

ON OTHER PAGES:

BRITAIN FROM THE
INSIDE (Page 2)

SIR JAMES ELDER
AGAIN (Page 3)

THE "MANAGERIAL"
REVOLUTION (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 9, No. 3, MELBOURNE FRIDAY, JAN. 22 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 time!
Now, when the
padlocks for our
lips are forging,
Silence is crime.
Whittier (1807-1892).

What Lies Ahead In 1943—And After?

Lessons of Recent Events

In these columns we have published many of the regular broadcasts from 7HO by Mr. James Guthrie, B.Sc. Again we have pleasure in reporting one of his recent broadcasts—his Christmas talk, in which he appropriately looked back on some significant past events and indicated some of the problems of the future in the following words:

As we come to the end of this year 1942, we begin to speculate what the New Year will bring to us; and this time we look forward with more hopefulness than we did last Christmas.

Not only is the military situation more hopeful, but there are signs of a revival of the spirit of the people. In political discussions the overwhelming success which attended the organised might of the German armies was the over-riding influence which crushed all opposition to any idea which was not a slavish imitation of Nazi Germany; Germany was a success and so we must imitate Germany, outbid Germany in her own methods. That was the crux of all arguments during these last few years. Germany was a success; the British Empire was a failure, so the British Empire had to go, and it was already being carved up by enterprising journalists in various parts of the world.

The mistakes these cheap jacks-of-the-pen make, and it is remarkable the number of mistakes they manage to make, are that they are too lazy to collect a few facts for themselves; they live on second-hand information, they belong to the fringes of the mob and never seem to come in contact with the real men of this world; all their men are newspaper creations, built-up men, boosted men, political men, public men. The men who do the real work behind the scenes are ap-

parently unknown to them; that's why they make so many mistakes.

When an unarmed man meets an armed man he is helpless—undoubtedly; and that's a sad lesson we learnt in this war. What we haven't yet learnt in this war is who disarmed the British people and what was their purpose? But apart from the armaments of the various armies the most important factor has been the tremendous indomitable spirit of small groups of people.

The heroic fight the little Greek nation put up against overwhelming armament is one of the most amazing events of this war; it indicated the underlying spirit which existed in many unsuspected places and which was to upset so many plans.

Even to-day, the Yugoslav army is still fighting, surrounded by enemies; it is still undefeated, and holding at bay ten or twelve divisions of the enemy troops. Where it gets its food and munitions nobody seems to know.

Another story yet to be written is the story of Dunkirk; the story of the thousands of boys and old men who came to the rescue of the stranded British Army, and carried it off safely in barges and a miscellany of small craft. This most amazing Armada went into Hell to bring back home the only army England had, the army that was brought home to lick its wounds and fight again under Montgomery and to chase Rommel across Africa.

This act alone of the old men and boys of England put heart into the entire world and switched our thoughts into new and bolder channels.

Hitler, with the most amazing organisation this world has seen, with his brilliant technicians and his bevy of scientists, was unable to muster enough skill, enough intelligence, enough men and enough courage to beat the Spitfire, a machine built by a small group of men under every possible discouragement. That is a fact of importance, very great importance, because it shows that the great planners of Germany are only successful when they are fighting an enemy whose hands are tied behind its back, and even then they are not always successful—not against Spitfires.

It is interesting to look back over the events of the year. To Burma. Remember how the little army under Alexander retreated though battered each day from the skies, stricken with malaria and without food they maintained their ordered and disciplined retreat to the end. Probably one of the epic retreats of history. This so-called beaten and broken General reappeared shortly afterwards in Africa to organise the campaign against Rommel; to give Rommel some of the medicine he himself had received. Rommel was a great general, but he never did what Wavell did with practically no armour. He never

did what Alexander did with armour. Amongst the gutter press of Europe and America it is not considered proper to praise British generals or British troops—it might offend the international Socialists.

Alexander, great general though he was, would probably have been beaten again if England had not rid herself of Lord Beaverbrook, the Canadian journalist, who tried to organise the aircraft industry and the tank-building industry. Why a journalist, who destroyed some of the finest newspapers in England and who made a large fortune out of it, should be selected to organise a complicated engineering industry is one of the mysteries of this war.

The damage this man caused before he was kicked out must have been colossal. Beaverbrook is now in America along with Baldwin, and it would be interesting to speculate as to how much damage these two men actually did before they were found out.

Looking back over our war-time efforts, certain interesting questions come to mind. In war time we have to depend on the decisions of a few men at the top for our safety—but does this mean we have to organise in the same expensive way for peace? War demands that men be regimented quickly in large mobs; does peace

(Continued on page 3)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Mr. Wilbur Ham, K.C., supports the view that "once a power is surrendered by a State Parliament, it is permanently surrendered." It is also pleasing to note in this connection that the Melbourne Chamber of Manufacturers and the Employers' Federation are opposing Evatt's centralisation scheme on the above grounds, and because the Canberra Convention which accepted it "consisted of political leaders who had no mandate from their electors." (Have YOU, Mr. Elector, written about this matter to your State M.P.? If not, please hurry.)

ABSENTEEISM: Evidence before the Coal Commission showed that prosecutions for absenteeism led to more stoppages—another illustration of bureaucratic shortsightedness. Now it is proposed to make matters worse by automatic fines deducted from wages. The idea of removing the CAUSES of absenteeism, and trying inducement instead of compulsion, seems to be shunned like the plague.

POLITICAL POINTERS: Signs of a Federal election are visible in the "nine points for Australia" featured in the daily press as emanating from Mr. Fadden. As usual, these policy planks are capable of the widest construction; and, of course, they do NOT contain any assurance of freedom for the individual or escape from the crippling taxation required to pay interest on the credit-money borrowed by Governments from the private banks. Past experience has shown clearly that Party-hacks all present the same underlying policy of "bankerism." Nevertheless, it is to be hoped the people will carefully examine the credentials of "Independent" candidates, over whom they may be able to exercise control more readily. Some "Independents" may be merely Party Robots or Bankers Men flying false colours—or they may intend to be independent, yes; but independent of the will of their electors when they come to vote in Parliament!

PAY-PINCHING PLAN: U.S. money-riggers are in a spot of bother devising ways and means of extracting taxation (from which bankers' interest is paid) and are propagating the "pay as you go" slogan. Commenting on the impossibility of suddenly extracting hundreds of dollars from the average taxpayer, one commentator says: "He (the taxpayer) might be forced to patronise the Loan Sharks"; but the tit-bit of the comment is that the plan to deduct (confiscate) taxes from the workers' weekly pay is drawn up by Beardsley Ruml, of the New York Central Reserve Bank. Just fancy that!

SPUD SPATE: Recent daily papers feature pictures of many tons of potatoes (some of which are quite edible) being dumped at Dynon-road, Melbourne. Here we see socialistic Boardism de-luxe. City Council employees (evidently primed) were busy explaining that the supplies had been condemned by the Department of Agriculture, which, incidentally, assists the Potato Board, and uses the alibi that transport delay caused the trouble. These alibis should be completely disregarded, and the individuals responsible should be promptly dumped, like the humble "spuds."

TAX TROUBLES: Mr. R. Chenoweth, chief of the Bankers' Toll Collection De-

partment, informs us that an intensive drive against "tax-dodgers" is being made in Victoria, and that heavy fines will be inflicted because the Government takes a serious view of such offences, as THE COUNTRY is urgently in need of MONEY. This must mean that Australia's money-factories are falling down on their job. But why blame John Citizen for THAT, when he is prevented by law from MAKING money? Why not deal with the obviously incompetent financial planners, who, judging by the statement of Mr. Chenoweth, must be artificially limiting our war effort by restricting the money-supply?

MENZIES AGAIN: On behalf of the bankers' party-hacks, R. G. Menzies is now using his broadcasting time in denouncing prospective Independent political candidates, who, he says, are in periodical demand again. In this attack on free men representing electors, all the Party-men will, no doubt, be in complete accord with wordy Bob. But it will need more than words to atone for the results—or lack of results—of the Party-system. Division of the people, needless regimentation and debt-slavery will take a lot of explaining away. On a results basis, Independents should romp home this time.

FEDERAL UNION: Under the heading of "Church Men and Events" in the Melbourne "Herald," of January 14, is a report that "growing interest among Melbourne Church people is shown in the proposal to establish a Federal Union" (world government). The usual bait of peace and economic security is dangled, like the carrot before the donkey. The sponsors of this plot against the self-government of British countries have evidently decided to work through the Churches, or rather, those clergy whose eyes are unnaturally focussed on distant vistas. Free publicity was given by the Murdoch press, which disclosed the address of the Victorian conspiratorial headquarters: Room 2, 5th Floor, 28 Elizabeth-street, Melbourne.

SOVIET SURPRISE: If one may believe the January issue of "International Conciliation," the Soviet has apparently abandoned its original aim of world-revolution. Such a further sudden change-of-front, though temporary, would be a blow to the "Australian" Communists, who would, no doubt, disband voluntarily if the world-revolution plan should prove to be officially banned by Moscow!

CURBING CURTIN: The Melbourne "Sun," of January 12, reports Mr. Curtin as objecting to the campaign in several States to prevent State Members of Parliament betraying their trust by surrendering

(Continued on page 4)

The Originator of the Austerity Campaign?

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

I had a few hard things to say about a certain Mr. Gilbert Anstruther in these columns last week. Mr. Anstruther, as one might expect, seems to know all the planners, and, after his diatribe on Australians' lack of loyalty, in "Cavalcade" of November, he gave his version of how the austerity campaign started:

"Surprising to many people, even to some 'insiders,' will be the fact that Austerity was fathered by a young, eager, enthusiastic gentleman named Senator Armstrong. He brought under notice the basic plan from which the campaign was evolved.

I have known John Armstrong for a long time." (I often thought that some of Senator Armstrong's nonsense was the result of contact with some vigorous Red.) "I know how earnest, how deadly serious, how hard-thinking he is about Austerity; and I can record some damn fine suggestions he made concerning that same Austerity Campaign."

If we can believe Mr. Anstruther, Senator Armstrong belongs to the school of thought which believes in sacrifice for the sake of sacrifice. Whether sacrifice is necessary or not appears to be a very secondary consideration. If Mr. Anstruther's version of Senator Armstrong's views on war finance is correct, Senator Armstrong should be removed to a place where he can do the Australian public no further harm:

"The workers must lend. That's the whole, basic necessity of this Austerity Loan. They'll be eager enough to lend if they know exactly what it's all about and what it means. And there's only one way to tell them that—by personal and continued contact. At present they're addressed by lecturers at the end of shifts. But they don't want to listen to lectures then—they're tired, and restless, and they want to go home . . . as quick as they can. . . . Every customer has to be 'sold'—personally. . . Isn't that the basis of modern business? Very well, let's get to work and personally 'sell' every man, woman and child in this country—let's 'sell' them completely on the greatness of this country of theirs, and on lending for its defence. . . ." It is a sad commentary on the state of affairs in this country when we need slick-tongued poli-

ticians to "sell" us our own country. Most of them are engaged in selling it to the private banks.

The following remarks attributed to Senator Armstrong indicate just how much we can expect in the way of financial reform from the Labor Party:

"Squads of trained voluntary workers can exploit special fields by telephone contact—and N.E.S. wardens can be trained for this work. There's a ready-made selling agent. They already know, personally, the people about them. Let them 'sell,' too. Let them take orders for loans. They won't be going into strange houses; they'll be going into neighbours' homes—the man next door, and the one across the road. Why not? Their basic job is defence—defence of life and property. And the lending of money is the very root of defence. Do you see what I am getting at? We've got to sell, sell, sell. . . ."

One would like to ask Senator Armstrong just what all this use of manpower and energy, urgently required on important war work, is going to contribute to our defence? It won't produce more guns, tanks, ships, aeroplanes or men. It won't even produce any of the things used to manufacture war equipment. It will "raise" a few million pounds which the banks could make available to the Government, free of debt, and for the mere cost of the trifling clerical work involved. Such "austerity" propaganda is camouflaging the fact that the Labor Government is refusing to face up to the urgent need for using a more efficient monetary system. Senator Armstrong's reported views on finance make me think of that humorous character known as the "Canary," who speaks at the Sydney Domain on Sunday afternoons. Among other things, the "Canary" advocates that all lunatic asylums should be thrown open to the public, and that the present inmates should be given key Government jobs. I sometimes agree with him.

"CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ORDER"

A Book by the Archbishop of Canterbury

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

(Continued from last issue.)

There is a significant fact to be noted regarding Dr. Temple's book, which may have a bearing, more or less direct, on his failure to apply the Christian principles he enunciates. Certainly it seems strange that in the whole of what amounts to an ethical treatise on Christian Society, and in which there are frequent references to the need to identify God's purpose with the Natural Order, there should be but one single quotation from the Gospels, and that a reproof to covetousness.

From personal experience one would feel inclined to call such omission willfulness in almost any writer. But when it is a case of the Head of the Church of England, and, in addition, during a world war generally, if rather vaguely, allowed to be an attack on Christian principles, the fact attains almost a glaring prominence. Even if the Archbishop, incredible as it may seem, had not felt impelled to cite his Master's teaching as his authority, one would have thought the exigencies of his official position would have induced him to make at least a show of it. But to his obliviousness—let us call it sincerity—he has not even done that.

The more legal of the Mosaic Books are referred to quite considerably, particularly in connection with usury. And there are very numerous quotations from the Epistles of Paul, who would, in fact, never have put himself forward as a better authority on the principles of Life and society than his Master. Plato is cited a number of times, also contemporary economists, including Sir William Beveridge. But of the sayings of Jesus of Nazareth, of the parables, the majority of which have to do with the Natural Order to which Dr. Temple so frequently alludes; of Jesus's Kingdom of God on earth, not one single word from beginning to end of the book.

What is the explanation—the cause—of this strange omission?

Its effect, at least, is disastrously apparent; for instead of holding up the clear light of faith in Natural Goodness and decency, which is surely the mission of the Church, Dr. Temple gives us a programme not deriving in one single item from the Christian principles he had laid down earlier in the book—in fact, flatly contradicting them—but calculated, whether consciously or not makes no difference, to bring about the complete regimentation of the individual in the shortest possible time.

It is a programme of "socialisation" which in its enforcement—now proceeding!—is simply the Mosaic Law, or rather its Talmudic perversion, from which Christianity was to be a release, translated into a ritual of Government form-filling and detailed instruction, and administered by a bureaucratic priesthood that for numbers and power would have filled the heart of Caiaphas with a sense of wonder and complete fulfilment.

There is surely something very much amiss with a Church, when all the practical comfort its Head has for his distracted flock is to hand out, presumably as a practical application of the teaching of the Gospels, an assortment of "approved" legalistic devices, of questionable "City" parentage, for regulating and checking, at least in theory, every natural and creative impulse known to man.

"Withering Capital"—after interest on an investment amounting to the original principle has been paid, the whole to be liquidated; Government and Labour representation on the Boards of all Joint Stock Companies; Family Maintenance—allowances in the form of coupons; international machinery based on gold to determine mutual export quotas; the whole bag of "financial" tricks!

It is a dry catalogue; but potent for a lot of human misery, if it is realisable. And by some mental twist, all directed against the sizable, get-at-able, individual activities of society. It is significant of much that for the purpose of illustrating business abuses it is not the documented, dynastic facts of Percy Arnold's "Bankers of London" that the Archbishop cites but a work of fiction, "The Crowthers of Bankdam," true enough in substance, of course, but none-the-less, propaganda in place of evidence.

After giving a table of figures showing that in 1936, 76 per cent of all the firms

registered in Great Britain had 25, or less employes, Dr. Temple comments: "There is a sentimental value in these little firms. But they are a hindrance to the progress of the science and art of Management, and are the scene of most of the remaining bad conditions of employment. Under our proposals men will be less likely to 'start a little business' because it is more 'respectable' than to become a wage-earner; so much the better." (Our emphasis.)

The charitable hope must be that the writer of the above, who has stated in the same book that "The primary principle of Christian ethics. . . must be respect for every person simply as a person. . . independent of all usefulness to society," is unconscious of its implications; though the satirical suggestion implied by his use of inverted commas hardly confirms it. How different is Dr. Temple's impatience with the natural desire of the individual to better his position and gain some independence of action for himself, from the tolerance of the man who cried out "Oh, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou who stonest the prophets. . . How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings. . . But "Socialism," which must be what is meant by "the science and art of management," to the progress of which the small business is a hindrance, is fundamentally intolerant of the individual.

Following closely, and after a preliminary application of butter to "our Banking System" for its integrity and public spirit—"There would not be the proverbial phrase 'As safe as the Bank of England' if its management had not been conspicuously sound." Ahem!—comes what might be a genuine thought, that interest charges on credits created by a bookkeeping entry are unethical; but how can one avoid the suspicion that the suggestion springs from the same questionable parentage as all the rest?

Reading on, one finds that ethically defensible practice would admit of 1/2 or 2-3rd per cent, on Bank-created credit for administration. Coupled with this is the suggestion for the amalgamation of the Joint Stock Banks with the Bank of England in a Public Utility Corporation. Here, for some unspecified reason we have somehow strayed from the bleak domain of "withering capital," and—though this may be merely a slip—it is not expressly stated that the 1/2 or 2-3rd per cent, constitutes one single payment only.

This point is not unimportant. For with the Joint Stock Banks merged in the Central Bank, which in its turn, for the purposes of the necessary "international economic control," will presumably be merged in the Bank of International Settlements, now in cold storage in conveniently neutral Basle, 2-3rd or even 1/2 per cent, on the total capital investment of two hemispheres would do well enough to be going on with.

Incidentally, this need for "international control" would account for the Archbishop's support of the League of Nations, upon which point, as he mentions, he and the Bishop of Gloucester, who was quoted lately in this paper, do not see eye to eye. Thoughtful people everywhere to-day are puzzled by the fact that in a world-crisis which most of us instinctively feel to be a direct attack on Christian principles, the Christian Churches, as institutions, are able to take little or no part. The truth as to this is, of course, summed up in the quotation at the head of this review. And if confirmation of that is wanted, it will be found in this little six-penny Penguin, from the hand of the Head of one of the great Christian Churches—the evidence of a tragic inability to accept "the Cross"—which is what it is—of consistent Christian thought.

There it is, upon almost every page, an intellectual plea for the principle, followed almost immediately by a refusal to accept its practical application. On page 35, to give one last quotation, we read, "If Christianity is true, it is a truth of universal application." And then only three lines down comes this: "Christian faith does not by itself enable its adherents to foresee how a vast number of people will be affected by particular political or economic innovations—social credit" for example.

Except for the assumption that "social credit" to Dr. Temple represents nothing but its technical proposals, that statement is a flat contradiction of the one above. But more than that, it inevitably raises speculation in the acute mind, as to what particular "faith", other than, and presumably superior to the Christian faith, enables the Archbishop of Canterbury to foresee so clearly the beneficent results of the proposed mass-regimentation to which, through himself, he lends the whole support of the Church of England?

BRITAIN FROM THE INSIDE

By B. M. PALMER.

I think the lions growled gently over the proposed coal rationing—whether that is the reason for its indefinite postponement, or that the machinery of compulsion has begun to seize up on the war effort it is difficult to say. And all to save less than a week's fuel supply! The situation is not without its humour.

Sir Leonard Hill, in a lecture at the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, stated that we could all withstand the severest wintry weather without artificial heat and with windows open if we dressed as the Northern Chinese in wadded tunics and trousers bound round the ankles, and wore undergarments knitted of soft wool. A few days later the coupon value of men's woollen underwear and women's woollen stockings were increased.

We were advised to stop up all crevices to conserve heat. Commander Stephen King-Hall announced that all those people who were unwilling to share their neighbour's fires to save fuel had better think twice. The committee reporting on the increased incidence of tuberculosis found that it was due mainly to overcrowding, nutritional deficiencies, black-out conditions and evacuation. The average quantity of milk a head needed for satisfactory nutrition is not less than three-quarters of a pint a day. The adult population has been inadequately supplied with milk during the winter.

I listened to the first broadcast summary of this report. I heard no allusion to nutritional deficiencies. There is a widespread attempt to prove that we have been all the better for a restricted war diet—*austerity, you know; to our shame it is true that the underdogs are better fed, even on war diet; and their improved health has done something to send the statistics in the required direction. But the testing is to come.*

The Lambeth Communal Kitchens Secretary informed the public (through "The Times") that they make constant use of haybox cookery; and intend to use it still more this winter in order to save fuel. Dr. Franklin Bicknell, of 79 Wimpolestreet, replied that such cooking is very injurious, destroying more vitamins in the protective foods than any other method. He continued "the use of a haybox, therefore, seems a false economy; more cold food, or even more fuel, being a wiser choice."

During the last few months the Government has forbidden the sale of any other sugar substitute than saccharin. According to the "Encyclopaedia Britannica" 14th edition, "Saccharin decreases appetite, gastric secretion, peptic digestion, and intestinal absorption." And in the case of that pale caricature that passes for a loaf on our table, it has not been proved that the added calcium cannot do more harm than good.

It would be easy to go on multiplying instances; broadcasts have stated that there is no essential difference between sugar, glucose, honey and black treacle, that special margarine is as good as butter

[although mice don't think so] or that you can do anything with dried eggs except boil them. The kitchen front of the B.B.C. has on more than one occasion given inaccurate information, notably in the recommendation to use metal lids with sulphur dioxide in fruit bottling. This is against the express instructions issued by the manufacturers of Campden Solution. There are, of course, plenty of a particular make of metal lid on the market, while more satisfactory preserving jars are difficult to come by. Why? Such incidents, though obscure, are worth noting. Those women who come across them, in their capacity as experts in the home, should never let them pass. Something was done with regard to the above, and the record kept. The general instructions for procedure are to be found in chapter XVIII. of "The Big Idea."

"The first strategy has many times been emphasised—it is to insist that Members of Parliament are representatives, not delegates. I am still of the opinion that so long as Parliamentary institutions subsist, which may not be much longer, this line of action is vital.

"But the same principle can be carried into every official quarter. Once get the mental attitude well established in oneself that institutions exist only legitimately to serve individuals and it is possible to make demands of Government Departments with which their organisation cannot deal, but are yet entirely reasonable. It is not necessary and not desirable, to organise this kind of action. The underlying idea is to call the bluff of institutionalism, and to make it either deliver the goods or expose the fact that it can't."

It is not the business of social crediters to set up as food experts, but they are concerned that the eye of the expert shall be single.

The unpalatable truth is that a majority of Government experts in key positions to-day are not men of integrity—they keep an eye on the main chance in their attempt to prove that the Socialism under which we are now living (according to Miss Ellen Wilkinson) is good for you. Events are proving that it isn't.

—Condensed from the "Social Crediter" (England), October 31, 1942

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the UNITED DEMOCRATS, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

COMMONWEALTH POWERS BILL: Parcels of request-letters and leaflets have been sent out to actionists throughout the State. A good flow of signed letters to Representatives in Parliament will indicate to them the attitude of their electors to the Powers Bill, which violates the principles of democracy. Adelaide and suburbs is being canvassed by a band of loyal helpers and several hundred letters have already been sent to Assembly and Legislative Council Members. The daily press has given the case against the Bill good publicity, but individual action will be the deciding factor. Parliament was to commence the debate on Tuesday (January 19) and it was expected to take at least two weeks. If you want further supplies of letter forms write in at once. **ACT NOW!**

—M. E. DODD, President.

BOOTHBY POLICY ASSOCIATION: This group of realistic people met their Federal representative, Dr. Grenfell Price, in Adelaide, on December 17. This was not a deputation, and was the first meeting of its kind in this State. The purpose was to discuss the everyday problems of everyday people with the man who represented them. There were about thirty present. Dr. Price was very pleased with the conduct of the meeting, and asked for another one in March. Almost everyone present asked questions. Admitting that he knew nothing of finance, Dr. Price said that he was not interested in any other group. Mr. A. J. Munyard, who organised the meeting, enthusiastically assisted by Mr. C. H. Allen, was also very pleased with the first effort to get the voters of Boothby to talk things over with their representative. This personal contact, almost always lacking, is essential to true Democratic Government. Mr. Munyard considers the effort well worth while, and hopes to further organise small home meetings in order to build upon this promising foundation.

OUR WOMEN HELPERS: As usual, our ladies provided a Christmas lunch for our friends who attend headquarters. This is to show that, in spite of everything, we are not down-hearted. The result was £3 paid in to the funds. We are—as usual—very much indebted to our ladies for

this side of our work. It is very essential and we here record our sincere appreciation. We also appeal to any who may be able to do so, to lend a hand, for our ladies are very few and very busy. The burden falls particularly heavily on the few who are able to help. If any lady could take a turn assisting in the kitchen once in a while, please let me know.

—M. R. W. LEE, Hon. Secretary.

THE PALM-OFF

For years Social Crediters have been demanding that money monopoly be ousted from its position of dominance over men, and that the cultural heritage of humanity be exploited properly so as to make available to all complete personal freedom and personal security.

For years they were the subjects of ridicule, attack and ostracism by those who believed that the unemployed man was unemployed because he was lazy, and that once "confidence" was returned the world would be all right.

But war has changed many things, and among them are the reactionaries. Now we find them foremost in the demand for social security, for family allowances, State medicine, unemployment insurance—anything, in fact, which bears a spurious semblance to that which Social Crediters seek.

The tactics are clear. It is to palm-off a fake brand of social reform to stave-off the demands for something better. It is to saddle free men with bureaucracy—State socialism—as the price of bread.

Examine carefully all pronouncements regarding "a better world" and "a new way of life" before according them as genuine.

The Big Idea is to sell you a pup that is mongrel in origin, unsavoury in habits, and uncertain as to future conduct.

Nothing but freedom to get and to do, to live and enjoy life abundantly will satisfy the human spirit. Talk of the "four freedoms" is stupid while these four are being used as a mask to deprive mankind of the greatest political freedom of all—the freedom to tell his Parliament what to do and when to dissolve.

—"To-day and To-morrow."

NEW PAMPHLET

What is Democracy? What is Totalitarianism? What is Communism? What is Socialism? What is National Socialism? What is Fascism? What is the choice before us?

All these questions are answered, briefly and clearly, but in a fundamental way, in the excellent pamphlet, "DEMOCRACY AND THE ISMS," the substance of which appeared in the "New Times" of November 6. Copies are now available from The United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.I. Price: One shilling per dozen (postage 1 1/2d.).

Every democrat should get at least a dozen copies, and circulate them as widely as possible. ORDER NOW.

FREEDOM TO CHOOSE OR REFUSE

By F. C. PAICE.

The extent to which individuals may choose or refuse is the measure of their freedom. Democracy, that much misused and abused word, is generally accepted to mean a state of society in which government is "of the people, for the people, and BY the people," or a state of society in which the people get what THEY want. This has been, and is now, nothing more than an ideal to strive for.

There can be no doubt that the vast majority of people throughout the world desire the democratic way of life, and for many years both men and women have been striving tirelessly to attain that ideal. Many groups and schools of thought have devoted years of study and effort, each hoping and believing that their particular school was right and that all others, though their intentions were good and they were really earnest people, were wrong. Each school thought—and still thinks—this, and from time to time open warfare has only just been averted between the different sections. There must be something fundamentally wrong when the efforts of thousands of earnest and sincere people all over the world, all seeking the betterment of themselves and their fellows, all striving to attain the same end, result in nothing more than argument as to who is right and who wrong, and in obtaining the results that they do not want—i.e., division instead of unity. The adherents of any one school of thought cannot, with fairness, claim to be more sincere than the members of any other school. Every school of reform thought known to me has been, and is, doing its utmost to educate and persuade people to accept their particular theories, hoping and striving to the end that they will eventually attract sufficient supporters and adherents to give them strength to impose their will upon those who do not subscribe to their viewpoint. Whether they realise it or not is beside the point, but the fact remains that the leaders of the majority of these movements are endeavouring to obtain enough power over their fellows "to compel them to accept their particular form of "New Order." It is not too much to say that in the majority of cases, once having obtained power, they would not hesitate to suppress any opponents to their system. It is but another example of "We are right, the other fellow is wrong, and in opposing our System, he is a disruptionist, and therefore an enemy of society, and should therefore be suppressed."

Now, it is a healthy idea, now and then, to hang a question mark on things we have long taken for granted, and it was only after hanging many question marks on many things that I had previously taken for granted, that I arrived at the conclusion that it is futile for any reform movement to ever hope to educate the majority of the people of the world, or even of a small country, to be technicians enough to demand that "As a majority of the people now understand and favour the principles of Social Credit" (or the theories of Henry George or Karl Marx, or any out of the thousands of different reform ideas) "we demand that they be implemented." The futility of it is so obvious to me, that I strongly suspect that it has been, and will be encouraged by those who to-day hold the people of all countries in bondage. Its futility is demonstrated by the fact that in spite of all the efforts of these groups of well-intentioned people, spread over many, many years, we find to-day, if we will but read history, and refer to such things as Magna Charta, The Petition of Rights, The Bill of Rights, etc., that our liberties have been, and are, slowly but surely being taken away from us, while our labours are being intensified and the results of them denied us or destroyed.

COLLECTIVE INITIATIVE?

I doubt if the people, or a majority, with united voice, have ever initiated legislation, and it is not reasonable to expect that they could. What happens is that some sectional group finds a way to exert pressure or influence on the Government to gain some advantage for their group, mostly at the expense of some other group or section, or perhaps at the expense of the rest of the people; the result being some law or regulation imposed upon people (who may be in the majority) regardless of whether they want it or not. To the group concerned, this is of no importance. Members of Parlia-

ment or the Government seldom, if ever, draft proposed legislation, they convey their ideas to the technicians, who draft it for them, and then Parliament exercises, or should exercise, its ability to choose or refuse to accept it. So we see that even when experts draft legislation or initiate it, the technical details cause controversy even among those trained in these things, yet many, in fact, practically all, reform movements still pin their faith on being able to educate a sufficient number of people to enforce their technical ideas on the rest. It is not possible. When large bodies of in-expert technicians try to set out in detail what legislation they want, they usually get what they do NOT want, and in addition, they become so confused that they actually ASK for what they DO NOT WANT. As an illustration of what I am trying to convey, let us have a look at what has actually happened when we have this type of "collective initiative." Large industrial organisations (trades unions, etc.), after many years of industrial and political strife, are to-day able to give orders to the Government of the day. What will they do with this power? A look at what they have been doing will, I think, give some indication. They asked for, and received, an Arbitration Court, believing that by this means

they were ensuring a higher standard of living for their members, only to find (though I am far from sure that they yet realise it) that the Court is not concerned with what a man, his wife and his family can live on, but is only concerned with "what industry can pay." Again, they asked for, and received, higher wages and cost of living adjustments. What have they received? The real wages to-day, are lower, in terms of purchasing-power, than in 1907, and the increased cost of living adjustments follow, not precede, three or six months of living at the increased cost, and further than that, it reduces the standard of living of those whose incomes are not so adjusted, including the dependents of the men who are fighting for the right to live decently and for "Freedom." They have demanded Work for all, and they have been given industrial conscription. I know instinctively that they did not, and do not, want any of the things they received, but they really thought that they were asking for a freer, fuller and better way of life. I believe there is no better way to get what they do NOT want than thus to usurp the function of experts. I believe this to be the strategy fostered by those who would enslave us.

(To be continued.)

UNDERMINING OUR MORALE

Sir James Elder Again

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

(Continued from last issue)

Sir,—According to "a government spokesman," taxation is to be further increased. We were not given the name of this "government spokesman" or informed of the authority under which he spoke. Who did instruct him to thus prepare the way, and why?

Since his announcement was made in the "news" session of the National Broadcasting stations, and in all the daily newspapers as something already determined and quite inevitable, I have addressed several public and private meetings, and on each occasion have asked the audience: Did YOU instruct the Government to increase taxation? Without exception, the answer has been a chorus of NO! The next natural question was: Then who did? To this there was always an impressive silence.

So now I put the same question to your readers. Was it they who asked the Government for higher taxes? If not, then who did? We are told that this is a country in which the will of the PEOPLE prevails, and consequently if the burden of taxation is heavy it should be because the PEOPLE have willed it so. No? Well, obviously it has been willed by someone, and it is high time we knew his identity. When I have asked my friends whether they favour higher taxation, some of them have indignantly replied: "I do not. Taxes are too bloody high already." So it would appear that some enemy has done it, and that by allowing itself to be the agent for such enemy the Government itself is acting treasonably!

Seeing that the PEOPLE have not asked for the nips to be put in further, let us continue the consideration of the speech recently given by Sir James Elder. This may give us a clue. The report of the speech occupied two full columns, and it is difficult to cover the whole of it in a connected way when there is such a limited amount of space available each week. But even though space is so scarce I want to quote a section of the speech in full, as it purports to be the final word of an infallible expert. It will be seen, however, that in reality it is an unashamed attempt to create a condition of fear in the public mind, so that such condition of fear can then be played upon to serve the interests of the Private Money Monopoly. Here is what he said. Read it carefully:

"The dangers of currency depreciation and its continuance are so obvious that one searches for reasons why the public fails to demand application of the measures to prevent it. Possibly the answer is twofold. One reason may be that the general acceptance of the principle that the strength of a nation's war effort primarily depends on its physical resources has led the public mind, or a large section of it, to assume that finance and financial methods no longer matter. The other reason I suggest is a widespread belief that our present physical controls alone—price-fixing, rationing, and the like—are infallible guards against rising prices and costs. Both beliefs are erroneous and dangerous. The controls I have referred to are inadequate. The root of the problem lies in restricting the capacity of the public to spend. This spending ability must be diminished by every conceivable means, of which the most obvious are further limitations on the supply of goods and services for civilian use, the fixation of ceiling prices for materials, labour and services, and the reduction of the quantity of money in the hands of the public by taxation or compulsory loans in one form or another. Circumstances demand that the people of Australia choose either a further reduction in their capacity to spend or greater currency depreciation, with its attendant evils. The supreme need of the moment is for leaders of all ranks and sections to forcibly present this issue to the commun-

ity, to warn it against, easy methods of finance, and to clearly demonstrate that the spending power of the public can only be lessened by a willing acceptance of the necessary physical and financial controls."

There it is, Mr. Editor, and, as was to be expected, Professor Copland obligingly gave us the "New Year Message" that further heavy taxation and less spending-power are the things we must expect in the Happy New Year. Now whose policy is the Government IMPOSING! — The People's or the Bankers? It is the BANKERS who are demanding that the people be robbed of their spending power through taxation and loans, and the professional economists, as well as Treasury officials, are supporting that demand against the interests of the Nation. The Government, as usual, is yielding to the Bankers, but I venture to think that this surrender of its sovereignty is due to the fact that hitherto the pressure from the Bankers and their tools has been greater than the pressure from the people.

Next week I hope to comment on the part of the speech quoted above, but in the meantime would ask readers to think over the important admission made by President Roosevelt last week. It was in the Melbourne "Argus" of 13/1/43 as follows: "Because of the magnitude of interest-bearing debt, taxes probably will never revert to pre-war levels." How do they like that prospect? And how will the men in the Fighting Forces like it when they find out? They have been assured that they are fighting for Freedom. The freedom they will get is the freedom to be put further into debt! What did President Roosevelt mean by "INTEREST-BEARING DEBT"? Has Sir James never heard of it? Obviously if Governments did not have it there would be no need to tax us. And if Governments are really sovereign as they make out, why are they saddled with such debt? Is it not strange that this aspect of the problem—the very ROOT of it—had no place at all in the speech of "warning" given by the noble knight which was broadcast throughout the land and appeared in all the daily newspapers? Is it not a fact, as set out in paragraph 504 of the Report of the Monetary and Banking Commission that the Commonwealth Bank can make money available to Governments without any charge, and that consequently there is no need for the Federal Government to be in interest-bearing debt at all?

Sir James says we must choose between less spending power and greater currency depreciation. This is false. What about the alternative of choosing to have the war financed by the Commonwealth Bank without any interest-bearing debt instead? This would mean that the Fighting Forces would NOT come back to pay higher taxes.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne. 17th January, 1943.

(To be continued.)

What Lies Ahead In 1943—And After?

(Continued from page 1.)

demand the same thing? Is there no other discipline than that of the barrack square? Is the killing of men the only incentive which will permit the energies and resources of this nation to be fully utilised? Is war the only excitement which our old men will permit our young men to have? Bombing men from the air with high explosives until they are broken and bewildered, and then rolling over them with tanks—that is war, and that is the means, for many the only means, which has provided large numbers of men and women with their first steady income, and some with their first real job.

I have suggested to you that there are ways other than war of providing incomes for the people; and perhaps after this war some people might be sufficiently interested to ask why a country which can supply itself with the ordinary needs of men and women cannot supply itself with sufficient money to buy what it produces.

It has long been apparent that men are not considered of any importance unless they speak for some mob. Men seem to be afraid to speak on their own behalf; they are afraid to take action on their own. Nothing is done except through the proper channel—when you can find the proper channel—and that is when the channel is not blocked. Simple experiments are held up for decades while our great men are exploring every avenue, and leaving no stone unturned.

To-day millions of men are tied down by little bits of red tape. They are quite helpless to do anything without permission of some bureaucrat many miles away. The independent spirit of our people is being undermined; we are building a nation of petty officials who operate like clock-work toys when some secret spring is pressed; or, when they escape from their offices, they join some mob. This feeling of helplessness is probably the most insidious and dreadful disease that we have to fight to-day; people seem quite incapable of standing by themselves; they have to go in mobs where they can hide their heads. But you cannot build a society out of mobs; mobs are nasty things, they have no conscience, no morals and no responsibility; mobs cannot construct, they can only destroy.

Party politics is merely a more subtle game of mob rule, the political mobs being used to hold down anyone who challenges the Party Bosses.

If mobs had enough intelligence to look after their own interests, things would not be so bad; but mobs have no intelligence

—they only have hate. And hatred is a poor and insecure basis for building a new world.

Although mobs do not know what they are doing and are incapable of looking after their own interests, the people who use mobs, who rouse them and supply them with slogans—these people know very well what they are doing, and know how to do it. Mobs are never used to destroy these big men; they are only used to destroy you and me.

Some of you perhaps have often wondered how you could help to build up a more reasonable community life after this war; or, perhaps you have gone further and asked how a group of experienced and sincere men could make themselves acquainted with pressing problems, and so help the community to solve them.

To-day, we require a small number of experienced and determined men who, like our soldiers, will submit to a period of training, when they can be given expert advice from the best brains available. We want a few men in this community to make themselves acquainted with a few fundamental facts so that they can avoid stupid mistakes and at least do small jobs well. What we want is not a lot of opinions, but expert advice. That expert advice is available to those who wish to use it.

Surely if you are sincere in your desire to help to make a reasonable world for the young men and women who return from this war, you are not going to leave all the decisions to others. Men are looking for advice and guidance, and if they do not receive it from you then they will receive advice from others. You cannot expect people to look to you for guidance unless they know you have something to give.

Have you anything to give? A word in the right place may work wonders. One question may crash an entire meeting. The one phrase "Poverty amidst plenty" has gone right round the world and, like yeast, is leavening the entire mass of political thought. That's how truth works: it is a growing thing—or, rather, it makes other things grow.

Good, capable men are like yeast; they help others to grow. A large quantity is not required—quality is what we want. And we want it now.

Urgent. Wanted to Buy:

Water Tank, 100-500 Gallons.—N. Rolls, c/o Box 1226 G.P.O., Melbourne.

THE "MANAGERIAL" REVOLUTION

The "Economic Journal" (Editor, Lord Keynes) June-September, 1942, issue, has a review of a book published in New York, in 1941, entitled "The Managerial Revolution: What is Happening in the World," by James Burnham, a Lecturer in Political Philosophy in New York, who was, it is stated, for some years active in the Trotskyist movement.

It appears that the Managerial Revolution "involves the solution of the problems, (1) of reducing capitalists to impotence, and (2) curbing the masses in such a way as to lead them to accept managerial rule, and eliminate the threat of classless (socialist) society.

It is stated that both these problems have been solved substantially in Germany and Russia, though in different ways and in a different order in point of time: that Russia is immeasurably further away today from the characteristics of socialist society, which are classlessness, freedom, and internationalism, than during the first year of the Revolution. The author of the book avers that "every shred of freedom and democracy has been purged from Russian life."

The reviewer explains that there is a third problem with which the future order would be faced, viz., that of the formation of super-States, and eventually the struggle for world-domination amongst them. Only three centres of advanced industry in the world are capable of constituting super-States, North Western and Central Europe, the U.S.A., and the Far East. The author believes that the war of 1939 is "the first formative war of managerial society, and that in the future the U.S.A., when it develops the full managerial structure, will inevitably be drawn to make a bid for world-power as against the super-States based on the other two central areas of Europe and the Far East. The hemispherical policy of Roosevelt and the acquisition of Atlantic Naval bases are stepping-stones towards this ultimate conflict, however little such ideas may be present in the minds of the existing rulers of America."

The author of "The Managerial Revolution" has no doubt as to the effect of the 1939 war on the future of England: "first, the political consolidation of the European Continent, which involves also the smashing of England's hold on the continent, and second, the break-up of the British Empire, chief political representative of capitalist world-society" are the two major results which are to be expected. Even

if Hitler is vanquished, "England can never again be dominant in Europe, or the controlling centre of a vast world-empire."

The reviewer describes the book as "most provocative, exciting, and indeed alarming," and as an "extraordinarily ably reasoned thesis," after which strong language he passes to what seems a lame and impotent conclusion: "the reader may console himself inter alia with the reflection that the future probably will not be quite so grim . . . and that ideas, sentiments, and individuals yet unborn are capable of giving world-events to come a twist in quite other directions than those so confidently forecast by the author."

C. W. Guillebaud, St. John College, Cambridge, the reviewer, states that the author is "by no means enamoured of the prospect he holds out, and that his whole book must be read in the light of an extract from a letter from Machiavelli which is appended as a motto to this work," viz.: "I teach princes villainy, and how to enslave. If any man will read my book with impartiality and ordinary charity he will easily perceive that it is not my intention to recommend that Government or those men there described, to the world, much less to teach men how to trample upon good men and all that is sacred and venerable upon earth, laws, religion, honesty and whatnot. If I have been a little too punctilious in describing these monsters in all their lineaments and colours, I hope mankind will know them the better to avoid them, my treatise being both a satire against them and a true character of them."

The reactions to these professions of an ordinary reader might perhaps be expressed suitably in the words of Macduff after Malcolm's recantations of villainy, "Such welcome and unwelcome things at once, 'Tis hard to reconcile."—T.A.T.

SOCIALISM AND SOCIAL CREDIT

Norman Jaques, the Canadian Democratic Member of Parliament, writes:

Every active follower of C. H. Douglas learns that Socialists—"red or pink"—are opposed to Social Credit because it stands for economic security PLUS individual independence and enterprise.

For Socialism is "collectivism," the transformation of people into masses and their control by bureaucracy—government by decree.

Socialists, therefore, work to centralise all control, and support any agency to that end—financial or political.

Social Credit is individualistic—the control of institutions, and of the State by the people—government by persuasion.

Social Credit would decentralise control of policy, both political and financial, and, for that reason, is utterly opposed to any scheme for its centralisation—such as the international gold standard, "Union Now" (both backed by Finance and Socialism).

Since the last war most of the European countries have been "socialised" and the people collectivised into "masses," ARMED TO THE TEETH, and all control centralised in ruthless dictators.

Hitler's "New Order" was lavishly subsidised by international finance (see U.S. Congressional records).

Those countries remaining democratic became the victims of financial sanctions (financial crises and depressions) imposed by International Finance for the purpose of destroying people's faith in democracy, and in their ability to govern themselves by persuasion, and as free individuals.

For this laudable purpose the international financiers were (and still are) ably assisted by the "Alumnae" of the London School of Economics (endowed FOR Socialists by international financiers), who formed the "brain trust" of Socialistic Governments of Great Britain—Governments who, if they did not restore the gold standard, retained it at the risk of Empire safety through neglect of its defences for reasons of "drastic economy" (French Socialists did the same), bringing ruin to millions of people, and stagnation to industry and agriculture.

Every Allied leader declares we are fighting to preserve our democratic freedoms and way of life. At the same time there is a promise, or a threat of a "New Order," a transformation from National Democracy to International Socialism.

And who is to be the controller of the new order? A Hitler or a Shylock? Gangster or Racketeer?

Notes on the News

(Continued from page 1.)

more power to the Federal Government. Apparently the people carrying on the campaign in the States realise that such powers are simply sought to permit bureaucratic socialism to be imposed, willy nilly, in the post-war period. Curtin clearly displays opposition to democracy by objecting to the people of the States insisting on retaining more than the fiction of State Parliaments and managing their own affairs.

NEW ORDERS: The London "Times," commenting on Sir William Beveridge's "New Order," says: "It does not include major departures from British social legislation," and "no administrative reform can be accomplished without some sacrifice by the interests affected." So! There must be a sacrifice to obtain already available benefits! How a sacrifice can simultaneously be a benefit to an individual will certainly need some explaining. Of course, it WOULD make sense if Sir William Beveridge proposed to sacrifice the present power of Finance (whether privately controlled OR State-controlled) to arbitrarily restrict the people's purchasing-power, even in the face of a super-abundance of goods. THAT sacrifice would mean no new economic sacrifice whatsoever for ANY of the people. Indeed, it would mean "not less for some, but more for all." And it need NOT involve any sacrifice of individual freedom of choice, nor any bureaucratic regimentation of the people, nor any "common ownership."

PROFIT PUZZLE: Public men are heavily featured in the Press as opposing the "profit motive." Among them are Treasury officials who, at the same time, announce a profit of a cool million on the note-issue. P.M.G. officials with another profit of a million or so, also join in the chorus. Are we to accept their words—or their actions? Then there is the State tramways monopoly, which clearly overcharges the people, at least to the extent of its surplus. But the gem of all comes from a Communist propaganda booklet, "Soviet Finance," showing that the socialised State monopolies take many millions, by making profits, from the Russian people!

—O. B. H.

ANTI-CONSCRIPTION MEETINGS

Under the auspices of the Anti-Conscription Campaign Committee, meetings are being held every Sunday night at the Savoy Theatre (Room 11), Melbourne. Also every Sunday afternoon on the Yarra Bank. This Sunday (January 24) the meeting at night will be a special rally in the main hall at the Savoy, and an extra large audience is anticipated.

THE IGNORANCE OF A MARQUESS

The Marquess of Donegal, writing under the feature-heading "Almost in Confidence" on page two of the "Sunday Dispatch," September 27, says:

"Now I know no more about Social Credit than the average newspaper reader. But my impression is that everybody gets £5 a month given to them. If they do not spend it at once they have to stick stamps on the back to maintain the value. Thus, Social Credit, as I see it, proposes to give everyone something for nothing."

So that is all the noble Marquess knows about Social Credit? No more than the average newspaper reader. This admission should not, I feel sure, have been published "Almost in Confidence," but kept wholly in confidence and not published at all. What has the Marquess been doing all these years—reading Nostradamus?

The Social Credit analysis and proposals were made public during 1919-20, when if I am not mistaken, the Marquess of Donegal was 17 years of age—just the right age to put the mind to a new world-theory of social-economics.

He is now, I think, 39 years of age, and there really can be no excuse for not having a better grasp of Social Credit than "the average newspaper reader." For, if an educated (Eton) man cannot gather a more accurate store of general knowledge than the average newspaper reader, his views on any subject can hardly be worth print and wood-pulp.

After more than 20 years of this sort of thing in the public press, I think we have had enough.

The gossip-columnists, whether they happen to be noblemen or cook-house dishwashers, must be taught that they have a public responsibility and that they must not mislead the public in matters of fact.

Social Credit has nothing to do with sticking stamps on the back of anything, and if the Marquess of Donegal does not know that stamp-money was the basic technique of the scheme put forward by the Swiss

"psysocrat," Silvio Gesell, and has nothing whatever to do with Social Credit, it is time he was told—and told very plainly indeed.

"As I see it," he writes, "Social Credit proposes to give everyone something for nothing." Well, he sees it all out of focus. And again he should be told so in no uncertain terms. He should be publicly "ticked off"—and I hope I am helping to do it. Social Credit proposes to give something (goods and services) to everyone, not for nothing, but because they have, with the help of machines, actually produced these things.

The WORK has been done, and the goods and services produced should be distributed. I will trouble the Marquess, or anyone else, to give any good reason why (in peace-time) this real wealth should not be distributed and used. But before he jumps in to reply, he would do well to take the trouble to know a little more about Social Credit than the average newspaper reader.

It is a piece of impudence for an educated man to write for the popular press, when, by his own confession, he knows no more than the overworked citizen who opens his Sunday paper.

But it is more than impudence when such a writer sets forth his uninformed and entirely erroneous notions regarding matters of fact. It is misrepresentation of a kind that helps to produce that flux and confusion in the public mind that paves the way for Hitlerism. This type of journalism is dangerous. And it is high time it was pulled up with a jerk.

—John Hargrave.

THE RED REFUSALIERS

(Dedicated to the rip-roaring recruiting agents in the Australian Communist Party, who would conscript others, but stay at home themselves.)

We will marshal all the wage plugs,
We will force them to the front;
If you're short of cannon fodder
We will make them bear the brunt:
Say they won't go, and conscript them,
Pack them off across the foam;
We will help you, we the Commos,
From our possies safe at home.

We'll pretend you're short of diggers
Who would rush to stop a Jap,
And we'll volunteer—as urgers;
Though we don't fight we can yap,
And our leaders—guys like Thornton,
Sharkey, Elliott and Co.—
Will do their very damndest
URGING OTHER MEN TO GO.

It's a shame to see the shirkers,
Men who really don't like wars,
Staying home in peace and quiet
While some others leave these shores;
We will do our best to force them
Shoulder guns and go and fight,
While we Commos stay in Aussie
Just to prove the cause is right.

And when they're marching forward
To face the foreign foe,
We'll line the streets and wave the flags
And cheer them as they go;
Yes, cheer as they go forward,
And cheer when they come back,
For when it comes to sooling on
We Commos nothing lack.

Since the A.L.P. did promise
To lift the Commo ban
We've had to do our stuff, and so
We boost the Curtin plan;
And though it means conscription
(Like any other URGER
We'll tag on it another name,
And designate it merger).

Our leaders have EXEMPTIONS
And so can talk quite free
'Gainst anyone who claims the rights
Of this democracy;
And so we have this slogan,
(To me it seems quite right)
WE COMMOS MUST REMAIN AT HOME
WHILE OTHERS GO TO FIGHT.

—W.J.C.

BOOKS TO READ

(Obtainable from the United Electors of Australia, Room 9, 5th Floor, McEwan House, Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.I.)

"Federal Union Exposed": A book you MUST have. By Barclay-Smith. Price, 1/-.
"Banks and Facts": How to Finance the War for an All-in War Effort. By Bruce H. Brown. Price, 6d. each.

"Money": What it is and how the Money System Works. By S. F. Allen. Price, 1/-.
"Story of the Commonwealth Bank": The Story of the People's Bank and How it Could and Should be Used. By D. J. Amos, F.A.I.S. Price, 1/-. each.

"Victory Without Debt": Showing that Victory can be Won Without Creating a Huge Burden of Debt to be Paid Off After the War. By Barclay-Smith. Price 1/- each.

"Answer to Tax Slavery": Explains the Taxation Racket, and shows WHY we Really Pay Taxes. By Barclay-Smith. Price, 1/-.
*In the "New Times" of December 11, 1942

WHY COLLECT TAXES?

(A short comment, by C. H. Douglas, on the previous article under this heading by Mr. Ralph Duclos.)

It is, I think, possible to measure roughly the progress made by the technical aspects of Social Credit in obtaining popular recognition, by comparing this article, and the extracts from statements by Canadian Cabinet Ministers in the House of Commons at Ottawa, with the comments made in the same place when the ideas were first put forward there in 1923. I do not think that any reasonable person could fail to be impressed by the change.

But Mr. Duclos earns, at any rate, my gratitude, by the form in which he carries forward the argument. He is concerned to show primarily what the financial measures current in, at least, every Anglo-Saxon community mean, and secondarily, that without comment on the propriety of the real objective of them, they can be shown to be wasteful and inefficient—a bad job. That is what we have always said, but not so insistently, because of our preoccupation with objectives.

But I should like to carry Mr. Duclos's argument a stage further. (He is all the more effective by reason of his limited objective, which he has attained.)

He brushes aside, as a pricked bubble, the nonsense about the Government wanting your money to win the war, and emphasises the truth which is only more obvious, but not more true in war than in "peace"—that the main object of modern taxation is that you shall not have the money.

Now, this raises the whole question of economic democracy. Behind it, is the "a priori" assumption of the Divine Right of Governments. Under this conception, your business is to work at anything you are told to work at, and your sovereignty over the product is to be permanently and for ever at the mercy of the next Finance Bill. And if there is anyone who is in doubt as to the source of Finance Bills, I feel sure that Mr. Duclos can enlighten him.

Always and ever, this world question comes back to the same simple issue—the relation of the individual to the Group. So long as the individual cannot contract out—not necessarily without penalty, but without any penalty for contracting out—there is no democracy and no freedom.

Every effort is being made at the present time to place the Group in unchallengeable control and to establish "the Group by Divine Right." The immediate counter-offensive requires the abolition of Cabinet rule, and the drastic reconstruction of the whole conception and construction of Government Finance, which is consciously complementary, at present, to the High Finance of the World Plans.

—C.H.D.

*In the "New Times" of December 11, 1942

"NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES
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.

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