the Treasury, and the company gets the bonds. For that service the banker receives £2500 commission on the transaction. The whole business is a racket, which has been going on since 1694, when the Bank of England was founded.

LONDON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES

Under the heading "General Principles of a Post-War Economy," the London journal, "The Engineer," in its issue of June 5 1942, publishes the following extracts from a report by the London Chamber of Commerce, dated May 29, 1942—

(Concluded from last issue.)

The fundamental problems, then, which a satisfactory system must be designed to solve, are:—

(1) The elimination of the fear and hostility resulting from the struggle of all nations to obtain an "active" favourable balance of payments, the penalty of the vanquished being economic servitude to the victor. This struggle has resulted in attempts by all the nations to restrict imports by barriers to trade, and to increase exports by subsidies and other artificial means, and by the use of political and economic pressure.

(2) The distribution internally of the purchasing power necessary to enable the nations to consume the whole of their own production; if this were done they could equally consume the goods of other nations which they might exchange for their own production. This problem is closely connected with (1) because an excess of exports over imports furnishes an excuse for increasing effective demand within a country (through the distribution of wages) without increasing the number of goods awaiting consumption in the domestic market.

(3) The unwillingness, consequent upon their industrialisation, of primary producing countries to receive, after the war, imports of certain manufactured goods which previously they had imported freely.

(4) Nations with different internal economic systems must be enabled to live in the same world without those differences constituting a threat to the continued existence of one another's internal systems.

(5) The movement of people from overpopulated to under-populated countries. The objection of the latter to receive immigrants is due to unemployment of their own people and will disappear when that problem is solved, assuming, of course, that the would-be immigrants are of the right type.

The Chamber, having considered whether there is any system which would achieve, wholly or partially, the solution of all the above problems, generally accepts the principles laid down in "A Twentieth Century Economic System,"* especially in

respect of blocked credits for the payment of international obligations.

It is felt, however, that there will be an undesirable time lag if measures to increase effective demand are not taken until an incipient slump has reached the point where prices have already started to fall. In many industries so much preparatory work has to be done after orders have been placed and before labour can be fully employed that a slackening of activity a year, or even two years ahead, can be foreseen. The Chamber, therefore, recommends that appropriate machinery should be set up to ensure that slumps may be forestalled, through close co-operation between industry and the central bank.

These proposals also have the merit that: (a) Whilst revolutionary in effect, they involve, so far as industry and commerce are concerned, little change in practice; (b) They require the minimum of agreement between nations;

(c) They can be put into effect even though some nations withhold agreement. So long as nations were struggling for active "favourable" balances, agreement upon exchange rates was found to present insuperable difficulties. An exchange rate which would give one nation an active "favourable" balance would necessarily give other nations "unfavourable" balances.

Under the system advocated, all the nations would be interested in finding the rate of exchange which would give each, of the one part, and the rest of the world of the other, equilibrium. They would, therefore, all be looking for the same thing and agreement should not be difficult; especially as the penalties for failure to make a correct estimate would not be disastrous.

As an undertaking by the nations to maintain their internal general price levels stable constitutes a guarantee of the maintenance of an honest measure of value, not only to other nations, but also to their own people, it is not thought that the giving of this undertaking is likely to be opposed.

*Reviewed in the "New Times" of April 17, 1942

M.L.A. REPORTS TO HIS ELECTORS

In preparing his quarterly report to his electors Mr. C Mutton, Victorian M.L.A. (Coburg), gave his listeners much food for thought.

Dealing with the State surplus (£750,000) Mr. Mutton made some pointed remarks. In the past he said, "the answers given for urgent public works has been where will the money come from?" To-day the finances of the State Government are in a flourishing condition. Public works that are urgent -----hospitals etc.) would be carried out, if money is available but, apparently, the other things that count, Man-power and material, are not to be had.

Continuing his remarks Mr. Mutton said unless immediate steps were taken the metropolitan area would be faced with a food famine next winter. "Friendly -----s" were engaged cutting firewood for ordinary rates of pay. The average result of two tons per week per man! Mr. -----contended that a housewife would use that amount before breakfast! A new -----of payment was to be tried: A single man would receive £1 per week even if he did not work an would be permitted to

results. The scale for married men would be £2/11/- minimum and £5/10/- maximum (payment by results). Special arrangements made with the Minister for Labor and National Services (Mr. Ward, M.H.R.) to enable this system to be tried.

(The "he-who-does-not-work-neither-shall he-eat" fanatics no doubt will disapprove; but they will burn the firewood thus produced. Or will they refrain on principle?)

Some light was thrown by Mr. Mutton on the operations of the Victorian Housing Commission. Recently the Commission purchased an area on East Coburg and paid £193/10/- per acre for it. Later a competent valuator assessed its value at £80 per acre! But, worse still, the Commission paid £1900 per acre for Richmond Racecourse. Mr. Mutton said that the difference in the purchase price of the land (Richmond—Coburg) would have provided palatial homes. At the conclusion of his report Mr. Mutton was subjected to questions dealing with local and State affairs, those present taking the opportunity of conveying their wishes to their member.

Coburg democrats are still waiting for the defenders of democracy in other districts to put their theories into practice.

Your VICTORY SUIT Hand-Tailored to Order



**FRANK
DEVLIN**
FOR
BETTER TAILORING

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

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

"For STYLE and EASE: FRANK DEVLIN PLEASE!"

THE APPLE AND PEAR BOARD

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—One of the main reasons, I understand, for the introduction of the Apple and Pear Board, was to deal with the glut of fruit caused by war conditions which made the usual export of apples and other fruits impossible.

It is my contention that nowhere near sufficient effort was made to ascertain whether it was possible for Australia to consume all the fruit that could be produced. It has been said of the dairying industry that, if all Australians consumed the minimum quantity of dairy produce necessary from a health point of view, there would be no surplus to export. And yet Australian butter was for years dumped on the overseas market, and the Australian public was penalised on every pound of butter purchased to make it possible for dairy produce to be exported.

I know that an advertising campaign was embarked upon to try to induce people to eat more apples, but the effort was defeated to a very great extent by the price demanded for the fruit. No matter how beneficial an article may be from a health point of view, it is of little use urging people to buy it when the price is beyond their reach.

Reference to the Commonwealth Year Book discloses some very interesting figures regarding the apple crop of Australia: The total apple production in Australia for the

year 1938-39 was 11,125,540 bushels, valued at £3,335,817 (an average of approximately 6/- per bushel). The total exports were 2,111,139 cwt., valued at £1,433,440. This means that we consumed a little under £2,000,000 worth of apples, each Australian spending less than 6/- per head for the fruit. To consume the complete crop, it would have therefore meant that each one of us would have had to spend 4/- each, making 10/- in all. At a cost of 6/- per bushel, and allowing a generous average of 150 apples to each bushel, every Australian would have had an apple a day for 250 days of the year. The doctor would not have been kept away for 115 days.

One of the most iniquitous aspects of the operations of the Apple and Pear Board is that an orchardist may grow excellent fruit, but it is refused by the Board because it does not come up to its particular standard. The grower then asks for permission to sell the fruit direct to the public, since the Board does not want it and the Board then demands 1/- for each case sold. In other words, the Board says, "Your fruit is not good enough for us, but if you sell it to the public we want 1/- for each case."

Which proves, I think, that Ned Kelly is not by any means dead.—Yours, etc., "EAT MORE FRUIT."

TWO VIEWS ON "THE PROTOCOLS"

The following extract is taken from the book, "The Oppermans" (pp. 134-135), by Lion Feuchtwanger, who also wrote "Jew Suss":--

In the year 1905 had appeared in Moscow a book with the title, "The Great in the Little, or, Antichrist as an Immediate Political Possibility." The author of the book was a certain Sergius Nilus, an official of the Synodal Chancery. The twelfth chapter had an appendix with the heading, "Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion." These "Protocols" professed to transcribe the proceedings of a secret meeting of the leading Jews of the world, which was alleged to have taken place in the autumn of 1897, on the occasion of the first Zionist Congress in Basle, in order to determine the general lines of a plan for the eventual conquest of the world by the Jews. The book was translated into many foreign languages and made a deep impression, especially upon German university men. In the year 1921, a contributor to the London "Times" proved that these "Protocols" had been copied, largely word for word, from a pamphlet written by a certain Maurice Joly, which had appeared in the year 1868. In this pamphlet, certain supporters of Napoleon III., Freemasons and Bonapartists, were accused of having concocted an enormous plot to achieve world-dominion for themselves. The author of the "Protocols" had simply substituted the word "Jews" for "Freemasons and Bonapartists." In so far as the "Protocols" had not been copied from Joly's pamphlet they were taken from the novel entitled "Biarritz," which had been published in the same year, 1868, by a certain Goedsche under the pseudonym of John Retcliffe. In this novel a description was given of how, once every hundred years, the princes of the twelve tribes of Israel, which had been dispersed throughout the world, met in the old Jewish cemetery at Prague and debated upon the further measures to be taken for the completion of the establishment of Jewish world-dominion. A burst of laughter went up from the whole civilised world upon the discovery of this stupid forgery. It was only in Germany, especially in the universities, that the "Protocols" were still believed in.

* * * *

The following item appears on the front page of the English weekly, the "Social Creditor," of July 25, 1942—

Jewish contempt for Gentile intelligence (perhaps justified by the way we behave) is strikingly illustrated by the assumption that the documents commonly known as the Protocols of Zion can be disposed

of by ascribing them to an obscure journalist, Maurice Joly, who wrote them as "a satire on the foreign policy of Napoleon III."

It is the correspondence with events which gives their interest to these satanic essays.

If anyone can believe that a man without incredible political, economic, and quasi-psychological knowledge wrote them, and then wrote nothing else of consequence, he can believe anything. Incidentally, Joly "committed suicide." Perhaps.

Even if the policies outlined had no relation to events since 1864, when Joly is supposed to have concocted them, they would still comprise an astounding document. As they outline almost exactly, and in considerable detail, the main political features of the past hundred years, their importance is primary.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the United Democrats, 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide.)

We have distributed a very large number of "The Victory Road" booklets. However, we recently received further supplies of these, and there must be quite a lot of people who have never read this exposure of a tragic state of affairs. Send for some copies, and give them to anyone interested. These can be obtained for 3d. each or 50 for 10/-.

"Economic Tribulation," by Vincent Vickers, is now on our shelves. This book has been referred to and quoted so much that it needs no introduction. It sells at 3/6. Supplies are very limited at present, but we hope to make arrangements so that we can get more of these books at a slight discount. At the moment, due to very strange business arrangements, a discount is not possible. We would appreciate any small donation added to the price of the book.

"Enemy Within the Empire." This has been a steady seller since it came out. We regret that these are temporarily out of stock, but further supplies are on order. (Price 6d.)

Next Executive Meeting: Wednesday, November 18.

—M. R. W. Lee, Hon. Secretary.

WEST AUSTRALIAN NOTES

To all electoral campaigners and Sympathisers: Mr. Dury was called up at very short notice (in fact, twenty-four hours' notice) and is now serving with the R.A.A.F. To immediately fill the position which Mr. Dury held for the last six years is somewhat difficult. However, the office is still open, and the work proceeding apace. It might interest you to know that we are moving into the next room, which is much larger than our present one. Therefore, instead of Room 1, now it will be Room 3.

The two important changes that we wish you to notice are: Firstly, please address all correspondence to F. Jones, Room 3, 81 Barrack-street, Perth; secondly, and more important still, ALL MONEY in whatever form, to be made payable to the ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN, above address, and not to an individual. These changes were considered necessary by supporters at a hastily-summoned meeting.

Please let me remind you that the booklet, "Alberta's Road to Freedom," is on hand. Price not determined, but no more than eight pence each. We look for as close co-operation, in the future as in the past.

F. Jones Correspondence Hon. Secretary.

AMAZING ARTICLE BY STANLEY JONES

Some years ago a play which had a successful run in Australian theaters had as its title the query, "What happened to Jones?" Perusal of an article entitled "The Score So Far," which was penned by Mr. Stanley Jones, prompts a similar enquiry. The article referred to first appeared in "The Christian Century," and for some reason which remains obscure, was recently republished in leaflet form by the Camberwell Brotherhood of Ministers." Possibly, they had formed the conclusion that Stanley deserved to be "shown up."

Something serious indeed must have happened to Mr. Stanley Jones to cause him to publish such an example of sloppy thinking—and inverted logic. The good points—and there are some notable ones—are as scanty as raisins in a boarding-house pudding. Space considerations preclude review in detail, but the points quoted will indicate the general tenor of his essay.

France's downfall, he suggests, was due to her having "dealt with Germany with cold military hardness" at the close of the last war. With more reason and sounder logic, it has been claimed that her downfall was mainly due to her not having persisted in preparations with cold military hardness against German aggression. The War Department was starved and the Maginot Line construction abandoned close to the spot where the Germans broke through in the previous war. The reason for this, as given by an eminent banker, was that "they had a serious financial crisis and had to economise." Not "military hardness," but financial stringency, was the main cause of the downfall of France.

With amazing short-sightedness, Stanley Jones claims that "the aeroplane has become England's greatest danger," a retribution, because, "at the disarmament conference, England alone refused to scrap aeroplanes as a war weapon." The real fact is that, as has been repeatedly proved, the aeroplane has been one of Britain's best safeguards and weapons of offence, as the Germans, Italians and Japanese know to their cost. Is anyone to-day simple-minded enough to believe that, if England had agreed to scrap aeroplanes, her enemies would not have speeded up secret production? Also, has the aeroplane been any less a danger to the nations who professed to be willing to scrap them, than to England? No doubt Holland, Belgium, Norway and others could truthfully affirm that they had reaped something that they did not sow.

According to this omniscient critic Holland lost her whole East Indian Empire because she refused "to take Japan as her friend." Burma, which somewhat recently accepted Japan's new version of "friendship," has since bitterly regretted her action. The gift of Dutch New Guinea suggested by Mr. Stanley Jones would not have diverted Japan from carrying out her plans to seize the whole of Holland's East Indian Empire, in pursuance of her "sacred mission."

Does the "Camberwell Brotherhood" really endorse Stanley Jones' proposition No. 10? "England did her best to get America into the war, and succeeded. She succeeded too well: she got America into the European war, plus an extra war in the Pacific for herself." (Naughty England tempted America into war, but—so Stanley states with evident satisfaction—got just punishment!). It is fortunate for America, that—unlike Stanley Jones—President Roosevelt and his advisers had sufficient commonsense to realise, that if England fell Germany would have forced British factories and workmen to manufacture munitions for use against U.S.A.—her next intended victim.

As a further example of his misconceptions, Mr. Stanley Jones claims that Britain and other nations are engaged in "war for the possession of desert sands" in North Africa. In the first place, Britain doesn't want the Libyan sands she is fighting on, and it is not, as he affirms, a "meaningless conflict," either. The fate of Egypt, control of the Suez Canal, possession of Palestine, Syria, and indeed, perhaps, the final result of the war hinge on the outcome of what he claims to me a "meaningless conflict."

In his references to the League of Nations, this sapient critic displays complete ignorance of its real character and aims. He affirms that it was an attempt "to reconstruct Europe and the world on the basis of right." It is now widely recognised that International Financial over-lords moulded the League into an instrument

NEW APPOINTMENT TO BANK BOARD

Dr. H. C. Coombs is the Federal Government's appointee to the Commonwealth Bank Board, in place of Professor Giblin, resigned. Some idea of what Australia can expect from Dr. Coombs is given by the Press interview which appeared in the Sydney "Sun":--

Interviewed to-day, Dr. Coombs declined to discuss his financial theories. "Bankers are notoriously silent," he said, but he paid a tribute to Prof. L. P. Giblin, whom he succeeds on the Bank Board. "For a number of years as a student of economics an employee of the Commonwealth Bank, and a colleague at the Treasury, I have come into contact with Prof. Giblin's work in the theory and practice of monetary policy, and I know what a major contribution he has made in both fields," he said. "I am proud to be thought worthy to succeed him."

Professor Giblin was the economist primarily responsible for the notorious Premiers Plan, which was imposed upon the people of Australia in 1931. Professor

for the furtherance of their own hellish plans. Speaking of their post-war activities Mr. Lloyd George said, "They swept statesmen, politicians, jurists and journalists all on one side, and issued their orders with the imperiousness of absolute monarchs who knew there was no appeal from their ruthless decrees." In reality the League was an attempt to reconstruct the world on the basis of MIGHT—financial might. "Federal Union" is a further attempt with the same objective.

In regard to "The Case of Japan" Mr. Jones falls into a curious historical error. He states that "Japan's present megalomania began" after the British and American representatives at the League of Nations had refused to affirm "equality of races." As is well known, the militarists' megalomania began when Japan defeated Russia in the Russo-Japanese War in 1905.

Toward the end of his article it is pleasing to note that he shows signs of emerging from the strange mental insight which seems to have enveloped him. His denunciation of money worship and its effects seem to be more in his old-time vein, as are his comments on trade competition. He states, "War is competition pushed to its natural conclusion—the white (?) flower of economic competition flowers into the red war of universal armed conflict. Whether or not he realises the part played by the international-finance gangsters in regard to world politics economic competition and war, is not revealed in this article. It seems possible though, that Camberwell's Federal parliamentary representative may regard his strictures on the former sales of scrap iron to Japan as a personal attack.

—"Stirrem."

No Going Back Etc.,

(Continued from page 1.)

bankers and those associated with finance that I almost thought myself back again in the House of Commons in Canada listening to members declaiming against the bankers. . .

It is known by all that secret discussion is not secret in the sense in which the word is used by my Noble friend Lord Strabolgi. It merely means that people meet together and discuss frankly the pros and cons of a proposal put before them.

The noble Lord, Lord Keynes, might make a suggestion and might afterwards withdraw it. It requires great courage, the greatest courage ever known in the economist, to publish a book and say in it that an earlier book was wrong. . .

It is only when settled conclusions have been reached that they can be published to the world. Then it is that we hear of them in Parliament, because it is the purpose of Parliament to deal with them in the last resort. When they are debated here they may be modified or amended but at least we know that they represent the best wisdom of the best men to deal with the financial problem. . . (The technique of the fait accompli. Ed. "N.T.")

The Lord Chancellor (Viscount Simon. . . My noble friend Lord Strabolgi also showed great consideration in what he put to me, but he was entitled, in view of that, to ask me one specific and formal question, which I will answer as well as I can. He asked this question is there any prospect of our returning to the gold standard?

Now, I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, but we have had our experience of returning to the gold standard last time.

That experience did not turn out to be a very happy one, and I have heard a whisper and no echo from the secret conclaves on which the noble Lord looks with some suspicion, of any intention to repeat our former experience in that matter. I trust that that will be regarded as a straightforward answer; I can hardly be expected to say more.

"New Diet of Truth Wanted"

(Continued from page 3)

the simple reason that they are inevitable products of the financial system. "Back to God" campaigns will make no difference to this fact.

Whether we like to admit it or not, the fact is that all Churches have been used to maintain a fraudulent financial system, which places Mammon above God, and they have been content to denounce the effects of that system while saying nothing against the system itself. They have nurtured the tree and then denounced its fruit, the very opposite to what Christ demanded. No wonder we were warned that "Not everyone that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven."

To those who can distinguish reality from make-believe it is clear that what is wanted is not a new diet of truth or men of prophetic quality, but simply an honest recognition of the OLD truth, that it is quite impossible to serve God AND Mammon. It is silly for the Churches to keep on trying!—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne. 1st November 1942

Printed by M.F. Canavan, 25 Cullinton-road