

ON OTHER PAGES:

"SECOND FRONT" AGAINST JAPAN? (Page 2.)

A LETTER TO DR. EVATT. (Page 2.)

SIR JAMES ELDER AGAIN. (Page 3.)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 8 No. 50 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, DEC. 18, 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)

M.H.R. States Case Against Conscription

"Our Last Stand," Says Mr. Blackburn

We wholeheartedly congratulate Mr. Maurice Blackburn, M.H.R., on the stand he is making against conscription proposals being put forward by Mr. Curtin, Sir Keith Murdoch and others of that ilk, and we have much pleasure in publishing the following article, entitled "Against Conscription: Our Last Stand," written by Mr. Blackburn himself:

1. Step by step, since the early months of 1940, the Australian Labor Movement has abandoned its anti-militarist position. Now a Labor Cabinet asks its followers to make the last surrender. If this is made, there can be no resistance when we are asked to force men to serve anywhere in the Indo-Pacific area.

2. It is urged that this war is different from the war of 1914-1918. It is suggested that the Australian people then voted against conscription because they were against the war. Whatever they may have thought in late 1917 or 1918, the Australian people were not, in 1916, against the war. The fighting men overseas voted "no" just as did their friends and kindred here. At the end of this article are set out references which the reader may consult for himself. The authorities cited were all conscriptionists, and all have thought that in 1916, as well as in 1917, the fighting soldiers voted against conscription.

3. It is urged by conscriptionists that there is no difference between compelling men to resist an invasion and compelling them to go away from their homeland to make war in another man's country. There is all the difference between killing in

hot blood and killing in cold blood. Men who are called out to drive off an invader have no doubt that the invader is their enemy. The invaders come as enemies of the kindred and the land of those who take up arms to resist them. Only a tiny minority believe that the invaders' force may not rightly be resisted by force. If we respect and protect the beliefs of the non-resistant minority, compulsion for those who are prepared to resist is merely organisation. Here reason and instinct combine to bid a man to defend his home and family against the foreign trespasser, just as they bid him to defend his home and family against domestic violence. Some form of organisation there must be. Here the legal duty to serve reinforces the reason and the instinct of the citizen.

4. But compulsion to serve overseas is compulsion to fight in cold blood. Human instinct is against injuring or destroying human beings against whom one has no resentment. But the conscript may be ordered to enter countries against whose people he has no resentment, and there to slay men whom he knows are rising merely to resist invasion—even men whose only offence is that they refuse to be em-

broiled in a quarrel which is not theirs. The volunteer has known that he may be so ordered. If he has thought about it at all, he has allowed his reason to overrule his instinct. He has prepared himself to attack the stranger in his foreign home because he believes that the stranger's rulers are leagued with the enemy and possible invader of Australia. He holds that to enter the stranger's country and there to slay the stranger will weaken Australia's enemy and make invasion less likely. Whether he has reasoned rightly or wrongly, his judgment and his will were free. No one could take away that freedom. But conscription would destroy that

freedom of judgment and of will. The conscriptionist stands for an Absolutist State which, overriding the conscience, the judgment and the will of a man, can compel him to kill. How long would capital punishment be endured if each of us could be compelled to be the hangman?

5. The distinction between compulsory service at home and compulsory service abroad is centuries old. It was part of the tradition of Britain. Until 1916 that British tradition law endured. For forty years the Defence Act has drawn the distinction. When, in 1916 and 1917, the Labour Party fought Mr. Hughes' proposals (Continued on page 4.)

"Capital Issues Board" Blocked New Industries, Says M.L.A.

In the course of a recent speech in the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, Mr. F. J. Cahill alleged that the Capital Issues Board had, in the past, blocked the development and extension of many important industries, mainly to satisfy the export-mania of overseas interests. According to the N.S.W. "Hansard" (pp. 581-2), he said:—

When the McKell Government took office it appointed the committee to which I have referred. One of the first snags it struck was an organisation created by the Menzies Government, known as the Capital Issues Board, on which were representatives of vested interests. The committee wanted to know why certain industries were not being given every assistance to get going. That was before Japan came into the war. Let me tell hon. members of some of the schemes that were hanging fire: One was for the establishment of the aluminium industry, another for the establishment of an oil and bitumen refinery, which was favourably reported upon by the Tariff Board. In regard to the latter, the Labour representatives in the Senate moved the adjournment of the House, and seriously criticised the Government for not allowing the industry to be established in Australia. Another industry that would have assisted the war effort was the manufacture of rayon yarn, so necessary for parachutes; another, the manufacture of crockery to replace the rubbish being imported from Japan. The sabotaging of the Standard Oil Company (Australia) in its plans to develop Baerami shale was a grave scandal. Other industries were: The manufacture of copper winding wire and also needles; the production of mercury, essential for war purposes; the development of ramie fibre to replace, imported fibres used in the manufacture of gun-cotton, cellulose acetates, parachutes, cordage, etc. The Menzies Government appointed the Capital Issues Board to deal with applications for industrial expansion. All these proposals were consistently retarded by the Board, and in the end some of them were completely killed in the interests of overseas and foreign concerns. The Board had representatives of those interests on it. Mr. Chifley, at our request, wiped out

that Board and established in its place a committee of public servants, but he left one man on who should never have been retained. The caucus committee decided to interview that gentleman, whose name was Balmford, and the Minister for Labour and Industry, with six or seven members of this House, went to interview him at the invitation of the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Chifley. When we asked him what was holding up a lot of these projects, and said that we wanted to see these industries established, he gave us innumerable reasons against their establishment. In the desultory conversation that took place later, we discovered that he had been in Australia for only a few years, and that, he was brought out by a former Federal Government to be actuary for the National Insurance Scheme, under a seven-years contract, at £3000 a year. The National Insurance idea fell through, and they had him on their hands, so they gave him a job and kept giving him jobs until finally, when the war came, he was put in as secretary and actuary of the Capital Issues Board. He said, "Of course, you know it is the policy of the committee and the policy of the Capital Issues Board not to permit any development in this country, which is likely to undermine English interests that have been built up here over a long period of years." I said, "Mr. Minister, may I ask a question?" and the Minister for Labour and Industry said, "Yes." I said, "Would you repeat that statement, Mr. Balmford?" He repeated the statement and I said, "Are we to understand that anything that is going to provide Australia with materials we previously imported from England, regardless of whether we need them for war or not, is going to be frowned upon by this committee set up by the Federal Government?" He said "After all, it is not quite fair to take advantage of the war to establish these industries to the detriment of English exports." Why was it that this lackey of British vested interests was permitted to sit in a position like that and to give expression to those views? He is still there, but I think he has not the scope he had before. That was one reason why we could not get our industries developed. I can give documentary proof to show that the establishment of every one of those industries was hindered by sabotage, delays, reference to regulations, and even the calling of evidence from the representatives of competitive interests.

do not produce what the hospital says it needs—money—and have less than sufficient for their own legitimate requirements. It is about time the sponsors of the appeal learned that the Federal Treasury is responsible for the manufacture of sufficient money for the needs of the community. If the Treasury supplies the money the community will supply the goods and services.

THERMAL THREATS: Another bureaucrat, Mr. Mighell, burst into print in the "Herald" of November 24 with a threat to ration gas and electricity if people continue to waste this form of power. This chap seems to think that people use gas and electricity simply for the purpose of getting rid of their money. Quite a stupid idea, of course, for practical people, but not unusual for these super-planners. It never occurs to these master-minds to state the facts in a simple, straightforward manner. No, they must bluster and threaten. But such methods do not save power.

WOMEN AND WAR: Women members of the House of Commons bitterly attacked the Government's refusal to pay for war injuries to civilian men and women. Dr. Edith Summerskill said: "The Government was exploiting women by using them in the services and the A.R.P. at cut prices." Perhaps when these women become a little more experienced they will understand that this is the Bankers' policy, and that mere "Governments," irrespective of party, are simply part of the machinery of administration to carry out the bankers' policy. Until women realise this they are just as useless in Parliament as men.

—O.B.H.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Criticising Sir Keith Murdoch's propaganda in favour of conscription for military service beyond Australian territory, Mr. Calwell, M.H.R., is reported as saying that Murdoch had "descended to the gutter and had attempted to start a sectarian war, and that he had also committed breaches of censorship." It is fortunate indeed that we have a few fearless men like Mr. Calwell to point out the danger of unscrupulous power-lusters stirring up strife in the community and endangering its well-being.

MONKS' MOANS: London "Daily Mail" scribe, Noel Monks, who has spent several months in Australia, bemoans the fact that we have not a National Government, but rebuts the suggestion that Australia is likely to become the 49th State of U.S. He also complained that "trade union caucuses were running Australia and that due to rigid censorship this was not realised outside Australia." Perhaps this chap would be satisfied if a newspaper caucus were given complete control.

SEA BREEZES: The journal bearing this name reports Mrs. Hewism, a prominent child welfare worker, thus: "We must build up these sickly children and make them worthy citizens to help defend our shores in the future." Now we know why we need more population.

CAUCUS AND CREDIT: After a bitter debate the Federal Labour Caucus rejected a motion by Senator Darcy "that the war be financed by interest-free loans from the Commonwealth Bank." He was supported by Mr. Rosevear, Mr. Morgan (both of N.S.W.), and about a dozen other private Members. The Government Whip (Mr. Connellan) moved an amendment in favour of the present system of debt and taxation, and was supported by Members of the Ministry and other senior Members. The debate will serve to show the bankers' friends.

BASLE AND BOMBS: Reports of the bombing of Italy state that alarms were sounded at Basle (headquarters of international banking gangsters), but it is not stated whether or not this den of infamy was bombed. It would be an Allied master-stroke if one or two of the new 3000 lb. bombs could be dropped on the Bank of International Settlements—when all the gangsters were assembled.

DEDMAN'S DUDS: Public opposition to the stupid ban on waistcoats has compelled the lifting of this ban, and explains Mr. Dedman's explanation that the supply of woollen and worsted materials has miraculously increased. The South Australian electoral campaign body, which, through the various tailoring associations throughout Australia, introduced the "pressure politics" idea, has again demonstrated that finality on all such matters rests with the people—and not their political servants. There are many more bureaucratic regulations to be disposed of along these democratic lines.

PETROL COMBINES: As a result of the socialisation (pooling) of petrol, prices have steadily risen, and Prof. Copland has just authorised another increase; it is interesting to note how quickly the worthy professor responds to the requests of the oil monopolists, who have consistently exploited the people. We were informed that pooling the supplies of these exploiters would reduce overhead and lower prices. We were also told that story about milk and bread. But it was only a story—just another one. This should convince many people that socialism (centralisation) is not the way out.

BUREAUCRACY: The latest edict of bureaucratic Liquid Fuel Board officials is that identity cards must be presented before petrol rations can be obtained. This move again illustrates the peculiar faculty of these departments for causing pin-pricking, irritating, delaying procedure. Since no reason for the latest edict is given, one presumes that harassing citizens must be the object. If this kind of procedure is extended, each individual will soon need an official to permanently attend him and carry around all the prescribed documents. That state of affairs would be the bureaucrats' Utopia.

MESSIAH MURDOCH: Speaking at a Brunswick church, presumably under special licence, Messiah (alias Sir Keith) Murdoch most impudently discussed the extremely personal matter of procreation, and urged that Australia should aim at a population increase of a million a year for ten years, as a remedy for our problem. Evidently it did not dawn on this super-egotist that, if population would solve the problem, China, with its teeming millions, would not have any problem. Simple facts like this are too much for simple minds. In any case, this is a question for each individual to answer, and the sooner Murdoch realises that God did not inflict him on the world to mind the other fellow's private affairs, the better for all concerned.

HOSPITAL HORRORS: The following distressing paragraph is contained in an appeal for money issued by the Royal Melbourne Hospital. "Constantly overcrowded and with an income never sufficient to meet its requirements in caring for our sick poor, this Hospital faces a very serious problem." The same can be said of all our communal hospitals; but this appeal for the victims of the bankers' system is quite wrongly directed to the public, who

Special Notice

The "New Times" will NOT be published on December 25 (Christmas Day) and January 1, 1943 (New Year's Day).

Our next issue will be published on JANUARY 8, 1943.

The "New Times" Office, after closing this evening (December 18), will not reopen until January 4, 1943.

"CHANGED SCARCITY TO ABUNDANCE"

Official Pronouncement In U.S.A.

To mark this first anniversary of the signing of the Atlantic Charter, the United States Office of War Information issued a special pamphlet. This pamphlet dealt with the Four Freedoms, and contained the following paragraphs:

"What unites them (the United Nations) is the purpose to create a world in which no one need want for the minimum necessities of an orderly and decent life, for cleanliness, for self-respect, and security.

"It is an ambitious design (!) . . . but it is supported by the sure knowledge that the earth produces abundantly and that men are already in possession of the tools which could realise such a purpose if men chose to use them . . . the discovery that, beyond any doubt, men now possess the technical ability to produce in great abundance the necessities of daily life—enough for everyone. This is a revolutionary and quite unprecedented condition on earth, which stimulates the imagination and quickens the blood. . . .

"Freedom from want, everywhere in the world, is within the grasp of men. It has never been quite within their grasp before. Prosperous times have been enjoyed in certain regions of the world at certain periods in history, but local prosperity was usually achieved at the expense of some

other region, which was being impoverished, and the spectre of impending war hung over all.

"Now, the industrial changes of the last 150 years . . . have given meaning to the phrase, 'freedom from want,' and rendered it not only possible but necessary. . . .

"The tools of production and the skills which men possess are tremendous in the present war emergency, and when the peace comes, the world will contain more skilled people than ever before in history.

"The great civilisations of the past were never free from widespread poverty. Very few of them, and these only during short periods, produced enough wealth to make possible a decent living standard for all their members, even if that wealth had been equally divided. In the short space of a few decades we have changed scarcity to abundance, and are now engaged in the experiment of trying to live with our new and as yet unmanageable riches. The problem becomes one not of production, but of distribution and consumption."

"SECOND FRONT" AGAINST JAPAN?

Major de Seversky, a foremost authority in the U.S.A. on the tactics and strategy of aerial warfare, estimates that if the U.S.A. plans to rely primarily on aerial attack to finish the war with Japan, decision cannot be reached until later than 1945, for not until that year will the constructional programme reach its full striking power. But if America must wait for the completion of her naval programme, decision will not be in sight until after 1948.

The prospect of a prolonged war is only too well founded, as long as hostilities in the Pacific continue to be scattered over tracts of ocean thousands of miles from Japan. "Think of Japan as a great octopus. If we were able to strike at the heart of this crawling beast, at Japan itself, and knock it out there, all the tentacles would instantly fall limp and relax their grip. We are now engaged in the laborious and costly task of hacking away at each of the tentacles. . . . In effect, we are trying to take over command of the entire Pacific basin—half a world!—piecemeal, in order that, thus entrenched, we may then prepare to carry the war to the vital organs of the octopus in the Japanese homeland."

This dissipation of prodigious effort for small gains remains the only way of prosecuting the war so long as America and her allies are unable to get near enough to cripple the sources of Japan's strength. These sources are located in Japan and in Manchukuo. It is known that, with foresight of certain war with the United States, the Japanese have taken care not to "have all their eggs in one basket." The seizure of Manchukuo on the mainland of

Asia was planned in view of the inevitable war with the U.S.A. Manchukuo, with its coal, iron, and other ores, has become part of the heart of "the sprawling beast."

But America is unable to strike there because of the distance from Alaska and the Aleutians—about 2000 miles. Heavy super-bombers could do the journey there and back. But bombers need to be convoyed by fighter escort, for which the distance is too great. What is needed is bases on the Asiatic mainland, for aerodromes fully equipped and serviced for fighters and bombers.

Kamchatka and the island of Sakhalin (the northern half of which is Russian, the southern Japanese) lie on top of Japan; Siberia is divided from Manchukuo only by a river and some mountains. Vladivostok is "a pistol pointed at the heart of Japan." Once Russia were at war with Japan, American supplies and men could stream from Alaska across Siberia, to Sakhalin and Kamchatka. A network of aerodromes would send air armadas of bombers protected by fighters to overwhelm the factories and depots which are keeping the Japanese fighting. The war would end long before 1945.

Certainly, the Russians are already heavily committed in the west. But they have given out that their Siberian armies are ready for war and are independent of the western armies. They know that war with Japan must come. If the Japanese did not fear a second front they would help the Nazis by attacking Russia.

— "Periscope." (Condensed from the "H.N. Monthly," Dec. 1.)

INITIATIVE—AND ALL THAT

By W. WILSON, in the "Social Crediter" (Eng.).

(Continued from last issue.)

Douglas has defined religion as a binding back to reality (truth). Now, if it be agreed that truth is the means of de-hypnotisation, we are forced to the conclusion that the social awakening towards which social crediters strive will be recognisable when it arrives, as a religious awakening. This is "in the air" to-day and is sensed by far more people than read this paper. Nevertheless, I am sure that it will fall to social crediters to bring it to the right directional stress.

Through past ages, religion has manifested itself as an emotional upsurging from the subconscious into the conscious mind. The engine has, in some mysterious way, come to the driver. This time it is the opposite that is happening. The driver is chasing the engine. There's a difference here which goes right down to the root of things. We are arriving at Faith through Knowledge and the inversion of approach is of such significance that it may indeed foreshadow the millennium.

Man's objective knowledge has become so abundant that the enemy finds it necessary to sabotage real thought just as he is sabotaging real wealth. The two are complementary. Exposure of the former leads inevitably to individual faith (faith in one's-self); exposure of the latter leads to social credit (faith in one another).

I have found it useful in developing my theme, to draw a simple parallel between the ego in the conscious mind and the engine driver in his cabin. I have done this deliberately, because it would seem that symbols or parables of some sort provide the simplest means of entry into that part of ourselves which is not conscious. Now I intend to carry my parable through a few evolutionary changes.

I have already said that the "natural" driver is completely unaware of the works— theoretically an ideal condition. But it must be remembered that he is also entirely at the mercy of the first hypnotist to come his way. His happy state has, for this reason, always been short-lived. It

belongs rather to the garden of Eden than to the present world, and must, I think, be regarded as a stage of evolution which will not return.

Now let us suppose that our driver develops a new awareness. He begins to realise that the "engine" is not an engine at all. It is alive, sentient. Moreover, it is old, as old as mankind, and knows every inch of territory between Land's End and John o'Groats with that deep, dark, instinctive understanding which a cat displays when he journeys into neighbouring gardens. The driver now feels himself to be in the saddle of a wise but passionate brute—a sort of super-elephant. He is awed by its power, somewhat afraid, anxious to propitiate. He whispers directional instructions and marvels at the ready and unerring response. This goes on until, one day, out of pure ignorance, he begins giving unreasonable instructions— asks to be taken to a mountain in Lincolnshire or an oilfield in Kent. His animal-god does not move. The driver becomes more insistent in his commands and, at the same time, throws out promises of big blood-meals (do not all big animals enjoy big blood-meals?— at least, to him it is a reasonably safe guess). But, instead of the desired response, the animal suddenly runs amok, and the driver gets the fright of a lifetime.

Here we have an emotion-picture of the subconscious mind as interpreted by the conscious mind in early biblical times, and expressed in the terms of a passionate, jealous, all-wise God who stampeded at intervals, with man sitting somewhere apart as a separate entity, forever propitiating the brute with incantations based on error, and with blood sacrifices.

Notice that the error here is one of conscious judgment. Objective knowledge had not advanced far enough for the subconscious upsurgings to be properly interpreted. Notice also that those who seek to gain remote control of the sub-

A CITIZEN'S LETTER TO DR. EVATT

28 Belgrave Street, East Coburg, N.13,
November 24, 1942

Dr. H. V. Evatt, M.H.R., Federal Attorney-General, c/o Federal Members' Rooms, Post Office Place, Melbourne, C.I.

Dear Sir,—Having read your pamphlet, "War Aims and Reconstruction," and also the "Commonwealth Constitution," would you permit me to ask, why, after so many years occupying a prominent position in the Labor Party platform, the "Initiative, Referendum and Recall" is conspicuous by its complete absence from your proposed alterations? I would not like to think that you were afraid to give this power to the people, or that you think the people are not intelligent enough to be given this power of control, over you and your fellow-members. You are asking for the powers of a centralised control, but what grounds have we upon which to base a belief that these great powers (if they are given by the people) will not be mis-used, especially when consideration is given to the workings of party control, and the balance of power may quite possibly rest on one or two men as at present.

Further, what have we to ensure that the Centralised Power envisaged by you will not neglect to use its power in the interests of the people, just as your present Government is neglecting to do in the field of finance. Under Section 51 of the present Constitution, as you well know, this Government has power to finance this war and the peace to follow (we hope) without the ever-increasing load of unrepayable debt and interest. But they continue to follow the advice of the same Copland, Giblin, Mills, etc., the very men whom the Labor Opposition were never tired of blaming for such things as the Premiers' Plan, etc. You will not use this power, which, if used as I am certain Mr. Curtin and yourself know it could be used, there would be no need whatever to alter the Constitution by so much as one word. You know only too well that "He who controls the nation's credit holds the destiny of the people in the hollow of his hand," and cares not who makes the laws." You promise to "reinstate and advance" those who have been members of the fighting forces and their dependants. If you mean this, why have you not already made it obligatory for employers to reinstate men in their jobs when they return?

conscious mind are virtually forced to treat it as if they accepted this interpretation. Blood, fear and wrong commands sum up the wisdom of the black brotherhood to-day.

Now back to the picture. As time goes on the driver gets more upsurges. His awareness increases. He begins to see his God in his own image. Then, vaguely, he comes to realise that that great fund of instinctive wisdom, reaching back through all the ages, is nothing other than the distilled experience of all the drivers who have sat in the saddle before him. Fear is gradually transformed into devotion towards this omniscient Father, to whom he will surely return after death. Commands now change to exhortations. He begins to allow for his own error of judgment. "Father, I would like to go to a high mountain; I think there is one in Lincolnshire. Nevertheless, thy will be done." And the all-wise Father, understanding the terms of the appeal, bears him safely to Scotland. This is how the great majority of church-going individuals interpret their subconscious minds to-day. They have still another stage to go.

Once again we return to our driver. What now?

Another upsurge—and blinding light. Of course. The Father and I are one entity. Of course. He is not only alive, but He is able to communicate with me, and, of course, His communications are what I have been describing as upsurges—more commonly known as intuition. I am in Him and He in me—of course. But wait. That is what Jesus said. And Jesus said "I am the life," and I will lead you to my Father."

The living "I." The Ego. At last we have our dynamic. No longer the one-way street of Judaism, but a circuit—a giving and taking. Conscious reason fed by intuition; inherited wisdom further enriched by living experience. The result—power.

It remains for us to give a little thought to the way in which we make contact with our subconscious mind. I believe it would be true to say that every single individual will find an approach of his own, if he seeks it. But Jesus gave us a key to all prayer and meditation in the Lord's Prayer.

The Lord's Prayer is a programme of action presented by the conscious mind to the subconscious. It assumes that, since both are of the same nature, both want to arrive at the same destination (policy)—the Kingdom. It also assumes that the Father is best qualified to lead the way (technique)—"Thy will be done." It further underlines the fact that motive force is, and should be in the hands of the technician—"Thine is the power." And it lists a number of useful interim objectives.

I am convinced that anybody who uses the Lord's Prayer with conscious awareness that it is a communication with the inner mind—an alignment of intent—will discover that it is a powerful auto-dynamic.

Why do you not do something about the standard of living of the dependants of men who are now fighting? With every increase in the cost of living (or dying) these people find their standard of living lowered. What is keeping you silent on this matter? After the war, God knows when that will be, will be too late for many of these dependants. We—you and I—are not risking our lives, yet our standard of living is much higher than theirs who are fighting and depending on those who are in the fighting services. Again, why? No money? You know, Dr., that if this war goes on for ten or twenty years, whatever else goes short, money will not and cannot, so long as we, the people, have the power to produce real wealth. You know also, that even if not one penny was subscribed by the people, our war effort need not suffer to the extent of a pin's head. That is true, isn't it?

Further, you want power to transfer workers from war-time to peace-time industries. You must mean industrial conscription, or else you believe that workers are not capable of choosing or refusing for themselves, and so therefore you will not give them the opportunity of doing so. Are you quite sure, Dr. Evatt, that there will be a problem of unemployment, or is it not a problem of "No incomes" or unemployment? In conclusion, sir, I would like to suggest, for your consideration, a proposal for transferring from a war-time to a peace-time footing.

At present many thousands of men and women are, economically speaking, unemployed—the Army, Navy and Air Force—and no matter how long this war continues, these people will be fed, housed and clothed. Assuming then, that the war finished in twelve months or so, I suggest that these people be not discharged except at their own request, when they have found an opening in civil life. Thus there would be no compulsion either to remain in the forces or be thrown out on to the industrial scrap heap and the dole. Our armed forces are fighting for freedom for the individual, and this is accurately gauged by the extent to which he may choose or refuse.—Yours sincerely signed), F. C. Paice.

[When this issue went to press, Mr. Paice had NOT received a reply from Dr. Evatt.—Ed.]

Other personal prayer and meditation will blossom from it like a flower.

To sum up. Initiative is an expression of the life more abundant which springs from integrity of mind. Integrity marks the mind united in policy and in power. Hypnotism (which includes propaganda of all sorts) severs the two minds. De-hypnotisation brings them together again. The instrument of de-hypnotisation is truth—truth about the objective world outside us merged with the truth about the subjective world within. When objective and subjective truth are made one, and held by the ego in the conscious mind, then we are de-hypnotised, and we have arrived at true religion.

I hope that nobody who reads this will charge me with having attempted to explain the spiritual world—much less to explain it away. My sole concern has been to diagnose a disease and find the antidote. Only by curing the disease shall we find the spiritual world—or the material world, for that matter.

HORSE-POWER TAX

The following paragraph appeared in the London "Evening News" of August 20: "I was particularly intrigued with the colossal tank transporters, which can draw even a huge Churchill up on their backs. These mammoth lorries are American 'Whites'. I understand that our horse-power tax was responsible for the fact that no lorries of that capacity could be found in this country. That is why we had to import them from America."

C.P. ATTITUDE

The central council of the United Country Party recently carried a resolution opposing the holding of a referendum on constitutional amendment while so many electors were absent on war service, "especially as the interests of returned soldiers will be so vitally affected by the carrying of the proposed amendments."

The council reaffirmed its firm adherence to the Federal system of Government, and the traditional decentralisation policy of the party as being essential to the welfare and the development of all interests in the Commonwealth.

"Consequently," the resolution added, "the council records its uncompromising opposition to constitutional amendments designed to accentuate centralisation."

SEASONAL GREETINGS

Mr. Frank Devlin, tailor, of 340 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, who advertises so consistently in these columns, extends seasonal greetings to "New Times" readers and expresses his appreciation of the valued custom that many of them have given him.

UNDERMINING OUR MORALE

Sir James Elder Again

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

Sir,—Last year Sir James Elder, as Chairman of the National Bank of Australasia United, issued a "warning" against the dangers of allowing people to have money, and of the ideas being spread by monetary reformers. He called for strong action to deprive us of our "spending power."

Spending power is, of course, buying power, and the availability of buying power determines whether we shall have industrial activity (prosperity) or industrial stagnation (depression). Buying power is the means through which we get access to the material things we desire, and also the only means through which we can get out of financial debt.

Sir James is again attempting to scare the people into a condition of mental apprehension, and he is doing so by seeking to spread the false idea that unless we stick to the absurd notions of the past all sorts of dire consequences will fall upon us. These absurd notions of the past have led us into the tragic but laughable position that we are still paying interest on the "financial" cost of the Crimean War, to say nothing of the South African and 1914-18 wars. Not only so, but it is the intention that we and all generations which follow us shall continue to pay interest on such "costs" forever. The purpose of this dishonourable conduct on the part of the elderly knight (he was 73 on the 10th of November) is to ensure that whatever else may happen, the PEOPLE will never be allowed to escape from the clutches of the debt merchants.

The more kindly people will naturally ask: But why should such an estimable old gentleman wish to do this? He is doing it because debts, and plenty of them, are the very life-blood of the banking system as at present operating. It was because of the inability of the people to pay their debts that even before the war the Banks, which produce nothing, were obtaining ownership of Australian assets at the rate of million pounds per month. The rate since the commencement of the war has, of course, been greater.

Without debts the people would be free, but in that case the Banks would be without assets. DEBTS owing by the people to the Banks are bank assets, but DEPOSITS owing by the Banks to the people are bank liabilities. So we see that, by depriving the people of large portions of their incomes, we keep them in debt, and if, at the same time, they are forced to use up their "reserves in the form of deposits, the result is that the position of the Bank is strengthened while the position of the individual is weakened. The effect of this on the PEOPLE doesn't matter to

the bankers. It didn't matter to them in 1920, until the late lamented Sir Denison Miller took practical steps to stop their roguery; it didn't matter to them in 1930, when they had professional economists ready to play their dirty game; and it wouldn't matter to them now if they were permitted to continue to impose their dishonest practices on a long-suffering community. They know that the people as a whole can never pay their debts because the quantity of money available to the community is purposely kept to a very small fraction of the amount owing. Those of us who are not in debt directly to the Banks have not escaped from their clutches, because we have been persuaded to place ourselves in lifelong debt to their deflation agents—the insurance companies. It is their purpose to keep a check on our "spending power."

This year Sir James Elder and other spokesmen for the private money monopoly are even more audacious. In the "Argus" of 26/11/42 there was a two-column report of the speech given by Sir James to bank shareholders, and I should like to comment on several portions of it. It is strange how there seems no shortage of space in the daily press for utterances of this kind, but no room at all for the actual facts as they affect the every-day living conditions of the people. In the course of his address to the shareholders, Sir James is reported to have said this:

"The fact that no country has devised methods of financing a war which completely avoid reduction in the purchasing power of its money must not blind us to the dangers of currency depreciation. Present financial trends in Australia demand that these dangers be more clearly recognised, and that every one of us should fight with all our might to arrest progressive depreciation of the Australian pound."

Coming from the Chairman of the leading bank behind the metal monopoly, that surely is priceless. For such a man to profess concern about the "dangers" of currency depreciation when he knows that this and currency appreciation are the two halves of the banker's trade cycle, is almost the same as Satan reproving sin.—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, 13th December, 1942.

(To be continued.)

you and Mr. Holloway. Dr. Evatt's promises to soldiers after the war are not nearly as important as your actions now.—Yours sincerely, (signed) F. C. Paice.

Senator Cameron's reply to Mr. Paice reads as follows:

Minister for Aircraft Production, 53 Russell Street, Melbourne, C.1., December 7, 1942.

Dear Sir,—As you say in your letter of November 24, conscription is always demanded by those who believe they will be able to obtain "cheap soldiers." I am certain, also, that the vast number of workers in this country are bewildered at the sudden political trend which, if carried to its desired end, will cause a very serious rift in Australian community life. When I see the Honorable Minister for Health, Mr. Holloway, I shall mention that you congratulated him for his consistent stand in opposition to conscription, and would like to add my thanks for your encouraging remarks about my own attitude.—Yours faithfully, D. Cameron, Minister for Aircraft Production.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

Christmas Holidays: The rooms at Headquarters, 17 Waymouth-street, will be closed from December 24 until January 4, 1943. However, during the latter part of the week, between Christmas and New Year, the rooms may be open during the lunch-hour period (12 till 2 p.m.), when members of the executive will be there.—M. R. W. Lee, Hon. Secretary.

LABOUR CAMPS: The Melbourne "Sun" of November 28 quotes Mr. Ward, M.H.R., as pointing out the dangers of manpower regulations thus: "Conscription as exercised by the Allied Works Council should be an illustration of the danger of placing greater power in the hands of these people." It seems unbelievable that such a body could have the power—in Australia—to drag aged men from their homes and send them to Allied works jobs. An emphatic protest should be made by electors to their Federal and State Members against these powers of compulsion.

NEW TACTICS OF NEW YORK "TIMES"

"Men First," New York, devotes considerable space, in a recent issue, to the "anti-money-monopoly" Speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury at the Albert Hall, London, on September 26. This breezy American publication concludes with the following reference to the reaction of the New York "Times":—

The N.Y. "Times," editorialising on the Archbishop on October 4, refers his speech to the idea of socialising credit, and, brudders, bowl me over with a three-man beetle if the "Times" hasn't suddenly stopped jeering at this idea. I have kept clippings of every "Times" editorial on Alberta; some day they would come in handy for a bit of banter. March 28, 1938, for instance, the "Times" jeered: "Social credit is a mystic thing, the more mystical the more it is defined." September 2, 1935, it said loftily: "In essence the (S.C.) plan will be seen to be merely one more of the infinite number of inflation schemes." But to-day, brudders, what do we read in the "Times"? "The idea of the socialisation of credit is widely held, and could conceivably be adopted overnight." The "Times" discovers that "it is nothing new to find a dignitary of the Church condemning the operations of the credit system," and it actually trembles on the edge of financial insight when it admits that "the underlying theory of the demand

for the socialisation of credit has been that our system leads to chronic deficiencies in the volume of purchasing power available to purchase the volume of goods produced." Quite a change, eh, from the old tone of mocking at Mr. Aberhart's fight against the credit monopoly?

But before you clap handies, I must tell you there's something tricky about this editorial. It seems the Archbishop overlooked that "we have already gone quite far in that direction" (socialisation of credit), and although the "Times" doesn't quite say so, the impression is conveyed that the "deficit financing of modern Governments" is practically socialised credit. Those who follow the monetary front in England will recognise at once that the N.Y. "Times" is adopting the line of the London "Times": borrowing the language of social credit and then palming off a substitute like deficit financing and suggesting that this is the social credit people want.

—Gorham Munson.

N.S.W. Council in Bonds of Debt

Mr. Seiffert: I ask the Minister for Local Government whether it is a fact that many shire and municipal councils throughout the country districts were encouraged to, and did, borrow large sums of money under what has been known as the Spooner Grant-Loan Scheme. Is it also a fact that because they adopted this Spooner scheme the councils now find themselves in bondage to private insurance and finance companies? If these are facts, does the Minister propose taking appropriate action to protect the councils that are now in difficulties, brought about by war-time conditions and the cessation of activities associated with semi-local Government organisations?

Mr. James McGirr: The total amount owing by municipal and shire councils outside the county of Cumberland up to the 30th June, 1935, was approximately £2,500,000. That amount had increased between 1935 and 1939 to approximately £9,500,000. Interest in excess of 3½ per cent, is being paid by the Government, which means that the State is paying an amount of over £50,000 a year under the undertaking given by the former Government. That is apart from the £177,500 endowment that the State Government pays annually to shires. It is true that many councils borrowed money in respect of schemes that, because of war conditions, are not being utilised to-day. For instance, improved bathing facilities were made available at beaches, but the councils involved in that expense are losing considerably because the beaches cannot be utilised. That, however, is a matter for the Commonwealth Government. So far as the impecuniosity of municipal and shire councils is concerned, they are not actually in that condition because general income to them at present cannot be expended due to war. For that reason the municipalities and shires are not in the position of being without finance for the carrying out of necessary works. The actual position is that those bodies have borrowed an extra £7,000,000, and in many cases no returns are being derived from the works

CENTRALISATION

"I come now to the question of centralisation, or unification, as it is sometimes called. As one who has made a life-time study of local government in country districts, I advise hon. members to be very careful before they are stampeded into handing over State powers to the Commonwealth, thus centralising the full control of this country entirely in Canberra. There is an old saying to this effect:

"The forms of law let fools contest,
That which is best administered is best."

"That is certainly true. This is really a question of administration. I agree with the hon. member for Dulwich Hill as to the growth of bureaucracy in this country. Unification must result in the intensification of bureaucracy throughout Australia, and by bureaucracy I mean the establishment of committees consisting of public servants, who are not subject to the will and control of the people, to carry out wide and diverse functions. Under unification we would have a position similar to that existing in this State to-day in regard to the Commissioner for Railways, who has dictatorial powers, and who has taken up an attitude of opposition to the State Government in a matter of major policy."

—F. J. Cahill, M.L.A., speaking in N.S.W. Parl., October 28.

upon which this money was expended. Councils find themselves in the position of owing huge sums of money upon which interest and sinking funds, or instalments, are falling due, and this Government, in order to carry out the obligations entered into by the previous Government, is now paying over £50,000 a year to meet the interest in excess of 3½ per cent., which is being charged on the councils' loans.

—N.S.W. "Hansard" report for Oct. 27.

EXTRACTS FROM MAGNA CHARTA (1215 A.D.)

10. If any one shall have taken any sum, great or small, as a loan from the Jews, and shall die before that debt is paid, that debt shall not bear interest so long as the heir, from whomever he may hold, shall be under age. And if the debt fall into our hands, we shall take nothing save the chattel contained in the deed.

11. And if any one dies owing a debt to the Jews, his wife shall have her dowry, and shall restore nothing of that debt. But if there shall remain children of that dead man, and they shall be under age, the necessities shall be provided for them according to the nature of the dead man's holding; and from the residue the debt shall be paid, saving the service due to the lords. In like manner shall be done concerning debts that are due to others besides Jews.

20. A freeman shall only be amerced for a small offence according to the measure of that offence. And for a great offence he shall be amerced according to the magnitude of the offence, saving his contentment (means of subsistence), and a merchant, in the same way, saving his merchandise. And a villein, in the same way, if he fall under our mercy, shall be amerced saving his wainnage. And none of the aforesaid fines shall be imposed save upon oath of upright men from the neighbourhood.

28. No constable or other bailiff of ours shall take the corn or other chattels of any one except he straightway give money for them, or can be allowed a respite in that regard by the will of the seller.

30. No sheriff nor bailiff of ours, nor

any one else, shall take the horses or carts of any freeman for transport, unless by the will of that freeman.

38. No bailiff, on his own simple assertion, shall henceforth put any one to his law, without producing faithful witnesses in evidence.

39. No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseized, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any way harmed, save by the lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.

40. To none will we sell, to none deny or delay, right or justice.

45. We will not make men justices, constables, sheriffs or bailiffs unless they are such as know the law of the realm, and are minded to observe it rightly.

CABLE FROM ABERHART

His Grace,

The Archbishop of Canterbury, England.

On behalf of the people of Alberta who re-elected this Government in nineteen forty to continue our fight for the establishment of a social security economy, I desire to express to your Grace our deep gratitude for your courageous lead to Christendom in urging the national control of money as an essential step to the elimination of the evils inherent in the present private monopoly controlled system. We trust that the nations will actively recognise the wisdom of your proposals. —William Aberhart, Premier of Alberta.

A LETTER TO SENATOR CAMERON

28 Belgrave Street, East Coburg, N.13,
24/11/42.

Senator D. Cameron, c/o Federal Members' Rooms, Post Office Place, C.1.

Dear Sir,—Please permit me the pleasure of offering my heartfelt congratulations to you and Mr. E. J. Holloway for the consistent stand which you are taking in opposing conscription of the A.M.F. for overseas service.

Conscription is always demanded by those who know that they will not have to serve under it, and coming from men who owe their present public position to their opposition to conscription for years is such a shock that it must make workers bewildered and uncertain as to who do really represent them. During all this talk of forcing others than ourselves into the jaws of death, nobody seems to remember that conscription would not be necessary if the word inducement were used more often. Does it not occur to Mr. Curtin and his colleagues that if men cannot see their way clear to risk their lives, and to reduce the standard of living of their dependants, for the amount offering, that it still is not necessary to compel them to do so, but that it is only necessary to give them, now, a guarantee of good faith by increasing the incomes of both the soldier and his dependants, so that they will at least have the same standard as those who do not risk their lives. As Mr. Curtin believes (or does he?) in equality of sacrifice, would he be prepared to serve in the front line knowing that his wife and children were trying to eke out an existence on the paltry income permitted to the dependants of the men whose blood is to-day staining the battlefield? What is it, Senator, that makes once good working men turn to the ways of the dictator? Have they lost faith in their fellow-workers? If so, can they wonder if the worker loses faith in them? Already the question is gaining ground: "Is Mr. Curtin preparing to follow W. M. Hughes and the late J. Lyons?" It would be interesting to know how many of the "patriotic" Communists who are now backing Mr. Curtin, will themselves be involved in the conscription move proposed.

Again congratulations, Mr. Cameron, and I know that if only the people were given an opportunity to express an opinion, they would be overwhelmingly behind

FOR WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING?

(The substance of a leaflet issued by the Democratic Monetary Organisation of Canada.—Concluded from last issue.)

FUTILITY OF PARTY SYSTEM.

At present we operate our political institution under the "party system." A political party is a vested interest for those who stand to gain from the party's organisation. Whatever ideals might have originally inspired the formation of the party, in time the main objective becomes the preservation of the party organisation as a means of conferring favours on its supporters.

Thus we get several vested interests existing as political parties all fighting each other, and scheming to win popular support—leading to intrigue, patronage, graft and all the evils we find to-day.

Because of this situation, parties become easy victims of big interests. To maintain a strong organisation, parties require funds which will readily be provided by big interests on conditions favourable to them. Thus parties become the tools of those who finance them.

At election time a divided and unorganised electorate is subject to a barrage of confusing propaganda. They are invited to vote for one party candidate or another. When elected, the party candidate represents his party and not his constituents; he is subjected to party control, and that means control by those who manipulate the party.

Is it any wonder that the people never get the results they want? That is not real democracy, because that kind of dog-fight, controlled from the top, can never yield the people the results they desire.

CONTROL BY THE PEOPLE.

However, if the people are organised and united in a single Union of Electors, they will decide the results they want, they will choose their representatives, and they will control, not only those representatives, but every institution in the country, and insist on getting the results they want.

How? It would be simple. A Government under an organised electorate would be able to govern only so long as it obeyed the will of the people. Democratic government requires co-operation by the people—in the payment of taxes, in the support of Government regulations, and so forth. If the Government refuses to obey its "directors," the people, the people can demand and enforce the Government's resignation, provided they are organised. No Government and no institution could withstand an organised demand by a united people.

That is how the political voting system of a democracy can be made effective. But what about the economic voting system?

Yes, just as the people have a political voting system to enable them to get the results they want in the political sphere, so they have an economic voting system to enable them to decide what kinds of goods and services are made available for their use in the economic sphere.

This economic vote is provided by the money system. To the extent a person has money he has economic voting power. He can go into a store and demand the kind of goods he wants. This in turn decides what goods shall be produced, how much shall be produced and who shall produce them. For example, by buying a pair of brown shoes made by the Smith Shoe Company in preference to any other article, a person votes for: (a) the production of more shoes, (b) the production of more brown shoes, and, (c) the production of more brown shoes of that particular pattern by the Smith Shoe Company.

MONEY—THE ECONOMIC VOTE

To the extent a person has money he has economic voting power. To the extent he has economic voting power he has security. And to the extent he gets this economic voting power as a right and not as a concession granted by somebody else, he has economic freedom.

So you see how important it is that the people should control their monetary (i.e., economic voting) system just as effectively as they control their political system. They cannot do so directly, but if they have effective control over parliament, and parliament has effective control over the monetary system, then the people will control their economic voting rights. The money system will be operated to give them the results they want.

Canada is a wealthy country. We have vast natural resources. Properly organised they could provide Canadians with a high standard of living.

Poverty can be abolished.

We can establish security and freedom for all Canadians in terms of the results they want.

The tyranny of unpayable debt and harsh peace-time taxation can be swept away—for they reduce the security and the freedom of all.

Fine homes; the best possible health services; adequate highways; a high standard of education for every child; these are all possible.

Adequate wages; just prices; more leisure for all instead of poverty-stricken unemployment for some; all these can be achieved.

BUT THIS IS POSSIBLE ONLY UNDER A PROPERLY FUNCTIONING DEMOCRACY.

Because only under a properly functioning democracy would the people control their affairs through the voting system to get the results they want.

FREEDOM OR SLAVERY?

Totalitarianism under any form means rule from the top. It means that the people must accept the conditions imposed upon them. It means regimentation of the many by the few. It means that "the State" controls the people's political and economic voting system and thus controls them; and "the State" are those who are managing the people's affairs, who, under democracy, are the people's servants, but under totalitarianism are their masters.

We know from experience that we have not given democracy a chance in the past. The poor inefficient thing that resulted in so much poverty, in unemployment and in debt-bondage was not real democracy. Yet we had the constitutional rights and the machinery to make democracy a functioning and glorious reality. But we, the people, failed to exercise our responsibilities as the "directors" of Canada. It has taken the tragedy of another war and the threat of totalitarian domination to make us realise this.

The vision of Canada re-born! The achievement of the Canada of our dreams! The inspiration of the Canada we can build under a strong and virile democracy! Is that not something worth fighting for, working for and making a reality?

Yes, it means hard fighting against the military forces of Nazi-Jap totalitarianism, which would deny us the realisation of that new and glorious future; it means hard work to get the people organised to obtain the results they want.

If in fighting totalitarianism, we become totalitarian ourselves, what kind of post-war world will we inherit? What will all the sacrifice and suffering in this struggle profit us? And what kind of world will we pass on to our children; yet is that not a very real danger we face?

A CHALLENGE TO ALL SINCERE PEOPLE

Moreover, let us not shut our eyes to the fact that this great conflict raging in the world, which is centred in the clash between the principles of the democratic and totalitarian concepts of life, is but the physical evidence of a much more fundamental conflict on the spiritual plane.

"For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places . . ."

You can see how the issues are. You can see how urgent is the call to "action stations." Shall we go forward together?

CASE AGAINST CONSCRIPTION

(Continued from page 1.)

It was pledged to maintain the policy of universal military training and service for the defence of Australia. As late as October 31, 1940, President Franklin Roosevelt, explaining to the American people the Selective Training and Service Act said:

"Your boys are not going to be sent to any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war away from our shores."

6. If you give to any man the power to decide whether another shall or shall not be sent abroad to fight, you make him that other's master. The more that other dreads being called on to serve out of Australia the more careful will he be to avoid offending the authority that can send him. Striking coal miners have already been threatened that they will be taken from the mines and put in the army. How much more intimidating would be that threat if the striker could be conscripted to serve overseas! The conscriptionist does not propose that every fit man shall be sent to fight overseas. He demands that every fit man shall be at the disposal of the military and the man-power authorities to go or to stay as they may direct. If the conscriptionist policy is adopted, each eligible man in Australia will enjoy on sufferance his home, the companionship of his family and his friends, his liberty of action and his freedom of conscience. A single act, a single omission, one word, a breath of rumour may deprive him of all these. No doubt the military and the man-power authorities will act according to their own conception of the national interest and the national need. But their act will be arbitrary. In the myriad of individual cases how could a Minister, how could Parliament interfere?

7. Knowing this, the exempt worker will hesitate to assert his own rights or to support others in asserting their rights. "If he happens for any reason to be obnoxious to his employer—if, for instance, he has taken an active part as a trade unionist in movements for the rise of wages or for the improvement of the conditions of labour—the employer may take advantage of this or that pretext to dismiss him. Thereupon he loses his certificate of exemption unless he can get re-employment at once in some similar trade, and he becomes 'ipso facto' a soldier and subject to military law."

This was said by Mr. Asquith in January, 1916. Mr. Asquith's remedy was to trust the employers. He was replying to Sir John Simon, who had said: "So long as you provide that the State may take an unwilling individual and at any time put him in the army, I see the

Mr. Hollins, M.L.A., Opposes More Power For Canberra

(Concluded from last issue.)

Two methods would be possible of employment in order to meet the situation. Vast public works would place the necessary purchasing power in the hands of the community to keep industry alive; or we could continue to pay the wages of munition workers and the men in the fighting forces until industry had been reorganised and rendered capable of meeting the effective demand.

Mr. A. A. Dunstan: What about the primary producers?

Mr. Hollins: They would come under the same arrangement in that the effective purchasing power would create a demand for their products, as it would for the products of secondary industries. Both methods I have outlined would, under the present, financial system, mean a tremendous increase in the public debt. Although it may be thought that we must choose one or the other, nevertheless, there is a method by which we could undertake public works or continue to pay fighting forces or munition workers until absorbed in industry, without adding to the public debt.

It has been implied during the present debate that when the war ends Australia will be a poverty-stricken nation, but I give that suggestion the lie direct.

I suggest that the stabilisation of prices, as proposed in the Constitution alteration measure, could be applied by the Commonwealth Parliament under its existing powers. In Great Britain price stabilisation has been achieved by subsidising producers to sell below the cost of production, and in that respect I propose to quote an extract from the Budget speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Kingsley Wood, who said:

"Rents have been practically stationary since the outbreak of war. Railway fares have been stabilised, and the general price level has been very steady for nearly ten months. Price stabilisation cost £125,000,000 in the last calendar year, which is less than it was feared it might cost. We must expect the requisite sum in 1942 to be materially higher, as a result of higher agricultural wages and the rising tendency of overseas markets. The stabilisation policy has largely obviated the necessity for increasing wages, resulting in the avoidance of an inflationary spiral."

greatest and most fundamental difficulty in combining that with individual freedom." In fact, they never were combined during conscription in Britain, and they are not being combined even now in Australia. It we extend the area within which men may be called on to serve, we shall make more intolerable and inevitable the danger of industrial conscription. And, if this is the plight of the organised worker, encouraged by the sympathy of his mates and fortified by the support of his union, how much worse will be the plight of the isolated fighter for an unpopular cause, the defender of his own right and of others' right to say unpopular things!

8. Finally, it must be seen that compulsion for overseas service threatens our national security. It is our national interest that the soil of Australia should be defended. Section 49 of the Defence Act is our only guarantee that Australia will be defended. But for Section 49 we should long ago have sent overseas all our available men. This is a controversy between Australians. Every Australian must regret that American publicists have intervened in it, and that we should be urged in the name of America, to agree to a policy which we detest. Those who talk of the American example should remember that this is America's war as much as it is ours. We do not look upon the American soldiers as men who have come here merely to aid Australia. The Americans are a small part of the forces placed under the command of an American general. Before Japan and America were at war, Major-General G. J. Rankin, M.H.R., told the House of Representatives why he is an anti-conscriptionist. His words have lost none of their point since the day they were uttered. Speaking on July 2, 1941, the General said:

"Personally I do not believe in conscription. During the last war I did not vote for it, and specific reasons have prompted me to adopt this attitude. For example, a general in battle will take the best weapon that comes to his hand and will use it again and again. If Australia had four divisions in the field with an unlimited supply of reinforcements they would be employed repeatedly, and this country would be bled white." ("Hansard," volume 167, page 765.)

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE.

The Official History of Australia during the War of 1914-1918: Vol. III, page 892 (first referendum), and Vol. V, page 22 (second referendum). Dr. C. E. W. Bean; Vol. XI, page 442, Mr. Donald Mackinnon (then Director of Recruiting); Pacific Affairs for 1936, page 594, Mr. F. W. Eggleston, who during the First Great War was a soldier and a conscriptionist.

[The foregoing article, together with a reprint of "Conscription Must be Rejected" (by H. E. Boote, editor of the "Worker"), appears in a pamphlet just issued by May Brodny, Box 39, Trades Hall, Mel-

bourne. Copies of the pamphlet may be obtained, at 1/- per dozen (postage 2d.), from Rawson's Bookshop, 169 Exhibition-street, Melbourne, C.1.]

That has been achieved in the Old Country, and I suggest that price stabilisation and profiteering can be completely controlled by that method in Australia.

I have made it clear that the present methods are disastrous. What we want is more sense, not more power. We are learning during the war that what is physically possible is financially possible. Nobody in his sound senses would suggest that the nations are going to call off the war simply because they have run out of money. In war-time, money is of no consequence. It is the physical limits only that count. When the war ends, let us recognise the fundamental principle which we are now learning, when we shall be wealthy beyond imagination. We shall have more trained artisans, more factories, additional material resources to develop such as we have never had before. In a physical sense, we shall be more wealthy than ever, yet we shall be financially poor. Physical wealth and financial poverty will exist, and, if we attempt to pay off the war debt instead of buying the goods we produce after the war, we shall be faced with financial and economic chaos. We have not yet finished paying for the Battle of Waterloo, and never will, within the framework of the present system.

We want individual freedom in security. A slave has security, but no freedom. If the proposed alterations to the Constitution were agreed to, the regimentation of the individual, which could be effected by the Commonwealth Government, could be very serious. The proposed new subsections (2) and (3), which have been amplified by other speakers, provide for powers that, if granted, would be almost absolute, and they would be included in the Commonwealth Constitution for all time, or at any rate until further amendments were made. If the measure is passed the Commonwealth Parliament will have the final say, and the time-honoured High Court will not be able to arbitrate any longer between the State and the citizen.

The Bill must not be allowed to pass into law, especially when so many men and women are bleeding and dying to maintain the freedom and privileges that we enjoy under the present Commonwealth Constitution.

POLITICIANS' RECORDS

"The evil that men do lives after them. The good is oft interred with their bodies."

When Mr. Curtin passes on from the Prime Ministership of Australia, please God that will be soon—the record of his stewardship will resemble that of every other Prime Minister in the memory of this generation. At least, all existing indications point that way. With this thought in my mind I conducted a sort of Gallup poll all of my own and, during a fortnight I asked numerous people such questions as "Who was the best politician Australia has produced?" "What was his outstanding act of legislation?" "Do you consider Federation has been justified?" My tabulation of the answers reveals an attitude of despair amongst the people. The best politician, according to my list of answers is Hughes. Then follow Deakin, Bruce, Fisher, Dr. Maloney, Sir Alexander Peacock, Jack Lang and King O'Malley—in that order. Very few could associate any one politician with any one piece of legislation. The following, however, are interesting:

Hughes: Creation of Commonwealth police force as a result of someone throwing an overripe egg at him.

Deakin: Betraying the protectionist policy on which he was elected by forming a "Fusion" Government.

Bruce: Wrecking the Commonwealth Bank in collaboration with Earle Page.

Fisher: The Baby Bonus.

Dr. Maloney: Initiated Referendum and recall—always beaten.

Sir Alex. Peacock: Wages Boards.

Jack Lang: The Lang Plan.

King O'Malley: The Commonwealth Bank.

Joe Lyons: Withdrawal of Commonwealth embargo on traffic in Tattersall's tickets.

Jas. Scullin: Reducing old-age pensions as part of the Premiers' Plan.

R. G. Merzies: Section 99 and failure to persuade the people to alter the Constitution.

E. G. Theodore: Mungana leases.

Most of those questioned had difficulty in saying whether or not Federation has been justified. Without exception, all considered Australia to be woefully over-governed. Older people, who remember pre-Federation days, were quite unanimous that Federation was an unwarranted burden, and they all preferred the "good old days," when more liberty prevailed.

— "Sherlock H."