

ON OTHER PAGES

EIRE'S CENTRAL BANK BILL (Page 2)

THESE CONSTITUTIONAL AMMENDMENTS. (Page 3)

M.P.'s SHOULD NOT JOIN THE FORCES (Page 3)

NOTES ON THE STATUTES OF WESTMINSTER (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY THE NEW TIMES PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 8 No. 45 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, NOV. 13, 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).

# Four Freedom's": Are They Enough

## Pertinent Broadcast from 7HO

**Of course we all approve of the "Four Freedoms." But do they go far enough? Are they specific enough? Don't they omit altogether the most important aspect of real freedom? . . . These and other questions are asked and answered, with deep understanding of the fundamental point-of-view of the ordinary man and woman, in the following talk by Mr. James Guthrie, B.Sc., broadcast from 7HO, on Sunday, November 1:**

Various public men throughout the world are vieing with each other in promising everybody (after this war) quite a selection of freedoms; in fact we are being threatened with so many freedoms that perhaps it might be useful to find out exactly what we are being offered.

Dr. Evatt is the latest to enter the lists with a new kind of freedom. He wants to change the constitution of this country so the Government can do anything it likes to give us new freedoms. Dr. Evatt suspects that some of us may object to his new brand of freedom, and he is going to take the precaution of preventing any person going into court to challenge the Governments new laws. We shall be forced to accept our new freedoms, but we shall not have the freedom to question them or object to them. Freedom is to be imposed upon us, if need be against our will, by the force of the state.

President Roosevelt says we are to have, after this war: Freedom of Speech, Religious Freedom, Freedom from Want, and Freedom from Fear. Now that sounds very nice, but what does it mean - or has it any meaning?

What, for example, does freedom of speech mean? After all, we hear a great number of different men broadcasting over the national network; but after they have all had their say what have we learnt? Where do we get to? I have tried to get on the national network, but always without success. I think I am more entitled to speak "on the air"

than a great many who do speak; certainly I have given a "great deal more thought and time and money to my subject than most of the speakers; but I am not allowed to speak on the national network. I can speak on the commercial stations if I pay the usual rate.

When Dr. Evatt socialises all the broadcasting stations I shall no longer be allowed to speak; I shall have to get permission from Dr. Evatt to criticise Dr. Evatt—and, if my experience of Broadcasting Commissions is any guide, or if the experience of other Socialist countries is any guide, or if Dr. Evatt's new Constitution is any guide, then I would say that the probability of Dr. Evatt giving permission to me to criticise Dr. Evatt over the national network would be so small as to be considered negligible. Or, to put it in plain English, I wouldn't have a dog's chance.

What I have said about National Broadcasting you can apply with variations to the daily press. The press give a fair amount of freedom and latitude to certain people, but not to me. That might just be my bad luck; I might be unfortunate in choosing my subjects. It appears one can speak about a great variety of subjects. In fact, anything from baby's milk bottles to the winner of the 3.30. One can even speak about freedom, as long as one doesn't speak about the kind of freedom you and I want. One can even speak about the Labor Party, as long as one doesn't speak about the men who finance the

Labor Party. One can even speak about the financial system, as long as one doesn't mention the names of the men who wangle the financial system.

Freedom of speech! Where is this freedom of speech for Government officials in peace time and what happens when everybody becomes a Government official under Socialism? What happens to a member of Parliament if he criticises the Party Bosses?

What does President Roosevelt mean by freedom of speech? Can any listener give me a satisfactory answer? . . .

"Freedom of Speech"; well, even slaves may chatter,  
So long as they're unarmed it doesn't matter.

"Religious Freedom"; well, what are the odds? So long as Mammon heads the list of Gods?

"Freedom from Want"; no breeder would deprive  
Good cattle of the means to keep alive.

"Freedom from Fear"; a counsel of perfection?

Not if there's always ample police protection

Freedom to act, to choose or to refuse?

Ah, that's a very "different pair of shoes!"

—"Excalibur" ("Social Crediter, England).

Freedom from Want! Before this war started there was a great deal of discussion

about malnutrition and lack of proper feeding, and even in a country like Australia, where the food supply was ample, the majority of the people were not properly fed. Ample supplies of health-giving foods, such as butter, milk, eggs, fruit and vegetables were beyond the reach of the average wage-earner. True, many families could have had more of the expensive foods if they cut down other semi-luxuries. But then, of course, men and women are not prepared to do that, and they are never-likely to—and why should they? In a war emergency, yes, if it gives better results, but for a man's entire life—No.

One can have nothing but approval for those men and women who are trying to teach the people the need for a better balanced diet; but the fact remains that the need for a better diet exists in its most acute form where the choice of food is a choice of cheap food. In fact, where there is no choice at all—that is, in the houses of the majority of the Australian people. But here I want to protest most emphatically against this polite fiction that is encouraged in official quarters, that you can make healthy and happy men and women by pouring the necessary vitamins and carbohydrates down their throats.

It is a piece of gross hypocrisy to suggest that a man or woman can be physically fit when they are mentally distressed or diseased. A man must be vastly ignorant

(Continued on page 4.)

## NOTES ON THE NEWS

**An indication that newspaper headlines do not reflect the people's opinions is found in a London "Daily Mail" report of interviews with hundreds of U.S. citizens, which shows clearly that they are not even interested in Britain's management of her own affairs.**

Many of those interviewed wanted to know what would happen if a British politician lectured U.S. on the voting status of Negroes in the Southern States. Most agreed that Britain was justly entitled to fight for her Empire—as U.S. was entitled to fight for hers—and that in doing so they were joint partners against the common enemy. Fair enough!

"LEGAL LEAKS": There is danger in the internationally inspired one-sided propaganda, being circulated at the public's expense, to indoctrinate them into believing that "legal leaks" exist in our Constitution which would prevent post-war reconstruction. Our present Constitution serves to prevent the remnants of power being filched from the people by would-be dictators. In effect, our soldiers, sailors and airmen are fighting and dying to preserve that foundation of our democracy. Under these circumstances it would not be right to even attempt to alter it behind their backs.

"BUTTER BLUFF": Reports in the provincial press disclose hostility to the principle of the butter subsidy from the merchandising section of the industry—not from the actual producers. So, we find the selling section (middle-men) endeavouring to increase butter prices—for their benefit. Strangely enough, the executives of many so-called dairymen's associations are opposing the producers' interests by defending these dairy-produce combines. Dairymen should send them a "please explain."

"HOLLOWAY'S HOOEY": Addressing the South Melbourne branch of the Australian Labor Party, Mr. Holloway, M.H.R., is reported as saying that the Government proposes to build 10,000 houses a month after the war as part of the post-war plans. Evidently he thinks the politicians are bricklayers, carpenters, plumbers, etc.—in short, that Governments DO build houses. Which is just plain hooey, of course. This propaganda is simply put over to represent the Government as a fairy godmother, who must look after the foolish little children. It is a confidence story de-luxe. If the people get enough MONEY they will build their OWN houses, and make their OWN adjustments in the post-war period.

"COUNTERFEITING": The Melbourne "Herald" of October 20 reports the so-called "Sound" Finance League as now admitting that banks create credit: "The trading banks have expanded credit; they have taken up £28 million in Treasury Bills and £35M in Government Securities, but their advances (overdrafts) have been reduced by £37M., leaving the net credit expansion at £26 millions." Since the "Sound" Finance League is the mouthpiece of the bankers, this may be regarded as a public admission of counterfeiting, because this credit expansion (cheque money) serves as an equivalent for legal tender (Government money). There is a penalty of 15 years "hard labour" for counterfeiting.

"CONFIDENCE": Under this heading the London "Financial Times" says: "For weeks past Australian banks have been in the financial refrigerator, but by degrees investors are gaining confidence, and are looking with kindlier eyes on Australian securities." It is to be hoped that Australian citizens will not look with kindlier eyes on overseas "investors" obtaining further securities (pawntickets) over Australia's assets.

"U.S. ELECTIONS": Two curious New York press comments appeared in our dailies: Firstly, Mr. Willkie's coming clash with President Roosevelt may result in a demand by the latter for the management of the Peace Conference. The second comment was that "unless the Democratic Party repudiates the socialistic wing now in possession of the Party, a Republican landslide would seem inevitable." (It is pleasing to note there is an active section alive to the evils of bankerism, alias socialism.)

"ALIEN REFUGEES": The Melbourne "Sun" of November 5 reports that the West Australian State Government favours the establishment of a Jewish, settlement in West Australia after the war, and that a committee at the Melbourne University, consisting of "leading" citizens, will assist the project. A curious aspect of alien settlement proposals is that sponsors of such projects apparently ignore the plight of our own nationals. For example, the wheat-farmers and other primary producers of Western Australia—and other parts of Australia—receive no such consideration from such sponsors.

"TALKING OF TANKS": The evening press of October 17 quoted a Russian Major-General thus: "General Grant tanks are out-ranked by Soviet and British tanks of similar size, and they burn like torches." He pointed out, however, that they were "very comfortable and very handsome." Well, that's something in their favour, anyhow. Perhaps they might be useful for the Collins-street spruikers, if the war urgency does not require them (the tanks, of course) to be melted down to make new and better tanks—which is not the case, judging by the idle tanks that some youngsters thought were defending the banks' premises in Collins-street.

"RUSSIAN DIET": An item in the daily press says: "The Russian soldiers seldom miss their meals, even during the heaviest engagement." The report also claimed that the Red Army gets three hot meals a day, whilst the Germans only get one. This sounds like a clumsy piece of well-meaning propaganda on the part of the press scribe, because, if the recent German effort in Russia was obtained on one hot meal a day, what would have happened if they, too, had been given three hot meals a day?

—O.B.H.

## ADOLF HITLER A JEW?

By ERIC D. BUTLER

**One of the great enigmas of contemporary history has been the relative lack of knowledge about Hitler's birth and early background. His attitude towards the Jews was, until the last few years, taken at its "face value."**

Douglas Read is most emphatic about the Jews in Germany in his book, "A Prophet At Home."

I should like anybody with a memory to bear these titles in mind ("The Extermination of the Jews in Germany") and recall them when this war is over, he will find that the Jews in Germany have neither been annihilated or exterminated, but that the majority of them are still there, trading and practicing, and I shall be glad in about five years from now, if anybody is still interested, to substantiate this statement with chapter and verse.

These and many other facts started closer investigation into Hitler's own ancestry, and certain facts of a strange nature were brought to light. Investigators stated, that like many other prominent men inside the Nazi machine, Hitler was of Jewish origin himself. This did not surprise me. Thysden, one of the big German industrialists who backed Hitler in his climb to power, and who was forced to flee from Germany upon the outbreak of war, dealt with the matter in one of the most astonishing books of modern times: "I Paid Hitler." Thysden should know: I will quote in full:

"It is in any case, difficult for any foreigner to understand Adolf Hitler's character. Sometimes, indeed, his intelligence is astonishing. The peasant's son (for such at least he pretends to be) often exhibits miraculous political intuition, devoid of all moral sense, but extraordinarily precise. Even in a very complex situation he discerns what is possible, and what is not. It is hard to believe that the scion of an Austrian peasant family should be endowed with so much intelligence. One is less puzzled, when one discovers an important gap in Hitler's ancestral line.

According to the published records, Hitler's grandmother had an illegitimate son, and this son was to become the father of Germany's present leader. But an inquiry once ordered by the late Austrian Chancellor, Engelbert Dollfuss, yielded some interesting results, owing to the fact that the dossiers of the police department of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy were remark-

Viennese family. For this reason she was sent back to her home in the country. And the family, in which the unfortunate country girl (afterwards Frau Schickelgruber) was serving, was none other than that of Baron Rothschild. This circumstance throws a new light on the story. The Rothschilds, who in the course of a century had risen from nothing to the position of one of Europe's great families, certainly did not lack a prescient intelligence—at least not in business! And it is this very type of intelligence that Hitler has been shown to possess in politics. Moreover, this presumed Jewish ancestry of Hitler might also give us a psycho-analytical explanation of his anti-Semitism. By persecuting the Jews, the psycho-analysts would say, Hitler is trying to cleanse himself of his Jewish taint.

"However this may be, Dollfuss prepared a document in which all these facts were established. After his assassination his successor, Dr. Schuschnigg, took possession of the document. Through his spies, Hitler was informed of this compromising inquiry. When he asked the Austrian Chancellor to come to Berchtesgaden, in February, 1938, he intended to get possession of the document. In order to get hold of it, he began by ordering the arrest of Countess Fugger, Chancellor Schuschnigg's friend, who later — after he was taken prisoner by the Gestapo—became his wife. The compromising document was then given to Baron von Ketteler, the secretary of the Fuhrer's Ambassador in Vienna, Herr von Papen. It is quite possible that Papen took care to have the incriminating papers photographed before having them carried to Berlin by Ketteler. It is clear that in these circumstances the unfortunate Schuschnigg, faced by his terrible adversary at Berchtesgaden, was deprived of his one weapon against him—the threat to publish the Dollfuss document, which would have revealed Hitler's true origin to the world.

"Incidentally a copy of the document in question is said to be now in the hands of the British Secret Service. At any rate,



**THESE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS**

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

Sir,—Many people are in doubt regarding the necessity for the proposed amendments to the Commonwealth Constitution or the likelihood of their proving beneficial, and in my view there is good reason for this doubt. Hitherto, I have had faith in Dr. Evatt, and I hope this faith has not been misplaced, but I must confess that there is a lot about the Constitutional Amendment Proposals I do, not understand.

Because of this lack of understanding I find myself full of doubts about the proposals themselves and suspecting the motives of those who have put them forward; consequently I cannot recommend them for acceptance in the present form.

The position as I see it is simple. Australia is a Democracy or is it not a Democracy. If Australia IS a democracy, then we are governing ourselves and getting the things we want; but if we are getting the things we do not want then we are not governing ourselves, and Australia is not a Democracy. The things we want are economic security, freedom to exercise our own initiative, freedom from debt and taxes, social justice and peace; but the things some people are getting are poverty, unemployment, disease, debt, higher taxes, higher living costs and war. It is therefore obvious that these conditions are being imposed upon us against our wish, and that we are the victims of a dictatorship. This dictatorship is exercised through FINANCE, and the instrument through which Governments are controlled is the BUDGET. Budgets are prepared in the Treasury according to the prevailing financial conditions, and financial conditions are determined by monetary policy. The PEOPLE are not consulted. Here is a significant quotation from the Melbourne "Argus" from 7th November.

"Mr. Chifley is that strange phenomenon of a politician who shuns publicity. Incredible as it may seem, he doesn't want to see his name in the newspapers. There are, of course, occasions when he has to submit, but he does so out of a sense of duty. Associated with the Treasury is an efficient loan publicity organisation, which insists from time to time on dragging the reluctant Treasurer into the limelight. Then we see pictorial representations of a Lincoln like figure advising Mr. and Mrs. So-and-so what to do with their surplus."

The point is that things not wanted by the community have been imposed upon it through financial policy, and this has come about because financial

policy has been formulated and implemented by private institutions to suit private interests. Unless my reasoning is at fault, the obvious way to give the people what they do want instead of the conditions they do NOT want is to reverse the method of formulating and implementing financial policy. By this I mean that whereas the present policy is designed to provide benefits for the financial institutions in the form of interest payments on privately-created money, we should reverse the policy so that it will provide benefits for all members of the community in the form of publicly-created money available for Government use without debt or interest, thus enabling the distribution of purchasing-power equal to the full consuming-capacity of the nation without increasing debt and taxes. In other words, money would be produced and used as a medium for facilitating the exchange of goods and services, and not as the commodity controlling all other commodities.

The plain fact is that it is already physically possible to give all families a higher standard of living, to heal the sick to a far greater extent than is now being done, to release every man and woman from mental anxiety regarding the means of subsistence in the evening-time of their lives, to reduce the working week to 30 hours, to raise the school-leaving age to 18 years, to provide every family with an adequate and comfortable home, and, in fact, to do anything that a civilised community desires to have done. The only thing standing in the way of the accomplishment of these desirable things is the financial system, under which the public credit is manipulated by a private monopoly. This is a fact, not an opinion; and yet the proposals put forward by Dr. Evatt for the amendment of the Commonwealth Constitution make no reference whatever to this aspect of the matter. Why? If existing financial methods are continued the Constitution alterations would be no more effective than the present provisions. — Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, 8th November, 1942.

(To be continued.)

**THE VIEWS OF M.H.R. FOR FLINDERS**

Hereunder we publish a letter to one of his electors from the M.H.R. for Flinders (Vic.)—Col. E. S. Ryan, C.M.G., D.S.O. This revealing letter shows an attitude that is more democratic than that of most politicians, and in the last paragraph it seems to indicate that if the RESULTS required by the electors of Flinders are NOT being demanded in Parliament, then the fault is not Col. Ryan's, but the fault of the electors themselves, because they have apathetically neglected to inform him of those requirements by individual letters.

When a sufficient number of the electors of Flinders shake off their political apathy, and UNITE, on a non-party basis, in demanding those results which would benefit all of them (not abstract "labels" or party catch-cries), they will really start to "get somewhere." We commend to them, as a slogan, the main front-page heading of our first issue: "Don't Blame Your M.P.—Tell Him!" We . . . but this introduction threaten to expand into an editorial!

Col. Ryan's letter, written from Berwick on September 8 was addressed to Mr. W. C. Wilson, of James-street, Dandenong. It reads as follows:

Dear Sir,—I would like to assure you that I am giving very considerable attention to the matters mentioned in your letter to me of 29th August.

Like yourself, I am entirely opposed to anything approaching socialisation of this country. I am a firm believer in the principle of individual initiative, and I am convinced, from what I know of our people, that the great majority are of that opinion. I am, therefore, resisting, and will continue to resist, such things as over-centralisation of control, compulsory unionism, and abolition of State Parliaments.

I believe, at the same time, that it is necessary for the Commonwealth Govern-

ment, during the critical times through which we are passing, to assume a greater control over affairs than would be the case in peace. This, I think, is essential in order to obtain uniformity and intensity of effort throughout Australia, but this should not mean, in my opinion, that the Government should intervene in local or State matters unless it is forced by events to do so.

I have also noted what you say in regard to the arrest of individuals after acquittal by the courts, and would add that I am in general agreement with your views.

In conclusion, I would like to thank you for the expression of your views. I can assure you that the expression of views is a real help to me, and that it is not often that people take the trouble to write. I imagine that they expect their Member to work them out for himself.—Yours faithfully, R. S. RYAN.

**YOUNG CHILDREN AND THE WAR**

So much emphasis is being placed upon the war effort that even mothers of young children are leaving them at clinics and crèches while they spend the day working in factories. Thousands of young mothers are doing this in England, and there is every intention of adopting the same system in Australia.

It now transpires that the results, for the children, are most unhappy—that young children do not thrive away from the affection that only a mother can give. The following cable from London bears this out:

"Hundreds of nurseries have sprung up in Britain for the care of evacuated babies and children, but it would be better to divert the large army which staffs nurseries to factories and return the mothers to their true job. This is the view of Dr. Bakwin in the current British Medical Journal. He is a psychologist, qualified by years of experience in American hospitals."

"Twenty-five years ago infant mortality in foundling institutes was nearly 100 per cent. Later, adoption of the Fosterhouse system lowered this rate. But the failure of the children to do well in the hospital remained a mystery and a grave problem.

Despite all hygienic care, the infants remained obstinately ill and sleepless. Emotionally dull in response to friendly gestures, they remained obdurately apathetic. Some pined away.

"Dr. Bakwin hit upon the idea of returning the more desperate cases to their homes. Miraculously they got well, despite the unhygienic and poor conditions. After that the nurses were encouraged to fondle and play with the infants, and the mortality rate, which, logically, should have risen, fell sharply.

"This is confirmed by Anna Freud, who is in England. This psychologist daughter of the famous Dr. Freud, unlike her father, insists on the value of a mother's individual attention and love to an infant, especially from birth to five years.—"New Era."

**M.P.'s SHOULD NOT JOIN THE FORCES**

By ERIC D. BUTLER

Considerable publicity has been given to the recent controversy between Mr. Falstein M.H.R., who is also a member of the R.A.A.F., and Air Force officials. The whole incident has been most regrettable, mainly because certain fundamental principles of democratic organisation have been neglected.

Representative democracy cannot function if the paid representatives of the people in the armed forces however laudable such a step may be. Furthermore, the fact that a Member of Parliament is a member of the Armed Forces can produce a ridiculous and dangerous situation, as witnessed by the Falstein case.

Democratic organisation is divided into two important but fundamentally different parts—policy and administration. I have dealt with this matter time and time again in the past, but I make no apologies for returning to it. It is a life-and-death matter. This war is going to decide whether the people are going to frame their own policies, demand what they want, or whether they are going to have even less say than they are having now. Policy, the results required by the people, must be decided by the people. Their representatives should only exist for the purpose of finding out what their electors want and seeing that all unnecessary difficulties constraining administrative experts are removed. Now, while policy (i.e. what the people want) must be democratic, administration, (i.e. the methods by which the results required are obtained) must in each case be left in the hands of an expert, who must make his own decisions as to how he will achieve results. He is a dictator on methods. Let us now consider the conduct of this war.

It can be truthfully said that the majority of the Australian people are in favour of winning this war; that is their policy. We have military experts whose sole job it is to obtain the people's policy, subject to supervisory control only by the people's representatives. These experts have decided that, to obtain results, they must have certain discipline, that certain men must be given responsibility to give orders and the power to see that they are carried out. The communist idea of running an Army by committee control is absurd nonsense. Now, when the ordinary man joins the Forces, he understands that a certain discipline is necessary, and that superior officers are meant to give orders. Should he feel that he has been treated wrongly, there are protective military channels available to him through which to make his complaint. He can even take a case right through to the Governor General in Council. Mr. Falstein has this, but he preferred to use his Parliamentary privilege to make a bitter attack on Air Force officials. Many senior members of the Air Force feel that if particular airmen are able to make derogatory statements in public, morale will be affected.

If a Member of Parliament is doing his real job, he will be very busy in keeping in touch with his electors and ascertaining whether they are satisfied with the results being achieved by military and other experts; he will be seeing that no difficulties are being placed in the way of those experts, and that there are no causes for complaint within the Armed Forces. But he cannot be a representative of the people and a member of the Armed Forces at the same time. If all Members joined the forces the people would have no representation of their policy at all. And we would probably see more cases of Members using their privileges to interfere with and oppose military experts thus producing unsavoury incidents, such as we have seen in the Falstein case. If M.P.'s desire to join the Forces, they should resign their seats in order that new representatives can be appointed to see that the policy of the people prevails.

**PLANNERS VERSUS INDIVIDUALISTS**

"The next Liberal split may be between the planners and the individualists. Both sides will be in action at next week's conference of the party at the Caxton Hall, which Sir Archibald Sinclair, the party leader, will attend.

"In a long resolution defining the 'Liberal goal' the executive maintains that the proper function of the State is to insist on the conditions necessary for the free development of individuals, and not to direct the whole economic and cultural life of the nation.

"In an even longer amendment, Mr. Clement Davies, M.P., will call for economic planning under a Minister with an economic general staff.

"Another amendment in the name of Capt. George Grey, M.P., asks for planning—but planning for consumption, not production. The . . . will come on the discussion on freedom . . . with Mr. T. L. . . . M.P. . . . the planners."

—Peter— in The Daily Telegraph, London, August 26.

**PRIMARY PRODUCERS BEING CHEATED**

Throughout Australia primary producers are appalled at the raw deal they are receiving at the hands of the Canberra Bureaucrats. Whatever primary commodity the Government has attempted to control—potatoes, onions, prunes, oranges, carrots, etc.—the result has been disastrous.

Prices have been fixed on a scale that robs the producer of a fair price, and by discouraging production denies the consumer of his supply.

"The primary producer is being cheated out of his very modest income by the freezing of his crops and unjust and callous price-fixing," said the chairman of the local War Agricultural Committee, Mr. W. H. Spinks, at a meeting at Windsor (N.S.W.). The recent order to orchardists to supply citrus fruit for juice purposes at £15 a ton for oranges and £13/10/- for lemons, was not only breaking the morale of the producer, but killing his incentive to make a maximum war effort, he said. The consequence could only be lost production.

The public seemed to think that primary producers were making a rake-off because of the high retail prices, Mr. Spinks said but it was not the farmer who was benefiting by the prices.

The confiscatory methods of the Department of Supply in regard to both fruit and vegetables were deserving of censure, as well as its policy of fixing vegetable contract prices on a basis below production costs. All these prices should be reviewed immediately, and adjustments made where they were too low. The increased costs of all materials used in the production of primary foods, the loss of efficient labour

restricted transport, difficulty of obtaining materials for combating diseases and pests, and numerous other disadvantages, should eliminate the averaging methods of arriving at price fixation, said Mr. Spinks. As it was not feasible or possible to apply this system with justice to contract production under the existing conditions, the agricultural industries should be placed on an equal footing with all other industries.

The plea of financial inability to remunerate sufficiently the farmers could not be accepted, because it was a myth. Every rural worker should be paid as liberally as his fellows working in munition and other essential work. To enable him to pay a just wage, the farmer must receive adequate prices for his products, concluded Mr. Spinks.— ("New Era.")

**JOHN BULL'S RECORD**

Commenting on the tactless remarks of some U.S. writers, regarding Britain's war effort and Empire policy, the "Christian Science Monitor" reminds U.S. of their own unsolved problems in Alaska and Puerto-Rica, and says: "A little study of history here would evoke a livelier appreciation of the liberal concepts of law and order established around the globe by John Bull."

Your VICTORY SUIT Hand- Tailored to Order		All Wool Worsteds  from <b>7/7/-</b> (30 Coupons)
ELIZABETH HOUSE, 2nd Floor. <b>340 LITTLE COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE</b> Phone: M. 5177		
"For COMFORT and EASE: FRANK DEVLIN PLEASE!"		

## NOTES ON STATUTES OF WESTMINSTER

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

**THE PREAMBLE:** (1) Lays down the principle that as the Crown is the symbol of the free association of the British Commonwealth of Nations, any alteration in the law touching the succession to the throne requires the consent of all the members. (2) Provides that laws passed by the United Kingdom shall not extend to other members of the British Commonwealth of Nations except by the consent of those members. (NOTE: Menzies stated in 1931 that whether there was legislative force in this preamble or not, there was completely binding constitutional force in it. Baldwin had to obtain the consent of the other members of the British Commonwealth of Nations before he could compel Edward VIII. to abdicate.)

**SECTION 1:** Members of the British Commonwealth of Nations are Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Irish Free State and Newfoundland.

**SECTIONS 2 to 6** Apply automatically to Canada, South Africa and the Irish Free State, but do not apply to Australia, New Zealand or Newfoundland unless adopted by their Parliaments. They may be revoked by the Parliaments in question after they have been adopted (Section 10).

**SECTION 2:** The Colonial Laws Validity Act 1865 (Section 2)—which provides that a Colonial Statute repugnant to the terms of any Imperial Statute applying to that Colony shall be null and void—shall no longer apply.

**SECTION 3:** Members of the British Commonwealth of Nations are given power to make laws having extra-territorial operation. (No one seems to be quite certain as to what the last three words may or may not include. It is possible that they may give the right to make treaties with, or grant concessions to, foreign nations independently of the United Kingdom. It is probably because of the powers

given by this Section, that the Curtin Administration have adopted the Statute in the midst of a World War.)

**SECTION 4:** Merely gives legislative power to the second portion of the Preamble.

**SECTION 5:** Abolishes the power of veto given by the Merchant Shipping Act 1894 (Sections 735 and 736) to the Imperial Government on Navigation and Shipping Laws passed by any member of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

**SECTION 6:** Abolishes the right of the British Admiralty to set up their own courts in nations which are members of the British Commonwealth of Nations or to suspend any Colonial Court of Admiralty. (This Section apparently throws the duty of defending their own coasts and territorial waters upon the member nations, and may have been the reason why the Statute was not adopted in 1931.)

**SECTION 7:** Applies only to Canada.

**SECTION 8:** Forbids Australia or New Zealand to repeal or alter their Constitutions otherwise than in accordance with existing law. (This is why the Curtin Administration has to appeal to the people by Referendum to give them certain powers not given by the Constitution. They cannot confer those powers on themselves by Regulation under the National Security Act.)

**SECTION 9:** Preserves the rights of the States in Australia as against the Commonwealth, and provides for the operation of any Imperial Law with respect to any matter within the authority of the States of Australia. (This apparently safeguards the rights of any Imperial Company operating in the States by State Law or by Imperial Charter—i.e., Van Diemens Land Co., South Aus. Land Co., and certain Imperial Banking Companies and Insurance Companies.)

**SECTION 10:** Deals with the voluntary adoption of Sections Nos. 2 to 6.

## THE WORK AND EXPORT MANIAS

Recent articles and correspondence in "The Times" (London), on post-war planning have made it clear, to quote one correspondent, "that expansion of consumption is the main post-war problem."

This is a remarkable conclusion, considering all the energy that has been expended in impressing of the people of Britain how poor we shall all be after the war! But it seems that the consumable goods are not to be consumed by those who are threatened with poverty, but to be exported in the traditional way for the benefit of primitive peoples specially educated to consume them, in order that the industrial poor may get the benefit of the WORK! "The backward communities must be instructed in better modes of life; primitive peoples provide no market either for themselves or for

other communities. Attention might be called to what Great Britain is doing along the lines of community education in her colonies, as it is an important contribution to the solution of the world problem of consumption. The colonial peoples are being systematically educated in such things as the improvement of housing, sanitation, hygiene, foodstuffs, local industries, and in marketing. . . . It is suggested that this British policy might be followed with advantage in all backward countries as a means of extrating world consumption."

By ignoring the real markets existing internally in the great industrial countries in favour of "educating" natives into buying things they don't want, not only is "inexorable economic law" (that you must be employed before you may eat) upheld in the home country, but its rule is extended.

## "Four Freedoms": Are They Enough?

(Continued from Page 1.)

ant of this world he lives in if he thinks that any person who works in a factory or an office eight hours a day for ten, twenty or thirty years can be anything else than culturally warped, mentally dead, and physically decrepit. If you don't believe me, stand on the post office steps in any large town and watch the people go by; look carefully at all those over thirty. You will be shocked and surprised; you will be horrified. There you will see printed large upon the faces of the people the marks of this so-called civilisation. If there is any word written across the faces of these people it is the word "CHEATED."

These people have been cheated; they are not healthy people; they have been young once, "but now they are old—old at thirty—they have been broken, and they no longer resist. Some of them might have tried to think once or twice when they were young, but it probably got them into trouble, and they gave it up as unprofitable. Others found that thinking made them discontented with their lot, so they flung thought overboard, turned on the wireless, and had a drink of beer.

I protest emphatically that you can't send a man into an office or factory for life at a monotonous job in which he cannot, after five years, have the slightest interest, and expect that man to remain sane, happy and healthy. What is the use of talking about Freedom of Speech, Religious Freedom, Freedom from Want and Freedom from Fear, if a man, as most men are, is condemned to be a wage-slave for life; condemned to be in the one spot during the best hours of each day and the best years of his life, doing something that you wouldn't make a person do unless by violence and fear of death.

Even if a man is an enthusiastic engineer, doctor or scientist, to keep him on a specialised job for twenty or thirty years without a break is merely cruelty to a dumb animal. For the sake of his friends, his family and the community, he ought to be saved from himself, otherwise he must become twisted and warped and narrow, and therefore a danger to the community. There is no more pathetic sight than a highly-trained specialist who is as ignorant as a babe in everything but his own tiny — of activity. It is no argument to

say you cannot force such men out of their grooves; of course you can't. They would probably die of fright if they had to change out of it after twenty years—it is probably too late then.

Why can't we break down all this hypocrisy about the four freedoms and realise and talk about the freedom ordinary men and women want? Here we are in this twentieth century with the machinery and the knowledge and skill to produce abundance of everything the ordinary man and woman wants, and practically every statesman is talking about the problem of making work for us after the war. I don't want any man to make work for me: I have been working hard ever since I left school; and as I grow older my work gets harder and my pay buys less with the passing years. I don't want more work; I want a rest for a while. I want time to think; time to fill my lungs with fresh air; time to do real work, a man's work, and do away with this time-serving, superannuated footing in factories and offices.

Physical jerks and a few vitamins won't make healthy men and women of wage-slaves. What they want is a belief that they are on the march to somewhere; that however uncertain the future is, honest toil will bring an honest reward; they don't want a certainty, but they do want a sporting chance. And the ordinary man and woman is not getting a sporting chance. That's what kills him (or her).

We were told that the last war would end all wars, but it didn't. We were told that the vote would bring justice to the ordinary man and woman, but it didn't. We were told that science and invention would give men more freedom and make life less irksome, but it hasn't. The men who left Europe to pioneer the new countries thought they would get away from outworn ideas, intolerance and privileges and vested interests—they didn't. Those of us who thought that Reason would conquer over ignorance have been sadly disappointed. In the last 25 years we have seen in action what can only be described as the technique of frustration.

If you take an animal and stop it doing everything it wants to do, make its every adventure a failure, allow it to do every-

(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.

Durant's eye-witness report on his return heightened my expectancy. He had been not only in the capital and in Leningrad but in Soviet Karelia. Everywhere he found the reigning proletariat joyous, enthusiastic, perhaps a little bewildered by its unaccustomed, glory and freedom, but adjusting itself to its new dignity. I recall his description of the anniversary demonstration on Red Square as Ernestine Evans, Billy, and several others of us drank Chianti at a little Italian restaurant in Greenwich Village. Through his eyes we saw the Caucasian horsemen dashing across the square, the massed banners, the flood of exultant workers, and our own romantic and too-willing imaginations added high colours to the recital. He told a few touching homely anecdotes of lowly peasants and workmen whose, eyes were still blinded by the incandescence of the revolution.

"God! Those are the things I want to write when I get there!" I exclaimed. "How do the other correspondents fail to report such things? They're worth tons of statistics!"

If anyone ever went to the Soviet realm with a deep and earnest determination to understand the revolution, to slough off petty detail and dig down to the hard, enduring core of a great event in human history, it was the newly-appointed United Press correspondent. My problem, I felt, would be to tone down the rhapsody to the humdrum level of American journalism. I was not deserting the direct service of the cause for the flesh-pots of capitalism. (The United Press, as a matter of fact, was paying me only a few dollars more than Tass.) I was accepting, rather, a post of immense strategic importance in the further service of that cause, and doing so with the wholehearted agreement and understanding of my chiefs in Tass and, therefore, presumably of the Soviet Foreign Office.

If I was aware of a congenital ineptitude for fanaticism it was a secret and guilty awareness. I reckoned it a serious flaw in my nature, a lurking enemy who must be shown no indulgences. Mine are the faults. I explained to myself, of a too idealistic

### OUR RUDE ANCESTORS

"We are apt to talk in a very unceremonious style of our rude ancestors, of their gross habits, their want of delicacy in their language. No man shall ever make me believe that those who reared the Cathedral of Ely (which I saw the other day) were rude, either in their manners, or in their minds and words. No man shall make me believe that our ancestors were a rude and beggarly race when I read in an Act of Parliament passed in the reign of Edward the Fourth, regulating the dresses of the different ranks of the people, and forbidding the labourers to wear coats of cloth that cost more than two shillings a yard (equal to forty shillings of our present money), and forbidding their wives and daughters to wear sashes or girdles trimmed with gold or silver. No man shall make me believe that this was a rude and beggarly race compared with those who now shirk about in canvas frocks and rotten cottons."

—Advice to Young Men (written more than 100 years ago), by William Cobbett.

### "PUBLIC" OR PRIVATE OWNERSHIP?

**We are constantly hearing of the conflict between private property and public ownership. There is no such conflict, because there is no such thing as public ownership. It is simply a device to expropriate the individual.**

It is possible to have successive use of a toothbrush by a large number of persons, and most people would agree that the attraction or value of the toothbrush would not thereby be enhanced. That is not an exceptional case. The exclusive use of property at will is not something which has a value which is increased by sharing—on the contrary, it disappears. A right-of-way may be a necessary arrangement in our present rudimentary stage of development,

but its effect on the land over which it passes is invariably, not merely to decrease its money value which is a matter of most importance, but to reduce its real value out of all proportion to the amount of land subject to it.

The use of property is an externalisation of the user. So far from the continual encroachment on the inviolability of property rights being an index of progress, it is the root cause of insecurity. Its philosophical basis is Judaism.

The problem of the immediate future is to render property rights absolute. Rights, a pure delusion fostered for interested purposes and arising out of the finance system that it is impossible to endow more than a small number of the population with a reasonable and increasing amount of property. Had one-tenth of the effort which has been devoted to attacking property (of which the present war is the largest scale effort so far) been applied in increasing it, the "property" problem would have disappeared centuries ago.

The first stage to a better world is to stop using words, which have no meaning such as "the public". We're not fighting the Germans, you know—just Germany.

—"Social Crediter," August 19—

Printed by M. F. Canavan 25 Cullinton road, Cambelltown—for the "New Times Ltd. McEwan House