

ON OTHER PAGES:

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ORDER (Page 2)

WHAT ARE WE UP AGAINST? (Page 3)

WHY VIC. LABOR REJECTED CONSCRIPTION (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 9 No. 2 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JAN. 15, 1943

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 lime!
Now, when the padlocks for our lips are forging,
Silence is crime.
Whittier (1807-1892).

What is Behind this New O.P.F.A. Movement?

Paradoxical Purposes Propounded

In the past few months we have heard a lot of talk about the "Four Freedoms": those somewhat abstract phrases which can be used by centralisers and power-lusters to entice us along the path to tyranny. And now, with a loud, urgent call—which, incidentally, must be costing a mint of money in advertising—the people of this country are being exhorted to flock to the banner of the "One Parliament for Australia Movement" in order to obtain a "True-Blue Democracy."

In one of the most sumptuous suites of Menzies' Hotel, Melbourne, Mr. A. W. Anderson, the founder, and Mr. Harold Sterling, his secretary, explained the aims of the movement to Messrs. J. Browne and J. R. Johnstone, representatives of the "New Times." The stated aims are:

- (a) The abolition of State Parliaments—for the sake of economy.
- (b) Decentralisation.

How can the above aims be reconciled? How could anybody advocate centralisation and decentralisation all in one breath? Here is their answer:

By abolishing Boards that cannot justify their existence, and setting up committees in their stead (!!!), we will have a host of localised (decentralised) bureaux carry-

ing out the policy of a central Government. In other words, Mr. James Smith, of Upotipotpon, who dislikes the regulation of his life by Mr. Potbelly Bureaucrat, still has no way of escape, as the latter gentleman is not responsible to him for his actions. So decentralisation, according to Mr. Anderson, merely means geographical decentralisation of administration—giving power to a more scattered bevy of officials without them being made responsible to the people they regulate.

The immediate aim of the O.P.F.A. Movement is to get 90 (although Mr. Sterling stated that if he had his way there would only be 20) "brainless, honest, sincere and conscientious statesmen" into

Parliament. The number quoted above is apparently considered quite sufficient for our needs.

The statesmen who "get into power" will vote "for or against, as they think most beneficial in the interests of Australia and the Australian people. . . ."

Do you get the idea? In our "True-Blue Democracy" we will have politicians, not representing the declared policy of the electors—Oh dear, no!—but telling us what we must do for our own good; as we, apparently do not know what is good for us!

On the question of financial control, both Mr. Anderson and Mr. Sterling were most evasive. All we required, they said, were sincerity, faith and optimism. Because the Movement was democratic, the people would formulate the technical details of the financial system as the organisation gained momentum. Although this would put the people in the position

of experts, and consequently place the responsibility for the correct functioning of the financial system on their shoulders, Mr. Sterling thought it a grand idea.

If the aforesaid Mr. James Smith is deprived of his means of livelihood through a muddling financial system, he will know precisely who to hold responsible—the people of Australia!!! You may think that unsatisfactory, but think of the trouble it would save the Bankers and our governing officials!

From the mass of high-sounding, nebulous sentences included in the prospectus of the O.P.F.A., these interesting facts emerge: The O.P.F.A. has been born within the same period as Dr. Evatt's Bill to take powers away from the States and centralise power in Canberra, and the fundamental aims of this movement and the present Government (which conform to those of the International Bankers) are the same.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

The Melbourne "Herald" finance writer threw a bomb into the orthodox camp, in the issue of January 5, when for once he stated some financial truths, viz.: "Actually taxes have nothing to do directly with winning the war. That depends mainly on manpower and material—which can be commandeered if necessary. If taxes are not paid and if loans are not subscribed, that does not mean that we shall lose the war." That ought to be an excellent reference, and one that should be framed and hung in every home and Bank—in fact, it would not be out of place anywhere.

MUDDLED MEDICOS: Dr. L. V. Hurley, giving evidence before the Parliamentary committee on social security, said: "A system of centralised medical services should begin now." He is the Director-General of Air Medical Services, and, of course, at the moment has the military centralised complex. Apparently he wants to eliminate the decentralised doctor's home practice, in favour of medical centres; in which scheme of things it might even be infragid or unprofessional to visit patients, and we would then see long queues of sick and infirm people waiting at these centres, as they do at our communal centralised public hospitals. This centralisation bacteria is the common enemy of man.

PEACE PARTY: The press of November 28, commenced on Italy's internal cracks, and described the "peace party," making a significant statement, viz.: "This party is sponsored by those whom even Mussolini dare not touch." Fancy that now! And all these years Musso has been held up to the innocent press-dope addicts as THE "big noise." Won't there be some fun when the time comes to tell us that Hitler also was just an errand boy for the International bankers. The pages of history are full of these puppets, but the time is not far distant when the master crooks will be in the dock.

PRICE PROBLEMS: Apart from other causes of increased costs, taxes imposed by the Government have caused such an increase in living costs that the bankers' economists are becoming alarmed, and now propose a subsidy plan for a selected range of essential consumer goods, along the lines adopted by Britain—that is, subsidised from revenue (taxes). This source of subsidies is an extension of the socialistic levelling-down technique similar to the Beveridge Plan—designed to sustain the bankers' rule. If the proposed subsidies were provided from new money, free of debt and interest charges, the scheme would be worth while. Students of "New Economics" should work overtime to press this point.

LEASE-LEND: Reports from Washington indicate trouble in the new Congress over lease-lend investments, and state that one Congressman says that Americans should be shown how they can make a profit from them. The following is also suggested as a post-war aim: "Some organisation of world affairs with a dominant voice for America to safeguard peace and enable U.S., in the role of banker and employer, to reap some return on its immense investment now being made in world stability." It will be bad luck if every country seeks this objective when the whistle blows.

POLITICAL PALS: "Hansard" for December reports Mr. Calwell as saying that at present "the Communist Party is allied with the U.A.P. in the campaign for conscription." This is interesting in view of the following statement made several months ago by leaders of the Communists, and quoted by Mr. Calwell: "Whilst the imperialist powers are destroying themselves the Soviet Government is standing

aloof and strengthening itself." All this may help to explain lifting the ban on the Communist Party.

GAINFUL WORK: This queer descriptive term, as applied to the proposal to conscript women, raises the question as to what is, or is not, gainful; but, presumably, that will be determined by the manpower bureaucrats. It does seem that out standing army of women money-box rattlers are in for a spot of gainful work. These armies of box shakers, who convert nearly every Friday into a Bedlam, have given rise to the saying that "Melbourne is a rattling good town."

CONVERSIONS: Press reports dealing with weakening Italian morale state that "Italians in Greece are converting their ill-gotten gains into Gold." Quite a surprising report, since all countries have been off the gold standard for many years! If this report is correct, Mussolini must have tricked the Italian financial gangsters—a most unlikely situation.

FARMERS STRIKE: As a protest against what they described as the tyranny of the "Tick Board," which insists on seizing and dipping live stock, nine hundred members of the Clarence Stockowners League, in the Grafton district of N.S.W., fed milk to the pigs and poured the rest down the drain. This action was designed to force intervention by the authorities, which has since occurred, and an investigation has been promised. It is very regrettable that bureaucratic Boards should drive producers to the point of even foregoing their income to defend their principles, but they saw no other reasonably quick way to eradicate the danger of Board interference.

U.S. BUREAUCRATS: A report in the Melbourne "Sun" of January 8 deals with the growing army of socialistic bureaucrats, and mentions just a few, viz., 80,000 in the Department of Agriculture, 19,000 in the War Production Administration, 28,000 in the Price Control Administration, who seem to do nothing but find new and complicated ways of harrassing citizens. The Yanks will have to go very hard to beat us in this field.

WAR EFFORTS: With due regard to the impressive U.S. war effort, "Hansard" for December quotes Mr. James, M.H.R., as illustrating Australia's super-effort thus: "We have an army of about 500,000, and about 800,000 in munitions and other direct war services. If U.S. was mobilised on a similar scale on a population basis she would have an army of 20 millions, and another two millions in the Air Force." President Roosevelt, in his address to the new Congress, stated that seven millions were now under arms; from which it will be seen that Uncle Sam has tremendous untapped reserves to meet the severe test ahead.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM: Mr. J. McNeill, A.W.U. secretary, is reported to the Melbourne "Herald" of January 2 as saying that "Teachers and schoolboys engaged at Leeton had been instructed to

(Continued on page 4.)

A Gutter Journalist Writes On "Patriotism"

By ERIC D. BUTLER

Since the outbreak of the present war there has been a growing volume of abuse of the British peoples, their institutions, their motives and their patriotism. I have no doubt that this is part of the programme to destroy the British peoples, as such; a programme which has made itself very obvious in certain well defined sections of our own community. It is time that some one answered some of the individuals responsible for the programme of undermining our belief in ourselves and in our own way of life.

An ugly example of this programme appears in the magazine "Cavalcade," of November, in a commentary by a Mr. Gilbert Anstruther. He starts off by asking his reader to compare his countrymen with the Russians or the Germans. He continues:

"Among the Russians there is a fanatic, inspired loyalty—a deeply-embedded love of country that has no equal anywhere else in the world. As a result, these Russians who, until recently we despised, are producing daily miracles of fighting and producing."

The British peoples, not being a race of "ballyhoo-mongers"—apart from a few exceptions like Anstruther—don't usually bother to compare themselves with anybody. They simply get on with the job to be done. Because they don't yell about their exploits, Anstruther says that they haven't the patriotism of the Russians. Perhaps he has forgotten the epic of Dunkirk, the fact that the British people alone, comparatively unarmed, stood up to the might of Germany after France fell. Can Anstruther point to a greater effort than that of the few hundred British pilots, most of them little more than boys, who thrashed the German Luftwaffe in the Battle for Britain? Apparently these lads had no patriotism, no love of country! And what of the British civilians who, night after night, were subjected to a rain of death from the skies? The whole world marvelled then, lovers of liberty everywhere took new heart and inspiration from the fact that forty-seven million people would not be cowed into submission by sheer mechanised terror. If Britain had fallen then, neither the Russians nor anyone else could have stopped Hitler. Perhaps Mr. Anstruther has never heard of the British Merchant Navy which, without any publicity, transported thousands of planes and tanks from Britain to Russia. I wonder what inspires the men of this service?

And what of our own Australians, the men who fought in Greece and Crete? Have they no love of country? Are the lads who pushed the Japanese back in the green hell of New Guinea not to be compared with the Russians? Of course, they don't want to be. They are simply doing a job of work under the worst fighting conditions in the world. They would all prefer one letter from home to praise in the press.

Mr. Anstruther continues, after telling the Australians that they are "just plain bloody dumb and dreary," as follows: "Tell your

Russians that henceforth their weekly pay envelope will be chopped in half, and they will probably reply by producing twice as much from that day forward. Tell your Australians the same thing, and the whole damn country would drop its tools." That is about the most absurd nonsense that I have ever read in any journal. Needless to say, Mr. Anstruther writes his anti-Australian abuse for "Cavalcade" for nothing! At least that's what he would have us believe. Mr. Anstruther is a Socialist; but he doesn't think that even the marvels of Socialism would inspire the people of this country to rise to the "heights of patriotism demonstrated daily by the Russians." Further abuse is then levelled at Australians:

"We're a spoilt, bumptious, precocious brat of a nation that has never known any suffering. That is why, sometimes, taking a long view, I think it would do us a hell of a lot of good if the Japanese landed on these shores and kicked the stomach out of us for a while." This is gutter journalism at its lowest. Because Australians won't fit in with Mr. Anstruther's bright ideas, imported all the way from Russia, they are told that a Japanese landing on our shores, with the resultant slaughter of our women and children, would be good for us. It is a sad commentary that enough people in this country think so little of themselves that they subscribe to a journal which prints such savage and sadistic insults about Australians. But a small section does exist which will sink to any depth of infamy to destroy our faith in ourselves. And, while the rest of the population is engrossed in defeating Australia's enemies, the members of this small section are worming their way into influential, cosy positions under a Government which is determined to socialise this nation under cover of war.

Mr. Anstruther says that we have had too much peace and too much food. Wonderful! We should have had our shores invaded every twenty years to make us more patriotic! Slaughter is good for you! If that is so, it is a wonder that Mr. Anstruther, who admits that he is a young man, does not join the "unpatriotic" sons of a "spoilt, bumptious, precocious brat of a nation" in the New Guinea hell. No; Mr. Anstruther is quite all right, thank you, safely writing abuse from the comfort of his office.

His gutter journalism is well typified by some of the following gems: "illegitimate (Continued on page 4.)"

"CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ORDER"

A Book by the Archbishop of Canterbury

A Review by N. F. W., in the "Social Crediter" (Eng.).

"... Judaism and Christianity have come out of the Synagogues and Churches into the banks and Masonic Lodges and Cabinets and workshops..."

—C. H. Douglas: "The Big Idea" (II).
It will be generally allowed that what more than anything else confounds Christian civilisation to-day is the contradiction and baselessness and complexity of human opinion. What we search for—and quite vainly outside the narrow limits of physical science—is just exactly authority. That is what is always looked for from those in leading positions, and if it is entirely wanting, the prospect is dark indeed.

For this reason, therefore, and notwithstanding small expectations on the part of the reviewer, based on previous pronouncements of Dr. Temple's, it comes as something of a shock to find that when the head of the Church of England "goes on record" as to the relationship of individuals in a Christian society, as he does in his small book, "Christianity and Social Order,"* he should not do more than add another opinion to the existing babel created by all the other noisy social pamphleteers.

"Christianity and Social Order" was published early last year, a few months only before its author came to occupy his present historic position as Archbishop of Canterbury, and at a time when he must have known there was every likelihood of his doing so. It combines, therefore, contemporaneity with the highest derivative authority—comparable to a Papal Encyclical. As might be expected, there is plenty of evidence in the book of scholarship and wide reading; nevertheless the outstanding impression it leaves is that of a mental inconsistency.

It may be that what Dr. Temple has to say is meant for comfort, but it could reassure no one; for unlike what was remarked of the Founder of his Church, the Archbishop's words are those of the scribe and quite without authority. They have no intrinsic value. What interest they possess is phenomenal, symptomatic—they are straws that show which way the wind is blowing in the higher official atmosphere and only more worthy of attention in the general din of confused council that represents the "intellectual" world to-day, by reason of the very considerable influence vested in their author.

Do these statements, particularly in view of the position held by Dr. Temple, appear sweeping? Their justice, or otherwise, can be verified by reading the book, of course; to prove them in a short review is hardly practicable. One example, however, may be given, dealing with what to Social Crediters is something of a test question; but it should be understood that it is not brought up here in order to confute it. It is to be taken as typical merely of the confused thought that pervades the entire book.

Writing, on page 15, of the need to conform to "the Natural Order in which is to be found the purpose of God," Dr. Temple says, very justly, "We are obliged to ask of every field of human activity what is the purpose of God for it. If we find that purpose, it will be the true and proper nature of that activity, and the relationship of the various activities to one another and the divine purpose will be the Natural Order of those activities. To bring them into that Order, if they have departed from it must be part of the task of the Church."

No reasonable person could cavil at that as a clear statement of the principle upon which we have to tackle the problems of society, or of the Church's position in respect of it. Surely it could hardly be bettered?

Turn back, however, only to page 13 and you find the results, as the Archbishop is prepared to accept them, of this principle applied to that anomalous field of human activity known as "unemployment"—for Dr. Temple must acknowledge that "unemployment" as a phenomenon is as much in the Natural Order as he puts it, as, say, Springtime, though men may not as yet have discovered how to put it to the same good use.

"The only cure for unemployment," we read on page 13, "is employment—beginning where school education is complete and continuing with no longer intervals than can be appreciated as holidays, till strength begins to fail. In other words, we are challenged to find a social order which provides employment steadily and generally, or our conscience should be restive till we succeed." (Our emphasis.)

Is that, or is it not, a false and one of the most impious statements ever made? At least by anyone with enough light to pen the following, on page 38 of this same book—"It is fundamental to the Christian position that men should have freedom even though they abuse it." Who challenges us to provide work for our fellow-men from kindergarten to bath-chair? Not the purpose of God, if as the Archbishop

*"Christianity and Social Order," by William Temple; a Penguin Special.

says, it is synonymous with the Natural Order. Not, certainly, the Founder of Christianity—at least as far as the laity have been taken into His convenience. Or did He subsequently repent of His commendation of the apparent idleness of the lilies of the field?

The clear evidence here is that the Church, in as much at least as Dr. Temple represents it, has given no thought whatsoever to discovering God's purpose, i.e., the reality behind the label "unemployment." Instead it provides us here with a glaring example of elementary unthinking reaction, away from what any child should be able to recognise as the abuse, the wilful misinterpretation of Leisure, back to its literal opposite—"the only cure for unemployment is employment." In other words, the natural fact is morally wrong. God has no purpose in "unemployment." It has no natural significance, no reality. He just made a mistake which it is our painful duty to rectify.

It is quite evident, surely, that the mind which can come to that conclusion is rapidly losing all touch with Reality.

And so in the rest of the sentence we have quoted, we get the complete statement for continuous regimentation of the individual from birth to declining strength—when, presumably, he can do no more harm. Is it out of order, one wonders, to enquire if men and women, whom Dr. Temple describes on the same page as created "with hearts and wills that cannot be coerced, but can respond," appear to him as fit only to inhabit a world run

on the keep-them-occupied principle of a Borstal Institute, what he conceives to be God's purpose—the Natural order—here? Or is man himself, like "unemployment," just another of God's mistakes to be rectified? Luckily for us, there is evidence, however slight, to suggest that the occurrence of the error is in the cerebral reactions of the Archbishop, rather than on the part of the Deity.

One is dealing here with an outstanding example of what for lack of a better word we call "abstractionism"—a kind of inversion of the normal mental processes. The tendency has always formed some part of the mechanism of the human mind, and in its individual aspect is familiar to the medical profession as "split personality" or two-mindedness. But to-day its increase, and its tendency to assume formidable collective and social proportions, is so universal and so marked as to suggest the approach of some cosmic crisis. In Mr. Aldous Huxley's latest book, "Grey Eminence," is shown an historic and outstanding example, treated with the author's usual dry intellectualism, but nevertheless giving a warning picture of the dire results of this mental phenomenon in action.

It is the divorce, not really between theory and practice—which would seem to be the inevitable fate of mortality—so much as between the principle and its correct mental application. The "split" occurs a stage further back than that of action, actually in the reasoning faculty itself, and results in an inability to distinguish between right and wrong—between the substance and the shadow. This state of mind undoubtedly constitutes the "field" in which subversive forces go to work. The inability to make up the mind, to decide between right and wrong, can be influenced from without, and converted to a wrong (incorrect) decision where the

interests of the individual, which are the real interests of society as a whole, are concerned; thus rendering him powerless and socially ineffectual. Douglas states the reverse of this disintegrated state in "The Big Idea" (XVI.), where he says, "The most irresistible social force is integrity."

What this pathological condition means in its collective forms may be studied best in the case of the German Reich, which, as Dr. Temple says with truth, has inverted the Christian principle of man as made in the image of God, and treats him "as having value only in so far as he serves its ends." Dr. Temple, however, goes on to exemplify in himself the same mental condition in its individual aspect when, later on he advocates that, "Christians should vote in the Christian spirit, at least to the extent of preferring the public interest to their own."

By no possible twist of logic can the abstract term "public interest" employed here be identified with anything but the "State." And if its interest is to be preferred by the Christian voter before his own, what is that but Totalitarianism, which the Archbishop assures us, if indeed the assurance is necessary, represents a reversion to Paganism?

(To be continued.)

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

DEMOCRATIC ACTION: We are pleased to report the success which attended the efforts of those fighting against unnecessary restrictions imposed by Mr. Dedman, The Hands Off Our Clothes Association was instrumental in the sending of thousands of request letters to representatives in Canberra, both Mr. Curtin and Mr. Dedman receiving a very full share. We have it on the best authority that it was solely due to this democratic pressure by electors that the Government has now permitted suit vests to be made. Thanks and congratulations are due to supporters for making this success possible. Letters were received by the Association from Members of Parliament, stating they had received the letters from electors. They considered that the best way to reply to so many.

COMMONWEALTH POWERS BILL: A new Request Letter, dealing with this, has just been put out, and is meeting a very favourable public. If you want to protest against the Centralisation of Power—for, remember, Centralisation of Power is Dictatorship—then send in for some of these letters immediately. We quote Clause (1): "Each individual shall have freedom of ACTION and economic security, at least equal to a living wage, so that he can live his own life and manage his own affairs with a minimum of interference by officials or other citizens."

1943 It has great possibilities, hasn't it? No, we are not going to ask you to make New Year Resolutions. They mean very little very often. But we should like you to remember that you are jammed in between 1942 and 1944—the actions taken in the year just passed will produce some results much later than 1944. If we have not learned that what we do now will show up in a certain result at a future date, then good resolutions would be so much pious humbug. Do we want to free ourselves from the danger of dictatorial control and regimentation? Then if we have faithfully observed what has taken place, in 1942 and before, we should be in a position to employ the correct action to produce that result. Don't just pat yourselves on the back for the Democratic success reported above—remember the methods used, and (we nearly said "resolve"!) try to employ them further. Let 1943 be a year of Observation, Determination and Action. We are sure it will then be a Happy New Year.

—M. R. W. Lee, Hon. Secretary.

are not robbed of the benefit of their plentiful supply of money through high prices; it is Dr. Coombs's job to see that goods in short supply are rationed so that each gets a proper share regardless of the plentiful money supply; and it is the Supply Department's job to see that items required for Governmental purposes are reserved or "frozen" so that our war effort cannot be affected by the so-called "competitive buying" on the part of the public. If the public are not to purchase the so-called "luxury" goods, then, obviously, the luxury goods should not be produced.

If each of the responsible persons or bodies mentioned above was living up to requirements, it wouldn't matter a snap of the fingers if every house in the community was full of "spending power," because Government war needs would have been fully met before civil supplies were released; goods in short supply would be rationed; prices would bear a proper relation to actual costs; and costs would not be increased in any way by Government spending.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
(To be continued.)

UNDERMINING OUR MORALE

Sir James Elder Again

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

(Continued from last issue.)

Sir,—Sir James went on to say that "Present financial trends in Australia demand that the dangers of currency depreciation be more clearly recognised, and that every one of us should fight with all our might to arrest the progressive depreciation of the Australian £."

Here, you see, is a clear case in which a citizen of considerable influence is endeavouring to divert our energies from the prosecution of the real fight we already have on our hands to a sham fight which has no purpose other than to confuse the public on the question of finance and to perpetuate their own enslavement to a fraudulent system.

I recognise that this is strong criticism of a public man, but I feel sure that Sir James Elder knows full well that the present financial system which he represents consists of alternate periods of inflation (i.e., decrease value of money and increase value of goods) and deflation (i.e., increase value of money and decrease value of goods) and that the effects of these alternations are always the same whether they occur in a war period or a "peace" period, and always to the detriment of the wage-earner.

During the last war we had inflation. In 1920 the International Bankers, at a meeting in Brussels, decided that the people had had too much "spending power," and that the time had come to impose deflation. Mere Governments were not even consulted! The Banks in Australia immediately took their cue from these foreigners, and actually started to impose their criminal policy by altering interest rates, making the money market tight, selling securities, and calling in overdrafts. On that occasion, however, they had reckoned without Sir Denison Miller, who was then Governor of the Commonwealth Bank. Between June and December of that year he issued more new money than the private bankers had recalled, and so defeated them and saved the people. Unfortunately, he died in 1923, and the enemies of the people immediately set to work to have our laws altered so that the international gang would not be thwarted again in such a fashion as it was in 1920. In 1924 the Commonwealth Bank was transferred from the control of its Governor to the control of a "Board," and in 1927 a "financial agreement" was completed, tying the Commonwealth Parliament and its people to that Board through the Loan Council. This, in turn, was incorporated as part of the Constitution in 1928. That was the signal for depriving the people of their "spending power," even though there was no actual shortage of goods and potentially our productive capacity was greater than ever.

From 1928 to 1931 there was a period of severe deflation. In 1931, in exchange for the dismissal of the Labour Government, the Banks permitted resumption of borrowing and the introduction of inflation as from 1932. Inflation was the vogue until 1938, when deflation again appeared. This, however, was cut short by the outbreak of war, which necessitated reversion to inflation, which, as previously stated, is merely another name for currency depreciation, about which Sir James seems now to be so concerned. These alterna-

tions are the very ends and middle of what is called "sound finance," and there is nothing whatever new in the current technique of trying to keep the people befogged regarding its operation. Even University Professors are employed to mislead students on the subject.

Many years ago a President of the United States warned us what to expect if we permitted the bankers to do this sort of thing. It was Thomas Jefferson, and he said this:—

"If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issuance of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the corporation that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all their property until their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered."

Was he right, or was he? Most people to-day possess chiefly mortgages, and even the supposedly wealthy are being so heavily taxed that they are fast becoming dispossessed. So "depreciation of the currency" is an inescapable effect of the bankers' policy of inflation, because so long as money continues to be brought into existence only as INTEREST-BEARING DEBT, there is no escaping the fact that any increase in the supply of money must automatically increase costs, and thus automatically decrease the purchasing-value of the money. On the other hand, if the money required for Government purposes is brought into existence as a credit, it will not carry the burden of interest and will NOT increase costs or taxation. As the London "Times" so truthfully said:

"A Government which provides its own money will become prosperous beyond precedent in the history of the civilised Government of the world." In such a case there would be no justification whatever for a rise in prices, and this would check any depreciation of the currency and, at the same time, no longer permit the word "inflation" to be used at the instance of the bankers as a bogey to frighten the people.

The fact is that for every £1 of legal tender money actually in the bank, the people are supposed to have £35 in deposits, and it is by manipulating the volume of the deposits that the bank effects the change from currency depreciation to currency appreciation.

It is the Government's job to see that there is a plentiful supply of money without adding to industrial costs; it is Professor Copland's job to see that the people

COMING DOWN TO REALITY

(A recent lecture to the Assn. to Defend British Culture, given by Alex. McPherson.)

This is just a short treatise on the hypnotic influence which is exerted over us by word-magic. If my friend, Joseph Stalin, were to make a public broadcast to the effect that he was renaming the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and was going to call it Fascist Russia, many people throughout the world would be horror-stricken; yet the physical facts about Russia would still remain the same. In other words, he would only be finding another symbol to represent the same series of events and form of government. Yet some people who would rebel against this system under one name would fight for it under another.

The fault lies, of course, in the failure to realise that words are not things, and the consequent result is that the word is confused with the event which it represents. It is failure to realise that the qualities of the rose are not altered by the changing of its name. Witness the result of this confusion in the schoolboy's remark that "pigs are rightly named because they are such dirty animals." This is abstractionism; i.e., drawing away from reality and vesting a word or a phrase with qualities which it demonstrably does not possess.

The realities to which a word refers are some times called the referents, and, wherever used in this talk, the word referent will apply to those physical, tangible effects, to which the word is drawing attention. If I say "My coat is wet" I am readily understood by normal English-speaking people, because people have experienced the phenomena known as coats and wetness, and can even prove by examination whether I am telling the truth or not. But if I say Russia is a free country, or if our Prime Minister says he is going to see that we have "freedom" after the war, many individuals will nod wisely and others deny vigorously, according to how they interpret the word "freedom." In other words, the referents for the word "freedom" vary from person to person.

There is an old saying that definition gives language meaning and precision, and in the work of experimental inductive science this exact means of conveying information has reached a highly advanced stage. To define a word is to break it down into events which come within the experience of the largest possible number of people, and to thus form a common referent for the word. If I place a plate on the table and agree with my opponent that in the course of our conversation the word "Alpha" will apply to that class of utensil having characteristics which are similar to the visible plate, we have a common referent, and are in a position to argue on the subject of plates despite the fact that the conversation would be so much Greek to any intruder.

Douglas discovered this flaw in language very early, and his books and writings are studded with definitions wherever abstract words are used. Compare his definition of freedom, "Ability to choose or refuse alternatives as they arise," with that of Dr. Evatt, who defines "freedom" as "ordered liberty," and you will see that Douglas has pinned his word to realities, while Evatt is still wandering round in his own misty abstractionism. You can get a clear understanding of choosing or refusing things one at a time, but Ordered Liberty is just a queer noise and transmits no meaning whatever. Maybe Dr. Evatt has in mind the words attributed to Henry Ford: "You may have any coloured car you want, as long as it's black."

So you see that this subject is very important because the word-jugglers and the metaphysicians are using these words every day, and it is up to us to find out from them what are their referents, so that we can judge whether or not we want their brand of freedom (or "blah"). The question, "what do you mean by this word?" wherever abstract words are used, forces a definition and one can then get down to a common referent. This procedure applies equally to all discussions which are partaken of for any other reason than idle amusement.

When arguing the pros and cons of any system such as clearly defined democracy—i.e., "Government in accordance with the expressed will of the governed"—it is not only necessary to define the abstract terms occurring throughout, but also to have a common basis of philosophy. If several persons have a belief that man is best expressing himself when he is a slave to some central body or institution, and is deprived of all initiative, then these people could reasonably discuss the relative merits of the forms of government known by the word "tyrannies," but sometimes called Absolute Monarchy, Communism, Fascism, Nazism, High Financism, etc., which all have this common philosophical background. But a Christian or any other individual who has a basic belief in the sovereignty of the individual and his need for self-expression and free choice in his own development finds these abstract names abhorrent, when pinned down to their referent states of being, and any argument between the two groups holding opposite philosophical beliefs is a waste of time. However, there are quite a number of people who are sincere believers in this latter philosophy, who support, in the abstract, forms of society belonging to the opposite camp, purely because they are engulfed by a verbal

jungle which obscures the realities of the situation.

If I were to ask one of these men if he would like a form of society where he would not be allowed to do anything contrary to the wishes of an all-powerful council of foreigners, he would violently protest. Yet if I clothe this reality in a beautiful suit of abstract clothing, such as Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, Communism, Brotherhood of Man, Federal Union, etc., he would accept it with open arms. Terms such as these are emotional rather than reasonable in their effects, and have no concrete meaning until they are defined. They are dearly beloved of those hordes of people who customarily stand several feet above reality, suspended in a world created by their own imagination. As Bill Robinson pointed out, Aristotle was one of these individuals, and derided the idea of coming back to solid earth and seeing how things acted in reality, as opposed to how he thought they acted. Galileo, by dropping a few common bails from the Tower of Pisa, conclusively proved that Aristotle's abstract thinking was fallacious, and the danger of getting away from tangible effects. Of course, there were people in those days, even as in these, who condemned Galileo for his deeds in proving the Greek philosopher wrong, and refused to accept the evidence of their senses. The nun who, on being taken to the Zoo for the first time, and being shown the hippopotamus, remarked: "It's a lie, there's no such animal," and the "social crediters" who say, "Leave the Communists alone, they are well-meaning people," have much in common with these ancients. It is useless a man meaning well, if his actions are all opposed to the only form of society in which, social crediters contend, rests any connection between man and the achievement of his desires.

It may be as well at this stage to give a few definitions from the pen of C. H. Douglas, which are fine examples of what I have been advocating throughout this talk. Social Credit is a policy of a philosophy. Policy means action towards a

preconceived objective. Philosophy is a conception of reality. Therefore, we have Social Credit defined as action towards a result or objective inherent in reality, as we know it, through observation and experiment.

Some people (often those enjoying leisure) contend that man is inherently wicked, and must be kept constantly employed in compulsory labour, in order to save him from degeneration, despite the fact that a study of reality where things happen produces little evidence for, and considerable evidence against, this contention. These men are not Social Crediters because they are not testing their beliefs in reality, by practical observation and experiment. (Remember the hippopotamus?)

Then comes another important definition. Democracy can almost be defined as that form of society in which all individuals can starve, or cause to flourish, any activity, by withdrawing or extending their co-operation. People have experienced all the referents in this definition at one time and another, and indeed they can see an example in our own society. By withdrawing from The Association to Defend British Culture, the individuals who comprise this group could starve this group-activity out of existence.

These few examples may suffice to show what the aim of definition is in relation to clarification of meaning. The fundamentals to which you may define an event, however, are quite finite and quite indefinable—they have to be experienced to be understood, and can be regarded as the highest common factors of transmission of meaning. For instance, to attempt to explain to a man who had never tasted it, the flavour of roast beef, would be impossible, except by the said man undergoing the experience of eating some. But as most people have at some relatively prosperous cycle experienced this minor miracle of taste, it would be safe to regard it as a referent.

Allow me to finish off this brief excursion into the science of language with a few pregnant words from Dodd's poem, "Through A Glass Darkly":

"Let us give up the following of ghosts—
Dream fancies, born of words,
Devils and bogies of our childish minds—
It's time they were outgrown."

and his closing:

"Until we learn
There is no poverty but only people poor.
No liberty but people to be freed,
No power to break their bondage but themselves."

WHAT ARE WE UP AGAINST?

In the course of some recent correspondence, Mr. Alex. Wilson, M.H.R., asked Eric Butler to submit his views on the present situation at Canberra. The following extract from his suggestions may prove of interest to our readers:

I would set the problem out as follows:

(1) A study of history reveals that the Money Power has been the main directing force behind world politics for many centuries.

(2) The Money Power has had one determination throughout its history: The centralisation of all power in its own hands by centralising all Government—i.e., taking control of policy further away from the individual.

(3) Practically all control of the world's Governments' financial policies was obtained by the Wall Street Group as a result of the last war.

(4) The last war saw the Money Power make its first bid for supreme World Power through the League of Nations, behind which the Bank for International Settlements was the real force. (Note recent reports that all members of the Bank recently met in Switzerland to discuss post-war plans.)

(5) The only sane suggestion to deal with the "German problem" at the conclusion of the last war, the decentralisation of Germany back into its original small States, was bitterly opposed by the Wall Street group. The Warburgs, who represented both America and Germany as financial advisers, said that Germany must be kept united—i.e., under the control of a central bank-dominated Government.

(6) When it became obvious that the British peoples were, mainly as a result of the Social Credit Movement, going to challenge Finance, particularly in Alberta, war became inevitable. Hitler was a useful tool, even though he may have thought that he was fighting the bankers. Napoleon thought that too.

(7) This war is being used by the Money Power to make sure, if possible, that the Anglo-Saxon people are paralysed as a result of war. Without consulting the British peoples, Governments throughout the Empire are practically all in favour of handing over our Sovereignty to an International Government backed by an International Armed Force. Note the great publicity being given to this idea. Eden says that the British Government is officially in favour of it.

(8) Douglas said at the outbreak of war

that powerful attempts would be made to centralise all Government in British countries as a prelude to World Control. Note the similarity between the move to smash the Provincial Governments in Canada, particularly the Alberta Government, and the move to smash the State Governments in this country by the Uniform Tax Plan. Now comes the Evatt (?) plan to centralise the control at Canberra in order that we can fit in with the war aims of the United Nations. And you know as well as I know who is dictating those war aims. I need only mention that Montagu Norman was secretly present at the signing of the Atlantic Charter.

(9) Douglas also warned us that the Money Power would, if it thought we social crediters were making too much progress, come out with some Monetary Reform scheme which, in itself, might be technically sound, but which would be used to control the people still further. After all, Hitler introduced "money reform" and abolished unemployment! We want more than mere money reform; we want the people to control their own credit as they see fit. You may not know that the Money Power has done exactly what Douglas warned us about; many of its mouthpieces, including the London "Times," are now openly advocating "money reform." But the London "Times" has also advocated socialism in order to "control" the money system. Many people think that all they have to do is to follow anyone who shouts money reform. . . . The Labour Party, not only in Australia, but elsewhere . . . has, while talking "liberty," played a prominent part in every move to enslave the people. Many of its members are sincere, but they are babes in the wood compared with the financial wolves. Our great fight, at the moment, is not money reform; it is to retain and develop control of our political machinery by making sure that Government is not removed still further from the people. The Labour Party is the leading advocate for centralisation of control. I say quite definitely that there should be no tinkering with the Constitution, and no move by the Labour Government to introduce socialism, which policy has never been endorsed by the Australian people. I sincerely hope that, notwithstanding the great demands on

THE NEW DESPOTISM

Lord Hewart, a former Lord Chief Justice of England, writes in his book, the "New Despotism," as follows:

Much toil, and not a little blood, has been spent in bringing slowly into being a policy wherein the people make their laws, and independent judges administer them. If that edifice is to be overthrown, let the overthrow be accomplished openly. Never let it be said that liberty and justice, having with difficulty been won, were suffered to be abstracted or impaired in a fit of absence of mind. The paradox which is in course of being accomplished is, indeed, rather elaborate. Writers on the Constitution have for a long time taught that its two leading features are the sovereignty of Parliament and the rule of law. To tamper with either of them was, it might be thought, a sufficiently serious undertaking. But how far more attractive to the ingenious and adventurous mind to employ the one to defeat the other, and to establish a despotism on the ruins of both! It is manifestly easy to point a superficial contrast between what was done or attempted in the days of our least wise kings, and what is being done or attempted to-day. In those days the method was to defy Parliament—and it failed. In these days the method is to cajole, to coerce, and to use Parliament—and it is "strangely successful. The old despotism, which was defeated, offered Parliament a challenge. The new despotism, which is not yet defeated, gives Parliament an anaesthetic. The strategy is different, but the goal is the same. It is to subordinate Parliament, to evade the courts, and to render the will, or the caprice of the executioner unfettered and supreme. The old King, as Rudyard Kipling sings in "The Old Issue," sometimes reappears under a new name:

"All we have of freedom, all we use or know—
All this our fathers bought for us long and long ago."

U.E.A. ACTION

We are pleased to report the lively interest of non-reform bodies in the "anti-Board campaign," and to congratulate those country centres—in particular Yallourn, Morwell and Orbost—which are keeping up a steady stream of signed "letter-forms" on their Members of Parliament. There is, however, room for much greater effort from metropolitan actionists, who are not nearly as active as they could be. Headquarters, therefore, makes a special appeal to suburban supporters to contact Mr. F. Elliott, metropolitan organiser (c/o headquarters) for the purpose of arranging groups of actionists. Campaigners should be well aware of the dangers of permitting these regimenting Boards to remain—and they will remain unless YOU act. We also send a special message to those who have fought the good fight in the past, and who have wearied. To them we say, "Being busy and overworked is a doubtless reasonable excuse for inactivity; but we appeal to the old fighting spirit, because we need you more than ever now. We urge you to get busy on the 'anti-Board campaign'—now."

Our address: The United Electors of Australia, Room 9, 5th Floor, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C. I.

your time, you study closely some of the recent material appearing in the "New Times," particularly articles by James Guthrie, B.Sc., and Bruce Brown. Your own position is difficult, and I sympathise with you, but I think that if you express your views on these matters, you will make a great contribution to our cause. As you said in Melbourne recently, the electors have the power in their own hands. But, is the Money Power, while creating hope in many minds, by allowing the Labor Party to talk vaguely of money reform, working to remove that power from the electors? Frankly, those of us who have studied the matter deeply are terrified that this is what would happen. In fact, it is happening. Any statements which you could make on this matter in the House would be of outstanding service to this nation.

Evatt's Constitution "Reform" must be defeated; if it is not, I make bold to prophesy that the Federal Government will take steps to bring this country inside the scope of the bankers' proposed International Government. It will be practically useless worrying about money reform then. Slaves can chatter—i.e., "free speech"—as much as they like, providing they are powerless to ACT.

I can only hope that you will continue to criticise inside the House, although I agree with you that a Composite Government would be worse than the present one. Personally, I would not be surprised, irrespective of what you do, if we finish the war with a National Government

—Sincerely yours, ERIC D. BUTLER.

WHY VICTORIAN LABOR REJECTED CONSCRIPTION

By D. LOVEGEOVE (Victorian Executive A.L.P.), in the "Century" (Sydney), Dec. 18 1942

Both prior and subsequent to the meeting of the Victorian Central Executive it has been publicly suggested that the Defence Policy adopted by the 1949 Victorian Labor Conference implied the acceptance of conscription for overseas service. It has also been suggested that, in seeking adoption of his Conscription proposal, the Prime Minister was merely "seeking an interpretation of the policy adopted by the 1940 Conference."

This is not true. Responsible Laborites who participated in drafting the amendment adopted by the 1940 conference know it is not true.

The writer of this article, who moved an earlier amendment at the conference, and who subsequently supported the successful amendment, knows it is not true.

In answer to a statement by Mr. Blackburn, M.H.R., who attended the conference, I stated that I was opposed to conscription for overseas service.

So were the other sponsors of the defence policy adopted by conference.

And, to make this position unmistakably clear, one has only to refer to the repeated declarations against conscription by labor members (including Mr. Curtin) since the 1940 Labor conference.

The question as to what the 1940 conference decision "meant," and as to how it should be "interpreted" is therefore merely a "question" raised at this stage for the purpose of justifying a proposal which, if it were in accord with Labor principles, should not require such dubious justification.

And people who voted for the 1940 conference defence policy, and who now hear their vote "interpreted" as a vote for conscription, despite the fact that they were and are opposed to conscription, will entertain little respect for the self-appointed "interpreters," whoever they may be.

Such juggling of words is unworthy of the Australian Labor Party and an insult to the intelligence of its members.

What, however, was the significance of the 1940 Victorian Labor Conference defence policy?

THE 1940 DECISION.

The significance of the 1940 decision had nothing to do with conscription, but the "interpretation" which some people are attempting to give it now must inevitably cast suspicion upon the bona fides of those now espousing conscription.

Before 1940, Victorian Labor opposed the raising of military forces for service outside the Commonwealth.

The 1940 Labor Conference agreed to raise forces for service outside the Commonwealth, but inside those strategic areas essential to Australian defence.

This was all Mr. Curtin then asked. This is the precise significance of the 1940 decision.

The voluntary principle of enlistment was never challenged.

The introduction of conscription was never even hinted at by Mr. Curtin, who gave conference an excellent and farseeing outline of the perils confronting Australia; an outline which was exhaustively considered by conference, and which, unfortunately, has since been vindicated by the disastrous logic of events.

Conference was then told that we must man the islands constituting our cordon sanitaire. Conference understood this proposition perfectly. But it also understood that Australia could and would fulfil its responsibilities as a free nation, and not as a nation of conscripts.

And apparently the Labor Minister for the Army, Mr. Forde, M.H.R., also understood this only one month ago, when he defended the principle of voluntary enlistment publicly.

When, therefore, Labor leaders tell us that the 1940 Victorian Labor Conference decision can be "interpreted" as a vote for a 1942 Labor Government to add to the Defence Act in the definition of the Commonwealth at present defining the territories to which this Act extends, the words

"and such other territories in the South-west Pacific area as the Governor-General proclaims as being territories as-

"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.I.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.

THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS

sociated with the defence of Australia.

Then are Laborites who voted for the 1940 decision justified in asking why this remarkable possibility of "interpretation" was not placed before them at the 1940 conference.

But this is not the only question which presents itself. For if the 1940 conference decision is capable of such a novel "interpretation," what "interpretation" can be placed upon the conscription proposal?

WHAT NEXT?

Supposing that Labor agrees to Mr. Curtin's proposal, what will be the next proposal? Who is going to "define" the South-west Pacific? What are the territories "associated with the defence of Australia"?

Or will the entire strategic conception of the "South-west Pacific" be thrown overboard at some future date, as some people are already advocating?

For instance, the Melbourne "Age" last Monday concluded a leader with me observation that—

"It is regrettable that any section of citizens should be so immersed in tradition is to be unable to adjust their outlook to the needs of a vastly changed situation, which demands unfettered mobility of our forces, and their ability to go wherever the High Command decrees in carrying on the war against Japan."

I repeat: If Labor agrees to Mr. Curtin's proposal of the present, will it be said at some future time that such agreement "implied" conscription, not only for the South-west Pacific, but for "wherever the High Command decrees," etc., etc.?

And if some political leader of the future makes this proposal, will he state that, after all, he is only asking for an "interpretation" of the last proposal?

Such speculation, of course, could proceed ad infinitum.

We do not know what the future may hold. But we do know that the U.S.A. Government has stated that Australia is already giving a greater proportion of its human resources to military service than the proportion of any other nation at war.

And we do know that Labor has always stood for the control of Australian military forces by the Australian Government, and not by the decree of any High Command.

In fairness to Mr. Curtin, it must be here stated that the Government has taken certain precautions against such a contingency as the one last visualised.

But it is possible that some other Government (or Governments) may wish to govern by decree of the High Command.

And who knows what questions may actuate the policies of the High Command in the days to come.

Australian defence may be only one of these questions.

After hearing the case for conscription put as ably as it can be put, the Victorian Central Executive has turned it down.

In so doing, it has not only considered the reasons which have actuated Labor policy in the past. It has considered the case on its merits, and it has considered the situation which will confront Labor in the days to come.

And it has made its decision with a realisation that the paramount problem confronting all Australians to-day is the adequate defence of this country.

BUREAUCRACY MENACES FREEDOM

No one disputes the necessity of a Government in wartime having full and ample powers to prosecute its war effort. And that, of course, is true of Australia. However, any student of political history will see many dangerous implications in the plenary powers being exercised by Australia's wartime Cabinet. One has only to look at the ever-growing mass of laws, rules, orders and regulations to realise that practically every sphere of human endeavour is now subject to the control of the Government to an arbitrary degree.

It is maintained that all our efforts must be bent to prosecute the war and anything therefore can be done in the name of the war effort. No doubt, in a sense, since this is a total war, the total efforts of the community, even in eating and sleeping, have a bearing on the struggle. But for the sake of the liberty for which we are fighting, liberties consonant with national security must be left to Australians.

Bureaucracy is on the march and unless great vigilance is exercised, the totalitarian powers claimed to successfully prosecute the war will be also retained to murder the peace.

At present there is not a home nor a person in this country who has not suffered from the inefficiency and incompetence of the myriads of boards and tribunals that have been set up to rationalise and control our economic life.

WHY DID CURTIN MAKE CONSCRIPTION AN ISSUE?

Why did Curtin throw the Labor Movement into the melting pot at the Melbourne Conference?

Senior Ministers declare they were not consulted. They offer that as their reason for not talking on the subject.

Curtin himself opposed Fadden's motion on the merger of the forces as recently as February last—when the military position was much more difficult than at present.

There is no known military reason for his proposal.

Therefore, it must have been political. Curtin had just arrived, back from Western Australia.

He had been accompanied by the Governor-General.

In 1940 he only won Fremantle by the skin of his teeth.

The U.A.P. had been boasting that they would win it from him at the next election.

What a humiliation to go to the country as P.M., have the Party come home with a majority, and yet lose his own seat!

So he went to Cottesloe. He came, he listened to the locals and was conquered.

But in both 1916 and 1917 Conscription Referenda, Fremantle voted solidly for conscription.

In 1916 it was 18,000 to 9,000. As a conscriptionist, Curtin, no doubt, believed he could win Fremantle. Is that the explanation? Is that why Labor has been sacrificed?

—"Century" (N.S.W. Labor paper), December 18 1942.

BUREAUCRACY IN CANADA

The move to centralise business in Canada has started with the announcement that 20,000 firms are to be wiped out, 30,000 workers jerked out of their jobs and "transferred," 15,000 wholesalers and 125,000 retailers to be subject to Orders and closure.

—"To-day and To-morrow."

Defeat Conscription!

Although the endorsement of Mr. Curtin's conscription proposals by the recent A.L.P. conference in Melbourne was a shock to those optimists who are content to "leave it to Party Bosses," political realists are not greatly surprised and do not regard the fight as finished. Actually, the anti-conscription campaign is just starting to get into its stride. A great deal of vigorous activity is taking place that is not reported in the daily press. The most hopeful and practical move, though not the most spectacular, is the initiation of an epidemic of letter-writing to individual members of Federal Parliament. A form of letter we can recommend reads as follows:

"Mr., M.H.R., Federal Members' Rooms, Post Office Place, Melbourne, C.1.

"Dear Sir,—I am opposed to conscription for overseas service, and I want you, as my representative in Parliament, to vigorously oppose its introduction.—Yours faithfully, (Signature):..... (Address)....."

Letters like that are starting to flow from individual electors to individual Members of Parliament. The flow may well become a flood—it will if YOU will lend a hand. Start by writing to your own M.H.R. Then get others to do likewise. Printed letter-forms will be available, no doubt. But don't wait another week for them. Make some duplicated, typewritten or even hand-written copies of the above on your own initiative—and get busy!

GUTTER JOURNALIST . . .

(Continued from page 1.)

punk," "pot-bellied-son-of-a-bitch," and "a damn big stick to beat out the stomach of everyone who gets in the road."

After telling us that our patriotism is only skin deep, that we have a "slothful history," Mr. Anstruther says that there is not a more "burningly-loyal" bunch of men in the world than our soldiers. What! Not even in Russia, Mr. Anstruther? After that little sop—which Mr. Anstruther doesn't believe: he has already told us that the Russians have no equals—he goes on to more abuse of Australians as a whole: "I couldn't imagine 7,000,000 Australians working like bloody slaves purely because they thought they had a great country and saw, as in a rosy vision, a great future for it."

Perhaps the great explorers of this country, men who performed deeds of heroism to open up this continent, had no vision; perhaps the pioneers who faced flood, fire and famine to build another British country did not work like "bloody slaves"; and perhaps the nation which produced the men who played a major part in the first world-war against foreign domination, and the men who have played, and are still playing, a big part in the second half of that war, is slothful and lacking in patriotism. As an Australian, I resent Mr. Anstruther's abuse. We all know that things are very far from perfect in British countries, but I am not aware of Mr. Anstruther ever dealing with the financial causes of our troubles. While admitting that our country has been well-nigh destroyed by certain influences, I, for one, am not prepared to quietly allow men like Mr. Anstruther to undermine our faith in our own race. Some people have said to me in the past that we must be tolerant with men like Anstruther. No; we must "take the gloves off" to this type of destroyer if we are to preserve our own way of life. We must answer the "intellectual planners" in the most forceful manner possible. They are dangerous individuals in the hands of dark forces.

In conclusion, I would like to mention that this article has been written in a forward area. Most of us up here would like to have Mr. Anstruther with us. As Mr. Anstruther seems to be going to do most of his fighting in his office, we will do our best to carry on without him. But, perhaps, we will see him when we get back. I would like to see the result of Mr. Anstruther telling some veteran of New Guinea that his patriotism was only "skin deep," that he was "bloody dumb and dreary," and that he had had too much "peace!"

Notes on the News

(Continued from page 1.)

join his Union within 24 hours, and to pay 15/- membership." It is difficult to believe that such Hitler and Al Capone gangsterism could be put over in a British Democracy. But there it is! The same issue of the "Herald" also states that in another connection workers defied their Union "Bosses," which can only mean that the Union leaders (Unionists' employees) must have tried to boss their employers. It may, of course, have been that the leaders, having tied up the Union funds in investments of a non-liquid nature, were afraid the Banks would not advance the finance for strike-pay.

—O. B. H.

THE IDEA SPREADS

An article on the subject of V.D. appearing in the January 11 issue of "Woman" (Sydney) concludes with the following paragraph:

"I suggest that all who are seized with the importance and urgency of this problem should immediately write to their Member of Parliament and ask him to do something about it NOW."

S.C.M. OF S.A.

The next monthly meeting of the Social Credit Movement of South Australia will be held on Thursday, January 28, in its room at the Rechabite Hall, Grote-street Adelaide, at 8 p.m. There is a rather lengthy agenda to be disposed of, and it will be followed by general discussion. —J. E. Burgess, Secretary.

The Brain of the Archbishop: "Profit-making must not be the chief motive in industry. . . . If the rates were levied on the land, instead of on the buildings there would always be the inducement to make the property as good as possible, in order that the best return might be received from it."—Archbishop Temple.

Printed by M. F. Canavan, 25 Cullinton-road, Hartwell, for The New Times Ltd., McEwan House, Melb.

—"The Catholic Worker."