

ON OTHER PAGES:
"MORAL" OBJECTIONS TO THE LEISURE STATE. (Page 2)
THE "HIDDEN HAND" AGAIN? (Page 3)
MOVE TO OUST J. T. LANG FROM A.L.P. (Page 3)
"NEW ENGLISH WEEKLY" AND SOCIAL CREDIT. (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY **THE NEW TIMES** PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 9. No. 6 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEB. 12, 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).

Ill-informed Criticism Of The Militia Limit

Open Letter to a U.S. Senator

TO SENATOR WILLARD TYDINGS, WASHINGTON, U.S.A.

Dear Senator,—Here in Melbourne the "Argus" daily newspaper of February 2 reported (under the heading, "U.S. Senator Criticises Our Militia Policy") that you, broadcasting on January 31, "referred to the debate in Australia on the use of Australian troops overseas." You are credited with saying this:—

"Considering that our army, navy, and marines have been fighting the Japanese in neighbouring territory and defending the Australian continent from invasion, it is of the highest importance, and in the interest of the best total war effort, that the **existing laws against sending Australians overseas** be reconsidered in the light of present-day occurrences." (Our emphasis.)

Now, dear Senator, the "Argus" is a very venerable newspaper, and every day of the week (except Sunday, when it retires into its righteousness) it prints the following words at the top of its editorial column: "I am in the place where I am demanded of conscience to speak the truth, and therefore the truth I speak, impugn it who-so list." So we can hardly suppose, without evidence, that its report of your remarks is incorrect, can we?

Of course, we are NOT suggesting by implication that the report "impugns" YOU in any way. But may we suggest, in all possible friendliness, that it "impugns" your source of information? We quite realise, for instance, that many daily newspapers—even some in your country, perhaps—fail to soar to the lonely Temple of Veracity inhabited by the Melbourne "Argus." We feel sure that some such circumstance is responsible for two remarkable inaccuracies in your assertion as quoted above. Perhaps it would be a good thing if you tried reading a different newspaper.

Both the inaccuracies, to which we most respectfully drew your attention, take the form of INCOMPLETE statements. Because we presume that the second omis-

sion mainly accounts for the first one, we will explain it first.

You spoke of "existing laws against sending Australians overseas." Well, dear Senator, when you spoke on the radio there were NO SUCH LAWS. What is more, they NEVER existed, and they have NOT been enacted since. But, had you added two little words—if only you had spoken of "existing laws against sending Australians overseas AS CONSCRIPTS"—you would have been correct. You will, of course, appreciate what a world of difference those two words make.

We hope that, some day, you will visit this country and call in at the "New Times" office for a long friendly chat. We would be delighted to enlighten you properly about Australia and Australians. In the meantime, let us assure you of three things. Firstly, the overwhelming majority of Australian men are NOT conscientious objectors and the like. That statement is not a slur on conscientious objectors, of course; it is simply a statement of FACT. (We respect the opinions and the courage of conscientious objectors. Apparently U.S. military authorities, on active service overseas, have a similar respect—judging by a news-item appearing on

the same page and in the same issue of the "Argus" as your little outburst. It reads as follows: "New York.—A conscientious objector in the Medical Corps, who refuses to carry a weapon that will kill Japanese, has been recommended for a decoration for gallantry. He rescued wounded comrades in the face of machine-gun fire on Guadalcanal Island.") Secondly, let us assure you that the overwhelming majority of Australian men are NOT "shirkers," in any sense of the word. Thirdly, Australians are loyal to their country and the British Commonwealth of Nations. So, you will not be surprised when we add that Australians, as well as Americans, "have been fighting the Japanese in neighbouring territory and defending the Australian continent from invasion." As to the question of Australian troops serving outside Australia and her neighbouring mandated territory, there has never been any real difficulty about getting all the VOLUNTEERS who could safely be spared from Australia's own defence. We have had such a force of volunteers for service overseas, if required, since September, 1939; but a description of their military prowess, in various overseas theatres of war, ever since that date (mark it well!), is far beyond the scope of this letter, and would require the services of a modern Homer. We call that force of volunteers the A.I.F. (It is very strange that you haven't heard of it.) One of our Cabinet Ministers (Mr. Holloway) stated recently that our military

authorities are finding volunteers for the A.I.F. in our Militia (home defence force) faster than they can deal with them, and faster than they need them. Our Minister for the Army (Mr. Forde) stated recently that there is to-day a greater number of men in the A.I.F. than ever before, and that the number is steadily increasing. At present, the only thing we can see that could, conceivably restrict the required flow of trained volunteers is our Federal Government's strange failure to follow the excellent example of U.S.A. in regard to adequate soldiers' pay, etc. (You, Senator Tydings, might be able to help us about that. Could you see President Roosevelt and persuade him to give a hint to our Prime Minister? Mr. Curtin seems to take a lot of notice of Mr. Roosevelt, but he is too busy, or something, to take much notice of common-or-garden Australian citizens.) You see, our chaps, like yours, are not mere mercenaries—far from it—but, besides loyalty to their country, many of them 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, you will agree, instead of threatening these men with the "big stick." In short, conscription of Australians for overseas service, even from a purely military point of view, is NOT NECESSARY. You should also bear in mind that the majority of Australian electors are traditionally opposed to it. Two referendums (Continued on page 4.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Admitting that the "pay-as-you-go" tax plan emanated from Banker Ruml, of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, the Melbourne "Herald's" finance writer says that because of that fact the idea should be sound; but he fails to say for WHOM it is sound. It should be obvious that if the plan is beneficial for the PEOPLE, it would NOT be in the interest of BANKERS, and if it did not further the bankers' plot to dispossess and impoverish the people, it certainly would not be sponsored by the money manipulators. Nor would it be featured by the daily press.

MIXED MINDS: Three thousand employees of a Sydney munition plant went on strike to compel one man to join the ironworkers' union. The dispute was referred to Mr. Justice Canton, who ruled that "the man should be allowed to make up his own mind—without pressure." In other words, he affirmed the voluntary principle. Strangely enough, when some of these justices adjudicate on conscientious objectors, they uphold the principle of compulsion, and, indeed, impugn their motives and courage. Such justices would be confounded if they read the report in the daily press of February 2 that a conscientious objector in the U.S. Medical Corps has been recommended for a gallantry decoration for rescuing wounded comrades in the face of machine-gun fire. Let's hope they did read the report and will observe the folly of their mental gymnastics.

RIGGED REPORTS: Commenting on what he described as inspired alarms in connection with reports of Japanese troop movements, Mr. McEwen, M.H.R., said that "it was noticeable that every newspaper of repute in Australia carried a story to the same effect; which could only mean that these stories were inspired from a common source." Continuing, he said he strongly opposes the Government issuing important statements anonymously. Strangely enough, he did not criticise so-called reputable newspapers for publishing anonymous reports. The public is entitled to protection from false reports, and whoever is responsible for them should be severely dealt with.

WORK WORRIES: An interesting report on the remarkable development of

the flax industry in Australia, in the "Argus" of Jan. 25, makes particular reference to the extensive labour-saving machinery used. Every machine in operation has been designed and manufactured in Australia by Australians and would eliminate roughly three-quarters of the men who would otherwise be employed; which, according to the article, should enable Australia to withstand the shock of expected slumps after the war. The chairman of the Flax Production Committee said that they had set out to eliminate the tremendous amount of manual labour previously used. In other words, they deliberately set out to eliminate work (which the Government and their theoretical economists are so eagerly searching for). Destroying work, so to speak—why, it's almost subversive!

DEBIT AND CREDIT: A returned soldier, evidently of a spirited nature proved in battle, but sick of red-tape and petty military discipline, went A.W.L. when his appeal for leave was refused, so as to help his mates to harvest 2400 acres of crop. At the hearing of his case, the prosecuting officer produced all the petty offences shown in the soldier's record book. When asked if he had anything to say, the soldier asked, "Does the record show that I sat on a hill and starved for three days; does it show that I carried my wounded mates down from the mountain; does it show that I was never arrested in civil life?" The court has yet to give a decision, and it is to be hoped that the credit side, so ably put by the soldier, will penetrate the hard crust of the judge's cranium.

U.S. UNIONS: A hopeful sign is seen in the report that U.S. trade unions are (Continued on page 4.)

A Vital Victory For Democracy

How a Few Actionists Started Something That Modified Current History

In describing the defeat of the Bill to alter the Constitution it is scarcely an exaggeration to quote the words of Mr. Churchill after the Battle of Britain: "Never did so many owe so much to so few." In its menace to freedom, the crisis which threatened Australians in October, when that Bill was presented to the Commonwealth Parliament, was similar to that when Nazidom sought to crush freedom by the defeat of England.

The pressure upon politicians which caused the withdrawal of the draft Bill and the substitution of a quite different and modified one for presentation to the recent Convention in Canberra (on November 24) has given to those persons who talk so much about Democracy a breathing space in which to become democrats to arm themselves with the weapon of the "Electoral Campaign" and fight until a complete victory for the sovereignty of the people is won against the "dark forces" which now impose their will upon all Governments.

Who were the few? How many Australians know that they owe the defeat of the Constitution Alteration Bill to the personal initiative of a league of indefatigable letter-writers scattered throughout the length and breadth of Australia—comparatively few in number, but powerful in initiative and integrity?

It is the duty of all social crediters to point out the significance of the successful action initiated by that small group, acting on individual lines, yet achieving a common objective because unified in policy. This group of persons, seized with the significance of what lay behind Dr. Evatt's Bill, got busy and expressed themselves spontaneously in no uncertain terms to all members of State and Federal Parliaments. Other democrats "followed suit."

Let us enumerate what was achieved by their victory—apart from the fact that electors succeeded in imposing their will upon the Government, which (in the words of Douglas Reed) is "the test of democracy":—

(1)—It challenged and brought out into the open and temporarily defeated a desperate attempt to impose centralised totalitarian power.

(2)—It compelled Dr. Evatt to draft an entirely new Bill.

(3)—Clause 3 of the original Bill, which

conferred complete over-riding power on the Federal Government, has been eliminated.

(4)—The Constitutions of the States (enshrining the priceless freedom guaranteed by British Common Law practice to ensure individual liberty) are still intact.

(5)—The "Four Freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter have also been dropped. One of these alone—the "freedom from fear"—would have committed Australia (by her Constitution) to what Aldous Huxley calls "that instrument of mass-murder, an international army—mis-called a police force."

(6)—The High Court of Australia—the guardian of the Constitution—was to have been scrapped. It is still in existence.

(7)—To date State rights are retained.

(8)—Extended powers to the Federal Government can now be obtained only for a clearly defined purpose and for a limited, and therefore probationary, period.

A comparative study of the letters which members of Parliament received, and the speeches they made, would reveal many more concessions to electoral pressure. The phrases of members' speeches, as reported in the Press, indicate how fully these letters had been digested. The fighting speeches of Dr. Evatt's opponents in

State and Federal Parliaments are due to members being stiffened up by the letters from representative citizens.

The "dark forces" will need bold politicians in the future to again sponsor the abolition of State Parliaments in order to centralise power.

In spite of the scope of this initial victory let us not sit back, for much remains to be done. At the moment of writing there is a proposal before the adjourned Canberra Convention to the effect that the States should voluntarily agree to cede powers to the Federal Government for a specified period.

This is exceedingly dangerous, as it would create a precedent by which the State Governments could flout the people and the Constitution and gradually suc-

cumb to Canberra. The State Governments have no mandate for this, and we democrats must tell them so (by each one of us writing to his—or her—representative in State Parliament).

Free co-operation among the States and the Federal Government seems to offer the only satisfactory road for progress in the post-war period, when the present unlimited powers of the Federal Government under the National Security Act have been abolished.

The above facts should provide sufficient argument to silence those inexperienced people who have cast doubts upon the efficiency of the "Electoral Campaign." For actionists, the knowledge of the results gained should be an inspiration for further effort.

—G. A. Marsden.

THOSE "MORAL" OBJECTIONS TO THE LEISURE STATE

BY EIMAR O'DUFFY

Those who object to the Leisure State on religious grounds usually base their case on two extracts from Scripture; the first being the Divine command: "In the sweat of thy face shall thou eat bread" (Gen. iv., 19), and the second, St Paul's advice: "If any man will not work, neither let him eat" (2 Thess. ii., 10).

In regard to the former, my commentary would be, in the first place, that if it is literally a command, it is a command to the human race as a whole, not to each and every individual of the race; otherwise there would be some definite stigma cast in some other part of the Scriptures on persons who do not earn their living by the sweat of their brows. But we do not find any such. Jesus himself, though He declared it difficult for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, did NOT denounce the rich for not working. On the contrary, when the young man with "great possessions" asked His advice, we are told that "He loved him," which He would NOT have done if He had regarded his leisured life as sinful. And He did NOT tell him to go and work, but counselled him, "if he would be perfect," to sell all he had, and "come, follow Me." In the second place, I submit that the text is not a command at all. It is a statement of the inexorable fact that, having forfeited the completely leisured abundance of Eden, mankind would now have to toil for its bread. And so it must. Even in the Leisure State the race as a whole will have to do SOME work, both with brain and muscle, to maintain itself.

As to the quotation from St. Paul, it is a case of taking a phrase out of its context, where it has a particular application, and so transforming it into a general precept; just as some people interpret Christ's obiter dictum that "the poor ye have always with you" as an injunction against all attempts to abolish poverty. Indeed it is surprising how pat the quotation comes from people not usually addicted to scriptural citation or markedly given to piety. Reader, if any solemn humbug plays that trick on you, tell him, in the first place, that St. Paul did NOT say: "If there is not work for a man, let him starve." Ask him, in the second place, does he know the context of the passage, and you will generally find that he doesn't. Here it is (2 Thess. ii. 10, 11): "For also when we were with you, this we declared to you, that, if any man will not work, neither let him eat. For we have heard there are some amongst you who walk disorderly, working not at all, but curiously meddling." From this we see that St. Paul was referring to a particular and contemporary case; he was suggesting that certain gay sparks among the Thessalonians ought to do something useful in return for their keep. He certainly was NOT thinking of men whose work has been rendered unnecessary by machinery.

If it must come to Scripture texts, what about this, from a higher authority than Paul? "Give to him that would ask of thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not away."

And what about the lilies of the field? In all the four Gospels you will not find a word in favour of the commercial virtues, or a single exhortation to let your fellow-man starve. Indeed, are we not told to love our neighbours AS OURSELVES—without any qualification as to his industry, integrity, or business efficiency? "You cannot serve God and Mammon," said Jesus. To whose service is the present economic system manifestly directed?

But the religious objection is not entirely dependent on scriptural citation. There is also the deeply-seated "instinctive" distrust of leisure, partly as a thing deemed to be evil in itself, but principally as giving opportunities for evil. Why is it that the feeling does not express itself more commonly in hostility to the present system, which, on the one hand, gives most of its richest rewards to idlers, to spend in extravagant luxury, and, on the other, compels millions of willing workers to stand idle (except in war-time) and starve! Why, in fact, is it that this system, with these crimes on its head, finds its firmest supporters among people honestly convinced of the criminality of idleness? The reason is fairly simple. Our moral ideas developed during the long era of scarcity, when a man's livelihood depended to a great extent on his personal exertions. His capacity for exertion was in turn largely dependent on his character—on his diligence, patience, temperance, and so forth—so that, speaking broadly, his prosperity was a measure of his virtue. Conversely, as indolence, intemperance, etc., tended to injure a man's capacity for work, poverty came to be regarded as a sign of vice. Since "Capitalism" was a development of this primitive economy, it was only natural that for a time the moral

standards of the previous period should persist, and that the piling up of wealth on the one hand and poverty on the other should be regarded as the cumulative effect of industry and idleness respectively, and be "justified" accordingly. But the day for such simplifications is past. Everybody with an eye in his head knows that no amount of industry nowadays will guarantee a man a livelihood (except in war-time), let alone wealth and comfort. These things are decided by forces and conditions as much out of individual's control as the movements of the heavenly bodies, and we must recast our moral ideas accordingly.

Industry and thrift, after all, are not absolute virtues like justice, honesty, and

love of our neighbour. They are "conditional" virtues—conditional, that is, upon a system of economics that has been superseded. Just as we have ceased to need the gigantic muscles and animal craftiness of our primitive hunting ancestors, and have been able to cultivate grace and refinement instead, so we can now dispense with these lower materialist virtues, and develop the higher spiritual ones that are now being starved and stunted.

But even where leisure is not regarded as an evil in itself, it is distrusted as giving opportunities for evil, and those who hold this view point to the follies of some of the rich and the demoralisation of the unemployed. To these it is really sufficient reply to say that the "virtue" which is secured by the removal of temptation is not virtue at all. The freedom which Europeans allow to their women gives occasion for a good deal of sexual misconduct, but nobody suggests that we should institute a system of purdah, or that the moral fibre of the race would be strengthened if we did. No doubt, some people will abuse their newfound leisure (for a short time, at any rate), just as a few abuse it to-day, and

just as a few abuse every other good thing; but that is no argument for keeping the whole race lashed on to unnecessary toil. Moreover, the examples quoted are unfair. The follies of some of the rich are due to their having more money than is good for fools, and the demoralisation of the unemployed is NOT due to unemployment, but to poverty. Under the Leisure State there would probably still be the rich, but there would be no poor, and one presumes that the vast majority of the leisured would live in a state of modest competence.

"What will they do with their leisure?" I had better leave the answer to that question till I have dealt with the sociological objections. I suggest, however, that one thing they would do would be to pay a little more attention to the things of the spirit than is now possible in "this age of strenuous and growing competition." To the so often recurring question, "Why are the churches so empty?" there is one very simple answer—that many people are so exhausted by the fret and strain of this unnecessary competition that on their one full day of rest they desire nothing but amusement or complete rest. I cannot imagine that religion will be worse served in a society where leisure and abundance prevail than it is in the present soulless scramble, where all the higher faculties are sacrificed to the primitive necessity to grab or go under.

[Adapted from the book, "Life And Money. Next week: "Those 'Scientific' Objections to the Leisure State."]

SECOND ANTI-CONSCRIPTION MEETING IN THE COBURG DISTRICT

At a public meeting held in the Progress Hall, West Coburg, on Thursday, February 4, Mr. H. Nicholes referred to the bitter fight, in which he took part, against the "hoopleiers" who tried to impose conscription upon the people during the last war. The Australian people refused to be conscripted then, and there was no evidence to show that they had changed their minds since. The love of freedom was inherent in their nature. In spite of the platform of the Australian Labor Party, which had always been opposed to conscription for overseas, Mr. Curtin had deserted the no-conscription principles which he advocated when a young man. In the speaker's opinion, it would not be long before Mr. Curtin would be sitting with the Opposition.

Mr. E. J. Grogan drew attention to the persistent policy of all Governments, irrespective of the Party which happened to hold temporary office.

Mr. Lovegrove had said at the Trades Hall that if industrial conscription had been imposed upon the people by Mr. Menzies "the roof would have been torn off." It seemed strange that the Labor Party was in office when Sir Otto Neimeyer imposed the Premiers' Plan and the depression upon the people. Even old age pensions were reduced. Mr. Scullin had to do the dirty work. The Labor Party was then removed from office.

To-day, the policy of military and industrial conscription was being imposed upon the people. The Labor Party was again in office. Conscripts were to be compelled to undertake dangerous work. According to Trade Union principles dirty work and dangerous work meant an addition of money to the worker's pay-envelope, yet soldiers were being paid 6/- a day. It should be noted that women would also be conscripted. The policy of Governments was not accidental. An individual or a group of individuals formulated the policy. As reasoning electors we should determine our policy by deciding what WE want, and then see that we get it, through our Member of Parliament. We should not allow someone else to determine our own affairs.

Mr. F. C. Paice said that regimentation and compulsion were the powers intended to be used for post-war reconstruction, when the worker would be ordered to go here or there and do this or that, whether he wanted to or not. He said that, contrary to the expressed will of the people, their representatives in Parliament and in Trades Unions, for reasons best known to themselves, had agreed to a dictator's policy. It had been proposed to set up a Man-Power Commission, and Mr. E. G. Theodore and Mr. E. Thornton (a well-known Communist) had been mentioned as likely members of this Commission. When answer-

ing critics of his (Thornton's) action in urging others to go and fight while he remained behind to urge, Thornton said that some critics would send all the intelligent members of union executives away. What charming modesty! The speaker went on to show the fate of the widows and orphans of soldiers as expected by the R.S.L. in Sydney. This body, together with others, was conducting an "Art Union" to raise money for the purpose of doling out charity to the expected widows and orphans after the war. It was a disgrace to this country if the dependents of the men who are giving their lives for us have to depend on gamblers' charity in order to live. Copies of the "form letter"—which had been drafted to assist electors to write (in their own words) to their member of Parliament, urging him to do his utmost to defeat conscription—were being eagerly enquired for, and, Mr. Paice went on to point out, it was important to send as many as possible to the local M.H.R. (Mr. M. Blackburn). Then, when he rose to speak on this issue in the House, with the written support of thousands of his electors, he would not be a lone voice crying in the wilderness, but would be a power to be very seriously considered.

Mr. F. Carton, the chairman, said further anti-conscription meetings would be held at weekly intervals in various parts of the electorate. The absence of interjections, he said, seemed to indicate that the electors were giving serious thought to this threat to their present and post-war freedom. It was the responsibility of individuals to do what they could to interest others in the pursuit of democratic action to make the people's will supreme through their elected Representatives in Parliament.

[The next meeting was held last night (Thursday, Feb. 11) at the Progress Hall, Merlynston, and further meetings will take place next Thursday (Feb. 18) at the Andalusia Hall, Bell-street, East Coburg, and on Thursday week (Feb. 25), at the N.W. Coburg picture theatre.—Ed.]

THE LADY AND THE DOG

In Sydney there lives a lady who owns a dog. She also owns a husband, but he is "in absentia"—two years ago he took his expert professional knowledge to the Middle East on an A.I.F. captain's pay, instead of waiting to be called up by the A.W.C. as a cook at £21 a week. The lady's only son is also in the Middle East with the A.I.F. Her daughter, a young girl, uses her time for the improvement of the lives of children in a slum area in which poor wharf-labourers cannot afford to bring up their children properly, two-up and s.p. being expensive. The mother of this family adds her quota to the war effort by working every day of the week from 8.30 a.m. to 5.15 p.m. in a Federal department concerned with important and urgent aspects of defence—she works on Saturday mornings, too, not being a State civil servant.

In her leisure she looks after a two-storeyed house, cooks the meals and mothers any stray sailor or soldier boys who happen to need a temporary home.

The only member of the family who lives a reasonably normal life is Bill, the dog. Bill looks like a dilapidated Barcoo ramskin which somebody has flung negligently over a sliprail. What appears, at first, to be two moth holes in his f.o.c'sle, on second glance reveal themselves as famine-stricken eyes. His contribution to the war effort is a bark like the love-call of a sick bull buffalo. He is the sort of dog a lonely woman needs in a browned-out city in which all police are on traffic duty.

Recently, while the offensive in Libya was just beginning, and every mother or

wife with interests in the Middle East was uneasy with foreboding, the shadow of the Law fell across the doorstep of the lady's household. "Where's y' dog license?"

It appeared that, having had one for 11 years, the lady was a month late in paying up.

She paid up next day—the half-crown in a single instalment. Two days later she got her receipt. Several days later she received a notice to appear in a court two or three miles away to answer for the delay.

She telephoned the police—said she was engaged on urgent war work. Police said: "No matter; so are other people." Mightier powers intervened—some higher colleague in the war effort telephoned a C.P.S. The C.P.S. said even the powers of darkness

could not stop the course of events now that the papers were issued.

Sacrificing her own (and the Government's) half-day's work and heaven knows how much morale as well—the Libyan offensive was by now well in being—the lady attended court, ploughed through a forest of new-criminals and found herself before the Beak.

She was entirely surrounded by coppers twice as tall as herself—coppers whom Mr. MacKay will not allow to enlist because they are needed urgently on the Dog License front. One of these bent double to ask for her excuses.

She told of the husband away, of the son fighting, of her work, but the prosecutor summed it up in one heady blast: "Slipped her memory, your Worship. Said the Bench: 'Fifteen and six, or else' — Every cringing memory-slipper knows the testy formula.

That night the lady wrote to the Minister for Justice. She imparted to her letter all the indignation of a spirited woman whose every male relation of military age (and some well over it) are voluntarily in uniform.

And the Minister took action. He sent another policeman!

When last seen this myrmidon was moving sedately down the street creaking under a load of data which he had recorded in a large black notebook—whether house owned by finee, allowance from husband, salary from Government, whether daughter earning . . . the coping-stone, in fact, to several pounds of wasted public time and effort over a half-crown fee, accidentally forgotten and long since paid.

It will be great when the socialist millennium arrives and the whole universe is run on Dog License lines.

—El V. (N.S.W.), in "The Bulletin."

THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS

THE "HIDDEN HAND" AGAIN?

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

Sir,—Notwithstanding the fulsome flattery of the prostitute press, the "selection" by the Federal Government of Dr. H. C. Coombs for the position of Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction is not an occasion for public rejoicing. As pointed out last week, from any of the viewpoints of training, past performances, or the professional company he has been keeping, we can only look forward, under his guidance, to the continuance of conditions involving more blood, more sweat, and more tears. That this is no figment of the imagination may be seen from what follows.

In the first place we are told that "from being a school teacher he achieved fame as an economist." It is fair to ask what sort of fame, and in what circles was he famous? His fame was certainly not known to the 95 per cent, of mothers and fathers who found life a never-ending struggle to make ends meet in a land of plenty. In any case, this achievement of fame on his part took its rise from the period of the so-called depression. Only men of a certain type, with a certain outlook, and having certain ambitions could possibly achieve fame in those days. Men of the other type were either cranks or nonentities, and the "brilliant economists" of the time were employed to talk about "Troughs," "Peaks," "Spirals," "Spots on the Sun," "Extravagant Living," "Inflation," "Deflation," "Repudiation," "Equilibrium," "Confidence"—in fact, about anything except providing means for the people at large to have access to the abundance of goods we were able and anxious to produce. All this was done in order to bring about conditions in which goods were destroyed, production restricted, and more and more of the people forced further and further into poverty, so that community activities could be fitted into a reduced quantity of money, as had been dictated by the Controllers of International Finance. So far as I have been able to ascertain, Mr. Coombs, as he then was, did not fight against this base treachery, but joined in with those responsible for it.

Clearly, therefore, he was a suitable "student" for special "training" in London. He was duly admitted to the London School of Economics, where his "studies" or "researches" were under the "supervision" of Professor T. E. Gregory, who is none other than Theodor Emanuel Guggenheim, one of the men who came to Australia with the infamous Sir Otto Niemeyer. This professor (who was also educated at the London School of Economics as well as at Stuttgart, in Germany), is officially described as "Economic adviser, Niemeyer Mission to Australia and New Zealand, 1930; examiner in the Universities of London, Cambridge,

Oxford, Edinburgh, etc." Excellently placed, you see, to keep his eye on the results of the work of students over a wide area. Mr. Coombs's "supervisor" had thus directly represented international finance in imposing a minimum subsistence level on the Australian people at a time of actual and potential abundance. This imposition was facilitated by the worldwide system of Central Banks, and was said to be necessary "to preserve the financial structure." The financial structure was duly preserved, but thousands and thousands of Australian homes were destroyed in the process. Our new Director-General for Post-War Reconstruction apparently approved of that, and also of the man Guggenheim, who had taken such a prominent part in bringing it about.

In due course, under appropriate "supervision," this brilliant student wrote a thesis on Central Banking, and evidently this was so satisfactory to the powers—that he was awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy for it. His views on Central Banking were apparently of the kind desired by Guggenheim, and so he had then reached the stage when he could safely be put forward as a suitable successor to men like Melville, Mills, Copland and Giblin, all of whom had so well served the international financial gang, but who were rapidly becoming more and more discredited in the eyes of the general public, so many of whom were beginning to find out the facts for themselves.

It was therefore to be expected that upon returning to Australia, this new-found economic genius would be placed under the tutelage of "suitable" men—and who could be more "suitable" than the men who had betrayed us to the bankers in 1931? And so he was taken into the Commonwealth Bank as an Assistant Economist, Melville being the Chief Economist for that institution, and Giblin a member of the Bank Board! On that occasion also it was a case of being specially "selected" for the position. — Yours, etc., BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne. 7/2/43.

(To be continued.)

MOVE TO OUST MR. LANG FROM ALP

Under this heading, the Melbourne "Argus" of Saturday last (February 6) published a report that we feel should be placed on record in these columns. Our readers should be able to provide their own comment. The report reads as follows:

SYDNEY, Friday.—The official A.L.P. executive, by an overwhelming majority, tonight decided to summon Mr. J. T. Lang, former Labour leader, to appear before a special meeting of the disputes committee on Thursday night next to explain articles he had written in his paper, the "Century." Members of the executive alleged to-night that the articles were causing disruption in the party.

It was learnt that a strong move will be made for the expulsion of Mr. Lang from the Official Labour party. Executive officers said to-night that "Mr. Lang was doomed" whether he attended the inquiry or not.

If Mr. Lang is expelled he would be unable to contest the selection ballot for the Reid seat at the next Federal election. He has already announced his intention to oppose the sitting member, Mr. Morgan, in the ballot. If Mr. Lang is excluded from the ballot it is known his supporters will strongly urge him to contest the seat as an Independent Labour candidate. Mr. Lang's supporters have already captured control of the Reid Electorate Council, which is the governing body of the official Labour party in the Reid electorate.

The proposed expulsion of Mr. Lang is expected to precipitate an immediate split in the Official Labour party, and may lead to the formation of a rival Labour party led by Mr. Lang. Mr. Lang has led the fight against the militia proposals of Mr. Curtin, which have been described in his paper as being tantamount to conscription. His supporters have openly organised against the official A.L.P. for the defeat of the proposals. They have submitted demands for a special conference to review the decisions, and have claimed that the majority of the leagues and unions have supported them. The leaders of the official A.L.P. rejected the demand for a special conference, and the tactics of the Lang faction were then to remain within the party with the object of attending the annual State Labour conference in June for the purpose of removing from control of the movement the followers of Mr. Curtin and Mr. McKell, who are now in charge.

The latest move of the executive to expel Mr. Lang may checkmate these plans.

By 22 votes to 11 the executive defeated a motion for the rescission of the previous decision to compel Federal and State politicians, and also candidates for future elections, to sign a pledge of loyalty to the militia proposals of the Prime Minister. The executive decided that all Federal and State Labour politicians must sign the pledge by February 18. Labour leagues and electorate councils have been given until March 31 to support the pledge.

U.E.A. NOTES

The fate of many Parliamentary Bills within recent months indicates a lively interest on the part of electors, and should encourage electoral campaigners to greater efforts. It has been said that the "electoral campaign" has now passed into general use. Judging by the number of bodies that have adopted it, the statement is substantially correct, and represents an important step in the direction of democratic political control. Headquarters has evidence of success in contacting organisations whose members suffer from the tyrannies of socialistic bureaucracy and their appreciation of educating their members to use "pressure politics." Each campaigner can further this policy. One individual, by contacting a radio lecturer, put him in contact with headquarters, and is directly responsible for some excellent propaganda going over the air. So keep on spreading the idea. Continued pressure has literally dragged the "Powers Bill" into public discussion; thus bringing its dangers into the open for the public to see. The overseas Conscription Bill and the Federal Union plot can and should also be forced into the open by discussion and pressure, and thus into oblivion—along with socialistic Marketing Boards. At the moment we are crowded with issues, but there are sections interested in one or the other; so, campaigners should have the correct ammunition for the particular issue and person—it's no use trying to sell the unwanted line when you can harness up an existing interest. Our

A CHANCE MEETING IN A PARK

On a delightful Australian summer's day, Old Sol poured his rays of generous warmth through the trees in the park. Tom Freeman sat and mused upon a garden seat beneath the spreading elm trees. The cretonne-patterned shadows on the ground around him, the green foliage above, the songs of the birds, the gentle breeze, all combined in a godly atmosphere of peace and good-will. What a contrast to the confusion of a torn and blasted outside world!

Tom's musings ended with the leisurely approach of a stranger. "Good-morning, Sir!" said he pleasantly. Tom returned the greeting and moved along the seat. The visitor accepted this friendly gesture and sat down.

As they chatted together it transpired that they were both enjoying a much-needed restful holiday, and, strangely enough, both were keenly interested in social reconstruction programmes—a Christian social order, so to speak. They soon settled down to serious discussion, as both had an hour or more available before lunch.

"What is needed," said the late arrival "is recognition of the just price, to avoid profiteering and usury." Tom Freeman moved closer to his new acquaintance. "Quite right, sir," he cheerfully agreed. "Inflated prices should be unknown." The former continued with confidence. "All these munition workers, airmen, soldiers and sailors must get justice." He emphasised his last word—"justice." During a moment of silence Tom thought of the tyranny of words and whether "justice" could be kept, like silkworms, in a box.

"We must not forget the tinkers and tailors," said Tom gravely. He also thought of beggars, and even of clergymen before he expressed his wider thought. "All individuals—er—want—er—just money, don't they?" said he, feeling his way, "and they don't want abstract—er—red tape, do they?" The visitor seemed to have heard of abstractionism, and answered "NO" reassuringly, but went on to explain the need for a housing scheme to provide for every Australian family.

"You mean a plan directed by some Government authority?" enquired Tom, having in his mind compassionate allowances made by Planners. His informant said such a plan was needed; but Tom said he felt sure that all the individuals mentioned (and unmentioned) could be allowed freedom in their enterprise and in their choice of their own production if the Government would only make provision to enable individuals to acquire the money they needed.

"Of course," responded the Christian student, "we must control credit in the interest of the nation." Tom wondered who this queer student could be. He didn't look like a Jap, who would commit suicide at slight provocation, yet his concept—the interests of the nation—conveyed to Tom an odour of State worship—as in Shintoism. Tom's vista of the bureaucrats' paradise caused him to speak contemptuously. "Interests of Hell," he almost snarled. "Why not distribute the nation's credit to all the individuals, to whom it belongs?" The social orderist had not once mentioned the rights of the individual. "We must have order," he pleaded, "therefore we must have control." "The question is," said Tom, "control by whom? The individuals of the nation, as consumers, could and should control production by the exercise of their demands upon industry, arising from their choice. The individual is the greatest authority on what he wants, isn't he?" pleaded Tom—and he quoted G. K. Chesterton: "The supreme point is not why a man demands a thing, but the fact that he does demand it"—and Tom added, "he should be enabled to back up his demand with money."

The Christian socialist removed his hat and stroked his head. "Surely you do not object to Government authority?" said he. "Certainly not," replied Tom the querulous. "I want Government authority to coincide with the individual's authority." "But don't you think," came the reply, "that we must consider the means to that end? The control of the means of production, the nationalisation of great big units, the establishment of great big co-operatives, the breaking up of great big monopolies, to be replaced by great big industrial councils for the introduction of workers' shares in industry—all in the interests of a bigger and better nation."

"The Big Idea," muttered Tom, as the heat in that windless corner of the park caused him to decentralise his hat to wipe the perspiration from his forehead. "I don't believe," said he, "that it is easier to feed the baby with a long-handled shovel than with a teaspoon." He claimed that the decentralisation of industry into small units to supply the people by free enterprise, stimulated by free money—debt-free money—to allow the individuals of the nation to expand as individuals, should

range of literature covers almost every potential contact—it's up to you to select the correct story and ignite the spark of personal initiative; that's the salesman's job, and YOU are the salesman. So write in immediately and obtain literature supplies from the United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne. We don't mind if you also enclose a donation with your order; rest assured it will be put to good use.

—O. B. Headley, Campaign Director.

suit everyone. He said that the Government is planning to give everyone post-war employment by restricting the use of immense mechanical power to a few great big units in industry, and by "making work"; whereas we could pour out our needs as freely as the currents flow in the ocean, in a free economy—and yet have widespread leisure. "What we are getting," said Tom, "is Socialism—the initial stages of Communism. I don't like it. I hate slavery."

The pair assured each other of their abhorrence of the Slave State, the sun shone brightly, and the discussion went on apace. It was agreed that the home and family life, freedom of religion and unrestricted scope for the individual's cultural development were essential features of a democratic community; that Christianity teaches that it is the right of every individual to exercise his free will in the pursuit of happiness; that a convict might enjoy freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of religion and freedom of speech, but no matter what the convict might think or say, he could not DO much about it without freedom of action. It was agreed that the Pope was right in saying that those who control credit and determine its allotment hold in their hands the very soul of production. Also, that when it came to arranging the peace, there would be no need whatever for any of the Allied nations to surrender their sovereignty.

Finally, after long argument, it was agreed that, as the purpose of politics is to get what we want, the will of the people—the power—must necessarily proceed from the people to their representatives, to be transmitted to Parliament. Furthermore, that a large majority of the electors can be confused and fooled all the time by the use of millions of words about methods, whereas very few people can be fooled some of the time about recognisable results, such as the proper distribution of potatoes and tomatoes. Such results could be arranged even by an "expert" such as Professor Copland, if he were held personally responsible for success or failure in getting results for the people.

The town clock struck twelve. The two debaters arranged to meet again in the park next morning. It was discovered that both of them were readers of the "Catholic Worker." One of them was also a reader of the "New Times." The pair shook hands and set off for their respective guest houses. Tom, on his return, read a maxim hanging on the wall in his guest house, which suggested that "all the world is queer but thee and me—and even thee's a little queer." He copied it for future reference.

—Terence OToole

"Long Live FREEDOM and Damn the ideologies!"

"Long live FREEDOM and damn the ideologies!" That is the slogan of Robinson Jeffers, California poet. It is one of the few slogans that have the touch of eternal truth about them. It could have been used just as truly 2500 years ago in Greece and can be used a thousand years from now, when, no doubt, there will be the same kind of fanatics that have cursed the world today trying to put over on free people their strangling "ideologies." Just what is an "ideology"? It is always something that extends the power of the State or a group of men and that narrows the activities, the thoughts and freedom of speech of the individual. The U.S. Bill of Rights is the supreme example of a piece of anti-ideological writing. So is the Declaration of Independence. So is the Constitution as a whole. So is the Emancipation Proclamation. These documents, like the English Magna Charta, limit the powers of the State, proclaim no "ideological" principle and are based on the biological necessity of freedom.—N.Y. "Journal-American" columnist.

BOOKS TO READ

(Obtainable from the United Electors of Australia, Room 9, 5th Floor, McEwan House, Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.1.)

"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.

LIGHT AND SHADE

A SHORT STORY BY JOHN CLIFFORD.

The big car climbed steadily upwards as it followed the road which followed, like a never-ending scar, around the mountainside. At times, the stout, middle-aged man clutched involuntarily at the handle of the door as the car swept around a sharp bend and appeared to him to be travelling right on out into space. The driver was quite unconcerned, and drove as if he knew every inch of the road. He did. He had been born and bred in the mountains, and, when the State Government decided upon improving the road up the mountain to the Chalet, he had done most of the scooping with his teams.

As the car crossed a concrete culvert over a mountain stream, the stout man asked the driver to stop. The magnificent view from the culvert had caught his eye far below was the valley, looking beautifully green and peaceful, which had been left over half an hour ago.

The numerous paddocks of the different farms, planted with crops and grasses of varying colours, looked like a huge chess board. Away to the north-east, looking a dark purple in the distance, a ragged range of snow-capped mountains stood out in bold relief against the clear sky.

The stout gentleman descended from the car, and, after a momentary hesitation, walked to the railing on the culvert. Although he felt slightly dizzy and his stomach experienced a temporary sinking feeling, he gradually steeled himself to look down. But the sight of the water from the mountain stream tumbling into space made him feel very giddy, and he walked quickly away to what he considered a safer vantage point.

After a few minutes' silence, he said, in a voice of wonder and amazement:

"Gad, what a view! I have never seen anything like this. Just look at the sun shining on those mountains. And smell the air. It makes me feel about ten years younger."

He drew the fresh mountain air into his lungs in short breaths, while continuing to talk in excited tones. He spoke as a man who was used to talking and being agreed with. The driver listened "with a slightly bored look on his face. He had driven thousands of tourists up this road, and he had heard the same phrases uttered time and time again. The scenery he took for granted. He had looked at it hundreds of times while working on the road. The months of hard work had been the means to an end; to earn sufficient money to get out of debt, to pay a deposit on a car and start a tourist service. He had grown a little bitter and cynical.

"I suppose it all appears rather marvelous to you people from the city."

The stout man looked surprised: "Why, man, I've been all over Australia, and I have never seen anything like this. I must bring the wife and daughter up some time. Surely you must find it a great life living up here all the time?"

"Well, I don't know. Although I suppose the scenery is beautiful. You see, I have never done much travelling. Too busy making a living." In a sudden burst of talk the driver continued:

"Do you know, I was reading a very interesting article the other day by a chap who said that one can never really appreciate anything unless one has seen it contrasted with what it isn't." Noticing the slightly puzzled look on his passenger's face, he continued hurriedly: "I am not very good at making myself clear. But this writer was dealing with the wonders of London. He said that the only people

who never really appreciate London are the people who have lived there all their lives and the people who have never visited it."

"But surely the people who have lived there all their lives would understand it better than anyone?"

"No; this writer pointed out how they have lived there for so long that they take everything for granted. They have never seen anything else to compare it with."

"H'm, that's very interesting—well, let's drive on." The car moved off on its climb. The tourist was silent for a few minutes as he looked at the scenery. He cast one or two quick glances sideways at his driver, as if attempting to sum him up.

Then, "You do quite a bit of reading and thinking?"

"No, not a great amount. Mostly rubbish that the papers give us now. Full of our Cabinet Ministers and others continually talking about liberty and sacrifice. What do they know about these things?" Ignoring the fact that his passenger had stiffened in his seat, he continued: "Take liberty. We are fighting a war against tyranny, and yet we are losing more of our liberties every day. Government by regulation instead of government by responsible representatives of the people. Of course, I may be rather cynical, but I think that the totalitarian countries have done us at least one good turn. We have always taken liberty for granted. We didn't really understand what it meant until they showed us what it wasn't. They provided us with contrast. That writer I mentioned had the right idea. We must have positives and negatives. We cannot have shade unless we have light. The people of this country, who are now starting to realise how precious their liberties are, may soon tell these bureaucrats and professional politicians that they are not fighting Hitlerism overseas in order to establish it in their own country."

His passenger remained silent for a moment while his face looked flushed and angry. His voice was strained:

"Turn round here," he snapped, "I don't feel like going any further." Looking slightly puzzled, the driver did so. And he said no more. He couldn't afford to argue with his livelihood.

The following day, the stout gentleman, sitting in the comfort of his Melbourne home, was telling his wife and daughter in rapturous tones about his brief trip to the mountains. "The only fault I found was the arrogance of my driver. Some country yokel who drivelled about contrasts or something. Some of these people want putting in their place. They irritate me."

His wife said in a soothing tone: "Never mind, my dear, you look much better for your trip. We will all go there after your coming Parliamentary session."

soldier wants, the reward for his sacrifice—financial security. He won't have any trouble in finding work, but he will have some trouble in finding an income.

SOCIALISTIC SOBS: The "Labour Call" of February 4 reports Mr. J. Brown, of the Railways Union (one closely connected with our socialised profiteering concerns) as lamenting the fact that "the fight for socialism would be hard." He further laments the existence of a middle section of voters, not afflicted with the "Party" virus, who object strongly to being bossed about by their political servants and Union would-be dictators infected with alien socialistic bacteria.

BOLSHEVIK BOGEY: German propaganda is reported to be playing up the "Bolshevik" terror as hard as possible, while Russia plays the "Fascist" abstraction with equal force. A peculiar point about both propaganda teams is their avoidance of the more descriptive term, "Socialism," which although another abstraction, is more generally understood. There seems to be mutual agreement that no odium shall descend on the Socialist label, whether it be National Socialist or the other sort. Maybe this is because it has the blessing of the inter-national bankers. Abstract bogies appear to be valued in all countries—the "democracies" strongly favouring "inflation", which is being played up with particular gusto at too moment.

CHILDREN'S CAKE: A pamphlet entitled "Care of the Children" gives the following sound advice for protecting children from the horrors of war: Adults should be careful how they discuss war news in the presence of children, and news-broadcast should not be turned on too loudly. (Judging by the conflicting war news presented by newsmongers and radio announcers this is excellent advice for children—and adults also.)

—O.B.H.

THE "NEW ENGLISH WEEKLY" AND SOCIAL CREDIT

The "New English Weekly" for August 20, contained an editorial note to a letter signed "John Hargrave." A strongly worded letter of protest to the Editor of the "New English Weekly" from Major Douglas alleged grave inaccuracies, damaging to "The Social Creditor," embodied in the note, and invited the Editor of the "New English Weekly" to publish a retraction of his own composition. Reasonable time having been given for consideration of the propriety of the course suggested and action in the light of it, which did not ensue, "The Social Creditor" deemed it expedient to publish the following commentary on November 7:—

It is not, as our readers will testify, the habit of the management of this journal to waste much time, or space, in attending to attacks upon it. It is desirable, therefore, to explain why, mainly for the benefit of overseas readers, an exception has been made in the case of the "New English Weekly" which was dealt with in the letter from Major Douglas to the Editor of that review. In order to understand our objection to the attitude criticised, it is necessary to recall, as briefly as possible, the main lines of the development of the Social Credit movement.

The origin of this was purely technical. Major Douglas is not, never has been, and certainly never will be, a propounder of Utopias, e.g., a Socialist of any variety. His belief is that society is an organic structure, and that what you can do is conditioned by what you have done. The implications of this conception, of course, go far beyond what is commonly understood as technics.

Certain investigations, quite familiar to those who are interested in them, convinced him firstly, that there was a radical defect in the money system, and secondly, that almost every identifiable injustice and weakness of both the economic and social systems was connected with this defect, sometimes directly, sometimes obscurely. At a later date he became convinced that the rectification of this defect was not desired, and would be opposed by every possible means available to International Finance.

After publishing certain technical articles in various technical journals bearing on the subject, he submitted, in the ordinary way, an article entitled "The Delusion of Super-Production," to Austin Harrison, the Editor of "The English Review." Austin Harrison was a courageous man with a strong journalistic sense, but with no reformist leanings whatever.

This article was printed in "The English Review," and paid for. It immediately attracted wide and influential attention, and, as a result, Mr. Harrison printed, and paid for at unusually high rates, a series of articles which were, for the most part, modified extracts from "Economic Democracy" which was then in preparation.

The ideas embodied in these articles were receiving a good deal of attention many months before Major Douglas had even seen a copy of the "New Age," but a favourable and highly intelligent comment on them by Mr. A. R. Orage was sent to him early in 1919, and, as a result of a number of meetings, they became the basis of a more or less organised propaganda, with the "New Age," as conducted by Orage, as its recognised organ.

It is important to recognise that the "New Age" had been a Socialist organ of fairly standardised type, and had a small, and at that time, dwindling, public of what is described by Sir Ernest Benn as the Pink variety. It is equally important to realise that this was, so far as Social Credit was concerned, purely fortuitous, and probably unfortunate. It was Orage, and not his Guild Socialist following, which made the "New Age" of value—an incontestable fact evidenced by the immediate repudiation of Social Credit by the more prominent Guild Socialists, such as G. D. H. Cole, S. G. Hobson, and A. J. Pent. y.

But, equally incontestably, in our opinion, it is this pre-Social Credit "New Age," and its following, of which the "New English Weekly" may legitimately be said to be a somewhat unimpressive descendant.

Now, it is a fact that there have been, and are, groups of people all over the world of the general type associated with the Guild-Socialist "New Age" who "took over" the vocabulary of Social Credit. Without exception, in every case with which we are acquainted, they have been a disruptive element.

No proposal for action has met with their approval. For instance, in Alberta the "New Age" group fought the Social Credit Government while professing Social Credit principles. Being unsuccessful, they have become Communists, thus again confirming the phrase that "the Pink is the best friend of the Red."

The root cause of this is simple—"Pinkism" is Parlour Planning. It is only interested in Large Schemes in which Superior People sit in offices and issue orders without responsibility. While none of them are likely to have read Marshal Foch, the Limited Objective is too dull, anyway, and actually doing something interferes with "co-ordinating," i.e., giving orders.

To put the matter shortly, the "New English Weekly" is a Socialist organ. The essential nature of Socialism is entirely independent of its particular theory—it is a manifestation of the Power complex which seizes on "Society" as a convenient organ through which to exercise rule. Socialism is therefore fundamentally anti-pathetic to Social Credit, which is a policy of placing the Group (e.g., Society) for ever and for always at the disposal of the individual;

not some individuals, but all individuals.

The Editor of the "New English Weekly" replied to Major Douglas's letter by an offer to print a reply to the attack on "The Social Creditor." We hope we have made it clear that it is not the form of the attack, which we are well content to leave to the judgment of anyone who is interested, but the fact that the attack proceeds from an irreconcilable tradition and mentality, which is of importance.

ILL-INFORMED CRITICISM...

(Continued from page 1.)

taken during the First World War went against such conscription proposals, and there is no evidence that there has been a definite change of opinion since then. (We hope that you believe in self-government for Australia and democracy, and will therefore agree that overseas service is a matter for Australians to decide for themselves: if not individually, at least by referendum. There are many, of course, who contend, as this paper does, that it should be a matter for individual decision.) Of course, dear Senator, in Australia we have our share of people who seem to believe in compulsion for compulsion's sake. (We suppose you have some people like that in your country, too?) Also, the political Parties here are indulging in a little skirmishing on the conscription issue. But reports of that are misleading. Truth is the first casualty in such wordy warfare, as you probably know from your own political experience. Without conscription for overseas service, Australia's general military set-up, since more than two years before Pearl Harbour, and as rapidly as bankers and bureaucrats would allow, has been shaking down into the only logical final form. We would describe that form very briefly as follows: All eligible men (other than conscientious objectors, etc.) who can possibly be spared from essential production, divided into TWO main armed forces. Firstly, fighting units of all kinds, confined to Australian territories and waters, and sufficiently large, in the event of enemy out-flanking forces attacking our shores, to give all possible protection to our womenfolk and our children (who, strange as it may seem to you, like actual immunity from Japs better than "global strategy") and all possible protection to our workers, who, with our factories and our farms, provide the very basis without which our war-effort would collapse. Secondly, the balance, however large or small, of our fighting men, in volunteer units of any or all kinds, to serve wherever required — at home or abroad.

Had you, dear Senator, not been under the wrong impression that Australian laws have prevented any Australian troops from being sent overseas, you could, therefore, have believed that newspaper over there, if it told you, about those deeds of valour already done in "neighbouring territory" and overseas by Australian soldiers. Consequently, you would have avoided your first omission. You would then have said no less than this, inter alia: "Considering that our army, navy, and marines have been fighting the Japanese in neighbouring territory and defending the Australian continent from invasion—as Australian soldiers, sailors and airmen have been doing so valiantly for so long. . . ."

On second thoughts, we realise that had you been in a position to repair those two omissions, in the draft of your broadcast, you would have cut out the whole section quoted by the Melbourne "Argus"—because, in its corrected form, it would have been nonsensical impudence.

Before we conclude this letter, let us tell you what Lowell Thomas, your well-informed compatriot, said in a recent broadcast from New York. These were HIS words: "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. 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."

We Australians welcome help, even in the form of criticism, from friends in U.S.A. But after all, particularly in view of what your own Lowell Thomas points out, perhaps you, a non-combatant, could do more good, Senator dear, by concentrating ALL your attention on further improving the big war-effort of your OWN country. We guess Australians might still manage to go on pulling their weight.

—Yours faithfully, "The New Times."

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

deeply concerned with the persistent rise in living costs, and that they realise that official statistics do not give a true picture because they do not take into account lowering of quality, particularly that of clothing, footwear and household appliances. They have not yet realised that increased wages must automatically be charged into prices, and that price-fixing without quality-fixing can be almost worthless. However, if they keep on thinking along these lines, they may soon realise that "consumer-bounties," direct from the Treasury, free of debt and interest, would overcome their real difficulty.

JOURNALISTIC JUNK: Now that the heavily-splashed ink describing the Churchill-Roosevelt Casablanca Conference has dried, the result ensuing therefrom, according to the Melbourne "Herald" scribe, is: "The immediate formation of a supreme Allied War Council with Britain, America, Russia and China." That sounds pretty good, but a few lines further down in the same article we read this: "There is virtually no likelihood of Russia entering a four-Power council as long as Russia and Japan are not at war." Readers of the "Herald" will certainly need some headache tablets to work that out.

DISCHARGED DIGGERS: Evidence of the Bankers' New Order is to be seen in the fact that large numbers of unfit men are now being discharged with pensions as meagre as those doled out after the 1914-18 war. Many protests have been made, but the bankers still dominate the financial hand-outs irrespective of political parties the latest development is the appointment of "Rehabilitation Officers," who will give sympathetic guidance to discharged men on their problems—particularly in finding work. These officers will be empowered to dole out advice only, NOT what the