

## ON OTHER PAGES:

POLITICAL ERUPTION  
AFTER WAR? (Page 2)  
ABERHART ON AGRICULTURE.  
(Page 2)  
MR. EDEN'S AMAZING  
STATEMENT (Page 3)  
WISDOM FROM "THE  
WATCHMAN"! (Page 4)

# NEW TIMES

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).

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for  
Vol. 8. No. 47. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, NOV. 27, 1942. transmission by post as a newspaper.

## Criticism Of The Constitution Proposals

### Speech by Mr. L. H. Hollins, M.L.A.

In the course of his speech at the joint meeting of members of the Victorian Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly, held in Melbourne on November 10 and 11, to discuss the proposed alterations to the Commonwealth Constitution, Mr. L. H. Hollins (Independent M.L.A. for Hawthorn) said:—

The proposed alterations in the Constitution are ostensibly designed to give the Commonwealth Government sufficient power to cope with the important problems of post-war reconstruction. At the same time, the suggestion that there should be incorporated in the Constitution what is tantamount to a political speech relating to temporary affairs, is extraordinary. It must be remembered that the Constitution, if amended in such a manner, would operate for an indefinite period. In his explanatory speech the Commonwealth Attorney-General, Dr. Evatt, placed special emphasis on the problems of unemployment, housing, health, child welfare, vocational training, markets, prices, and certain other matters. While all those questions are of tremendous importance, it is significant that every one now comes within the province of the State Parliaments.

As to the suggestion that these problems cannot be solved under existing Commonwealth power, I would say that the Commonwealth Government has all the power it needs in the directions indicated, or it could deal with the questions in such a manner as would allow the State Parliaments to cope with the situation. The fact is that there are embodied in the Commonwealth Constitution powers that are not being exercised. We cannot deny that the whole programme laid down in the proposed alteration of the Constitution is impressive, yet I fear there is a nigger in the wood pile. There is something fundamentally wrong with the whole thing. If it be true, as I contend, that the Commonwealth Government possesses adequate powers to deal with these problems now, then why should it suggest at this time an alteration of the Constitution? The problem that concerns me, as well as hundreds of thousands of people throughout Australia, is that the power which controls everything—money—has not been mentioned. There is not one suggestion throughout the whole of the constitutional proposals that has any reference to money.

Mr. Barry—Do you think the Commonwealth Government has not thought about it?

Mr. Hollins—It has thought about money, but it is not mentioned in the proposals, and I want to know why.

Part V. of the Constitution Act relates to the powers of The Parliament. Section 51 sets out that the Parliament shall have power to make laws in respect of various subjects, among which is paragraph xiii.: "Banking, other than State banking; also

State banking extending beyond the limits of the State concerned, the incorporation of banks, and the issue of paper money." That paragraph gives the Commonwealth Government all the power it requires to meet the situation.

The details of the suggested alterations to the Constitution are set out in a series of paragraphs in sub-section (2) of the proposed new section embraced in the Bill, and I shall show that every one of those proposals could be effectively dealt with if the Government had control of finance. For instance, let us consider the subject in paragraph (a) concerning which the Commonwealth Parliament is to have power to make laws for "the reinstatement and advancement of those who have been members of the fighting services of the Commonwealth during the war and of the dependents of such members who have died or been disabled as a consequence of the war."

It is perfectly obvious that employment cannot be guaranteed to any of the demobilised men and women, or any of the munition workers, after they have left the war industries, unless money is made available either to the State, private enterprise, or the Commonwealth to be used either for public works or for payments to be made directly by the Government. Why must money be made available? It is not that the persons concerned may get work, but that they may be able to make effective demands on industry. That is the purpose of making available the money of which we talk. Work is not made available because people want work; it is that they may have incomes. Incomes are required for effective demands on industry. Therefore the essential problem is one of money, and the Commonwealth Government within the framework of its Constitution has all the powers necessary to provide satisfactory employment or satisfactory incomes, whichever way we like to put it.

The next paragraph reads—" (a) employment, including the transfer of workers from war-time industries." The answer that I have just given covers that proposal, because it is essentially a matter of making incomes available to persons who have been taken out of the war industries and the fighting services.

The next paragraph is—" (c) the development of the country and the expansion of production and markets." I cannot say what is meant by the word "country." Eminent legal members of this gathering have drawn our attention to the way in which this paragraph is worded. It prob-

ably means the whole of Australia, and I shall read it that it does so. There again is the problem of money. What is required to develop industry or to develop the country? We have the man power, the materials, and the resources necessary to develop the country, and the only thing needed once again is money.

Under the Commonwealth Constitution the Commonwealth Government could deal with the matters set out in paragraph (c). What is meant by the expansion of production and of markets? If we increase production, and the orthodox economist is right, that must automatically increase the incomes of the public to a figure sufficient to buy the increased production. The fact is, however, that all the increased production cannot be bought by the increased incomes. Therefore, we try to solve marketing problems by finding markets overseas, but that is ridiculous, because every nation is endeavouring to do the same thing at the same time. In that way international antagonisms are developed and wars occur. If we have not the money in the Commonwealth to develop our industries and markets we shall head for another war if we try to force the goods we cannot buy on other nations.

We must have enough money in circulation in Australia to buy the whole of our production, whether we want it or not. If there is a surplus of production which we do not want, we should be

free to exchange it for the surplus production of other nations. That means that when we bring their surplus production back here the Australian people will have sufficient money with which to buy the imported goods. Our people must have sufficient money to buy the whole of their production whether or not they want it. In my opinion, if finance were made available private enterprise could deal with the matter of production. Representatives of labour are not concerned about who produces the goods required; all they are concerned about is being able to buy the goods; or, in other words, having the money in their pockets. No inquiry is made whether the State or private enterprise produces the goods.

The next subject set out in the Bill is paragraph (d) — "the production and manufacture of goods and the supply of goods and services, and the establishment and development of industries." If that paragraph means anything it means that when the Constitution has been amended the Labor Government will have power to implement its policy to effect the socialisation of industry, production and distribution. Any kind of industry will come in under that paragraph. However, there will be no need to socialise industry if we can make it possible for the people to buy

(Continued on page 4)

## NOTES ON THE NEWS

The British Under-Secretary, Mr. Law, indicates one reason for Russia's remarkable resistance by supplying the following details of British aid to Russia. During the past 12 months they received the following: "3052 planes, 4084 tanks, 30,000 vehicles, 831,000 machine tools, 42,000 tons of aviation spirit, and 66,000 tons of fuel oil." This, of course, is only a fraction of British workers' (not politicians' or economists') production that has enabled the Russian soldiers to hold the Nazis.

**FOOD BOARDS:** Although the Apple and Pear Board has been suspended in all but two States, another super-Board (alias "Directorate") is being set up to centralise the control of food production. In this connection the following significant comment appeared in the daily press. "It was learned [source unstated] that the Directorate in all probability will become a permanent feature of the Australian economy." It is just another illustration of socialistic bureaucracy being fastened on the people under cover of war. The time is overdue for the "Electoral Campaign" to swing into action to eliminate all these unnecessary food-controlling bodies.

**FARMERS ACT:** Some Tasmanian farmers are evidently "fed-up" with the regimenting control and muddle of Boards. Mount Pleasant and York Plains farmers have refused to sign contracts with the Government. They decided to grow whatever crops the Government desired, provided they had suitable land and were supplied with fertilisers at the growers' cost. It is pleasing to note that these practical men will no longer tolerate theoretical planners retarding their vital efforts by giving foolish direction on matters which they do not understand.

**BRITISH DECADENCE:** A fitting answer to anti-Britishers' accusations of British decadence was recently given by Lord Croft: "This 'dying' race had a finer system of justice, and greater social services than any other land. Let us abandon our inferiority complex and realise that what we defend is as sound as anything yet discovered." This, of course, does not mean that our system cannot be improved; but no other country has any right to criticise it until they can offer something better, which precludes all foreign criticism, for the present.

**AUSTERITY CAKES:** Following the edict of Mr. Dedman insisting on a dismal Xmas, Mr. Staff, secretary of the Pastry Cooks' Association, says that as cakes are not permitted to be ornamented, "thousands of pounds worth of sugar plaques, flowers and bells already in stock will be wasted." Our soldiers' morale will not be stimulated by unnecessarily preventing their children from enjoying a little brightness whilst their fathers are defeating the external threat to our way of life.

**SKELETONS:** The A.L.P. Federal Conference produced a very bony skeleton in the form of a resolution from South Australian delegates urging the use of national credit as an alternative to interest-bearing loans for war finance. The Melbourne "Sun," of November 18, reported that this motion was incorporated with other financial measures—and put back in

the cupboard. The "Herald," of the previous evening, commenting on this motion, said that "the full weight of the Curtin Government would be opposed to it." The bankers have powerful friends controlling the daily press and the political parties.

**GOOD OMENS:** The position in New Guinea appears to be very much improved. The most encouraging sign that control of the situation is almost complete is contained in the official news release that "General MacArthur and General Blarney are now on the spot directing operations."

**FEDERAL UNION:** The Melbourne "Sun," of November 19, reports that U.S. is badly shocked at Wilkie's reply to Churchill's statement that he had not become the King's first Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. Incidentally, it is also reported that Churchill's speech was well received in U.S. and that many observers believe that powerful groups (international bankers) are attempting to replace British imperialism with American imperialism. Actually these powerful groups are attempting to replace British democracy with world dictatorship. Slowly but surely the Federal Unionists' plot for world-government is becoming unpleasantly obvious.

**OLD AND NEW IDEAS:** Mr. Menzies is in constant trouble squaring his present-day urge for conscription with his earlier opposition to this issue. The Melbourne "Sun," of November 20, reports his "get-out" thus: "The war cannot be won by old theories." Well, well! But, when it comes to applying modern financial ideas to our war effort?? Ah, that's a very different matter! We must not play around with "new fangled ideas." This face-changing caper of politicians is very prominent at the moment. Mr. Curtin is also very adept at it. For example, his former vocal objection to conscription and orthodox finance has now been thrown overboard.

**SOMERSAULTS:** A controversy on Communism in the evening press of October 6 clearly indicated the former attitude of local Communists. The following motion was quoted as being carried at the Women's Congress in Melbourne on March 10, 1940: "The present war is an imperialist war, waged for colonies, markets and raw materials. We condemn the reactionary labor-leaders supporting the war. The Communist "Guardian," of January 17, 1941, was cited as giving advice "to our troops in Libya, telling them the Italian soldier was really a good fellow, and their real enemy was their own officers." It was also stated that 98 per cent of the Russians are not Communists.

—O.B.H.

## Alberta By-Election Result

In September there was a by-election in Alberta, following the death of an independent member in the Provincial Parliament. The by-election was won by a C.C.F. candidate. (C.C.F. stands for Christian Commonwealth Federation.) The Social Credit candidate, who was narrowly defeated, defeated the orthodox political party candidates.

"To-day and To-morrow" (Edmonton) comments on the election as follows:

The C.C.F. have won their first seat in Alberta. After many attempts they finally won with a candidate that has been five times defeated before. The election of Elmer Roper is a very significant feature of the Edmonton by-election.

The outstanding feature of the election, however, is the defeat of the Liberal candidate. This can only be considered as a slap for the Dominion Government. It is indeed astounding that a city with two Liberal M.P.'s at Ottawa only turned out 2838 Liberal votes. The Liberals apparently did not care to support the name "Liberal" in the light of Mackenzie King's failure to give true leadership in our Canadian war policies.

The vote was small—barely over one-third of the number of electors on the voters list. This also is clear confirmation of the little interest taken in the by-election. The small turnout at the meetings of all parties was already an indication of the trend.

The next outstanding feature in the election is the showing of the Social Credit candidate, Mr. Gillies. Despite the ganging up of all the opposition candidates against Mr. Gillies, he, nevertheless, succeeded in

obtaining 4432 first choice votes, only 402 behind the winning candidate, Mr. Roper. Mr. Gillies lost out however in the second choices. The opposition candidates pretty well exchanged their second, third and fourth choices among themselves. An indication of this trend can be seen in the second choices of Major Buchanan's. Mr. Gillies only received 190 second choices out of Major Buchanan's total vote of 2838, a proportion of only 7 per cent. From Paddy Griffin's total vote of 4028 at the time of his elimination, Mr. Gillies again only received 829, a bare 10½ per cent. This ganging up of the opposition finally resulted in the defeat of the government candidate.

The next significant fact is the defeat of the official opposition candidate, Mr. Lymburn, former U.F.A. Attorney-General. His past record as Attorney-General and his present party affiliation did not appeal to the Edmonton electorate.

The nett result of the by-election is: (1) No change in the Government standing; (2) the loss of one seat for the official Independent party; (3) the admission of a new party in the assembly; (4) the rejection of an official Liberal candidate in a recognised Liberal constituency.



## SUBTLE MENACE TO CLEAR THINKING

We offer no apologies for devoting so much of our very limited space to the article reprinted hereunder. It has more than academic interest. Indeed, its practical importance cannot be exaggerated—much more than clear thinking is ultimately at stake (e.g., individual security and freedom, and the Christian and British ways of life). We hope that our readers will study it very closely. It appeared in the "Social Creditor" (Eng.) of August 29. The author, "C.G.D.," entitled his essay, "On the Corruption of Words." This is what he wrote:—

To this great subject it would seem at first glance unlikely that one who has not made it his chief study could have any very useful contribution to make, but if we bear in mind that our language is constantly changing, and as constantly subject to attack, and that the works of the more scholarly defenders of it are rapidly becoming out of date, it becomes obvious that anyone with a good etymological dictionary, and a lively interest in the language as it is to-day, can play his part in its defence. Furthermore, the students of Semantics, or the Science of Meaning, in drawing particular attention to the distinction between the reference, or mental meaning of a word, and the referent, or thing in the "real" or external world which is meant, have provided us in this generation with a weapon which was not fully appreciated by our predecessors. So important is this distinction that it seems a pity that it is not available for incorporation in the common language and thought of the people in some form more assimilable, than is provided by these rather uncouth technical terms, and I have found "the meaning" and "the meant" more useful than "reference" and "referent," and propose to use them so in this essay.

It is surprising how many words carry in their history a record of the corruption of that philosophy with which Social Crediters have identified themselves, to that which is prevalent in the world to-day. The word "school," for instance, contains in its etymology the whole of what we have been struggling to express on the subject of work and leisure. It is derived from the Greek "skhole," meaning leisure, ease, spare time, and hence the inevitable employment of such leisure in learning, study, discussion, and thence the building in which such learning takes place. It has been left to the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries to degrade a school into a place of compulsory instruction for all.

In the works of Archbishop Trench, dating from the middle of the last century, attention is drawn to many words which illustrate a similar change in philosophy. "Indolent," for instance, formerly meant "indolorous," without grief or pain, and hence indolence becomes a form of wickedness! "Insolent" was merely unusual. "Selfish" and "selfishness" were newly minted by the Puritan writers of the seventeenth century to meet a pressing need which people, apparently, had never felt before, having been satisfied with the commandment to love their neighbours as themselves. The English language got along well enough without "suicide" until about 1670, without "starvation" until an American debate in 1775, without "international" until Jeremy Bentham invented it some time about the beginning of the nineteenth century.

It is, however, with more recent changes that I am here concerned. As Fowler and Fowler point out in "The King's English," the misuse of the word "individual" has been pilloried again and again, until to use it wrongly stamps the writer as being without literary sense. The attack started early in the nineteenth century in the form of "polysyllabic humour" (e.g., "that peculiar individual" for "that odd man") whereby the word soon lost its sense of a single, separate, private person, as opposed to a combination of persons, and became merely a vague counter for "man" or "person." This attack, however, has been successfully repelled, but, as I shall try to show below, an outflanking movement has been launched by the enemy which is obtaining greater success. The substantive has held its ground, but the adjective "individual," along with nearly all the other adjectives which are applicable to individual people and things, is gradually being deprived of its proper character, or forced to take on an unfavourable meaning. Consider "singular" and "peculiar," and "unique" which is going the same way but is still being vigorously defended, and may perhaps be saved. And "proper" which has been degraded into "priggish." It seems to me no accident that the last few generations have seen, and we are now seeing, a concentrated attack upon the meanings of all these words connected with the individual.

When we come to nouns, however, the direct attack is less easy. They are pegged down firmly to reality in the form of the things meant, and as long as people are in touch with that reality and keeping their eyes and their minds on it, it is next to impossible to prize the meaning away from the meant. But adjectives appear to be more vulnerable than nouns, and hence we find that the Technique of the Essential Adjective is made use of to corrupt the meaning of an otherwise invulnerable noun. As I have not seen this commented upon elsewhere it is my particular purpose in writing this essay to draw attention to it.

Take, for instance, the word "property," meaning one's own, proper to oneself! Our experience of property, unless, indeed, we

are without any, is quite sufficient to keep the meaning firmly stuck to the world of reality. It is useless anyone saying that property ought to be abolished, for we all know that it is the basis of our freedom, and that we should be reduced to the condition of slaves without it. So the suggestion is made, not that "property" itself is harmful, no! no! of course not! but that private, personal or individual property is the source of all our troubles and should be done away with, it being, of course, of the very essence of all property that it is private, personal, or proper to an individual. If this is swallowed by the unthinking, the meaning of the word is successfully removed from anything in experience, and the meaningless blank, "collective property," can be attached to something completely remote from the original meaning of "property," such as the control of the whole of the resources of a dispossessed people by a few individuals who are said to administer them on the people's behalf. This technique is verbally as crude and as absurd as it would be to say that, while dogs can be tolerated, all canine dogs should be done away with, or that, while no one dare say anything against the Church, or the Synagogue, all Christian churches, and Jewish synagogues should be abolished. Nevertheless it appears to have been largely successful, not only with the word "property," but with nearly all the other nouns which signify the powers, properties, or qualities of individuals. Thus any combination of the adjectives "private," "personal," "individual" which is in common use, with the nouns "ownership," "enterprise," "gain," "profit," "initiative," is coming to be used in a derogatory sense, as of a harmful thing which ought to be abolished, by people who have not considered that they are recommending the abolition of all ownership, enterprise, gain, and profit, or rather the limiting of these things to the very few, usually anonymous, individuals who will control what the rest have lost.

I have even read, in some leftist paper, the suggestion that in this war (never, have so many owed so much to so few!) individual courage is getting out of date; what we need is the collective courage of our Russian Allies. It is this deliberate attempt to attach qualities, such as enterprise and courage, which are meaningless apart from the individual, to the collective herd, which, as all students of mass psychology know well, has quite different and altogether "lower" qualities, which pro-

vides evidence of evil, and quite possibly consciously evil, influences at work on the language.

But the Technique of the Essential Adjective has been carried even further, and has been used to attack the very core of the Christian religion. As I understand it, and I do not claim to understand it much, the essential difference between the Christian and the Jewish belief which it superseded, is the substitution of the voluntary, or free, principle of Love, for the compulsory principle of Law. How can this great central word, so firmly tied to reality in the lives of every individual, be corrupted? That is, how can a confusion be introduced as to its nature? What essential property can be extracted from it and used as a qualifying adjective, so that the whole becomes vulnerable?

The word "love" is related to "lief," gladly, willingly, and to "leave," permission. The word "free" is from the Old English "freon," to love, and is related to "friend." Here then is our essential adjective!

Without entering in the least into the dreary and interminable Bloomsbury-style argument which almost invariably arises about the relative freedom of the various far from novel types of sexual relationship, whenever, nowadays, the adjective "free" is applied to the noun "love," I seek only to make the point that, by whatever means, only during the last half-century of the Christian Era, the phrase "free love" has been made to mean something immoral to the vast majority of those who come across it. Incidentally, it is a phrase which has been spread by books and newspapers, and scarcely if ever occurs naturally on the lips of ordinary people.

Some indignation has been vented against those who are prepared to defend what they mean by the phrase, but these are so small a minority that their influence is scarcely important. The really deadly damage is done by those who attach these two words, when they are brought together, to an immoral meaning, for they are involved in a denial of the nature of the thing meant by the symbol "love," which is once again prized away from reality so that it can be used to mean something different.

Thus "God is Love"; but "Free Love is immoral." "God is Free Love," is therefore blasphemy, and the suggestion is inescapable that the nature of "love" must be that it is not free. The essential lesson of the New Testament, as against the Old, is thus confused and lost, and the meaningless symbol, "love," deprived of its essential quality, can be applied to the old Law of Duty and compulsion.

I do not know what further use will be made of this devilish technique against us, but I suggest that we can be on our guard, and warn others against it, and it would also be of interest to note particularly those who make use of it, and more especially those who revive it in any new form.

## POLITICAL ERUPTION AFTER WAR?

Mr. Ernest Bevin, a member of the British War Cabinet, in an engagingly candid speech at a conference of the National Chamber of Trade on July 15, expressed the opinion that "when demobilisation came there might be a great political eruption if they were not careful. They had to anticipate what the conditions were likely to be then."

In the Royal Air Force," he said, "men had been put in charge of the most powerful machines that science had ever produced, and that had developed an individualism the like of which no country had ever seen before."

"The Air Force and the motorised units of the Army and Navy had created in thousands of young men a greater adventurous spirit than had ever existed. Thus an unprecedented problem had been thrown up. So far as industry was concerned, they had to launch out on new, broader and more adventurous developments."

What IS the problem? This Mr. Bevin never clearly stated. He would not dare to. There is perhaps only one audience before whom that problem could be baldly stated.

"The second secret requisite for the success of our government is comprised in the following: To multiply to such an extent national failings, habits, passions, conditions of civil life that it will be impossible for anyone to know where he is in the resulting chaos, so that the people in consequence will fail to understand one another. THERE IS NOTHING MORE DANGEROUS THAN PERSONAL INITIATIVE; if it has genius behind it, such initiative can do more than can be done by millions of people, among whom we have sown discord."

Whoever may have written those words, they set forth the procedure of tyrants of all time—divide and rule, and liquidate genius if it cannot be perverted. Mr. Bevin in his speech has shown himself an advocate of the totalitarian State. For he reveals: (a) that the demobilised men are not likely to want socialism, or surely he would have nothing to fear; (b) that socialism has no use for individual initiative; (c) His aim, therefore, is to force them to live under socialism by producing "adventurous developments" in industry so that their individualism shall be absorbed. How this is to be done without allowing the profit motive to function (Mr. Bevin took care to discredit this

during the latter part of his speech) must be giving him furiously to think. We should never forget the behaviour of the Socialist gang when war broke out. Until May, 1940, they did nothing whatever to help the war effort, making it plain at their Bournemouth conference that they did not desire victory unless the war could be used for the socialisation of the whole resources of the nation. They were partisans of the meanest brand, using a time of national weakness to force on to a reluctant electorate a programme which would never have been accepted in peace time.

"Individualism the like of which no country has ever seen before"—Let them tremble and shake in their shoes at the vision of that returning army. For them it is a problem indeed. The longer the war lasts the greater will be that individualism, and the greater the spirit of nationalism, for the war cannot be won without strengthening these emotions, both of which are anathema to Mr. Ernest Bevin and his colleagues.

It follows that the only means by which socialism can be made to function is the adoption of complete regimentation on the German model, where individualism is given an outlet, not in "service," but in a vested interest in the Party machine. To this the Socialists in this country are being driven rapidly as their only expedient. To enlarge bureaucracy as much as possible, so that they can have half the people checking up on the rest, is their only way. Conditioning cannot start too early—note the plans already being laid to hand over children to State training at the age of two.

According to the London "Sunday Times," Dr. John Murray, Principal of University College, Exeter, said on July 18: "The shadow of Hitler darkens Europe, and the infection of his authoritarianism and bureaucracy has reached our shores. You may not know it, but many of our 'reconstructors' are totalitarians at heart. Some of the loudest and most confident of them in respect of education are mov-

## MR. ABERHART ON AGRICULTURE

In the course of a recent statement on the problem of agriculture in Alberta, Mr. Aberhart, Premier of Alberta, said:

Now, after more than two years of a wartime economy, the farmer continues to be victimised with uneconomic prices and most of the other evils from which he was suffering before. True that, under pressure, he has been accorded some increase in the price of his products, but this is off-set by the increase in the prices of the goods he must buy.

He continues to be handicapped by lack of credit and to be burdened by unpayable debt; his markets are restricted in a manner which creates constant uncertainty. In short, agriculture is being kept in the same disastrous condition from which it suffered before the war. . . .

It is now quite evident that the situation will be allowed to drift unless the people bring effective pressure on Parliament and insist on timely action being taken.

The first step in this regard is for the farmers themselves to decide on a clear-cut policy. They should agree on the definite results they want and mobilise public support for obtaining those results.

For example, this business of asking for a certain price for wheat at Fort William seems inequitable and inadequate. . . .

Again, the farmers should be protected against a general rise in the price level. It would be useless for them to obtain a 25 per cent increase in the prices of their products, if the prices of the things they buy increase 30 per cent. . . .

The following appears to provide a reasonable basis for discussion in obtaining a clear statement of the policy our farmers want:

(1) The 1926 price level to be taken as the basis for guaranteed prices for all farm products. Existing prices, based on point of delivery, to bear the same ratio to the 1926 prices as the general price level of secondary products bears to that which existed in the same year.

(2) A definite long range policy in regard to grain and live stock production.

(3) Adequate low cost credit facilities for agriculture.

(4) A comprehensive scheme of crop insurance.

(5) An equitable readjustment of all debts on a three per cent, basis.

It will be evident that except for (2), all the foregoing have to do with money. In other words, they can all be provided by a manipulation of the money system. It is now generally recognised that the money system is nothing more than an elaborate bookkeeping arrangement, and there would be no difficulty in giving effect to the very reasonable policy outlined above.

It should also be evident that at the present time the money system is being operated to divest the farmers of the fruits of their labour. As the financial interests, who now control the money system, are the chief beneficiaries of this arrangement, it is quite certain that they will resist any change by every means within their power. . . .

## THE INDORE SYSTEM

"In 1903 the then Maharajah of Indore incurred the disapprobation of the governor-general by driving the State bankers harnessed to his chariot round his park." ("The Times," London, March 1, 1926.)

A correspondent, recalling this quotation, comments:—"I look upon this event as a piece of prophetic symbolism. We shall see a time when the King, as representing the people, will be drawn round the City by a team of bankers harnessed to his coach, as part of the annual celebration of the inauguration of Social Credit."

## FRIEND FELIX

"What I have had, too, in affection from Felix Frankfurter is greater even than he has given me in insights; more than that I could not say."

—H. J. Laski, in the book entitled "I BELIEVE.—The Personal Philosophies of Twenty-Three Eminent Men and Women of Our Time." (Page 178.)

ing towards totalitarianism such as exists in Germany, where schools such as this have no governing body, where we find officials everywhere, where the headmaster is merely a civil servant, and where education has a military flavour. German schools are not like English, nurseries of citizenship, and it is the most astonishing paradox of these days that what some 'reconstructors' desire is to see English schools like those in Germany.

There is now a need, more urgent than ever, for Social Crediters to deal with these things. They have the information, and they know the way. The Social Credit Secretariat exists to give advice to individuals who see that something must be done, and wish to set about it immediately. Our strongest weapon is the development of personal initiative.—B.M.P., in the "Social Creditor" (England).



## THESE CONSTITUTION ALTERATIONS

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

(Continued from last issue.)

Sir.—After setting out that the purpose of the move to alter the Constitution is to give the Commonwealth Parliament the power to carry into effect "the war aims and objects of Australia as one of the United Nations," the Bill goes on in these words:

"Without limiting the generality of the foregoing sub-section, it is hereby decided that the power of the Parliament shall extend to all measures which in the declared opinion of the 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 regard to . . ." And then follows fourteen separate items which will be referred to later.

The part of the Bill quoted above is worth reading again. The GENERALITY of the first section is not to be limited in any way, and apparently no attempt is to be made to specify or clarify what it really means. You recall what the first section does say—"the Parliament shall have full power to make laws for the purpose of carrying into effect the war aims and objects of Australia AS ONE OF THE UNITED NATIONS. . . ." Not, you will notice, as a self-governing sovereign community, but as one of the United Nations! It makes us immediately subject to dictation from an international body domiciled in some other part of the world. The war aims and objects of the PEOPLE of Australia, like those of the PEOPLE of other Allied nations, are not known, and, so far, no one has been authorised by those PEOPLES to formulate them. Some unauthorised persons have, however, busied themselves to the extent of setting out war aims suitable to their own interests, and apparently someone, assuming the right to speak for Australians without consulting them, has assured the interested parties that Australia will fall into line with THEIR ideas. Hence the reason for not indicating what the aims and objects really are until after we have unwittingly placed ourselves in such a position that our freedom of choice will have been surrendered. If we limit the "generality" we protect ourselves, but if we do not limit the generality we play right into the hands of the forces working against us. These forces were responsible for the Depression, for the War, and for the conditions which convert every so-called Democracy into a financial dictatorship. And the proposals as put forward by Dr. Evatt will not lessen that dictatorship!

That, of course, is bad enough, but the same sort of "generality" is also intended to apply to such terms as "economic security" and "social justice." What, precisely, do these mean? As someone else has already pointed out, a slave is eco-

nomically secure, and there are all sorts of ideas about social justice. But a slave is not free, and our youngsters will still inherit irredeemable DEBT. Can it be that there is actually a scheme afoot to bring about conditions in which we WILL be slaves? If this is not the case, then why seek to have incorporated in the Constitution such a provision as this: "security of employment and the provision of useful occupation for all citizens"? Our object should be to reduce "employment" in the sense in which the term is usually understood and increase the proportion of leisure. We are already using the power of the sun to such an extent that machines are doing "work" equal to the effort of five times the population of the earth, and it is already possible to reduce hours to such a degree that a great number of people could be released altogether from what is called toil; but evidently the intention of those behind the move for these alterations to our Constitution is to ensure that none shall escape the yoke of toil. We are the goyim or cattle, and must be treated as such.

And what is actually intended by the phrase, "useful occupation for all the people"? Are old-age pensioners to be put to "work"? Are the widows and orphans and retired clergymen to become "toilers"? Are men and women who may have retired on superannuation benefits to have their retirement SUPERVISED to ensure that they are "usefully" employed? By whom will the question of "usefulness" be determined? Is it not clear that whether Dr. Evatt realises it or not, his proposals, if adopted, will result in Australia being converted into a SLAVE STATE, in which the people will do what they are told to do by a few men living elsewhere, concerned only with their own interests and the exercise of power.—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, 22nd November, 1942.

(To be continued.)

## "INDIVIDUALIST GROUP" IN BRITAIN ISSUES A MANIFESTO

In Britain, on August 13 a Manifesto was issued by the new "Individualist Group," which "consists of members of different political parties who are united in the desire to restore to British public life that spirit of individual liberty and responsibility which characterised its period of greatness and which is to-day gravely threatened." After thus describing the Group, the Manifesto (some signatories to which are well known, even outside Britain) continues:—

What follows is not a rigid creed, but a broad statement of beliefs, within which there may be many minor differences of view.

1. State and Individual.—We reject the notion, common to all totalitarian systems, whether Communist, Fascist or National-Socialist (Nazi), that the State is a supreme and monopolistic super-entity, the sole source of authority and morality. "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely"; the omnipotent State lacks the moral elements inherent in the individual; it not only devours its own creators, but becomes a force for evil, both inside and outside its boundaries. The unit of existence is the natural human being, and his or her natural extension in the family, not the artificial personality of the State. This is true whether the approach be religious, biological or political. In the words of J. S. Mill: "The worth of the State, in the long run, is the worth of the individuals composing it."

2. Government.—State interference with the liberty of the subject should be reduced to a minimum. It is difficult, in complex modern societies, and in a world ravaged by war, to define that minimum with precision; but it is clear that of late years it has been vastly exceeded by the inordinate growth of executive powers at the expense of the legislature and the judiciary.

(a) Our constitutional system needs a return to Parliamentary responsibility. There must be a lopping off of the ever-spreading tentacles of bureaucracy, and a severe restraint on the processes by which Westminster has long been yielding its constitutional powers to Whitehall.

(b) The Rule of Law must be reasserted and jealously safeguarded. By the Rule of Law we understand the ancient constitutional principles that the administration of justice is the function of the Courts of Justice, and not of secret administrative tribunals; that there is only one system of justice applicable to all citizens; that all men, whether private individuals or officials, have the same standing before it; and that justice shall not be suffered to yield to any real or supposed requirements of governmental convenience or expediency.

(c) If bureaucracy is to be restrained,

decentralisation of administrative powers must be encouraged.

(d) The successful operation of democracy depends upon the highest possible degree of responsibility and intelligence in the electorate, so that intellectually debauching influences, whether by written, spoken or broadcast word, may be seen in their true light and resisted accordingly. To this end the educational system should aim at true mental discipline, independence of judgment and the awakening of interests, curiosity and enterprise.

Equality of opportunity, and the encouragement of promise and ambition, should be an important aim not only of education but of social policy generally; but this should not be allowed, in the minds of the young, to degenerate into a belief that they can rely for a secure existence, not upon their own efforts, but upon the State.

3. Economic.—State organisation, as opposed to individual enterprise, suffers from grave inherent defects. Certain essential public services must be organised and guaranteed by the State, but it is not the true function of government to manage private life. Bureaucratic control is invariably accompanied by lack of flexibility and initiative, and by waste of time, effort, personnel and public money. It therefore inevitably fails of the very object for which it is supposed to exist—efficiency.

Trade, whether domestic or international, should be freed from unnecessary restrictions, and profit (regarded as a premium on economy and efficiency) should be regarded as a proper motive of commerce. Individual initiative, independence and achievement, within the limits of legitimate competition, should be regarded as virtues in the citizen. This applies specially at the present time to the small trader, for long our economic infantryman, but now threatened with extinction.

4. National Morale.—The sense of individual responsibility, which former generations regarded as a characteristically British quality, has been systematically undermined by many influences. The swamping of self-help by State-help has resulted in regimentation of opinion and in a tendency on the part of the average citizen to regard measures of which he disapproves as inevitable, and thus not

worth the trouble of opposing.

The flabbiness of the electorate has responded with a progressive decline in the prestige of the House of Commons, from which, owing to the tyranny of party "discipline," the spirit of independence has all but disappeared. The older spirit of vitality and of confidence in the achievements and capacities of our race has been succeeded by a pusillanimous mood which inculcates a drab uniformity of unadventurous living. It is the same spirit which represents the British Empire—the most remarkable political achievement in history—as the product of mere oppression and cupidity.

The assertion of individual right has been regarded as hopelessly reactionary, and its advocacy by any public man as equivalent to a political suicide. That sentiment persists and, despite the so-called political truce, innumerable efforts are being made

to persuade our people that social salvation is to be found only in millennial plans which involve vast expansion of the functions of the State and corresponding limitations of the rights of the individual. This spirit, unless it is fought promptly and resolutely, can only result in the country's lapsing into one or other of the forms of totalitarian government.

The signatories are:—

Ernest J. P. Benn (chairman), S. W. Alexander, C. K. Allen, Collin Brooks, H. S. Cooper, Arthur O. Crichton, Leonard H. Cripps, Frederick E. M. Day, St. John Ervine, Montagu L. Gedge, Frederick H. Hamilton, F. J. C. Hearnshaw, Francis W. Hirst, W. R. Inge, J. H. Clifford Johnston, Leverhulme, Stanley Maxwell, W. W. Paine, Cecil Palmer, Perry, Greville J. Poke, Roger P. Stade, J. Stevenson, Teviot, Donovan M. Touche, Arthur Villiers, R. J. Watson.

## INTERNATIONAL COURT OF "JUSTICE"

The following is an extract from British House of Commons Debates on July 29.

Mr. Bellenger asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government have in contemplation, as part of their post-war reconstruction plans, the establishment of an International Court of Justice, with compulsory jurisdiction to adjudicate upon differences which may arise amongst the peoples of the world and their rulers upon such questions as the interpretation of treaties, alliances, charters, revision of frontiers, and other similar international problems, as the preferable alternative to war?

Mr. Ivor Thomas asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has considered the recent speech by Mr. Cordell Hull; and whether his Majesty's Government supports the policy of an international court of justice backed by an international police force.

Mr. Eden: "His Majesty's Government are entirely in favour of the establishment, or re-establishment, after the war of an international court of justice, and, have noted with much interest the references to this subject made by Mr. Cordell Hull in the course of his speech on July 23. The functions of such a court could not appropriately include certain of the matters referred to by the hon. Member for Bassetlaw (Mr. Bellenger).

"As regards the point made by my hon. Friend the Member for Keighley (Mr. I. Thomas), as I have made plain on previous occasions, it is the view of his Majesty's Government that international authority after this war will require to be backed by international force. In this respect also, we are in entire agreement with the United States Secretary of State."

Mr. Bellenger: "While I welcome my right hon. Friend's assurances, might I ask whether any definite steps are being taken now, in conjunction with the United States, and perhaps with other countries, to implement the desires which he has just expressed?"

Mr. Eden: "These things are being examined and discussed, as I think my hon. Friend will realise from the public speeches which are being made on both sides of the Atlantic."

Mr. Thome: "Does the right hon. Gentleman think it will be possible to re-establish the International Court of Justice at the Hague?"

Mr. Eden: "My hon. Friend will have observed that my language was guarded of set purpose, on that subject."

[By the Hague Agreement 1930 (Article 10), the Bank of International Settlements is declared immune "from any disabilities and from any restrictive measures such as censorship, requisition, seizure or confiscation in the time of peace or war, reprisals, prohibition or restriction of export of gold or currency and other similar interferences."—Ed.]

## PUBLIC MEETING

To form a League for ACTION, to care for those interests of our Fighting Forces, mainly post-war, not handled by existing groups.

SPEAKERS: DISCUSSION: DECISION. Builders Rooms, 17 Waymouth St., Adelaide, TUESDAY DECEMBER 8 8 p.m. Authorised by E. A. Chappel, 166 Cross Roads, Malvern, S.A.

## "New Times" Subscription Rates

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

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

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

## EVATT'S PROPOSALS ARE DANGEROUS

The proposals to amend the Commonwealth Constitution, which the Attorney-General (Dr. Evatt) initiated, are the subject of widespread discussion. They are not merely political proposals, for they involve the vital liberties of workers, the ordinary rights of citizens and affect every form of social, industrial and religious organisation within the country.

With the object (or under the pretext) of promoting "economic security and social justice," Dr. Evatt invites the Australian people to give the Parliament of the Commonwealth absolute and unfettered power to pass legislation which the Parliament itself says will tend to promote security and justice.

In other words, Dr. Evatt proposes that, for the first time in Australian history, the Commonwealth Parliament alone shall decide the limits of its own legislative and executive power. The effect of his proposal will prevent the High Court from acting as a curb and a check upon the overweening political ambition, the totalitarian appetite, of pre-selected persons.

As they stand, Dr. Evatt's proposals make for dictatorship. They make for the totalitarian State. If accepted in their present form, without any modification whatever the proposed constitutional amendments will bring about the final establishment of a modified Fascist or a modified Communist State in Australia.

For Dr. Evatt in effect seeks to make the Commonwealth politicians the unfettered masters of the Australian people.

Already, under the guise of promoting war, we have seen the politician and the bureaucrat entrenched and the people largely enslaved. Such enslavement we tolerate while the Japanese are at our doorstep, but once the enemy is driven from our gates, the people will demand the restoration of their liberties.

It is idle to pretend that the Commonwealth must have this absolute power in order to prevent a post-war depression.

—(Condensed from the "Catholic Worker.")

Your  
VICTORY  
SUIT  
Hand-  
Tailored  
to Order



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

ELIZABETH HOUSE,  
2nd Floor.  
**340 LITTLE COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE**  
Phone: M 5177  
"For STYLE and EASE: FRANK DEVLIN PLEASE!"



## WISDOM FROM "THE WATCHMAN"!

We have often had occasion to adversely criticise, in these columns, utterances of the radio commentator who calls himself "The Watchman." But we are not "one-eyed." We believe in giving credit where, in our opinion, credit is due. We are therefore pleased to place on record our wholehearted approval of practically everything "The Watchman" said in his broadcast from 3UZ on Sunday, October 18

After referring to the "four freedoms" and their incorporation in the Federal Government's proposals to alter the Constitution, he said that the first, second and fourth freedoms needed no explanation. But "freedom from want" opened the whole field of economic controversy. HOW it was to be ensured was not explicitly specified. "It must be assumed, therefore," he went on, "that the list of other measures which the Federal Government is seeking power to enact must be taken as its specification of how it proposes to build this new world. There is no need to recapitulate these—they occupy perhaps a quarter of a newspaper column, and they may be modified by the convention of politicians which is to consider and report on them, but their general nature may be indicated.

"They are all more or less proposals by which the Government will plan the economic and social life of the community. This will delight the 'planners,' who of recent years have been so vociferous about 'national planning' as though they were getting tired of doing things for themselves, and would like to shift the burden of ordering their own lives on to someone else's shoulders.

"To many, however, this will represent the abomination of desolation. 'Planning' means classification, compulsion and regimentation, not according to a citizen's own desires, abilities and ambitions, but according to the views and opinions of someone else—probably a civil servant—who surely must think he partakes of Divine wisdom and foreknowledge if he attempts such a task for a whole nation. What more insecure foundation for freedom can there be than general compulsion and planning?

**It would appear, therefore, that we are to be asked to establish the four freedoms at the cost of destroying freedom itself.**

"In all these attempts to enumerate freedoms, there is no reference to freedom of action. What is the use of freedom of thought and speech, if you are forbidden to act according to your convictions? The thought of the minority to-day is often the thought of the majority to-morrow, but if the majority are to forbid the minority to act according to their own thought, that is to condemn the community to a living

death, and deny the very essence of democracy.

"Of what service is freedom of speech and thought to a manacled spirit? The denial of Liberty, in all its manifestations, is to turn men into mechanical robots—and that is and must be the ultimate result of planning. Every new activity of Government designed to control and push citizens here and there like pawns upon a chess board, to do not what they want to do, but what the Government decides they must do, means the establishment of another bureau or department full of officials, to whom are committed the destinies of the people.

"Bureaucracy is the greatest restriction on liberty, and like an old man of the sea on every citizen's back. We have seen something of what it means under the excuse of war necessity. Douglas Reed, in his latest book, 'All Our To-morrows,' attacks, in his trenchant, penetrative manner, the extent to which this monstrous parasitic growth is (on the plea of war necessity) killing the fine old British conception of liberty in England, and in that mirror we see the reflection of our own deepening plight.

"An ex-Army officer in a recent address in Sydney referred to this growing menace of the civil servant. He is a dangerous animal," he said, "but comparatively easy to get rid of; but that is too optimistic a view.

"Government departments are to-day still the hide-outs of many of military age, who like to impose on others a discipline they avoid themselves, and who, under the protection of political or other influence, from their reserved occupation issue shoals of rules, regulations, prohibitions and restrictions, which bid fair to perpetuate the destructive grip they have upon our private lives and interests.

"Though citizens are patriotically enduring it without a murmur, 'to help win the war,' nothing will be easier than to extend this system into the subsequent peace, unless we are vigilant, to ensure that, under this plausible excuse of 'carrying into effect the four freedoms,' we do not suffer the loss of freedom itself.

**It does not need more power to establish freedom—for it is only necessary to remove the obstacles to it."**

## "THE FOUR FREEDOMS"

A Talk Broadcast from 7HO by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc., on Sunday, November 8, 1942  
(Concluded from last issue.)

If the productive system is to supply you and me with the amenities of life with as little bother as possible, then obviously the best thing to do is to place first-class brains in charge of production and use the latest machinery and the latest inventions.

On the other hand, if our problem is to keep men and women constantly at work whether they are required or not—in other words, permit of no leisure: "no unemployment," as our politicians prefer to call it—if that is what we want: plenty of work; then there are four things we can do:

1. Remove all our best organisers and inventors from production and fill their jobs with half-wits. This will make more work for everybody.

2. We can export all our best butter, wine, wool, etc., abroad. This will keep us working all day and every day.

3. We can start another war and employ every man, woman and child day and night presenting the enemy with shells and bombs, free, gratis and for nothing.

4. Or, we can put our young men back on the land to grow apples, and then dump them in the sea, as they do in Tasmania; or we can grow coffee and then pile it into a heap, pour tar over it and burn it, as they do in Brazil; or we could grow cotton, and then dig it back into the ground, as they do in the United States of America; or we could build huge Atlantic liners and then sink them, as they did in England; or we could breed scores of thousands of head of cattle, and then shoot and burn them, as they do in the Argentine.

There are many schemes for keeping men working most of their lives; the real difficulty lies in keeping them from getting the results of their toil, in goods, services and leisure. Hitler solved this problem by war; our Government solved it by Marketing Boards. Hitler's way was much more successful.

I believe the Brains Trust is evolving a system of Marketing Boards which will keep every man, woman and child at work, eight hours a day, for 300 days a year, for fifty years, at union wages; the prices given to producers will be low enough to keep them working like niggers to make ends meet; the price to the consumer will be high enough so that he will have to work all the year round to get enough money to buy enough to eat. The method to be used by the Brain Trust to dispose of the "surplus" production, and so prevent anyone getting it, is a closely-guarded secret.

The position is this: Most of the world's important industries—wheat, cotton, fruit, wine, sugar, tea, coffee, iron, steel, rubber, coal and engineering goods of all kinds, and transport services—all of these, every one of them, has had its production either limited or destroyed, or its plant sabotaged, sometimes on a colossal scale, by financial manipulation and Government Boards. Our powers of production have increased

enormously in the last 25 years, and we have had large so-called "surpluses" of nearly every important commodity; and yet, side by side with this abundance, we have had men struggling as men seldom struggled before, to get their hands on these very commodities, which were being fed to the pigs or burned in great mountainous heaps.

Everybody clamours for work at a steady WAGE; everybody has got it now—war has brought it, and only war and destruction can maintain the steady "wage system." It is absolutely impossible, with the power machinery we have at our disposal to-day—let alone that which is yet to come—to maintain a steady system of employment on the present scale. If the future is to have any kind of reasonable stability and any kind of real Freedom, then the ridiculous sight of ten men clamouring to do a job only requiring one man must be banished from this earth.

The wage system has definitely broken down, and is now only a system of servitude. The wages of labour must recede gradually into the background as its importance decreases, and its place must be taken by a National Dividend, paid to every man, woman and child. The National Dividend must necessarily increase as the machinery of production improves.

To-day it is possible to run quite a large factory by one or two men with the aid of automatic power machinery. Why should these one or two men receive wages and others receive nothing? What right have these men to monopolise the output of a machine which represents centuries of endeavour and invention?

The output of modern science and invention and automatic machinery is the heritage of every man, woman and child of this country, and neither the politician, the international financier, or the union boss has any right to say this man shall have a right and that man shall have no right to the production of machinery.

Those who wish to tackle the difficult tasks of this world have a right to a reward for their services; but let that labour be given freely by free men in a free community. For over a hundred years we have tried the other way—the way of compulsion and ungodly and unjust punishments. That way has failed dismally; it has flung the world into one war after another and flung hordes of poverty-stricken and servile people into the hands of evil men who have used these helpless wage-slaves to attempt to destroy you and me and everything we hold dear.

We must try this other way; a way which is based on Truth and Freedom; it will be a little strange at first, but truth is sometimes very strange, and so is Freedom. We hear a great deal about the need for change, but I cannot find much sign of

## "THE MAGNIFICENT ROTHSCHILDS"

BOOK REVIEW, BY ERIC D. BUTLER.

The mention of international banking usually brings to mind one of the most powerful families known to history, the Rothschilds. This Jewish family dominated European affairs throughout all last century. This, of course, was not done openly, and is never mentioned in the "history" books used in our schools and universities.

But many writers have made public some amazing things about the House of Rothschild. Count Corti's great historical work on this subject is a classic. Just what part the Rothschilds are playing in the present drama is hard to ascertain. The old glamour which surrounded the name no longer exists. The modern members of the family may have lost some of the shrewdness of their forebears? Dr. Cecil Roth's book, "The Magnificent Rothschilds," a recent contribution to the literature on the Rothschilds, is a very clever attempt to do some whitewashing. However, even so, some very interesting admissions are made which are well worth noting. They reveal the fact that powerful international forces have operated quite independently of nations or governments in the past. It is too much to ask us to believe that similar things are not taking place to-day.

The founder of the Rothschild fortunes was a German Jew, Mayer Amschel Rothschild (1744-1812). Although Roth vaguely states that the Rothschild paved the way to the amassing of a great fortune—and, more important, great power—by dealing in coins, the truth of the matter is that Rothschild got his start in the greatest racket of all time: the manufacture of money at no cost to himself by the establishment of a bank. Mayer Rothschild is reported as having said in 1790, "Permit me to issue and control a nation's money and I care not who makes its laws." Roth doesn't mention that.

Mayer Rothschild had five sons, and they all established themselves in the different European capitals. Roth admits the great power which the family built up as a result of being international:

"Its influence was now vast—unexampled perhaps hitherto among persons below royal rank. . . . True, to the outside world there was little to choose between the Five Frankforters." (Frankfort not only produced the first Rothschild; it also produced the Warburgs, the men whose devilish influence in modern world affairs I have often dealt with.) "But the inner circle knew that the brains of the house had been centred in that ungainly figure which perpetually obscured, day after day, one particular pillar in the Exchange in London. . . . and there held a mute levee, at which envoys from every part of the world of finance appeared to be greeted with a nod or a whispered phrase, and to hasten away with sufficient knowledge to send the stocks sky-high or to depress them to the abyss."

The "ungainly figure" was Nathan Rothschild, who established the family in England. When he died in 1836, his sons, particularly Lionel, took control of the big banking house which was already well established. Lionel paved the way for the introducing of Jews into the House

of Commons, after tremendous intrigue. He was elected to the House in 1858. The family rapidly forced itself upon Britain. Roth states: "If the great Whig leaders came to formal dinners, partly because the Rothschilds were their devoted followers in politics, Disraeli was their father's greatest friend and was to be seen at home almost every Sunday night, sometimes bringing one of his own House of Commons cronies with him. . . . The ambassadors of foreign Powers could hardly afford to refuse the hospitality of the leader of the London money-market, and British ambassadors abroad were always grateful for Rothschild introductions. Distinguished foreigners would arrive in London with letters of recommendation from great-uncle James in Paris, or cousin Anselm in Vienna; and there was always some kinsman from the Continent."

One of Lionel's sons, Alfred, apparently played a powerful part in international diplomacy for many years prior to the last war. The British people, who did the fighting and dying in that conflict, have never heard the part played by the Rothschilds behind the scenes. Roth writes: "By reason of his (Alfred Rothschild's) social intimacies with the very highest circles in England and abroad, and his personal as well as his business relations with the accredited representatives of more than one country, his voice was listened to with deference. It was only on the publication of various confidential diplomatic documents in the period after the war of 1914-18, and the appearance of the indiscretions and indiscretions of a host of statesmen and diplomats of the late Victorian and Edwardian eras, that a wider public realised how strongly, his influence had been felt in the Chanceries of Central Europe during the quarter century that preceded the great cataclysm."

Roth's book, while dealing mainly with the Rothschild's personal affairs and interests, marriages between various members of the family, their sporting interests and art collecting, gives a splendid picture of the colossal power which the Rothschilds have wielded in British affairs during the past hundred years. Roth thinks their efforts worthy of nothing but the highest praise. The increasing number of people who are becoming concerned about the power wielded by international bankers will take exactly the opposite view "and advocate the limitation of secret power by irresponsible individuals or groups. The people must have more power—not the Rothschild's and their ilk. One modern member of the Rothschild family, Sassoon, says he doesn't want that. He has openly advocated the destruction of British traditions and the establishment of an International Government. But I believe that the reign of the Rothschilds and others of their race is now coming to an end.

## CRITICISM OF THE CONSTITUTION PROPOSALS

(Continued from Page 1.)

**the production of the country; but they cannot do that without money.**

The next two paragraphs are—"(e) prices of goods and services, including their regulation and control. (f) profiteering." The subject of paragraph (f) could have been included in paragraph (e) because both mean the same thing. I do not know why this has been introduced, other than for propaganda purposes in an attempt to appeal to large numbers of the community who oppose profiteering. I shall deal with this matter fully at a later stage, but I would now point out that in the Old Country most effective methods of control have been introduced. I believe similar methods could be adopted here with advantage to the community.

Paragraph (g) relates to the encouragement of population. All that we need to achieve that aim is the establishment of satisfactory economic conditions, which would not only increase the birth-rate in Australia, but would also attract suitable immigrants from other countries. Our main problem then would be to regulate the flow of immigrants. Lack of money has prevented our achieving this object up to the present, but the Constitution already confers on the Federal Government power to make money available.

In paragraph (h) the "four freedoms" are expressed. The first is "freedom of speech and expression." Although it is not now specifically provided for in the Constitution, we certainly have a measure of freedom of speech and expression. If the Constitution were amended to give effect

change in the changes that are being recommended by the men in power to-day.

The Freedom we want has not been included in President Roosevelt's "Four Freedoms." Dr. Evatt seems to have overlooked it, too. I hope before the great men of the world impose their New Freedoms upon us after this war, that they will ask us what kind of Freedom WE want. After all, I think we should have some say in this vital question, don't you?

to this desire, I believe we would be in danger of some future Government abrogating to itself such powers that liberty of speech and expression would disappear in Australia. The second "freedom" is "religious freedom." Section 116 of the Constitution already provides for this freedom, and, so long as the present wording of the Constitution is not altered, we shall retain that measure of religious freedom. The "next" "freedom" is "freedom from want." This should be the birth-right of every individual, not only in this country, but in every other country. We should be guaranteed freedom from want from the cradle to the grave. The world is full of the good things provided by God Almighty, but Governments seem unable to guarantee freedom from want. If we cannot provide that every man of our fighting services, every munition worker, and every other citizen assisting in the war effort does not want for the necessities of life on returning to their civil occupations, we shall be faced with a very serious situation. Freedom from want should be assured to all citizens in this scientific age, when we have a capacity to produce greater than the world has ever known. We are prevented from enjoying the great abundance of production through lack of purchasing power. Some people describe it as a shortage of money; but I prefer to say that it results from a shortage of brains.

The fourth "freedom" is "freedom from fear." This, too, is an essential freedom. How wonderful it would be if every man woman and child in this Commonwealth could be free from fear, living in an era when fear did not exist. Does this item suggest further regimentation of the community, or does it mean putting into practice the teaching of scripture—"But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid." Such men would not be regimented as are the citizens of certain nations which have attempted to solve present-day problems.

(To be continued.)