

EXPOSURE OF LOCAL

COMMUNISTS'

TACTICS AND

OBJECTIVES.

(See page 3.)

EVERY FRIDAY

# THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 9 No. 4 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JAN. 29, 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).

## Conscription is Unwanted and Unnecessary Democratic Electors Must Act Quickly

**We believe that a majority of Australian electors are definitely opposed to conscription for overseas service. But Mr. Curtin's proposal—which may well prove to be the thin-end-of-the-wedge of unlimited conscription—will soon be implemented unless the anti-conscription electors act quickly by writing to their respective Members of Federal Parliament demanding that they oppose its introduction.**

The amazing thing about the proposal is that it should have got so far. This is supposed to be a democratic country, yet, in the face of the traditional opposition of a majority of electors, Mr. Curtin's proposal threatens to become a reality without the electors even being consulted by referendum, as they were during the last war!

Of course, the proposal has been endorsed by the recent Federal A.L.P. Conference in Melbourne—to the great chagrin and astonishment of most genuine Laborites, many of whom took part in the anti-conscription campaign during the last war, and retain vivid recollections of the prominent part played by the same John Curtin in that campaign! How, then, did that Conference come to make such a decision? J. T. Lang, who has for many years been one of the most unflinching fighters in the Labor cause, and enjoys the distinction of being the only head of an Australian Government, State or Federal, to directly challenge the Money Power (and fight it out), summarises the answer to that question as follows in a signed front-page article in the Sydney "Century"—"Only Labor Newspaper in N.S.W."—of January 8:

"The decision became possible because, in the words of the Federal President, a delegate from Tasmania changed his mind. The decision was taken in the teeth of the opposition of the men and women of the Labor Movement in the three populous States of Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. An apparently legal majority was obtained because delegates from New South Wales, under instructions from their State Executive, ignored the will of the Labor movement in this State, as expressed by resolution in unions, councils and branches."

Lang goes on to say: "It is many years since the Labor Movement in this State has been so unanimous on any point as it is in its opposition to conscription for service overseas. It is just as unanimous in its opinion that the decision of the New South Wales Executive must be altered at a General Conference, which is the

normal method of a democratic Movement."

That is not merely Mr. Lang's unsupported opinion. In the same issue of the "Century" appears a "Conscription Barometer," consisting of lists of Labor politicians, leaders, branches, unions, etc (in N.S.W.) opposing conscription, set against a list of their counterparts favouring conscription. This reveals that: NINE Federal Members oppose conscription, while TWO favour it; TWENTY-SEVEN State Members oppose conscription, while NINE favour it; ALL the 10 Senate candidates oppose conscription; TWO Regional Conferences oppose conscription, while NONE has expressed approval; ELEVEN Federal A.L.P. Councils oppose conscription, while TWO favour it; EIGHTY-SEVEN Branches oppose conscription, while TWO favour it (!); THIRTY-FOUR Unions oppose conscription, while TWO favour it (!). Finally, the "Barometer" shows—and here in lay the snag—that FIFTEEN Members of the N.S.W. EXECUTIVE oppose conscription, while TWENTY-THREE favour it!!! A "democratic movement," forsooth! The ordinary members of this Executive (union "representatives," etc.) are almost evenly divided on the conscription issue, but seven other individuals, of the "Big Labor Boss" and "Big Bureaucrat" type, practically held the balance of power. These seven advocates of conscription (for other people) include the President, Vice-President and General Secretary of the Executive, and the Assistant Secretary of the Labor Council, while five of them (including the aforesaid President and Vice-President) are members of Government BOARDS! (Shipping Board, Bank Board, Milk Board, Tea Board and Film Board). Rather significant, don't you think?

We have not the space to fully discuss the jerry-mandering that has gone on behind the backs and over the heads of the rank-and-file, in various sections of the A.L.P.; but the foregoing details should provide an adequate indication. We notice that hardly any information of that kind has been published in the dailies of the Monopoly Press—particularly the Murdoch Press.

## That Mortgage Bank Bill

### "An Insult to the Farmers' Intelligence"

**What does the intelligent and well-informed farmer think of the Mortgage Bank Bill? The letter published hereunder gives some indication of the answer to that question. It was written recently in reply to a letter from Mr. H. V. Johnson (M.H.R. for Kalgoorlie), who enclosed a copy of the Federal Treasurer's second-reading speech on the Bill:**

THE WHEAT AND WOOLGROWERS' UNION OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA (INC.), Walgoolan Branch, W.A.

Dear Sir,—I have given careful consideration to the Bill, and the only conclusion I can come to is that the Treasurer, no doubt in collaboration with the Commonwealth Bank Board, has gone to an immense amount of trouble in devising a scheme which could not possibly be accepted by the great majority of farmers, and which is an insult to their intelligence.

In the first paragraph it is stated that the Bill gives effect to a promise. That promise was made to Alex. Wilson, who desired a Bill which would be of real benefit to farmers. The present abortion is an indication to me that the Government was not in good faith when it made the promise.

In your letter you state that "it is not intended to finance the bank by an issue of bonds." You apparently have not read the speech very carefully. If you will look up sub-clause C, under "Additional Powers," page 4, you will note that "the Treasurer may raise loans and lend such moneys to the Mortgage Bank at the ef-

fective rate of interest payable by the Commonwealth on such loans."

I also note that "the Government hopes that it will be possible for the bank to make loans at about 4 per centum per annum plus suitable amortization payments where applicable." Has the Australian Labour Government, of which so much was expected, actually sold out to the money gangsters, or have its hands been tied by some underground work by foreign money magnates?

The Bill, as proposed, is a great disappointment to me and other farmers, and the only suggestion I can make is that Senator Darcey, Mr. Dwyer Gray, of Tasmania; and Mr. Alex. Wilson be asked to draft a new one.

You may not be aware of the fact, but a large number of the members of this Union have for a number of years been drawing closer to Labour. The insult to their intelligence implied in the Mortgage Bank Bill, together with the ineptitude of the present Federal Labour administration, in dealing with the money question, is driving them away again.—Yours, etc., D. J. O'LEARY, Chairman, Walgoolan Branch.

Just an accident, perhaps. Perhaps!

Incidentally, those Laborites and others (if any) who are inclined to trust a Labor Government (good, bad or indifferent) with undue powers of compulsion should remember that such powers may not always be wielded by a Labor Government!

A first-class political mystery, as yet not definitely solved, was provided by Mr. Curtin's action in sponsoring the new conscription proposal. We have before us as we write a printed copy of the lurid anti-conscription manifesto issued by the same John Curtin in 1916. We also have before us an extract from the "Argus" of December 13, 1916 (Page 10, Column 3) which shows that Mr. Curtin suffered imprisonment rather than abandon his principles. While not advocating such an extreme course, we admire his courageous stand of 1916. What, then, caused him to change his attitude? That is the mystery. His own electorate of Fremantle is reputed to be pro-conscription. It certainly was in 1916 and 1917, when the local electors voted two-to-one in favour of conscription. It is therefore conjectured in some quarters that the U.A.P. threatened to contest Fremantle next year on the conscription issue if Mr. Curtin did not push conscription now. Such a threat would be no idle one, as Mr. Curtin only retained his seat at the last election by the narrowest of margins. Of course, if Mr. Curtin has indisputable evidence that a majority of his electors still favour conscription, it is his duty as an individual

member of Parliament to vote for a conscription proposal in the House; but he has no right whatever to use his position as Prime Minister and his position as leader of the Labor Party to impose the will of the electors of Fremantle on the whole of Australia, without any other electors having a direct say in the matter. Furthermore, the Labor Party, of which he is leader, was clearly understood by the electors voting at the last election to be anti-conscription. There was no mandate for conscription from Labor voters generally. Quite the contrary.

Was Mr. Curtin's volte-face due to pressure from those seemingly strange bed-fellows, Sir Keith Murdoch and the Communists? Or from those arch-compulsionists, the almighty Bankers? Who knows? Your guess is as good as anybody's at the moment.

But there is one explanation that will NOT be accepted by intelligent and well-informed citizens. That is the suggestion that sufficient recruits cannot be obtained for the A.I.F. without compulsion. At least one responsible Cabinet Minister (Mr. Holloway) has stated recently that the military authorities are finding volunteers for the A.I.F. in the Militia faster than they can deal with them, and faster than they need them. And the Minister for the Army (Mr. Forde) has stated that there is to-day a greater number of men in the A.I.F. than ever before, and the number is steadily increasing. In short, it is apparent that all the fighting men that

(Continued on page 4.)

## NOTES ON THE NEWS

**As a further indication of the drift into the tyranny of socialism, the daily press of January 19 reports that the Melbourne University (house of culture and learning!) now threatens to turn students over to the man-power head-hunters—presumably as a spur to greater study efforts! Commenting on this, Mr. Mair contended that "reporting students to the man-power authorities was a sinister threat and a bludgeon that would react seriously on the boys." The individuals responsible for this decision are certainly mentally unsuited for educational activities.**

**POLICING PRICES:** Mr. A. R. G. Hawke, W.A.'s Minister for Labour, admits (vide Melbourne "Herald," January 16) the inefficiency of theoretical economists who manage price fixing, and urges every citizen to be a policeman for the department—a la Gestapo. This suggestion brings to mind the book, "Assignment in Utopia," wherein one reads that the G.P.U. offered cash rewards of 25% of all foreign money or valuables, other than the rouble, to citizens who informed on their relatives or friends. Presumably Mr. Hawke would have us emulate this exalted practice.

**COOMBS CASHES IN:** Yet another economist, in the person of H. C. Coombs, described by the press as a young man with ideas, is to be foisted on the weary public. Perhaps Copland has exhausted his bag of tricks. The new star turn receives £1400 per year as "post-war reconstructor," plus £600 per year as a director of the Commonwealth Bank—£2000 in all—and we are told he believes in a fair share for all, and no "profit motive." He was awarded his Doctor of Philosophy degree for a thesis on central banking—a fact which helps to explain the press boost accorded this gentleman, and warns discerning citizens to look out for squalls.

**MILK MUDDLE:** Following the increase of gastro-enteritis due to impure milk, which has increased since our socialistic planners took control, they are now busy attempting to lay the blame, firstly on the dairy farmer, and, as a second barrel, on the householder. A peculiar and dangerous characteristic of these bureaucrats is their determination to exercise power but refuse responsibility for results—to "pass the buck" in correct departmental style, which is precisely what the people must prevent.

**ECONOMISTS' ERRORS:** In describing Hitler's strategic blunders, Lord Halifax says that Hitler's military advisers demanded that the Russian front be made a short line, to save men, whilst his economic advisers insisted on a long line, to get oil; Hitler gambled on his economists—and lost. Fancy the allegedly shrewd Hitler trusting theoretical economists! It's a moot point whether Hitler is a greater menace to mankind than the economists encumbering this planet.

**NEUTRALITY:** Press reports inform us that U.S. State Departments are in full accord with Britain's announcement deploring Argentina's neutral relationship with "the enemy of humanity." It is not clear from the report whether Japan or

Germany is specifically referred to; but, in the daily press issue of January 2, it is pointed out that Japan is at peace with Russia, and is free to use the trans-Siberian railways to reach Axis territory through the Caucasus and Turkey. So, Germany must be the "enemy of humanity" referred to. It's certainly a queer business.

**COMMUNIST CHALLENGE:** We are informed that membership of the Australian Communist Party has increased to 20,000 since it has been restored to "respectability." If the report is even 10% true, it means that a considerable number of Australians prefer the "world revolution" idea to the British ideal of democratic self-government—which is difficult to believe. However, as this Party presumably will advocate conscription, higher taxation and more regimentation at the forthcoming election, it will be interesting to note public reaction.

**POLITICAL PLOT:** The "Sydney Morning Herald" of December 12 quoted Mr. C. G. Fallon, Federal President of the Australian Labour Party, as declaring: "We associate this war emergency with the achievement of nationalisation and socialisation." Continuing, the article states: "This is an admission of a conspiracy, and that what actuates the new bureaucracy, in its bullying regimentation of the people's lives, is not so much winning the war, as to effect socialism under cover of war." So much for Labor policy; but although the U.A.P. and C.P. howl against Labor socialism, each of them is equally guilty in undermining our democratic way of life. Hence, the people must play safe: quit all Parties and be independent.

**LOADS ON LIVING:** The stupidity of the financial system championed by bankers and Professor Copland was illustrated when he pointed out in the Melbourne "Sun" of January 22, that the price of imports had increased by 77%, whilst export prices had increased only 30%. Also by the tit-bit that the basic wage had only increased by about 20%. It looks as if we have been robbed by the money and exchange riggers. In the same report the windy wizard for once admitted that taxes in the form of excise, Customs duties and sales tax had affected the cost of living; but, of course, he failed to mention that taxes taken directly from workers help to pay bankers' interest AND accentuate the indirect burden by making the workers' net incomes even more inadequate to meet even the former cost of living!

(Continued on page 4.)

## UNDERMINING OUR MORALE

### Sir James Elder Again

A Letter to the Editor from BRUCE H. BROWN.  
(Continued from last issue)

Sir.—Quite unintentionally, Sir James has confirmed what we have been declaring—namely, that the financial policy being imposed on the people is being imposed at the dictation of the Bankers. Further confirmation is given in the Melbourne "Argus" of 21st January, which informs us that the "pay-as-you-go" taxation plan for squeezing more out of us, as recently outlined by "a Government spokesman" in Canberra, was actually prepared by Mr. Beardsley Ruml, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank, New York!

Note the name and the Bank! Then consider these things in conjunction with President Roosevelt's admission, as published last week, that taxes have to be increased because of the magnitude of the interest-bearing debt, the very thing we "cranks" are fighting against.

We can see why it is that every governmental action adds to the national burden. Not one measure has yet been introduced to lighten the burden, which is always imposed in terms of the Bankers' product—FINANCE. And this is done, mark you, notwithstanding the fact that counterfeiting is a crime, and that all the resources of Australia are supposed to belong to the people of Australia, and to be utilised for the benefit of the people of Australia. You know—"Government of the people by the people for the people!" The thing our sons are told they are fighting to PRESERVE! We could laugh heartily were it not for the tragic fraud of it all. And to make matters worse, in selecting men for controlling positions, the Government has been careful to choose only those who may be depended upon to do all they can to perpetuate the fraud. Yes-men. But more about that aspect on another occasion.

At present we are particularly concerned with the undermining activities of Sir James Elder. He said, "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 necessary to prevent it." The truth is that the dangers are not so obvious, and they are not obvious because of the manner in which the Bankers have camouflaged the subject and mesmerised the people. There is no need for Sir James to "search" for reasons why the public does not demand action. The reason is that the public have been deliberately misinformed on the subject or not informed at all, and the financial institutions which control the various channels of publicity are themselves responsible for this lack of understanding and apparent absence of public interest. Indeed, the Bankers have purposefully fostered the fiction that the subject is too intricate and difficult for ordinary mortals to understand.

However, simple explanations like that would never occur to such a man. Instead, he feels called upon to put forward a couple of his own. The first of these is 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." It is a fact that a nation's war effort does primarily depend on its physical resources, and it is also a fact that a nation's peace effort similarly depends primarily on its physical resources. But it is NOT a fact that a nation's effort should depend in any way upon finance. This is not to say that finance "does not matter," and I know of no one who holds such a belief. Finance does matter, but it should SERVE our national effort. In no circumstances should it be permitted to control, limit, or hamper such effort, as Sir James and other bankers are endeavouring to have it do. The fact is that the financial METHODS hitherto employed in this respect have been so disastrous that they must be discarded. More and more of the public are realising that these METHODS have been disastrous, and this, I think, is the aspect that brings fear to Sir James's heart. Not only are the people finding out that they have been swindled by the bankers, but there is increasing resentment against those in high places who have so seriously misled them or betrayed them.

His second explanation for the "failure" of the public to demand further enchainment for themselves and their children is "the widespread belief that our present physical controls alone—price-fixing, rationing, and the like—are infallible guards against rising prices and costs." Here again I know of no one who does believe that these measures can prevent rising costs and prices. They can't. Without subsidisation, prices simply can't be FIXED under present monetary conditions, because the method under which finance is produced and issued automatically increases costs. Rationing is not intended as a measure to control costs and prices. Its purpose is to ensure fair sharing of essential goods in short supply. So no person with any knowledge of the subject believes what Sir James says he believes.

All this, of course, is mere padding. The kernel of the nut is something altogether different. According to Sir James, "the root of the problem lies in restricting the capacity of the people to spend." You

are not a menace only when you have restricted spending capacity. Without money you are harmless, but with money you are a danger! And to think we have allowed them to get away with this rubbish for so long! That is precisely the sort of mumbo jumbo they put over us between the years 1929 and 1931. On that occasion we knew so little of how money is actually produced that we allowed them to restrict our capacity to spend, and they did it so effectively that unemployment rose to 30 per cent., bankruptcies more than doubled, the marriage rate declined, suicides increased, and distress spread in all directions. It was after the bankers had thus "restricted the capacity of the people to spend" that the Great Methodist Local Preacher, when he was Premier of New South Wales, made the following announcement: "We are prepared, as courageously as our bankers will allow, to get out into the field of development to assist in arresting the drift from the country to the city." (The Hon. Sir Berttram Sydney Barnsdale Stevens, K.C.M.G., 19/11/32.) You see it is what the bankers allow that matters, not what is made possible by a universally beneficent Creator. This time, because of the war, they have not yet been allowed to do it as much as they wish, but they have a great many "yes-men" doing their utmost to bring such conditions about.

The root of the problem does NOT lie in restricting the capacity of the people to spend. It lies in the Government borrowing privately-manufactured counterfeit money and forcing the community to pay interest on it. (Less than 20% of Government borrowings come from the savings of individuals.) As President Roosevelt has now admitted, INTEREST-BEARING DEBT is the curse, and so long as the Government continues to get its war finance as interest-bearing debt instead of non-interest-bearing CREDIT, so long will

it continue to be faced with all the "problems" and difficulties of which we have heard so much, and which are making life harder and harder for all sections of society. The Commonwealth Bank must be required to provide finance for war purposes without any interest charges, so that when the Federal Government spends on war activities it is not imposing any further costs on industry. Without additional costs there will be no justification for increased prices, and therefore no depreciation of the currency. To increase taxation or impose compulsory loans will not help the war effort; it will retard it; because it will increase costs, intensify the prevailing inflation, and weaken morale on the home front.

Sir James finished with a dramatic touch. "Circumstances demand," he said, "that the people of Australia choose either a further reduction in their capacity to spend or greater currency depreciation. The supreme need of the moment is for leaders of all ranks and sections to forcibly present this issue to the community, 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." As was to be expected, the yes-men are duly responding to these orders. Members of the Cabinet, Government "spokesmen," radio commentators, leader-writers, professional economists, the present-day counterparts of the "chief priests and elders," and even high-ranking military officials are already dancing as marionettes to the bankers' string pulling. The choice for the people is NOT between reduced spending capacity and greater currency depreciation. The choice is between continuing to finance the war with interest-bearing debt or requiring the Commonwealth Bank to provide non-interest-bearing credit. "Easy methods of finance" are surely more desirable than difficult methods of finance, and if the "leaders" are to do any warning, then they must warn against the difficult and disastrous methods of which we have already had too much evidence. Any person publicly advocating a reduction of the people's spending power is an enemy of society, and is working against the interests of the men of the Fighting Forces. The only interests which can possibly gain any benefit from such advocacy are the financial interests, and disturbance of the community at such a time, in such a way, and for such a purpose, is treason.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,  
189 Hotham St., East Melbourne. 24th January, 1943

## DEMOCRATIC RECONSTRUCTION

(To the Editor.)

Sir.—We have been repeatedly told that we are fighting this war to make the world safe for democracy, and now plans are being made for post-war reconstruction.

The people of the world, certainly, are not responsible for organising and conducting this war, and it would appear that the people will not be consulted regarding the plan of reconstruction. Where does democracy come in?

Democracy must be caused to function. The time is ripe for responsible people throughout Australia, and the many democratic countries of the world to, in the first place, exert their energies to the full in the mighty effort to win the war, and, in the second place, see far beyond the present turmoil and tribulation, with full understanding and preparation for democratic reconstruction when peace on earth prevails.

God-given faculties, and the powers of the will of the people need to be exercised with purpose and determination. Law, order and progress, based upon the essential fundamental principle of "Freedom in Security"—local, national and economic—operating under an advanced system of local self-determination and national co-ordination, await to be established.

The people living in many areas, having interests in common, of from 40,000 square miles and upwards, throughout the continent, should be given the democratic privilege which makes British communities outstanding—the privilege of self-determination.

The decentralisation of "Local Self Government" in many "New Federal Units" would give the people living within those Units the opportunity of applying their initiative and resource.

Guided by hard-won local experience, and animated with an intimate knowledge of their own problems, environments and possibilities, they could best advise upon and direct local settlement and development, industrial and commercial expansion and transport, and fashion and administer all social services within the Unit.

Democratic reconstruction can be speedily advanced and full results be more readily achieved by embracing the principles of "Economic Democracy."

Every Federal Unit, every immigrant, every asset added to the resources of the nation, further increases the nation's credit and its security. The activities of the Commonwealth Bank must be advanced to give full national service, making available the nation's credit to finance adequately the nation's requirements, without increasing the public debt or annual interest charges.—Yours faithfully,

WILLIAM AGER,  
Yamba, Clarence River, N.S.W.

## THE VALUE OF TRADITION

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

There has been more nonsense written about the conditions in Russia, particularly since Hitler turned on his former assistants, than about any other country. It is quite certain that we know very little about the general state of Soviet Russia after her first eighteen months of war. The Soviet authorities have discouraged independent tours of Russia by foreign correspondents, most of whom have had to stay in Moscow.

But I have been interested to notice that practically all these writers stress the fact that the Soviet leaders, in spite of all previous talk and action to the contrary, now realise that traditions play a valuable part in spurring a people on to greater efforts, and in preventing internal disintegration. Paul Holt, the "Daily Express" correspondent at Moscow, writes:

"The Russians measure their conduct by the fact that millions have died and millions are suffering for the great privilege of being Russians. The Government has gone deep back into Russian history to give the people this comfort. The most popular opera now running in Moscow is built round Catherine the Great's General Suborov. In the last scene, after singing a warning that Napoleon will raise the menace of Holy Russia, Suborov kneels and kisses a yellow, silken flag on which is embroidered the double-headed black eagle of the Czars. The most awesome figure I have yet seen on the Moscow stage is Catherine herself, who is given the reverence that British playwrights love to give Queen Victoria. The best scene in Soviet drama, opera or ballet is always the court scene. It seems to the foreigner that Moscow's real wish is to exhibit stage characters of Russian history who were great rulers and Russians." (My emphasis.) What do our local Reds, who deny all tradition, think about this? Fancy the Czars being mentioned as patriotic Russian leaders! I thought that the Russian people had been so downtrodden under the Czars that any attempt to make those "despots" figures of reverence would cause an uproar among the people. Apparently, under the stress of war, the doctrine of Communism has not proved a strong enough inspiration for the Russian people, and the traditions of the past have been revived. While a lot of tradition may seem very foolish to the "progressive" thinkers, it has proved a great cementing force in keeping nations together. People will always believe in something. Even the swarm of obscurantist writers, who have been engaged in destroying loyalties and traditions for years have their own beliefs. Most of them are sentimental "materialists," of the modern miracle-working priesthood, a priesthood which can prove anything with its stream of abstractions. Whether it is logical to our "progressives" or not, it is a fact that the institution of the British Monarchy keeps millions of British citizens of different races, colours and creeds, cemented together. Remove that central institution and, unless

we can replace it with some other great institution—quite impossible, at present—the people become torn between conflicting loyalties and factions. They become a rabble. It is very interesting to note that in all the abuse of tradition and loyalty there is no criticism of such institutions as the Bank of England, which is an alien institution. While loyalty to the institution of the British Monarchy remains strong, the attempt to disrupt the British Empire will prove very difficult. While the British Empire remains strong and retains its fundamental institutions and traditions the International Bankers will find it very difficult to introduce their proposed world-tyranny. The unconscious stooges of the bankers, the Socialists and the Communists, have worked for years in British countries to undermine loyalty to national sovereignty as symbolised by the Crown; they have reduced the will to resist aggression. They have caused confusion everywhere. "The Nineteenth Century," wrote some very apt words on this matter in a recent article: "In the realm of politics, with which we are now concerned, the decline in the fundamental loyalties is being fearfully avenged. . . . The heart alone can achieve nothing if it is not exalted by the spirit and guided by the mind. The people of England are as patriotic as any, but their patriotism, although it asserts itself in its original integrity at times of supreme and immediate peril, has lost much of its amplitude, the width of horizon, and the imaginative quality that goes to the making of national and imperial greatness. The disease—a disease of Western civilisation—that afflicted France and struck her down afflicts England, too. What has saved her so far is that the disease has not eaten into the heart as it ate into the heart of France."

Well, it's not because the planners, Socialists, Communists and other obstructionists have not tried hard enough to encourage the disease.

### "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., C.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.

## AUSTRALIA IS PULLING HER WEIGHT

Lowell Thomas, broadcasting from New York, said: "In proportion to their small population, Australians have done more towards winning this war than any of the other United Nations."

"Australia has given a greater percentage of men than anyone else for the battle of liberation," Thomas said.

"We will feel up to Australians only when we have given as much in proportion of our human material and our resources as Australia has."

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the United Democrats, 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide.)

COMMONWEALTH POWERS BILL.—Electoral Campaign tactics on a scale quite unprecedented in South Australia have been used in an effort to bring before electors the issues at stake in this Bill, and to show them how they can express their will to their parliamentary representatives. Thousands of request letters have been printed and circulated to every business house and most stores. For two days tables were manned in the main street of Adelaide and hundreds of citizens willingly signed up to protect their democratic rights. If you and "George" do your bit to keep up the flow of requests to Parliament the result should be a success for democracy—but don't leave it to "George."

Supplies of the request, "Democracy in Danger," are available at this office. Write in for some NOW.

FRIDAY LUNCHESES.—During the past seven years several ladies have loyally helped the Movement by serving lunches on Fridays. Two or three find it impossible to continue. If our Friday lunch meetings are not to stop it will be necessary for other lady helpers to come forward and carry on this good work. Can you, Madam, spare one Friday a month so that members and their friends may meet and enjoy a cup of tea at these rooms?

—M. E. DODD, President

### APPROACHING MARRIAGE.

The marriage of Olive, twin daughter of Mr. and Mrs. George Minter, Alma-street, Murrumbidgee, to John, younger son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Devlin, Valentine-grove, Malvern, will be celebrated at St. Joseph's Church, Stanhope-street, Malvern, at 6.30 p.m. on Saturday (Jan. 30). A reception will be held at "Grosvenor," Toorak-road, Toorak. The bridegroom is a son of Frank Devlin, a well-known advertiser in the "New Times."

## FREEDOM TO CHOOSE OR REFUSE

By F. C. PAICE.

(Continued from last issue.)

**"The Change of Heart" theorists are very little different from most reform movements, in as much as they are wanting to change the individual from what he is to what they would like him to be. This may be all right from the point of view of "education," but not from the aspect of getting the results HE wants. In so far as he is permitted, the average individual conducts his life by exercising his ability to choose or refuse.**

The majority of individuals did not get together and demand that the power of steam, electricity, water and sunshine must be harnessed and used for the people, they did not demand telephones, photography, wireless or thousands upon thousands of the things which to-day we take for granted. No, these things were all the results of individual initiative, and AFTER they were SHOWN or DEMONSTRATED to be of use or benefit to them the people accepted them. When someone invents a machine, hat, boots, engine, or anything at all, he does not expect it to be accepted merely because he claims it to be good. He knows that he must prove its worth before the people will accept it. To put the matter another way: The housewife knows that the local butcher has meat for sale, but when she visits him, she does not take what he thinks she should take. He may protest that it is all meat, but she exercises her ability to choose or refuse, and the butcher who fails to meet the wishes of his customers would soon be out of business. Similarly with any other goods or services for which the individual still retains that freedom of choice.

As an illustration of what some are trying to do, imagine an empty shop in any suburb. An enterprising person, with Democracy well in his mind, rents the shop, and prominently displays this notice in the empty window: "I am willing and anxious to faithfully serve you, but you must tell me what you want me to supply you with, for if you do not tell me, how can you expect me to know your wishes?" The result would be, if he were not labelled crazy at once, he would find that to satisfy the needs of even a few of his customers, as expressed in answer to his request, would be almost impossible—so diverse would they be. The most likely answer he would receive would be, "Show us what you have to offer for our acceptance, then we will, by exercising our ability to choose or refuse, determine whether you are offering us what we want."

Numerous examples readily come to mind to prove how individuals "get what they want, by the process of examining what is offered or demonstrated to them, and then determining whether, in the opinion of the individuals, it is good for them or not. It will be observed that the individual does not trouble to enquire what technical process was employed to produce the article or service offered. He judges by the result, and thus determines what shall be produced, without owning the means of production, and without being an expert in anything, except in knowing what he does or does not want.

Knowing the foregoing to be true, it is amazing that, when the field of politics or national economy is entered, the individual is divested of his individual characteristics, merely because there are many instead of one. He is grouped, numbered, labelled, regimented, deprived of all that makes him an individual, and then called "the masses." Having been moulded, pushed and dragged into an ant-like condition, he is then expected to be a technical expert on complex questions of legislation, laws, "New Orders," economics and "isms." No wonder there is confusion, no wonder that power-lusting fiends, with Hitlerite tendencies, find it easy to get "the masses" to work for them, when they think that they are working for themselves. To put any proposed legislation to a referendum under these condi-

tions, and call it a mandate from the people, is obviously wrong. The correct time, if it is desired to obtain the true opinion of the people, to hold a referendum is after all the technical experts and both Houses of Parliament have completed the measure in all its details, and these details have been made well known to the people to enable them to judge whether the measure will increase or reduce their ability to choose or refuse. The people of Australia conducted an unofficial but very effective referendum on these lines after they learned that the National Health and Pensions Insurance Act would reduce their ability to choose or refuse by reducing their immediate income. The people did not ask for the introduction of black slavery, of child slavery in the mines of England, of National Insurance in Australia, of the Commonwealth Bank Act Amending Act. They did not want them, and, even if they had, I very much doubt whether a sufficiently large majority could have been technically-minded enough to have demanded their introduction. But it was possible and practical to get a majority to recognise that they did not want them, and to demand that they be abolished. No law, whether it be good or bad, can operate for long without the willing co-operation of a majority of the people, and I am convinced that the people can get the results they want, by refusing to accept what they do not want.

It may be argued that this is a process of elimination, and is, therefore, too slow. Elimination, yes; slow, perhaps; but then a lasting change must necessarily be comparatively slow. On the other hand, has Party Politics, with all its so-called long-range plans for socialisation or what not, after many years of tireless effort, given the people what they want? The answer, of course, is "No." Have the numerous reform movements given the people what they, the people, want? Again the answer is "No." Then why complain if this way proves slow? However, I do not believe it will be slow. The fight will be intense admittedly, because it will be a fight to restore power where it rightly belongs, to the PEOPLE. I do not believe it will be slow, for the same reason that leads me to believe that if a business man is slow to gauge the needs of his customers when they repeatedly refuse the goods he offers them, he would not have to wait very long before he was recalled—i.e., put out of business.

The present Labor Government is following the same advisors as previous Governments, and will continue to do so until the people refuse to accept the legislation framed by those experts. I believe it is reasonable to expect that when the people had rejected a few unwanted measures, this (or any other) Government would hasten to seek the advice of other experts. It is at this point that the technicians of the various schools of thought and reform could submit their legislative plans and advice to the Government of the day, and if and when such legislation was submitted (in the manner outlined) to the people, they, the people, and not the particular "New Order" executives, would either accept or reject it. That is, in my view, true Democracy—i.e., "Government of the people, for the people, and BY the people."

What I have outlined has been called "Negative Action" by opponents of the idea, but I am convinced that it will bring Positive results.

this? No, that couldn't happen anywhere else.

"If I had the decision in these things in this country, I would repeal conscription; and I would five minutes later show the world as fine an army as any it can produce, made of volunteers. Not all the politicians, publicity experts and cretinous film producers in the world could think out a better propaganda campaign... than this."

Reed's book, "Nemesis?" was published early in 1940, but that statement shows how strikingly apposite it is to the situation that has developed in Australia to-day. —L. Montfort, in the "Century" (Sydney).

## ANTI-CONSCRIPTION MEETING

A special monster public meeting will be held, under the auspices of the No-Conscription Campaign Committee, in the Savoy Theatre, Russell-street, Melbourne, on Sunday (January 31), at 7.45 p.m., to hear Mr. Maurice Blackburn, M.H.R., on his return from the momentous session of the Commonwealth Parliament, at which Mr. Curtin's proposal is to be debated.

## BORROWED TO INVEST IN WAR LOAN

### Did a Bank Supply the Wherewithal?

The following communication, dated December 23, 1942, has been sent to the Prime Minister (Mr. Curtin) by the Hon. Secretary of the Returned Soldiers', Sailors' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia, Merredin (W.A.), sub-branch:

At the last meeting of the Merredin Sub-Branch I was directed to draw your attention to the questions contained on the memo attached hereto, and to ask if you would be so good as to have the matter seen into.

It is felt by members of this sub-branch that certain financial authorities are going behind the expressed policy of your Government, and as service men with the interests of the nation at heart, we are not prepared to stand by and see this done.

We regard it as an impertinence that the flagrant disobedience perpetrated in this case was actually advertised over the "National" network. It makes one wonder who does control broadcasting.—Yours faithfully, (Sgd.) R. H. Wilkes, Hon. Secretary.

[The memo referred to in the foregoing

letter, and enclosed with it, reads as follows:]

The National Station announced during the 8 p.m. and 10 p.m. news sessions on Tuesday, 8th December, 1942, that a Yugo-Slav community had mortgaged their Freehold Hall for £300, and had invested the money in the Austerity Loan.

Will the Prime Minister institute enquiries and ascertain the following:

(a) Who is the mortgagee? (b) What rate of interest is being charged by the mortgagee to the mortgagors? (c) Why didn't the mortgagee invest directly into the Austerity Loan? (d) If a higher rate of interest is being paid by the mortgagors than that being paid by the Treasury on the Loan, will the Government take steps to deal with this fifth-column practice?

## EXPOSURE OF LOCAL COMMUNISTS' TACTICS AND OBJECTIVES

### A Bombshell in Booklet Form

**Just when the local advocates of bloody revolution were beginning to think that their new-found veneer of enthusiasm for the war effort was hiding their ultimate purposes, their ingrained habit of throwing somersaults, and all that, along comes a new booklet which will tell Australians the very things—past, present and prospective—that the aforesaid veneer is intended to hide!**

"Red Glows the Dawn" is the name of the booklet, and its sub-title is "A History of the Australian Communist Party." The author is Michael Lamb.

The booklet covers the period extending from the days of the early Socialist Parties in this country to the time of its recent publication—i.e., just before the lifting of the ban on the Communist Party. In his first chapter, Mr. Lamb deals briefly with the tactics, the progress and setbacks of the Communists until June 15, 1940, when the Commonwealth Government declared the Party to be an illegal association. In this chapter we are told, among many other things, that "until the great economic depression commenced in 1929, the Party was not an imposing factor in Australian affairs, although its nuisance value was great." (It is to be hoped that the local Reds are duly grateful to the Bankers, who co-operated so effectively by imposing the depression on Australia. Of course, the resultant physical and mental suffering was bad for the Australian people, but the power of the Communists and the Bankers was increased.) The early efforts to penetrate and dominate the trade unions are described, particularly the use of "basher gangs" of selected hoodlums to intimidate trade union executives and others, where more peaceful methods failed. "These efforts," we are told, "reached their climax when a Labor meeting on Melbourne's Yarra Bank was broken up in 1932, and the then Leader of the State Labor Party, Mr. T. Tunnecliffe, M.L.A.; the president of the Trades Hall Council, Mr. F. Riley; and the secretary of the A.C.T.U., Mr. C. Crofts, and others were manhandled." Consequently, the author tells us, at the meeting of the Melbourne Trades Hall Council held on Thursday, May 5, 1932, the following resolution was agreed to: "That this Council resents and condemns on behalf of the Industrial Movement the premeditated vicious attack upon the Acting Premier, the President of this Council, and other Union Officials, on Sunday, May 1, and the OUTRAGEOUS VIOLATION OF THE RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH, and declares that such methods establish that the Communist Party and its subsidiary groups are obstacles to the progress of the working class, and as such must be treated as other opponents of the Labor Movement." (In the intervening decade there have been plenty of additional examples of the local Reds' fierce opposition to freedom of speech—except for themselves.) The booklet also records the stand taken by the Federal A.L.P., as far back as 1924. This first chapter concludes by enumerating the subsidiary organisations that served as smoke-screens for Communist propaganda until their progress was "seriously jeopardised in August, 1939, when the Russo-German Pact astonished the world, and the outbreak of the Second World War a few weeks later dealt a sudden and heavy blow to the Communist Party, which was apparently caught completely by surprise by Moscow's change of front.

In the second chapter, entitled "The Surrender to Fascism," the author expresses his earnest desire to see the Russians beat the Germans, and he pays a warm tribute to the gallantry of the Russians. He writes:

"I yield to no one in my desire to see the victory of Russian over German arms. It seems to me a matter of cold logic that, disregarding the manner of entry (which, for this purpose, is beside the point), Russia's defence forms an integral part of the Allies' structure for victory. If Russia smashes the Axis forces, our position, at least, will be much easier. Conversely, if

Russia is defeated, our position will be much worse although not, as some would have us believe, by any means entirely hopeless. Therefore, as a matter of common sense, we must give all the aid we can reasonably give to the Soviet Government in its hour of difficulty. I yield to no one, also, in my appreciation of the gallantry of the Russian resistance in Leningrad, before Moscow, in Sebastopol, before Stalingrad, and in many other sectors. I regard the defence of Sebastopol as being worthy of comparison with almost any other single episode in the war, excepting perhaps, the defence of the island of Malta."

"But," he continues, "all this does not prevent me from taking a realistic view of the situation. Firstly, the fact that we are allied with Russia does not mean that we should condone all the happenings, in the past, in that unhappy country. It does not mean that, because the Communist Party dominates the Soviet landscape, we should permit it to dominate ours. To spoil a favourite illusion of our Red friends, I would remind you that of a total population in Russia of between 170,000,000 and 180,000,000, only about 5,000,000 persons are actually members of the party. This is the latest figure provided by the Kremlin, which formerly claimed 3,000,000 party members. So, it is fair to state that ninety-seven out of every hundred Russian soldiers, sailors and airmen are not Communists, no matter how subject to the party they may be. The 5,000,000 party members certainly provide the Government, the leaders of industry and commerce, the Army Commissars, and other notables, but alliance with the Soviet does not mean that we agree with, and will promote here, its form of Government or its beliefs—any more than our Chinese Pact should make us support Chinese totalitarianism, or the Kuo-Min-Tang, or the teachings of Confucius. Our Red friends again would have us believe that the defence of Russia by the Russians, in such excellent fashion, is the result, and only the result, of the New Order produced by the ruling party. I have often heard a pro-Left radio commentator insert the following in his address: 'You have read, ladies and gentlemen, of the gallant struggle by the Red Army in the Ukraine. Why do the soldiers of the Red Army, mostly peasants from the Ukraine, and other parts, fight to the death for their homeland—fight as no other soldiers have ever fought before. Because, ladies and gentlemen, they have something to fight for. Because the Soviet collective farms have ensured to each of them, etc., etc....' But the plain fact is that the political complexion of Russia's Government has little to do with the Russian soldier's determination to fight and die, if need be, for his homeland. This has always been his reputation. One hundred and thirty years

(Continued on page 4.)

THE "NEW TIMES"  
IS OBTAINABLE  
AT  
ALL AUTHORISED  
NEWSAGENTS

## DOUGLAS REED'S VIEWS ON CONSCRIPTION

### Propaganda Value of Voluntary System

With Conscription—"To be or not to be"—again the issue, the following extract from "Nemesis?" by that widely-known and provocative author, Douglas Reed, is both timely and pertinent:—

"What greater dishonour was ever done to the spirit of a nation than the introduction of conscription in England—in Great Britain, if you prefer it. This is the one country in the world where you do not need conscription, where you could at a moment's notice have all the men in the land worth having as volunteers. Some months after the war began a call came for volunteers for mine sweepers, and within twenty-four hours, I believe, about 24,000 men volunteered.

"At that time a German I know said to me, shaking his head in bewilderment, That is the thing I can't understand. Germans are patriots, and will immediately rush to die in the cause of patriotism, if they are ordered to; but to volunteer like

## DICTATORSHIP OR TRUE DEMOCRACY?

In the history of every nation, there comes a time of supreme crisis, a testing time when people are forced to make the most fateful decisions affecting their destiny. Such a time will ensue for our nation during the next year or so.

Whichever way the cat jumps, the Party System of Government is doomed because it has failed to deliver the goods the people want: and a new form of government will arise to take its place. We Australians will decide now by our action or inaction whether our new system is true democracy or dictatorship.

If our race is too apathetic or rather insufficiently mature to accept the responsibilities of democracy, so much the worse for us. After all, it is only our whole future that is at stake and the future of posterity! Of course, posterity has done nothing for us, so maybe, we do not feel like doing anything for posterity, or even preserving ourselves; but if the Australian-British have not deteriorated to this extent, then there is yet time to avert the catastrophe.

In attempting to obtain supreme powers to enforce its post-war plans, the insolent waiving of people's sovereign rights to choose, the Canberra Government has given clear warning that its plans are not acceptable to us. "By their fruits ye shall know them," and from the evidence on every hand we can safely assume that such plans will include higher centralisation and bureaucratic planning boards, national and international, swarms of forms, shelving of responsibility, third-rate experts ordering first-rate experts how to do their job, destruction of private enterprise, frustration of individual effort; and in case we are not sufficiently conditioned to meekly submit to the grand plan of compulsion in peace-time—a Gestapo.

But if we do not want bureaucratic socialism, if we want a true democracy that will

give expression to our will—i.e., provide the results WE want, then we have to act immediately.

Electors in each Australian electoral division must regain control of their parliamentary representatives and through some simple mechanism make known to them their will upon broad matters of policy. (It might be noted in passing that "will" can be quite different to "opinion.")

Nothing has perverted the true function of Parliament more than Cabinet rule, yet most members detest taking orders from Party bosses, and, both from a sense of duty and for their own protection, are willing, and even anxious, to co-operate directly with their electors whenever this is made possible for them. Such a procedure is operating successfully in several Australian electorates, and only needs extending in order to produce political democracy in this country.

Either we act and obtain the results most of us want, somewhat upon the lines indicated, or remain passive and have rammed down our necks whatever the academic planners believe is good for us. Political responsibility or social disaster. That is the choice before us. Our future awaits our decision.

—JAMES KIDMAN.

## EXPOSURE OF LOCAL COMMUNISTS

(Continued from page 3)

ago, in the Czarist regime, a combination of undaunted heroism and an effective 'scorched earth' policy almost destroyed a mighty Napoleonic host, and began the ruin of the French Emperor. Does any one who lived through the last Great War need to be reminded of the squandered, but almost incredible, bravery of the ill-led, badly equipped Russian armies on the Eastern front, a bravery which twenty Tannenbergs could never efface. If it is an argument for Communism that the Russians have held out in this war for over a year, is it not an equally valid argument for the Czarist despotism that in the last war these same Russians, with the worst possible equipment, held out for more than three years. Although Australian Reds would have you believe differently, the Soviet Government is itself aware that Communism is not the correct appeal in Russia to-day. I have read several of Joseph Stalin's pronouncements, and I have not seen one which asked the men of the Soviet Army to fight only for the Soviets. I have certainly read several which were indistinguishable from those of Mr. Winston Churchill, as an appeal to members of the armed forces to fight for hearts and homes, for the land which bore them. . . . If you add, therefore, to the great personal bravery of the Russian soldier and the patriotism of the Russian citizen (a patriotism largely provoked by the ancient hatred of the national enemies of Russia) these items: (a) The fact that the Russian Army is one of the largest the world has seen; (b) the enormous area of Russia; (c) the concentration of effort upon Russia's war industries, under the several five-year plans; you will discover reasons, other than Communism as such, for the Russian resistance.

Quite so; but there is, nevertheless, a serious omission from that last sentence: the author should have mentioned a fourth major item—not the least, either—namely, the enormous volume of planes, tanks, munitions, etc., sent to Russia by Britain, at great hazard to many British lives and ships (a very small, but all-too-precious, percentage of which were lost).

The author then turns to the main theme of his second chapter, and introduces it with these words: "It is useful to contemplate the declarations of Australian Reds on the present war, from its outbreak in September, 1939, to June 22, 1941. Declarations made, mark you, during the period when Poland, Holland, Belgium, France, Greece and other nations were being ravished, and British non-combatant men, women and children were being slaughtered in the most ferocious civilian war-time attacks on record. It is useful for at least two reasons. Firstly, because they demonstrate just how much respect the Reds had for the Liberty and Democracy we were fighting for, and how helpful they were generally to the cause. Secondly, because they assist us to properly assess the worth of current Red protestations." Plenty of examples are given in the booklet. We quote the following choice tit-bits:—

An article on page four of the Communist paper, the "Guardian," edition of January 17, 1941, concluded with this paragraph: "Elsewhere in this issue of the 'Guardian' we publish facts about our troops in Egypt, amongst whom the Australian Communist Party is active, and with good results. They, too, are infected with the anti-war spirit. They are bitterly hostile to their reactionary officers at the head of whom stands Blamey (Here follows a most libellous statement). . . . The Australian soldiers overseas are now realising that this is no war for democracy they are engaged in, but an imperialist war, and that their enemies are not the Italian or German

the capitalists of Australia, Germany, Italy and Britain."

The "Guardian" printed on May 1, 1941, referred to the war as a "filthy imperialist slaughter" on page 2 and commenced its leading article with these words: "Twelve months ago the Communist International, in its May Day message, appealed to the workers of all lands to fight against imperialist war, which, it said, would increase their exploitation and bring only horror and suffering."

The "Pilot," also heralded as a Communist publication, of June, 1941, contained this invitation: "Australians, demand the return of our soldiers. Demand that not another man leaves these shores to fight in this boss's war."

A trade union with a reputation for Red sympathies submitted an anti-war resolution to the All-Australian Trade Union Congress held in Melbourne on June 2, 1941. The resolution (quoted in full in the booklet) contained these words: "Victory for ANY of the capitalist Powers would mean the more complete subjection of the masses to imperialist exploitation. . . . In its own interest, the working class must refuse support for the war and take its own measures to bring it to an end." The body submitting that resolution was the Victorian branch of a union catering for hospital employees. By a remarkable "coincidence," the Queensland branch of a union catering for painters and decorators, and likewise enjoying a reputation for Red sympathies, submitted another resolution that was, with the exception of a few words, exactly the same! Telepathy, no doubt!

Two of the principal members of the Communist Party, prior to its proscription, were Mr. Ralph Gibson and Dr. G. P. O'Day. There was no equivocation about their speeches. Mr. Gibson, as the Communist candidate for the Collingwood (Victoria) State election, on March 16, 1940, had this to say: "The other parties all support the war. The Communist Party opposes it." Dr. O'Day was nominated as the Communist candidate in the Corio

## Conscription is Unwanted and Unnecessary

(Continued from page 1.)

can safely be sent outside Australian territory in the future can be drawn into the A.I.F. by voluntary methods. Thus, except for the proportion always necessary to garrison Australian soil, all the soldiers can be assembled into the ONE ARMY about which Sir Keith Murdoch prattles interminably (while keeping well away from ANY army).

But were that not so, the Government would have the ever-present but too often ignored alternative to compulsion. It is called INDUCEMENT. We are not suggesting an army of mercenaries, but merely that the Government should reinforce the natural patriotism of potential A.I.F. recruits with the guarantee of a better deal in financial matters, particularly pensions, now and after the war (but starting right now). It is not the purpose of this article to labour the point in regard to present inadequacies; it should be sufficient to say this: The Melbourne "Herald" of December 19 quotes a number of glaring cases under the bold heading, "No Pensions For Men Medically Discharged," and refers to soldiers being "discharged medically unfit with pensions of 4/2 a week," and the Sydney "Sun" of January 8, under the big heading, "Pension Fight Grows Hotter,"

Federal by-election, and he was equally candid in a speech delivered on February 12, 1940. "My opponents stand for war, for the interest and profits of the big financiers, for the death of thousands of Australians. The Communist Party stands for peace."

The foregoing revelation (and others) are followed by the author's appropriate comment, with which the second chapter is concluded: "All of these statements and resolutions make it quite clear that the Reds were very definite in their attitude to the war during the period I have mentioned. . . . Not theirs to worry over the fact that the British Commonwealth of Nations was engaged in the greatest struggle of its existence, that tens of thousands of its bravest and best were pouring out their life-blood in defence of all that civilisation holds dear. . . . Not theirs to worry over the fact that we were fighting the very evils against which their fulminations were always directed—Nazism and Fascism. . . . Not theirs to worry over the fact that defeat meant the end of trade unionism, the end of collective bargaining, and the end of democracy, as we know it. Not only were the Reds responsible for hostile and insulting declarations, but they sabotaged the war effort by every means within their power. Strikes, go-slow tactics on defence jobs—anything else which could be calculated to hinder and not to help—these were the Red contributions to victory. . . . What a pleasant contemplation for the parents and wives, and brothers and sisters of our Australian lads who died over the English Channel, or in the deserts of Libya, or the hills of Syria! And yet these are the very people who to-day pose as patriots of the highest quality!"

Our space is exhausted, so we must defer our review of the other, and probably most important, five chapters of the booklet until next week. Of course, you can buy a copy for yourself, and read the whole booklet. The price is sixpence (1/2d. extra if posted). It may be obtained, we understand, from booksellers throughout Australia (wholesale agents: Gordon and Gotch). For the convenience of supporters, the United Electors of Australia (343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne) have obtained supplies of the booklet.

—H.F.A.

cites the case of a "Tobruk rat" (and Military Medal winner), and reports in double-column black type that "in an intensive fight to rectify Repatriation Act injustices to Diggers, N.S.W. sub-branches of the R.S.L. will be asked to attend a big public meeting at the Sydney Town Hall." The "Sun," in the course of its article, refers to "the appalling position of war widows," and states: "At present a woman with two children receives £3/17/- a week on allotment, but on the death of her husband the amount is reduced to £2/19/6." When such reports appear in the daily press, it is obvious that the policy of inducement is NOT being followed. The fact that so many A.I.F. volunteers are forthcoming, in spite of such things, is a tribute to their loyalty to their country. But many men also have a right and proper loyalty to a wife and children to think about. Conditions under which the two loyalties may pull in different directions can and must be rectified, instead of the Government threatening to "wield the big stick."

Finally, we repeat our headings to this article: "Conscription Is Unwanted And Unnecessary" and "Democratic Electors Must Act Quickly." A further reminder of the manner in which electors should act is provided by reporting that the following letter-form is being distributed by the Melbourne Anti-Conscription Campaign Committee (Box 39, Trades Hall, Melbourne), for electors to sign and forward to their respective M.P.s:

"Dear Sir,—I am against extending military or industrial compulsion as Mr. Cur-tin has proposed. I believe it to be a betrayal of Australia's interests and a threat to freedom of conscience and personal liberty. I look to you as my member to prevent our young men being conscripted.—Yours faithfully, ....."

—H.F.A.

## NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

**AUSTERITY:** Press reports state that "U.S. austerity does not apply to man-power, because two million wardens are carrying out a house-to-house campaign explaining the necessity to economise on meat." This does not mean that U.S. citizens cannot read or think, so it might indicate that high-pressure writers and radio propagandists can't be trusted on this big stunt. The same report denies the war-prosperity idea by saying that "hundreds of schools and colleges are passing out of existence because parents are unable to pay for expensive education, as they are short of money." It looks like austerity for posterity.

**WORK WORRIES:** University students sent to Shepparton for fruit picking are unable to find work, and have not received any pay, yet the man-power bunglers are sending another 100 students to this area. Well, at least they'll have an opportunity to study bureaucracy. The report also stated that "work or no work, the students will be paid, so all will be well." This matter, like so many other incidents in the news, centres around the money question. Too much of our "war effort" consists of dealing with effects arising from money-shortage.

**TICKET TROUBLES:** In Melbourne the "Clean Your City" Campaign Committee considers that tram tickets littered about is the big problem. Many suggestions have been made to correct this, but no one seems to have thought of letting the people ride without tickets, from anywhere to anywhere, for a payment of (say) 3d.—as is done in certain parts of U.S. After all, what's the use of tickets? They don't make the tram go any faster or better, and, in any case, trams are for transport, not to make jobs for ticket-collectors. Or are they?

—O.B.H.

## CANADIAN TEN POINT POST-WAR PLAN

Pledging themselves to a post-war reconstruction policy which they declare conforms to the will of the Canadian people, New Democracy M.P.'s and Social Credit provincial members in caucus at the Legislative Buildings at Edmonton recently endorsed a 10-point resolution embodying a comprehensive programme of social and economic reform, including the establishment of social dividends, reform of the financial system, a scientific price structure, home-building and the abolition of taxation except as a method of withdrawing surplus purchasing power.

Preamble to the resolution declared that the fighting men of Canada are looking to the Canadian people at home to make immediate preparations for a post-war reconstruction programme worthy of the ideals for which men of the services now offer their lives.

Points enumerated in the resolution deal with:

1. Preservation of the sovereign integrity of Canada within the British Commonwealth.

2. War-time mobilisation of all natural resources by the most efficient means, stripped of unnecessary bureaucracy and infringements of democratic rights.

3. Establishment of a reconstructed democracy through a reformed monetary system with freedom from bureaucracy and State regimentation, so that Canadians will obtain the living conditions they want from Government through the management of public affairs. This to be the basis of the post-war order.

4. Adequate post-war economic security for fighting men and their dependants and preferential treatment and assistance in re-establishment in Canada's post-war economic life.

5. Comprehensive and adequate social dividends free from odious features such as compulsory and contributory State insurance schemes, so as to protect every citizen from destitution through unemployment, sickness, disability or old age.

6. A broad reform of the nation's economy to provide adequate wage scales sufficient to maintain a living standard in keeping with natural resources, combined with a system of family allowances; a reconstructed price structure in which primary and other producers, manufacturers and merchants will be assured of reasonable returns and just prices; recognition of agriculture as the basic industry, with provision for sound prices, orderly marketing and land tenure protection; unrestricted orderly development of the country's resources; elimination of private monopoly control.

7. Reform of the financial system to provide control by Parliament by full and effective measure of the monetary system, including the issue of all currency and credit; adequate monetary facilities to finance the work of reconstruction; issuance of all money, in peace or war, to finance Government projects,

## GENERAL SMUTS ON CONSCRIPTION

"Most South Africans would agree to war service outside the continent. When Africa is cleared up, I am certain that our boys of the first and second divisions, indeed, the whole Army, will want to go onwards," he said.

But, he continued, "I will not deviate from the voluntary principle, none will be compelled to go outside Africa, or even the Union of South Africa. It is the men's OWN choice, and after what I have seen in North Africa I have no doubt that 80 or 90 per cent will agree to go." (Our emphasis.)

to be issued by the Government without debt to the people; abolition of taxation except as a mechanism to withdraw surplus purchasing power.

8. Equitable adjustment of the debt structure without loss to individuals and the abolition of usury as usury is incompatible with Christian principals.

9. Comprehensive national home-building programme and the extension of public utility services to rural areas.

10. Highest possible standard of health and educational services to all, by means of adequate grants to local authorities.